

Appendix 1: MEAA Code of Ethics for Australian Journalists

A: Current version of code (1997-)

(available from Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance (AJA subsection) website at <http://www.alliance.org.au/hot/ethicscode.htm>)

Respect for truth and the public's right to information are fundamental principles of journalism. Journalists describe society to itself. They convey information, ideas and opinions, a privileged role. They search, disclose, record, question, entertain, suggest and remember. They inform citizens and animate democracy. They give a practical form to freedom of expression. Many journalists work in private enterprise, but all have these public responsibilities. They scrutinise power, but also exercise it, and should be accountable. Accountability engenders trust. Without trust, journalists do not fulfil their public responsibilities. MEAA members engaged in journalism commit themselves to

- Honesty
 - Fairness
 - Independence
 - Respect for the rights of others
- 1 Report and interpret honestly, striving for accuracy, fairness and disclosure of all essential facts. Do not suppress relevant available facts, or give distorting emphasis. Do your utmost to give a fair opportunity for reply.
 - 2 Do not place unnecessary emphasis on personal characteristics, including race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual orientation, family relationships, religious belief, or physical or intellectual disability.
 - 3 Aim to attribute information to its source. Where a source seeks anonymity, do not agree without first considering the source's motives and any alternative attributable source. Where confidences are accepted, respect them in all circumstances.
 - 4 Do not allow personal interest, or any belief, commitment, payment, gift or benefit, to undermine your accuracy, fairness or independence.
 - 5 Disclose conflicts of interest that affect, or could be seen to affect, the accuracy, fairness or independence of your journalism. Do not improperly use a journalistic position for personal gain.
 - 6 Do not allow advertising or other commercial considerations to undermine accuracy, fairness or independence.
 - 7 Do your utmost to ensure disclosure of any direct or indirect payment made for interviews, pictures, information or stories.
 - 8 Use fair, responsible and honest means to obtain material. Identify yourself and your employer before obtaining any interview for publication or broadcast. Never exploit a person's vulnerability or ignorance of media practice.
 - 9 Present pictures and sound which are true and accurate. Any manipulation likely to mislead should be disclosed.
 - 10 Do not plagiarise.
 - 11 Respect private grief and personal privacy. Journalists have the right to resist compulsion to intrude.
 - 12 Do your utmost to achieve fair correction of errors.

Guidance Clause

Basic values often need interpretation and sometimes come into conflict. Ethical journalism requires conscientious decision-making in context. Only substantial advancement of the public interest or risk of substantial harm to people allows any standard to be overridden.

B: Previous version of code (1984-1997) as published in the MEAA publication, *Ethics in Journalism*, Melbourne University Press, 1997

Respect for truth and the public's right to information are overriding principles for all journalists. In pursuance of these principles journalists commit themselves to ethical and professional standards. All members of the Australian Journalists Association section engaged in gathering, transmitting, disseminating and commenting on news and information shall observe the following code of ethics in their professional activities. They acknowledge the jurisdiction of the professional colleagues in the AJA judiciary committee to adjudicate on issues connected with this code.

- 1 They shall report and interpret the news with scrupulous honesty by striving to disclose all essential facts and by not suppressing relevant, available facts or by distorting by wrong or improper emphasis.
- 2 They shall not place unnecessary emphasis on gender, race, sexual preference, religious belief, marital status or physical or mental disability.
- 3 In all circumstances they shall respect all confidences received in the course of their calling.
- 4 They shall not allow personal interests to influence them in the course of their professional duties.
- 5 They shall not allow their professional duties to be influenced by any consideration, gift or advantage offered and, where appropriate, shall disclose any such offer.
- 6 They shall not allow advertising or commercial considerations to influence them in their professional duties.
- 7 They shall use fair and honest means to obtain news, pictures, films, tapes and documents.
- 8 They shall identify themselves and their employers before obtaining any interview for publication or broadcast.
- 9 They shall respect private grief and personal privacy and shall have the right to resist compulsion to intrude on them.
- 10 They shall do their utmost to correct any published or broadcast information found to be harmfully inaccurate.

Appendix 2: Relevant sections of industry codes of practice for Australian broadcast news media

This appendix contains sections from five separate codes of practice which currently apply to broadcast news media services in Australia:

- A: Commercial Television Code of Practice** (Section 4: News and Current Affairs Programs)
- B: Commercial Radio Code of Practice 2** (News and Current Affairs Programs)
- C: ABC Code of Practice** (Item 4: News, Current Affairs and Information Programs - for television and radio)
- D: SBS Code of Practice - July, 1999** (Item 2.4: News and Current Affairs - for television and radio)
- E: Pay TV Code of Practice** (Item 2.2: News and Current Affairs Programs)

A: Commercial Television Code of Practice (Section 4: News and Current Affairs Programs)

Published by the Australian Broadcasting Authority

(available at <http://www.aba.gov.au/tv/content/codes/commercial/index>)

Objectives

- 4.1 This Section is intended to ensure that
 - 4.1.1 news and current affairs programs are presented accurately and fairly;
 - 4.1.2 news and current affairs programs are presented with care, having regard to the likely composition of the viewing audience and, in particular, the presence of children;
 - 4.1.3 news and current affairs programs take account of personal privacy and of cultural differences in the community;
 - 4.1.4 news is presented impartially.

Scope of the Code

- 4.2 Except where otherwise indicated, this Section applies to news programs, news flashes, news updates and current affairs programs. A “current affairs program” means a program focussing on social, economic or political issues of current relevance to the community.

News and Current Affairs Programs

- 4.3 In broadcasting news and current affairs programs, licensees:
 - 4.3.1 must present factual material accurately and represent viewpoints fairly, having regard to the circumstances at the time of preparing and broadcasting the program;
 - 4.3.2 must not present material in a manner which creates public panic;
 - 4.3.3 should have appropriate regard to the feelings of relatives and viewers when including images of dead or seriously wounded people. Images of that kind which may seriously distress or seriously offend a substantial number of viewers should be displayed only when there is an identifiable public interest for doing so;
 - 4.3.4 must provide the warnings required by Clauses 2.8 and 2.30 of this Code when there is an identifiable public interest reason for selecting and broadcasting visual and/or aural material which may seriously distress or seriously offend a substantial number of viewers;
 - 4.3.5 must not use material relating to a person’s personal or private affairs, or which invades an individual’s privacy, other than where there is an identifiable public interest reason for the material to be broadcast;

- 4.3.6 must exercise sensitivity in broadcasting images of or interviews with bereaved relatives and survivors or witnesses of traumatic incidents;
 - 4.3.7 should avoid unfairly identifying a single person or business when commenting on the behaviour of a group of persons or businesses;
 - 4.3.8 must take all reasonable steps to ensure that murder and accident victims are not identified directly or, where practicable, indirectly before their immediate families are notified by the authorities;
 - 4.3.9 should broadcast reports of suicide or attempted suicide only where there is an identifiable public interest reason to do so, and should exclude any detailed description of the method used. The report must be straightforward, and must not include graphic details or images, or glamourise suicide in any way;
 - 4.3.10 must not portray any person or group of persons in a negative light by placing gratuitous emphasis on race, colour, gender, national or ethnic origin, physical or mental disability, race, religion or sexual preference. Nevertheless, where it is in the public interest, licensees may report events and broadcast comments in which such matters are raised;
 - 4.3.11 must make reasonable efforts to correct significant errors of fact at the earliest opportunity.
- 4.4 In broadcasting news programs (including news flashes) licensees:
- 4.4.1 must present news fairly and impartially;
 - 4.4.2 must clearly distinguish the reporting of factual material from commentary and analysis.
- 4.5 In broadcasting a promotion for a news or current affairs program, a licensee must present factual material accurately and represent featured viewpoints fairly, having regard to the circumstances at the time of preparing and broadcasting the program promotion, and its brevity. A licensee is not required by this clause to portray all aspects or themes of a program or program segment in a program promotion, or to represent all viewpoints contained in the program or program segment.

**B: Commercial Radio Code of Practice 2
(News and Current Affairs Programs)**

Published by the Australian Broadcasting Authority

(available at <http://www.aba.gov.au/radio/content/codes/commercial> as a .pdf file)

Purpose: The purpose of this Code is to promote accuracy and fairness in news and current affairs programs.

2.1 News programs (including news flashes) broadcast by a licensee must:

- (a) present news accurately;
- (b) not present news in such a way as to create public panic, or unnecessary distress to listeners;
- (c) distinguish news from comment.

2.2 In the preparation and presentation of current affairs programs, a licensee must ensure that:

- (a) factual material is presented accurately and that reasonable efforts are made to correct substantial errors of fact at the earliest possible opportunity;
- (b) the reporting of factual material is clearly distinguishable from commentary and analysis;
- (c) reasonable efforts are made or reasonable opportunities are given to present significant viewpoints when dealing with controversial issues of public importance, either within the same program or similar programs, while the issue has immediate relevance to the community;
- (d) viewpoints are not misrepresented, and material is not presented in a misleading manner by giving wrong or improper emphasis, by editing out of context, or by withholding relevant available facts;
- (e) respect is given to each person's legitimate right to protection from unjustified use of material which is obtained without an individual's consent or other unwarranted and intrusive invasions of privacy.

C: ABC Code of Practice

(Item 4: News, Current Affairs and Information Programs - for television and radio)

Published by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation

(available at <http://www.abc.net.au/corp/codeprac.htm#news>)

4.1 News, Current Affairs and Information Programs. In programs produced by ABC News and Current Affairs Departments and information programs:

- (a) Every reasonable effort must be made to ensure that the factual content of programs is accurate. Demonstrable errors will be corrected in a timely manner and in a form most suited to the circumstances.
- (b) Editorial staff will not be obliged to disclose confidential sources which they are entitled to protect at all times.
- (c) Re-enactments of events will be clearly identified as such and presented in a way which will not mislead audiences.
- (d) If reported at all, suicides will be reported in moderate terms and will usually avoid details of method.
- (e) Sensitivity will be exercised in broadcasting images of interviews with bereaved relatives and survivors or witnesses of traumatic incidents.

4.2 News and Current Affairs Programs. Every reasonable effort must be made to ensure that the content of programs (sic) produced by ABC News and Current Affairs Departments is:

- (a) impartial: impartiality does not require editorial staff to be unquestioning; nor should all sides of an issue be devoted the same amount of time.
- (b) balanced: balance will be sought through the presentation, as far as possible, of principal relevant viewpoints on matters of importance. The requirement may not always be reached within a single program or news bulletin, but will be achieved within a reasonable period.

4.3 News Flashes. Care will be exercised in the selection of sounds and images and consideration given to the likely composition of the audience.

4.4 News Updates and News Promotions. News updates and news promotions will not appear during obviously inappropriate programs, especially programs directed at young children. Due to their repetitive nature, there will be very little violent material included in them, and none at all in the late afternoon and early evening.

D: SBS Code of Practice - July, 1999
(Item 2.4: News and Current Affairs - for television and radio)

Published by the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS)

(available via <http://www.sbs.com.au/code.html> as a .pdf download)

2.4.1 Introduction

Section 10(1)(c) of the SBS Act makes it a duty of the SBS Board to “... ensure by means of the SBS’s programming policies, that the gathering and presentation by the SBS of news and information is accurate and is balanced over time and across the schedule of programs broadcast.”

SBS believes in the right of the audience to make up its own mind after a fair, objective, balanced and professional presentation of the issues. SBS provides a forum for views on important issues to be communicated to audiences and will seek to present the widest range of opinion over time.

From time to time, SBS issues guidelines to assist broadcasters and journalists, particularly in handling controversial issues which could create tensions within the community. SBS journalists are also encouraged to work to the Code of Ethics of the Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance.

Accuracy has the highest priority and SBS will take all reasonable steps to ensure timely acknowledgment and correction of any errors of fact.

SBS avoids sensationalised and exaggerated treatment of issues and events. In covering murders, accidents, funerals, suicides and disasters, SBS expects its program makers to exercise great sensitivity, particularly when approaching, interviewing and portraying people who are distressed. SBS will report suicides only when such reporting is in the public interest. Any reporting of suicide will be in moderate terms, usually avoiding the details of method.

SBS has a policy of self-identification (see Code 2.3 above) and does not arbitrate on the validity of territorial claims.

2.4.2 Non-SBS Sources for News and Current Affairs Programming

SBS draws on many sources for its Television and Radio news and current affairs programming. Sources include domestic and overseas stringers [contributors], international news agencies, national news services, services available on the Internet, newspapers, and journals.

SBS journalists and producers are expected to draw on their specialised knowledge of homeland affairs to judge the news value and reliability of stories from outside sources.

All journalists and contributors gathering, processing or presenting news for SBS are required to observe the SBS Code of Practice.

2.4.3 Overseas Television News and Current Affairs Programs

SBS Television also broadcasts, substantially unedited, news and current affairs programs from other countries. Much of the material is in non-English languages and un-subtitled. In selecting such programming, SBS endeavours to ensure a level of quality which is appropriate to the SBS schedule. These programs are drawn from a variety of overseas sources – government, commercial and public – and will often be produced and interpreted from particular editorial perspectives. Prior to broadcast, SBS will clearly identify the source of the programs so that audiences can exercise their own judgements about the way issues and information are presented.

2.4.4 Violence in News and Current Affairs

The decision whether to broadcast certain pictures or sounds which portray violence is based on the normal judgement of their newsworthiness and reporting value, together with a proper regard for the reasonable susceptibilities of audiences to the detail of what is broadcast. SBS does not sensationalise violent events, nor present them for their own sake. Some news

segments require an announcement, before they begin, that the material may be distressing to some viewers.

Because the timing and content of newsflashes are completely unpredictable, particular care is exercised in the selection of sounds and images, and consideration given to the likely composition of the audience.

News updates and news promotions which portray elements of violence are not scheduled during obviously inappropriate programs, especially programs directed at young children.

**E: Pay TV Code of Practice
(Item 2.2 News and Current Affairs Programs)**

(available at http://www.aba.gov.au/tv/content/codes/payTV/paytv_code1.htm#prog)

(2.2) News and Current Affairs Programs

News and current affairs programs, including news updates, broadcast by Licensees must:

1. present news accurately, fairly and impartially;
2. clearly distinguish the reporting of factual matter from commentary, analysis or simulations;
3. not simulate news or events in a way that misleads or alarms the audience;

In broadcasting news and current affairs programs to the extent practicable licensees:

1. must not present material in a manner which creates public panic;
2. must display sensitivity in broadcasting images of, or interviews with, bereaved relatives and survivors or witnesses of traumatic incidents;

In broadcasting news and current affairs programs licensees must not use material relating to a person's personal or private affairs, or which invades an individual's privacy, other than where there are identifiable public interest reasons for the material to be broadcast.

Note: The question of intrusion into private domains, such as bereavement or personal tragedy, is one of real difficulty for all providers of news and current affairs programs. It is a matter of balance between what should be reported in the interests of the general public and what, if reported, would cause an individual or group of individuals unnecessary anguish.

(2.3) Program Promotions and News Updates

Licensees will have particular regard to the need to protect children from unsuitable material in program promotions, news updates and news promotions.

The content of program promotions, news updates and news promotions will be consistent with the classification of the programs during which updates or promotions appear and will, where relevant, include classification information about the program being promoted, (see Part 3 of these Codes).

The content of news updates and news promotions will be consistent with the classification of the programs during which updates or promotions appear.

Program promotions or station promotions must be readily distinguishable from program material.

Appendix 3: Australian Press Council Statement of Principles

(available at <http://www.presscouncil.org.au>)

To help the public and the press, the Australian Press Council has laid down the broad principles to which it is committed.

First, the freedom of the press to publish is the freedom of the people to be informed. This is the justification for upholding press freedom as an essential feature of a democratic society. This freedom, won in centuries of struggle against political and commercial interests, includes the right of a newspaper to publish what it reasonably considers to be news, without fear or favour, and the right to comment fairly upon it.

Second, the freedom of the press is important more because of the obligation it entails towards the people than because of the rights it gives to the press. Freedom of the press carries with it an equivalent responsibility to the public. Liberty does not mean licence. Thus, in dealing with complaints, the Council will give first and dominant consideration to what it perceives to be in the public interest.

The Council does not lay down rules by which publications should govern themselves. However, in considering complaints, the Council will have regard for these general principles.

1. Newspapers and magazines (“publications”) should not publish what they know or could reasonably be expected to know is false, or fail to take reasonable steps to check the accuracy of what they report.
2. A publication should make amends for publishing information that is found to be harmfully inaccurate by printing, promptly and with appropriate prominence, such retraction, correction, explanation or apology as will neutralise the damage so far as possible.
3. Readers of publications are entitled to have news and comment presented to them honestly and fairly, and with respect for the privacy and sensibilities of individuals. However, the right to privacy should not prevent publication of matters of public record or obvious or significant public interest. Rumour and unconfirmed reports, if published at all, should be identified as such.
4. News obtained by dishonest or unfair means, or the publication of which would involve a breach of confidence, should not be published unless there is an over-riding public interest.
5. A publication is justified in strongly advocating its own views on controversial topics provided that it treats its readers fairly by
 - making fact and opinion clearly distinguishable;
 - not misrepresenting or suppressing relevant facts;
 - not distorting the facts in text, headlines, pictures, billboards or posters;
 - disclosing any commercial or other interest which might be construed as influencing the publication’s presentation of news or opinion;
6. A publication has a wide discretion in matters of taste, but this does not justify lapses of taste so repugnant as to be extremely offensive to its readership;
7. Publications should not place any gratuitous emphasis on the race, religion, nationality, colour, country of origin, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, disability, illness, or age of an individual or group. Nevertheless, where it is relevant and in the public interest, publications may report and express opinions in these areas.
8. Where individuals or groups are singled out for criticism, the publication should ensure fairness and balance in the original article. Failing that, it should provide a reasonable and swift opportunity for a balancing response in the appropriate section of the publication.
9. Where the Council issues an adjudication, the publication concerned should prominently print the adjudication.

The Council strives to ensure that its adjudications on complaints reflect both the conscience of the press and the legitimate expectations of the public.

October 1996

Appendix 4: Diagnostic Criteria for PTSD

Source: American Psychiatric Association (1994), *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (4th Edition), Washington DC

- A: The person has been exposed to a traumatic event in which both of the following were present:**
- (1) the person experienced, witnessed, or was confronted with an event or events that involved actual or threatened death or serious injury, or a threat to the physical integrity of self or others
 - (2) the person's response involved intense fear, helplessness, or horror
Note: In children, this may be expressed instead by disorganized or agitated behavior.
- B: The traumatic event is persistently re-experienced in one (or more) of the following ways:**
- (1) recurrent and intrusive distressing recollections of the event, including images, thoughts, or perceptions
Note: In young children, repetitive play may occur in which themes or aspects of the trauma are expressed.
 - (2) recurrent distressing dreams of the event
Note: In children, there may be frightening dreams without recognizable content.
 - (3) acting or feeling as if the traumatic event was recurring (includes a sense of reliving the experience, illusions, hallucinations, and dissociative flashback episodes, including those that occur on awakening or when intoxicated)
Note: In young children, trauma-specific reenactment may occur.
 - (4) intense psychological distress at exposure to internal or external cues that symbolize or resemble an aspect of the traumatic event
 - (5) physiological reactivity on exposure to internal or external cues that symbolize or resemble an aspect of the traumatic event
- C: Persistent avoidance of stimuli associated with the trauma and numbing of general responsiveness (not present before the trauma), as indicated by three (or more) of the following:**
- (1) efforts to avoid thoughts, feelings, or conversations associated with the trauma
 - (2) efforts to avoid activities, places, or people that arouse recollections of the trauma
 - (3) inability to recall an important aspect of the trauma
 - (4) markedly diminished interest or participation in significant activities
 - (5) feeling of detachment or estrangement from others
 - (6) restricted range of affect (e.g., unable to have loving feelings)
 - (7) sense of a foreshortened future (e.g., does not expect to have a career, marriage, children, or a normal life span)
- D: Persistent symptoms of increased arousal (not present before the trauma), as indicated by two (or more) of the following:**
- (1) difficulty falling or staying asleep
 - (2) irritability or outbursts of anger
 - (3) difficulty concentrating
 - (4) hypervigilance
 - (5) exaggerated startle response
- E: Duration of the disturbance (symptoms in B, C, and D) is more than one month**
- F: The disturbance causes clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning.**

Appendix 5: Copy of fieldwork questionnaire

AT22 MASTER OF ARTS

FIELDWORK

VSTE

INTERVIEW NUMBER 0

Researcher:	Trina McLellan
Organisation:	QUT School of Media & Journalism
Principal supervisor:	Cratis Hippocrates
Associate supervisor:	Lee Duffield
Date:	October, 1999

B. PARTICIPANT HEALTH PROFILE

b1. General physical health

How would you describe the state of your general physical health?

prior to this event

very good generally good some problems _____ poor

since this event

very good generally good some problems _____ poor

b2. Current treatment status

Are you being treated for any of the following (or any other) serious illness or condition?

- anxiety, traumatic stress or other nervous condition
- a mental health disorder
- hypertension, stroke or heart disease
- epilepsy
- diabetes

b3. General mental health

How would you describe the state of your general mental health?

prior to this event

very good generally good some problems _____ poor #

since this event

very good generally good some problems _____ poor #

b.4 Post-event symptomology

Have you experienced any of the following symptoms since this event occurred?

Possible symptoms	When last experienced
0 any	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
3/3+	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
2/2+	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____
0	_____

1

(c) Looking back now, what would you say were the three or four key things that caused you most concern or distress at the time?

(d) What about since that time?

(e) What sorts of words or actions could have lessened the impact of any of these things?

c2. Duration participant spent at site of event

(a) Were you at the site of this event when it occurred? yes no ... go to (d)

(b) (If yes) How many hours were you at the site on that day? _____ hours

(c) Did you receive any form of debriefing and, if so, from whom? no yes _____

(d) Have you spent time at the site of this event since it occurred? yes no

D. PARTICIPANT MEDIA EXPOSURE**d1. Degree of contact with media prior to event**

How often had you had contact with news reporters, photographers or television camera operators before this event?

never rarely occasionally frequently worked in/with media

d2. Prior rating of media

How would you have rated media, as a whole, prior to this event?

rather highly
 moderately well
 neutral
 moderately poorly
 rather poorly

d3. Commencement of media interest

When did you or your family first notice media interest in what happened to you?

. Nature of contact with media during this event

(a) *How often did you or your family have contact with news reporters, photographers or television camera operators during this event?*

never ... go to d5 rarely occasionally frequently worked in/with media

(b) *Which forms of media did you encounter during this event?*

print media radio news radio programs
 tv news tv current affairs wire services international news service

(c) *Was any contact with the media during this event*

face-to-face? telephone/mobile? via facilitator (e.g., police, clergy)?

other? _____

(d) *About how many interviews did you or your family give to the media at the time of this event?*

none ... go to d5 _____ (approx. number)

(e) *Where did any interviews you had with the media take place during this event?*

home work family's/friend's place at/near site in a studio/newsroom

other _____

(f) *Where did the media you dealt with come from?*

local State (elsewhere) interstate national overseas

(g) *Was there a difference between how you were treated by local and out-of-town media personnel?*

no yes _____

d5. Nature of media conduct while covering this event

(a) *Could you please describe for me how the media went about its work at the time of the event?*

(b) *How did you feel about this?*

(c) *Did you understand – either then or now – why the media operated as it did?*

Yes:

No:

(c) *Did any person or agency help you deal with the media either during or since this event?*

(d) *If so, would you describe how this arrangement worked for you/your family?*

d6. Nature of contact with media since event

(a) *How often did you or your family have contact with news reporters, photographers or television camera operators since this event?*

never ... go to d7 rarely occasionally frequently worked in/with media

(b) *Which forms of media have you encountered since this event?*

print media radio news radio programs
 tv news tv current affairs wire services international news service

(c) *Was any contact you have since had with the media been*

face-to-face? telephone/mobile? via facilitator (e.g., police, clergy)?

other? _____

(d) *About how many interviews have you or your family given to the media since the event?*

none ... go to d7 _____ (approx. number)

Why? _____

(e) *Where have any interviews you've had with the media taken place since the event?*

home work family's/friend's place at/near site in a studio/newsroom

other _____

(f) *Where have these media come from?*

local State (elsewhere) interstate national overseas

d7. Nature of media conduct since this event occurred

(a) *Has there been any change in the way the media have covered this event since the initial days?*

(b) *How do you feel now about the way the media has covered this event as time goes on?*

d8. Duration of contact (post-event)

For what period of time have the media appeared to maintain an interest in you/your family because of your link to this event?

d9. Number of media interactions since event

In total, how many interactions (interviews, conversations, photographs, tapings) would you or your family have had with the media since this event occurred?

d10. Participant impressions of close coverage

Have you seen any news reports that have resulted from

interviews you have given about this event?	<input type="checkbox"/>	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	no
a family member/friend had given?	<input type="checkbox"/>	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	no ... if both no, go to d11

(a) What were your impressions of those reports?

(b) What were your impressions of images/sounds used to illustrate these reports?

d11. Participant impressions of general coverage

Using this rating scale, please rank your recollections of the way different types of media covered this event. (SHOW RANKING CARD)

	n/c	dis.	conc.	mix.	fair.	help.
• newspaper stories	0	1	2	3	4	5
• newspaper images	0	1	2	3	4	5
• magazine stories	0	1	2	3	4	5
• magazine images	0	1	2	3	4	5
• radio news stories	0	1	2	3	4	5
• radio current affairs	0	1	2	3	4	5
• TV news stories	0	1	2	3	4	5
• TV current affairs stories	0	1	2	3	4	5
• TV news/current affairs images	0	1	2	3	4	5

d12. Participant's impressions of individual journalists

(a) *Were there any particular journalists or news outlets that you would single out from your interactions?*

yes no ... go to d13

(b) *If yes, which one/s and why?*

d13. Impacts of new reports on participant

Could you please describe how you or your family were affected by

(a) *specific stories involving you?*

(b) *the general level of public/media attention surrounding this event?*

(c) *Which was the greater concern to you?*

specific stories about you general level of public/media attention

d14. Respect for participant's privacy

Did the media adequately respected your privacy? yes sometimes no

d15. Participant impressions of media (post event)

(a) *So, have your experiences with the media since this event changed your opinion about them?*

no ... go to d16 yes _____

(b) *How would do you now rate the media, as a whole?*

- rather highly
- moderately well
- neutral
- moderately poorly
- rather poorly

d16. Whether complaints against media were raised

(a) *At any stage did you/your family want to complain about an aspect of media attention or coverage?*

θ no ... go to d17 θ yes

(b) *If yes, what was the concern?*

(c) *What action, if any, was taken?*

d17. Feedback for media

If you had the opportunity to speak to the decision-makers in the media – or to individual journalists – again, what would you say?

To media decision-makers: _____

To individual journalists: _____

d18. Comparison with other agencies

How would you describe the behaviour of other agencies in the period since this event?

• police investigation staff	very helpful	somewhat helpful	rather unhelpful
• ambulance/rescue personnel	very helpful	somewhat helpful	rather unhelpful
• counselling/support agencies	very helpful	somewhat helpful	rather unhelpful
• local authorities	very helpful	somewhat helpful	rather unhelpful
• State Government agencies	very helpful	somewhat helpful	rather unhelpful
• Federal Government authorities	very helpful	somewhat helpful	rather unhelpful

PARTICIPANT IMPRESSIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

e1. Impact of involvement

(a) *How did you feel about being approached to be involved in this research?*

(b) *How did you feel as you went through this interview?*

(c) *Did this interview evoke unwanted feelings or memories?*

0 no ... go to e2 0 yes _____

(d) *If you answered yes, what steps will it be appropriate for the researcher to take now?*

(e) *If you could change anything about this process, what would that be?*

e2. Confidentiality (refer also to Research Consent Form)

Is there anything you have told me today that you would prefer remained confidential? (A copy of the transcript of our discussion can be provided to you if you would like.)

RANKING CARD

Impressions of media coverage

Ranking Scale

0	=	no coverage noticed
1	=	coverage was distressing
2	=	coverage was concerning
3	=	coverage was mixed
4	=	coverage was fairly good
5	=	coverage was helpful

Media being ranked

- Newspaper stories
- Newspaper photographs/images
- Magazine stories
- Magazine photographs/images
- Radio news stories
- Radio current affairs programs
- TV news stories
- TV current affairs stories
- TV news/current affairs footage

Appendix 6: Society of Professional Journalists' Code of Ethics (US)

(available from http://www.spj.org/spj_ethics_code.asp)

Preamble

Members of the Society of Professional Journalists believe that public enlightenment is the forerunner of justice and the foundation of democracy. The duty of the journalist is to further those ends by seeking truth and providing a fair and comprehensive account of events and issues. Conscientious journalists from all media and specialties strive to serve the public with thoroughness and honesty. Professional integrity is the cornerstone of a journalist's credibility. Members of the Society share a dedication to ethical behavior and adopt this code to declare the Society's principles and standards of practice.

Seek Truth and Report It

Journalists should be honest, fair and courageous in gathering, reporting and interpreting information.

Journalists should:

- Test the accuracy of information from all sources and exercise care to avoid inadvertent error. Deliberate distortion is never permissible.
- Diligently seek out subjects of news stories to give them the opportunity to respond to allegations of wrongdoing.
- Identify sources whenever feasible. The public is entitled to as much information as possible on sources' reliability.
- Always question sources' motives before promising anonymity. Clarify conditions attached to any promise made in exchange for information. Keep promises.
- Make certain that headlines, news teases and promotional material, photos, video, audio, graphics, sound bites and quotations do not misrepresent. They should not oversimplify or highlight incidents out of context.
- Never distort the content of news photos or video. Image enhancement for technical clarity is always permissible. Label montages and photo illustrations.
- Avoid misleading re-enactments or staged news events. If re-enactment is necessary to tell a story, label it.
- Avoid undercover or other surreptitious methods of gathering information except when traditional open methods will not yield information vital to the public. Use of such methods should be explained as part of the story
- Never plagiarize.
- Tell the story of the diversity and magnitude of the human experience boldly, even when it is unpopular to do so.
- Examine their own cultural values and avoid imposing those values on others.
- Avoid stereotyping by race, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, geography, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance or social status.
- Support the open exchange of views, even views they find repugnant.
- Give voice to the voiceless; official and unofficial sources of information can be equally valid.
- Distinguish between advocacy and news reporting. Analysis and commentary should be labeled and not misrepresent fact or context.
- Distinguish news from advertising and shun hybrids that blur the lines between the two.
- Recognize a special obligation to ensure that the public's business is conducted in the open and that government records are open to inspection.

Minimize Harm

Ethical journalists treat sources, subjects and colleagues as human beings deserving of respect.

Journalists should:

- Show compassion for those who may be affected adversely by news coverage. Use special sensitivity when dealing with children and inexperienced sources or subjects.
- Be sensitive when seeking or using interviews or photographs of those affected by tragedy or grief.

- Recognize that gathering and reporting information may cause harm or discomfort. Pursuit of the news is not a license for arrogance.
- Recognize that private people have a greater right to control information about themselves than do public officials and others who seek power, influence or attention. Only an overriding public need can justify intrusion into anyone's privacy.
- Show good taste. Avoid pandering to lurid curiosity.
- Be cautious about identifying juvenile suspects or victims of sex crimes.
- Be judicious about naming criminal suspects before the formal filing of charges.
- Balance a criminal suspect's fair trial rights with the public's right to be informed.

Act Independently

Journalists should be free of obligation to any interest other than the public's right to know.

Journalists should:

- Avoid conflicts of interest, real or perceived.
- Remain free of associations and activities that may compromise integrity or damage credibility.
- Refuse gifts, favors, fees, free travel and special treatment, and shun secondary employment, political involvement, public office and service in community organizations if they compromise journalistic integrity.
- Disclose unavoidable conflicts.
- Be vigilant and courageous about holding those with power accountable.
- Deny favored treatment to advertisers and special interests and resist their pressure to influence news coverage.
- Be wary of sources offering information for favors or money; avoid bidding for news.

Be Accountable

Journalists are accountable to their readers, listeners, viewers and each other.

Journalists should:

- Clarify and explain news coverage and invite dialogue with the public over journalistic conduct.
- Encourage the public to voice grievances against the news media.
- Admit mistakes and correct them promptly.
- Expose unethical practices of journalists and the news media.
- Abide by the same high standards to which they hold others.

Sigma Delta Chi's first Code of Ethics was borrowed from the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1926. In 1973, Sigma Delta Chi wrote its own code, which was revised in 1984 and 1987. The present version of the Society of Professional Journalists' Code of Ethics was adopted in September 1996.

A.7 US guidelines for victims' rights when dealing with the media

Guidelines for victims' rights when dealing with the media are promulgated in several US states and federally. This appendix lists three sets of such advisory lists published by:

- (a) National Centre for Victims of Crime;
- (b) State of Wisconsin Department of Justice; and
- (c) New Hampshire Department of Justice.

A. Crime Victims' Rights in the News Media

National Centre for Victims of Crime

(available from <http://www.ncvc.org/infolink/info35.htm>)

Overview

The news media can often inflict a "second victimization" upon crime victims or survivors by enhancing their feelings of violation, disorientation, and loss of control. Common concerns victims express about the media include: interviewing survivors at inappropriate times; filming and photographing scenes with bodies and body bags; searching for the "negative" about the victim; printing a victim's name or address; and inappropriately delving into the victim's past. It is important for journalists to understand the emotions felt by victims and survivors. They are usually numb and often physically and mentally stunned by the crime and its impact. Frequently, victims feel confused and completely disoriented, especially immediately after the crime occurs, and the story is "newsworthy."

The issue of privacy of the individual versus the freedom of the press is a contentious one, and the related issue of victims' rights often creates the "battleground." There is an ethical consideration being re-examined by the media: many journalists realize that while they may have a legal right to publish certain information, they have an ethical responsibility to go further and balance the potential for public good against the private harm resulting from publication.

A recent study shows that television news directors agree in principle that crime victims have privacy rights and the private individual's right to privacy is not outweighed by the public's right to know. However, when a specific case of invasive footage is placed before those same directors, especially if their competitor possesses the same film footage, they are less likely to respect the victim's privacy (Thomason & LaRocque, 1992).

The National Center for Victims of Crime advocates the adoption of a proposed code of ethics for media professionals who deal with crime victims. This code was developed at a 1985 symposium by Seattle University and Seattle Women in News and was designed to recognize the demands journalists face while encouraging them to treat victims with dignity and respect. The code includes a vow that the journalist shall notify and ask permission from victims and their families before using pictures or photographs and shall not promote sensationalism in reporting crime or criminal court cases in any way (National Victim Center, 1990).

Victims should have rights when dealing with the media. In most cases, a person will not be able to bring a legal action against the media if his or her rights are violated.

Victims Should Have the Right:

- To say "no" to an interview;
- To select the spokesperson or advocate of the victim's choice;
- To select the time and location for media interviews;
- To request a specific reporter;
- To refuse an interview with a specific reporter even though he or she has granted interviews to other reporters;
- To say "no" to an interview even though the victim has previously granted interviews;
- To release a written statement through a spokesperson in lieu of an interview;
- To exclude children from interviews;
- To refrain from answering any questions with which the victim is uncomfortable or that the victim feels are inappropriate;
- To avoid a press conference atmosphere and speak to only one reporter at a time;

- To demand a correction when inaccurate information is reported;
- To ask that offensive photographs or visuals be omitted from airing or publication;
- To conduct a television interview using a silhouette or a newspaper interview without having their picture taken;
- To completely give the victim's side of the story related to the victimization;
- To refrain from answering reporters questions during a trial;
- To file a formal complaint against a reporter;
- To grieve in private; and
- To suggest training about media and victims for print and electronic media in their community.

A victim has the right at all times to be treated with dignity and respect by the media. Victims' rights to privacy can be better protected by the active participation of a victim advocate. A victim advocate can play an effective role as a "go-between" for the reporter and the victim establishing an environment conducive for the victim to speak to the press. This minimizes the invasion of privacy felt by the victim, allows advocates to advise victims about their rights in the media, and gives the media access to the story. Additionally, such a process assists those victims who wish to refuse to grant an interview. It also provides an opportunity for the advocate to assist the victim in preparing a statement, including reviewing the facts that can and cannot be released to the public, calming their fears, and being present when the actual interview is conducted (Ibid., p. 13-25).

End Notes

National Center for Victims of Crime. (1990). *Crime Victims and the Media*. Arlington, VA: National Center for Victims of Crime.

Thomason, Tommy & LaRocque, Paul. (1992). *A Survey of Television News Directors on Their Policies Regarding Coverage of Crime Victims: Final Report*.

Bibliography

Haines, Steve. (1990). *Police/Media Relations and Victim's Rights*. Detroit, MI: National Press Photographers Association.

National Center for Victims of Crime (1997). *Talk Show Guidelines*.

"News Media Can Be Tough on Crime Victims." *CQ Researcher*, vol. 4, July 22, 1994: 638.

Thomason, Tommy and Babbili, Anantha. (1986). *Crime Victims and the News Media: A National Symposium*. Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Department of Journalism and The Gannett Foundation.

For additional information, please contact:

National Center for Victims of Crime
2111 Wilson Blvd., Suite 300
Arlington, VA 22201
(703)276-2880

Texas Christian University
Dr. Tommy Thomason
TCU Journalism Dept.
TCU Box 298060
Fort Worth, TX 76129
(817) 921-7425

Victims and the Media Program

School of Journalism
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824-1212
(517) 432-2171

FYI: A Program of the National Center for Victims of Crime.

All rights reserved.

Copyright © 1997 by the National Center for Victims of Crime. This information may be freely distributed, provided that it is distributed free of charge, in its entirety and includes this copyright notice.

**B. State of Wisconsin Department of Justice
Office of Crime Victim Services
Crime Victims and the Media**

(available from <http://www.doj.state.wi.us/cvs/info/media.asp>)

During a stressful time, dealing with the media may be overwhelming. Remember, as a crime victim, you have rights in dealing with the news media, including the right to:

- Remain Silent and not give interviews. Even if you have given other interviews.
- Grieve in private. Grief is a very personal matter. You have a right to ask reporters, photographers or others to leave during times of grief.
- Select the time and place for interviews. You may protect the privacy of you home by giving interviews elsewhere ...
- Select your own spokesperson. ... or expressing your point of view through a written statement or a spokesperson.
- Have offensive visuals omitted from a story. If you feel graphic photographs or visuals are not fair to you or your loved ones, you have a right to ask that they not be used.
- Exclude children from interviews. Exposure to the media may re-traumatize children already traumatized by crime.
- To demand a retraction of inaccurate reports. If you feel reports are unbalanced or otherwise flawed, you have a right to offer your point of view or ask for a correction.
- Not answer any inappropriate questions.
- Tell your story completely.
- Not have your picture used.
- Be treated with dignity and respect at all times.

PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS SOCIETY ETHICS CODE:

Journalists at all times will show respect for the dignity, privacy, rights and well-being of people encountered in the course of gathering and presenting the news. The news media must guard against invading a person's right to privacy. The media should not pander to morbid curiosity about details of vice and crime.

RADIO-TV NEWS DIRECTORS' ETHICS CODE:

Reject sensationalism or misleading emphasis in any form. Respect the dignity, privacy and well-being of people with whom they deal.

**C. New Hampshire Department of Justice
Victim's Rights and the Media**

(available from <http://www.state.nh.us/nhdoj/victimwitness/med.html>)

The Department of Justice will often provide press releases to the media about the status of the criminal investigation. The Victim/Witness Advocates do their best to notify the family of the victim what the Department of Justice is releasing. It is important to our office that you know what information is being released about your loved one and the case. Please understand that sometimes the media will acquire information before we have been given the authority to release it to the family, and the situation is beyond our control.

The media is very resourceful and will often talk to anyone and everyone they can to get a story. Often times people who did not know the victim well or any of the circumstances surrounding his/her death, will make statements that are incorrect, based on rumors and exaggerated. This is very frustrating and painful for the family of the victim.

- You have the right to grieve in privacy.
- You have the right to say "no" to an interview. Never feel that because you have unwillingly been involved in an incident of public interest that you must personally share the details and/or your feelings with the general public.
- You have the right to select the spokesperson or advocate of your choice. You have the right to expect the media to respect your selection of spokesperson or advocate.
- You have the right to select the time and location for media interviews. Remember, the media is governed by deadlines. However, nobody should be subjected to a reporter arriving unannounced at the home of the victim's family.
- You have the right to request a specific reporter. Don't hesitate to request the reporter you feel will provide accurate and fair coverage of your story.
- You have the right to refuse an interview with a specific reporter even though you have granted interviews to other reporters. You may feel that certain reporters are callous, insensitive, uncaring or judgmental. It is your right to avoid these journalists at all costs. However, be aware that the reporter may write the story regardless of your participation.
- You have the right to say "no" to an interview even though you have previously granted interviews. It is important to remember that survivors of homicide victims often ride an "emotional roller coaster." You may be able to talk one day and then physically and emotionally unable the next day. You should never feel "obliged" to grant interviews under any circumstances.
- You have the right to release a written statement through a spokesperson.
- You have the right to refrain from answering any questions with which you are uncomfortable or that you feel are inappropriate.
- You have the right to demand a retraction when inaccurate information is reported. All news mediums have methods of correcting inaccurate reporting or errors in stories.
- You have the right to file a formal complaint against a reporter. A reporter's superior would appreciate knowing when his or her employee's behavior is unethical, inappropriate or abusive.
- You have the right at all times to be treated with dignity and respect by the media.
- From time to time, survivors will be given information about the crime which should not be released to the media or anyone else. Please respect the confidentiality of any information you receive in such circumstances.

Adapted from:

Victim's Rights and the Media

National Victim Center, 307 West 7th Street, Suite 1001

Fort Worth, TX 76102

A.8 Talk Show Guidelines for Crime Victim Guests

(available from <http://www.ncvc.org/INFOLINK/Tlkshow.htm>)

In response to the concern that crime victims are being re-victimized during their appearances on television talk shows, the National Center for Victims of Crime is pleased to announce the development of specific guidelines alerting television talk show staff to the specific needs of crime victims. In addition to the guidelines, a Crime Victim Guests' Bill of Rights has been drafted. The Guidelines and Bill of Rights will be widely disseminated to talk show producers and staff. Each production company will be encouraged to adopt the Guidelines and observe the Bill of Rights so every crime victim who agrees to appear on their show will know that they will be treated with dignity and respect.

INTRODUCTION TO VICTIM PSYCHOLOGY

When a person has been victimized by crime, the traumatic event transforms their life. Appropriate support and treatment can help a victim reconstruct a new life. Assistance comes not only from criminal justice professionals, family and friends, but also from the media.

A person who is victimized, loses a sense of control over their life. One of the most important services to provide to a victim is information and the ability to make decisions based on that information.

For this reason, victims and their advocates have fought for the right to be informed and involved in each phase of the criminal justice system.

This sense of control does not just apply to the investigation and prosecution of their case — it also applies to retelling of their story to the media. It is critical that the victim's requests be respected and followed to avoid inflicting a second victimization.

While working with a crime victim who has agreed to appear on television, it is critical that members of the media be sensitive to the trauma the person has experienced. Agreeing to tell their story should not be construed as a sign that the trauma of their victimization is no longer a factor to be considered. On the contrary, a person who has been traumatized by crime often does not know when, or if, an event will "trigger" a crisis reaction. Appearing on air, whether television or radio, is a new and potentially intimidating experience for most people. The anxiety produced by this new experience, and the retelling of their story, combined with the trauma of victimization, creates an environment in which a victim needs additional support and control over the situation. The guidelines outlined in this document have been designed to minimize the possibility of a second victimization inflicted by the mishandling of a victim or his/her story by the media.

RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES FOR TALK SHOWS AND CRIME VICTIM GUESTS

1. Television talk shows should use only those victims who have had the benefit of counseling and guidance from a trained victim counselor, professional, or advocate (i.e., rape counselor, domestic violence advocates, legal counsel, etc.).

A surprising number of victims end up on shows in the immediate aftermath of their victimization. In some cases victims have appeared within a few days after being victimized. This is primarily due to the fact that production staff learn about victims through news media accounts and then contact the victims directly. Because of the short time frame, many victims will not have had the opportunity to speak with a victim advocate or counselor to begin processing what has happened to them and what they can expect in the aftermath of their victimization. In the aftermath, most victims experience a cataclysm of emotions and are generally not in the best frame of mind to consider the emotional, mental or legal consequences associated with telling their story on television.

With the assistance of a trained victim advocate or counselor, victims will be better able to regain some of the control over their lives that is taken by the criminal act and make the most appropriate decision for themselves about telling their story. For these reasons, we feel it is essential that victims receive counseling from victim professionals so they can understand the pros and cons of such appearances, and decide with full knowledge of the potential consequences. Focusing a program on crime and victimization issues should not be done at the expense of the mental and emotional well-being, as well as the physical safety, of crime victims.

2. Crime victims should not appear in the immediate wake of their victimization — particularly if they

have not had the advantage of counseling by professional victim advocates and service providers. As outlined in the first guideline, victims deserve the right to the assistance of a victim advocate or counselor when deciding whether or not to appear on a television show. It is crucial that victims understand the potential risks involved in telling their story on a television talk show. When victim guests have not had the benefit of guidance and counseling from victim professionals, they may feel intimidated by production staff and/or the studio environment. This inexperience may lead them to consent to decisions that are not in their own best interests simply because they do not know they can object or do not feel comfortable doing so.

The first and perhaps most important consideration is the emotional impact of appearing on television so soon after the crime has occurred. A second consideration is the potentially devastating impact that the premature telling of the victim's story may have on the criminal investigation and subsequent prosecution of the case, as well as any potential civil litigation pursued by the victim.

Questions asked, comments made, or visual depictions displayed could possibly be used as evidence in a way that could compromise their case. Such an outcome would be the ultimate re-victimization and disservice to the crime victims in their pursuit of justice. Also, in the absence of a conviction of the perpetrator, the potential exists for libel; therefore, crime victims should be encouraged to seek legal advice concerning what constitutes libelous comments before appearing on any talk show.

3. Child victims should not be guests.

Children who are already suffering from the trauma of victimization are often retraumatized by exposure to the media. Children often lack the means to verbalize their emotions and are therefore vulnerable to misinterpretation by both the media and the public. Because of their inexperience with life, and thus being less able to envision and understand the ultimate consequences of their decisions, children are extremely vulnerable to exploitation by the media. Appearing on a television talk show, and thereby revealing their identity to their community and the world, may forever stigmatize them as victims to their peers and the public and have continuing negative effects on their developmental years.

While child victims may not suffer negative emotional consequences in all cases, the risks are so high that children generally should not be guests. Although there may be special circumstances that reduce the risks sufficiently to consider an appearance — for example, the age of the child. There is a significant difference between a seven-year-old and a seventeen-year-old.

For talk show production staff to badger parents and/or guardians to be allowed to interview child crime victims in "the interest of the news" or "to help other children and parents" is inexcusable. When a child is victimized, parents are also emotionally traumatized and may not be in the best frame of mind to make decisions concerning their child's welfare.

It is, therefore, essential to have an experienced child victim advocate available to assess the situation of the child victim and to counsel the child victim and the victim's parents or guardian in order to avoid negative emotional impact on the child victim or endangerment of their safety.

4. A professionally trained victim advocate and crisis counselor should be on hand at all times.

Utilizing the services of a trained crisis counselor or victim advocate when having crime victims as guests on a program results in guests who are more comfortable and relaxed, more cooperative, and better prepared for the interview and appearance on air. There are many instances where victim guests who were not properly prepared or who were not really ready to go public with their story were unable to talk about it once tape was rolling or the broadcast began. Having a trained crisis counselor or victim advocate present in the green room with the crime victim guests is important not only for the several hours before the taping or live broadcast begins, but also for a period of debriefing after their appearance is over.

Having such trained victim counselors present in the studio to monitor the crime victim's appearance is also important for detecting and dealing with any signs of harmful trauma to the crime victim during the taping or broadcast. This is vital because the stress of the situation and publicly reliving his/her story can very likely trigger a posttraumatic stress reaction for the crime victim, especially if the appearance includes visual depictions of the crime scene and/or unpreviewed questions from the audience.

Even if victims are not under the care of a victim advocate at home, there is no reason why national talk shows could not recruit crisis counselors and victim advocates from the cities where they tape.

This will give victims at least one opportunity to receive guidance in deciding whether or not they want to appear and under what conditions. Having crisis counselors on site will help reduce the damage to victims should some event trigger a crisis response.

5. Crime victim guests should be treated with dignity and respect at all times. Talk show hosts and production staff should be particularly sensitive and understanding of a victim guest's emotions and feelings which may be heightened by the stress of appearing on a television talk show.

Being sensitive to crime victims' emotions and letting them know that their emotional reactions are okay is very different from requesting that they cry and show their emotions on the air. Crime victims' emotional reactions are highly personal experiences which they may not wish to share publicly. To request or beg them to expose this very personal part of themselves on air is not only insulting but can also be re-traumatizing.

6. Crime victims should always be fully informed about: the format of the show; how their story will be told; who else will appear (in person or otherwise — i.e, from a remote location); and what subjects will be discussed with each guest. Whenever possible, victims should be provided with copies of the producer's notes on each guest.

The purpose here is not only to avoid surprises in terms of guests, material, and subject matter, but to also give victims the information they need to negotiate their involvement and to prepare for the show. Reducing the unknown, will dramatically reduce the victims' fear and trepidation about the show. It will also help them to tell their story more effectively and to defend themselves against insensitive questions or comments from the host or other guests.

There have been instances where producers surprised victim guests by either presenting the offender on the show or showing graphic depictions of the crime scene without informing the victim beforehand. The resulting trauma of such surprises have sent crime victims into posttraumatic stress reactions so severe that they were unable to continue, and the show had to be canceled.

7. If an offender, any offender, is to be physically present in the studio or elsewhere in the facility, the victim should be given notice of the specific facts and asked what arrangements can be made in the studio to make the victim feel comfortable and safe (e.g., a physical barrier like a table or floral arrangement between the offender and the victim, interviewing the offender via satellite or from a remote location on the premises, etc.). Every precaution should be taken to prevent the offender and the victim from "crossing paths" before, during and after the show.

One of the most often stated needs of a crime victim is access to information relating to his/her victimization, case or offender. In the situation of crime victimization, the old axiom, knowledge is power holds true. By knowing if an offender, any offender, is going to appear on the show with the victim, the victim will be better able to prepare for that portion of the show. It will also be helpful to the victim to know as much about what the offender will be discussing during his/her interview. Also, the contact between a victim and the offender should be minimized. As the criminal justice system has learned, by having separate waiting areas and avoiding contact with the offender, the potential for the offender to intimidate the victim is greatly reduced.

8. Offer the victim the opportunity to get comfortable with the set by allowing them to arrive early or even the day before the actual taping.

Most crime victims have had little or no involvement with the media, so the experience of appearing on a talk show or other program can be frightening and very stressful. That stress can be reduced when they are prepared in advance by familiarizing themselves with the environment in which the interview or appearance will take place. This involves touring the studio with explanations provided of where the interviewer/host will be, where the audience will be situated, where camerapersons will be located, which monitor they should look at if necessary, etc. The more familiar and comfortable they are with the environment, the better the program will be because they are more relaxed and better prepared to relay their story and interact with the host.

9. Victims should always have the right to view pictures, video/audio tape, graphic and/or any other depictions that will air as part of the show.

Again, victims should not be surprised with graphic representations they have not seen and approved in advance. Victim guests should always have the right to veto the airing of any visual depictions they find offensive or feel are inappropriate. Crime victims should have the right to say no to production staff at any time without feeling guilty.

10. Victims should be informed in advance of the option to protect their anonymity by whatever means are necessary (e.g., silhouette screens, disguises, electronic voice alteration, pixel and fog screening, etc.)
Anonymity is important to victims, not only to protect them from embarrassment and stigmatization from the general public, but also in some cases from harassment and threats to their safety.
11. When the victim desires, no information should be presented which would disclose the location of their home, place of work, or whereabouts.
For stalking victims and those who have gone into hiding to escape their abusers, the need for absolute confidentiality about their place of residence and employment is critical for their safety. Care should be given so that no clues as to the victims' current location are given.
12. Victims should have the right to request that their show not air in certain markets.
Again, this is for reasons of their safety.
13. Victims should have the opportunity to request that disclosures which compromise their anonymity or safety be edited.
14. Victims should also be informed of when the original show will air and when the show will be re-broadcast.
This will give victims the opportunity to make any arrangements they feel are necessary in advance of the broadcast or re-broadcasts. Especially in the instance of a possible re-broadcast, victim guests should be informed and their permission obtained before the re-broadcast. Their situation may have changed (e.g., the offender may now be out of prison, the criminal acts may have started again or accelerated) and any re-broadcast could potentially put them in physical danger, or the original airing of the show may have caused such a negative reaction for them that any re-broadcast could be harmful to them emotionally.
15. Victims in the viewing audience may experience a crisis reaction while watching a show about crime victimization experience.
A television program that features crime victims detailing their stories and experiences, especially if graphic depictions of the crime scene are involved, will often trigger crisis reactions for viewers both in the studio and viewing audience, who have also been crime victims at some point in their life. Therefore, it is strongly advised that talk show producers provide a disclaimer at the beginning of their show cautioning viewers of the content. Also producers should provide a public service announcement at the end of the show advising viewers that there is help available for them and provide the name of an appropriate, qualified victim information and referral phone line or crisis line which can provide more information and referrals to local victim assistance programs in the viewers' area.

BILL OF RIGHTS FOR CRIME VICTIMS GUESTS ON TALK SHOWS
CRIME VICTIMS HAVE THE RIGHT:

1. To be treated with dignity and respect at all times by the talk show host, production staff and crew, or any other employees who have contact with them.
2. To be informed of the format and subject of the show including how their story will be told and what subjects or issues they will be asked about on air.
3. To be informed of all other guests who will appear on the show, along with each guest's full background relative to the issue.
4. To object to the format or other production decisions concerning the subject matter and other guests of the show.
5. To establish conditions and prerequisites for their appearance and to have the show's host and production staff comply with any such prerequisites.
6. To have the services of a professional victim advocate/crisis counselor on site before, during and after taping.
7. To have victim advocates, counselors, or other necessary support persons accompany them to the show at the show's expense.
8. To preview, prior to their use, any pictures, video or audiotapes, graphics and/or any other visual

- depictions which will be aired and to always be allowed to veto the airing of any they find offensive.
9. To have their personal items such as photographs, letters and videotapes returned promptly and in the same condition as which they were received by the talk show's representative.
 10. To know in advance what questions will be asked and to refuse to answer any questions with which they are uncomfortable or that they feel are inappropriate.
 11. To request measures that will ensure their safety before, during and after production of the show.
 12. To request measures that will guarantee their anonymity (e.g., silhouette screens, disguises, electronic voice alteration, pixel and fog screening, etc.).
 13. To request measures that will guarantee the confidentiality of any identifying information which would disclose their whereabouts or address.
 14. To have edited out any information that discloses their identity or whereabouts contrary to their wishes.
 15. To not have the show air in specific markets and locations which may jeopardize their personal safety.
 16. To be informed of the original air date and any subsequent airings of the show as soon as practicable.
 17. To be informed at the earliest opportunity of any changes which affect their rights and interests.
 18. To choose to withdraw their consent to participate in the show at anytime they feel it is in their best interests, regardless of any previous commitments or expenditures on behalf of the show.

A9. What it's like to face the media: A victim's perspective

(available at <http://www.crimevictims.net/spj/victim.html>)

In 1994, American woman Lynn Shiner's two children, Jennifer (10) and David (8) were stabbed to death by her ex-husband the day before Christmas. He then killed himself. Lynn discovered their bodies the next day when she came to pick the children up for the holiday. To read Lynn's story of how she reacted to the media's attention go to <http://www.crimevictims.net/spj/victim.html>.

A.10 Controversy around promoting victims' rights

(available from <http://crimevictims.net/ovc> and <http://crimevictims.net/spj/session.html>)

In March 2000, the International Association of Chiefs of Police hosted a meeting at their offices in Alexandria, Virginia, in March 2000 to explore issues arising from the December 1999 issuing of a "victim and witness advisory card" by police in Fairfax County, Virginia. The following is (a) a report on the deliberations of the two-hour open forum and (b) a further follow-up session with Society of Professional Journalist representatives that were posted at the Office of Crime Victims' websites listed above.

A. Should police issue cards to victims offering help in dealing with the media?

The Fairfax County (Virginia) Police Department plans to begin handing out cards to victims and witnesses in cases where the police are concerned that the media might reveal a vulnerable victim's identity or where they fear that the media could compromise the integrity of an investigation. The idea of the new cards stemmed from the department's concerns about a succession of recent cases where they had concerns about how victims and witnesses were dealt with.

The message on the card that the Fairfax County Police hand out to victims and witnesses:

"News media may wish to interview you regarding this incident. You have the right to grant or refuse interviews. If you choose to give an interview, please call one of the numbers on the reverse side. You will be given advice important to protecting your rights and the investigation, but there is no legal requirement to contact police prior to an interview."

This new move is viewed with alarm by many journalists and journalism organizations, especially since other police agencies nationwide are contacting Fairfax saying that they may follow their lead.

Among the many questions raised:

- What are the risks and drawbacks when victims talk to the press?
- What do victims think about their interactions with the media?
- Do they want and need better protection from irresponsible reporters?
- If victims need guidance and assistance, are the police the appropriate group to intervene on their behalf?
- Will these new cards solve the problem?
- Or will they penalize the responsible journalists by making it harder for them to do their jobs?
- Will police agencies use this tactic to deny the media any access to victims and witnesses?
- Should journalists participate in efforts to draft policies that respect the role of the press, or should they actively work against the issuance of any cards by police?
 - How does a free society balance the people's right to know with the police department's legitimate concerns and the wishes of victims?
- What do communities want from both the police and the media?

Tensions and areas of agreement between police and reporters

Fairfax County Police Department public information officer Warren Carmichael made it clear that the journalists at the table were not the offenders who prompted the invention of the cards. "The card is not a reaction to one incident but the result of many concerns," said Carmichael. There was a case in 1999 when the police wanted to keep secret the fact that a young woman had witnessed a homicide. Another incident involved a situation where a victim inadvertently blurted out details about a con artist's "flimflam" that the police wanted kept secret. The "last straw" was the case in October 1999 when a local TV station briefly aired footage of a 5-year-old boy who had been approached by a molester who was still on the loose.

"We appreciate the fact that there are many cases where the media has helped us solve the crime or warn the community," said Fairfax County Police Department victim service director Carroll Ellis. There was general agreement that the cards formalize the informal guidance that police often provide to victims on how to deal with the media (and which reporters to avoid).

"We are not an anti-media department. We see this as an extension of services offered by our victim services program," said Carmichael. "We were surprised at the furore this created [among journalists]. We can understand their concern about how this might be applied elsewhere, but, frankly, that is not our concern."

Many of the journalists in attendance said their organizations questioned why cards were needed at all, and that mistakes should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. Many also expressed concern about the specific wording of the Fairfax card. "My concern is that the wording implies to victims that there is something wrong in talking to the media," said Richard Hammerstrom of the *The Free Lance Star* of Fredericksburg, Virginia. "Imagine how the police would feel if some group began handing out cards urging victims and witnesses not to talk to the police."

Fairfax' Carmichael said that the cards will not be handed out indiscriminately but only in cases where the police are concerned about the potential for media abuse. Carroll Ellis made it clear that the cards will not just be handed out in a vacuum, but that officers will be encouraged to talk with people about the important role that the press can play.

Bob Becker of the Society for Professional Journalists, Washington, D.C., raised concerns about how immigrants from other countries with authoritarian regimes will view the cards. "I suspect they will see it as meaning they need police approval to talk with reporters." Others raised the concern that the cards might be misused to silence police critics.

Many journalists at the table also offered ideas about how the wording on the card could be made more "reporter friendly," while also reserving the right to oppose the idea of the cards altogether at some future date. The wording on the police cards has already been revised once after feedback from journalists, and Carmichael said that the department is open to continuing input. The department plans to do an initial printing of 10,000 cards in English and 5,000 in Spanish, with versions in other languages planned, and they are willing to listen to ideas for succeeding "editions."

The D.C. Chapter of SPJ announced that their group would offer journalists competing cards that they could provide to victims and witnesses. The cards say: "My job is to inform members of the public about crimes so they may protect themselves from becoming victims in the future, and to inform them of the progress police make investigating and solving such crimes. If you do not wish to talk with me now you may call later at the number below."

The issues for victims

Olga Trujillo, director of Special Programs for the Office for Victims of Crime, said that the creation of the card has had the benefit of sparking a much-needed discussion of the critical issue of the media's relationship with victims. John Stein, director of the National Organization for Victim Assistance, said, "I would prefer to see a pamphlet that provides more information, but I cannot start from the premise that formalization of the process is a bad idea from the victim's point of view."

Bonnie Bucqueroux of the Victims and the Media Program at the Michigan State University School of Journalism said that the cards alone cannot solve the complex problems that victims face when dealing with the media. "In addition to the problems that the police have identified, victims tell us that they are re-victimized by reporters who have not been trained to interview people in trauma," she said.

She recommended that jurisdictions nationwide would benefit from adopting a community policing approach to the problem, where key stakeholders -- police, reporters, victims, victim advocates and others concerned about the problem -- would collaborate on developing policies and procedures tailored to concerns in their particular communities. John Stein noted, however, that there is still a benefit in having national-level groups work together to create a model policy on the wording for any cards that police might issue.

Ian Marquand of the Society for Professional Journalists noted that the Fairfax County Police Department would have benefited from working with journalists and journalism organizations before the announcement that the cards were headed to the printer. Ted Gest of Criminal Justice Journalists echoed those sentiments and said that his membership has concerns about advocate groups that are developing policies for victims' interaction with the media without any input from or collaboration with reporters.

A continuing dialogue

At the end of the session, the Fairfax police remained eager to field-test the current version of the cards, while journalists continued to express reservations. But the group agreed that the meeting should be considered the beginning of a continuing exploration of issues and solutions, and that the session helped identify areas of common ground.

Plans include a possible panel discussion at the Society for Professional Journalists annual meeting in Columbus, Ohio, in the fall. Olga Trujillo of OVC noted that her office is committed to supporting initiatives that benefit victims.

B. Issues, challenges & solutions: Relationships between victims, victim advocates, police and journalists

by Bonnie Bucqueroux

The Society for Professional Journalists hosted a follow-up session on issues of concern about media coverage of victims, sparked by the Fairfax County (Va.) Police Department's decision to hand out cards warning victims not to talk to the press without conferring with police first. In the interim between the first SPJ meeting on the Fairfax "victim card" issue in Washington, D.C., and the October SPJ convention in Columbus, the Fairfax County Police Department has handed out the cards to victims in a small number of cases. "We hand them out along with other materials about our victim assistance program," says Fairfax public information officer Warren Carmichael. It is not yet clear whether this has directly interfered with reporters trying to get interviews.

Meanwhile, attorney Robert Becker, who works with journalists, said that he has had 10 to 12 requests from around the country for the competing Society for Professional Journalists (SPJ) cards, produced to counteract the perceived anti-press tone of the Fairfax police cards. However, Becker does not know if any of those cards have been used.

Lucy Dalglish of the Reporters Committee for the Freedom of the Press recently taught police executives from around the country at the FBI Academy in Quantico, and many of them jokingly dismissed putting their concerns in writing on a card. "They told me, 'We just tell victims not to talk to reporters.'"

The issue of primary concern to reporters is unwarranted and possibly illegal restriction of press freedom. Reporter Richard J. Hammerstrom and attorney Becker both raised concerns that the cards constituted a new and unwelcome obstacle that reporters should protest.

Ted Gest of Criminal Justice Journalists echoed those sentiments, noting that victim advocate organizations are now issuing guidelines whose tone, in some cases more than the specific content, could make the journalist's job tougher. For example, the National Victim Center's new pamphlet urges victims to demand that reporters tell them the purpose and angle of the story. Gest said that this reflects a lack of understanding of the field. "Many times, my job is to do the reporting in order to find out what the story is," he said. Reporters can also discover later that their editors want the story changed to explore a different issues.

The discussion shifted to the specific concerns of victims after Lynn Shiner talked about her experiences with the media in the aftermath of the murder of her two children. Members of the panel and the audience were quick to denounce the reporter who came uninvited into the funeral home. There was also consternation about TV newscasters who apparently secreted a microphone to capture her whispered good-by's to her children at graveside.

An area of disagreement, however, surrounded the reporting of the children's toys placed in the casket. While there were ethical questions about how the information had been gathered, some journalists commented that the details that Shiner saw as "bells and whistles" were instead personal touches that humanized the plight of victims. Shiner was adamant that reporting those details was a painful breach of her right to privacy.

Her comments served as a reminder that victims are not monolithic, underscoring why communication between reporters and their often traumatized subjects is so important. Shiner said that the stories where she felt most comfortable were done by reporters who allowed her to see their articles before they were published -- a practice traditionally condemned in the field.

In my capacity as coordinator for the Victims and the Media Program at Michigan State University's School of Journalism, I revealed that many of the winners of the Dart Award, the \$10,000 prize awarded annually for the best newspaper story or series on victims of violence, admitted that they had allowed people to read stories about them before publication, sometimes without their editor's knowledge. Part of the challenge in determining best practices is that much of journalism education is based on the investigative model and this does not typically work well for dealing with people in trauma.

Among other issues discussed:

- Paying the penalty - Journalists said that they often find themselves by the excesses of a few of their bottom-feeding peers. There was general agreement as well that the intrusiveness of lights and cameras puts an additional burden on broadcast reporters to be less intrusive. The competition to get the story contributes to a pack mentality that adds to the distress and resentment that victims feel.

- Police cover-ups - Attorney Robert Becker raised the concern that police could use tactics such as the cards to hide police mistakes that reporters should be covering.
- Victim's compensation - John Stein of the National Organization of Victim Assistance (NOVA) told reporters that they often fail to use their power to let victims know about the compensation and services available to them in the community. He urged broader coverage of a range of victim issues.
- Educating journalists/news organizations - Bucqueroux explained that the MSU J-Schools guarantees that all of its journalism graduates will receive special training in interviewing victims of violence and catastrophe, but that other J-Schools have not yet followed suit. She also noted that the MSU effort has expanded to hosting workshops and facilitating discussions with journalists, victims, victim advocates, police and other members of the criminal justice system.
- The reporter's mission - The question about how to cover victims well rests on what the reporter's mission is in doing these stories. There was virtually universal agreement among all participants that the community benefits from stories that warn the community about a threat or that solicit information about suspects. But there is less consensus about stories that explore the personal lives of victims and their recovery.
- Local dialogue - The Society for Professional Journalists has chapters that could function as catalysts for discussion of general issues and case-by-case concerns. Discussion at the end of the session and informally afterward suggests that this is just the beginning of an exploration of how police, victims, victim advocates and journalists can work together to resolve these critical issues.

A.11 From the inside: When a journalist is the victim

(an extract from Cote, W. & Simpson, R. (2000) *Covering violence: A guide to the ethical reporting of trauma and victims*. New York: Columbia University Press (Pp39-41) that cites Shapiro, B. (1995). 'One violent crime'. *Nation*, April 1995, Pp445-52. Reproduced with permission)

Seldom does one person's experience encompass the wide range of trauma reactions we have described. One survivor's story, though, may be helpful because it does reflect several emotional responses common to victims. The person happens to be a journalist. Bruce Shapiro, a contributing editor of the *Nation* magazine, was among seven people stabbed and seriously wounded when a mentally deranged man attacked customers and employees – all strangers to the attacker – in and outside a coffee bar in New Haven, Connecticut. Several years after the 1994 assault, Shapiro vividly recalls what he felt during and after the attack.

The physical pain from the man's two lunges with a hunting knife into Shapiro's back and chest caused pain that 'ran over me like an express train', leaving him screaming on a sidewalk (1995:446). Police and emergency medics arrived quickly, summoned by bystander, but at the time Shapiro thought no one was trying to help him. 'I was really aware of just wanting people to help me,' he told us. 'I was feeling quite frightened. People didn't seem to be there for me ... I really perceived these bystanders as not having acted in my behalf.'

In an article in the *Nation*, Shapiro explains his response this way: 'For weeks I thought obsessively and angrily of those minutes on Audubon Street, when first the nameless woman in the window and then the security guard refused to approach me – as if I, wounded and helpless, were the dangerous one' (1995:449). However, the woman had called police, and a few minutes later the guard helped police chase down the assailant. As Shapiro was loaded into an ambulance, 'My heart was going a mile a minute and I was aware I was in a lot of pain. I described to them what I thought had happened. I also was just trying to understand myself what had happened. I kept asking them, 'Just tell me where we're going; what happens next?' he told us.

Shapiro's reaction to the reporters who interviewed him or tried to in the next few days helps us understand early traumatic reactions of assault victims. On the first day after his life-saving surgery, he felt very weak and turned aside two interview requests from newspaper and television reporters. It was too soon and he did not sense that either reporter truly was concerned about him personally. Two days later he did give an interview to another local reporter he knew. 'His first concern was human,' he told us. 'It made all the difference, especially when he said beforehand that if I decided after the interview that I didn't want any of it run, it wouldn't.'

Details in other interview stories struck him as callous in some cases and careless in others. One that published the names and addresses of the victims 'just invited potential burglars to come and steal from their houses while they were hospitalised,' he said. He was upset by the coverage of two friends who, sent home to recover, were ambushed by a television crew as they left their physician's office. In common with many victims, he was angered by errors in the stories. Although he was single at the time, a New York Times reporter 'even invented a wife for me.' He told us that 'it seemed more humorous later, but I was very irritated at the time.'

Over time, Shapiro placed the press coverage in the context of his emotional injuries and ways of coping. The anger he mentions was part and parcel of the trauma he endured. The triggers for some of that anger were provided by journalists through carelessness or ignorance of the likely effects of their work. 'Such press coverage inspired in all of us a rage it is impossible to convey,' Shapiro writes. 'To the victim of violent crime the press may reinforce the perception that the world is an uncomprehending and dangerous place' (1995:450). He also recognizes the frequent correlation of trauma-associated anger and actions calculated to reap revenge – motivations often seized upon by politicians and amplified by press coverage. A better answer, he says, is to strengthen the social institutions that saved his life and sheltered him from greater injury within moments of the assault.

A.12 Cohort #1 demographics

Gender profile

The researcher interviewed, at length, 12 people associated with this event, eight men and four women¹.

Age profile

At the time of the massacre, one woman was aged 36-45 years and three 46-55, while two men were aged 26-35, three 36-45, one 46-55 and two 56+. By the time of the interviews, 42 months later, the age profile of the women remained the same, while the man in the 46-55 band had moved up into the 56+ band.

Family/marital status/disruption

At the time of the event (42 months earlier than the survey) three of the survey participants were married or in an established *de facto* relationship and nine were married with children. The event claimed the wife of one of the participants. They had no children. Three participants who were married with children at the time of the event had since separated from their partners or divorced. Those who had divorced cited direct or indirect impacts of the event itself on their situations.

Principal place of residence

Five of the 12 interviewees had moved house since the event: two participants (who are married to each other) chose to move out of the district entirely, specifically as a result of impacts of the event. One man moved to the city as a result of his divorce which followed the event (but still spends half of his time in his original home), one woman moved into the home she and her former husband had been building at the time of the event and one man moved interstate after losing his wife in the event.

Another man was anticipating both a divorce to be settled and a relocation. However, at the time of survey, neither of these things had occurred.

Occupation

Seven of the 12 participants (five men, two women) had some change in their occupation since the event. Of these, only one woman has been unable to return to work at all, two men changed occupation after having a period off work due to the event, one remaining in the tourism industry but working in another state, the other moved into a solo work role with heavy machinery.

One woman who had worked in an agricultural position at the time of the event changed her occupation when an opportunity arose to move into retailing work. One man, the husband of the woman unable to return to work, dropped around half of his work responsibilities to concentrate on her care. One man who had recently sold a small business (food sector) when the event occurred, has built a new small business in another area (tourism sector). The remaining man, now a divorcee, moved from a part-time volunteer position in the local community to a full-time position in the city but retains a business in the district which he actively manages.

Interestingly, five out of these seven participants either had ongoing post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms (diagnosed or reported) or reported strong PTSD symptomology during at least the first year after the event. A sixth's circumstances had been directly impacted by his wife's ongoing PTSD. One woman who had not changed occupation at the time of interview but was expecting to soon finish working in the role she had had since before the event, largely due to consequences of the event, had ongoing PTSD. Only one man who reported significant PTSD symptoms for at least the first year post-event had not had a change in his occupation.

Country of birth

Only one of the 12 participants was born overseas (a man born in the United Kingdom). Six men and three women were born in Tasmania, one woman was born in South Australia and one man was born in New South Wales.

¹

A further six specialist interviews were conducted with persons of interest (a trauma expert, a counsellor, forensic psychiatrist, an author/history academic, a government media officer and a journalist). Demographic information for these experts is not included in this study.

Participants' level of connectedness to this event

While five men and two women identified themselves as being victims or survivors of this event, none received direct physical injuries at the time of the massacre. However, all but two of the 12 had strong to very strong links to the event. Three men were related to people killed by Martin Bryant at Port Arthur. One was the husband of one of the deceased, the other two men were cousins of another woman who died that day. Two of these men also were related to someone at the site on the day of the shootings who was not physically injured.

The entire sample experienced the death of at least one friend and had at least one friend who sustained physical injuries as a result of Bryant's actions. All participants were active members of the community at the time of the shootings and all but two had official roles in the local community or in local business. Eight of the participants surveyed attended victims and survivors at the site on the day of the shootings in either official, volunteer or community response roles and all but one had provided some form of assistance or support to survivors since the event².

General physical health (prior and since)

Prior to the event, three women and four men reported 'very good' physical health, two men and one woman reported 'generally good' health at that time and one man, a retired businessman, had experienced 'some problems' with his physical health before the event. One man chose not to participate in this section of the survey.

Of the 11 participants who did, seven reported their physical health had deteriorated in the 42 months since the event: two women and two men reported going from 'very good' to 'poor' (-3), one man went from 'very good' to 'some problems', the man who initially reported 'some problems' deteriorated to 'poor' and one woman slipped from 'very good' to 'generally good'.

One man maintained 'very good' physical health and only one participant (a man) improved from 'generally good' to 'very good'.

General mental health (prior and since)

Again, one of the male participants declined to participate in questions in this section. Of the remaining 11 who did, 10 reported 'very good' mental health (seven men, three women) prior to the event. One woman reported 'generally good' mental health at that time. In the 42 months since the event, only four of the 11 participants, one woman and three men, reported no change in their mental health.

Two men and one woman slipped from 'very good' to 'generally good', one man deteriorated from 'very good' to 'some problems', while one man and one woman dropped from 'very good' to 'poor' and the woman who had previously reported 'generally good' reported 'some problems' after the event.

Reported trauma symptomology

Responses to traumatic events can be varied and may change over time. In some people such responses are transient, while in others they may persist. Where significant ongoing psychological and social impacts are evident, the likelihood of a psychiatric disorder such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety disorder or clinical depression is increased. While individuals may consider they are suffering from one or more of these disorders – or, indeed, another psychological disorder – only a trained practitioner can confirm such diagnoses.

However, the American Psychiatric Association has done some valuable work on quantifying trauma impacts as it has developed diagnostic criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder and other conditions over recent decades. Its most recent revision of criteria for PTSD was in 1994³. This criteria listing is referred to as DSM IV. It lists 19 possible symptoms under three broad clusters, with a fear response required in all cases. To have a diagnosis of PTSD confirmed, patients need to display a minimum number of symptoms in each cluster.

² It should be noted that none of the four participants from the first cohort – the Port Arthur case studies – experienced the death of a parent, partner or child, as all four participants in the second cohort. Only one of the 12 people interviewed at Port Arthur experienced such a loss.

³ See Appendix Four for the full list of DSM IV diagnostic criteria for post traumatic stress disorder.

This survey neither asked participants whether they had been diagnosed with PTSD (although a few participants confirmed this without prompting) nor does the researcher assume that because they reported symptoms in the requisite numbers across the clusters that they necessarily have – or had – PTSD. However, as a set of traumatic responses, the 19 symptoms form a good ‘trauma symptomology’ by which others can understand the extent of the overall impact on their lives of this event.

Again, in this part of the survey, one male participant declined to respond. Of the remaining 11 participants, only one man reported experiencing only two psychological responses (or symptoms) in the wake of the event. One woman reported six different symptoms, two men reported seven symptoms, two men and one woman reported 13 symptoms, one man reported 15 symptoms, one woman reported 17 symptoms, one man reported 18 symptoms and one woman reported suffering all 19 symptoms at some stage over the time since the event.

Notwithstanding the important proviso about clinical diagnosis outlined above, a check of symptoms reported against the most recent DSM IV criteria shows it is possible that as many as eight participants from this cohort have experienced, or continue to suffer from, PTSD.

All participants who responded reported symptoms from the first cluster referred to above. At least two women and one man reported experiencing the full range of symptoms that constitute this cluster.

Notably, DSM IV stipulates a minimum of just one symptom from this cluster. These five symptoms specifically demonstrate persistent re-experiencing of the event – distressing recollections, intrusive or distracting thoughts, recurrent distressing dreams, a sense of reliving the trauma, and upset by similar things. Three of these four participants were on site the day of the massacre and lost friends or workmates, the fourth lost his wife on that day.

One female participant reported four of the five symptoms in this cluster, two men and one woman reported three of the five symptoms in this cluster, one man reported two of the five symptoms and one man reported one symptom.

The second cluster of symptoms features a combination of social limitations and disturbing psychological responses which, together, demonstrate persistent avoidance of stimuli associated with the trauma and a numbing of general responsiveness (which was not present before the trauma). DSM IV stipulates a minimum of three or more symptoms when clinicians test for PTSD. The eight possible symptoms include avoidance of certain thoughts, feelings or conversations; avoidance of certain activities, locations or people; inability to recall important aspects of the event; markedly diminished interest or participation in significant activities; feeling detached or estranged from others; restricted range of emotions; general feeling of numbness; and a sense of a foreshortened future.

Of the participants who responded, one woman reported all eight symptoms, one man reported seven, one woman and three men reported six symptoms, one woman reported five symptoms, one man reported three symptoms. Only three respondents reported fewer than three symptoms in this cluster, one woman reported two and two men reported one.

The final cluster of five symptoms point to increased arousal that was not present before the event and includes difficulty falling or staying asleep; irritability or outbursts of anger; difficulty concentrating; overvigilance; and increased startle response. DSM IV stipulates a minimum of two or more symptoms in this cluster.

Nine of the 11 respondents reported a number of symptoms that exceeded the stipulated minimum for this cluster. Two women and one man reported experiencing all five symptoms. Two men and one woman reported four symptoms. Three men reported three symptoms. One woman and one man did not report any symptoms from this cluster.

Of those who did, on paper, meet the DSM IV criteria profile, one man and three women reported significant ongoing and distressing disruption from their reported symptoms and one of these participants said pre-existing issues possibly contributed to her distress as well. One man acknowledged that symptoms had subsided to a manageable level after approximately one year. One man reported symptoms began to diminish after three years and one man was not overly distressed by most of the residual symptoms he was still experiencing. An eighth’s symptoms have come and gone over the period under review.

Presence at site when event occurred

On Sunday, April 28, 1996, Martin Bryant shot more than 50 people at Port Arthur and nearby Seascapes cottages. Two children were among the 35 people killed. Those who died either immediately or later from their injuries included international and interstate tourists, local day trippers, off-duty staff and on-duty staff. Others who came to the site on the day as a result of the shootings included emergency services personnel (mostly volunteers), ambulance personnel (initially volunteers), police (local and city), doctors (local), off-duty staff, relatives and friends of staff, mortuary attendants, clergy and counsellors.

Eight of the 12 participants in this survey were not at the Port Arthur Historical Site when the shootings took place. Two women and two men were on the site at the time of the shootings, with one woman and one man actually witnessing people being shot by Bryant. One woman and one man interviewed came onto the site in an official role, while one man went there after the death of his wife.

Only two respondents in this cohort, one man and one woman, said they did not go to the site at all on the day of the shooting. The male respondent, however, spent six hours assisting victims in Hobart where he was attending a training course. While one man was not at the site when the shootings happened, he did not indicate if he went there later in the day.

Researchers in the area of critical incident stress debriefing say the impacts of trauma are exacerbated the longer the time spent at the scene of the incident in the period immediately after it happens. With this group of respondents, the 10 participants who were there or went there ranged from 10 minutes (a man) to 19.5 hours (a man who lives at the site), the time it took between when Bryant fired his first shots until he was captured by police following an overnight siege at the nearby Seascapes cottages.

Interestingly, of the five people who spent more than 10 hours on site that day, four (two men, two women) are also those who have reported the strongest ongoing trauma symptomology. The fifth was the man who lives on site. Eight of the 11 respondents to this section were offered debriefing either organised by site management, the local council or the Tasmanian Ambulance Service. All 11 respondents have since returned to the site at some stage. Four participants were employed there at the time of the event and two participants (one man, one woman) still work at the site, with the man still living there also. The man and woman who no longer work at the site have not been there for quite some time, one since September 1996. The other reported worsening of PTSD symptoms every time she approaches the site and so has limited in number and duration her subsequent visits to attending only special ceremonies and anniversaries.

A.13 Cohort #2 demographics

According to the Industrial Death Support & Advocacy (IDSA) group, there are as many deaths in the workplace each year as on the nation's roads. However, its members say, the circumstances surrounding workplace deaths rarely rate a mention in the media and, as a result, they claim, employers continue to put employees at risk.

Gender profile

During October 1999, the researcher interviewed four people in depth associated with deaths in workplaces, all women who belonged to IDSA, which is based in Victoria. A further focus group comprised of two men and six women was conducted with members of this organisation. The trauma counsellor mentioned in relation to the Port Arthur research earlier in this section also provided valuable perspectives about trauma impacts and responses for this second cohort of participants.

All four participants from this group were relatives or a partner of loved ones killed at work. Time elapsed since those deaths were 11 months (parent who had lost her son on his first day of a new job), two years (woman who had lost her *de facto* husband), four years (adult child who lost her father) and 13 years (parent who lost her son from injuries he sustained in a workplace explosion).

Age profile

One of the four participants was aged 26 to 35 years at the time of their family's loss and the remainder were aged 36 to 45 years. At the time of interview the ages were 26-35 (1), 36-45 (1), 46-45 (1), 56+ (1) respectively.

Family/marital status/disruption

When these deaths occurred, two participants were married or in a *de facto* relationship and two were married with children. The death of one woman's partner was the only change to marital status among the four, however the sample is far too small to draw statistically significant assumptions.

Principal place of residence

None of the four participants in this cohort had moved address at the time of surveying, however one participant indicated she was preparing to move her family.

Occupation

This same participant (the most recently bereaved who will be referred to as T+11 months) also indicated she was about to change her employment as a process worker due to stress. One participant (T+4 years), who had been in full-time study at the time of her father's death, has graduated and now leads the IDSA support and lobby group. One participant (T+2 years), who had been a childcare worker when her partner was crushed to death by a slab of granite, had moved into the role of a support services officer. The fourth participant (T+13 years), who had been a real estate property manager at the time of her son's death, was semi-retired when surveyed.

Country of birth

Three participants were Australians (two born in Victoria, one born in New South Wales) and the fourth was born in Spain.

Participants' level of connectedness to this event

All four were related closely to those who died, with one participant (T+11 months) also being a friend of another worker injured when her son died.

General physical health (prior and since)

All four participants cited 'very good' physical health prior to their sudden bereavements. Only one (T+11 months) said she had remained in 'very good' health since. One participant (T+2 years) said her physical health was now 'generally good' and the other two (T+4 years and T+13 years) nominated 'some problems'.

While this sample is too small to draw statistically significant conclusions, the possibility that general physical health deteriorates as the amount of time after an event increases would be worth consideration in a larger sample.

General mental health (prior and since)

All four participants cited 'very good' mental health prior to their sudden bereavements. Afterwards, however, two (T+4 years and T+13 years) said their mental health was now 'generally good' and two

(T+11 months and T+2 years) said they had experienced ‘some problems’ in this area. While this sample is too small to draw statistically significant conclusions, the possibility that general mental health impacts are more evident in the earlier years following a traumatic death is consistent with traumatology research findings and would be worth consideration in any larger sample.

Reported trauma symptomology

All four participants in this cohort had experienced or were still experiencing clinically confirmed PTSD and nominated a strong array of the possible 19 symptoms described earlier in this section⁴. Again, the most recently bereaved (T+11 months and T+2 years) each confirmed they had experienced 17 of the 19 DSM IV list symptoms, while the remaining two (T+4 years and T+13 years) had experienced 16 symptoms. One (T+4 years) acknowledged that her symptoms were worst in the first three years after her father’s death.

Only one participant (T+13 years) did not report experiencing all five symptoms from the first cluster which demonstrate persistent re-experiencing of the event. When it came to the second cluster of eight symptoms (a combination of social limitations and disturbing psychological responses which, together, demonstrate persistent avoidance of stimuli associated with the trauma), three of the four participants reported six symptoms (T+11 months, T+2 years and T+4 years), while a fourth reported seven symptoms (T+13 years).

With the final cluster of five symptoms (which point to increased arousal), three participants (T+11 months, T+2 years and T+13 years) reported all five symptoms, while one (T+4 years) reported four.

Presence at site when event occurred

None of the four participants in this cohort was at the site at the time of the deaths, nor did any of them go to the site the day that their loved one died.

Only one (T+11 months) had not visited the actual site where her 17-year-old son died in a warehouse crush accident on the first day of his new job. One, whose father was crushed when his heavy vehicle overturned during freeway roadworks, visited the site the following day and sometimes passes the spot. Another – whose partner was crushed by a falling slab of granite made a short visit to the site a few days after his death. The remaining woman, whose son sustained massive burns injuries as a result of an explosion in a steelworks and died in hospital three weeks later, first attended the site of the explosion for a special, 10-year memorial hosted by the company to mark the deaths of three employees as a result of that explosion.

While none of the four participants was offered psychological debriefing in the wake of these sudden, violent deaths, only one participant (T+13 years) was offered any form of information debriefing following her bereavement. These debriefings were organised by, in the first instance, the fire brigade, and then later (when the inquest was being held) by the Department of Public Prosecutions.

A14. *The Age* on the consequences of misbehaviour by Nine Network

A. Judge revisits Willesee's 'disgraceful' kidnap phone call

The Age, September 16, 2000, available from

<http://www.theage.com.au/entertainment/20000916/A2217-2000Sep15.html>

By STEVE BUTCHER

The infamous telephone call from *A Current Affair's* Mike Willesee happened more than seven years ago, but the reminder of it yesterday was enough to move a Melbourne County Court judge to express renewed distaste.

In March, 1993, alleged multiple- murderer Leonard Leadbeater (sic), with two other men, held two children hostage in a farmhouse in northern New South Wales after a killing spree across two states.

Mr Willesee rang the farmhouse and interviewed the children. Had they been frightened? Mr Willesee asked them. Had they enjoyed this adventure? Had they seen anybody get killed? Did they know that Leonard and Robbie (Steele) had killed some people?

A coroner later described Mr Willesee's interview as a "media event targeted to titillate" the show's audience. The coroner also attacked Mr Willesee's colleague, Mike Munro, for showing "complete disregard for the safety of anyone" by approaching the farmhouse in a helicopter.

Mr Munro later defended Mr Willesee. He said Mr Willesee had been trying to find out if the children were safe. Mr Willesee had also got an undertaking from Leadbeater to release the children, which Leadbeater later did.

In hindsight, Mr Munro agreed Mr Willesee would have asked some questions differently.

The controversy was partly relived yesterday before Judge John Barnett when he read transcripts of the telephone call and news stories about the death of teenager Deborah Marie Gale, one of the five people murdered during the rampage.

Prosecutor James Dowsley said Dianne Leslie Burgess, 45, Ms Gale's mother, who pleaded guilty to intentionally causing serious injury, had stabbed a man in Footscray on March 5 this year.

Defence lawyer Andrew Hale told the court the stabbing coincided with the anniversary of Ms Gale's murder. He said Mr Willesee was given a "chilling description" of the murder when he rang the farmhouse. "I remember it at the time," Judge Barnett said. "It was disgraceful."

Mr Hale said a Human Services worker described Burgess, whose son was killed this year in a car accident, as "about as traumatised" as any person she had seen.

Judge Barnett, in sentencing Burgess, said her background, which included being sold as a child for the price of a flagon of wine, was as "tragic a background as one could hear". Judge Barnett said hearing the Willesee transcript was "enough to severely affect anyone".

Burgess, of Patterson Road, Shepparton, received a 30-month jail sentence, suspended for three years.

B. *Gourmet news hounds leave a nasty taste*

Available from <http://www.theage.com.au/daily/990905/news/news13.html>

Sunday 5 September 1999, The Sunday Age

By MELISSA FYFE

Mike Willesee may have found God, but his former colleagues at Channel 9 have proved in the past fortnight that they're quite some way from godliness.

First there was the Robert Bogucki incident. Police were furious that *A Current Affair* delayed notifying them when its crew found the starving trekker in the Great Sandy Desert. ACA had endangered Mr Bogucki's health, police said.

The program defended its behavior but was then busted on the ABC's *Media Watch*. An embarrassing leaked tape revealed the ACA crew asking Mr Bogucki to walk around and drink from a jar of muddy water. At least 17 minutes passed before the parched man was given a fresh drink. Channel 9 later said it had offered him water when Mr Bogucki was first found, but the tape wasn't rolling. What the tape did show was Mr Bogucki vomiting a banana the crew had given him. ACA had set him down to be sick, then filmed him from the air, leaning over retching. The footage was used as if that was how ACA had come across Bogucki.

Then this past week, *60 Minutes'* Richard Carleton was deported from East Timor for possessing tourist instead of journalist visas. Indonesian police accused him and his crew of contributing to the possibility of a disturbance – an offence punishable by a fine and/or five years' jail – after Carleton asked voters how they would vote in the secret ballot. To add to his problems, the tabloid press seized on the Esky of gourmet delights such as quince paste, caviar and camembert that Carleton left behind. With the *Herald-Sun* declaring him "The Caviar Crusader", Nine's head of news and current affairs, Mr Peter Meakin, was annoyed journalists kept talking about caviar. It was non-sturgeon fish roe.

"It's one thing to drive the *60 Minutes* formula in a country like Australia, and to arrive on people's doorsteps and create conflict and make the reporter the star," says Mr Peter Manning, former head of news and current affairs at the ABC and Channel 7. "But when you are in a highly tense, ethnically explosive foreign situation I think that is completely another thing."

The antics of both Nine and Seven's current affairs programs provided plenty of inspiration for the ABC's satirical comedy *Frontline*, but not since Mike Munro and Mike Willesee were accused by a coroner of disregarding the safety of hostages in the 1993 Cangai siege, has Channel 9 copped such flak about its news practices.

"I don't think these two incidents have helped Channel Nine. Put it this way: anyone who says all publicity is good publicity is an idiot. Storms like this we can do without," Mr Meakin said.

He told *The Sunday Age* there were a couple of things the network sincerely regretted about the Bogucki rescue. It had been childish, he said, to put a Channel 9 T-shirt on the tired trekker, and it was silly to film him retching from the chopper.

Mr Anthony McClellan, Seven's executive producer for current affairs, believes the damage to current affairs journalism has now been done. "I think *Frontline* did have an effect on people's attitudes to what we do and

there's a degree of cynicism. What Channel 9 has done in one week has quadrupled that cynicism."

But Mr Meakin stands by Richard Carleton's view that his actions did not endanger lives.

Tonight Carleton will be judged. Will they tune in, turn off or simply watch the ABC's *SeaChange*?

Author's footnote:

For more on the Bogucki incident, see Richard Ackland's Media Watch analysis on the ABC's website at

<http://www.abc.net.au/mediawatch/transcripts/s49998.htm>

A15. Practical suggestions for journalists covering traumatic events

(Available at <http://cjr.org/year/01/5/coveringcatast.asp>)

Practical suggestions for journalists covering catastrophe

by Anne Nelson, Columbia Graduate School of Journalism and

Dr Daniel Nelson, M.D., University of Cincinnati

Interviewing People Experiencing Primary Trauma

The term "primary trauma" applies to individuals who have had first-hand experience of a catastrophic event. It would include those who survived or witnessed a catastrophe as well as those who have lost someone close to them. Telling their story to journalists can be damaging to these individuals, or it can be therapeutic. The journalist has a significant role in determining which of these it will be.

A journalist, like a doctor, should uphold the principle: "First, do no harm." The biggest determining factor is whether the affected person is ready to talk, and feels some measure of control over the situation.

1. You should ask permission. You may ask a potential interview subject, "Would you like to tell me about it now?" If he or she says no, you should accept it. You may leave an opening for them to speak to you later. A person who is not ready will not be able to tell her story in a coherent way; the information will be fragmented.
2. If the person agrees to talk, give him a sense of the parameters of the interview. This includes the time frame. ("I'd like to talk to you a few minutes..." or "I'd like to ask you a few questions...") If you need to move on after a bit, this will help the person accept it on without feeling abandoned. If the person is in a highly emotional state, begins to break down, and seems self-conscious, you may ask if he would like to move the interview to a more private place — even a lobby or a doorway.

If other journalists crowd in and you lose control of the interview, think about ways to alleviate any distress the interviewee is experiencing as a result. This may include offering the interviewee the option of terminating the interview. We are in the early stages of creating a journalistic culture that is respectful of these considerations. You cannot always control or influence the behavior of other journalists — but you can conduct yourself in a way that allows you to live with yourself and to serve as an example.

3. Your tone of voice and body language matter. A person experiencing trauma has a reversal of the emotional and the cognitive roles of the brain — the emotional areas gain influence, and the cognitive areas (those that logically process information) have a diminished role. A traumatized person will probably be slower to process language, and may ask you to repeat questions, or, in a detailed interview, even to write them down. She will forget much of what you say, but remember how you say it.

Show empathy, not detachment. But strive to maintain control of your own emotions. Empathy is not so much about joining a person in his emotions, as about appreciating and validating those emotions.

Don't expect any single reaction. Different people manifest trauma in different ways, ranging from the stoic and wooden to the hysterical. Do not judge the condition by the reaction.

Physical posture

Adopt a posture that shows empathy. If it is a long, seated interview, you may consider sitting beside the person. Some people find that it is helpful not to make eye contact, but to look at the same abstract spot on the floor or the wall that the interviewee is looking at, literally, "to see things from his perspective." Leaning

slightly forward expresses openness. Crossed arms and crossed legs can be interpreted as closed or hostile. Do not be surprised if you feel awkward or uncomfortable. This is natural.

Crying

If the interviewee cries, this is not necessarily a bad or harmful thing. As stated above, if he feels exposed or humiliated by being in a public setting, try to modify the setting and find privacy. You may proceed if the interviewee is willing.

Carry paper tissues at all times, and offer them as a caring gesture. One reason people feel self-conscious about crying is nasal discharge, and offering them a paper tissue can help. A friendly touch on the arm is also often good. You may want to help them with a sense of purpose for the moment. It might help to say, "I know this is really traumatic for you to talk about, but people need to know about it because..." Do have a good reason at hand as to why people need to know.

Questions

Avoid stupid questions. First among these is "How does it feel?" Psychologists say that a less direct approach is sometimes better. "What do you want people to know about what happened?" Tread carefully.

Don't project. Do not say, "I know how you feel." You don't. Don't say, "You must have felt..." You should be helping the person to articulate her own narrative, whatever it is, and by reflective listening, to legitimate it.

Avoid pat responses. These include, "It could have been worse," or "You're lucky ..."

Respect silence

If they ask "Why did it happen?" do not try to give a direct answer. An appropriate response is an echo: "Yes, why did this terrible thing happen?" If they express denial, don't challenge it. Denial is a legitimate and useful stage of the grieving process.

Ending the interview

Be supportive. End up with a warm handshake when possible, with thanks and comforting words, such as, "I wish you well."

If it is a long, major interview, consider a follow-up call after a week or so, to say, "I just wanted to see how you're doing."

Sometimes people will feel violated or show anger, even if you haven't done anything wrong. It can be their experience talking, not their reaction to you. Examine your conscience. If it is clear, move on.

Anne Nelson has developed a curriculum in human rights reporting at Columbia. Dr. Daniel Nelson (her brother) is a child psychiatrist who led the Family Notification Unit at the Oklahoma City Bombing.

A16. Ethical processes for this research

The researcher followed guidelines established by the Queensland University of Technology when approaching potential candidates for research in this study. An initial telephone call was followed up with a three-part package which comprised (a) a letter confirming the conversation as well as (b) an information sheet that explained the nature and direction of the study and (c) an informed consent sheet for signing by each participant:

(a) Confirmation letter

8 Celles Street

BRIGHTON QLD 4017

(07) 3269 0273

0407 693 778

(Addressee details)

Dear

Request for assistance with a postgraduate research project

Firstly I would like to thank you for considering this request and assure you that any assistance provided by you or your family would be both valuable and appreciated.

 completing a postgraduate research project which aims to determine the extent of any impacts on victims and their families of news reports of traumatic events they have experienced. To do this, next month I will be interviewing a number of adult survivors as well as adult members of victims' families and their local communities. From these questionnaire-based interviews, I will then develop and analyse a select number of case studies that highlight issues raised by participants.

This research is part of a Master of Arts program being completed at the Queensland University of Technology, where I am also a full-time staff member.

Earlier this year I conducted a review of relevant literature in this area and – having worked for the past 20 years as a journalist or with the media as a liaison officer – I am aware that there are limited operational guidelines available for Australian media covering significant traumatic events that take into account the wellbeing of victims, survivors and those close to them.

Hence, I am now seeking to firstly document the impact of first-hand interactions people have with the media at or after a traumatic event. I am also keen to examine how reporters, photographers and other editorial decision makers handle these situations and present their news. Additionally, my research will compare the impacts reported by victims and families who have experienced a multiple-victim event – such as those touched by the events of April 28, 1996 – with those impacts reported by people connected to a single-victim event.

The information and ideas that come from this research will enable me to suggest a series of constructive steps that reporters, photographers and others in the media can take to alleviate pressure – or minimise further distress – for victims of trauma and their families/communities.

My principal research supervisor is Cratis Hippocrates (formerly the head of journalism here at QUT and now working for the Fairfax organisation in Sydney as Group Editorial Training Manager). I am also receiving support and advice from Gary Embelton (a professor who recently retired from our School of Psychology and Counselling) as well as Lee Duffield, a journalism lecturer in our School of Media and Journalism. Another researcher at QUT, Phillip Castle, is looking at the impact on journalists of reporting traumatic events.

As far as my own research is concerned, I will be in Tasmania between October 6 and 15, in Victoria between October 15 and 20 and in New South Wales between October 20 and 22 specifically to conduct interviews and would be most appreciative if you could spare time during this period to participate.

An information package about this research is enclosed for your information. If you are willing to participate in this research, please read the enclosures and call me on **(07) 3269 0273** or **0407 693 778**.

I can be contacted on one of these numbers at any time and please feel free to reverse the charges (or to call me and I will call back) if you would like to discuss this request further.

Yours sincerely

Trina McLellan

(b) Information sheet**Subject Information Package**

Chief Investigator: **Trina McLellan (AT22 Master of Arts candidate)**
School of Media & Journalism, QUT
(07) 3269 0273 or 0407 693 778

Project title: **The impact on victims and their families
of news reports of traumatic incidents**

Date: **September/October 1999**

If you agree to participate in this research, you would be agreeing to an interview (of approximately one to two hours) which would canvass your direct and/or indirect experiences with the media during or after a traumatic event.

The interview would take place either at your home or at another convenient location. To enable transcripts to be prepared for comparative analysis, the interview would be taped. You would have the discretion to halt the tape – or the interview itself – at any point. Similarly, if you would prefer, sensitive information can be kept confidential. If requested, a copy of the transcript of this interview can be provided to you by the researcher. Recordings of interviews and related materials will be kept under lock and key at the premises of the researcher for a period not less than five years.

Following your interview, the researcher will make contact again within a few days and then again when the transcripts have been finalised (approximately three to four weeks).

Should the interview/research itself have an unforeseen impact on you at any stage, the researcher will make every attempt to arrange support and/or counselling that you deem appropriate.

Issues to be probed would include (but not solely limited to):

(About your own experiences of this event, not necessarily about media)

- overview of your experiences in relation to this event
(this may include accounts of the experiences of family/community members)
- things that particularly caused – or alleviated – concern/distress
- specific words or actions that helped or hindered

(About specific experiences with the media)

- how media got in touch with you/your family/community
- spread of media seeking interviews (local, state, national, international)
- with which types of media did most interactions take place (print, radio, tv, etc.)
- volume and duration of interactions (i.e., overall timeline of media interest in you/your family)
- timeliness of interactions for you/your family/community
- description of how the media went about its work
- whether you/your family/community understood how/why the media worked this way
- extent of your prior experience with the media
- whether an advocate/intermediary helped with the media at any stage
- how any such facilitation arrangements worked & whether these were satisfactory
- whether you saw/heard news reports/photos/footage at the time or since
- whether specific news reports affected you/your family/community
- whether media/public attention affected you/your family/community
- ranking of different media's behaviour during/after this event
- how would you have ranked the media prior to this event
- were there any journalists/news outlets that you would single out for mention & why
- have your opinions of the media altered as a result of, or since, this event
- did different media outlets treat you/your family/community differently
- did you/your family/community ever feel a complaint was necessary

- if so, was that followed through and, if yes, through which channels
- what you would say to these media again if they had the chance
- what you might tell their employers/managers

(Regarding other interacting agencies)

- how did you find the behaviour of police throughout this time
- how did you find the behaviour of emergency services personnel
- how did you find the behaviour of legal/court personnel

(Socio-demographic information)

- your age at the time of event, as well as your gender, country of birth, marital status, residential postcode (then/now)
- what your occupation was before this event & what it is now

Questions related to the project are welcome at any time. Please direct them to either me, Trina McLellan, on (07) 3269 0273 (ah) or 0407 693 778, or if at any time you are not satisfied with my responses, to either Cratis Hippocrates on (02) 9282 3117 or Lee Duffield in the School of Media & Journalism at QUT on (07) 3864 1360. If you have any concerns in relation to the ethical conduct of this project, you may contact QUT's Registrar on (07) 3864 1056.

Participation in this project is entirely voluntary. You are free to withdraw consent before or during the interview without comment or penalty. If you withdraw consent during the interview, action will be taken by me to terminate the exercise and to comfort you. Under no circumstances will you be prejudiced as a result of your actions. Your participation or withdrawal of consent will not influence your present or future involvement with QUT.

Thank you for your consideration of participation in this study. Your help is greatly appreciated in the completion of my Master of Arts degree. Please ensure that you have read and understood the enclosed information and, when you have decided whether to participate, could you please call me on (07) 3269 0273 or 0407 693 778. If you are willing to participate, I will need you to complete the enclosed Research Consent Form and fax it back to me on (07) 3210 0474.

Yours sincerely

Trina McLellan

(c) Informed consent form

Research consent form

Chief Investigator: Trina McLellan (AT22 Master of Arts candidate)
 School of Media & Journalism, QUT
 (07) 3269 0273 or 0407 693 778

Project title: The impact on victims and their families
 of news reports of traumatic incidents

Date: September/October 1999

The investigator conducting this research project, Ms Trina McLellan, abides by the principles governing the ethical conduct of research and, at all times, avows to protect the interests, comfort and safety of all subjects.

This form and the accompanying Subject Information Package have been provided for your protection. They contain an outline of the research being done and any possible risks.

Your signature below will indicate that

you have received the Subject Information Package, and read and understood its contents and, therefore, what would be required of you by agreeing to an interview with Ms Trina McLellan.

you have had any questions about this research answered by Ms McLellan to your satisfaction.

you are alert to the possible effects of participating in this research and understand that Ms McLellan, through QUT, will facilitate any counselling or support which may be specifically needed as a consequence of any discussions you have with her on these issues.

EITHER

you realise that Ms McLellan might have difficulty in guaranteeing total anonymity to you when reviewing such specific circumstances and, so, give her permission to disclose your identity within her research if that is unavoidable.

OR

you understand that Ms McLellan will maintain and safeguard the confidentiality of information you disclose wherever possible and, further, that she will allow you to view the transcript of your conversation/s when prepared. If, in the completion of her analysis and/or the drafting of her thesis, Ms McLellan believes that it might be possible for your identity to be inadvertently disclosed, she will contact you and discuss the nature of this risk and whether to exclude the reference from final publication.

you understand that you are free to withdraw from this project without comment or penalty and that your withdrawal will not effect and current or future involvement with QUT.

you have agreed to participate in this research project.

you will be able to direct any inquiries or further questions to the investigator's principal supervisor Cratis Hippocrates on (02) 9282 3117 or to her associate supervisor Lee Duffield at QUT's School of Media & Journalism on (07) 3864 1360. You may also direct any specific complaints or concerns regarding the ethical conduct of this investigation to the University's Registrar, Mr Ken Baumber, on (07) 3864 1056.

Your details

Signature _____
 Date _____
 Name (please print) _____
 Address _____
 Telephone (day) _____

Emergency contact:

Name _____
 Phone _____
 Family doctor _____
 Phone _____