

ETHICS FOR MEDIA COMMENTATORS

Equipping expert live commentators with an ethical code

Mike Granatt and Patrick Lagadec

The world has changed. It has a new monster, or a new friend, depending on your point of view. Rolling 24-hour broadcast news is voracious for information and comment, and never more so on the eve or in the aftermath of disaster.

It is possible to define the general responsibilities of the expert commentator within the role created by broadcasting and the written media. This role itself has changed considerably over the last 15 years or so, as the backbone of broadcast news has moved from the crafted compilation of bulletin to the rolling vista of 24-hour newsgathering and delivery.

Before this became the norm, extended commentary was mainly the province of newspapers, because they alone had the capacity to carry the weight of words. This was set in the context of a rhythmic delivery of news to its audiences, based around broadcast bulletins and newspaper editions.

Within this older, more measured context, the role of the expert was generally to offer a retrospective view at length, or to provide some quotes which could be selected or edited. This offered something of a considered view of facts and context which had emerged over time. It was possible, if not easy, to discern the interactions of a connected world.

Now 24-hour broadcast news takes us to the physical or metaphorical cordon around an unfolding dramatic event, complete with its unfolding stream of vivid snapshots, bereft of context and time for analysis. And the world has become exceedingly complex, with countless more interactions between behaviours and systems in network society.

This has created a completely new balance among the actors involved in a disaster, crisis or impending crisis.

Over the period, two dynamics have considerably deepened the challenge of live commentary.

□

1. Crises appear to be more and more saturated with fuzziness, complexity, instability, discontinuity, and the potential to trigger unforeseen and unthinkable effects. Therefore the role of the expert has changed, with much less emphasis on historical comparisons, and much more on the explanation of new phenomena. New oceans of ignorance and extremely unstable contexts amplify the risk of words causing disruption, collapse of morale, loss of control, and even death.

2. Crises set a dramatic stage, feeding on the real-time global affects facilitated by broadcasting, the internet, and mobile telephony. Millions of people can now observe from the very boundary of the event, while mobile phones have raised their expectation of instant contact with loved

ones, wherever they might be.

□

Consider the families of the three million people who travel into London to work every day.□15 years ago, before the widespread use of the mobile phone, news of multiple terrorist attacks certainly gave rise to anxiety among those families.□However, it was tempered by the fact that it would probably take some time for a commuter to reach his or her place of work, and make contact to say they were safe.

However, on 7 July 2005, those millions of people faced two very changed affects – instant, continuous broadcast coverage, coupled with the expectation of instant mobile telephone contact.

But the GSM mobile system simply couldn't meet the demand for calls, and blocked access to huge swathes of London workers for the crucial early period of after the bombings.□Their relatives all suffered a level of frustration, worry and stress from an unprecedented in the city's history.□□□

This then adds to the burden of the expert commentator.

The inevitable information void between the impact of a disaster or crisis and the point at which good data is flowing is therefore of even greater significance.□And filling that post-impact information void has become an intensely competitive period for broadcasters, and a time of real challenge for the expert called to support the broadcasters.

Rolling news programmes now make extensive use of the “presenter's friend”, an expert who sits with the newsreaders or joins the reporter in the field.□As news flows in, often disjointed and partial, the presenter's friend is asked to comment on its significance within seconds, long before there has been any time to consider it at any more than face value.□

This problem used to be the sole province of the news reporter, who is known to the public as a professional observer rather than an analyst, and whose lack of specific knowledge is recognised and tolerated.

However, the expert commentator has no such luxury, and indeed is often required to offer authoritative views on

- Comparisons from history
- Analysis of unfolding events
- Breaking news
- The quality of emergency response
- Political and personal implications

This is a daunting responsibility.□

An ethical code for expert “live” commentators

Given the capacity of rumours and misinformation to gain political and social traction, there is a

clear need to discuss an ethical code for the protection and guidance of the expert, of the broadcaster, and all those who may be affected by broadcast commentary in the vulnerable period of the void and beyond.

Below are some suggestions for the code. It is not exhaustive or structured, but it is intended to provide the initial material for the debate which will lead to this increasingly necessary consensus.

1. **First do no harm.** Do nothing knowingly that makes matters worse for victims, or which creates new victims through implication or action.

2. **Speak the truth.** Never mislead on the facts or on the implications of the facts. Interpretation and speculation must always be based on realistic and considered assessment.

3. **Comment proportionately and with balance.** Ensure that the context is clear, and that snapshots do not build a false picture.

4. **Exercise compassion.** Take care with comment and tone. Actors of every sort may be victims or may become victims.

5. **Warn or criticise with calculation and care.** Consider this course only when you consider the facts are clear, that the net effect will drive improvement, and the need is pressing.

6. **Create understanding and reasonable expectations.** Build the ability of your audience to make informed choices and to understand how the world has changed.

7. **Do not pursue irrelevant causes.** Do not distract the audience or other actors from their task of understanding what is before them.

8. **Strengthen resolve, and discuss difficulties frankly.** Give praise where it is due, and even in the direst circumstances explain how recovery or protection can be achieved.

9. **Serve all the audience.** As far as practicable, commentary must be accessible to the largest number of people, while retaining integrity and accuracy.

10. **Encourage learning, self-help and community action.** Self-help is an acknowledged therapy, and the provision of useful information is a key component of risk-communication.

11. **Do not exploit the difficulties or mistakes of others.** No err is human, but to profit from mistakes is malign.

12. **Do not create a new paradigm from poor information.** Where information is scarce, ensure the audience understands the consequent imprecision of conclusions and analysis.

13. **Attribute assertions and identify uncertainty.** The expert's role is the creation of certainty and confidence, even about uncertainty and lack of confidence. Help the audience to understand

the boundaries of knowledge, to separate mere belief from solid fact, and to judge the speed and likelihood of progress.

Last but not least, the expert must prepare for the extreme.□As emerging crises appear within the new, global, instant information context, he will be increasingly confronted with situations for which no script has ever – or could ever – been written.□

The only solution has three equally important components.□

The first is in-depth preparation, testing capabilities on the most difficult scenarios.□

The second is the ability to check and calibrate in real time using a large network of colleagues who share the same duty.

And the third is the ethical code, guiding the standards, responses and behaviour of the network and those who seek to use its members.

THE AUTHORS

Mike Granatt is Visiting Professor, University of Westminster, and Senior Visiting Fellow, Defence Academy of the United Kingdom.

Patrick Lagadec is Director of Research, Ecole Polytechnique, Paris and co-founder of the European Crisis Management Academy.