

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

The courage to speak

How investigative journalists persuade reluctant
whistleblowers to tell their stories

James Hollings

A thesis submitted to Massey University in fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

2010

School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing

Primary supervisor: Nikki Hessel

Secondary supervisor: Wendy Bacon

Abstract

Investigative journalism is often said to be based on two pillars of information gathering – documents and human sources. Yet while document retrieval and analysis have received much attention in recent years, particularly with the advent of computer-assisted reporting and Freedom of Information legislation, remarkably little attention has been given in the journalistic literature to best practice for developing and maintaining sources, especially reluctant, vulnerable sources with high-risk information. This thesis uses a case study approach to analyse four high-profile examples of New Zealand investigative journalism based on revelation by vulnerable and reluctant human sources. Using interviews with both the sources and the journalists who persuaded them to speak out, it draws on persuasion and social psychology theory to explain the decision-making process of the whistleblowers and establish a model of best practice for journalists wishing to persuade reluctant, vulnerable people to speak out safely and effectively.

Acknowledgments

This thesis would not have been possible without the generous support of many people. In particular, I would like to thank my supervisors, Nikki Hessel and Wendy Bacon, who kept me motivated and waded through many drafts. It was a great pleasure to engage with such learned minds. My colleagues at Massey University: Grant Hannis, Sriramesh Krishnamurthy, Karl Pajo, Sean Phelan, Alan Samson, Frank Sligo, Cathy Strong and Elspeth Tilley were always encouraging and gave valuable advice. Wendy Sullivan, Sharon Benson, Nicky McInnes and Mark Steelsmith provided essential technical and administrative support and were as always helpful and available. Investigative journalist Nicky Hager was also very generous with his time and helpful in discussing some of the ideas in here, as were Clive Lind and Tim Pankhurst. My family was always enthusiastic and a special thanks must go to my partner Kate, who bore the brunt of family life and often put aside her own work so I could finish this. Lastly, and above all, I would like to thank the journalists and sources who trusted me with their stories and gave generously of their time to critique a draft. In particular, I would like to thank Philip Kitchen, a brilliant journalist, who generously introduced me to some of his sources and encouraged this project from the beginning. Such a long and involved task truly does seem like a collective effort and I hope the result will be useful.

Attestation of authorship

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, nor material which to a substantial extent has been accepted for the award of any other degree of diploma of a university or other institution of higher learning, except where due acknowledgement is made in the acknowledgements.

James Hollings

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments	ii
Attestation of authorship	ii
 Chapter One – Introduction	 1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Evolution of the research interest	2
1.3 Developing the research problem.....	3
1.4 The organisation of this thesis.....	4
 Chapter Two – Literature review	 9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Definition and context	11
2.3 The role of news sources	14
2.4 Other kinds of witnesses: Whistleblowers and police witnesses.....	24
2.5 Investigative journalistic practice	31
2.6 Summary	49
 Chapter Three – Methodology	 53
3.1 Introduction	53
3.2 Methodological choices	56
3.3 Theoretical perspectives.....	60
3.4 Research design.....	94
3.5 Conclusion	108
 Chapter 4 – Case Study One - Philip Kitchen and Anna Smith	 110
4.1 Introduction	110
4.2 The case	111
4.3 Analysis	121
4.4 Conclusion	135
 Chapter Five – Case Study Two - Philip Kitchen and Louise Nicholas.....	 140
5.1 Introduction	140
5.2 The case	141
5.3 Analysis	160
5.4 Conclusion	171

Chapter Six – Phil Taylor and Donna Johnson	177
6.1 Introduction	177
6.2 The case	178
6.3 Analysis	191
6.4 Conclusion	203
 Chapter Seven – Fionnuala Kelly	 206
7.1 Introduction	206
7.2 The case	206
7.3 Analysis	220
7.4 Conclusion	228
 Chapter Eight – Discussion.....	 230
8.1 Introduction	230
8.2 Persuasion effects.....	231
8.3 Message and other factors	233
8.4 The role of emotion in the ELM and CDT	238
8.5 Relationship Effects	247
8.6 General Effects.....	250
8.7 Conclusion	252
 Chapter Nine – Conclusion.....	 258
9.1 Introduction	258
9.2 The findings	260
9.3 A model of best practice: The Informed Commitment Model	276
9.4 Strengths, limitations and implications of this research	278
9.5 Implications for the ELM	279
9.6 Implications for the whistleblower and witness literature	2800
9.7 Towards a new theory of whistleblowing.....	282
9.8 Implications for the journalism literature and journalistic practice	283
9.9 Conclusion	288
 Appendix One: Sample Interview Schedule and Information Sheets.....	 292
Appendix Two: Sample Interview Schedule.....	296
Appendix Three: Master coding and data sheet	300
Reference list	300

Chapter One - Introduction

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Evolution of the research interest

1.3 Developing the research problem

1.4 The organisation of the thesis

1.1 Introduction

Investigative journalism is a term that means different things to different people. For some it is the kind of journalism epitomised by Watergate; bringing down a corrupt government by harnessing people power to the typewriter. In the United States, especially, it is often associated with long, painstaking investigations, sometimes using the techniques of social science, to produce a comprehensive picture of a social trend or problem. In Europe the term is interpreted more loosely, and maybe applied to what many Anglo-educated journalists would see as highly politicised crusades. For others it is more modest; perhaps a report on a faulty consumer product, which nonetheless saves money and even lives. What has entered public consciousness, thanks to a flood of Watergate and post-Watergate films, is that investigative journalism often depends on the help of a well-placed source. Often this source is a mysterious, angel-like figure who appears at crucial points in the investigation to guide the journalist to a vital clue that leads them to their ultimate goal. For such a celebrated archetype, remarkably little is known about the process by which such people become such sources. In part this is because many choose to remain secret, and journalistic ethics usually precludes journalists from revealing their identity. Those sources who do become public have not attracted a great deal of research interest. Where there has been research, it has generally concentrated on the intrinsic interest of the case itself, rather than relating it to journalistic practice. Despite the widespread acknowledgement of the importance of the whistleblower to

the investigative journalist, this author is not aware of any academic study that has attempted to look at the interaction of these two iconic figures of late 20th and early 21st century society. This thesis attempts to redress that.

1.2 Evolution of the research interest

Like many journalists of my generation, Watergate was an inspiration to get into journalism. The drama of the investigation, and the fact that two young reporters could challenge the apparently unchallengeable, was dream-inspiring. Growing up in the 1980s, we were at university at a time when big government and the abuses of the Reagan administration seemed to need a new generation of journalists to keep a check on power. A few years later, as a young journalist covering the health round in New Zealand during the turbulent years of the 1990s, I tried to develop the kinds of sources that would provide a glimpse into the innermost workings of government. Most of my attempts to cultivate those in positions of influence were ignored or fobbed off. Few senior civil servants or private sector bosses then had media training. Many viewed the media rather like a biosecurity threat; something to be contained, avoided, and ideally eradicated, rather than cultivated. Later, I was able to develop some excellent sources who took risks to help break stories of significant public interest. Such victories were not common, however, and for every such person, there were many that didn't help. On one occasion, after a long-running investigation into the sexual offending of a small group of known dangerous psychiatric patients who had been released from asylums, I was surprised to read of a psychiatric nurse, Neil Pugmire, who told another newspaper what many had suspected; that officials were well aware of the risk but were releasing dangerous patients regardless because they felt the law required them to. I remember feeling surprised that this whistleblower had not contacted me, as our paper had led the reporting on the issue, and I had put out many feelers for information. Years later, I

was still wondering what made this person help, and that person not, when the appeal to each was usually the same – something along the lines of a better-informed citizenry is vital for a democracy. I found myself wishing I had questioned those who had helped me more closely on why they had done so.

1.3 Developing the research problem

A few years later I read *The Secret Man – The story of Watergate's Deep Throat*, Bob Woodward's account of his relationship with Mark Felt, the senior FBI official who guided his investigation of Watergate (2005, p. 17). Again, the question came up; what made this person take the step of helping the media, when so many of his colleagues didn't? Later, like many New Zealanders, I watched with admiration as *Dominion Post* journalist Philip Kitchin nailed corrupt MP Donna Awatere Huata with the help of a whistleblower, and as the testimony of Rotorua housewife Louise Nicholas led to an inquiry into and changes in the New Zealand Police. Again I wondered, how did this work? Why did some journalists seem to get such sources, and others not? Was it luck, or something else? There was little in the journalism memoirs and manuals I had read that offered much insight. I knew what journalistic tradecraft said about the issue; developing sources was about building trust, and keeping your word, but also not getting too close. Some of that gelled with my own experience; but how close was too close? I knew that was something many reporters wondered about. Did getting too close help or hinder the story coming out? What did "close" mean? Often as a journalist I felt frustrated that I could not take sides; at other times it was a relief to shelter behind the credo of impartiality. Once or twice, I deliberately did take sides, and write stories that were not really justified on news grounds, to ingratiate myself with a source. Without saying anything untrue, I wanted to show I was on their side, or at least willing to give them a fair hearing. Sometimes this worked; but other times it did not. I was left wondering what makes

people holding important and dangerous secrets want to reveal it, especially to a journalist? And why this journalist, and not that one?

After leaving reporting and entering the academy, and beginning to acquaint myself with the journalism research literature, I was surprised and somewhat disappointed to find so little of the research preoccupied with the kinds of questions that I would have liked answers to as a working journalist. Most seemed to be about what was wrong with the news media, how or why journalists were captured by elites; questions which had little relevance to many working journalists who spend most of their time simply trying to find out what is going on, and to get people to talk. Only when I read Barbie Zelizer's *Taking News Seriously* (2004b), with her call for journalism research to move beyond the preoccupations of sociology, did I start to understand how and where to stake out the ground I was interested in.

When I began this doctoral study, I returned to what seemed to be the central difficulty and constant preoccupation of my time as a reporter; how to get people to talk; in particular those who are reluctant, and in possession of a story or information that the public really needs to know. I wanted to know whether these people want to talk, but feel afraid, unable to, or simply uninterested in the public discourse. What could a journalist say or do that would make any difference?

1.4 The organisation of this thesis

This thesis takes a traditional approach in attempting to find answers to this research topic. This chapter, the introduction, lays out the genesis of the research problem, and its relevance to journalism practice.

Chapter Two surveys the journalism literature, both academic and non-academic, for insights into how journalists deal with sources. Although there is a wide body of journalism literature, this study chose to focus on the investigative journalism

literature, because these tend to be the most difficult stories to do, the most controversial, those with the most at stake for sources and journalists, and therefore where journalists and sources are likely to have had to work out the nuances of interaction under the most pressure. They are also the stories with the most public interest at stake and therefore where it matters most to learn how they can be brought to light safely and effectively. However, where relevant, the wider journalism literature is also discussed.

The journalism literature can be divided into craft manuals and academic research. The former provides insights into and recapitulation of craft knowledge; the latter expands on this with the application of theoretical models, in particular the viewpoint of sources, which tends to be lacking in the journalistic literature. After a discussion of the various descriptions of investigative journalism, it settles on Ullman's widely accepted definition (1995), that it must be a) the work of the reporter, and not a report of an investigation by someone else, b) involve something that someone wishes to keep secret, and c) involve something of importance to the reader or viewer. It then moves on to a discussion of the context surrounding the academic study of journalism. There is surprisingly little research on investigative journalism practice. One theme that comes through is the need for application of theory from disciplines other than sociology, political science and history to significant questions of journalism practice. Journalism practice lacks a solid body of research that draws on general empirical theory from disciplines such as psychology, philosophy, and science.

To get some insight into people who come forward with their stories, the literature on whistleblowers and police witnesses is also discussed. Both areas lack a widely accepted, empirically based theory of how, why or when people choose to speak out. In particular there is virtually nothing on why people talk to this or that journalist; usually the literature either only canvases one side (journalists or whistleblowers) or where it does talk to both, is preoccupied with what has been described as issues of

“power and control”(Manning, 2001). Without discounting the relevance of the politics of power at both the macro and micro level, the literature has tended to be preoccupied with the former, leaving a gap for more work on the latter.

Chapter Three outlines the method chosen to explore the research topic. Rather than include a summary of relevant theoretical literature within the literature review, this study foregrounds the epistemological choices here. A brief summary of approaches to an exploratory topic is given. This makes clear that conscription of a theoretical paradigm is itself a methodological choice, and not necessarily an inevitable one for an exploratory field. The method chosen here was designed in line with the dictum that research should aim to balance tradeoffs between accuracy, generality and simplicity (Langley, 1999; Weick, 1979). It aimed to maximise accuracy, by staying close to the data, and not prematurely imposing a hypothetical paradigm that might occlude other relevant data. Hence an exploratory approach was taken, with a pilot study aimed at identifying theoretical areas that could be brought to bear. Three broad strands were identified; persuasion theory, relationship theory, and media effects. Only the first two were considered; although the third could still have relevance, it was considered beyond the scope of this study, which was concerned with the effect on the internal processes of whistleblowers. To enhance generality, the wider literature on these strands was then surveyed to identify relevant, empirically supported theory that usefully be extrapolated to the data, and to which the data could themselves contribute. To enhance validity through triangulation, and following Langley’s (1999) alternate template strategy, where possible at least two alternate theories were chosen within each strand. A suitable research method was then devised, involving four case studies selected purposively, in line with Znaniecki’s prescription for analytic induction (1934). Three of these four cases involved reluctant whistleblowers, with a fourth providing a “negative” case. The cases were selected to meet Ullman’s (1995) criteria for investigative journalism. This does not mean the study does not have relevance to journalism as a whole –

“investigative” cases were chosen because they involved reluctant and vulnerable whistleblowers, and these were almost inevitably on socially significant issues. The cases were also selected to maximise opportunities for triangulation of the data. Firstly, cases were only selected if both whistleblower and journalist could be interviewed, allowing comparison of their accounts. Secondly, case selection allowed comparison of journalistic approaches, as one journalist worked on two cases. Thirdly, one case was an overtly “negative” case, in which the whistleblower was apparently less reluctant, allowing comparison with the other three and opportunities for theoretical replication.

In Chapters Four to Seven each of the four case studies is outlined and explained, and analysed both in the light of the theoretical paradigms chosen in Chapter Three, and also more generally to account for other relevant factors. A brief outline of the genesis of each case is given. A summary of the interviews is then provided, then these are analysed in light of the relevant theory. While the analysis was broadly inductive, it also drew on deductive and inspirational approaches, following Langley’s advice to “make sense whatever way we can” (1999, p. 708).

Chapter Eight draws together the threads teased out in chapters Four to Seven. Again a variety of analytic approaches is taken, with the overall aim of providing meaningful, accurate interpretation of the data. Coding sheets drawn up for each case were collated into a generalised sheet, and all four cases are discussed as a body, to tease out their implications in light of the research questions. This chapter advances the view that the four cases chosen do provide useful insights into the processes by which reluctant whistleblowers decide to speak out, and what role journalists play in that process. In particular, it shows that journalists can play an integral role in this process, both in helping whistleblowers through an often difficult decision, and in ensuring their safety before, during and after the process.

In Chapter Nine, the conclusions drawn in Chapter Eight are discussed further, in light of the literature on journalism and the theoretical paradigms outlined in Chapter Three. As well as providing insights for journalists wishing to persuade reluctant whistleblowers to speak out, the results provide interesting additions to the theoretical literature. In particular, it explains further the role of emotion in persuasion and makes suggestions for a reformulation of theory which may more successfully predict whistleblowing. Chapter Nine also proposes a model of best practice for journalists wishing to persuade reluctant, vulnerable whistleblowers to speak out that aims both parties to participate without compromising their safety or professional ethics. This chapter also discusses the limitations of this study and directions for further research. These include the role of emotion in persuasion, the role of the Spiral of Silence Theory as a mechanism for engaging the wider community in construction of the investigation, and the usefulness of the journalistic notion of impartiality when dealing with reluctant sources.

Chapter Two follows this introduction, with a discussion of the literature on investigative journalism. This includes the various definitions of the term, how practitioners of it have seen their craft, and in particular the issue of dealing with sources. It also looks at how the whistleblower literature explains the process of speaking out, and how this relates to journalism.

Chapter Two - Literature review

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Definition and context

2.3 The role of news sources

2.4 Other kinds of witnesses: Whistleblowers and police witnesses

2.5 Investigative journalism practice

2.6 Summary

2.1 Introduction

Surprisingly, given the popular image of the journalist's "Deep Throat", there is a relatively small body of literature on investigative journalism, and even less on how investigative journalists persuade sources to talk. However, the slow journey of this sub-genre of journalism from muckraking outsider to limited acceptance as one pillar of a democratic society has been mirrored by a growth of interest in it as a subject worthy of serious study. The following chapter gives a brief overview of the literature on investigative journalism, and in particular the interaction of journalists and their sources, with a view to identifying areas for further research.

Investigative journalism is often seen as the preserve of specialists, gifted individuals who have a natural talent and aptitude for it, rather than as a result of training or management strategy or a development of a newsroom culture that supports it. If this is true, perhaps some of this natural "talent" could be deconstructed and explained and made available to other non-specialist journalists. This review of the literature on investigative reporting aims to identify this knowledge and explore gaps in it worthy of further research. Why investigative journalism? Although

questions of how to persuade reluctant people to talk are of interest to all journalists, this study chose to focus on investigative journalism because these tend to be the most difficult stories to do, the most controversial, those with the most at stake for sources and journalists, and therefore where journalists and sources are likely to have had to work out the nuances of interaction under the most pressure. They are also the stories with the most public interest at stake and therefore where it matters most to learn how they can be brought to light safely and effectively. However, where relevant, the wider journalism literature is also discussed.

In light of the above, firstly a definition of investigative journalism as a wider more inclusive term rather than a narrow specialist area is discussed. This is followed by an overview of how the wider journalism literature has treated questions of journalist-source relations. It suggests that a preoccupation with sociological methodology has meant some important questions of journalism practice have not received the attention they deserve, and that these questions could benefit from the application of theory from other disciplines such as psychology. This is followed by a survey of the literature on journalists' sources, which again identifies a gap; this literature focuses on "professional" sources, or people who interact with journalists as part of their jobs. There is little on those who come forward perhaps once, and then reluctantly. In search of scholarship on the motivations and decision-making process of this sub-group of journalists' sources, this review surveys the non-journalism literature, including that on whistleblowers and police witnesses. While there is some useful information here on why such people speak out, it does not explain or include the role of the journalist, if any, in facilitating this process. To understand more about this end of the research problem, the review turns to the non-academic literature, particularly the wider body of work on journalistic craft and memoir. As a mirror to the source literature, it provides some insights, but like a mirror it only works one-way; there is no discussion of the same case by both journalist and source. However, from the above discussion, three important themes

emerge. Firstly, the vital role this sub-group of reluctant, vulnerable sources plays in ensuring stories of significant public interest are published. Secondly, how little is known about their motivations and decision-making process and in particular to what extent the journalist influences their decision to speak out. Thirdly, that discussion of these questions involves consideration of themes such as persuasion, relationships, and media effects, which are likely to require insights from disciplines of communication and psychology as well as those of journalism and sociology.

2.2 Definition and context

Investigative journalism is a term which has been interpreted widely. It is a term which is commonly used in the literature, usually to distinguish the kind of journalism which goes further than simply daily reporting on the issue of the day. Definitions vary from more inclusive to those restricting it to a certain kind of journalism, but all have in common the element of exposure of injustice. The Oxford Concise Dictionary describes investigative (of a journalist) as meaning “Investigating and seeking to expose malpractice or the miscarriage of justice” (Soanes, Stevenson, & Pearsall, 2004). Wider definitions include those of American investigative journalism historian James Aucoin, who defines it as “telling the public something which it is important for them to know, and which they don’t know” (Aucoin, 2005). For many reporters, such as John Pilger, it is not just about “detective work”, but journalism that “bears witness and investigates ideas”. For him, all journalism should “not only keep the record straight, but hold power to account” (Pilger, 2004, p. xiv) Watergate reporter Carl Bernstein believes investigative reporting is simply “trying to find the truth” and doesn’t believe investigative reporting is “some kind of pseudo science ... all good reporting is really the same. It’s an attempt at attaining the best version of the truth” (Behrens, 1977, p. 35). Other writers tie it more specifically to a function in society building; for example de Burgh suggests that

whereas journalism is often described as the first draft of history, investigative journalism is “the first draft of legislation” (Burgh, 2000). The influential American sociologists Ettema and Glasser believe it to be more than just a draft of legislation; they suggest it helps build shared moral values, and thus a sense of community; they call this “an exercise in public conscience despite itself”(1998, p. 200) . This more restricted view is often preferred by those studying the investigative journalism produced by the heavyweight news national news organisations, which often specialise in taking on government secrecy. For example, in her review of Australian investigative journalism programme *Four Corners*, Marni Cordell summarises the major works in the field and proposes strict criteria:

1. The target of the story must be a public figure and /or a person or group in a position of power (can be collective), and the information revealed about that target must be in the public interest.
2. The story must reveal information that someone wants suppressed and/or is for other reasons concealed from the public that would only have been uncovered through the journalist’s initiative.
3. The journalist must seek to pursue the issue beyond allegation and denial.
4. The story must reveal new information and/or bring together information that is already in the public domain in a way that is revelatory.
5. The story must alert us to systemic failures and/or point out where society is failing/or falling short of purported standards (Cordell, 2009, p. 123).

However, in general, journalism texts are not as restrictive as Cordell, in the sense of requiring some element of systemic failure. One definition that has become widely accepted is that first proposed by US investigative journalist and author John

Ullman, who in turn quoted Robert Greene, the former assistant managing editor of *Newsday*:

It is the reporting, [primarily] through one's own work product and initiative, matters of importance which some persons or organisations wish to keep secret. The three basic elements are that the investigation be the work of the reporter, not a report of an investigation made by someone else; that the subject of the story involves something of reasonable importance to the reader or viewer; and that others are attempting to hide these matters from the public. (cited in Ullmann, 1995, p. 2)

This three-pronged definition has been widely quoted in both academic studies of investigative journalism and in journalism manuals (Northmore, 1996; D. L. Protess, et al, 1991). It has also become the preferred definition of the U.S.-based Investigative Reporters and Editors (IRE) (cited in D. L. Protess, et al, 1991, p. 5). British investigative journalist David Northmore points out an important subdivision within that definition; the distinction between consumer-related investigations into dodgy tradesmen or consumer rip-offs, and those into conflicts between the individual and the state. He points out that in many European countries investigative journalism has often been preoccupied with the latter. But overall, Ullman's definition is widely accepted and is preferred here.

Having defined investigative journalism, it is worth turning to its literature for what it can tell us about how investigative journalists deal with their sources. The literature on investigative journalism tends to be divided into two categories – academic studies of the nature and context of the genre, and how-to manuals on the nuts and bolts of the craft. There has been much useful work done on the role and effect of investigative journalism (Burgh, 2000; Patterson, 1986; D. L. Protess et al., 1987) the factors causing it to flourish or decline (D. Berkowitz, 2007; Cordell, 2009;

Feldstein, 2006), and variations between countries (Nord, 2007; Ojo, 2007; Zdovc & Kovacic, 2007). There has also been a burgeoning of how-to guides, anthologies, and studies of practitioners in recent years. These have provided a useful and increasingly coloured overview of the field, emphasising its strong appeal across wildly different cultures and astonishing resilience in the face of violence and repression. However, perhaps because of this focus on the macro-sociological perspective, there has been less work done on investigative journalism work practice. This study takes a micro-sociological approach to these issues, arguing that the psychology of individual relations between journalists and their sources can be useful to the field as a whole. It takes its cue in part from influential social theorists such as Pierre Bourdieu in arguing that the nature and coherence of journalism work practice can be a fundamental influence on its influence and role in society, and by implication that this practice is worthy of further study. Investigative journalism historian James Aucoin has called for more work on journalism practice, including “biographies of practitioners, especially those who have influenced how journalism is done; the ideas held by practitioners about the craft; and the cultural and social setting of the practice” (Aucoin, 2005, p. 10).

This discussion will look first at the literature on journalists and sources together. It will then drill down into the literature on other kinds of sources, such as whistleblowers and police witnesses. Finally, it will turn to the literature on investigative journalists’ work practice and memoir for insights into the source-journalist interaction.

2.3 The role of news sources

The pre-eminence of news sources in the study of journalism has been well-recognised. Michael Schudson argues that “journalism, on a day-to-day basis, is the story of the interaction of reporters and government officials, both politicians and

bureaucrats ... there is little doubt that the centre of news generation is the link between reporter and official." He quotes Hess's study of Washington correspondents, which found that they use documents rarely; people and talking to people are what matter. "[Much of what] journalists do on an ordinary day, even in the era of e-mail and the Internet, is talk to people." He estimated that this could be as high as 24 interviews a week – clearly showing the importance of the people and persuasion aspect of the job (Schudson, 2002, pp. 150-151). Manning agrees that news sources are central to the study of the "big questions" of news journalism (2001, p. 1).

In New Zealand, too, some of the most significant investigative stories of the past two decades have relied on the use of anonymous sources, or named whistleblowers who spoke out at considerable personal risk. Examples include Nicky Hager's expose of the Echelon spy network (1996), Philip Kitchin's expose of the fraud of MP Donna Awatere Huata, and of the baton-rape by serving police officers of Rotorua teenager Louise Nicholas (P. Kitchin, 2007; P. Kitchin, & Mirams, C., 2002; L Nicholas & Kitchin, 2007). Other significant investigations in New Zealand that have relied on whistleblowers include one into the release of dangerous psychiatric patients (Cf Essex, 1994).

Given this central role of the human source, what can the literature tell us about how this relationship works out? There are two main streams of literature on this topic; the academic literature, and the non-academic (mostly manuals of investigative journalism and memoirs of investigative journalists). Taking the first stream first, much of the early thinking on how journalists interact with those they rely on for news was articulated by Stuart Hall (1978). He advanced the concept of the "primary definer"; that is, that the structure of the media automatically gives preference to the voices of the powerful, and these people become the primary definers of a topic. Journalists were "secondary definers", who largely transmitted what the first group had defined as the news.

But as Schlesinger (1994) points out, this argument is problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly, it ignores competition between official sources, and ignores the fact that official sources often use off-the-record briefings, which means they don't appear in the media, overtly at least. It ignores the fact that boundaries between definers shift; some lose importance; they may even compete with each other. Finally, Schlesinger thought Hall's argument overstated the passivity of the media. They weren't always in a position of "structured subordination" to the primary definers. It didn't take account of investigative stories, where the media take the role of primary definer, by defining the topic of investigation, or explain the role of counter-definers, people who challenge the official position. If it were that simple, why the massive investment in corporate public relations? "Thinking of 'primary definition' as a resolved matter makes us incurious about source competition and what its implication for the workings of the public sphere might be" (Schlesinger, 1994, p. 21).

One attempt to resolve some of the problems in Hall's work was a ground-breaking study of the Canadian law and crime scene (Ericson, Baranek, & Chan, 1989). The authors' team undertook direct observation and interviewing of 93 different reporters and news sources in the Toronto area, covering three different beats; police, the legislature, and the courts. They combined this with participant observation and an analysis of how sources were treated by the newspaper as expressed through a selection of letters to the editor, over a six-day period. Much of the detail and observation of the routines and culture of journalists would ring true to many journalists. The study noted the problem facing many reporters focusing on the elites; they often get into a state of dependency on the source. The authors are particularly good at differentiating between kinds of reporters, described as "inner-circle" and "outer-circle". Inner-circle reporters are very close to their sources, and have so absorbed the culture of their beat that they will voluntarily censor themselves to further their source's interests e.g. by suppressing details of a police

investigation, until it can be released without damaging the investigation. These reporters often rely heavily on experienced communications spokespeople. The outer-circle reporters are the real reporters, ferreting out what's interesting information in their organisations, and presenting it to other journalists, who then act more as editors, deciding what will be used and mixing it with similar information from other "reporters" in other organisations. (pp. 6-7). The authors argue that the sociology of newswork has tended to emphasise that sources have the whip hand over journalists. Instead, they say, the process is more even: "Sources and journalists join together socially, culturally, and on beat location as interdependent participants in knowledge production and use" (p. 379) .

Ericson, Baranek & Chan's study makes a major contribution, firstly, in the level of empirical detail it provides about the way journalists and news sources view their work, and secondly, in the more nuanced understanding it provides of these relationships. In particular, the authors are brutally efficient on the pragmatics of power relations between news sources and journalists: "For the source who feels compelled to seek adequate representation in the news, the trick of the trade is to turn bad news into good news for hegemonic effects. By appreciating that bad news is a public good that can be traded on for organisational advantage, the source can benefit from its power." But although the source is involved in power politics, he must appear in the news "as a team player who acknowledges the public interest". If he doesn't, he will be reduced in the "hierarchy of authorised knowers" and possibly even put beyond the pale of worthy sources. Ericson et al., steeped in the politics of power, see even the development of trust between sources and journalists as a mode of control. Acknowledging that sources will develop a degree of trust such that they will say things that could ruin their careers, they see this as linked to interests and values: "The source feels she can trust a journalist or news organisation when she can take for granted that regardless of what she says it will be construed reasonably, even favourably ... that is, in accordance with the source's values and interests." For

example, the trust can be useful to discredit others, when the source does not want to appear to be doing so; reporters “must feel confident that the knowledge the source gives is factual, and is in accordance with mutual interests”. Trust is something used by sources when other means fail. The courts, buttressed by legal restrictions around reporting, can afford to keep reporters at a distance. The police, more porous, “are obliged to seal the leaks by solidifying trusting relations with journalists.” Even outer-circle reporters, “mandated to uncover procedural strays” within the police, reproduce a common discourse of order and consensus”(pp. 379-395).

Ericson et al. developed a model to answer what they saw as the central concern of this study: how sources protect their organisation against journalists and control their organisational environment by achieving favourable publicity. A four-way matrix of back regions, front regions, confidence and secrecy, it is mapped like a compass, with front regions at the North pole, back regions at the South, confidence at the East and secrecy at the West. Front regions are the public face of organisations; back regions those places where decisions are reached out of public view; enclosure or secrecy is the tendency to keep things private; disclosure or confidence is the obverse. As the authors point out, these regions do not necessarily determine what is revealed; front regions may not reveal reportable material, because it is still enclosed (e.g. suppressed material in court) while back regions, although nominally private, may be revealed through off-the-record conversations.

One of the major contributions of Ericson et al.’s study is that it makes the relationship between journalist and source more equal, by emphasizing the power journalists and news organisations have. It documents many of the practices of beat reporters, particularly those who deal with power. But a reader is left wondering whether it is the whole story? Is the journalist/source relationship simply a business partnership to pursue mutual interests? How useful is this theoretical model for determining why sources talk to journalists? To the extent that they do comment on

how sources choose journalists, one of their major points is that those wishing to communicate in the news media “must share values with journalists, including core values of the dominant culture”. Journalists and sources are interdependent; each learns to bring their views into conformity with the other. Sources learn what journalists see as reportable material, and adjust their rhetoric; sometimes journalists also adjust their news values to accommodate this. The example given is that “the news requirement for objectivity, fairness, and balance ... means that sources are safe in giving accounts that will only be challenged by the representations of an opposing source, rather than by independent evidence generated by the journalist”(pp. 14-15). In other words, sources may be encouraged in mouthing empty rhetoric to a journalist, when they know the journalist is only going to match their speciousness with another’s, rather than expose it for what it is. This is no doubt true for some beat reporters, or those who are more concerned with what Tuchman (1980) called the “strategic ritual of objectivity” than what they see as the truth. However, investigative reporters tend to fall into the latter category – they go beyond the strategic rituals to look for a greater truth. Thus the idea that they must necessarily share values with their sources is problematic. Ericson et al.’s model does provide some level of predictability, and a way of determining the likelihood of a source to provide information, in the sense that it provides a way of classifying the degree of secrecy attached to the information. But their map is essentially just that; a way of tagging information quality; it describes whether information from a source is likely to be private, public, official or non-official. It does provide for informed guesses about whether a source is likely to talk, based on the kind of information they have. But it doesn’t really account for the personal, non-purposive or strategic factors that may influence human behaviour.

Thirdly, Ericson et al.’s study is of how organisations interact with journalists, rather than how individuals do so. It misses some of the nuances of how individuals,

particularly those who do not want to be identified as talking to journalists, interact with them. It doesn't take account of the differing motivations of the disaffected within organisations, or those who have just left (such as whistleblowers), who are often those of most interest to investigative journalists¹. Even for beat journalists who have worked rounds for years, there can develop a whole extra level of intimacy and trust with a few sources, that goes beyond the mere retailing of that organisations' views, to a mutual exchange of views, as has been documented more recently (Flynn, 2006). Ericson et al., focused on agenda-setting and control of the public space, tend to overlook this aspect. Because of this, the sources interviewed are people for whom talking to journalists is routine; part of their job. It is not about people who do not particularly intend to, or want to talk to journalists, but find themselves forced to by circumstance or desperation. This includes whistleblowers, particularly those who are not part of an organisation. A more open, less thematically focused study might have picked up sources and/or whistleblowers without such focused agendas, and those without institutionalized legitimacy for their media interaction.

Fourthly, the study is more about how and why sources talk to journalists, rather than particular journalists. What are the factors that cause sources to favour some journalists over others? Is it simply a matter of who offers the best exposure, and who reports more uncritically than others? Many journalists would like to believe that there is an element of trust and gratitude in the relationship, yet the model tends to downplay this. It also doesn't account for the more sophisticated, mutually dependent relationships that have been described between reporters and sources; for example Bob Woodward's with Mark Felt (2005). Ericson et al.'s study does not adequately tease out the motivations and decision-making process of these more complex relationships. It is too simple to impose a deterministic analysis based on

¹ Investigative journalist Seymour Hersh, for example, once summed up his method as "Follow the retirements" (Hager, 2010).

the rituals of power, especially so when this study, like almost every other on journalists and their sources, does not compare one journalist's perceptions of their sources with that source's perceptions, and vice versa.

Another significant study of both crime reporting and journalist source relations is Schlesinger and Tumber's analysis of crime reporting in the UK (1994). Looking at the interaction of journalists, policy makers, police and the public, they found that the centrality of sources to the news making process was profound, and growing. People in policy positions had to engage with the media, to advance their policy agendas – it was considered part of the job. This could take the form of overt engagement, or surrogate involvement, in which policies were “tested” in the public arena before becoming official policy. News sources were not simply a matter of the rich and powerful elites co-opting journalists. There was variation within the types of groups that have access, and journalists themselves had considerable power, by denying coverage, or choosing who they privileged over others. One problem with Schlesinger's work is that it is focused mainly on public sources; and although he doesn't quite say it, official and quasi-official groups who are trying to influence the public space. This doesn't take account of the private, unofficial individuals who, while they may have strong views on a topic, have not tried to advance a point of view; who probably aren't a public figure; who have never approached a journalist and who are probably have no idea how to do so. These are the people that have to be persuaded to talk; people who don't really fit the definition of whistleblower, in that they aren't thinking of going public; yet who have a vital contribution to make to the public debate.

To summarise, the sociology of journalists and their sources has been preoccupied with what Manning describes as the one question central to the study of news sources: “understanding the way in which both structures and dynamic social practices shape the flows of information generated by news source activity and news organisations” (2001, p. 41). Or as Berkowitz and TerKeurtz put it: “issues of power

and control”(1999). In other words, do journalists control the news, or are they merely mouthpieces for the bigger forces that shape society?

Schudson (2002) has noted that influence over reporters comes from the pleasure they gain from the exclusive access “that other mortals are denied”. He quotes reporter J. Anthony Lukas: “The relationship between reporter and source, particularly one of long term, is filled with collaboration and manipulation, with affection and distrust, with a yearning for communion and yearning to flee” (2002, p. 145). This preoccupation with who and what influences the news may indeed be one of the big questions, but in reaching for the overarching narrative, many of the smaller but vital questions for journalistic practice (and possibly democratic function) have been left behind. Another problem is the lack of comparison of the journalist’s account of the interaction with that of those who were their sources. Apart from the validity issues this raises – of whose account is most accurate – we thus get little insight into the relationship dynamic between journalist and source. This review could only locate one study that compared the journalist’s experience with those of the sources or whistleblowers they have actually dealt with, and even then only as part of the same group, rather than one on one. Flynn’s (2006) study of Australian “leakers” and political journalists considers some aspects of best practice for journalist-source relations, including what she calls “unauthorised leakers”, and touches on aspects of persuasion of those who are taking a risk (although still people who deal with the news media regularly as part of their job). It affirms the importance of trust and good relationships; some of the journalists develop such good relations with their sources that the sources take considerable professional risks to guide the journalists on issues of high government policy. This notion of the journalist-source interaction as a relationship is important – it implies that factors in relationship management must be important to development and maintenance of these kinds of sources. However, this study is also frustratingly limited in what it tells us about how these relationships are nurtured. Trust is important, but how

important? What other factors made the leakers decide to choose this journalist and not that one? What did the journalist say or do that made any difference?

Because of the nature of the ethnographic methods used, sociological studies of the journalist-source interaction have tended to rely on people that have constant and ongoing professional media involvement i.e. public relations officers and authoritative sources. This study, like those above, is no different – it is concerned with “professional” sources – people who are leaking as part of, or as an extension of, their job.

These studies, in which these professional “leakers” have remained confidential, tell us little about those more voluntary, marginalised, often scared people who interact with the media perhaps once or twice in their lives, at times not of their choosing. These are the whistleblowers and sources who have to be persuaded to speak out, publicly, and do so despite little or no experience with the media and at considerable personal cost and risk. These studies also tell us little about the decision-making process of these people, or analyse this in the context of current theory, e.g. of trust or relationships. Trust may be important, but how important? And what kind of trust? What kind of relationship?

In her review of the literature on journalism studies, U.S. journalist-turned sociologist Barbara Zelizer (2004a) suggested sociological interpretations of journalistic practice have tended to over-generalise, taking one example of practice as representative of all journalists. She argues for more work on practice that is non-strategic and non-purposive, believing journalism studies in general has suffered from being viewed through the individual lenses of academic fields – whether historical, sociological, language studies or political science. What is needed, she believes, is work that ranges over all and draws on all these areas.

From the author’s own experience, and anecdotal evidence from other journalists, there is a great deal of difference between a reporter’s everyday interactions with

people on their beat who are running routine agendas and not taking personal risks, and those rare individuals who take considerable personal risks to speak out. For many journalists, the issue is not whether they are being indoctrinated (although one could legitimately argue this should be an issue for them) by their sources, but more prosaically simply finding sources, and getting them to talk. This is especially the case with non-professional, “voluntary” sources.

The gap in the literature in this area suggests it’s an area that would be worth exploring – not just because the whole tradecraft of journalist/ source interaction is of vital and daily interest to journalists, but because of what it says about the way journalism works in society. Before turning to that, however, it would be worth surveying the literature on other kinds of witnesses to see what insights it brings to these questions.

2.4 Other kinds of witnesses: Whistleblowers and police witnesses

Whistle-blowing is often defined as employees speaking out on an issue. One widely quoted definition is that whistleblowing represents “the disclosure by an organisation’s member [or former member] of illegal, immoral, or illegitimate practices under the control of their employers to persons or organisations that might be able to effect action” (Miceli & Near, 1992, p. 15). However, not all definitions require that a whistleblower be a member of an organisation:

Whistleblowing is a deliberate non-obligatory act of public disclosure, which gets onto public record and is made by a person who has or had privileged access to data or information of an organisation, about non-trivial illegality or wrongdoing whether actual, suspected or anticipated, which implicates and is under the control of that organisation, to an external entity having the potential to rectify the wrongdoing. (Jubb, 1999, p. 78)

This definition seems more useful and inclusive, as it doesn't exclude people who are not specifically part of an organisation, but nonetheless are part of that organisation's community. For example, in two of the cases in this study, the two individuals were not part of the police force, but were involved at various times in a police officers' social network, and aware of many of the social values and norms associated with it. This confusion about how to define whistleblowing has been matched by a lack of agreement in the literature about the motivations and process of whistleblowing. While studies have generally characterised whistleblowers as principled, moral people, many reviewers have noted that there is no convincing socio-demographic profile (Brown, 2008; Glazer, 1999; Hersh, 2002). Glazer's survey of 64 whistleblowers from a range of fields, from nuclear industry to political activists in the former Soviet Union, to environmental campaigners, concluded there was no one type of person that blew the whistle. It found a number of factors were important in their decision to speak out; these included anger, an attempt to preserve their moral view of themselves; a feeling they could make a difference, and if they didn't no one else would; and the support of others, as well as more pragmatic reasons such as the desire to influence the policy process. Hersh (2002) summarised the situational factors likely to lead to whistleblowing as when evidence of wrongdoing is clear, when it is believed it will be effective, and when whistleblowers have support from family or friends; but he noted that whistleblowers are motivated more by their own consciences than the belief they are able to change anything, and may act in order to protect their self-image of themselves as moral people. One study of 800 public sector employees asked them what would deter them from blowing the whistle; it found that not having enough proof and absence of legal protection were the most important factors likely to deter them (Zipparo, 1998). Another recent study of police misconduct in Georgia, USA, found that supervisory status was the most consistent predictor of willingness to and actually blowing the whistle (Rothwell & Baldwin, 2007). It also found that police were more likely than civilian employees to speak out. One of the biggest

studies, of 7663 Australian public sector employees across 118 agencies, confirmed there was no one type of person more likely to blow the whistle. The most common factor identified by the respondents as making them more likely to “blow” was whether they thought it would be effective. Other factors were the seriousness of the wrongdoing, and whether they would be protected from the consequences of speaking out (Brown, 2008). This study used Miceli and Near’s more restrictive definition of whistleblowers (see above) requiring they be part of the organisation involved. Unfortunately this study, while immense, does not tell us much about why people blow the whistle, or their decision-making process. It relied on self-report of the whistleblower, using a fairly limited set of Likert-scale based questionnaires, and did not compare their responses with the views of anyone else. Like virtually all studies of whistleblowers, it preconceptualises whistleblowing as an individual act, thereby precluding the potentially significant influence of other people on their decision.

One metastudy of whistleblowing literature found that ethical judgement is related to whistleblowing intent, but not to actually blowing the whistle (Mesmer-Magnus, 2005). Uys (2008) has noted the way in which whistleblowing can be a political act as much as an ethical act. She argues it can be seen as a form of betrayal, an “expression of irreconcilable values” (2008, p. 906).

While studies have identified factors associated with blowing the whistle, researchers have been less successful at coming up with a theory that predicts it.

One widely quoted attempt is Miceli and Near’s four-stage model (1992). Stage one is the “triggering event”, consisting of some kind of wrongdoing. Stage two is the decision-making process on whether and how to report the wrongdoing. Stage three is reporting the wrongdoing, stage four the reaction from the organisation or others. Hersh (2002) argues this model places too much emphasis on a rational decision-

making process and does not take account of those who feel compelled to act or who delay acting. He prefers Rosecrance's (1988) five stage process:

Internal criticism of questionable activity is followed by lack of reaction from superiors and hardening of positions on both sides. The next stage, external disclosure, results from frustration at the lack of response and the need to do something. The fourth stage is organisational responses, involving transferring whistleblowers out of the mainstream of probation work, and the last stage is aftermath, with unsuccessful attempts to get the transfers rescinded. (cited in Hersh, 2002)

Rosecrance's study was based on interviews with whistleblowing probation officers. Of particular interest is the second stage, external disclosure. Although many officers complained, only four generally competent and above average employees took it to the next stage of blowing the whistle. These were financially secure, had high self-esteem, but blew the whistle when they felt "backed into a corner". Some reported that they felt "It was time to put up or shut up"; "I just couldn't allow things to continue". The action was more a personal reaction to an intolerable situation than a calculated plan to effect change (Rosecrance, 1988, p. 104).

Unfortunately, there is tantalisingly little detail on how or why these people made their decision to speak. In particular, there is nothing on why some decided to go to the news media, and others did not, and why they chose some journalists over others. This is somewhat surprising, given that blowing the whistle usually involves interacting with the media in some way. Hersh (2002) has pointed out the difficulties facing researchers on whistleblowers; the conditions they face are difficult to replicate in the laboratory, and qualitative methods usually chosen make it difficult

to replicate research and create predictive theory. He argues much of the research has resulted in one-dimensional hypotheses, and “seem to ignore the fact that there can be different groups or types of individuals who become whistleblowers, for instance both loners/outsiders and conventional organisational identified individuals” (p. 246).

More recently, researchers have tried to refine models that predict whistleblowing, particularly by including the role of emotion as a trigger point for the decision to speak out or not. A whole body of research has grown around the concept of voice within organisations (E.g. Greenberg & Edwards, 2009). As the authors point out, early models drew on bystander theory, and saw whistleblowing as essentially a set of rational choices. More recently, recognising the oft-cited role of emotion by whistleblowers, researchers have tried to develop models that incorporate some or a number of emotions (Gundlach, Douglas, & Martinko; Henik, 2008). All of these models come from what Edwards, Ashkenasy and Gardner (2009) call the “affective revolution” in the organisational sciences, recognising the basic role of emotion in decision-making. Edwards et al. propose a model which extends the number of emotions that influence the decision, by including non-discrete, or self-conscious emotions, and anticipated emotions (such as the likelihood of regretting the decision). This model builds on Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) which describes how employees’ emotions from observing an event will affect their decision-making. AET is based on cognitive appraisal theory and assumes a two-stage paradigm of decision-making, with behaviours driven by emotion “influenced primarily by instantaneous reactions to an event”, or judgment-driven behaviours, which “occur following a cognitive evaluation of the situation ... driven by enduring attitudes about the job or organisation” (cited in Edwards, et al., 2009, p. 89). This model is interesting and the use of appraisal theory to explain the emotion involved in whistleblowing takes the whistleblower literature further than the essentially typological explanations which characterised earlier studies. In particular, the

attempt to explain the role of anger, which is most commonly mentioned in studies of whistleblowers as a motivating factor, is worthwhile. However, the distinction between emotion and cognitive evaluation as separate processes is problematic, as a recent review points out (Clore & Ortony, 2008). More recent models are discussed further in Chapter Three. The authors themselves acknowledge several limitations, including the likelihood of factors other than the organisational context being of influence. As has been observed above in relation to the larger typological studies, one of these other potential factors is the role of the persuader, such as the journalist, in the decision to speak out. These and other potential variables in the decision-making process need more exploration, ideally in relation to relevant theory, before an attempt can be made at constructing a predictive theory that has a real chance of accuracy. Some potentially relevant theoretical approaches are discussed in the next chapter.

Like journalists, police often have to persuade people to help them with their enquiries. There is a growing awareness in policing of the value of witnesses, and intensive efforts have been made in the UK over the past decade to encourage witnesses to come forward and give evidence in court (Fyfe & Smith, 2007). In the UK, this work has been followed up with a baseline Witness Satisfaction Surveys (Angle, Malam, & Carey, 2003; Hamlyn, Phelps, & Sattar, 2004; Whitehead, 2001). These have shown that careful communication with and handling of witnesses by police and improved measures in the courtroom are important predictors of witness satisfaction with the process, and likelihood of being willing to be witnesses again. However, as Fyfe has pointed out, much of this effort is situational – trying to make it easier for witnesses in the courtroom. More work is needed on what he calls causes, rather than symptoms – such as what motivates witnesses to come forward or not in the first place. Such research as there is has identified a tension between individuals' instincts to keep out of trouble, and to do what's right (Fyfe & Smith, 2007; Spencer, 2001). Spencer found both circumstantial and personal reasons behind

witnesses' decisions on whether or not to come forward. Circumstantial reasons included the place of the offence, and whether they felt responsibility lay elsewhere, such as in a place with security cameras; whether they were worried about interfering. They were more likely to come forward if the crime was serious, or the victim vulnerable; less likely if there was no apparent victim or they thought the crime justified. Personal reasons included whether they were anxious about having to appear in court (Spencer, 2001). The Witness Satisfaction Surveys have identified women and children as having particular concerns about the latter (Whitehead, 2001). However the research on police witnesses is frustratingly limited in that it either tends to be quantitative, and thus less focussed on the complex internal decision-making process of individuals; or in the case of Spencer it draws on sociological literature on social capital and bystander apathy, rather than on general psychological theory that might better explain a) the decision-making process of individuals and b) whether the police officer has any influence over that process. Nor does it appear to have drawn on the whistleblower literature, which appears to corroborate many of the same processes; such as that people are more likely to speak out if they feel they have a special role or responsibility; that only they have the power to stop this thing happening again (Hersh, 2002).

To sum up, then, the whistleblower literature makes it clear that the decision to speak out is a very serious one for many, risking as it does the almost inevitable retribution, and requiring extremely difficult choices. It is perhaps not surprising that it is also a complex decision involving strong emotion. However, despite some decades of study, whistleblower research has not produced a reliable predictive model of whistleblowing, possibly because it has not until recently begun to explore the role of emotion in decision-making in a way which takes advantage of emotion research. Nor does whistleblower research explain in enough detail the decision-making process leading to speaking out, and in particular the role of other actors,

such as journalists, in this. For insights into how journalists approach and deal with sources, it is necessary to turn to the literature on journalism practice.

2.5 Investigative journalistic practice

There are three main strands of literature on journalistic practice; academic, memoir, and tradecraft or “how-to” books. All of these provide some insights into how journalists deal with sources, but as will be seen, all have their shortcomings.

Turning first to the macro-sociological context, one of the most significant texts in recent years is *Custodians of Conscience* (Ettema & Glasser, 1998). This was one of the first attempts to describe the sociology of investigative journalism, and probe the meanings and context of the practitioners, and their work practices. The authors describe investigative journalism as a moral discourse, an “exercise in public conscience despite itself”. Journalists, though conflicted, serve an important social role – that of helping construct public virtue, through reminding the public of social norms and the departure from them. One of the central paradoxes in investigative journalism, the authors suggest, is whether it is “possible to know and tell what is important about human affairs without also knowing and telling what is right? Put another way: Can such fact exist without value?” (p. 10).

They argue that this paradox creates a tension for journalists. They suggest that fact and value are interdependent, and that investigative journalism offers important lessons about the relationship between fact and value. Investigative journalists begin with some vague notions of moral concern, and in the process of the investigation come up with a recipe for moral action; with “specific standards for the evaluation of public conduct”(p. 192). While their moral codes are still hidden beneath the drama of the story, they are much more upfront about those moral codes than daily reporters.

Ettema and Glasser posit investigative journalists as “agents of reform and reconciliation”, promoting the Habermasian concept of solidarity, or a sense of commonality, of shared ideals that result from an informed conversation. This “search for common ground” is the great contribution of investigative journalism, and vital for investigative journalism to flourish. Other vital factors at the microsociological level include the techniques and practices of what they describe as the “master practitioner”. Drawing on Schön’s (1983) reflective practitioner theory, they argue that journalists display some of the same skills as lawyers, doctors or engineers. They suggest a distinction between what might be termed the formal skills – the application of theory and principle to a problem – and what Schön called “the irreducible element of art in professional practice” (cited in Ettema & Glasser, 1998, p. 21). The practitioner draws on past experience to decide how the current problem might best be solved. They use “on-the-spot experiments” such as hypothesis-testing, in which the practitioner proposes an idea, as they work, to see what comes of it. They note that the key point about this approach is that it is affirmative – it looks for approaches that affirm a particular solution to a problem. Unlike scientific experiments, which look to disprove a theory-based prediction, the master practitioner looks for evidence that can “affirm the practical value of an approach to a problem” (cited in Ettema & Glasser, 1998, p. 21). The expert may not be able to explain to others on what basis he or she is making decisions, for it is a sense of “knowing in action” rather than “knowing in words”. Schön suggested key concepts – frames, repertoires, experiments - for analysing this element of “irreducible art” (cited in Ettema & Glasser, 1998, p. 21). Ettema and Glasser compare this concept to what Michael Schudson terms “mature subjectivity” – the ability to tolerate uncertainty and risk rather than cling to “arbitrary conventions established in the name of objectivity” (cited in Ettema & Glasser, 1998, p. 22). Investigative journalists, they argue, don’t simply apply a set of objective rules (though there are many journalism textbooks willing to prescribe them). Rather, they must learn to “creatively sustain a conversation with the situation” (p. 22). They use

their tacit knowledge and “intuitive methods” in the “irreducible art” of reporting. Schön argued that the “irreducible element of art” in professional practice was not in applying a set of rules, but in simplifying and organising a problem so that theory and principle could be brought to bear on it. Ettema and Glasser argue that investigative journalists do this simplifying by framing the problem, then bringing to bear a “repertoire of moves”. Nowhere, they argue, is this more apparent than in the way these journalists go about gathering information. They argue the skills can be broken into three sets: getting people to talk, getting information from documents, and working undercover. Journalists’ “nose for news” is another example of this “knowing in action”. They give several examples of this “irreducible art” in practice, of the reporter’s ability to “see as” something already present in his/her repertoire. One is of a reporter who locked on to a city council pension report buried in a pile of uninteresting bylaws. “He saw that ‘pensions’ plus ‘elected officials’ equalled interesting” (pp. 21-24).

How do reporters choose from their “repertoire of moves”? They do it by conducting a “conversation with the situation”. The example given is of a young reporter who, in a rape investigation, was stuck on how to make it more solid. A senior reporter suggested she talk to the rapists in prison. When she protested they wouldn’t, he countered with a keystone of reportorial wisdom: “If you know enough to ask questions, they will say something”. Another example of this “conversation with the situation” is the evaluation of sources. They suggest that the process of “assessing and assembling evidence” is the most vital test of the mature subjectivity of the veteran reporter. Some of the principles veteran reporters operated by included; never assume a source won’t lie to you; that self-incriminating testimony is more reliable than self-exculpating testimony; that more than one source is important; or even that such rules are meaningless.

In summary, Ettema and Glasser argue that investigative journalists exemplify Schön’s idea of thinking in action. Masters don’t think, then do; they think while

they do, or through doing (cited in Ettema & Glasser, 1998, p. 59). Schön argued that it is vital that professionals reflect on their practice, not just for personal advancement, or advancement of the profession, but for the benefit of society as a whole; so that “professional practice can be transformed from an exercise in unchallengeable expertise to a conversation with the client” (p. 59). Ettema and Glasser acknowledge that few journalists have, or believe they have, time for this kind of reflection. But they argue, at a time when the credibility of the news media is in decline, that readers clearly do not believe journalists have any unchallengeable expertise, and that it is high time journalists begin to reflect on their practice and begin that conversation with their clients.

Ettema and Glasser’s analysis has been widely cited and has certainly provided new ways of looking at investigative journalism. Their documentation of investigative journalists’ work practices, and in particular the art in their skills, is excellent. But some of their conclusions have been questioned. Ullman (1995) contests their suggestion that journalists select their facts to serve the “moral task at hand”. He is highly critical of their suggestion that in the cases studied the journalists “cooked the books to make people who are not innocent appear innocent so that the reader or viewer will be outraged, and to ensure that the reader or viewer will believe the reporters that there is a real problem” (Ullmann, 1995, p. 198) . He suggests the authors, in claiming to have discovered that journalists create a narrative that has a moral form similar to other kinds of storytelling, have done nothing new.

Two other criticisms of Ettema and Glasser’s approach are worth mentioning here. Although the use of master practitioner theory does provide a neat and convincing description of the way journalists feel their way through the process of learning and refining their craft, its preoccupation is more with the meaning of the process, than the detail of it. Thus they have little to say on quite large areas of the knowledge production process. Perhaps the most obvious of these is the journalist’s relationships with their sources, and the wider community. How do they build these

relationships? Who influences whom? What factors help them decide who to trust and who to build relationships with? What influence does the wider community in which the journalists and their sources operate have? These are all vital questions for working journalists.

A related problem is that Ettema and Glasser's analysis does not take into account the intersubjective dynamic that may exist in the journalist-source relationship. Its emphasis on the skills of the practitioner in elucting the story from the myriad data and sources suggests they are the sole actor in the process and asserts a primacy of agency, or more particularly the reporter's agency, in the production of the story. It may be true that the ability to think on their feet and entertain a "conversation with the situation" is fundamental to the success of these journalists in the practice of their craft, and in particular in the interaction with sources. But does it explain why sources decide to speak to a journalist? Or to this particular journalist? The journalists themselves like to characterise their ability to engage with sources as a vital part of their repertoire of moves, but is this really the case? Do the sources that journalists believe they have cultivated so carefully really see the relationship the same way, and decide to talk to the journalist because of a long-nurtured relationship of trust? Or are there other factors in play? Part of the reason why the authors don't address these issues is because of their choice of methodology. By limiting themselves to the texts and interviews with the journalists, they occluded the possibility of exploring the views of the sources of the stories. Like nearly all the texts on investigative journalism which attempt to draw conclusions about how to deal with sources, the journalists hard-won conclusions about sources' motivations has never been systematically cross-checked with the sources themselves.

Another influential work on investigative journalism practice, historian James Aucoin's study of U.S. investigative journalism, also emphasises the importance of good work practice in producing a good result. Aucoin frames this in terms of the social practice theory advocated by Alasdair MacIntyre (1984), which in turn was

derived from Aristotelian ethics. MacIntyre suggested that good work is a result of a person acting virtuously. He defined the virtues as: “justice, truth, courage, and an adequate sense of the traditions of a social practice”. Practitioners must choose those virtues most apt to each situation. The social practice – “any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity” develops as practitioners seek “internal goods” by aiming for excellence (cited in Aucoin, 2005, p. 204). Aucoin suggests that in investigative journalism these goods include telling the whole story, making a difference, reporting on issues of public import, truth-telling and originality. The standards of excellence needed to achieve these include “having the courage to confront the powerful, being independent, documenting their assertions, doing a thorough job of reporting, presenting their findings vividly ... and doing follow-up stories” (2005, pp. 204-205). Aucoin is particularly adamant that the ethical core of investigative journalism comes not from being outraged at something; it is in investigating and reporting on it in an ethical manner. Ethical means applying a high standard of truth-telling; facts must be able to be proven; reporters must be free of malice and independent. However, a practice must not only have standards; the practitioners must be willing to subordinate themselves to them.

The emphasis of these two studies on integrity of work practice as essential to the success of investigative journalists is well-supported in more populist studies. This literature tends to emphasise their ordinariness in everything except dedication to the craft. Those profiled in one early study, *Typewriter Guerrillas*, (Behrens, 1977) included singletons and those happily married, early and late risers, some were gregarious, some more reserved, young and old, men and women. Some liked to work alone, some worked best in teams, some were street-wise and educated, others extolled the benefits of social science research and techniques and computers for their craft. Many saw their job as “nothing special”, just another form of reporting. John Seigenthaler, in the foreword to *Typewriter Guerrillas*, says the common factors are:

toughness, self-reliance, cynicism, inquisitiveness, or the simple desire to know more about the facts of the story than anybody else alive The courage to stand down a bluff, the guts to confront a lie, the gall to invade unwelcome premises, the lonely inner strength to keep a secret, the sensitivity to ask the tough question, and the determination to protect a confidential source right up to and into jail. (Behrens, 1977, pp. xiv-xv)

He quotes a veteran editor who described them as “always two parts bastard and one part angel”. Other reporters quoted in Behrens include Carl Bernstein, who believes patience – the ability to go through vast amounts of records – and an ability to deal with people and get them to trust you, are key qualities, while others, such as Peter Bridge, list patience as vital. For Gene Cunningham, responsibility to her sources, a sense of ethics, is crucial, and “as sacred as the relationship between lawyer and client” (Behrens, 1977, p. 89). Behrens believes they must have “brass”, and often a streak of paranoia. He likens them to guerrillas because they “volunteer for hazardous duty because they enjoy the excitement of going behind sensitive questions and issues of public interest” (Behrens, 1977, p. xviii).

More recent writers have affirmed and extended these descriptions. For John Pilger, the “common element is the journalist’s insurrection against the rules of the game”(2004). David Spark quotes various investigative reporters, who say the qualities needed are luck, persistence, being someone who wants to get to the bottom of things, being single-minded, being prepared to read, and having “a feeling of outrage about wrongdoing”. They are also often short tempered and quirky, have flexibility of mind, and an ability to be out of step with the herd (1999, p. 13). While doggedness and inquisitiveness are important, it is arguable whether investigative journalism requires the best or brightest, or even great expertise. As Bernstein says:

Woodward and I used the most basic, empirical techniques similar to those we first learned when we were very young. ... What was really extraordinary about it ... was not the methodology but what was yielded by the methodology. (Behrens, 1977, p. 35)

As can be seen from the above, the academic and populist literature demonstrates the importance of integrity and other personal qualities, such as persistence, to do good work. But the actual details of how these top journalists persuade reluctant and vulnerable sources to talk are frustratingly absent. What do they say to them? What messages do they use? How do they know these work? How close do they really get to their sources, how much do they promise, and do they really keep their promises?

Journalists have proven remarkably uninterested, or reticent, in writing about the motivations and thinking of those who take such risks to provide them with information on which they build their careers. In the journalistic canon, almost the only book that does is Bob Woodward's *The Secret Man* (2005), his memoir of his relationship with "Deep Throat", the mysterious government official nicknamed after a 1970s porn star who helped topple U.S. President Richard Nixon. Perhaps the most famous whistleblower of all time, "Deep Throat" guided *Washington Post* reporters Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein from behind the scenes in their investigation of the Watergate scandal. "Deep Throat" was revealed in 2005 to be Mark Felt, the deputy director of the FBI during the Watergate investigation. One of the many unanswered questions about the Watergate story is the exact nature of Felt's motivation, and this is one of the central questions of Woodward's book. In leaking to the *Post*, and keeping the story alive, was he playing a deliberate game of agenda-setting, or was he helping out a friend? Was Woodward partner or pawn? Bernstein, in his addendum to the book, clearly believes the former. And it seems there was a good deal of personal warmth in the relationship. Woodward clearly also believes Felt's motives were honourable. Yet the book also makes clear Felt was

often deeply ambivalent about leaking, and worried that he would be seen as betraying the service he had devoted his life to.

If Ericson et al. (1989) are correct that most journalist-source interaction is a battle for control, Felt's actions were spectacularly successful. By keeping Woodward and Bernstein pumped and primed with news tips, he kept the story alive until it gained enough public attention to develop a life of its own. More importantly, by putting the suggestion of White House corruption on the public agenda, he forced the hitherto inert Justice Department and Senate to take action; he stiffened the spine of the regulators. According to Woodward, Felt's motivations seem to have been to get the crooks in the White House, because of a genuine sense of outrage at their criminality, and also because they were subverting the FBI; to help his young friend; to uphold the image of the FBI, out of filial loyalty to Hoover; a sense of revenge at being passed over for director; and to play a game of keeping it in the public eye to provoke a genuine Senate inquiry. It seems his motivations changed as he went along, from hesitantly helping out a young reporter, to a sense of outrage, unguided but genuine, and then to a calculated and sophisticated agenda-setting campaign in which Woodward was the tool. This trajectory would explain why his attitude to Woodward changed during the course of the relationship; from friendly and paternal, to fearful, to hostile, then finally friendly again.

The power of the public space in this case lay not just in empowering the like-minded; it forced public officials to either justify their inaction, or act. Also, it almost certainly sparked debate in the corridors of power, such as in the Senate or at the Justice Department. The sensitivity of public officials to the public image of their organisations has been well documented. Ericson et al. explain this well, in their study of Toronto police:

Often news discourse creates a political concern and pressure that are unrelated to the realities of the organisational environment ... a

moral panic over a particular problem of public safety can lead to unreasonable pressures on the police to solve the problem. (1989, p. 389)

Woodward notes that in 1976, one very senior FBI official was so concerned about the damage done to the agency by Watergate that he suggested opening their records of the case to public scrutiny, to show they had tried to resist White House pressure; this was blocked because several criminal cases were still awaiting appeal (2005). Whether or not Felt knew and deliberately played on the professional sensitivities of his public service colleagues is impossible to prove; he developed dementia before Woodward got around to asking him why he leaked. But regardless of whether he was conscious of it or not, the mechanism was the same; the trickle of public concern in the *Post* and then on *CBS News* was if not the catalyst, then at least the excuse, for the various Congressional enquiries that gnawed out the foundations of Nixon's legitimacy. The Woodward-Felt interaction over many years is suggestive of a relationship, and implies that such personal connections can play a vital role in the decision of someone to speak out.

Besides *The Secret Man*, the cupboard is thinly stocked for those looking for an in-depth account of a journalist's relationship to her or her sources. Most journalistic memoirs dwell on the content and effect of their work, and their path to becoming journalists, with less attention to their technique or craft. Many of the great investigative journalists left no published memoir at all. One that did is Jack Anderson, a protégé of the legendary US muckraker Drew Pearson. Pearson is barely mentioned in the literature on investigative reporting, yet can be truly considered one of the greatest. His weekly column, syndicated to over 500 national papers, and weekly radio broadcasts, wielded immense influence over American political life for over 40 years. His sources were legion, and his investigations sent numerous congressmen and senators to jail. He seemed fearless, and the tone of his reports, which usually consisted of revelation of astonishing political venality

delivered with droll irony, still make hilarious reading (See, E.g. Pearson & Anderson, 1968). Anderson worked with Pearson for decades, and developed his own methods for loosening lips:

My missionary experience had taught me that deep in the souls of most people lurks a compulsion to talk about themselves, to confide in someone their darkest secrets, to spill what they know – against their own interests, even against their fears. It is as though by retelling their experiences to an appreciative listener, they are showing an otherwise indifferent world that they, too, have trod the earth, have coped, have counted, have played a role. (Anderson & Boyd, 1980, p. 38)

However, Anderson is clear about the impermanence of this confessional state:

But it is also true that those who give incriminating interviews, like those who impetuously sign instalment purchase contracts, tend towards remorse on the morning after. So I would stick to an informant like adhesive, trying to work up his salient reminiscences into a written statement, and if he showed the slightest receptivity, never to leave his side until he had signed his name to it. (Anderson & Boyd, 1980, p. 38)

In the case above, Anderson persuaded members of a far-right Klan-like organisation, the Black Legionnaires, to appear before a public congressional hearing to expose one of their own who had become a member of Congress. His is certain kind of persuasion; one that hopes to catch the informant in an unguarded moment, rather than effect a lasting and genuine conviction of the need to speak out. Moreover, although it offers an interesting insight into why people reveal, it does

not tell us much about exactly what Anderson did or said to provoke such a confessional state.

Many investigative journalism textbooks emphasise the two key pillars of investigative reporting; the use of documents and the ability to get people to talk (Northmore, 1996; Spark, 1999). There has been a great deal written on the use of documents, but remarkably little on the nuances of building these kinds of relationships. One commonly prescribed textbook by British investigative journalist David Spark (1999) recognises the importance of this craft of developing sources, with a whole chapter entitled *Getting people to talk*, but the section on persuading reluctant people to talk amounts to five pages. One journalist quoted, Bernard Clark, acknowledges the centrality of whistleblowers to investigative journalism: "Many of the best stories depend on finding the right person." He goes on to describe his technique: "You have to win their friendship and gradually they begin to relax. You have to get the story, but you have to be yourself, a totally genuine person. People like to talk." Another, Sam Bagnall, gives his perspective on why scared people will still talk; "You can only persuade the persuadable. If it's going to do them damage, you've got to let them make the choice. It amazes me how many people will speak if they feel a burning sense of injustice." Another, Mark Hollingsworth, advises against being too impatient; people may refuse and you won't get a second chance. "If you ring and say you know a friend, people are more likely to talk." He says people will speak for many reasons, including a grudge, for money, or because they like talking and want to be involved, especially in something exciting and mysterious. "People will talk to further their own agenda. They may want revenge or publicity or to further the public interest, get something cleaned up." He says the British are private people and more likely to talk if offered information or a favour. American journalists are too puritanical to make this sort of offer... they miss a lot of stories." Spark suggests journalists must be good listeners, and quotes *News of the World* journalist Bob Satchwell as recommending amateur psychology and "creating an

atmosphere of revelation". "Sometimes, [if] you keep talking to people and telling stories, they may be encouraged to top your stories by revealing their own" (Spark, 1999, pp. 76-78).

Spark's approach is typical of many tradecraft books. Many appear to spend as much time cautioning against the often mixed motives and agenda-building, time-wasting risks of dealing with whistleblowers as telling journalists how to find and cultivate, let alone nurture or protect them. For example, one influential US manual on investigative reporting devotes only two pages specifically to whistleblowers (Houston, Bruzzese, & Weinberg, 2002). It includes a paragraph on the ethical risks of dealing with whistleblowers but frustratingly little on how to find, let alone persuade them, suggesting they try various whistleblower organisations. There is nothing on how to persuade those who may be reluctant or scared or vulnerable, or on working with individuals as opposed to groups, perhaps confirming Hollingsworth's view of the puritanical nature of the U.S. press.

The main journalism textbook for New Zealand journalists has only six pages on sources, mostly devoted to ethical concerns, with virtually nothing on how to cultivate reluctant sources and persuade them to talk (Tully, 2008). A more specialised work on the New Zealand context by investigative journalist Amanda Cropp (1997) devotes a chapter to developing sources and is one of the rare tradecraft manuals that describe the source-journalist interaction in terms of a relationship. Cropp emphasises the need for rapport and empathy when developing sources, meeting face-to-face, knowing personal details about their lives and revealing details of your own life, all of which "helps to build a trusting relationship" (p. 140). She also emphasises regular contact, to make sources feel a personal interest, rather than treating them as a "news whore". From her own experience, she found that government officials were more likely to help those journalists with whom they had a good relationship, but does not give much detail on how or what made the relationship "good". Cropp also emphasises reciprocity-

based techniques such as exchanging information or withholding publication on the request of police to build trust. But there is little in detail on the how or why people talk, or what kinds of messages are effective with various kinds of people.

Another influential text, by U.S. journalism professor and freelance investigator John Ullman (1995), does not devote a specific section to cultivation of sources. While he acknowledges that “overcoming understandable reluctance to talk is one of the biggest obstacles an investigative reporter has to overcome” (p. 47), he devotes little or no space to explaining how or why they do that. Instead, he describes methods for putting people at ease in interviews, emphasising common tradecraft methods such as the silent pause, asking why, and confronting people with what you know. The *AP Reporting Handbook* (Schwartz, 2002) has no section on developing sources, instead containing tips from various beat reporters. Its section on investigative journalism tools amounts to one page, with nothing on how to persuade sources to talk. Both these books are typical of many investigative journalism textbooks, which tend to be organised by social category (investigating politics, police etc) than by practice-based journalistic theme (using documents; dealing with people etc) (see also Tanner, 2002).

British journalist David Northmore, who claims to have written his country’s first textbook on investigative journalism, does include a section on whistleblowers, but it focusses on avenues for them to blow the whistle, rather than how journalists should interact with them (1996). Despite containing much useful information on penetrating government secrecy, his text has virtually nothing on how to cultivate and protect sources.

One more recent manual which does consider the journalist-source relationship in more depth is Mark Hunter’s *Story-based Inquiry: A manual for investigative journalists* (Hunter et al., 2009). It is unusual in that it draws on the experiences of a collection of very experienced European and Arab investigative journalists, based on their

experiences in dealing with very difficult, often dangerous investigations. It includes a more extensive section on dealing with sources than most manuals. Hunter proposes journalists must give sources a reason to speak, and these reasons can be divided into either pride (because something excites them) or pain (and they want someone to help them). He says pain is stronger than pride, which is why the first people to speak in investigations are usually victims. Unlike the more “objective” approach of many U.S. manuals, he is explicit that journalists must create a relationship:

There is also a specific reason that someone will speak with you: He or she believes that doing so is safe. For this to occur, and keep occurring, you and the source must create a relationship. In that relationship, each of you will count on the other to do certain things, more or less reliably. Both you and the source may furnish each other information, and make certain engagements. Whether or not the source keeps them, you must keep yours. It is not merely a professional obligation. It is also a matter of character. You must be instinctively trustworthy, or people will sense that they cannot trust you. (p. 37)

Within this broad ethical framework, Hunter then outlines a strategy for meeting and engaging with the source that is focussed on assuaging their fears and persuading them to talk. He emphasises source safety as paramount, with great care in the approach to avoid the contact being monitored by other parties. In the meeting, he places great emphasis on the initial pitch, with “right” and “wrong” messages. Journalists should avoid any suggestion that speaking to them means trouble, and should presume they are important and that the source will want to speak to them. To do this they should suggest it is an important story and they want to tell it fully and accurately. This is important because:

You identify yourself and your purpose fully, and you give the source a good reason to speak with you. You do not ask if you may meet, you ask when. You do not use the word “interview”, which invites the source to connect his or her own name with headlines and a future full of trouble. (p. 39)

Once they have gained an interview, they can choose roles, either as innocent or expert, both calculated to appeal to different kinds of sources. He also suggest tactics within the interview, such as bringing news, using the source’s defences against them, surprising them, making them work, and getting them involved. A journalist should never lie to a source, but nor should they reveal the whole truth. He is not concerned with a source’s motivation, only that both parties are kept safe, and information is traded. Above all, he emphasises the relationship:

In the news world, relationships with sources are often like one night stands that leave the partner disgusted ... Investigators are not trying to be ideal lovers ... but they are certainly seeking a more stable, long-term relationship. (p. 40)

Hunter’s approach is thus much more complex than most other manuals, in that it acknowledges the journalist-source interaction as a relationship, with mutual obligations. This alone takes it well beyond the pious we-must-not-risk-being-tainted approach of many other journalism manuals. But at the same time it locates that relationship as one of power and control, where the journalist has to assert their control. There is a very strong emphasis on establishing the trustworthiness of the journalist, and impressing the source with your confidence and expertise, but this is more done by impression rather than conscious discussion. The actual message content has a relatively low emphasis; there is little elaboration on the reasons why they should talk. No doubt this method is well-proven by experience, although there is little evidence offered in support. More importantly, there is no suggestion of

different kinds of messages for different kinds of sources, such as those wanting revenge, or those suffering abuse. Although the author suggests categories of source (pride or pain), he does not suggest each may require a different message or approach. While Hunter's manual is undoubtedly the best reviewed here, it leaves tantalising questions about the nuances of best practice in dealing with different types of sources.

Another problem is that these anecdotal accounts rely on the journalists' assumptions as to why the whistleblower spoke to them; we know little about their motives from their own mouths. How do we know that the factors the journalists thought important really were important? There is also frustratingly little differentiation between the different kinds of whistleblowers; surely those who have experienced sexual abuse may think differently from those outraged about financial impropriety?

The more research-based approaches to journalism practice are also frustratingly limited on this question. One of the only ones that attempts to draw conclusions about investigative journalism technique, as opposed to its sociology, is Maxine Ruvinsky's study of Canadian investigative journalism (2008). This adopts a case study approach, analysing 13 examples of successful investigations, drawn from her work as a judge of Canada's National Newspaper Awards in 2002. The stories are well-chosen, each fitting the conventional definitions of investigative journalism given above. Each case study includes a summary of the story, interviews with the journalists responsible, and a brief commentary to extract the lessons from each, with an overall conclusion section drawing on all case studies. She asks fundamental, important questions of each: "How did the story originate and how was it nailed down? What does it show us about the practice of investigative reporting? And what do I need to be able to learn to be able to write this story instead of just read about it?" (p. v). Her conclusions include thinking for yourself, persistence, research, follow-up, and embracing the "moral dynamic" of journalism.

She claims to have sacrificed breadth for depth, yet all she has really done is confirm what many studies of investigative journalists have identified as the qualities of investigative journalists: persistence, integrity and independence. One explanation for this is the methodological flaw in her approach. Her questions are asked of the whole story, yet her dataset only reflects one group who had input into it; the journalists. Her method could thus be said to lack construct validity. Inevitably, her conclusions end up being biased in favour of what journalists thought, rather than what was important. Likewise, she does not compare her findings with any kind of broader sociological, psychological or other theory; rather she appears to have let the data generate the concepts. This kind of grounded theory approach can be useful but has also been criticised for its tendency to risk repeating the obvious (Alverson & Skoldberg, 2009).

Also from Canada comes a classic study of investigative journalism, *History of Investigative Journalism in Canada* (Rosner, 2008). Similar in range and approach to Aucoin's study of American investigative journalism, it also draws on MacIntyre's (1984) social practice model, but does not attempt a comprehensive study of reporters' methods. One reporter, John Sawatsky, is held up as an exemplar, particularly of interviewing. He is said to have honed his skills selling encyclopaediae in high school, and later made use of the first tape recorder to analyse his own interviewing technique. He believes this helped him crack some remarkable stories, particularly involving the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Rosner says Sawatsky learnt to hone his questions:

He believes that the professionalism of the approach, and a natural, non-judgmental demeanour, were critical in winning the confidence of so many officers.... With each piece of new testimony, Sawatsky found more [people] ... willing to come out of the woodwork to dispute official statements or reveal their version of what had really taken place. (p. 133)

Sawatsky believed that the questions asked were vital; and that answers given were a function of the questions asked. He found that certain questions “consistently got great answers”. He advocated sticking to the topic, but changing the query.

Questions had to be neutral and open-ended, not double-barrelled, and without hyperbole. One should proceed gradually, establishing a factual consensus, then proceeding to targeted, close-ended questions. A tough, aggressive questioning style was often the worst tactic (p. 133).

While this is interesting, it is typical of all studies of investigative journalism surveyed in this literature review in relying too heavily on the uncontested opinions of the journalists involved, and lacking a wider theoretical context for the processes at work, perhaps from the burgeoning communication and social psychological literature. Zelizer (2004b) has identified an over-reliance on sociological theory; the under-reliance on other avenues of theory is equally as limiting.

2.6 Summary

There is a broad and growing spectrum of literature on the role and impact of investigative journalism. This emphasises the broad appeal of investigative journalism across cultures, its resilience in the face of repression and the overwhelming importance of human sources for some very significant stories. However, despite the importance of human sources to their work practice, there is little on the work practices of investigative journalists, and less still on a fundamental aspect of their craft – how they persuade those non-professional, often reluctant sources to speak out. The literature on news sources tends to be preoccupied with questions of access and control by what could be described as non-voluntary sources; people who do it as part of their job. As has been pointed out, (Schudson, 2002, 2005; Zelizer, 2004b) many of these questions are of limited relevance for many journalists. To the extent that it does touch on journalistic

practice, the tradecraft literature emphasises the importance of relationships, and in particular the need for trust. This has usually been generalised to apply to people who come forward even when they aren't pushing an organisational line, or even working for one, but do the same rules apply for what might be called non-professional, reluctant, often vulnerable sources? There is little about the nuances of building these kinds of relationships. Where there has been discussion about why a source talked to a journalist, there is little on why they talked to *this* journalist, let alone any triangulation of such conclusions by talking to the relevant journalist and source and comparing their accounts.

The literature on whistleblowers does tell us more about these kinds of non-professional sources. It suggests that the process of speaking out is a complex and difficult one for many, and may involve intense thought and often the generation of powerful emotion, and may require whistleblowers to overcome real fear of retribution. However, while many of the factors that lead to whistleblowing have been identified, researchers have so far been unable to generate a reliable predictive theory of whistleblowing, perhaps reflecting the lack of detailed exploration of whistleblower decision-making and the influence outside actors such as journalists may have on that process. Likewise, this field has only recently begun to draw on psychological theory that could explain some of these factors.

The academic literature on journalistic practice does throw up some of the ways in which journalists seem likely to affect that process; the connection between good work practice and good work and the role of personal qualities such as integrity and persistence in achieving that. The journalistic tradecraft literature emphasises the importance of persuasion, while the memoir literature, such as the Woodward-Felt interaction over many years, suggests the notion of relationship. Yet just as the source literature has not so far drawn much on theory outside the sociology of journalism, the practice literature has not drawn on theory that could illuminate these themes. Two particularly promising areas that could provide insights include

communication theory, in particular that relating to persuasion, and social psychology, for its insights into emotion and relationships. The next chapter will discuss each of these various theoretical perspectives in turn, with a view to gaining a deeper understanding of how each can explain the source-journalist relationship. A way of framing this issue is proposed under the following broad research topic:

How do investigative journalists persuade vulnerable reluctant people to talk?

This topic can be further broken down into two main themes:

1. Persuasion effects - What factors are important for encouraging sources to speak out? What kinds of messages/ approaches are likely to be effective?
2. Relationship effects: what influence does relationship quality have on the decision to speak out? What kind of relationships if any do investigative journalists have with their sources?

It seems axiomatic that journalism must develop a greater understanding of the motivations of sources if it is to retain its relevance and role as the authoritative source of news for most people; yet to date there has been remarkably little research into why people talk to journalists. We need to know more about how these motives interact, and what kinds of appeals resonate with potential whistleblowers. In particular, there has been none on how journalists persuade frightened, vulnerable, often abused people to take the difficult step of revealing their story to the public, and on how and why these people decide to do so.

Such questions are vital, not just for investigative journalists, but for society. In a world in which peripheral information is ever more available and important information ever more controlled by professional communicators, helping marginalised voices connect to the news media is still a cornerstone of good journalism and fundamental to a democratic society.

Chapter Three – Methodology

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Methodological choices

3.3 Theoretical perspectives

3.4 Research design

3.5 Conclusion

3.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the methodological approach taken to answering the research questions identified in Chapter Two. There has been little, if any, research on investigative journalism in New Zealand, so this study had to involve original research. Elsewhere, the journalistic literature which does make findings about how journalists persuade whistleblowers to speak out either suffers from construct validity issues (it selects as measures factors that may not represent the truth of what they purport to measure) or lacks consideration of the wider theoretical literature bearing on the issues raised, including the persuasion, emotion and relationship literature (e.g. Aucoin, 2005; Rosner, 2008; Ruvinsky, 2008).

In this chapter, an approach designed to avoid those problems is laid out. A two-step approach was taken, with a pilot study used to explore the topic and generate potential theoretical approaches, then a main study in which specific theoretical approaches were tested and applied. The pilot study involved discussions with a number of investigative journalists to identify key factors involved in persuading sources to speak out. After consideration of the research method literature, a qualitative study using Langley's (1999) alternate templates model was chosen as

most suitable for the kinds of process decision-making involved. In this approach, alternate theoretical explanations, often already empirically tested in other areas, are offered for the same phenomenon. This model was applied using a case study as the unit of analysis, as the case study is recommended as most suitable to an exploratory area, particularly involving how or why questions, and on a small population, which the researcher wishes to explore in depth (Yin, 2002). While there is a range of opinion about what constitutes a case study, many researchers agree it can include a “single entity around which there are boundaries” (Merriam, 1998, p. 27). In this study, the entity was defined as the journalistic investigation. Within this, the key measures chosen were the journalist, and the key whistleblower that helped the journalist break the story. The text of the stories themselves and subsequent related articles were used to identify the range and impact of the investigation, in order to determine whether it met the definition of investigative journalism given in chapter two.

Using the text produced by journalists, a number of potential investigations were identified. Of these, one was chosen as a pilot study (Smith and Huata, described in full in Chapter Four of this thesis), to generate data that could inform useful theoretical approaches. Following Flick’s (2007) advice on approaches to exploratory material, a hypothesis-driven approach was deliberately avoided at this stage, to enable capture of as wide as possible a range of factors. The extended focussed interview (Iorio, 2004) was chosen as the most suitable data gathering method. Further justification for these choices is given below. Interviews were video-recorded where possible, to enhance reliability.

The pilot study identified several theoretical streams in the persuasion and relationship literature that appeared to bear on the key factors identified by the interviewees. Of these, two well-tested theories were chosen from each stream, where possible, that could offer rival explanations for the observed effects. A preference was given to theories that are well-established in their fields and have

been well-validated through empirical research. The aim was to see if the generally-predicted effects from these theories could be observed in the cases selected for this study, and if the effects could be pattern-matched to produce a theory specific to the field. These theories included some relating to persuasion (and the role of emotion within that) and relationships. Persuasion and emotion theories included the Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion (R. Petty & Cacioppo, 1984), Cognitive Dissonance Theory (L. Festinger, 1956) the Cognitive Functional Model (Nabi, 1999) and the Anger Activism Model (Turner, 2007), and the Iterative Reprocessing Model (Cunningham & Zelazo, 2007). Relationship theories included the Investment Model of relationship maintenance (C. Rusbult & Martz, 1995; C. E. Rusbult, 1980) and a general approach to psychological therapy based on well-established practice that is described here as the Therapeutic Model (ACC, 2008).

From these, a series of propositions was generated which could be applied to the data. A further three cases were then selected. These were chosen in order to provide the possibility of literal and theoretical replication to assert external validity (Yin, 2002), and more broadly, following the advice of case study researchers to include a range of cases and particularly negative cases (Denzin, 2005). Multiple cases also enhance the validity of built theory and make it more likely that such theory will be parsimonious, accurate and robust (Denzin, 2005; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Yin, 2002). These four cases were then analysed individually in terms of the research questions, then collectively. Methods of analysis of data to build theory from cases include analytic induction (Znaniecki, 1934), using theoretical propositions, rival explanations (including pattern matching) and logic models (Yin, 2002). Pattern matching is similar to Langley's alternate template model (1999), and this was broadly the approach taken. However, Langley also proposes applying deductive analysis and creative inspiration in parallel where appropriate, and this was undertaken where it seemed to offer useful insights. In the conclusion, the results of

the data analysis were compared with the literature on investigative journalism, and the wider theoretical literature.

The chapter is divided into five sections. The next section, 3.2, discusses the various epistemological approaches which can inform methodological choices and identifies choices appropriate to the research questions. In particular, it discusses why the case study design was selected. Section 3.3 discusses the theoretical approaches to the research questions, and generates a series of theoretical propositions which can be tested on the data. Section 3.4 explains the design of the case study, to ensure validity and reliability, and includes methods used for capturing and analysing data, including selection of cases. Section 3.5 concludes this chapter with a recapitulation of the research method and the general validity and reliability of the results.

3.2 Methodological choices

Researchers within the social sciences have a choice of four main research paradigms, characterised by Denzin (2005) as positivist, post-positivist, constructivist-interpretive, or critical and feminist-post-structural. Much research on investigative journalism (Burgh, 2000; Rosner, 2008; Ruvinsky, 2008; Tanner, 2002) has tended to adopt a constructivist-interpretive approach, usually based on case study². This approach often recounts in detail the way investigations unfolded, based on interviews with the key participants. There is little attempt to relate the experiences to general theory in the wider literature, or where it does, to explore disciplines other than sociology, such as psychology. This emphasis on the experiences of the actor (nearly always the journalist) is part of a well-established tradition in qualitative study. It is considered particularly useful for exploratory studies, where the aim is not to prejudge an exploratory study by premature

² Whistleblower research has used a broader range of paradigms, including positivist (Mesmer-Magnus, 2005) but more often qualitative, particularly interview-based and case study (Glazer, 1999; Jos, Tompkins, & Hays, 1989; Uys, 2000).

conceptualising. Flick (2009) argues that the goal in qualitative research is not always to test the already known, but to discover the new and develop empirically grounded theories. He quotes Freud on the dangers of the hypothesis-testing approach: "In making this selection, if he follows his expectations he is in danger of never finding anything but what he already knows; and if he follows his inclination, he will certainly falsify what he may perceive" (Freud, 1958, p. 112). Rosenberry and Vicker (2009) also argue that the qualitative researcher's main goal is to "understand the meanings behind communication and the viewpoint of the actors in the situation rather than seeking evidence to test a hypothesis" (p. 24).

Lindlof and Taylor (2002) agree that hypotheses are rare in qualitative research; researchers are usually looking for qualities of social phenomena, so there is little reason to predict relations between variables and it is usually better to ask research questions (p. 31). This atheoretical approach emphasises accuracy of the reported experience and is particularly sensitive to the unique features of the individual case, but has been criticised for the difficulty of making meaningful generalisations from the data. Malcolm Williams (2002) argues that if interpretivism is to be of any use, it must be able to say something authoritative about instances beyond those of the research, while Max Travers (2001) agrees that research must in some sense refer to theory, and make some attempt at generalisation.

One solution, adopted by many researchers in the social sciences, is Grounded Theory (Glaser, 1992). Based on ideas of symbolic interactionism, it emphasises the study of particular cases to generate theory from the data, using a coding as close to it as possible, and building theory through constant comparison. This method does emphasise accuracy, in that it requires close readings - perhaps dozens of times - of the data. However, in their review of Grounded Theory, Alverson and Skoldberg note that it can be time-consuming, inefficient, and "belabouring the obvious" (2009, p. 70). They argue that Grounded Theory overlaps with post-modernism in its emphasis on the provisional, pluralistic nature of data, but also positivism in that it

regards data as theory-free. They agree with the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu that analysis should take account of the actor's spontaneous categories, but that analysis should not stop there; the researcher should not let themselves be captured by the object's moods and preconceptions, but instead "try to effect an epistemological break with the actor level in the formal grounded theory" (cited in Alverson & Skoldberg, 2009, p. 73). They recommend being open to whichever kind of thinking it seems may be the most fruitful route to follow (p. 224).

Therefore, in an effort to maximise possibilities for generalisation and relation to existing theory, while not precluding or occluding new phenomena thrown up by the data, this study takes a variation of the constructivist approach; one which allows the consideration of existing theory as explanation, yet still allows where necessary for rival, as yet unexplicated theory, including that generated by the actors themselves. Lest this notion of being open to a range of methodological approaches be seen as antithetical to hard science, consider the admonition given by one of the pioneers of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy, Don Meichenbaum. In the early days of development of this widely practised therapeutic model, he feared that the field would develop a few theories that would be superimposed on the treatment of various disorders. A better approach would be to "explore the nature of a particular disorder from the perspective of behavioural, cognitive, systemic and other theoretical approaches. The results of these investigations should then guide treatment development" (Cited in DiGiuseppe & Tafrate, 2007, p. xiii).

Langley (1999) argues that being open to a mix of methodological approaches is particularly important when analysing "process data", or data which deal with sequences of events. She argues that process data have proven difficult to analyse because they often involve units of analysis whose boundaries are ambiguous, and may draw in "phenomena such as changing relationships, thoughts, feelings, and interpretations" (p. 692). This is of particular relevance to the kinds of problems unique to investigative journalism; in particular, the interpersonal processes at work.

Langley (1999) argues against rigidly adhering to either inductive (often used in qualitative studies) deductive (reasoning) or inspiration (driven by creativity and insight) strategies. Instead she proposes a categorisation of seven different “sense-making” strategies, according to their approach to accuracy, generality and simplicity. These are narrative (the constructivist, story-telling approach), quantification, alternative templates, grounded theory, visual mapping, temporal bracketing and synthetic. All have their advantages and disadvantages, with some favouring accuracy at the expense of simplicity and generality, while others provide more generality and often simplicity, but at the expense of accuracy.

Narrative and visual mapping are useful for organising data, while quantification, natural bracketing and synthesis are classed as replicating strategies. Some are best for tracing meaning (grounded theory, narrative strategy), others for prediction (synthetic), and others for revealing driving process motors (alternate template, temporal bracketing, quantification). She advocates choosing or combining research strategies as appropriate, including “both inductive and deductive approaches iteratively or simultaneously as inspiration guides us. Sensemaking is the objective. Let us make sense whatever way we can” (p. 708).

As the research topics identified in Chapter Two do involve the revelation of driving process - the kinds of process decision involved in sources deciding whether to speak to journalists - alternate templates strategy was chosen as the methodological paradigm for this study. Under this model the analyst proposes “several alternative interpretations of the same events based on different but internally coherent sets of a priori theoretical premises ... then assesses the extent to which each theoretical template contributes to a satisfactory explanation” (p. 698).

Alternate templates strategy has often been used for decision processes, most famously in Allison’s three-pronged explanation of the Cuban Missile Crisis (1971). Langley suggests this essentially deductive approach, which she compares to Yin’s

pattern-matching method (2002), combines “both richness and theoretical parsimony (simplicity) by decomposing the problem. Qualitative nuances are represented through the alternative explanations, and theoretical clarity is maintained by keeping the different theoretical lenses separate” (Langley, 1999, p. 699). While each theory may be inaccurate on its own, together they may make a coherent explanation.

This alternate templates strategy was chosen because it allows accuracy in recording the actor’s experiences, and the induction of undiscovered or categorised factors from the data, yet still maintains the ability to apply deductive reasoning to the data on previously established operationalised factors. This aims to maximise the ability to generate useful, simple, generalisable theory and satisfy Bourdieu’s plea to effect an epistemological break from the actor’s experience – while still maintaining accuracy. It also responds to Zelizer’s (2004a) appeal to broaden the range of theoretical perspectives on journalism beyond the sociological. The main risk with the alternate templates approach is that it can “leave the researcher and reader puzzled as to how the various theoretical perspectives can be combined” and lead to unwieldy combination theory (Langley, 1999). To avoid this, as few theories as appeared relevant were selected to be applied to the various topic areas. These are discussed below.

3.3 Theoretical perspectives

There is little in the literature on journalistic practice that provides an inclusive, all-encompassing and convincing explanation of how and why people talk to journalists. However, there are theoretical perspectives from other disciplines that shed light on different aspects of the process by which people are persuaded, how emotions interact with decision making, and how relationships are formed and maintained. This section will discuss each of these various theoretical perspectives in

turn, with a view to gaining a deeper understanding of how each can explain the source-journalist relationship. It is proposed that investigative stories often go through three distinct phases; developing the story, (i.e. through identification and targeting of relevant sources) breaking the story (through collaboration with sources) and expanding the story (the follow-ups and further developments that indicate whether a story has “legs” – often a phase in which the story gathers momentum, is picked up on by other media, and other people come forward). These three phases can be characterized as source development, source consolidation, and source expansion. It is argued that successful investigative journalists deploy a range of techniques which draw on theory that applies to each of these phases. In the first phase, in which journalists need to persuade often reluctant, frightened sources to talk, the highly developed literature on persuasion theory, and in particular the Elaboration Likelihood Model, and Cognitive Dissonance Theory, are relevant. In the second phase, in which journalists solidify relationships with sources and collaborate with them in order to break a story, the developing field of relationship science, and in particular the even newer area of relational maintenance, offers useful perspectives.

Many texts on persuasion note that the art of persuasion is at least as old as Aristotle (E.g. Perloff, 2008; Seiter & Gass, 2004). More recently, at least eight major theoretical strands have been identified (Gass & Seiter, 1999) of which one, the Elaboration Likelihood Model (R. Petty & Cacioppo, 1986a) has been shown to have wide, although not universal, support as a tool for explaining and predicting the process of persuasion (Booth-Butterfield & Welbourne, 2002). Before discussing the ELM in more depth, it is worth discussing some of the factors relevant in persuasion. McGuire (1985) lists five independent variables that affect persuasiveness; the characteristics of the source, message, channel, receiver and destination. Source variables can include factors such authority, credibility and attractiveness, while message characteristics may include the use of fear appeals. Channel variables may

include the medium, such as print, broadcast, or face-to-face, the receiver may be the person the message is targeted at, or someone else, while the destination may be individuals or groups. There have been literally hundreds of studies on the impact of each of these factors in various settings, with widely varying and sometimes conflicting results (See E.g. Perloff, 2008).

The development of the ELM has been credited (Booth-Butterfield & Welbourne, 2002; Perloff, 2008; Seiter & Gass, 2004) with helping organize the “chaos” in the literature on persuasion and providing a convincing explanation of how and why the various message and source variables have had different effects at different times. Perloff (2008) suggests that it is almost impossible to overstate the ELM’s importance in the field of persuasion – for the first time it provided an overarching theory which explained how people process persuasive messages. Booth-Butterfield and Welbourne say it has been ““instrumental in integrating the literature on source, message and receiver” and that before its development, research in the area was in a state of disarray “characterised by an abundance of seemingly inconsistent and contradictory findings” (2002, p. 155).

The ELM is what is known as a dual-process model; it asserts that there are two main paths, or routes, by which people can process a persuasive message. Dual-process models have become widely used in research on thought, behaviour and emotion in recent decades. In their review of the use of dual-process models across such areas as persuasion (Chaiken, 1980; R. Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b), attitude-behaviour relations (Fazio, 1986), stereotyping (Devine, 1989), and cognitive psychology (Sloman, 1996), Smith and Neuman (2005) affirm Smith and DeCoster’s (2000) review classing such systems as basically similar, saying that “despite differences in detail, they all essentially rest on the same distinction between two basic processing systems”(2005, p. 288). These two systems are variously labelled rule-based and associative (in cognitive psychology), heuristic and systematic, or central and peripheral (in persuasion). These models all draw on the basic idea that

humans use different processes for different kinds of information processing. Emotion theorists have also proposed models similar to dual-process models, to explain the incongruity between self-reported attitudes and performance in implicit association tests. Smith and Neuman (Smith & Neumann, 2005) have summarised some of these binaries as primordial/ elaborated (Keltner & Haidt, 2001) non-conscious/ deliberative (Ochsner & Feldman Barrett, 2001) and associative/rule-based (Clore & Ortony, 2000). More recently, emotion theorists argue that new data about neural processing generated from MRI studies indicates dual-process models may be too simplistic to describe the way affect and cognition interact (see e.g. Cunningham & Zelazo, 2007) and these will be discussed further below. But while the jury is still out on the dual-process approach in emotion theory, the ELM has developed a solid body of empirical support in the persuasion field.

The main idea in ELM is that of the elaboration continuum. This suggests that the extent and type of persuasion depends on the extent to which the receiver elaborates on the message, source and other variables. When motivation (M) and ability (A) to think are high, messages, source and other relevant factors will be scrutinised carefully, and a large number of thoughts will be produced. This is known as the central route to persuasion (CRP). It requires deep, systematic, conscious processing of the arguments in a message, weighing up the pros and cons before reaching a decision. It is the sort of thinking most of us would do if we were about to put our life savings into a house, for example. Booth Butterfield and Welbourne (2002), in their summary of the ELM, note that attitude change resulting from CRP should be based on careful evaluation of the merits of the arguments and should reflect the content of the thoughts that were generated by the person during exposure to the communication. If arguments were perceived as strong, a person should generate many positive thoughts regarding the message/ issue, and greater persuasion should occur. If, on careful scrutiny, the arguments were perceived as weak, issue – and message-relevant thoughts should be less positive (or even negative), and

consequently less persuasion should occur. When motivation is low, or a person's ability to think is reduced (perhaps because they are distracted), other low-effort heuristics, or mental shortcuts, such as the credibility of the message sender, or their likeability and attractiveness (often called "goodwill") are more likely to come into play. This secondary route is called the peripheral route to persuasion (PRP) and is characterised by a lower number of thoughts produced.

Seiter and Gass note that the key to persuasion is understanding the "thoughts about, responses to, or elaborations of a message" (p. 97). Two factors are particularly important; the valence of thoughts (whether they are positive or negative) and the number of thoughts. The valence of thoughts depends on strength of argument, on whether the receiver agrees with the message, and whether the receiver is forewarned. The more positive thoughts about a message, the more persuasive it is. The number of thoughts is related to the motivation to process thoughts about the message, and the ability to do so. They note that many studies have confirmed that people are more likely to systematically think about a message, or use the central route to persuasion on an involving topic. "The more important a message topic is to a receiver ... the more motivated that person is to think about the message" (p. 98). Booth-Butterfield and Welbourne (2002, p. 158) note that CRP goes beyond simply considering the merits of a message; it must involve generation of one's own issue-relevant thoughts in relation to a message. One of the effects of choosing either route is that the amount of effort, or elaboration involved in processing the message affects the strength of the resulting attitude change; attitude changes brought about through high-elaboration processes will be characterised by their strength, durability, resistance to counter-persuasion, and how predictive they are of future behaviour. PRP is different firstly in that thoughtful consideration of message arguments occurs less (a person using PRP might consider only two of six given arguments) (p. 158).

Two factors affect a person's likelihood of using CRP – their motivation and ability. A person's motivation to process a message centrally is determined by their involvement. Seiter and Gass define involvement as the salience, relevance or importance of a topic. Topic involvement "increases message receivers' motivation to process a message and increases the number of cognitive responses they are likely to produce in response to that message" (2004, p. 98). Perloff (2008) agrees that personal relevance is crucial: "Individuals are high in involvement when they perceive that an issue is personally relevant or bears directly on their own lives. They are low in involvement when they perceive that an issue has little or no impact on their own lives" (p. 184).

A person's ability to produce thoughts can be affected by time, knowledge, the complexity of the message, or whether they are distracted. Distraction may increase or reduce persuasion, depending on whether it suppresses negative thoughts or positive thoughts. Another factor that affects an individual's ability to process a message is their natural motivation to do so. Some people prefer central to peripheral processing, regardless of their level of motivation. Other factors can also affect how an individual processes a message. One of the most important of these is the presence of strong personal values or attitudes. Perloff (2008) gives the example of the death penalty, an issue that arouses strong passions. Supporters and opponents of capital punishment proved resistant to cogent arguments, which ELM suggested would have carried the day. The reason is that it is important to distinguish between "issues that are of interest because they bear on important outcomes in the individual's life ... exams, tuition increases, the economy – and those that bear on values or deep-seated attitudes" (p. 195). When the message touches on outcomes, people process rationally, and listen to the merits of an argument. When the message grazes core values, people can be very biased and subjective (Perloff, 2008). Producing attitude change does not necessarily lead to changes in behaviour. One meta review has noted that there have been several unsuccessful media

campaigns in which knowledge acquisition “failed to have attitudinal and/or behavioural consequences” (R. E. Petty, Brinol, & Priester, 2009, p. 152). This is because even if a message produces favourable thoughts, recipients could have lacked confidence in them and their ability to act on them, or attitude changes might have been based on peripheral cues and thus not durable (R. E. Petty, et al., 2009).

For those processing a message centrally, and elaborating strongly on the message, message factors are especially important. Perloff (2008) notes that two meta analyses (Allen, 1998; O’Keefe, 1999) found that messages are more effective when they are two-sided (contain arguments for and against) and draw explicit conclusions, but only as long as the message refutes opposing arguments. Such “refutational” two-sided messages “gain their persuasive advantage by (a) enhancing the credibility of the speaker and (b) providing cogent reasons why opposing arguments are wrong” (Perloff, 2008, p. 249). Other structural factors found to make a message persuasive include conclusion drawing, and possibly order of presentation, although there is no conclusive evidence in favour of presenting the argument earlier or later in the message delivery. But Perloff adds that numerous studies have demonstrated the importance of evidence, defined either as “factual statements originating from a source other than the speaker, objects not created by the speaker, and opinions of persons other than the speaker that are offered in support of the speaker’s claims” or “assertions, quantitative information, eyewitness statements, or opinions from credible sources” (p. 252). For evidence to be effective, auditors must understand it is being offered and see it as legitimate, and it must be processed. Evidence does not need to be processed centrally to be effective. It can operate as a cue, if people are unable to process the message, but are impressed by the apparent credibility offered by the use of statistics, for example. Both statistical and narrative evidence are effective; after reviewing the literature, Perloff concluded that both can influence attitudes, but there is some evidence that narrative appeals work best to overcome

strongly entrenched attitudes. However, even the most compelling evidence will not be effective against attitudes based on self-concept or core values (Perloff, 2008).

For those processing a message peripherally, peripheral “cues” such as the credibility or attractiveness of the message sender are likely to be more important than the message. It is important to note that credibility is about the recipient’s perception of the communicator, not some concrete set of factors the communicator exhibits. Seiter and Gass (2004) note that it does seem clear that source credibility does affect persuasion, and that its effect is greater on non-involving topics, suggesting it functions as a peripheral cue. But they note there is a problem in defining “credibility”; studies often confound expertise, liking and trustworthiness. They describe the two main elements of credibility as expertise (which they describe as the level of the source’s knowledge of the topic, typically established by education, training, or experience in the field) and trustworthiness (whether the source can be trusted). They note that one meta analysis (Wilson & Sherrell, 1993) found that the effect of expertise on persuasion is greater than that of trustworthiness, attractiveness or similarity. Trustworthiness appears stronger than the attractiveness, likeability or similarity of the communicator. Seiter and Gass (2004) summarise the literature as holding that source credibility affects the persuasiveness of a message only before the message has been processed. On highly involving topics “message arguments produce attitude change but source credibility does not” (p. 100). While credibility has been found to have more influence than argument quality only on uninvolved topics, there have been studies in which source credibility had effects in high-involvement situations. They suggest that this may be due to whether credibility factors become part of the message itself: “Sometimes apparently peripheral, non-message factors such as source credibility can also affect attitudes under high-elaboration conditions if they are part of the argument” (p. 67). One final point regarding credibility is that message senders of questionable trustworthiness elicit more elaboration than those perceived to be

trustworthy, mainly for those not intrinsically motivated to think (R. E. Petty, et al., 2009).

It is important to remember that the essential idea of ELM is that processing is a continuum. CRP and PRP-based processing are not mutually exclusive; for example people may still use some PRP under conditions of high involvement (2009).

Furthermore, as noted above, the same variable can act either peripherally or centrally, depending on the type of argument and level of involvement (Dillard & Pfau, 2002, p. 161). Although the ELM is widely empirically tested, it does not offer a complete explanation as yet of the persuasion process. Perloff (2008) notes it has been criticized for being too flexible. While Seiter and Gass (2004) attribute some of this concern to confusion in some studies over the measurement and importance of source effects, such as credibility and trustworthiness, there are other gaps in its explanatory ability. One of these is the role of argument quality in ELM. Booth-Butterfield and Welbourne (2002, pp. 167-169) define this as: "information that bears on the central merits of the attitude object" but note that based on research so far, this definition cannot be used to construct arguments that will reliably produce attitude change in a high-elaboration receiver. They suggest reasons for this include that measurements of argument quality are not always scientific. Nonetheless, they hold that one of the most strongly verified and reproduced effects in persuasion research is that arguments "produce thought profiles that produce attitude change, but only under conditions of high-elaboration likelihood." And despite the need for further research to establish some reliable bounded measures of ELM variables, such as elaboration likelihood (at present measured mostly just by involvement) and involvement itself, the model is nonetheless so well tested that it can now be regarded as scientific fact that: "Elaboration likelihood interacts with argument quality (and/or cue strength) to affect cognitive response and following attitude change" (pp. 167-169).

This widely verified model suggests one of the key questions of this study; to what extent does the ELM explain the decision-making process of potential whistleblowers? Further, to what extent do they engage in high-elaboration thinking on the decision to speak out; if so, on what kind of arguments do they elaborate; what influence if any do journalists' arguments have on this attitude change; and does this attitude change lead to action?

Based on these questions, the following research questions were established:

1. How well does the ELM explain the decision-making process of potential whistleblowers to speak out?
2. How are messages, particularly from journalists, processed by the potential whistleblower and what impact do they have on attitude change (the decision to speak out)?

The question of what factors cause people to elaborate on arguments, and in particular what affects their involvement level, is still unclear. One of these factors is the role of emotion, and in particular anger, which can trigger positive action when stimulated appropriately and is often mentioned in whistleblower studies as helping people decide to speak out. This suggests that two areas worth looking at would be: a) the role of emotion, particularly anger, in decision making, and b) how emotion, particularly anger, arises, with a view to establishing what role the journalist may or may not have in that process.

There is a growing body of literature on the effect of emotion on decision-making, but as one recent review (Vohs, Baumeister, & Loewenstein, 2007) pointed out, a wide spectrum of views on what factors cause it to help or hinder the process. Zelenski (2007) notes that research has found that fear produces a higher perception of risk, whereas anger produced similar risk perceptions to those of happy people, and thereby presumably prompts quicker decision-making.

Nabi (2002) suggests that the persuasive effect of anger has also been largely ignored in persuasion research, which to the extent that it has considered emotion, has concentrated mostly on the role of fear. Nabi suggests three different approaches dominate thinking on how emotions work under the ELM model, all based around the depth or quality of information processing. Firstly, emotions may act as heuristics, “guiding decisions with minimal information processing or thought.” Emotions can also stimulate careful information processing, such as CRP. This line argues that “under conditions of moderate or high elaboration, emotions influence the direction or depth of information processing, respectively” (p. 299). Nabi proposes an alternative model, the Cognitive Functional Model (1999) based on a functional emotion perspective. This is based on the idea that emotion is a psychological construct consisting of five components: cognitive appraisal of a situation, the physiological component of arousal, motor expression, a motivational component, and a subjective feeling state.

Nabi relies on Darwin’s evolutionary ideas about the adaptive role of emotions, to explain the action tendency associated with each emotion. This approach argues that each emotion is discrete, and the action tendencies are “associated with physiological changes that together influence future perceptions, cognitions, and even behaviours in accordance with the goal set by the emotion’s action tendency.” In this model, anger is “generally elicited in the face of obstacles interfering with goal-oriented behavior or demeaning offenses against oneself or one’s loved ones.” Anger is “believed to motivate and sustain high levels of energy”, and be conducive to problem solving, unless it is extreme. This suggests that emotion influences the actual level of elaboration. According to the CFM, once a message –induced discrete emotion is experienced, the “depth and direction of information processing is determined by the type and intensity of the emotion experienced (i.e. motivated attention) in conjunction with the expectation of whether the message content will help to satisfy the emotion-induced goal.” Thus, “discrete emotions can themselves

prompt careful information processing, which is likely to promote more enduring attitude change” (pp. 290-299).

In short, anger is likely to make them want to act. This action is likely to take the form of either a change in either the depth or direction of their thinking about the messages that made them angry (Nabi, 1999). Thus whistleblowers who experience message-induced anger are more likely to process those messages more carefully, and may change the direction of their thinking as a result of a message.

Turner (2007) built on the CFM to propose the Anger Activism Model to explain how messages that ignite anger are translated into action. Based on Nabi’s (1999) idea that anger can in some situations motivate individuals to take control of the situation that is causing them anger, and consequently process the message systematically, she proposed that when messages communicate themes consistent with obstruction of personal (ego-related) goals, anger will result. When angry people also feel efficacy (a perception something can and should be done to fix the problem) they will engage in action to fix the problem. However, message recipients must already have a positive attitude towards the recommended solution:

Given that angry feelings can motivate people to take control of a situation and ameliorate the problem at hand, it is also likely that a message igniting anger can motivate at risk audiences to engage in higher commitment behaviours. The AAM argues that the extent to which people will process an anger appeal depends on the intensity of their angry feelings, and their perception of efficacy (Turner, 2007, p. 115).

This model does seem useful in attempting to connect theories of anger to communication and messages, but it does not give much explanation as to how it is established that the message did in fact lead to the anger that led to the action. Nor does it explain or predict whether processing the appeal will lead to action. The

process by which people process appeals, and what kind of emotion that elicits, may be a good deal more complex than the AAM allows. Nonetheless the basic theoretical framework is worth considering in the context of this study as an explanation for the ways in which anger motivates decision making in these cases. If it can be shown that journalists enhance potential whistleblowers' perceptions of efficacy by giving them a way of acting (publication of their story) which promises results, that would explain one way in which journalists influence whistleblowers to speak out.

The CFM and AAM provide explanations for how emotions, particularly anger, can motivate and direct the decision-making process of whistleblowers. But they don't explain how strong emotion arises in such people; and why it arises when it does. This is important because if there are ways in which the journalist or others may consciously or unconsciously facilitate the elicitation of emotion in whistleblowers, a better understanding of this process could result in more informed and responsible journalistic interaction with those considering speaking out.

The exact nature and mechanism by which anger works is still not clear. It has been described as the "forgotten emotion", lacking even its own category in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DiGiuseppe & Tafrate, 2007, pp. 3-10) . The emotion literature itself is characterised by a wide range of theoretical approaches, with key questions revolving around whether emotions and their accompanying physiological responses are purely a response to sensory input, or whether they involve cognitive input, and if so what kind of input, when, and how often (Lazarus, 1991; Zajonc, 1984).

Within this broad field, the functionalist perspective has been influential. In his review of the anger literature, Kuppens (2009) summarises the functional perspective on the causes of anger as assuming that it is "elicited by unwanted or harmful circumstances and to serve the purpose of mobilising energy to remove or

attack the cause of such circumstances” (p. 32). He describes the experience of anger as “feelings of unpleasantness or high arousal, in the form of antagonistic feelings and action tendencies” (p. 32). He notes there is considerable debate around what kind of conditions should be accepted as eliciting emotion.

For example, attachment theorists argue representations are important; that the way we learnt to emotionally engage in childhood can set a pattern for how we feel with others later. Freudian analysts argue that we draw on previous experiences, either in memory, or through patterns of thinking, which help inform what kind of emotion is elicited by the current situation. (Feeney, Noller, & Roberts, 2000; Freud, 1958).

More recently, appraisal theorists suggest that cognitive structures (appraisals) help order incoming information and decide what emotion results. One dominant strand within appraisal theory includes the so-called dual-process models, in which emotions are posited as being processed either automatically or consciously, depending on the situation (Clore & Ortony, 2008; Smith & Neumann, 2005).

Scherer (2009) categorises appraisal theory into four main strands (theme, attribute, meanings or criteria) depending on what kind of appraisals they see as relevant.

However they all share the same premise: “that emotions are elicited and differentiated by the subjective interpretation of the personal significance of events.” (p. 38). While Scherer notes that social psychologists tend to favour attribution-based appraisal theories, which emphasise the role of attributions, such as the desire for control, in the processing of information, he suggests criteria-based theories are the most developed. Criteria-based appraisal theories, as the name suggests, list a set of factors by which incoming information is appraised, such as illegitimacy, efficacy, coping, and novelty. How the incoming information is rated by the individual according to these factors will determine how an emotional episode develops. For example, imagine a person piloting a helicopter for the first time. Physiological responses to the effects of gravity and acceleration during take-off may

well spark anxiety and fear. However, a more experienced pilot, experiencing the same sensory inputs, would feel little or no fear. A criteria-based appraisal theory would explain this difference as due to different cognitive appraisals of the sensory information using criteria of coping. The pilot's cognitive coping structures are much more advanced, hence the incoming data is reprocessed into an emotion other than fear – possibly joy. Scherer's appraisal criteria are based on a sequence, based around the themes of evaluation (is something good or bad) potency (powerful or not) and activity (is it urgent or not). This is assumed to serve the evolutionary purpose of allowing humans to assess whether something is a threat, whether they can cope with it or not, and how quickly they have to react. Within those themes, he proposes a sequence of stimulus evaluation checks. Clore and Ortony summarise these as "novelty", "intrinsic pleasantness", "goal/ need significance" ("whether an event is relevant to goals, conducive to goals, expected, and urgent") "coping potential" and "norm-self compatibility". Coping potential evaluates "causation, coping potential, control over consequences, relative power, and options for internal adjustment", while the last evaluates "the compatibility of actions or events with social norms, conventions, or expectations of others, as well as with internalised norms of standards of self." They add that he "assumes that the outcomes of these checks change various subsystems that serve emotion, such as physiology, expression, motivation and feelings. (Clore & Ortony, 2008, p. 635)

Coping is itself a field of intense study within psychology, since a landmark study by Lazarus (1966). Scherer defines coping potential as "the ability of the individual to cope or deal with a situation that is potentially or actually threatening to the well-being of the person." He argues that the "major function of the coping appraisal is to determine the appropriate response to an event, given the nature of that event and the resources at one's disposal." Scherer further argues the importance of distinguishing between control, power, and adjustment capacity because each affects coping ability. The first determines whether an individual can affect the outcome of an event; the second what resources they have for doing so (including physical

strength, money, knowledge, attractiveness) and the third determines the individual's ability to adapt, including an assessment of the cost of changing goals. This is "particularly important if the control and power appraisals suggest that it is not possible for the organism to change the outcome of an event." He argues that the results of these checks have a significant impact on the resultant emotion and associated action. High control and power will produce anger and aggression; the lack of these will lead to fear or flight. Lack of adjustment potential may lead to resignation, sadness and despair (Scherer, 2009, pp. 103-104).

DiGiuseppe and Tafrate (2007) propose a similar argument, suggesting that an individual's perception of whether they can overcome a threat determines whether they will feel anger or fear. If they feel powerful, they will become angry; if they feel powerless, they are more likely to experience fear. Under this model, high self-efficacy is not necessary for anger arousal, though it makes it more likely. In confident individuals, high self-efficacy fails to arouse anger but arouses confidence, commitment and dedication.

One of the advantages of appraisal theories is that they explain why the same event can elicit more or less anger (or other emotions) at different times, depending on variations in the individual's coping potential or other appraisals. The implication of this is that by enhancing an individual's coping potential, (or other appraisals such as their ideas about what is legitimate), a journalist may change the way an individual processes a situation and thus the emotion they feel about it. However, there is still much debate around how and at what stage these appraisals occur and what kinds of factors are drawn on. Neo-associationistic theory (L. Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004) allows a wide range of factors, whereas appraisal theories are more specific about what factors can elicit emotion. Kuppens proposes a middle road between these two positions; not all the appraisals are always necessary for anger to be experienced, but nevertheless some minimal anger-relevant appraisal is nevertheless necessary (2009, pp. 32-33).

One early problem with cognitive appraisal theories was how to explain the fact that people can either have an instant, strong emotional reaction at times or a more slow-burning response at others. To explain this, emotion theorists have suggested a variety of models that distinguish between low-level affect (including the physiological response) and the resultant emotions. These include sequence, parallel constraint, iterative and dual process models. The latter use the same dual-process concept used in the ELM; that people engage in either heuristic/systematic or central/peripheral processing of affect into emotion. Sloman (1996) characterised this distinction as associative vs. rule-based processing. In their summary of dual-process theories, Clore and Ortony (2008) describe associative processing as guided by subjective similarity and temporal contiguity, and rule-based by symbolic reasoning. In new situations, people may do a lot of rule-based processing before emotions are elicited, even though people may hardly be aware they are doing it (2008, p. 633). But emotions can also be elicited by associative processes: “One can become happy, angry, or anxious simply by being in situations where one was previously happy, angry or anxious” (2008, p. 633). Clore and Ortony suggest that such reinstatement of prior emotion explains much about attachment theory and the reappearance of emotion patterns when people fall in love. But they propose that although there may be two routes to an emotion, the appraisal for each emotion does not change:

Regardless of whether fear or anger arises from computation, conditioning, imitation, or predisposition, fear is always a response to apparent threat, and anger to apparent infringement. Whereas the constituent thoughts, feelings, and physiology may differ, each instance of anger involves similar perceptions. (2008, p. 634)

Cognitive appraisal theory has only recently begun to be considered by whistleblower researchers as a way of explaining the impact of emotion on the whistleblowing process. Gundlach et al. (2003) have described this area as the most fruitful area for further whistleblower research. Their social processing model was

one of the first attempts to explain the emotional process of whistleblowers. Based on an attributional approach, it proposed anger would predict whistleblowing and fear would predict inaction. Henik (2008) built on this model by proposing a model combining cognitive appraisal theory with a social-functional value pluralism model. This model is more useful because it predicts what kind of emotion the whistleblowing situation will elicit. She draws on research that identifies certain kinds of value conflict as inducing anger and integratively complex thinking that moderates emotion. The idea that value conflict, complex thought and emotion are all interdependent is a useful contribution to whistleblower motivation research, and it will be interesting to see if Henik's model can reliably predict whistleblowing behaviour. However, it was decided not to apply it here, firstly because the complexity of variables would make it too difficult to operationalise in a non-experimental study such as this, and secondly, because the idea that cognition regulates emotion is out of step with more recent models.

One such model is the Iterative-Reprocessing Model (Cunningham & Zelazo, 2007). This model proposes that affective attitudes and reflective processing interact in a dynamic way, constantly creating and recreating emotional experience. They propose that this model explains one of the paradoxes of cognitive research, which has been based on the assumption that attitudes are relatively static, and yet found that different attitude measures have revealed different attitudes. Dual-process models sought to answer this by proposing different routes for different situations – low-level “instinctive” reactions for sudden threats, for example, and more elaborate cognitive responses for long-term goal setting. Drawing on recent brain imaging data, the authors propose that instead, both types of reaction are linked by brain circuits which ensure that each constantly informs the other.

When rendering an evaluation, one draws upon pre-existing attitudes (in particular those aspects of the attitude that are currently active), together with novel information about the stimulus,

contextual information and current goal states. We suggest that stimuli (e.g. people, objects and abstract concepts) initiate an iterative sequence of evaluative processes (the evaluative cycle) through which the stimuli are interpreted and reinterpreted in light of an increasingly rich set of contextually meaningful representations. Whereas evaluations based on few iterations of the evaluative cycle are relatively automatic, in that they are obligatory and might occur without conscious monitoring, evaluations based on additional iterations and computations are relatively reflective. (Cunningham & Zelazo, 2007, p. 98)

They use the term “attitude” to refer to a “relatively stable set of representations of a stimulus” and “evaluation” to reflect “one’s current appraisal of the stimulus, including whether it should be approached or avoided”.

One of the main differences between the Iterative Reprocessing Model and dual-process models is that the authors propose that the neural networks are hierarchically arranged, rather than in parallel. So while lower order networks continue to provide information about affect (e.g. good or bad, approach or avoid), higher order networks are simultaneously being recruited and are evaluating the information in conjunction with previously held attitudes and other information, perhaps as often as eight times per second. The variables proposed to influence the number of iterations include differences in ability (an individual’s ability to reflect), motivation (including the consequences of an appraisal), and opportunity (the time available for responding). The authors suggest that two additional drives combine as well; firstly, one that wishes to minimise discrepancies between one’s own evaluation and the situation, to reduce error, and secondly, a drive to minimise processing. “ These opposing drives create a dynamic tension that can propel us to move beyond our initial ‘gut’ responses to generate an affective model that is more complex but not computationally catastrophic” (Cunningham & Zelazo, 2007, p. 98).

This inclusion of motivation, ability, and opportunity sounds remarkably similar to the ELM, and like that model, the IRM is also based on the idea of a continuum. The idea of opposing drives creating tension has echoes of cognitive dissonance models. The model provides a framework which explains how many different inputs – from low-level physiological response to complicated Freudian patterns of memory – can interact to produce emotion. In their recent review of cognitive appraisal models, Clore and Ortony (2008) prefer the IRM over other approaches, partly because it better explains recent developments in neuroscience, and especially the interaction of the amygdale, cortices and limbic system in reprocessing experience. They agree with the IRM's basic principle that rather than there being two separate routes, information is processed and reprocessed by both the cortices and the amygdala in a series of "recursive feedback loops With continual interaction of limbic and cortical areas, evaluations that start out as automatic become situated and progressively refined. In short, they become emotions" (p. 638). This account, they argue, changes the common idea that implicit emotional attitudes are unconscious versions of conscious, explicit attitudes, where the cortex simply regulates the underlying emotion. Clore and Ortony agree that cortical processing is not simply regulatory, but also helps define the reaction:

The explicit fully elaborated emotion is also not the same thing as initial subcortical and neurochemical reactions of affect. They are the same thing only in the sense that the block of marble that Leonardo da Vinci [sic] selected for his statue of David was the same thing as the statue that emerged from it. Both are made of the same material, but the latter has a very different form as a result of being processed and reprocessed many times. (Clore & Ortony, 2008, p. 638)

This interpretation of the way in which emotions are elicited has significant implications for this study. It implies that feelings of fear or anger in potential whistleblowers may be consciously evoked, or may arise associatively from a

memory of a previous association, and then maybe reprocessed into a different emotion over time depending on what other kind of inputs – from a journalist for example - occur. This is obviously quite possible where someone has been abused, for example. It also implies that a person's emotional reaction to a given person or situation can change from fear to anger if their perception of it changes from threat to infringement. Thus a journalist who helps a potential whistleblower's perceptions of a situation or person change from threat to infringement could help change their resulting emotion from fear to anger. Since anger is associated with action and can motivate people to confront a threat, this makes it more likely the potential whistleblower will decide to speak out. The journalist may not have to consciously change the whistleblower's perceptions; simply improving their sense of self-efficacy may help them do this. However, efficacy is only one criterion; as Clore and Ortony point out, the appraisal field is still far from clarified. They argue for an expansion of the concept of appraisal to include perceptions as well as cognitions; it could well be that changing perceptions about other factors could also be influential; whether an act is right or wrong, for example. All sorts of factors could influence the cognitive constituents of emotion; not just rule-based processing (such as the judgment of whether I can cope with this infringement or threat) but representations as well (what it brings to mind about earlier such situations I encountered) and the topography of the situation itself. In other words, they argue it is not necessary to be conclusive about the exact structures involved in emotion, as long as we agree that they are involved, and that they may be made up of many things; and that these structures then interact with sensory affect in a constant process to produce the fully fledged emotion. Their model "emphasises emotions as emergent constructions rather than as latent entities; it makes a sharp distinction between affective reactions and emotions; and it sees appraisal as an iterative process" (Clore & Ortony, 2008, p. 639). The whole process of forming an emotion is thus often far more involved than is often depicted:

Reflexes and low-level affective reactions often get the emotional ball rolling. These undifferentiated states are then refined, situated, further evaluated, and re-represented. The results are the rich and nuanced emotional states that mark the important occasions and turning points in people's lives, that embody people's aspirations and fears, and that are capable of motivating their best and worst actions. (p. 639)

Physiological response, memory of past experience, learnt behaviour patterns, goals, attitudes, and perceptions of legitimacy and coping are just some of the myriad factors that interact at different times and in different ways to produce emotion. Such a complex and richly nuanced model of emotion elicitation would be difficult to operationalise in an experimental design, let alone in an exploratory study such as this one. Instead, the above factors were listed in a coding sheet, to compare with other models of emotion elicitation such as Cognitive Dissonance Theory³. In addition, evidence of changed emotional responses to a similar situation was taken as indicative of the kind of recursive processing proposed by the IRM (although it is conceded it could also be indicative of dual-route processing). This is obviously not conclusive, but it was decided that evidence of complexity may not confirm, but at least does not rule out this model as an explanation.

This brings us to our next set of research questions.

3. How and when does emotion, particularly anger, arise in potential whistleblowers after their interaction with journalists, and to what extent does this appear to be influenced by their interaction with journalists?
4. What theory or combination of theories best explains the way in which emotion, especially anger, influences the potential whistleblower's decision to speak out?

³ As CDT is a model of emotion elicitation as well as persuasion, for brevity's sake it was applied here as the alternate template for both ELM and the IRM.

One other area of persuasion scholarship worth mentioning is interpersonal persuasion. This is the study of techniques and behavioural approaches (e.g. reciprocity, foot in the door, lowballing) used, most commonly in sales, to influence human behaviour. Perloff (2008) notes that all these techniques have been shown to be effective under certain conditions but points out that this area of interpersonal persuasion is still in development, with a lack of agreed definitions of strategies, and much research about hypothetical, rather than real situations. Given the relative lack of development of this research area, it is proposed to rely on the ELM as an overarching theory, but the kinds of factors explored in the interpersonal persuasion literature are interesting and worth noting and observing where they appear in the case studies.

One theory often mentioned in persuasion research which provides an alternative explanation of motivation to process arguments is Cognitive Dissonance Theory (L. Festinger, 1956). Although it suffered a later decline in research interest, Seiter et al (2004) suggest it has more recently enjoyed a revival. Cognitive dissonance is described as “the uncomfortable state that arises when individuals hold psychologically inconsistent cognitions” (Perloff, 2008, p. 347). An inconsistent cognition is one that does not follow from the preceding one, such as continuing to hold the belief that the world will end at sunrise when sunrise has been and gone and the world is still here. Perloff notes that CD is particularly powerful when the issue is important to the individual and touches on the self concept. The subject must also have freely chosen to undertake the subject behaviour – CD does not occur when the behaviour is coerced. Seiter and Gass (2004) suggest there are at least four paradigms of research on CD; the best fit in this case seems to be that known as disconfirmation bias. This paradigm suggests that people confronted with information inconsistent with their beliefs will reject, distort or fabricate information that arouses dissonance. Another important point about CD is that irrational beliefs concocted to justify an inconsistent position (the world didn’t end at sunrise because

a race of aliens heard we were in danger and rushed to deflect the meteorite that threatened our planet) - are more likely to be held if there is social support for such a position. Eddie Harmon-Jones, in his review of the literature on CDT (2002), suggests Festinger's original theory was lacking in that it never specified why cognitive inconsistency generated the motivation to reduce it. Nonetheless, he summarises recent research as supporting the view that dissonance is a motivational theory and that dissonance produces "genuine and lasting attitude, belief and behavior changes" (2002, p. 106). Seiter and Gass (2004) agree that CDT has generated useful insights on persuasion, in particular the process of self-persuasion. They concur that while there is disagreement on the motivation for dissonance, there is concord that genuine cognitive changes occur, that these changes are motivated in nature, and that the source of this motivation is psychological discomfort. Perloff (2008) agrees that there is "little doubt" that dissonance influences attitudes and cognitions. He suggests that unlike usual persuasion theories that emphasise accommodating people or meeting them halfway, CDT can help in persuasion by provoking inconsistencies in people. "Dissonance then serves as the engine that motivates attitude change" (p. 351).

Based on the above, it could be that whistleblowers who have not yet spoken out may hold a belief that prevents them doing so. Journalists who successfully persuade such people to speak out are likely to have challenged this belief by provoking CD, and prevented formation of a disconfirming belief by enlisting the source's close support networks.

This raises the next set of research questions:

5. How well does Cognitive Dissonance Theory, in particular the disconfirmation paradigm, explain a potential whistleblower's decision to speak out?

6. Can journalists influence this process, in particularly by enlisting close support networks of potential whistleblowers?

Relationship effects

As we have seen, the ELM literature suggests that high credibility, even liking, of a journalist would not be enough to convince someone to speak out if they were highly involved and therefore processing arguments centrally. Does this mean the quality of the relationship is not important? No, for three reasons. Journalists often cite trust as the over-riding factor in good source-journalist relations, and describe the development of a relationship as crucial to the source deciding to speak out. Secondly, as has been shown above, there is still much unexplained about how ELM works, to the extent that it is worth considering other models that may explain the role of important factors; especially the nature and effect of trust, which is still an under-explored area in persuasion. Thirdly, the literature on therapeutic relationships suggests that the kind of relationship can affect disclosure, particularly of traumatic events (Petrak & Hedge, 2002; Roy, 2005).

One commonly used definition of a relationship is: "A relationship exists to the extent that two people exert strong, frequent and diverse effects on one another over an extended period of time" (H. H. Kelley, 1983, p. 4). Kelley notes that this implies that a close relationship is one with relatively strong interdependence, and that this definition can apply to a wide range of relationships, from intimate, to friendship, to work relationships. Harvey and Wenzel (2006) identify four theoretical streams in relationship theory; evolutionary, social exchange and equity, cognitive-behavioural, and attachment approaches. The first of these suggests that psychological processes evolve and reflect the survival strategies of species; we learn to think and feel in a certain way because it has evolutionary advantages. For example, different dating and mating styles are adapted to make the most of our particular physical or intellectual advantages, and thus ensure our genes are passed on. Attachment theory

argues that a lot about the way we feel and think is a result of the way we bonded or not to our parents or primary caregivers when we were young; our patterns of behaviour are formed, rather than innate. Cognitive-behavioural theories propose that relationship quality depends on different ways of thinking; for example, people in good relationships are more likely to see good events as due to their partner's inherent qualities, rather than external factors, and bad events as due to external events, rather than anything inherently faulty about their partner. The reverse is true for people in bad relationships. The other main body of theory, social exchange, or equity theories, are generally known as rule-based theories. These are based on the idea that relationships are an exchange of gifts and benefits, and that stable relationships tend to be those in which the ratio of gift to benefit is about equal.

Each of these paradigms has generated a large body of scholarship, each with a solid body of empirical data behind it. There is at present no widely accepted universal theory of relationships, although Harvey and Wenzel's (2006) review proposes that all three strands are not mutually exclusive; evolutionary approaches explain gender differences in mating and dating behaviour, while a mixture of cognitive-behavioural and attachment approaches go a long way to explaining individual differences in the way in which people negotiate relationship events. The authors suggest that social exchange models are declining in favour now, because "they cannot readily account for the maintenance of relationships in which the ratio of rewards and costs is out of balance" but remain a "fundamental system of logic in the analysis of close relationships" (pp. 40, 46).

Within these four paradigms, relationship work has divided into the study of the process of initiating, developing and maintaining relationships. When initiating relationships, people are inclined to regard humans more favourably than non-humans, and specific individuals more favourably than the groups to which they belong, and tend to like others who like them, and tend to dislike others who dislike them (Backman & Secord, 1959). In developing relationships, communication is very

important, both verbal and non-verbal; often it is the intent, rather than the content, that determines whether a relationship progresses (H. E. Reis & Rusbult, 2004). Relationship maintenance is a relatively new area of scholarship which has been defined as “the mechanisms by which partners conserve, protect, and enhance the health of their important relationships, once those relationships have achieved a degree of closeness” (C. Rusbult, Olsen, Davis, & Hannon, 2004, p. 281). In a sense, this maintenance aspect is more important than the development aspect for this study; as the nature of the relationship between the journalist and the source is deeper and more interdependent than a business relationship, with many relationships between journalists and their sources extending over years or decades and implying a degree of friendship, trust and loyalty similar or stronger than some familial relationships (see e.g. Woodward, 2005), it is not unreasonable to suggest that the maintenance phase is crucial to the overall success of the relationship. It was thus decided to focus on it in this study.

Dindia and Emmers-Sommer (2006) point out that early research on relationship maintenance tended to look at it through a typological approach, i.e. through listing relevant factors that appeared to be present in successfully maintained relationships, such as positivity, openness, assurances of trust and sharing tasks. However, they note that these typological approaches are essentially descriptive, and do not attempt to make predictions about how different factors might interact. More recently, theoretical approaches have been developed to explain how the various factors interact with each other to explain the way people act to keep relationships in repair. Most work in the area is based on interdependence theory (H. Kelley & Thibaut, 1978) which a meta-review described as a “sophisticated approach to understanding how individuals address both their own and the couple’s needs and expectations in close relationships” (Harvey & Wenzel, 2006, p. 40). One important proposition of interdependence theory is that ongoing relationships require that partners coordinate their actions, and “consequently, that people often act in ways

that go against their immediate self-interest in order to benefit the partner” (H. E. Reis & Rusbult, 2004, p. 14). Reis and Rusbult summarise dependence as the extent to which an individual needs a relationship. The level of dependence depends on the satisfaction an individual gets from a relationship, i.e. positive feelings. The satisfaction level increases if a relationship meets someone’s needs, such as for intimacy, security, sexuality and belongingness. But dependence isn’t just a result of satisfaction; it also depends on whether there are alternatives. So, according to interdependence theory, the level of dependence an individual has is a product of their satisfaction level and the quality of available alternatives (H. E. Reis & Rusbult, 2004, pp. 14-15).

One theory which builds on interdependence theory is the Investment Model (C. E. Rusbult, 1980; C. E. Rusbult, Coolsen, Kirchner, & Clarke, 2006). This model was developed in part to explain why people persist in relationships where satisfaction is low and alternatives exist. It proposes that a third factor which creates dependence is the level of investment an individual makes in a relationship. If, for example, people share friends, houses, cars, hobbies, even children, the costs of exiting the relationship are much higher. The Investment Model also takes interdependence a step further by proposing that commitment emerges as a consequence of increasing dependence. Commitment level “is defined as intent to persist in a relationship, including long-term orientation toward the involvement as well as feelings of psychological attachment to it” (C. E. Rusbult, et al., 2006, p. 618). This differs from dependence which Rusbult et al. describe as a structural property that describes “the additive effects of wanting to persist (feeling satisfied), needing to persist (having high investments) and having no choice but to persist (low quality of alternatives)... commitment is the sense of allegiance that is established to the source of one’s dependence” (p. 618). So as people become more dependent, they develop strong commitment. The Investment Model holds that the key predictor of relationship persistence is commitment; it is the “psychological state that directly influences

everyday behaviour in relationships, including decisions to persist”(pp. 618-619). Commitment mediates the three bases of dependence (satisfaction, alternatives, and investment). Commitment is the glue that keeps relationships going when things get hard, and is the factor that mediates many other variables, such as trust, and the various maintenance mechanisms partners use. According to the model, commitment depends on satisfaction level, availability of alternatives, and investment size. Satisfaction level is defined in terms of positive or negative affect; i.e. the feelings one has about the relationship. Commitment is the intention to stay in the relationship; investment is things that cannot be retrieved if the relationship ends; e.g. loss of social circle, friends etc.

The concepts of commitment and trust are fundamental to the Investment Model; it is worth some further discussion of them here to show how they are interpreted by interdependence-based theories. Trust is often defined as a willingness to place oneself in a position of vulnerability relative to another person (H. E. Reis & Rusbult, 2004). While earlier research around trust has seen it as a personal trait or disposition, more recently it has been seen as an interpersonal phenomenon, specific to a particular relationship with a particular partner, and defined as “the strength of one’s conviction that the partner will be responsive to one’s needs, now and in the future” (C. E. Rusbult, et al., 2006, p. 627). Rusbult et al. note that Holmes and Rempel (1989) suggest it is more useful to define trust level, and that it includes three components; predictability – belief that the partner’s behaviour is consistent; dependability, or belief that the partner can be counted on to be honest, reliable and benevolent, and faith; belief that the partner is motivated to be responsive and caring.

It has been suggested that when goals and preferences coincide, relationships are relatively easy (H. E. Reis & Rusbult, 2004). The real test is when partners’ needs and desires conflict, and one or both must bend to maintain the relationship. These moments of conflict have been described as “interdependence dilemmas” or

“diagnostic situations” (Holmes & Rempel, 1989; H. H. Kelley, 1983; C. E. Rusbult, et al., 2006), because they enable one partner to gauge the strength of another’s commitment.

It is when John declines a job offer that he very much wants to accept that Mary can discern that he places the interest of their relationship above his personal interests. When John declines a job offer that does not interest him, Mary learns nothing about his commitment. (C. E. Rusbult, et al., 2006, p. 627)

According to the Investment Model, the key factor, or interpersonal orientation, that helps decide why some individuals react on the basis of immediate self-interest, and others exhibit pro-relationship transformative behaviour, is commitment. Rusbult et al. (2006) also suggest that besides persistence, commitment encourages relationship maintenance mechanisms. These can be divided into behavioural and cognitive. Among behavioural mechanisms are accommodation, willingness to sacrifice and forgiveness of betrayal. Accommodation describes the process where one inhibits the impulse to reciprocate destructive behaviour. Accommodation is more likely among those with strong commitment, although commitment is not the only variable likely to affect willingness to accommodate. Willingness to sacrifice (such as foregoing undesirable behaviours, or enacting desirable ones) has also been shown to be positively associated with commitment. Commitment also encourages cognitive maintenance mechanisms such as cognitive interdependence (thinking in a we-based rather than I-based way) positive illusion (seeing the relationship and partner as better than they really are) and derogation of tempting alternatives (e.g. finding things wrong with potential alternative partners).

The Investment Model is particularly useful as a way of understanding how trust grows in relationships. Rather than being seen as a dispositional factor, or something one simply has or doesn’t have, it is a function of the relationship, and more

particularly, of commitment. Both commitment and trust are intertwined and together produce what Rusbult et al. (2006) call the mutual cyclical growth of a relationship. One trusts when one is confident of a partner's commitment. As one becomes more trusting, one is increasingly willing to place oneself in vulnerable situations by becoming more dependent; that is, more satisfied, more willing to ditch alternatives, and more willing to invest (p. 628).

Recent reviewers agree that there is some empirical support for the Investment Model, "especially the hypothesis that commitment is positively related to maintenance behaviours including accommodation, willingness to sacrifice, forgiveness, positive illusion, and derogation of tempting alternatives" (2006, p. 313). But it is less clear that these things result from commitment; relational maintenance behaviours may not just result from commitment, but may affect commitment (Harvey & Wenzel, 2006). Also given the emphasis above on cognitive models of persuasion and emotion, it may seem illogical to choose a relationship theory based on a paradigm in apparent decline. However, its emphasis on trust, commitment and diagnostic situations seem so relevant to the journalist-source interaction, and in the interests of exploring across as wide a range of theory (and paradigmatical approaches) as possible, it was decided to include it here.

To maintain theoretical triangulation, one other relationship model is worth considering here. One theory that has been widely applied in the professional setting is that of the therapeutic relationship, based on Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT). CBT-based therapies based on it have proven effective in treating many psychological disorders including depression and anxiety. It is also helpful for victims of many forms of trauma, including war and sexual abuse, and has been described as the "non-pharmacological treatment of choice" for post-traumatic stress disorder PTSD (Roy, 2005). CBT therapy for abuse victims often uses "guided discovery", a form of empathic, exploratory questioning to help a patient uncover knowledge they have overlooked or suppressed, and identify often automatic,

negative thought patterns that may result from abuse. The therapist aims to help train the client to identify such patterns and develop more realistic, less harmful responses. It involves “generating and challenging hypotheses through questioning and drawing attention to inconsistencies between clients’ thoughts and the available evidence”(Petrak & Hedge, 2002, p. 144). Important factors in CBT include collaboration with the patient throughout the process, and developing a structure for the therapy, and an emphasis on helping the client to help themselves through better insights into their condition. This “therapeutic” model is well-established as successful in helping abused or vulnerable clients heal through self-disclosure, and many of the standard guidelines for treating sexually abused people refer to or are based on the principles of CBT. For example, one of New Zealand’s major health provider’s manuals for best practice emphasises treating the therapist client interaction as a relationship, and emphasises relationship-enhancing strategies such as availability, friendliness, empathy. It also emphasises the importance of maintaining a healthy relationship between the client and counsellor, through matching language, behaving consistently, and remaining client centred – giving the client power over the rate and choice of topics being discussed(ACC, 2008).

As the majority of the cases in this study involved clients who were vulnerable and had suffered varying degrees of abuse, including sexual abuse, it seems a good fit for the cases here. As can be seen from the above, a vital part of therapeutic treatment for abuse victims is establishing a safe, collaborative relationship, and helping them to talk about their experiences. These are all things that participants in this study emphasise as important, so it was considered worthwhile analysing the cases in this study to gauge the extent to which they exhibited at least some of the techniques of good therapeutic practice. Thus a coding sheet was prepared which listed key factors of the therapeutic relationship identified in the cases here. For reasons of practicality, these were narrowed here to the level of client-centredness; the safety of the relationship, consistency and availability.

Taking the above literature on relationships and relationship maintenance into account, the following research questions were proposed:

7. How well does the Investment Model explain the interaction between journalist and potential whistleblower?
8. How well does the therapeutic relationship model explain the interaction between journalist and potential whistleblower?
9. What role does the quality of relationship (e.g. level of investment and commitment, or safety of relationship) play in the potential whistleblower's decision to speak out?

Summary

There is a wide spectrum of theory that could be applied to the journalist/source interaction to explain how and why people become whistleblowers and what impact journalists have on this process. Four broad strands that seem particularly useful are persuasion theories, theories of the impact of emotion on decision making, theories of how emotion is elicited, and relationship theories. In line with the alternate templates approach, two were chosen for each strand. For the first strand, the Elaboration Likelihood Model, and Cognitive Dissonance Theory; for the second, the Cognitive Functional Model and the Anger Activism Model; for the third, CDT and the Iterative Reprocessing Model; and for the fourth, the Investment Model and the Therapeutic Model. Taking all of the above into account, a series of research questions were derived from the theory. Key factors to operationalise for each question were identified and listed in a coding sheet (see Appendix One). Where factors emerged that were not anticipated by the coding, these were included in the analysis, and the results fed into one final overarching question, listed below. The research questions were:

1. How well does the ELM explain the decision-making process of reluctant, vulnerable whistleblowers to speak out?

2. How are messages, particularly from journalists, processed by the potential whistleblower and what impact do they have on attitude change (the decision to speak out)?
3. How and when does emotion, particularly anger, arise in potential whistleblowers after their interaction with journalists, and to what extent does this appear to be influenced by their interaction with journalists?
4. What theory or combination of theories best explains the way in which emotion, especially anger, influences the potential whistleblower's decision to speak out?
5. How well does Cognitive Dissonance Theory, in particular the disconfirmation paradigm, explain a potential whistleblower's decision to speak out?
6. Can journalists influence this process, in particular by enlisting close support networks of potential whistleblowers?
7. How well does the Investment Model explain the interaction between journalist and potential whistleblower?
8. How well does the Therapeutic Model explain the interaction between journalist and potential whistleblower?
9. What role does the quality of relationship (e.g. level of investment and commitment, or safety of relationship) play in the potential whistleblower's decision to speak out?
10. Overall, what is best practice for journalists wishing to persuade reluctant potential whistleblowers to speak out?

3.4 Research design

A case study design was chosen because many qualitative researchers favour this approach, particularly for small groups where the kinds of research questions are exploratory rather than causative, and when the researcher wants to understand or explain a phenomenon (Denzin, 2005; Flick, 2007; Wimmer & Dominick, 2006; Yin, 2002). Definitions of what constitutes a case study can be as wide as “a descriptive analysis of characteristics surrounding a particular case or situation” (Rosenberry & Vicker, 2009, p. 64). Yin (2002) has been influential in trying to distinguish the case study as more than just a description of a topic, but as a distinctive research method “to be preferred when circumstances and research problems are appropriate rather than an ideological commitment to be followed whatever the circumstances” (Platt, 1992). Yin’s approach has been widely cited and his more restricted definition was preferred here:

An empirical enquiry that

- uses multiple sources of evidence to investigate a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are not clearly evident.
- copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result
- relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in triangulating fashion, and as another result
- benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. (Yin, 2002, pp. 13-14)

There is a wide range of thought on how to design a case study. Yin proposes five essential components: questions, propositions, units of analysis, logic linking data to propositions, and criteria for interpreting the findings. Under this post-positivist model, research questions – usually “how” or “why” questions - are proposed after reading the relevant literature, or perhaps undertaking a pilot study. Propositions are then derived from the questions. Yin argues propositions are essential to help refine and focus the research questions, except in exploratory studies, where they may be inappropriate. Given this study is largely exploratory, it was thus decided to derive a series of research questions from theory, as proposed above, rather than propositions. However, Yin is clear that even then a purpose should be stated, and the criteria stated by which the exploration will be judged successful. The unit of analysis is the factors being studied – or how the case and components of the case are defined; the logic linking the data to propositions can include methods of analysing the data, such as looking for patterns, or testing rival explanations. The criteria for interpreting the findings can include such factors as how widely they can be applied. Yin prefers a restrictive way of measuring the quality of case study design, according to four criteria well-established in social science: construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability (See E.g. Kidder, Judd, & Smith, 1986). Some qualitative researchers argue that such an “instrumentalist” approach aimed at theory building can blur the intrinsic interest of the case itself (Denzin, 2005; Stake, 2005) and propose alternative validity criteria such as credibility, dependability, and transferability (Flick, 2009; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Whichever method is chosen, most qualitative researchers agree that the researcher still needs to have a research design, where the researcher addresses the “two critical issues of representation and legitimisation” (Denzin, 2005, p. 26). It is likely that either approach could be usefully applied here, but given that one aim of this study is to establish a model of best practice from several cases – rather than just one- it seemed more transparent to construct a model that tried to compare cases in a systematic way, while still allowing room for random, loose threads to contribute to

their overall picture. The way in which this study asserts validity will now be discussed.

Construct Validity

Construct validity means to establish correct operational measures for the concept being studied. Yin suggests one must (a) select the types of changes that are to be studied (and relate them to the original objectives of the study) and (b) demonstrate that the selected measures of these changes do indeed reflect the specific types of change that have been selected, usually through multiple sources of data.

The types of changes studied are defined in the research questions above. To demonstrate (b), the factors involved in each question must be identified and a working definition given of each, with a justification of why it accurately reflects the change being measured. A discussion of each follows.

Investigative journalism: Investigative journalism was defined as journalism that met the definition given in Chapter Two, of revealing something which would not have come out otherwise, which is in the public interest, and which led to some kind of change.⁴ The cases chosen (listed below) are not the only ones of their type in New Zealand, or possibly the most important, but they do meet the criteria of being of public benefit (in that some kind of law change or enquiry or judicial procedure followed), and of being very unlikely to have come out if the reporter had not dug them out. The decision to focus on cases of investigative journalism was taken not just because of the intrinsic interest in this branch of journalism, but also because the stakes for both whistleblower and journalist are much higher in these stories. These are the kinds of stories in which sources are most likely to be reluctant, and have the most to lose. It was thus decided to select the most controversial and risky stories possible that had successful outcomes (i.e. the whistleblower was persuaded to

⁴ Using these criteria, it is possible to discount much TV-style 'investigative journalism' which is essentially consumer affairs reporting, or personality based.

speak out), in the hope that what worked for these journalists and sources would likely be applicable to less controversial stories.

Investigative journalist: This was defined as a journalist working on the cases chosen.

Reluctant, vulnerable whistleblower: As discussed in Chapter Two, a wider definition of whistleblower was chosen, to include people not necessarily part of an organisation, but with knowledge about a group's practices. This was chosen because some people such as sexual abuse victims may not be formally part of an organisation, but nonetheless are part of its social orbit – as two of the cases in this study were. In effect, these people were insiders exposing a group's practices. They may not have been subject to the same power relations as an employee, but it is argued that they exhibited the key characteristics of whistleblowers – of exposing a practice within an organisation they had knowledge of, in the face of fear of retribution. By reluctant, I meant those who had to be persuaded to speak out, rather than those whistleblowers who approached the news media having already made that decision. This distinction was vital to this study. It was essential to capture the decision-making process of such people as completely as possible, from as early as possible. Those with the most important stories to tell are often the most elusive, and it was the decision-making process of this group that this study aimed to capture. All those chosen for this study were not in contact with the news media before being approached by the journalist in question. All had varying degrees of reluctance about speaking out, from extremely reluctant, to quite amenable, but all still had to be persuaded.

It could be argued that as all whistleblowers risk retribution, all may be considered vulnerable. For this study, I meant those who were especially vulnerable, in that they had experienced either severe abuse or threats. By severe, I meant either significant physical (e.g. sexual) or emotional (persistent bullying) abuse. Threats were defined as either explicit (e.g. a direct threat of violence) or implied (an implication that one could lose one's job, or expect a "visit").

It was decided not to create objective measures of reluctance or vulnerability, such as a Likert scale, because to do so would have potentially biased the whistleblower's response, and because the small sample would make such quantitative measures statistically meaningless, especially in the absence of any baseline reluctance data to compare them with. It was considered that the depth of description provided in each case study adequately reflects the nature and extent of each of these factors.

However, future researchers may consider some kind of scale measures of these factors useful.

For each of the theories chosen to apply to the cases, factors were operationalised as closely as possible to the definitions given in the discussion on theory in Section 3.3. A broader rather than narrow interpretation was allowed for each of the factors, given that this was an exploratory study. For each of the theories under consideration, a list of the main relevant factors was compiled from the summary literature and drafted into a coding sheet (see Appendix 1). For the ELM, factors included message content, processing styles (CRP or PRP), message sender qualities such as attractiveness and credibility and involvement (defined as affecting the individually personally) (Booth-Butterfield & Welbourne, 2002; Perloff, 2008; R. E. Petty, et al., 2009; Seiter & Gass, 2004). For CDT, factors included evidence of dissonance (defined as psychological discomfort⁵) and irrational beliefs (beliefs that were clearly out of step with the facts, but which justified not taking action to resolve dissonance). For emotion, the presence of fear or anger, and evidence of consideration of such appraisal related factors as legitimacy and coping were relevant. For relationship effects, these included relationship, commitment, investment, dependence, satisfaction levels, availability of alternatives, safety, collaboration and client-centredness. The coding sheet in appendix one summarises these main measures and their presence or absence in each case studied. A different

⁵ Obviously a broad term, but one chosen to encompass as wide an array of symptoms or effects as possible. It was considered more useful to be more inclusive in such an exploratory study, rather than exclude factors potentially relevant to future researchers.

kind of study that aimed to isolate the effect of any of these variables would require more precise definitions and more objective measurements of their presence or absence in these cases. This would have had some advantages, in terms of construct validity, in assuring that the factors being discussed in this study were the same as those in earlier studies that generated the theory being applied in this study. For example, many studies of the ELM use thought-listing tasks to assess the number of cognitions about an argument, and Likert-scale- based questionnaires.

However, it was decided that this would have been inappropriate for this study, for two reasons. Firstly, as mentioned above, it would have introduced an element of bias to the interview with the subjects; they would have been more likely to pick up what kind of effects were being sought from the question content. This would have reduced the possibility of spontaneously generated data which may not have related to the survey questions, of the kind that a more exploratory interview could have revealed. Secondly, the aim was not to prove that one process, such as the ELM, applied here; simply to demonstrate that it was more likely than other explanations, so that future researchers can design more focused studies with the confidence that their theoretical path is a suitable one. Other researchers have also applied the ELM qualitatively. For example, one study used the ELM to help explain survey results showing a preference for fear-based appeals in anti-smoking advertisements, rather than incorporate it into the study design (Montazeri & McEwen, 1997). It did not claim to have proved the application of an ELM-based explanation, but simply to have shown a strong case for testing the resulting propositions using an experimental model. This was the approach taken in this study.

An important aspect of construct validity is ensuring that the data captured measures what it is intended to measure. A vital aspect of this is choosing a suitable data collection method. While quantitative researchers aiming to generalise to a population emphasise representativeness in a sample, qualitative researchers emphasise the need for range, and offering opportunities for data triangulation

(Denzin, 2005). Stake (2005) and Patton (1990) suggest the researcher should integrate extreme or deviant cases, such as particularly successful cases, or failures: “Sometimes it is better to learn a lot from an atypical case than a little from a seemingly typical case” (2005, p. 471). Morse (1994) emphasises accessibility (cases should have the capability to reflect and articulate) and suggests either going for width or depth, but not both. While the primary emphasis of this study was on depth, a limited multiple case design of four cases was preferred, following Yin’s (2002) dictum that this allows greater opportunities for theory building through literal or theoretical replication. Given the small number of cases available from which to choose, it was decided to seek triangulation through multiple data sources and theoretical templates rather than a large number of cases. Thus it was decided to use multiple cases, but with an emphasis on depth rather than width, and adopt an approach based on sampling for generally identifiable features which appeared to fit the criteria in the research questions. This also allowed for triangulation of data, through comparison of one journalist-source interaction with others.

Having established the broad criteria for the operational measures and the rationale for case selection, a shortlist of cases was selected from the New Zealand experience according to the following criteria, which promised the possibility of replication.

1. They were all examples of successful investigative journalism, in that the stories produced meet the criteria for that given in chapter two.
2. The sources involved met the criteria established in chapter two as being of research interest, i.e. vulnerable, needing to be persuaded, and pivotal to the story coming out.
3. They enabled triangulation of data by comparing the journalist’s experience with that of the sources they interviewed.
4. They were accessible.

To identify potential cases, a search was made of suitable published investigations (which met the criteria above) in New Zealand over the past 15 years. This time frame was chosen to ensure the likelihood of participants still being available to interview and their memories being intact. Some stories of significant investigations were discarded because the whistleblowers were not available, usually because they were anonymous. From the list of suitable stories, a shortlist of journalists and whistleblowers who contributed to the story was drawn up. From this shortlist, a journalist well-known for investigative work (Philip Kitchin) was approached in order to conduct a pilot study. This pilot case met the criteria for investigative journalism outlined in Chapter Two, and also allowed for interview of both journalist and source. Next, the key source in the case was interviewed, using an in-depth, focussed interview approach, around the key topic areas of how and why she chose to speak out. The interview method allowed for open, exploratory questions, and encouraged and followed suggestions from the subject about relevant topic areas to explore. The interview was transcribed and forwarded to the subject for checking for accuracy of representation of her views.

The interview confirmed that the journalists' approach and relationship style were felt to be critical by the source in her deciding to speak out, but raised questions about whether journalistic messages made any difference. It also highlighted relationship strength as a much stronger factor than expected, and affirmed the importance of strong emotion as a factor in deciding to speak out. The relevant persuasion, relationship and media effects literature was reviewed and a series of research questions were derived from these. Three more cases were then selected from the shortlist that met the overall controlling criteria and allowed the possibility of literal and theoretical replication across all cases.

All four cases in this study thus met the criteria given above: each involved an important public issue; each would not have come out without the journalists' work; each also had a whistleblower as a significant actor. In each case, the whistleblower

was crucial to the story coming out. Also, in each case, the whistleblower did not seek the media, but had to be persuaded to talk, with varying degrees of persuasion necessary. Each whistleblower also fitted the criteria outlined in chapter two of being of particular interest; they were vulnerable, had suffered emotional or physical abuse, and had little or no positive experience of the news media prior to the story. Within these broad criteria there were significant differences that emerged, which were explored in terms of what they explained about the “fit” of each theory, and in terms of their implication for theory building. Many of these intriguing opportunities for comparison emerged only as the study progressed and obviously could not have been built into the research design, but were taken note of where appropriate and where it was felt they contributed to the aims of the study. Patton’s advice to integrate deviant cases and allow the possibility of theoretical replication as well as literal replication, through falsification of any hypothesis that may develop, across the three apparently similar cases was thus achieved more by accident than design. The only obvious difference with case study four that was known beforehand and deliberately taken into account was that the whistleblower took much less persuasion to approach the news media, and this provided a useful comparison to the more reluctant whistleblowers, and promised the opportunity for theoretical replication. This sample was obviously small, gender specific, and must have some limitations. These will be discussed further in Chapter Nine.

Data collection

One of the advantages of the case study approach is the opportunity for it to capture a range of data collection methods. Some of the common methods include interviews, ethnography, textual analysis, field observation, focus groups, as well as more quantitative approaches such as surveys or experiment. However, given the aim of being able to compare across cases, the most obvious comparative units were interviews of the journalist and source, and the news stories generated. As the latter focussed on the outcome, or result, of the investigation, they were relevant only to

whether the case met the controlling criteria. For the actual decision-making process of each whistleblower and the approach of the journalist, the interview was chosen as the best method of data capture, as recommended by Yin (2002).

The method of interviewing chosen can be critical to the outcome of the study. Lindlof and Taylor (2002) identify five main types of interview; ethnographic, informant, respondent, narrative, and focus group. They argue that under the influence of critical and cultural theory, the traditional informant approach is giving way to a more complex approach, which enlarges upon this concept of the interviewee's report of their experience, in which "respondents are now conceptualised as sites of multiple, changing and often contradictory cultural discourses" (p. 179). However, given that this study is not situated within a critical theorist epistemology, it was decided to pursue a variety of the respondent interview, the focussed interview (Iorio, 2004).⁶ This maximised the opportunity of accuracy in capturing the respondent's views, and allowed comparison across cases. Journalistic researchers (Iorio, 2004) suggest that the focussed interview is particularly useful when a project requires an interpretative technique, i.e. one "that will gather specific data and at the same time reflect on the lives, circumstances, and distinctiveness of a populace (whether large or small)" (p. 123). While sharing many of the techniques of the journalistic interview, the focussed interview is more exploratory, trying to elicit themes important to the subject, rather than gather views on a theme or in response to a question decided by the interviewer:

The focussed interviewer will not build a sequence of leading questions to ferret out facts or test a possible conclusion. The focused interviewer encourages general discussion as a way to identify and

⁶ There is some dispute about what a focussed interview is. Flick (2009) suggests it usually takes the form of screening a film or giving some information, then questioning the viewer about their responses. Iorio (2004) and Yin (2002) describes it as one in which a respondent is interviewed for a short period of time – an hour, for example, but still following a protocol. This definition was preferred here.

extrapolate newsworthy concerns that come from the lives people lead the point is not to publish many voices on an issue or problem but to compare and analyse many voices to find commonly held points of view. (p. 114)

Following Iorio, a set of clear and compelling research questions was formulated, a sample selected and an interview schedule constructed which listed broad topic areas related to the theoretical concepts being explored (see Appendix Two). Nearly all questions were open-ended. Rather than a specific order of questions, each interviewee was asked to provide a narrative account of how they became involved in the story. This was designed to help jog their memories, and empower them to tell the story at a pace and detail of their own choosing. The interviewer moved the conversation on to the broad topic areas above, with the focus on the interviewee's own feelings and thoughts, decisions and experiences, as they remembered them, rather than what they thought others were thinking or feeling. Interviewees were given an information sheet with a broad outline of the aims of the study, but to prevent interviewer bias, interviewees were not told about the various theoretical approaches being explored, or the explanations those theoretical approaches suggested. Where an interviewee appeared to be confirming a theoretical approach, the interview attempted to explore rival explanations. To minimise bias, interviewees were not told what other subjects had said.

Ensuring the ethical validity of the study was important to ensure the safety and comfort of the subjects, and to ensure that the research itself did no harm, as prescribed by the Nuremburg guidelines (Seidelman, 1996; Shuster, 1997). Ensuring the safety of the subjects was also important to minimise bias, especially involving sensitive subjects and interviewees who had previously been abused. To meet these concerns, the research proposal was submitted to Massey University's ethics committee. The committee recommended a protocol for interviewing, including an information sheet and consent procedure. Some of these procedures included:

avoiding raising the subject of the abuse itself, unless the subject brought it up spontaneously, being clear about the parameters of the interview beforehand, and sticking to these, and giving subjects the opportunity to review and emend the transcript of the conversation. This protocol is attached in appendix two. In addition, interviewees were also sent a draft of the completed thesis and asked to comment if they wished. Several did, and made factual emendments. None withdrew or asked for substantial changes to the draft.

Internal validity

Internal validity means establishing a causal relationship, and is particularly important at the data analysis stage (Yin, 2002). For example, although the investigative journalists interviewed claim factors x and y were the reasons they were able to persuade someone to talk, was this actually the case? Yin suggests three broad strategies for establishing this causal relationship: theoretical propositions, rival explanations, and explanation building. He considers the first, in which a predicted outcome is compared with an empirically observed pattern, preferable. However, as Flick (2007) has noted, establishing detailed propositions at an exploratory stage can lead the researcher to occlude potentially important data. The second, where alternate explanations are offered to the data, has been compared to Langley's (1999) alternate templates model, and was used in this case along with explanation building where appropriate. It was not intended to prove the exclusivity of one or other of these theories; merely to assess their potential for explanation of the effects observed, and where possible, provide opportunity for analytic induction, deduction or creative inspiration to explain the processes at work.

An important way in which internal validity was assured was through comparison of the journalist's account of the case with that of the whistleblower. Triangulating journalists' accounts of the case with those of the whistleblowers themselves helped ensure as accurate an account as possible was created of the process at work. This

was particularly important for the perceptions of why whistleblowers spoke out, as most previous studies have not done this. For example, journalists often assert trustworthiness as crucial to getting whistleblowers to speak out; this study showed the expertness and independence of the journalist were equally if not more important.

External validity

By external validity, Yin means establishing the domain to which one can generalise; i.e. whether to population or to theory. In this study of investigative journalists, the sample size is too small, and there are too many uncontrolled variables to enable meaningful generalisation to the population of investigative journalists, or even possibly journalists as a whole. However, Yin suggests it is possible to generalise to a theory, provided a replication logic is applied across multiple cases. In this method, patterns in the data are observed in one case, which can then be tested using replication logic in other cases. Replication can be either literal (it produces similar results for predictable reasons) or theoretical (it produces different results for predictable reasons). As discussed above, with one exception, the cases were not specifically chosen to provide opportunities for both literal and theoretical replication, in keeping with the overall exploratory theme and aim of not prematurely occluding relevant data, but opportunities for replication were exploited as they arose. For example, each of the four whistleblowers experienced strong feelings of anger at quite different periods in their decision-making process. The Iterative Reprocessing Model explained this theoretical replication convincingly, by predicting that changing topographies (the facts of a situation) or attitudes could influence what kind of emotion was elicited in association with a previous event. Likewise, the Elaboration Likelihood Model predicted in a convincing way the differing trajectory of the persuasion process of the whistleblower in case study four.

Repeatability

Yin's fifth criterion, reliability, means repeatability. In other words, another researcher following the same method with similar material could reasonably expect to get the same results. Following Yin (2002), a protocol was constructed (see Appendix Two) which outlined the research strategy, field procedures, questions, data shells, and procedures for data collection and storage. The main features of the data collection and analysis were as follows:

The 10 interviewees were approached by phone or email, and asked if they would be interested in taking part. All did; these were then given an information sheet outlining the aims of the research, and given two weeks to consider it. All subjects approached agreed to be interviewed. Interviews were conducted at a place of the subject's choosing; usually at their home or a suitably private neutral space. Interviews were either videotaped where possible, or audiotaped. The interviews were transcribed, either by the researcher or by a transcriber who signed a confidentiality agreement. Interviewees were given the opportunity of being anonymous. Two chose this option. To preserve confidentiality, these interviews were transcribed by the researcher, and the notes of these were recorded without any name attached. Only one of these was recorded; after transcription, the tape was destroyed. All interviewees were given the opportunity to revise the transcript of the interview. Emendments were made to the transcript as requested and these revised transcripts were used for data analysis. A summary of each transcript is included in the discussion of each case.

A short report was written of each case, based on the interview transcripts and published articles about the case. A coding sheet was then drawn up, incorporating the operational measures described above. This included space for noting data which did not appear to fit the theoretical measures identified prior to the study. Each case was then analysed and coded, using the case report, interview transcripts

and relevant published articles. After all cases had been analysed individually, a master coding sheet was drawn up to facilitate comparison of all cases. Cases were compared largely using inductive analysis, but also deductive analysis and creative inspiration where possible, with an attempt to include exploratory data captured and not predicted by the relevant theories. The results of this analysis were discussed, then used to produce a final set of conclusions.

3.5 Conclusion

To summarise, this chapter has laid out the ontological and epistemological framework for exploring the research topics posed at the end of Chapter Two. This chapter has argued that the research paradigm must suit the research topic. It has argued that exploratory studies of process data are best studied with qualitative methods using an interpretivist epistemological framework. Other writers have emphasised the need in exploratory studies such as this to avoid imposing solely hypothesis-driven frameworks which may occlude data of unforeseen value. However, completely atheoretical approaches risk losing the ability to produce generalisable, parsimonious theory. Thus it was decided, in the spirit of Langley's advice (1999) to combine models where appropriate to maximise sense-making and apply a well-used case study design (Yin, 2002) that allowed the application of theoretical models and also the possibility of exploring and considering non-theoretical factors generated by the data.

Four cases were chosen that met the criteria of investigative journalism, that were accessible and allowed triangulation of data sources on each case on the same phenomena. A case study database was created, that included transcripts of interviews, research questions, protocols and methods of analysis. One case was chosen as a pilot study, to analyse for key factors, test against the broad topic areas suggested by the literature review, and throw up further ideas for relevant theory.

Relevant theories were identified and three further cases selected which allowed for both literal and theoretical replication. Data was captured by in-depth interview, based on the focussed interview approach, of both journalist and the relevant whistleblower. Interviews were transcribed and transcripts forwarded to each party for checking. Each case was written up in an expository style, foregrounding the whistleblower's and journalist's own voices, and comparing both accounts. A semi-journalistic tone was adopted for these sections, in which an emphasis was placed on accuracy of reporting the detail and nuance of each party's view. These accounts were then analysed inductively to draw out the key factors intrinsic to that case, and also in light of the relevant theory. All four cases were then analysed together inductively, to induce common factors and generate theory which could be applied using a replication logic to determine literal and/or theoretical replication across cases. A conclusion related the findings to the wider literature and suggested areas for further research.

Chapter 4 – Case Study One - Philip Kitchin and Anna Smith

4.1 Introduction

4.2 The case

4.3 Analysis

4.4 Conclusion

4.1 Introduction

The whistleblower in this case, Smith (not her real name), worked with the high-profile Maori activist and MP, Donna Awatere Huata, and her husband Wi Huata at the Pipi Foundation, their charitable educational trust for children. Smith embezzled \$21,000 for what she claimed were unpaid wages. The Huatas called the police and in 2001 Smith was convicted of fraud. While on trial she was approached by investigative journalist Philip Kitchin and asked to help confirm that the Huatas had embezzled \$80,000 from the state-funded foundation. Despite anonymous threats of violence, and public bullying from the Huatas, Smith agreed to help Kitchin. In 2002, Kitchin's employer, *The Dominion Post* newspaper, published several articles detailing the Huatas' fraud (Anon, 2002; P. Kitchin, 2002a, 2002b; P. Kitchin, & Mirams, C., 2002). Donna Awatere Huata was expelled from Parliament in 2004. In 2005, after a long police investigation, both Huatas were convicted of fraud and obstruction of justice and each jailed for two and three years (McLoughlin, 2005).

4.2 The case

Anna Smith⁷ was a family friend of the Huatas. There were close links between both families; her mother was a friend of Donna's mother; she was close to Donna. When the Pipi Foundation was established, she went to work for it, helping run the office and daily business. She saw all the accounts, invoices and ledger books and knew the business intimately. Not only did she help keep the business running, but she often helped look after the Huata children (Anon, 2008b).

At some point, she also began stealing from the foundation. She says this was because the Huatas started falling behind in paying her wages. It was by most accounts an action that was out of character for her. When the Huatas discovered the money was missing, they went to the police – even though it was later shown that they were raiding the trust's funds themselves at this time. After an investigation, Smith was arrested and charged with fraud.

Kitchin had heard, through an anonymous tip to *The Dominion Post* newsroom, that something was wrong at the foundation (Kitchin, 2008). He had been investigating, and through an undisclosed source or sources had begun accumulating trust documents. However, while the documents appeared to show that someone was raiding the trust funds, he could not be sure who, because he did not know whose handwriting was whose. He needed another source, and believed Smith might be willing to talk. The way in which Kitchin heard about, then went about getting this source is a textbook example of how to work with a reluctant and frightened witness. By a curious irony, the source Kitchin needed was ultimately delivered to him by the Huatas themselves.

As will be shown, his interpretation of why the witness ultimately decided to talk to him differs materially from her own account on some important points. What is

⁷ Her name has been changed at her request to protect her identity. Although she wished to be anonymous in this study, she is included as a public whistleblower because she was known to many of those involved in the story and therefore was not a confidential source.

interesting is that, despite him perhaps not fully understanding her motivations and concerns at the time, she saw enough to trust and find her own way to take what was for her a very difficult and frightening step into the public space. Much of that trust she developed came not through what Kitchin did specifically to alleviate her concerns, but through simple acts of decency, of ethical behaviour in professional practice that were virtually unconscious to him but of immense importance to her.

This case and the one covered in Chapter Five show that one of the hallmarks of Kitchin's approach is that he devotes an unusual amount of care and patience to the initial approach to a potentially significant source. Where many journalists simply approach the source directly, in sensitive cases Kitchin often spends some time talking to those who know the source to map out a possible approach. In this case, he first asked his sources if they knew anyone who was friendly with Smith; these contacts pointed him towards a friend of hers, who they thought might be willing to approach her on his behalf. He approached that person:

With a view to getting alongside them in order to make an ally, I suppose, before I made an approach to the person being charged. I'd been told by a good source that was probably the best way of doing it as Smith was in the early days of being charged with fraud and she was frightened, ashamed and very media shy. I told her my information was that her offending was minuscule compared to Donna and Wi's and that if Donna was allowed to get away with it she was in part condoning corruption at the highest levels of public life. (Kitchin, 2008)

That to-ing and fro-ing went on for about a month, because there was initially a brick wall from Smith. "Initially she wasn't going to talk to me, full stop, and it was after a couple of, more than a couple, two or three meetings, coffee, one lunch, that eventually we sort of struck a deal I suppose" (Kitchin, 2008).

As Kitchin sees it, Smith was afraid, and the key to getting her to agree to talk to him was to alleviate that fear: “She was terrified, one, of the court proceedings against her [but] also of the media coverage” (Kitchin, 2008). There was nothing he could do about the court proceedings, but after thinking about it, he realised there was something he could do about the media coverage.

I said ... almost certainly there will be coverage of your court case by the Hawke’s Bay local paper but it’s a grey area whether *The Dominion Post* would be that interested in reporting your case ... I will talk to my editor Tim Pankhurst and suggest to him that it isn’t that newsworthy on its own, but I can’t guarantee that he will agree with me. But I’ll do my best [to ensure that] we don’t cover it, but we would still like to talk to you. (Kitchin, 2008)

At that point, Smith still hadn’t agreed to talk, and Kitchin was getting increasingly worried that another news organisation would get to her first. He was keeping in touch, partly through his ally, partly through watching the court case against Smith. Such was his concern about alerting TVNZ, who he knew had been tipped off about the story, that he didn’t enter the courtroom, but watched from the car park. He was afraid that if he was seen in court for a relatively minor fraud, other reporters would realise something bigger was at foot.

[It] was sort of, cloak and dagger stuff ... I’d be sitting in the car in the car park to see who else was there and then I’d ring [Smith] and her friend, who stood by her. And it was after her, after her pleading guilty, from memory, that we sat down and I said “Okay, well where do we go from here?” and then it started to roll from that point.(Kitchin, 2008)

Kitchin believes Smith felt aggrieved at her treatment by the Huatas.

She felt enormously let down by Donna and Wi. They had reported her to the police for theft ... Her rationale was that she had seen so much of it. She had worked for Donna and Wi for a good 10 years I think, she had looked after their kids, she was almost a member of their family, she'd done their books, she had seen what they had been doing for a long time and in particular she had seen what had been coming out of the Pipi Foundation which is the trust that was involved. And she said: "Well I saw what they were doing, I was short of money and so I had a go" and she came across as being basically honest apart from that theft. And then they shopped her and she thought well, she always said: "It's not revenge" but there was, you know you have to suspect that there was an element of utu⁸ in it there. (Kitchin, 2008)

Kitchin believes that the deal he struck with Smith to keep her name out of *The Dominion Post* helped her get over her reluctance to help him with his investigation. But mostly, he believes it was the building of trust over a series of meetings that cemented the relationship to the point where she felt able to talk. For him, always being honest, never lying, and never breaking a confidence, is the key to getting sources to trust him. But he says there are many ways he works to gain someone's trust.

Let's say I'm trying to get a cop to talk who I don't know, and I want them to talk either on the record or off the record, with some cops I'll say: "Okay I can give you a list of police officers that you can talk to, I'd prefer that you'd kept that confidential, I'm trusting you in the same way that I would hope that you're going to trust me and you can check up with those people whether I'm trustworthy." With

⁸ Utu (Maori): a complex concept involving reciprocity and restoring balance in human relations. Often used to mean repayment, either of debt, favour, gift or slight.

people like [Smith] it was just a process of I think gradual meetings, keeping my word and eventually I think she thought: "Well yeah I'm going, I am going to trust this guy."

Time is very important and it's no good trying to rush things. If somebody is clearly reluctant, allow them that reluctance and don't go at them like a used car salesman. Just talk it through with them.
(Kitchin, 2008)

Although journalists are usually told to be objective, and keep some distance from their sources, Kitchin believes it is almost inevitable that some degree of attachment develops.

In ones that take a long time - years - then it's very difficult not to. For one ... particularly if you're starting off from the situation where you are having to get them to talk and they don't necessarily want to ... there has to be an element of charm I suppose, you have to get them to a position where first they trust you, they don't have to like you, but usually those two things come you know they're slightly hand in hand. But they do certainly have to trust you. (Kitchin, 2008)

Far from being a hindrance, he sees this attachment, or sense of commitment, as a positive thing in the sense that it helps motivate him to pursue the story,

I think that ... once you're doing a story like that you have to have that kind of passion to want to do that kind of journalism and once you see that there is wrong doing and you're fairly convinced that it is wrong doing and it's quite genuine wrong doing and you've built up a relationship with your source, or your sources, in particular you know with [Smith] in this case where they hadn't only stolen from Papi ... there was a level of arrogance there where they had felt that they could do it, she couldn't, they'd shop her and they would

get away with it. So ... there was a sense I suppose that you were trying to put some things right for this person that I had got to know reasonably well by that stage. (Kitchin, 2008)

It also contributes to the building of the relationship. And it doesn't mean he compromises his ability to look for the truth of the issue.

I think sometimes you know some stories you have to be absolutely, you have to be as objective as you possibly can. That doesn't mean that we are objective but you should try and be objective. Other stories when it appears obvious to you that this has happened, hell I mean there's no point in putting a blindfold on and saying hey I'm just going to be objective about this, you know if you know that there is something that has gone on that's deeply wrong then why would you, why would you try and offer the same advantages to the people or the organisation that's done the wrong doing that you would to the people that you are trying to get the information out of? (Kitchin, 2008)

So for Kitchin then, the sense of commitment to and responsibility for the source were vitally important to him. This co-existed quite comfortably with his professional obligation to pursue the truth; in fact, they helped rather than hindered it. The development of trust with a source is vital; and in this case this was gained through a combination of referrals from other trusted people, and by sticking to his word over a period of time.

For Smith, the decision to trust Kitchin developed slightly differently. She agrees that she took some time to come around to the idea, and that the development of trust of Kitchin and her impression of him were important factors, but it was clear in talking to her that the trigger point, the thing which seemed to finally decide her, was a combination of quite complex inter-related events.

For Smith, the beginning of the relationship with Kitchin was when she got a call from her friend Rachel⁹, who told her Kitchin wanted to see her. Rachel told her Kitchin had called and left his card. “We still don’t know how Phil got hold of her. She rang me straight away” (Anon, 2008b). Rachel explained that Kitchin wanted to talk to her, and suggested it would not hurt to meet him. But Smith was very worried. She was afraid, partly of the repercussions of talking to a journalist, partly of speaking ill of people she had worked with. For the next six weeks, Smith agonised over whether she should meet Kitchin. Finally she made the decision to meet him, at least.

I had come out of the police station and Phil had rung Rachel and asked if we would like to go for a coffee, at Robert Harris. Rachel said going for a coffee is not going to hurt us. She said I will be there ... We can just sit there and talk. That’s what we did, too. I have to admit I was very nervous. If Rachel hadn’t been there [at the first meeting] I would have run a mile. (Anon, 2008b)

She was nervous about having to talk to him about the case, especially at a time when she was going through her own hearing. But his easy-going, low-key manner helped relax her. After speaking to him, she realised what he was after – corroboration of the documents he had.

When I first met him in the coffee bar, I thought you don’t look like a reporter. He had an open-necked shirt and a pair of jeans on and I think that’s what I liked about him. He was so very casual and so very down to earth ... He said to me he had this info. [When I saw] what he had I was astonished. I said you need confirmation that what you have is correct. He said yes. I went away to think about it. I was still recovering, so to speak. I was still going through my court

⁹ Not her real name.

case then. And I think it was in October or November when I did eventually meet with him. And I opened the book. I gave him verification of everything. In between all that we had been speaking of [he] was making himself He was hoping that I would trust him. And I did, in the finish. He was the only one I did trust. (Anon, 2008b)

Smith says this was because he took his time to get to know her.

He didn't go straight into what he wanted. We talked about his nationality, my nationality, what kind of person I was, it wasn't straight into the [details]. He relaxed me. He made me feel relaxed. He told me about ... what he knew about the Huatas. He told me about Donna being in Parliament and different enquiries they had on her with the Serious Fraud Office. He wasn't in favour of the Huatas at all. (Anon, 2008b)

Smith contrasts Kitchin's approach favourably with that of a TV3 journalist who came to interview her: "I was dressed up, out for a meal. She [the TV3 journalist] came up to me and said that ... she had been told I was a low-lifer. I said 'Excuse me, never judge a book by its cover'" (Anon, 2008b). When she saw the TV3 story, Smith felt deceived; she had been led to believe the report would present her side of the story. "It [the TV3 story] was sympathetic to Donna. I felt that wasn't justified. It didn't represent what I told them. They only used the juicy bits" (Anon, 2008b).

So by comparison, as well as in his own right, Kitchin was making a favourable impression on Smith. But even though she thought him a gentleman and liked him, she still couldn't bring herself to talk him. Asked during our interview why this was, at first she said: "I just couldn't." She didn't want to "put it out there" (Anon, 2008b). She was also afraid. During this time, she was getting threatening phone calls. She

didn't know who the calls were from. "It was so scary at times. [They were saying things like] 'We are going to waste you.'" (Anon, 2008b).

She had people come up to her and offer to take vigilante action on her behalf, an offer she declined: "I said it has to be dealt with through the law" (Anon, 2008b).

But even the threats were not her main fear. When pushed on this, during our interview, she went silent. Then, after a long pause, she finally revealed her main concern:

I was afraid of speaking ill about people. I was afraid of speaking ill about people that I had worked with for 14 years. What really drove me to it was that in the meantime we were hearing them [the Huatas] talking ... in the Maori TV, on the radio, on the National Radio. That was when I actually decided to open the book and come forward. It was the way they were speaking about me and calling me a liar and a thief and a cheat. They were actually naming me. We all knew that what they were saying was definitely not true. (Anon, 2008b)

Even though she was edging towards making the decision to go public, she was still not sure that Kitchin was someone she wanted to talk to. So she made some enquiries of her own about him, with a police officer she had been dealing with on her own case. She felt she could trust the policeman because he had shown her some kindness, by delaying charging her for a couple of days to allow her to take care of some personal business. There was a kapa haka competition in Christchurch which she had already booked tickets for, and the policeman's consideration meant she was able to go and support her whanau (extended family) in that. The trust developed with the policeman helped her decide that she could trust Kitchin. "He said I think he's a man you can trust, and he [said that Kitchin] should have been a detective,

anyway" (Anon, 2008b). Lastly, talking it over with her husband helped her make the final decision to help Kitchin.

He said: "You know this is a big case and ... it will go down in history that you took an MP out of parliament and sent her to prison." I said: "What do I do?" He said: "This is never going to [go away]. You can't stop it." He had also met Phil. He came with me on the fourth occasion. We both came home. We discussed it and he said: "Let the story go." He thought it would come out anyway. And he didn't want it to come out all wrong. He said: "Let your story go and let them know the truth." (Anon, 2008b)

Interestingly, the factor that Kitchin felt was important, the deal to keep her case out of *The Dominion Post*, did not in fact make any difference to her. "The fact that it was going to be published nationally, it didn't make any difference [to me deciding to talk]. It came out in the Auckland paper" (Anon, 2008b).

As was the case with other sources on other stories, the decision to talk to Kitchin did not imply a sudden, high degree of trust. She certainly liked him, and felt he had a way of putting her at ease. He was also different from other reporters she met. "They were too abrupt, arrogant and pushy, whereas I felt Phil to be the total gentleman. He has got a way with words, I must say" (Anon, 2008b).

More importantly, he showed her he cared, by keeping in contact. "Right through the whole period, even two years after, he still rang me. He let the story end but he still kept in contact with me. So when I had concerns, I rang him" (Anon, 2008b).

When she was being harassed by other reporters, Kitchin gave her advice on how to deal with it. When approached by this researcher, she rang Kitchin to check out whether she should talk. It was this ongoing, unfailing support that cemented her trust in him, not a sudden decision taken at the time. This degree of closeness to a source would be disturbing for some journalists, who believe distance and formality

assists, perhaps even implies objectivity. For Kitchin, the feeling that he wanted to put things right for Smith was important to him. He saw it as simply something that often goes with the kind of investigative journalism that he does.

4.3 Analysis

The ELM provides many useful insights into the process by which Smith decided to blow the whistle on the Huatas' fraud. It seems clear that Smith had to make two distinct decisions. One was the decision to talk, and the second was the decision of whom to talk to. Both appeared to be CRP-based decisions, rather than PRP-based. However, each took her considerable time to make, and as the ELM predicts, she first had to gain the motivation and opportunity to process the arguments for and against each question.

Taking the first question first, the main message from Kitchin was that she should corroborate documents that he had, to help confirm the Huatas' involvement, and that to do so was important, to help correct an injustice. This can be seen as the "good of society" message. While Smith's husband clearly agreed with it, Smith herself seemed either unable or unmotivated to process it.

Smith clearly had the ability to process the message, in that she was given time by Kitchin to ponder whether she wanted to talk to him. The fact that he did not "go at her like a used car salesman" (Kitchin, 2008) gave her the opportunity to work through the issues and arguments in her own mind. She was also well able to understand what he was looking for, and why he needed it – she was familiar with the operations of the Pipi Foundation, knew what the documents were, and why they were significant. We know this because when she later chose to help him she was able to do so.

However, there was still a period of several weeks in which she was resistant to the message, before she finally agreed to talk. One explanation is that she lacked motivation to process his argument because she did not feel personally involved; she did not feel the outcome of what happened to the Huatas directly involved her. She knew the Huatas were guilty of fraud, as she was, but she probably felt, quite rightly, that the outcome of their case or whether they were brought to justice or not, was not going to directly affect her own life. She had already stopped working for them; whether they went to jail or not was not going to change the outcome of her court case or her situation. Alternatively, she may have been processing it peripherally. The fact that she noticed peripheral issues about Kitchen, such as his dress and his gentlemanly manner, suggests that she was thinking about the issue in a peripheral way at this point, rather than feeling herself directly involved.

The ELM literature makes it clear that it is useful to distinguish between “issues that are of interest because they bear on important outcomes in the individual’s life – comprehensive exams, tuition increases, the economy – and those that bear on values or deep-seated attitudes” (Perloff, 2008, p. 195). In both cases the message recipient is processing centrally, thinking carefully and evaluating the ideas in the message. But in the latter case, while they listen carefully to the ideas, they usually reject them because of their deep-seated attitude or value (B. T. Johnson, & Eagly, A.H., 1989; Perloff, 2008; Wood, 1995). In this case, Smith clearly had a deep-seated attitude; she had strong personal values (“don’t speak ill of people”) that conflicted with the message. Two other factors argue that she was processing it centrally; she describes her intense concern over the issue, and she has excellent recall of the process, even some years later. Thus it seems most likely that she was highly involved, but still could not overcome a core value blocking her acceptance of Kitchen’s message.

To put it another way, there were two opposing messages Smith had to resolve. One said: “You need to speak about this for the public good.” The other said: “People

who have known each other for so long would never speak ill of each other in public.” In other words, unbeknownst to Kitchin, there was a counter argument in Smith’s mind, which was running strongly against the argument he was making. She had to resolve that argument before she could accept the validity of his message. It was only when the Huatas’ public statements resolved her internal argument that Smith was able to centrally process the message from Kitchin. The resolution of this “internal argument” or “core value” could also be framed as a change in her appraisal structures; this will be discussed further below.

Once Smith had made the decision to talk, to tell her story, the question of which journalist to talk to needed to be decided. The factors that appeared to be important here were expertness, trust, and liking. Smith made a point of remarking on her favourable impression of Kitchin and how he “relaxed” her, she also thought he had a way with words, and had charm – all evidence of social attractiveness. She also increasingly trusted him, as he kept in touch regularly, and helped her deal with other more intrusive media. Kitchin provided small favours to Smith, e.g. helping her deal with media pressure, keeping her name out of *The DominionPost* in relation to her own trial, and delaying publication of the Huata case stories. While not turning points, these small favours helped build Smith’s trust.

In terms of the ELM, trustworthiness and expertness (together with social attractiveness, or liking) are usually peripheral cues, but can also function as central route cues if they are part of the argument itself. Smith makes it clear she did not simply take Kitchin’s word that he was expert, or could be trusted. She checked out his trustworthiness and ability with someone she did have a trusting relationship with; her police officer, and sought advice from her friend Rachel and her husband. It could be argued this is evidence of a PRP-based decision; she relied on those she did trust on the issue of which reporter to speak to. But she did not rely on these other people entirely; she also weighed up his acts of kindness to her, and the way he had kept in touch and kept his word. This, combined with her excellent recall,

and the enduring nature of her attitude change – she still speaks well of him – is most suggestive of a CRP-based decision.

While ELM provides a useful explanation of the factors that influenced Smith's decision, and highlights the role of factors other than trust, it leaves important questions unanswered. Like many whistleblowers (Jos, et al., 1989), Smith says she needed to become angry in order to overcome her resistance to the idea of speaking out. But what exactly made her angry? And why then? She had been bullied by the Huatas before; why did she suddenly become so angry at that time? And what role, if any, did Kitchin's interaction with her play in this process. To explain this, we need to consider the role of emotion, particularly anger, in Smith's decision-making process.

According to the criteria for anger outlined in Chapter Three – cognitions of resentment, and feelings of arousal, generated by a threat to freedom, to oneself and loved ones, or a blocked goal (Kuppens, 2009; Nabi, 1999, 2002; Turner, 2007) Smith can be described as experiencing anger. She certainly had resentment, when she became angry at hearing the Huatas bad-mouthing her in public. She was also threatened, aroused (by fear) and to a degree also had a blocked goal – of speaking out. So how did anger influence Smith's decision to speak out? We now discuss this question in the light of each of the theoretical models outlined in Chapter Three.

Cognitive Dissonance (L. Festinger, 1956) has been described as "the uncomfortable state that arises when individuals hold psychologically inconsistent cognitions" (Perloff, 2008, p. 347). Seiter & Gass (2004) suggest at least four paradigms of research on CD; the best fit in this case seems to be that known as the disconfirmation paradigm (Leon Festinger, Riecken, & Schachter, 1956). This suggests that people confronted with information discrediting their beliefs will reject or distort it, or fabricate new information to avoid dissonance. Another important

point about CD is that beliefs held to justify an inconsistent position are more likely to be held if there is social support for such a position.

It seems likely that Kitchin's pitch to Smith aroused, or at least reflected, a state of CD. By asking her to help expose the Huatas, he was asking her to speak ill of people she had known a long time. She must have thought it a good idea to expose fraud in general (after all she had pleaded guilty to her own fraud) but that idea immediately ran up against the next logical step; the Huatas are fraudsters, therefore they should be exposed. And yet, for some time at least, she did not, because there was a counter-argument that she should not speak ill of people, particularly those she had been friends with. This was despite disconfirming evidence; they reported her to the police; they did not support her when she was charged; they lambasted her in public. It is clear that this dilemma did agitate Smith, as she points out herself. According to CD theory, she could have tried to reduce it by either bringing her actions into line with her beliefs (by exposing them) or developing a new theory to reconcile the inconsistent facts. This could have been something like: "They reported me to the police because I deserved it – they may be speaking ill of me now for some good reason I do not understand - but I should still say silent." When her support group (her husband, Rachel, and Kitchin) declined to support any such belief, an unbearable state of cognitive dissonance arose which required her to act.

Festinger (1956) suggested conditions for the arousal of such cognitive dissonance; a) there must be firm conviction b) there must be public commitment to this conviction c) the conviction must be amenable to unequivocal disconfirmation d) this must occur e) social support for the changed beliefs must be available. Smith's case meets these criteria neatly. She did have a firm conviction one should not speak ill of people; she made a public commitment to this (if not explicitly, then implicitly, by refusing to talk to Kitchin initially); the conviction was amenable to disconfirmation; this was very publicly disconfirmed by the Huatas. Importantly, if Smith had tried to concoct a new belief, she would have lacked the social support to sustain it, as both

her friend Rachel and more importantly her husband were on Kitchin's side, or at least not on the Huatas' side. Kitchin, either consciously or unconsciously checkmated this possibility by including her support networks in his pitch; once they were on side, it eliminated a precondition for Smith continuing to hold a logically inconsistent position. It is not suggested here that Kitchin deliberately sought to arouse this state of CD in Smith; merely that he laid the groundwork for this to happen by laying out a logically compelling argument and giving her time to confront the illogic of her own position. However, while a neat fit, this argument does not explain how dissonance led to action at this time, and not at others; why not when the Huatas reported her to police, for example? Nor does it explain why the dissonance produced by conflicting values led to anger in this case, rather than shame, or fear, or resignation. While CDT provides a useful framework, it provides little explanation of the detail of how various emotional and cognitive factors interact to influence decision-making.

The Cognitive Functional Model (Nabi, 1999) proposes that emotion may influence the depth and direction of processing, provided the message-related goal aligns with the action tendency of the related emotion. One application of that in this case is to argue that Smith's anger made her elaborate on Kitchin's message and somehow see the wisdom in it. We already know she had been elaborating hard on it, but her strong value about not speaking ill blocked complete processing of Kitchin's message until she became very angry; anger thus acted to raise the elaboration level. However this assumes that Kitchin's pitch addressed the issues Smith was cogitating over. She had largely accepted his argument that the truth should be told; what she was really cogitating on whether it was right to speak ill; Kitchin's message did not include or address this issue. Therefore, it can't be said anger raised her ability to process Kitchin's message, because she was really processing an entirely different message (though one that was implied by Kitchin's). Should she speak ill? He said yes; he implied it was what good people would do; but that was in his world; her

own values and upbringing said it was not done in her world; how could she resolve this? Nonetheless, the issue Smith was cogitating over was related to Kitchin's, and therefore we can conclude that while her anger did not on the face of it seem to enhance her elaboration of Kitchin's message (she had already been agonising over it), it did influence the direction of her processing, as the CFM suggests; it helped decide her to accept his message. And perhaps, even though she says she had been agonising over it, her anger did in fact force a sharper appraisal of the pros and cons of the arguments around speaking out, and speaking ill, and thus help her resolve her agonising over Kitchin's proposal.

The AAM holds that the extent to which whistleblowers process an anger appeal will depend on the intensity of their angry feelings and their perception of efficacy (Turner, 2007). While Kitchin's message does not on the face of it appear to be a direct appeal to anger, it was delivered and repeated in the context of a wider anger-generating situation (Smith's conflict with the Huatas). It seems clear that Kitchin did enhance Smith's feelings of efficacy, by offering her a way of responding to the Huatas' public comments about her – he provided a way of getting the truth out there. By increasing her efficacy, he helped lay the groundwork for her to process and resolve the anger-generating situation. But while the AAM may explain how Smith's anger affected her decision, it doesn't tell us much about what caused it.

If the most intense moment of anger for Smith came when she heard the Huatas on the radio, what was it about this moment that elicited such intense emotion? She had already been experiencing threats to freedom – such as threats against her for talking to the police, and already had her coping and legitimacy appraisals exposed to challenge. She had arguably also experienced cognitive dissonance at various times – such as when she was first approached by Kitchin. What seems unique is the coincidence of those factors with her own representations and the topography of the situation itself. Her description of the moment suggests that deep memories from her long association with the Huatas combined with her own sense of the value of

loyalty to ignite a sudden and visceral realisation of betrayal; they really did not care a fig for her, if they ever had. Furthermore, she realised that her own cherished value was not relevant when it came to these people. Her presumably changed perceptions around legitimacy and even coping were suddenly put to the test in this defining moment.

The theoretical model that seems to provide the fullest and most convincing explanation of how and why anger arose at this point in this case is the Iterative Reprocessing Model (Cunningham & Zelazo, 2007). This holds that an emotional episode is a result of a combination of low-level sensory input, evaluated in accordance with an individual's cognitive structures, including various appraisal criteria such as coping or legitimacy, and other goals, attitudes, and representations, including the facts (topography) of the situation itself. A change in an individual's appraisal criteria, or any of these other factors, can thus result in the same situation triggering a different emotion.

While it is impossible in the context of this study design to prove the application of this model, two key factors argue strongly for its relevance here. Firstly, it seems to explain why relatively similar situations produced strikingly different emotional responses in Smith. Though bullied and threatened for some time, she only erupted quite late in the process. This suggests that while the low-level threat responses were being activated, the evaluative response she produced depended on a change in other factors, such as her own appraisal criteria. At the same time as she was considering Kitchin's appeal for her to speak out, and evaluating his trustworthiness and credibility, she was – probably unconsciously – re-evaluating her own appraisal criteria. As she says, a big issue for her was legitimacy – was it right to speak ill of those she knew well? But coping also appears relevant here – for someone who had just been through the court system, as a result of the Huatas' informing on her, she must have felt a lack of control over her situation. Her interaction with the police and Kitchin had probably boosted her self-esteem by making it clear that while she

had made a mistake, it was a relatively minor one compared to the Huatas. The fact that she now felt able to do something to stop their harassment of her, and also that she understood it was legitimate to do so, meant that the next time she accessed the feelings and memories (or representations) around the Huatas (provoked by hearing them on the radio bad-mouthing her) the resulting emotion was reprocessed from whatever it had been (fear? shame?) into anger. This anger then helped motivate her decision-making process. This explanation seems the best explanation for the long delay before she felt anger, and the mechanism by which it was ignited. To put it another way, once her self-esteem and sense of what was right and wrong began to be altered, through the courteous and respectful treatment of her by the police and Kitchen, it became more likely that the next incidence of bullying would be met with resistance rather than capitulation.

In Smith's case, it's also likely that some other aspects of the topography of the situation were important. Firstly, her husband's involvement; he urged her to let the story go. He told her she would go down in history as the person who put an MP in jail, and that the story was bigger than her now. Compelling arguments though these were, it doesn't appear they were enough to get over Smith's deep-seated value-based inhibitions about talking about the Huatas. Perhaps one reason for the depth of this connection lay in her mother's relationship with the Huata family. Smith recounted how her mother had reminded the Huatas of their families' long friendship, and Smith's long-standing loyalty; this clearly cut little ice with such self-centred people as the Huatas. However, one can imagine that Smith would not have wanted to embarrass her mother, or jeopardise her mother's relationship with the Huatas, by helping put them on the front page of the newspaper. This would see the Huatas condemned not only by the establishment, but by someone from within their own community; it is no wonder they reacted so vitriolically towards her, as if sensing the danger to their local support base, and trying to bully her into silence. It is perhaps significant that Smith's mother died shortly before the story came out

(Anon, 2008b); now there was no longer a reason for Smith to hold back. The family ties were cut; Smith was no longer beholden to them.

The differing emotional responses to similar threat situations, combined with the apparent change in her attitudes/appraisal criteria, are suggestive of some kind of either dual-route processing, or recursive processing as proposed by the IRM.

Further evidence comes from Smith's account of the intensity of her thinking; she clearly went over it many times, each time in a slightly different situation, probably with changing attitudes (due to constant discussion with others). Whatever the exact factors were, it seems most likely that there were many of them, and they interacted many times to produce differing and powerful emotions that fuelled her decision-making.

So while the ELM, CDT, CFM, and AAM all offer insights into Smith's thought processes, they seem to explain only part of a very complex picture, in which attitudes, evaluations and representations combined with the topography of the situation to produce an emotion that in turn deepened and directed the processing.

One of those parts that should be considered is the wider relationship patterns at work. It seems likely that the decision to speak involves a complex series of decisions about more than one relationship; it involves extricating oneself from one relationship, as much as it does involve entering another set. We now turn to a discussion of the relationships at work in light of the theories outlined in Chapter Three.

Source consolidation – Relationship Models

This second phase, of what we have termed source consolidation, demonstrates the applicability of relationship models. Before we turn to the Investment Model, it is worth discussing the applicability of the Therapeutic Model for trauma victims outlined in Chapter Three. This model suggests that good therapeutic outcomes are more likely when the interaction between the client and therapist is seen as a

relationship, with the good communication and respect that implies. It should be conducted safely and collaboratively, be client-centred, and the therapist should be reliable and allow the client to direct the pace and collaborate in the structure of the sessions. The therapist may gently stimulate discomfort, through guided questioning in a safe setting, to access painful memories, and allow the client to construct meaningful, non-threatening narratives that explain the trauma. To a degree, Kitchen's behaviour fits this model reasonably well. He approached Smith sensitively, let her set the pace of the discussions, provided support, proved his reliability, and generally managed it in a client-centred way. While he did not deliberately seek to generate discomfort, his requests for her to testify against the Huatas inevitably did, and yet he allowed Smith the time and space to work through this in her own time and with her own support. However, it was not strictly collaborative, in that he did have his own timetable, and made her aware of this, and also was more direct in setting the agenda of discussion rather than simply relying on guided questioning. But his respectful treatment of her, with good, honest, prompt communication, and providing support where needed, is clearly indicative of a relationship.

While the Therapeutic Model provides useful insights, it does not explain so well how or why trust developed. For an explanation of this, we now turn to another model of relationship – the Investment Model of Relationship Maintenance. This model holds that dependence grows as a result of satisfaction level, availability of alternatives, and investment size. These three bases of dependence are mediated by commitment; the key predictor of relationship persistence. Commitment is the glue that keeps relationships going when things get hard, and is the factor that mediates many other variables, such as trust, and the various maintenance mechanisms partners use. Commitment helps promote “adaptive relationship-relevant acts which in turn cause relationships to persist” (C. E. Rusbult, et al., 2006).

Clearly Smith and Kitchin developed a mutually satisfying relationship; among other things, she appreciated his approach, his steadfastness, and his integrity; he admired her courage and honesty. Each was able to help the other; he with her problems with other news media; her with his story. Thus they can be said to have developed a degree of dependence; he on her for the information for the story; she on him for support and loyalty at a time when she had little; and for practical help such as media advice. According to the Investment Model, this dependence would have also been based on the low quality of alternatives and the level of investment each made. For Kitchin, there were no alternatives; he needed her to corroborate his story; For Smith, the news media alternatives were of poor quality; pushy and untrustworthy. The non-media alternatives (in terms of non-familial friendship) do not appear to have been plentiful; it was a time when she was being bad-mouthed by the Huatas. Kitchin offered her a way to gain respect in the wider community, to which, by that stage there were few alternatives. She clearly seems to have had some respect from the police officer she dealt with, who trusted her enough to delay the charges so she could attend a concert. But this was not public; Kitchin's support offered her a way to regain public respect. In private, of course, she had plenty; such as her husband and her friend Rachel; so perhaps the issue of alternatives was not so important for her. In terms of investment size, Kitchin did invest a lot in her, in terms of time and effort. Smith also invested in him, in that she put her trust in him, and her hope not to be betrayed again. She did not, perhaps, invest so much in terms of friendship networks; but she did put her public reputation in his hands; he had the power to do her considerable damage. Again, however, she says this was not so important to her; other media had already done her damage. So, for Kitchin, all the bases for dependence were there; there was no one else he could turn to for corroboration of the facts; he invested heavily; and only needed to gain high satisfaction (which eventually came). For Smith, it appears that as her satisfaction level grew, and the potential alternatives showed themselves false friends, so did her investment in Kitchin. The Investment Model holds that as people become

increasingly dependent, they develop strong commitment; Kitchin clearly developed strong commitment, but it is probably less clear whether this came before or after his dependence. Smith also developed commitment, but probably more as her dependence on him grew.

Thus the Investment Model does appear to provide a broad conceptual structure for the progress of the relationship between Smith and Kitchin. Looking at it in more detail, how does it explain the role of trust, and the formation of trust, that investigative journalists believe so important in building relationships with sources? One way to look at the growth of trust in the Smith/ Kitchin relationship is through its interaction with commitment in diagnostic situations.

As discussed in Chapter Three, partners observe how each other behaves in diagnostic situations, to see whether they are willing to place the other's needs ahead of their own. If they do, trust develops. The Investment Model proposes that commitment is the key mediating factor that helps individuals put their partners' needs ahead of their own. Their commitment to the relationship, even when it seems things are not going their way, is what makes it work. This is what Rusbult (2006) means when she says that trust, therefore, is a gauge of commitment; trust will only develop if partners are committed enough to survive these diagnostic situations.

Kitchin's behaviour towards the relationship with Smith, as explained by himself, and corroborated by Smith, was a model of commitment. He emphasised right from the beginning that it was important to be reliable in what he said and did. He never lied, or made commitments he did not keep. He kept in contact, and did his best to put Smith at ease. All of this was important, and helped build the relationship. But from Smith's point of view, it was not these gestures that cemented her trust of him; they did not really cost him anything. Rather, it was his behaviour in a key "diagnostic situation" that demonstrated his commitment. Just before Kitchin's story was to be published, Smith's mother died. She asked him to hold back publication so

that she could deal with the tangi (funeral). Kitchin, at some inconvenience to himself and the paper, agreed. Smith says this was very important to her in building her trust of him. Likewise, his patience and lack of pushiness with her can be seen as a diagnostic situation, in which he put her need to take time and think things through ahead of his own need for the story and fears about being scooped.

Interestingly, Smith described a similar diagnostic situation in her relationship with the police officer who was interviewing her. She asked for the charges to be delayed so she could attend a kapa haka concert. The officer could easily have brushed this off; his acceptance of her request greatly increased her appreciation for and trust of him. The trust built up with this officer enabled her to use it to gauge Kitchin, and assess whether he was worth running a diagnostic test on. As it turned out, he was. The increased trust she built up as a result of these diagnostic situations helped her increase her commitment to the relationship.

The kind of trust that Smith developed fits the definition of trust used in Chapter Three: the kind of trust that “begins to develop when we observe our partners placing our needs above their own, for example by taking a risk, or making themselves vulnerable” (Holmes & Rempel, 1989). Smith clearly did take a risk with Kitchin, and made herself vulnerable to him. From Kitchin’s perspective, his trust for Smith grew because of these diagnostic situations; he had to ask his editors to hold off on a story on his word; if she had pulled out, his reputation would have suffered. Likewise, he had to trust she was telling him the truth, and not put him in the position of running something that could not be substantiated, and thus risk his reputation. Thus he was required to invest in, and commit to the relationship. The reward was the increase in his trust of her, and hers of him.

One of the key claims of the Investment Model is that commitment is positively associated with satisfaction and investment size. In other words, if someone is satisfied with a relationship, their commitment to it, and what they have invested in

it, are likely to be more than if they were not satisfied. Smith clearly had fulfilled the requirements of the Investment Model, by showing commitment to the relationship, and investment; the reward was her obvious satisfaction and continued appreciation for Kitchin. Likewise for Kitchin, his increased investment and commitment was rewarded with a corresponding increase in satisfaction with the results and course of the relationship. As Rusbult (2006) has noted, the question of whether trust or commitment comes first is often hard to untangle; what is clear is that his commitment helped promote “adaptive relationship-relevant acts which in turn cause relationships to persist”.

Smith’s account of the way in which she came to trust Kitchin affirms the basic precepts of the Investment Model, i.e. that trust is a product of the dialectic between the participants rather than dispositionally constituted (i.e. a facet of personality that each party either had or didn’t have). Her trust of him grew as her ability to depend on him increased, and as she saw him placing her needs ahead of his own. His trust of her likewise grew when her commitment to the relationship increased, and she placed his needs, if not ahead of her own, at least at the forefront, by agreeing to talk to him.

4.4 Conclusion

For Smith, the decision to speak out and help Kitchin with the story involved two separate decisions; one to change her own strongly held values of not speaking ill of those she knew (in effect, to speak out) and two, to trust Kitchin. In terms of the ELM, despite a persuasion strategy from Kitchin that emphasised peripheral factors, such as liking, trust, and expertness, both decisions by Smith were ultimately highly conscious, systematic decisions using Central Route Processing. However, it took some time for Smith to reach a level of personal involvement high enough to overcome her own barriers to “speaking ill” of the Huatas. Kitchin’s message to her

– that she should help him identify who was stealing money, because people such as these needed to be exposed – did not generate this involvement; probably because it was not personally relevant. However, several factors suggest that she engaged in CRP. Firstly, she thought long and hard, generating her own thoughts, about the decision to give Kitchin the help he needed. She was able to recall this process easily and in detail. The major issue was not apparently raised by Kitchin, but came from her own strongly held value that one should not “speak ill” of close friends. She only marshalled enough “pros” to overcome this “con” through realising that the Huatas’ low integrity did affect her personally (when they bad-mouthed her in public). The anger generated by the Huatas’ behaviour was crucial in her reaching this involvement level. It appears to have operated to enhance the direction and depth of processing, rather to change the involvement level as Nabi’s Cognitive Functional Model (2002) suggests.

The case does appear a good fit for application of Cognitive Dissonance Theory, as most of the usual factors are present. Kitchin was asking her to inform on people she knew well. This caused her discomfort (dissonance) because it touched on a self-concept, that one should not speak ill of people one had worked so closely with over such a long time. When the Huatas spoke ill of her, she experienced greater discomfort (she became angry). Clearly, despite her beliefs, close workmates did speak ill of each other. To resolve this discomfort she had to either modify the belief (in CBT terms, assimilate it) or reinterpret the facts to fit with her beliefs (accommodate). The idea that people did not speak ill of those they knew so well was clearly untenable – the Huatas had proved that themselves. She may have resolved this discomfort if she had been able to concoct another belief (e.g. that they spoke ill of her to protect her from some other threat) but only if her social support network supported this. Clearly, it did not. Kitchin’s message thus provoked cognitive dissonance which required Smith to confront the arguments and resolve them to eliminate the discomfort the arguments generated. However, this model

does not explain why cognitive dissonance caused her to act on this occasion and not earlier, nor does it tell us much about the process by which dissonance leads to action.

The AAM does seem useful in that it explains how anger combined with Smith's feelings of efficacy to lead to speaking out. It does seem likely her sense of self-efficacy did change, but a different kind of study to this one would be needed to show this. The other problem with this model is that its emphasis on efficacy precludes consideration of the wider range of inputs which more sophisticated psychological models such as the IRM propose as constituents of emotion.

The best explanation of how and when anger worked in terms of persuasion in this case is provided by the IRM. This suggests that Smith's anger at the Huatas' treatment of her arose due to iterative reprocessing of the facts of the situation combined with her own physiological reaction to that and her own cognitive structures. These structures could have included her goals and attitudes, which in turn were likely to have been influenced by her appraisal criteria such as her perception of legitimacy and coping (what is right, and her own ability to be effective). These appraisals were probably changed as a result of discussion with her close support group, including her friend Rachel, Kitchin, and particularly her husband. This change in her own appraisals meant that the next instance of Huata bullying was reprocessed in a way which transformed it, probably from shame or fear into anger. This anger then helped motivate her to overcome blocks to processing the message and decide her to speak out.

The Therapeutic Model of relationships has some applicability to this case. Kitchin was generally client-centred, collaborative, and behaved toward Smith in a way that demonstrated it was a valued relationship. This in turn made Smith feel valued and respected, and helped her trust him. However, the model does not explain so well why trust developed, or how. For this, a better explanation comes from the

Investment Model. Both clearly liked each other, but this is not enough to explain why the relationship grew. Neither had much in the way of alternatives – Smith was Kitchin’s only source of the documents, while Smith could have turned to other journalists but had been turned off by their crass behaviour. By investing in the relationship (through time and effort and willingness to consider her needs such as for publication delays), Kitchin developed commitment, which helped him remain steadfast while Smith tested his trustworthiness. Smith also invested her time and effort, in thinking about him and testing him, and eventually giving him the help he needed. Again this developed her commitment, which kept her going through times of doubt and when she was feeling vulnerable to him. These “diagnostic situations” were the crucible in which trust incubated and grew, which in turn reaffirmed and strengthened commitment.

The theoretical models considered here offer important insights into the decision making process of this source, but do not entirely explain all the factors apparently involved in her decision to speak out. In particular, the case shows that the process the journalist follows is more important than the arguments which were used; something that seems to confirm the ELM literature which tends to indicate argument quality has little effect (Dillard & Pfau, 2002). It is vital the source is allowed time to develop their own arguments to resolve their own unique, often unexpressed conflicts.

Lastly, what is striking about this case is how complex, how personal, and how carefully thought through the decision to speak out was, and how little journalistic truisms applied. Simply being nice, or gaining trust were not enough. This was an immensely brave, and difficult decision for the source to make, and it could not have been made if the journalist had not demonstrated, as well as expressed, the right qualities. The sophisticated way in which Smith scrutinised the trustworthiness message is striking and shows both how much is at stake for potential whistleblowers and what lengths they are prepared to go to to minimise the risks they

run. By being – albeit sometimes unconsciously - an expert persuader, therapist and relationship partner, Kitchen was able to persuade a vulnerable, frightened, but courageous individual to overcome bullying and negotiate the long and effortful path to self-expression. This self-expression did not take the more public form that the next three whistleblowers took, but it did require speaking out against power in the face of retribution.

Chapter Five – Case Study Two - Philip Kitchin and Louise Nicholas

5.1 Introduction

5.2 The case

5.3 Analysis

5.4. Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

Louise Nicholas is probably the best-known whistleblower in New Zealand's history. She alleged that she was raped by a group of serving police officers while a teenager in the 1980s. She complained to police in the 1990s but the subsequent rape trials were aborted due to hearsay evidence given by the investigating police officer, the head of the local CIB, John Dewar. Almost 10 years later, investigative journalist Philip Kitchin uncovered evidence that Dewar had done so deliberately, to wreck the trials. In 2004, Kitchin persuaded Nicholas to go public and name the police officers, one of whom was Clint Rickards, the assistant commissioner of police. The allegations prompted other women to come forward. In 2006, Rickards and three other officers were tried and acquitted on 20 charges of the sexual violation of Nicholas. However, in 2007 a Commission of Inquiry sparked by her allegations found evidence of a "wall of silence" among police officers about mishandling of sexual abuse complaints and made 60 recommendations about change to police procedures. That same year, a police investigation led to the conviction of Dewar for attempting to obstruct the course of justice. Rickards later resigned from the police. Nicholas went on to work as a survivor advocate for rape prevention education.

5.2 The case

The Nicholas story meets all the criteria of investigative journalism, by any standard. It was clearly in the public interest, in that it revealed disturbing police behaviour; it was representative of wider social issues, in that it revealed systemic problems in the conduct of internal police inquiries; it would not have come out without the dedicated professionalism shown by an investigative journalist; and it led to substantive change, through the instigation of a government Commission of Inquiry and changes to police procedures. It also led to the resignation of the assistant commissioner of police, and the jailing of other former policemen for rape and sexual violation.

The story was also unusual in that it was broken jointly by television and a newspaper. This came about because Kitchin started on the story while at *The Dominion* (which later merged with *The Evening Post* to become *The Dominion Post*), then left to join a new investigative unit at TVNZ created by its new director of news, Bill Ralston. Under an agreement with *The Dominion Post*, both organisations published the story simultaneously. TVNZ's investigative unit was later closed, but lasted long enough to ensure that the Nicholas story benefited from the double exposure. However, the subsequent impact of the story in producing substantive societal change was undoubtedly due to the substantive quality of the material it revealed.

Like the Donna Awatere Huata story, it relied on the revelations of a reluctant, vulnerable, but ultimately determined whistleblower, who was persuaded by Kitchin to reveal substantive wrongdoing, despite significant personal risk. Like that case and the others in this series, it provides useful insights into the research questions; how do journalists persuade reluctant whistleblowers to talk, and why do they decide to talk to a particular journalist? This case study will first outline the facts of the case, then analyse it in terms of the theories discussed in Chapter Three.

A coding sheet was prepared which summarised the key factors in the case in terms of the theories identified in Chapter Three. To see the coding sheet, see Appendix Two.

Nicholas is from the small town of Murupara, near Rotorua in New Zealand's North Island. It is a forestry town, on the edge of the remote and beautiful Urewera National Park. Nicholas' dad worked at a logging company, and her mum was a housewife. She had a happy upbringing, with loving parents, bossy older brothers, and plenty of friends. She was a top sprinter at school. By her own account (2007), Murupara was a friendly, integrated community. Her family would often be invited to hangi, and everyone helped in the regular search and rescue operations in the Ureweras when trampers got lost. Her parents got to know the local police well, through their involvement with search and rescue, and Nicholas thought of them as friends of the family. One day, when she was 13, as she was walking past the police station, one of the local policemen invited her in. She knew him and trusted him as a family friend. Once she was inside, he locked the door, and then raped her. That was the beginning of a spiral of abuse at the hands of a ring of police officers that would poison her teenage years. Throughout the late 1980s, these policemen appeared to have a list of young women they would use for sex, sometimes all at once. On at least one occasion, she alleges, the policemen used a police baton taken from a female police officer (P. Kitchen, 2007).

In the mid 1990s, Philip Kitchen, the Hawkes Bay reporter for the Wellington-based newspaper *The Dominion*, got tip-offs about the behaviour of the above group of police officers. One had been prosecuted for rape, but the trials had been aborted after a senior police officer, John Dewar, who was then head of the Rotorua CIB, gave hearsay evidence (a very surprising mistake for a senior officer to make). One of the three men Nicholas accused was Clint Rickards, by then the assistant commissioner of police, and being groomed for the top job. The other two were Brad Shipton, by then a Tauranga City Councillor, and Bob Schollum.

Kitchin had no idea of the name of the victim, let alone where to find her. He began by seeking access to the court records. Mysteriously, his repeated requests to the Rotorua courts for access were not passed on to the judge. Only after going over the head of the court official who had apparently stonewalled him for over a year, did he get the files. He was not allowed to photocopy them, but had to take 45 foolscap pages of notes. These notes told him the name of the victim, plus much more besides. One of the key questions was over the role of John Dewar, whose unfathomable decision to quote hearsay evidence had aborted two trials of those accused of raping Louise. After reading the documents, Kitchin thought it showed Dewar deliberately perverted the process to protect his friends. With the help of *The Dominion* librarians, Kitchin managed to find an address for Nicholas, and set out to see if he could get her story.

Over a series of interviews, Kitchin heard Nicholas' story, and interviewed everyone he could get to about the case (Kitchin, 2008). Together with the court documents he'd gathered, the story began to emerge. Getting one person to talk helped persuade others; the more Kitchin knew, the more others trusted him with what they knew. His knowledge of court procedure, and Dewar's inexplicable ignorance of it, made him begin to smell a rat. A particularly useful break came from Rex Miller, a retired Waikato police officer who had investigated Dewar's behaviour in the 1990s for the Police Complaints Authority. Miller had had serious concerns about Dewar, but had concluded there was not enough evidence to charge him. However, he gave the notes of his investigation to Kitchin.

Kitchin moved to TVNZ, and a key breakthrough came when Nicholas caught Dewar admitting on tape that he knew the baton sex had not been consensual. After TVNZ and *The Dominion Post* published their stories, more victims come forward. Within a few days, the Government announced a Commission of Inquiry, headed by Dame Margaret Bazley. Her inquiry found a culture of sexual abuse within the police, and evidence of protection of perpetrators of the abuse. The Government said

all 60 of her recommendations would be implemented (L Nicholas & Kitchin, 2007). Simultaneously, a police investigation into the claims led to trials of the key officers Nicholas named; Rickards, Shipton and Schollum. All three were acquitted on charges of raping Nicholas, including once with a police baton. However, in other trials, the latter two were jailed for rape of another woman. Rickards admits he had sex with Nicholas, but claimed it was consensual (Anon, 2007). He later stepped down from his job as assistant commissioner of police and left the police force. He has now retrained as a lawyer.

Nicholas' evidence was the bedrock of the story. Without her decision to speak out, the story could not have been done. This was a very significant decision; she was accusing the man being groomed to be the next head of the New Zealand Police Force of rape. She had to waive the automatic right of rape victims to name suppression; she also had to approach a senior police officer, coax him into incriminating himself, and covertly tape him doing so; she also had to reveal her identity to the entire country as a victim of some humiliating and embarrassing sexual offences. She then endured public scrutiny of her character during the media exposure that followed and during a long and arduous rape trial, suffering threats and abuse while doing so. Besides this, she had to open up old wounds on an issue she had tried and failed to seek justice on years before. This included changing an entire set of beliefs about someone she trusted completely (Dewar) and all that he represented, as a senior police officer, who had presided over the investigation into her earlier rape trials. All of this she decided to do after Kitchin approached her (L. Nicholas, 2008). She took some months to decide to speak out; this and the level of risk involved put her in the category of reluctant and vulnerable witness.

The approach

Much of Kitchin's method has been covered in the previous chapter on Smith. He makes it clear that the approach he takes to persuading sources to be involved in a story applies regardless of who it is – his ethical stance is foremost. He relies on demonstrating his reliability and integrity over time, through always being honest and keeping his word. However, the Louise Nicholas case required some differences in his approach. Kitchin got on to the story in 1994, after taking a mysterious call from an anonymous caller. He described the moment in his book:

The man on the other end was a police officer, so paranoid about talking to a reporter that he was ringing from a public phone. I could hear rain hammering on a corrugated-iron roof. We spoke for about 20 minutes and agreed to talk again. (L Nicholas & Kitchin, 2007, p. 16)

Unfortunately, there was frustratingly little detail. All he heard was that there had been a senior officer who had deliberately wrecked the trial of a young woman who accused a former police officer of rape. The first two trials of the police officer accused of raping Nicholas had been aborted because the then head of the Rotorua CIB, John Dewar, had deliberately given hearsay evidence. Kitchin made some calls to Rotorua from his office in Hastings, but got nowhere, and was eventually put on to another story. He now says that he should have pushed harder.

I tried to make enquiries but ... back in those days I wouldn't have described myself as an investigative journalist. I mean I made some enquiries and I spent maybe a week or two on it, and then got pretty much nowhere. I can't blame the people that I worked for because I should have pushed harder to go across [there] ... it's only a three-hour drive ... but equally there was a tendency if you can't get it done by phone don't worry and you're never as likely to get to a

story unless you're actually on the ground then with something like that. (Kitchin, 2008)

Four years later, there was another call, which he describes in his book:

This phone call gave more detail, and it was explosive. The new caller claimed three other policemen had also raped the girl.

He didn't know the name of the girl, but he gave me the names of three Rotorua cops ... he told me the complainant had been passed on by [another police officer] to this trio like a piece of meat. She was a teenager who had learned not to complain about misbehaviour by police officers, and there were stories going around that they'd raped her with a police baton. (L Nicholas & Kitchin, 2007, p. 17)

He believes this call came from someone inside the police.

I don't have any doubt there were people there that felt that there had been wrong doing at a high level ... when I got that call it was still largely going on in that [Rotorua] station where there were, in particular, there were female police officers who were being treated wrongly in terms of their career and in terms of the way they were talked to and behaviour by other police officers. There was a massive division in that station about John Dewar, who was the head of the CIB, and so an element of politics I suspect also came into it. (Kitchin, 2008)

Regardless of who made the call, it helped energise the case. The next step was to try and identify the victim. But as the implications of the case reached further up the police hierarchy, mysterious new difficulties arose. Rickards was by then Waikato District Commander, and being groomed to be the first Maori Commissioner of Police. Few in the police were prepared to say anything about him. Kitchin decided

to try for the victim's name through the court records of her trials. But due to a bizarre string of delays, which Kitchin attributes to a stonewalling court official, it took two years for Rotorua District Court to make the files available. From these, Kitchin got the name of the victim: Louise Crawford, now married to Ross Nicholas. With the help of *The Dominion Post* (the paper was renamed in 2002) library staff, he got an address for her, and set off to meet her.

A friend, who had expertise in dealing with victims of sexual abuse, suggested he not approach her directly, but through her father. He found Louise's dad, Jim Crawford, at his home in Ngakuru, a village just south of Rotorua on the Taupo road. He told Jim that he was a reporter and had seen documents and been told his daughter had been ill-treated by police officers. Jim invited him in and here Kitchin showed his remarkable gift with people. He had deliberately dressed casually, as he believed appearing in a suit and tie would put the Crawfords on guard. The two men rolled a convivial smoke together, and Kitchin opened the conversation by asking about John Dewar. He did not immediately name Dewar as the villain, as he had been told the Crawfords thought he was on their side. This turned out to be true. However, they had no such good feelings towards Rickards, Shipton or Schollum. Kitchin "took a breath" and told Jim he wasn't so sure about Dewar. This was a tense moment – he could tell Jim did not like hearing this. However, he told him what he knew about the documents and sources he had that suggested Dewar had been playing a double game. He then asked if Jim knew that Rickards was expected to be the next Commissioner of Police. He didn't. Kitchin followed up, by reminding him of the newspaper he worked for, and saying it was the most politically influential as all the politicians read it. Jim finally agreed to talk to his wife and maybe Louise as well, but warned Kitchin against trying to talk to Louise before he had done so. Kitchin left, and was almost at Taupo when he got a call saying Jim's wife Barbara would speak to him. He met her, and they got on well. He drove home,

and the next day was invited back to meet Louise Nicholas (L Nicholas & Kitchin, 2007).

She remembers the day well. She had been told by her parents that a journalist wanted to have a talk about what happened with Dewar and the trials back in 92 -93.

I couldn't work out why the hell he would want to bring all that up again. But I was prepared to have a listen and see what he had to say ... The guy walked in the door, and you've got to be a wee bit polite, but he was a scruffy-looking bugger. Even Dad said: "The guy could do with a haircut." You know, he was in jeans and boots and open-necked shirt. But he had really kind eyes ... and that's just something I do, I look at people's eyes. And he seemed like a nice bloke. He had a good handshake, so that was another thing. He sat down and told me all about what he had uncovered about Dewar, and about the trials. And from there it started. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

Nicholas says she decided at that meeting that she would co-operate with Kitchin. Her decision was an easy one to make.

It was, and the reason being, I'm not one to trust that easy, I give people the benefit of the doubt and that's fine, but what he had was the evidence. He actually showed me right then and there the documentation and the job sheets and what he had uncovered. And having seen that, I knew straight away that what he was saying was true. Dewar had duped me back then, all those years ago, and had covered up something. What that was I didn't know then, until Phil did a lot more digging obviously, but it was because he showed me the evidence, and I just knew. He put it in two scenarios, like the good Dewar and the bad Dewar, and he started off with the good Dewar, and even my mum and Dad were sitting there going "Yeah,

yeah, yeah, good bloke, held him in the highest regard.” And then he said: “Well this is what I term the bad Dewar,” and he showed all that evidence. And I just cringed. Yeah, he got me, big time. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

Nicholas, her parents, and Kitchin talked at great length about what had happened. Kitchin told her he would like to do a story. He wanted to tape an interview and then sit back and decide what was there and whether or not there was a story. Although she agreed to do that, she says she was still very wary.

He was very open and honest. He said I need for you to trust me. As I need to trust you. I need the truth and the whole truth, but he said there’s stuff that I know and I will find out that I can’t tell you. His sources and things like that. Which I figured was understandable. There would be stuff there that would help him, but not necessarily have anything to do with me. I accepted that. If he needed me to know anything he would tell me. But it did take a long time for me to, I mean I told him everything I had nothing to hide; I had nothing to be ashamed about or anything like that. I told him everything, and any documents I had I showed him. But I was still very wary. And he knew that. Just wary of the whole situation I was now becoming involved in. After all these years, why bring it up? And what were his motives? He said he worked for *The Dominion Post*. And we all sat there and went ‘Who?’ We didn’t even know of the paper. I mean we knew of the *Herald* and the big papers like that. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

Looking back at the interview now, Kitchin says it was a calculated gamble to be so blunt about what he could and couldn’t say to her, and to demand that she tell him the whole truth. It seems a high-risk approach to such a vulnerable source, especially

at the first meeting. But for him, it was a mixture of a calculated gamble, because he hoped they would appreciate his honesty. But beneath that lay an important ethical principle that guides his work – that if a story is not true, it is not a story.

I felt able to say that to her at that that point because I had a very strong belief from what she had said to me that she was probably going to tell me her story, or ... that she was probably committed to working towards that end so I felt that it was, I mean that was partly a precautionary thing so I felt that I could actually say that. And it may have been a bit premature at that point in hindsight to say that then because it could have frightened her, I suppose. But I also had a pretty good idea of what she was like just from studying the body language, having met her parents prior to meeting her and I sensed that she was somebody that preferred reasonably straight talk to, you know rather than trying to be a bit surreptitious. I think some people ... I think a dishonest journalist would say that by saying that you might have lost the story. Well it's not losing the story because you know it's not a story if it's bullshit, it's not a story if it's not true, if you know that's wrong. So if you are going to lose, if somebody is going to walk away because they think: "Oh this person, hey this person might find me out, so therefore I'm not going to cooperate with them," well it's kind of tough. (Kitchin, 2008)

After Kitchin had left, Nicholas decided to do some research herself. He had told her he had done an investigation into Donna Awatere Huata, which had led to her jailing, and several other high-profile cases. Nicholas had heard of the Huata case. Nevertheless, she googled those stories, to see for herself, and was impressed.

They were cases that were brought to the fore, to the public's attention, and stuff was done, immediately, because of what he'd

broken, what he'd unravelled. So I thought, that's pretty impressive. I thought, if he could do that, for example with the Huata case, which was quite political, quite up there, I'm thinking, well for all the bad that's happened to me in the past, just maybe, he might be able to uncover the cover-up. And after having spoken with Phil at great lengths, it was pretty obvious there was [a cover-up], but how the hell do we do this. So I just left all that up to him. I was just there to answer his questions. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

Nicholas says if Kitchen hadn't been so experienced, she wouldn't have gone ahead. But the other thing that helped persuade her was his constant honesty, and constant communication.

It was the way he came across, the way he put himself out there. He was just very honest. He would ring me and say now Louise I've heard this, this and this, but I can't tell you who I've heard that from. It's a police source or it's a you know, and I respected that. But he kept me informed all the time. Anything, any lead, any break, if he was able to tell me, he did. And the more he delved, the more he uncovered, the more safe I felt, and I was able to open up a hell of a lot more, because he just proved to me his honesty and integrity. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

From there, the investigation proceeded more rapidly. Kitchen had by that time moved to TVNZ, to a new investigative unit set up by its new head of news, Bill Ralston. However, in an example of co-operation which is unusual in the news business, both Ralston and *Dominion Post* editor Tim Pankhurst agreed to share the results of the investigation and publish simultaneously. This level of co-operation gave the story an extra momentum – suddenly people being sought as witnesses were no longer having to brush off just one reporter or news organisation. It also

helped in that Kitchen now had an experienced producer, Chris Harrington, to help him. This gave the investigation extra momentum, and led to a breakthrough moment - when they asked Nicholas to approach Dewar with a hidden microphone, and he admitted he knew she had been baton-raped. This provided solid evidence he had wrecked the earlier trials, and was vital in his eventual conviction for obstructing the course of justice. But although the investigation was proceeding, for Nicholas, the decision to keep going was not always easy. She had many moments of self-doubt. Kitchen's steadfastness at these times was vital; but at one point, his bluntness was almost too much.

The day before the story broke, at the end of January 2004, he phoned me and said it's all set up; we're all set to go. Tomorrow's the big day, Louise I need to know that you're not lying, if there's anything you've said that's not true, I need to know now. He put the fact that his job, his career, his boss's career, his families, their families, he said this is huge mate, and I need to know that everything you have told me is the case. And I got very angry and very upset then, because I thought the bastard hasn't believed me at all. He's just pulled me along, and first impressions, he's got what he wants, he's put me through all this, and I just kept saying to him you don't believe me, you don't believe me Phil. And he was saying no it's not that I don't believe you, I just need to know. That was hard, so hard, and I hated him for a very short time for doing that. But I could understand, this was big. And I think I didn't realise how big. He did, to a certain point. But I think at the end of the day both of us didn't realise how big ... the political awareness it was going to raise. The fact that I was taking on the next commissioner of police. I was going to accuse these men of doing some heinous crimes. And it

was politics as well. Phil warned me about all of that. We would sit down and talk for hours. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

Nicholas also became increasingly concerned about the effect the story would have on the families of those she was accusing. Not their wives, because she knew they would hate her, but their children. Kitchin talked her through this, reminding her that although she had every right to be concerned, they did not think of their families when they did these things.

He said you have got to get hard mate, put that behind you. Think of your husband, and your family, and your kids. So he was very good at setting my mind at ease. Very good at that. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

But the effect on the families was only one of her concerns. There was also the very real fear of the power of those she was taking on, in particular Rickards.

And that, alone, I thought, shit I can't do this. I'm not going to take that guy on. Um, yeah, that was a huge decision. Knowing who it was. Jingoos. But, then you've just got to think back to what he'd done. Not only to me, but to the others. And having been told by Phil, for him to have found out so much more about Rickards, and his rise, his rapid rise through the ranks. And that was coming from serving members of police, and ex members of police, and how they just hated the fact that he has got to where he is now because of his bully boy tactics, and people hated him for that. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

How did Nicholas overcome this fear of Rickards? She says adding to her concern was the accusation, which came later, that she was against him because he was Maori. But she says the fact that he was a police officer, or Maori, had nothing to do her decision in the long run.

I thought well you could be the King of England mate, but what you've done is a bad thing and you need to be held accountable for it. And Phil having ... uncovered the fact that Rob Robinson, then commissioner, knew about what happened in Rotorua, and so did some of the politicians, you think well why didn't they stop him, why did they allow him to go on rising through the ranks the way they did? So I think ... I got my shit rag out and I thought this is not right. I thought bugger you. There were many reasons why I decided to keep going. It was not just the Dewar cover up. There was also so much more further on up the food chain.... It became more about Rickards, simply because I didn't know the fact that Dewar and Rickards and Shipton were all good mates. You see once all this started to come out, you know with Phil just, he was like a dog with a bone, he would uncover a little bit here, which would help him uncover a little bit there, which would help him piecing together, you'd know he'd ring me and say mate did you know this? Dewar and Shipton and Rickards, they were all good mates? And that's when the anger started. You know because back in 93 and 94 when these court cases were going on, Dewar knew. He kept saying in his court case I never told him about the baton incident, and I kept saying well yes I did. He said well no he didn't socialise with these guys, and they weren't his mates, and then it's found yeah they are? A lot of anger. And the more Phil uncovered, the more angrier I got, the more determined I got, I kept saying to Phil we have got to do this. And he kept saying "'yeah mate". (L. Nicholas, 2008)

It seems clear that the anger that began to well up inside Nicholas was fundamental to her decision to keep going with the story. She agrees, and says she consciously

turned that anger into something else. She says it was “very much” about trying to stop the same thing happening to other people.

Yes I knew exactly where I wanted to go now. I needed for the public to know that these bad things happened, but it’s a consequence of that, look what else has happened over the years, look at how many other victims there are. It was a conscious decision. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

Balanced against this concern for others’ families was the more obvious concern for her own.

But you know I really wouldn’t have done this without the kids’ consent. Because it was and it did affect the family hugely. To be able to sit down with the girls and say look this is what happened to me, this is what I want to see happen, I want justice for what’s happened in my life, but if you guys aren’t cool with that, that’s fine. Because I am going to have to go through the media, that’s the only way we are going to be able to bring it out, and people are going to know who I am. And I reiterated the media can’t touch you guys. They can’t talk to you, they can’t photograph you, they can’t do nothing. If they do they’re in big trouble. And that was one of my huge concerns, and I said to Phil, I’m really worried about the kids and what the media can do to my kids. And he said they can’t do anything mate. I won’t allow that to happen. But they are not allowed to go anywhere near your children. So I was cool with that. Thank goodness. Otherwise I wouldn’t have done it. If the kids were going to be dragged into it. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

Nicholas does not believe speaking out was necessary for her as a kind of personal catharsis. She feels she had already done that. But it was an opportunity to give some kind of closure.

I think I had already done that [catharsis]. I figured I had. I guess it was an opportunity given that I grabbed, because it was an opportunity taken away from me so many years ago, to seek the justice that I felt I deserved. So yeah I guess in a big way it helped to provide the closure that I needed. It was a good thing. And if I had to do it all over again I wouldn't hesitate [because of the need to raise public awareness]. Phil kept uncovering and uncovering, and it was blatantly obvious the conduct of police back in the 80s. It was bad, it was really bad. They got away with so much. And, you know, the fact that my brother is a cop for example, and has been for 20 years, and I was thinking he's one of the good guys, as far as I know, I hope like hell I never hear anything different. But the majority of police, men and women, are fantastic, they really are, but it's those that, there are some mongrels out there too. And they are the ones that bring the good guys down. And that was really obvious when this whole story was coming out. I think it was ... meant to be. Because it helped to start to clean up the police from within, internally. And a lot of cops walk up to me today even and say "Good on you, mate." And I think between us, Phil and I, we have achieved more than what we thought we would ...

Yes, it was. That's what it all boiled down to was seeking the justice that I wasn't able to get all those years ago. And now my opportunity had come where I perhaps could get it now. (L. Nicholas, 2008)

For Kitchin, Nicholas' understandable doubts and fears exacted an emotional toll, as he worked to keep the story on track. But it has confirmed to him the importance of honesty with sources, even when it may not appear to be in the reporter's professional interest.

I think one of the key things in dealing with sources like that is to always be absolutely honest, don't try and tell them that it's not going to be if it's a big story don't try and tell them that you know that it's not going to be a big story. That there's going to be a whole lot of attention, don't try and say look don't worry about the other media coming around and you know, you have to be absolutely honest with them. Better to talk them through and say you are going to get people knocking on your door, you're probably going to get TV cameras parked outside your house, they're probably going to follow you. If they find out or if they even have an inkling that you're the person that's behind this.

In Louise Nicholas's case although I talked through with her that this was going to be you know a very big story and that people would come and knock on her door and all the rest of it, the reaction she, I think she said in her book she said she still hadn't quite taken it on board how big it would be. But for her the reaction was different [from Anna's], she had put her face out there. And she initially sort of hid away a bit but then when she realised we're going to have to go and get some groceries, she found people ... she had no idea who they were, sort of saying "good on you"; coming up and hugging her ... which was the complete opposite of what she had imagined might have happened. She thought that there would be people finger-pointing. (Kitchin, 2008)

Kitchin says the case helped other women come forward with similar stories, that wouldn't have if Nicholas had not spoken out.

The fact that she had put her face to it certainly made other people come forward ... I think there were ... three elements. One that she put her face to it, two, that there was substantial evidence ... we were also able to write about and broadcast it. It wasn't just saying this is a woman who is saying she was packed raped. And they don't want to comment. We had other evidence. We had evidence of the cover-up by John Dewar, which was really primarily that. Although the headline didn't say that, it was primarily the way the story was angled, which was there had been a cover-up of these allegations by this woman.

So the fact that she was prepared to put her face to that ... and we had other evidence ... and that they were denying it, or that they were not commenting (the people the allegations were specifically aimed at), I don't have any doubts at all that prompted other women who had fallen foul of some of these people to come forward and say she needs support. One of the first ones that I did talk to said: "I've agonised about this for a few days now and they shouldn't be allowed to get away with calling her a liar again". (Kitchin, 2008)

Kitchin is pleased with the impact of the story, and would do it over again. He emphasises that the story had to be told. He readily acknowledges that another motivation for him is the excitement, the adrenalin, of the chase. But the case was also a twisting road of hopes and pending disappointment, and the uncomfortable realisation that the results of an investigation could send someone to jail. But he emphasises that as in Smith's case, one thing that kept him going was the sense that he was helping put things right.

I think in those two stories, in both of those two stories there is a sense that you are, I mean maybe you're just convincing yourself but no I think that there is a sense that you are trying to put something partly right, or right, yeah. (Kitchin, 2008)

Another difficulty for the investigative reporter on a long case is trying to maintain a sense of distance from sources, to ensure information is still scrutinised critically.

Kitchin accepts he became too close to sources at times.

Other stories when it appears obvious to you that this has happened, hell I mean there's no point in putting a blindfold on and saying hey I'm just going to be objective about this, you know if you know that there is something that has gone on that's deeply wrong then why would you, why would you try and offer the same advantages to the people or the organisation that's done the wrong doing that you would to the people that you are trying to get the information out of? [But] I think there are times when people could possibly have said you know you should have kept your personal life a bit more separate from your professional life in terms of you know making friends with sources, becoming friends with sources. I mean I have become a friend of Louise Nicholas and her family and her husband and her family, wider family. And I don't know that I necessarily want to go back and say that I shouldn't have done that but I think it probably if I was looking back in hindsight now it probably would have been better not to have become that close.

I don't know if it ultimately matters but because you still have to ... get your facts right. But I think there is a sort of a perception issue there ... I mean I don't know I'm sort of struggling for words a bit

here really. It might have just been wiser to not have got that, got to that sort of [place] ... where we became friends. (Kitchin, 2008)

5.3 Analysis

This case also seemed to require Nicholas to make two decisions – whether to speak out about the abuse she had suffered, and whether to do it with Kitchin. Both decisions were carefully thought out in a process that bears all the hallmarks of CRP-based processing. Before exploring that process, it is worth discussing Kitchin's approach, which was subtle and multi-faceted and seemed to operate on both PRP and CRP levels.

Kitchin's approach, through Nicholas' father, helped pave the way to a successful approach to Nicholas. As will be shown, his approach to her optimised the chances of success in terms of both ELM and Cognitive Dissonance approaches to persuasion. Taking the ELM first, his pitch clearly allowed for both peripheral route (PRP) and central route processing (CRP), whether he intended this or not. To deal with the PRP first; he emphasised his credibility, by referring to successful cases he had undertaken. This encouraged Nicholas to see him as an expert – something we know was important to her, because she later confirmed this by checking him out on Google. He also emphasised she could trust him, by referring her to people who could vouch for him. He also used social attractiveness – he dressed in a way that he thought would appeal to this family on this matter – down to earth, non-threatening, certainly not an authority figure. While Nicholas thought him scruffy, she was not put off by this, and it may in fact have worked as Kitchin intended. Lastly, he had “kind eyes” and a “good handshake” – both appeals to social attractiveness which initially at least, made a good impression, and probably helped her process his message that Dewar may have duped her and there was a cover-up of her case.

However, as Nicholas makes clear, he did not rely on these peripheral cues alone. His main pitch to her was based on the facts. This was enough to persuade her that

Dewar was not her friend, as he had claimed to be, and therefore to allow Kitchin to pursue the story. How Dewar had misbehaved was of direct personal relevance to her, and thus it is easy to see this became an issue of high involvement for her that required CRP. We know she used CRP because she says that what swung his appeal to her was that “he had the evidence”(L. Nicholas, 2008). Kitchin’s message, which presented the “good Dewar” and the “bad Dewar”, was even more persuasive, in ELM terms, because it was two-sided, and posed as a question. Further evidence that she used CRP comes from her quick and accurate recall of this conversation, the number of thoughts that were generated in response to his message (she checked him out on Google), and that eventually it predicted her behaviour, in that she did actually act on her changed attitude about Dewar. However, this action came much later, so we need to be careful how we interpret this.

The ELM literature is clear that message sender credibility factors, in particular trustworthiness, expertness and attractiveness, can operate as either peripheral or central cues, depending on the situation. Also, message senders of questionable trustworthiness elicit more elaboration than those perceived to be trustworthy (R. E. Petty, et al., 2009, p. 138). Kitchin came into Nicholas’ life cold, as a complete stranger, with a difficult message to deliver to someone very disinclined to trust. At first glance this may seem to have been a disadvantage, but in fact Kitchin’s relative lack of credibility may have acted to his advantage, by encouraging Nicholas to think harder about him and the issue in general than might otherwise have been the case if she had already known, trusted and respected him.

In one sense Nicholas was accepting of peripheral cues, because she said she would generally give people the benefit of the doubt; but she clearly also thought carefully about Kitchin’s trustworthiness and expertness. If she had perceived him to be reliable on both scores, she could simply have accepted his message. As it was, she was persuaded on the spot by the content of his message (“He had the evidence”) but reserved judgment on his expertness and trustworthiness (she googled his

expertness, and remained “wary”). She had no idea who he was, what the newspaper was that he came from, and why he was bringing the subject up. When she found he had expertise, she still reserved judgement on his trustworthiness. Thus her lack of knowledge about him increased the likelihood of her elaborating on his message. By emphasising his expertness – mentioning the previous cases he had done – she was able to check this and quickly establish that his message was probably worth listening to and processing. Thus she clearly seems to have processed these peripheral cues centrally – she did not just take his word for it, but scrutinised it carefully and checked it out. For someone as serially betrayed as Nicholas, trust of unknowns was clearly a high involvement issue, and it seems to have operated as a central route cue in this case. As she says, “I was still very wary” and “over time he proved his honesty and integrity” (L. Nicholas, 2008). Trust and integrity were not things she simply accepted at his word, and they thus seemed to function as evidence for a message that was centrally processed. Nonetheless, because she had already accepted the validity of his message that Dewar had duped her, she probably did not need to rely too much on these credibility cues for this first decision about whether to accept his message. But both these cues would become more important when she came to make her second decision, as we will see shortly.

While Nicholas had accepted Kitchin’s message to pursue the story to see where it went, she had not at that stage finally decided to go public with it in the news media. As she says, they needed to do the interview, then Kitchin needed to go away and do more research, and then look at it again to see if there was a story. While Kitchin had been successful in changing her attitudes (convincing her that Dewar was not her friend, and that this issue was worth looking into more), he had yet to persuade her to change her behaviour (to stop being silent about it).

Nicholas was still wary, but as it became clearer that Dewar had lied, and what he had lied about, her anger grew. Unlike Smith, she did not appear to have some strong value that prevented her processing Kitchin’s message at this point (though

she did on another part of the decision); she simply was not entirely convinced at that point. However, as the evidence accumulated, she became more convinced, and her anger at her mistreatment grew accordingly. An important moment came when she realised Dewar had deliberately misled her about whether she had been violated with a police baton. Dewar had claimed, at the time of her rape trials in the 1990s, that she had not told him about this incident. Nicholas thought she had. The seeds of doubt Dewar planted clearly helped undermine her confidence about taking the issue further. When Kitchen showed her that Dewar was mates with Rickards, Shipton and Schollum, she realised he had a motive to lie about the baton, and as she says, “that’s when the anger started” (L. Nicholas, 2008). From there it was a short step to agreeing to Kitchen’s request to approach Dewar with a hidden microphone and getting him to admit he had known about the baton incident. Here was clear, indisputable evidence that Dewar had lied to her. It seems likely that the lingering self-doubt about the reliability of her memory suddenly lifted, and was replaced by anger at the way she had been used. This was hugely empowering moment for Nicholas, and it is no wonder she recalls it easily.

However, while she had made the decision to pursue the story of Dewar with Kitchen, she makes clear that the decision to name Rickards was a separate one that involved further thought. As she says, it was a “huge” decision, because of his position and influence. She makes clear that eventually his position did not come into it – he could have been the “King of England”, but he still needed to be held accountable, despite the potential impact on the offenders’ children (L. Nicholas, 2008). Nicholas makes it clear this was a difficult decision for her. This may be because her own experience of abuse as a child made her particularly sensitive to the vulnerability of children to adult behaviours. This concern of hers that children should not be involved is so emphatically expressed that it should count as a strongly held value that she had to overcome before she could accept Kitchen’s message that she should speak out.

Kitchin helped her through this part of the decision-making process, helping her clarify her thoughts, and when resolve faltered, reminding her of the need to speak out, to counter her fears and concerns. This helped her overcome her strongly held value, in the same way that Smith overcame her concern not to speak ill of people she was closely connected to. Nicholas also clearly accepted Kitchin's argument that these people needed to be held accountable, and that it was important to expose them to stop the same thing happening to others. Thus Kitchin's approach operated on both the peripheral and central route levels; his manner and credibility helped her accept his arguments peripherally, while the solidity of his factual evidence meant that when she was able and involved enough to use CRP, the argument was persuasive on that level too. This case demonstrates also that one simple pitch is not enough; the journalist has to be constantly in touch, so that each new counter argument can be dealt with as it arises.

As one review of ELM effects found:

Information will be most successful in producing enduring changes in attitudes and behaviour if people are motivated and able to process the information, and if this processing results in favourable thought and ideas that are integrated in to the person's relatively enduring cognitive structure ... one of the most important determinants of motivation to think about a message is the perceived personal relevance of that message An important goal of any persuasion strategy aimed at enduring change will be to increase people's motivation to think about the message by increasing the perceived personal relevance of the communications or employing other techniques to enhance processing. (R. E. Petty, et al., 2009, p. 153)

Kitchin achieved this neatly, in three ways. Firstly, he made clear the potential outcome of the story, and how it would benefit her. Secondly, he ended his key pitch with a question: which Dewar did she believe? Thirdly, he used multiple sources; not just himself, but also her parents.

Characteristics of attitudes changed by CRP include being relatively easy to access from memory, held with high confidence, persistent over time, predictive of behaviour, and resistant to change. Nicholas's attitudes seem to exhibit these characteristics; her memories were recalled lucidly and easily during the interview, were expressed with resolve and confidence, and clearly reflected her behaviour. Thus we can say with considerable confidence that Nicholas used CRP for a substantial part of her processing of Kitchin's message.

Merely producing an attitude change does not mean the message recipient will change their behaviour. (R. E. Petty, et al., 2009). Kitchin's approach was remarkably successful at changing Nicholas's attitudes about Dewar at the first meeting, and later about Rickards and the others through his subsequent contact with her. But as she makes clear, she was still undecided about whether she should act on that new information by speaking out through Kitchin. So in one sense she had two decisions to make about this core issue for her— one to change her own attitudes, and then whether to change her behaviour (of keeping silent about the issue).

The second decision was a much harder one. It seems impossible to explain this part of Nicholas's decision-making process without reference to the role of emotion, and particularly anger. She is clear that the anger she felt helped her finally decide to go ahead with the story.

As discussed in Chapter Three, the role of emotion in persuasion is still unclear. Models which suggest how it might work include Nabi's Cognitive Functional Model (1999) Turner's Anger Activism Model (2007), and the Iterative Reprocessing Model (IRM) (Cunningham & Zelazo, 2007). The CFM suggests anger helps change

the level and direction of elaboration, provided the message-related goal aligns with the action tendency of the message-induced emotion. Nicholas was considering Kitchin's suggestion that she speak out about Rickards, but she was constrained by her concern about the impact of publicity about him on his children. While Kitchin's message was not explicitly an appeal to become angry, it nonetheless had that effect, and should be considered an anger appeal in this context. Nicholas became angrier at Rickards, when she perceived people might think he should not be challenged because of his position. This anger helped concentrate her mind on the arguments for and against speaking out, and by her own account, helped influence her to speak out. This speaking out can be seen as an example of approach, or attack, in line with the action tendency of anger. Thus, in CFM terms, the message-related goal (speaking out) did align with the action tendency (approach, or attack) of the message-induced emotion (anger) and did change the level and direction of her elaboration and led to her speaking out. The AAM develops this idea, but argues that the extent to which whistleblowers process an anger appeal will depend on the intensity of their angry feelings and their perception of efficacy. This model also seems relevant here. Nicholas certainly had intense feelings about Rickards. As she says: "I got my shit rag out" (L. Nicholas, 2008). A strong argument could also be made that Kitchin increased her perception of her own efficacy, by giving her an outlet (publication) and increasing her sense that she could change her situation through using it. The problem with both of these models, however, is that they don't explain how and why the anger arose when it did. Why did she not become angry earlier, when Kitchin was also suggesting she take on Dewar?

There is also an argument for the application of Cognitive Dissonance Theory here. Cognitive dissonance can be described as the psychological discomfort felt when a core belief no longer aligns with reality. A discredited belief – one that no longer accords with reality – can be maintained if an individual's support group also maintains that belief. Kitchin laid the groundwork for Nicholas to experience CDT,

by laying out the opposing scenarios on his first approach. He first showed her the “good” Dewar – the one she then believed – then laid out the alternative scenario – the “bad” Dewar. The evidence he had was compelling – at least enough to agree to help him pursue the story. There is some evidence of the psychological discomfort necessary for CD at this stage; one of her core beliefs, that Dewar was on her sides, was starting to crumble; she cringed and thought “you got me” (L. Nicholas, 2008). Nicholas’s support group – her family – were present when she heard these arguments and were also convinced and thus could not help her sustain a discredited belief. Stronger signs of CD came later, when the further evidence Kitchen produced – that this man in authority had lied – provoked extreme anger in her, and she “got [her] shit rag out” (L. Nicholas, 2008).

An argument can be made that until that time, despite her negative experiences at the hands of some relatively junior police, that another core belief was that the higher levels of the police hierarchy would do the right thing. But after the revelation of Dewar’s duplicity, and the cover-up of his duplicity, that core belief was starting to be challenged as well. However, for this belief to be challenged, she needed to be persuaded that the police hierarchy knew about Dewar, and did nothing. This is why her comment about Robinson and other politicians knowing was important; it stripped away the last prop - that if they had known, they would have done something. As Kitchen showed her, with evidence, they had known, and had done nothing (apart from ordering an inquiry and moving Dewar). With Dewar no longer a person she trusted, and no longer able to maintain her confidence in the integrity of the police hierarchy, she experienced cognitive dissonance, due to the anger-based psychological discomfort she felt at having a core belief challenged. According to CDT, to reduce the psychological discomfort, she had to act, by changing her core beliefs, about Dewar, and about the police hierarchy. This she clearly did; we know that she was convinced by Kitchen’s research that there had been a cover-up.

The second instance of CDT was when Nicholas was conflicted over naming Rickards and the others. She was concerned at the impact it would have on their children, as she strongly believed children should be protected if possible. Kitchen helped her through this by pointing out the inconsistencies of her taking responsibility for protecting the children from their fathers' actions, given that they had already been involved by them. Nicholas also experienced discomfort over accusing Rickards, as she appeared to believe that as a high-ranking member of police she was not worthy of accusing him. She resolved this herself, by reminding herself that regardless of his position he should be accountable. All these situations meet many of the criteria for CDT; disconfirmed beliefs were present, there was social support for such beliefs, the issues were important to Nicholas and touched on her self-concept (e.g. don't involve children); Nicholas chose freely to think about the issues; the messages provoked discomfort, they required extensive thinking to resolve, and there was evidence of attitude change. Kitchen's chances of success were further reinforced because his approach aroused cognitive dissonance, which required action to resolve. As with Smith, by engaging her close family in the decision-making process, he reduced the chances of Nicholas being able to sustain a disconfirmed belief and therefore being able to maintain an irrational belief.

While CDT explains why Nicholas changed her beliefs about Dewar, Rickards, and the police hierarchy, it doesn't explain why she then felt compelled to act on those changed beliefs. It could be that Nicholas also had a deep core belief that one should always speak out about what one believed. Or perhaps she thought that by keeping silent, she would have been helping maintain the proposition that the hierarchy were good; to resolve that dissonance, she had to act. Neither of these core beliefs has been shown here, and both seem more difficult links to make.

The best explanation for the role of emotion in Nicholas's case comes from the IRM. This model holds that an emotional episode is a result of a combination of low-level sensory input, evaluated in accordance with an individual's cognitive structures,

including various appraisal criteria such as coping or legitimacy, and other goals, attitudes, and representations, including the facts (topography) of the situation itself. A change in an individual's appraisal criteria, or any of these other factors, can thus result in the same situation triggering a different emotion.

At the same time that Nicholas was consciously processing Kitchin's arguments for speaking out, and assessing his trustworthiness and so on, she was re-evaluating – perhaps unconsciously – her own attitudes. The subsequent change in her appraisal criteria meant that the next time she accessed deep memories of Rickards, Dewar, and how they had misled her she experienced a new intensity and perhaps type of emotion in relation to her memory of that experience. It is difficult to say exactly what the change was from, but it appears to have gone from feelings of resignation or acceptance, to anger. The next interesting question becomes what kinds of appraisals were changed? Two likely contenders are those around coping and efficacy, and legitimacy. The fact that her surge of anger came when she learnt more about how she had been deceived, suggests legitimacy appraisals were important here. She seemed particularly outraged by the betrayal of the concept of mateship: "He said well no he didn't socialise with these guys, and they weren't his mates, and then it's found yeah they are? A lot of anger" (L. Nicholas, 2008). Dewar had clearly lied to her; an illegitimate act in most people's book. However, it could also be that coping appraisals were significant – he had taken her for a fool, something which would leave most people feeling powerless. She had tried to do something about the rapes earlier, and been beaten back by Dewar's deceit. Even if her appraisals had not changed, the altered topography of the situation (she now knew more about Dewar's character) would have helped feed into the mix to produce a new emotion. Of course, she already knew Dewar may have deceived her, but this was conclusive evidence, which seemed to spark a gut response in a way that earlier more tentative evidence had not. The fact that she kept coming back to the issue could also suggest the kind of recursive processing proposed by the IRM: "And the more Phil

uncovered, the more angrier I got, the more determined I got, I kept saying to Phil we have got to do this. And he kept saying ‘yeah mate’” (L. Nicholas, 2008).

One final point about the role of the ELM is worth making. As part of the second decision outlined above, Nicholas was also required to make a decision on whether this reporter was worth the considerable risk involved – did he have the expertise and trustworthiness to make it a likely bet to produce results? Thus these factors that had operated peripherally in the first decision (of whether she should change her attitudes, did she have something to speak out about) became central route factors in the second decision (should she act on those changed attitudes). Reporters tend to emphasise the need for building trust with sources, and as this case shows this is a very important factor in the source’s decision-making process. But this case also shows that the reporter’s expertness is also very important, possibly more important. Nicholas may have been relatively quick to make up her mind on his expertness, but she thought hard about it nonetheless.

Source consolidation - Relationship Models

Both of the relationship models proposed in Chapter Three, the Therapeutic Model and the Investment Model appear to fit this case. Taking the Therapeutic Model first, Kitchen helped Nicholas through this process in the context of a relationship which meets most of the criteria for a therapeutic relationship. He was collaborative and communicated well (he kept her informed throughout the process, and regularly discussed new developments and asked for her opinion), he let her set the pace of the relationship (by letting her take her time to trust him, and explaining clearly what he could and could not tell her, and what she could expect from him). His directness about what he would and would not tell Nicholas (for example not telling her the source of some information) could be compared to a therapist establishing the ground rules about client boundaries, and can still be seen as within the context of a client-centred therapeutic relationship. Kitchen also guided Nicholas’s recall and

processing of difficult decisions and events with skilful questioning (for example, helping think through her concerns about the effects on the children of those she was about to accuse in public) and also made sure he was available at crucial times, when she was processing and cogitating on these issues.

However, what really cemented the relationship was the commitment both Kitchin and Nicholas showed to it, which is best explained in terms of the Investment Model. Kitchin was committed to finding the truth, as was Nicholas. Both invested in the relationship; Kitchin with time and effort, Nicholas with her emotion, especially by allowing herself to trust Kitchin, and by exposing herself to public scrutiny. As the model suggests, this investment seems to have sustained their commitment, and their commitment encouraged further investment. As the relationship progressed, diagnostic situations arose which tested their commitment; these included his asking her to trust him and not ask his sources; him keeping her constantly informed, and putting her interests first by helping her with other media and her concerns about her children; and most crucially, the day before publication when he asked her directly if she was lying. This was a significant diagnostic situation; he made clear how much he and his paper had made themselves vulnerable; she made clear how vulnerable she had become by her reaction to the question. Despite their mutual vulnerability, neither took advantage of the other. Out of this diagnostic situation, the trust that had been steadily growing in many earlier interactions was cemented further.

5.4 Conclusion

The ELM provides a convincing explanation of the nature of Kitchin's approach to Nicholas and the reasons why it was successful, with some caveats. His approach allowed her to process his message either peripherally or centrally, with appeals that worked on each level. His appearance and manner were persuasive as peripheral

cues, as were his apparent trustworthiness and expertness, the two key components of credibility. However, he also provided a message that was rational, factually rich and that stood up to CRP. In terms of PRP first, he emphasised his credibility, consisting of his expertness (which she could check), and his trustworthiness (which she couldn't easily, but he at least helped by making sure he was there on the initial recommendation of someone she could trust - her father). He also emphasised his social attractiveness – his firm handshake, his kind eyes, his easy-going, I'm one-of-your-type dress. This was enough to get him a hearing, but of course on an issue of such personal relevance, likely to generate high involvement, he also had to have a good argument. As Nicholas makes clear, he did have the evidence. Furthermore, Kitchin's message was delivered in textbook CRP style; two-sided, personally relevant, ending with a question, and using documentary evidence. Because Nicholas was intelligent, knowledgeable and highly involved, she was able to CRP Kitchin's message about Dewar quickly. However, the second part of Kitchin's message, that she should speak publicly about it, through Kitchin, required much more thought on her part. It required her to scrutinise his trustworthiness carefully, as well as his expertness. She clearly used CRP to scrutinise both; she generated her own thoughts about his expertness by checking his background with a Google search; and tested his trustworthiness and reliability over a series of meetings. She already had the motivation to use CRP; it was on an issue of high personal relevance. By allowing her the time to think about these things, and discussing the role of the news media during this period, Kitchin gave Nicholas the opportunity to engage in CRP. Further evidence that Nicholas used CRP comes from her exemplary recall of the process, the consistency of her changed attitudes, and that the attitude change did eventually predict her behaviour – she did agree to Kitchin's request to speak publicly, despite the considerable personal costs to her of doing so.

Like Smith, Kitchin's approach to Nicholas resulted in her having to make two main decisions – to speak out, and who to speak through. Within these, there were other

decisions. First, she had to decide was there a cover-up? As she says, from the evidence he laid out to her at their first meeting, it seemed there was, and the question was “how do we do this?” – i.e., pursue the issue. As she makes clear, that was something she was happy to let Kitchin pursue, but the decision as to whether they would go further would depend on what he found out. While Kitchin was off digging further, Nicholas was researching whether Kitchin was up to the job. This implies that she also had to make a decision about whether to entrust him with her story. Clearly this was a CRP decision – she investigated his track record, by googling him, and systematically weighed up his experience and expertise. While his credibility – (expertness and trust) would usually be a peripheral cue, in this case it was also subjected to CRP, because his ability to see the job through was a high involvement issue for her. She decided, on the evidence she found through her Google search, that he was a serious journalist, that it was worth pursuing the issue further, and that maybe he could “uncover the cover-up”. So she had made two key decisions – one to pursue an issue she thought she had put behind her, and secondly to do so with this scruffy but kind-eyed investigator from a newspaper she had never heard of, who had shown up out of the blue. However, there were further decisions to come. The next decision she had to make, once Kitchin had dug further, and revealed the extent of the cover up, and particularly the awareness of the police hierarchy, was whether she wanted to take on the police. She was at least partially aware of the risks of this, though as she says, neither she nor Kitchin realised how big it would become. Part of her concern with this decision was overcoming her personal value that children should not be involved. This was a difficult decision for her, possibly because as someone with personal experience of abuse as a child by adults, she knew very clearly just how vulnerable children were to adults. Kitchin helped her through this decision, by reminding her that these people didn’t think of their families before they acted, and needed to take the consequences of their own decisions.

One important caveat with the ELM-based explanation is that it does not account for the important role of emotion in Nicholas's decision-making. As she says, her anger helped her – she reminded herself that Rickards was a person too, regardless of his position. Kitchin helped her access her anger, by keeping going on the story, “like a dog with a bone” (L. Nicholas, 2008). In this case, anger seems to have played a role predicted by the Cognitive Functional Model – it changed the depth and direction of processing, rather than just increased the level of elaboration. Nicholas was already processing Kitchin's message, but anger changed not only the level of elaboration, but the direction of processing, by helping her change from not challenging Rickards, to challenging him. The Anger Activism Model may also apply here; by providing an outlet for Nicholas's anger, Kitchin increased her feelings of efficacy, and thus made it more likely she would act on her changed beliefs. However, neither adequately explain why emotion erupted when it did.

The success of Kitchin's approach in changing Nicholas's attitudes can also be explained in terms of Cognitive Dissonance Theory. Firstly, Nicholas clearly initially held a discreditable belief about Dewar – that he was her friend – one which was supported by her social network (her parents and husband). By laying out evidence which challenged Nicholas's initial misconceptions about Dewar, Kitchin generated physical discomfort, which required her to change her beliefs about Dewar to fit the facts. By ensuring her social network was part of this process, Kitchin ensured that Nicholas was unable to concoct another discreditable belief. Compared to the more nuanced explanation of the links between emotion, attitude and action provided by the CFM, AAM and IRM, CDT seems to explain only part of the process well.

The IRM seems the best explanation of how and why the anger erupted when it did. The developing intensity of her anger, in response to Dewar's duplicity, is suggestive of some kind of recurring processing, incorporating the changing topography of the situation with her memories of past experience with these people, and in accordance with her own attitudes and appraisal structures. It is possible that

Kitchin's approach helped spark a process of re-evaluation of Nicholas's appraisal criteria, particularly around legitimacy and coping. This meant that the next time she accessed deep memories of Rickards, Dewar, and the others, they were perceived differently and the resulting emotion was transformed from whatever it was (fear? shame?) into anger. The facts that she was particularly blocked at this point, and sought advice on the rights of raising these issues in public that may affect children, again suggests she was going through an intense re-evaluation of her legitimacy appraisal criteria (i.e. values). Likewise, her coping appraisals may have changed when she realised that this time she could do something about the abuse which would be effective.

Kitchin helped Nicholas through this process in the context of a relationship which meets most of the criteria for a Therapeutic Relationship. He was collaborative, communicated well, let her help set the ground-rules and pace of the relationship; in short was client-centred. He guided her recall and processing of difficult decisions and events with skilful questioning, and also made sure he was available at crucial times, when she was processing and cogitating on these issues.

The Investment Model also fits the journalist/ source relationship here. Both invested in the relationship, emotionally and in terms of time. This helped drive their commitment to each other and sustained them through some testing diagnostic situations in which each became vulnerable. By holding the course, despite their doubts, and having their faith confirmed, trust was able to grow between them. Nicholas is clear that her trust of Kitchin only came about very gradually, through observing his behaviour in these diagnostic situations. The Investment Model is thus a good fit for how trust grew in this relationship.

Another decision Nicholas had to make, which was under constant review, was how much to trust Kitchin. She may have made the decision to talk to him, and do the story with him, but her exposure to him was under constant review in each

diagnostic situation that arose. His constancy throughout these, and especially in the climactic moment just before publication, when their trust of each other was openly questioned, and then affirmed, helped cement her trust. That final questioning was critical; both made themselves vulnerable, and their vulnerability was explicit; however, their commitment to the relationship got them through this difficult test. By committing to the relationship, Kitchin also showed an implicit understanding of the Investment Model. His commitment continued, at a time when Nicholas no doubt had alternative journalists she could talk to, but when Kitchin did not have alternative sources. These testing situations helped Nicholas's trust grow and helped her invest more in the relationship. Both of them invested more as time went on, which in turn made the relationship more likely to keep going through the testing times that arose, and as satisfaction levels waxed and waned.

Chapter Six – Phil Taylor and Donna Johnson

6.1 Introduction

6.2 The case

6.3 Analysis

6.4 Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

Donna Johnson is one of several women who gave evidence to the Commission of Inquiry into Police Conduct, which began in 2004 after the allegations by Nicholas of abuse by serving police officers. Johnson alleges that in the 1990s she too was abused by former police officer Brad Shipton, one of those accused by Nicholas. Johnson had earlier tried to make a complaint about Shipton, but was intimidated by a policeman at the time and so withdrew the complaint. Later, Johnson was interviewed by police investigating the Nicholas case, but her case did not go to trial. In 2004, she was contacted by investigative journalist Phil Taylor¹⁰ of *The New Zealand Herald*. After some negotiation, she agreed to tell her story, at first anonymously and later using her name. She also spoke to Philip Kitchin. Like Smith and Nicholas, she felt vulnerable and uncertain about making her story public and had to be convinced it was worthwhile to do so. After she did so, she was again subject to intimidating

¹⁰ Taylor has won the premier national journalism award, the Qantas Award twice, both as reporter of the year and feature writer of the year. He has also been awarded both major journalism fellowships available to journalists, at Green College, Oxford, and Wolfson College, Cambridge.

behaviour, but stands by her decision to speak out. Like Nicholas, she has subsequently spoken out regularly to the news media on issues related to the case.

Johnson's story is not widely known in New Zealand. Although she has appeared in *The New Zealand Herald* and on *Radio New Zealand* and *TVNZ* (P Kitchin, 2007; P. Taylor, 2004, 2007), her account of abuse at the hands of serving police officers has not had the impact of the Nicholas story. That is mainly because it came to public attention shortly after Nicholas's revelations and does not have the cloak and dagger elements that came about in the unearthing and telling of Nicholas's story. Her interaction with the news media was in many ways more straightforward and less fraught. However, her story also raised disturbing questions about police culture, and was deserving of public exposure. It was a story that she would not have told had it not been for Taylor's thoughtful and sensitive approach. In this chapter, his approach is analysed in terms of the theoretical models presented in Chapter Three. These theoretical models provide a convincing explanation of why his approach to Johnson was successful.

6.2 The case

Like Nicholas, Johnson alleges that she was abused by a serving police officer, Brad Shipton (D. Johnson, 2008; P. Taylor, 2007). She says the abuse occurred in Tauranga in the mid 1990s. Unlike Nicholas's case, Johnson's case never went to court, despite her attempting to lay a complaint with the police at the time the abuse occurred.

Johnson first came to know Shipton in the mid 1980s when a teenager. She was introduced to Shipton as the officer in charge of the investigation into an allegation she had made of childhood sexual abuse. After several years, without action on the complaint, there were further allegations from new victims. A new investigation commenced into the allegations, which resulted in the offender being charged and convicted of seven counts of sexual abuse against Johnson as a child. Johnson's

mother, Shipton, Bob Schollum and Clint Rickards were friends and had been flatmates in Rotorua in the mid 1980s. Johnson alleges she was intimidated and violated by Shipton in the mid 1990s and forced to perform oral sex on him. A short time after this incident, she went to the police station in Papamoa and spoke to a policeman. Before she had a chance to finish her story, the police officer she was speaking to was called away to take a phone call. While he was gone, another policeman, who had overheard her talking to the first officer, approached her and intimidated her, so much so that she left the station abruptly, without completing her complaint. She believes that officer also alerted Shipton to her presence, because shortly afterwards Shipton tracked her to her new residence and threatened her, warning her not to try and make any further attempts of disclosure. She also tried to speak to a local newspaper about it, but withdrew, feeling she did not trust the process.

There her story may have finished, if it had not been for Nicholas. One weekend in 2004, Johnson sat down to watch the TVNZ current affairs programme, *Sunday*. The feature story that evening was Nicholas's account of her own attempts to get her abusers prosecuted. One of the most dramatic moments in the story was footage of Nicholas approaching former Rotorua CIB chief John Dewar with a hidden microphone and obtaining incriminating evidence.

As Johnson sat watching, memories of her own experience and her attempt to lay a complaint at the Papamoa Police Station washed through her. She knew, as she heard that a Commission of Enquiry was to be set up to investigate Nicholas's claims, that she would finally see movement in her own case.

Unknown to her, another person who was watching that programme was also experiencing a strong reaction. That person was the policeman she had first spoken to at the Papamoa Police Station many years before, when she had tried to make a complaint. Ever since that meeting, he had wondered why Johnson had left the

station so suddenly that day. Unaware she had been approached by another officer, he had felt she simply had not trusted him. Knowing only her first name, he had no way of contacting her again. Although he had since left the police, he still felt strongly enough to contact a senior police officer and tell him about Johnson. Shortly afterwards, Johnson was interviewed by police. Johnson also made contact with the Commission and sought to have her complaint heard. She was not alone; many other women who had also seen the programme, or heard about Nicholas's case, had come forward with similar stories.

Johnson was clear that she wanted her own story heard. She wanted Brad Shipton, in particular, to know that she was not intimidated. Later, she was approached by a lawyer, Vinay Deobakhta. He told her he had been approached by Taylor, who wanted to do a story on other women involved in the case. However, as Taylor explains, it was only after a protracted period of negotiation that Johnson decided to let him tell her story.

In over 25 years as a journalist, Phil Taylor has built a reputation as a determined, responsible investigator. He sees the role of journalism as being to challenge power and help those who are the victims of the abuse of power. He has done several notable investigations, won numerous awards, including twice winning the NZ reporter of the year award (P. Taylor, 2009).

Taylor remembers being moderately sceptical of Johnson. He was not disbelieving, but he wanted to check out the details. Partly this was because Johnson was not telling the full story at that stage – as mentioned above, she withheld details such as her name. But it was also because some of the allegations could not be confirmed at that stage. That was difficult, because she was expecting him to write a story, but wasn't telling him enough to enable him to corroborate the details. But he had a sense there was more to the story. He explains how he approaches such people:

Some people can be difficult to deal with because they are not going to give it to you all on the plate. She didn't tell me the first couple of times what had happened. Here we had another woman alleging similar sorts of things but it was only allegations and at that point not verified. [You need to] Show a little bit of empathy. You can't really teach that. Either you can imagine being in other people's shoes or you can't. It was important to let her take her time, and to show empathy. You need to be open and honest. And not push her along too far. (P. Taylor, 2009)

He remembers Johnson being particularly suspicious of the news media, after experiences with a newspaper in Tauranga, that he believes had probably mishandled it by being impatient.

She didn't have a very good attitude towards them. She was quite delicate emotionally. It was some time before she would tell me the full account. (P. Taylor, 2009)

While Johnson's caution did slow the story down, it gave Taylor the chance to do his own checking. He tracked down the police officer who had approached the Commission of Inquiry, who validated Johnson's story about visiting the police station to make a complaint many years before, and being brushed off. Eventually the *Herald* ran a story, saying another complainant had come forward, but not naming either her or the person she accused (Anon, 2004).

Eventually, Johnson decided to let her name be used. Taylor remembers what his message was to her. He wanted to be sure she was aware of the consequences of publication and was ready for them. He says it is very important not to push people into doing a story.

I probably told her the importance of it was that it took some brave people to speak out to send a message out that these things go on

behind closed doors. I was also concerned not to bully [her] into it. It's quite a big deal to have your photo [and story] in the paper, with your name on it. The other side of that is that if people are ready for it, it can be an empowering thing ... You are there to try and empower the powerless against the powerful. (P. Taylor, 2009)

In this and other stories, he's had to develop a way of approaching and persuading people to talk. He says persistence is essential, but there is also an element of a sales job. But he's not the kind of journalist who turns up with a big bunch of flowers.

I don't ever do that, because I think it's manipulative. You are a human being first, and a journalist later. It's ok to care. And show a bit of emotion, as in death knocks¹¹, because I am affected by it. You need to understand their vulnerabilities. Some people are embarrassed. You have to work through ... explain to them why it's important [that the villain is exposed, so that they can't do it to others]. You try and inject a little bit of yourself. What sort of person you are. It comes back to what are you in journalism for? I differentiate between journalism and selling papers. Because they are not always the same thing. (P. Taylor, 2009)

He also says it's important sometimes to know when not to do a story; such as when it might expose a source. There is a lot that he hasn't been able to publish.

It takes a while to build that sort of confidence. You don't last very long as a journalist if you expose any contacts through not caring, or carelessness. (P. Taylor, 2009)

He says a big part of being a journalist is to help the powerless:

¹¹ A journalistic term for interviewing the relatives or friends of someone recently deceased. The term is probably a contraction of 'door knock' and 'death'.

I'm conscious of the situation of the vulnerable and the stress they are under, and being sensitive to that. I wanted to help people who have no power. (P. Taylor, 2009)

For Johnson, the decision to tell her story was not easy. Seeing Nicholas on TV came as a shock, bringing back a past she had thought buried.

I was quite horrified, basically. I had no inkling, warning, I had never heard of who Louise was, I just recall standing in my lounge seeing that story play on TV. I stood and watched that ... and at the same time had the first thought that this was the beginning of the end. Because although I had made a complaint earlier, I had secretly hoped that there wouldn't be others. Obviously my worst fears were founded. So it was a period of time that I was quite shocked, wondering about what would be coming next. I thought I had to do something to support this woman on TV making these allegations. I knew, like it or not, I would have to become involved. Which was a concern to me, because I'm not the sort of person who would turn her back on someone who was telling the truth. (D. Johnson, 2008)

Within a few days of seeing the programme, she was contacted by police working on the allegations against Shipton and others.

It became obvious in the media that the country was calling for something to be done about it. I realised I simply couldn't turn my back on Nicholas and I did feel strongly that there would be a lot of people out there that knew things that would need to come forward. I had absolutely no idea there would be as many as there was. I knew I had to speak up and support this woman's allegations ... I have got two daughters myself so it was something I felt very strongly about. There was a risk with Louise coming forward that

she might have ended up being made into a liar or that her allegations may not have gone further and something not have been done about that, and I felt [that because of] my situation 10 years earlier I didn't want to see another person in that situation.

Alongside of that of course was the motivation of how many others may there have been in our position. Because I always knew in my heart what a couple of those people were capable of.

In a lot of ways I think more the motivation was that I didn't want Louise to feel that she was on her own. I felt very strongly that if I came forward that maybe others would pick up the courage to tell the truth. And I thought there would be this whole revelation that everybody would tell the truth and everybody would live happily ever after. That this was a turning point, that things were going to be righted. From the behaviour patterns I had seen in people over the years I feared that if it wasn't stopped then it was going to take a turn for the next generation which could well have been my daughters. For so many years those particular officers had support [from] journalists and other people that held power ... I felt that the whole tide had turned, that there were media organisations from outside who wouldn't be bullied or railroaded, who reported what they wanted to report. I felt quite strongly that the whole situation was about to be a new thing. It will be so different to what it may have been 10 years earlier. (D. Johnson, 2008)

Johnson had a strongly held belief that the media were not to be trusted. She had overheard things over the years when her mother flatted with Shipton and Schollum that led her to believe that the police controlled a big part of the community.

I believed for a number of years that some certain situations in a community were only ever reported on [according to] what they wanted reported. And to be a journalist to buck that and to dig further; that, in my opinion, would have made their job difficult. Police deal very closely with the editors of newspapers.

For a long, long time my fear was that the media would do as they were told. That's why those investigative journalists [Taylor and Kitchin] made it very clear to me right from the start right I will go on the facts and I will dig and dig until I find the facts ... I became aware very early in the piece that they were independent individuals sitting there and they weren't going to be controlled by what could and couldn't be said and what they were going to say was how it was. So that was something they needed to stress to me and actually managed to get that message across to me very early in the piece. (D. Johnson, 2008)

Asked how she knew Taylor would be independent and not intimidated, Johnson makes clear it was not simply because of her gut feeling about him, but because of how he behaved when he interviewed her.

I knew right from the start that when I voiced those fears, he agreed. I knew wholeheartedly that [Taylor, but also Kitchin, who interviewed her separately] had the drive and the guts to make sure that even if he was told to cut that, minimise this, he would go on his gut feeling and on the truth. I just knew that I could put the trust in him. [From the] first day ... he questioned me, he took screeds and screeds of notes, how did you know this, how could I believe that, I just knew. Somebody that's so interested in getting it right, I would have put the blind faith in.

After the years that had gone on I had very little trust in anybody. I was very precise about my situation and I wasn't prepared to enter into any other version of my situation. Once I realised that he was prepared to write down word for word what I said, I knew what have I got to lose, because what I said was how it was. So I had no fear of any of it being interpreted in any other way ... my biggest fear was that it had to be the truth, the whole truth and nobody else's version. Because I knew what had occurred and I needed the offender to know that I am going to say it exactly how it happened and despite anybody else's version you, the subject, and I know what happened. My message was solely to the offender because I wanted the offender to read that and know that I have now told on you and I have told on you exactly how it happened. So, to be honest, the public opinion or people reading it didn't even enter my heart.

I knew that the offender wouldn't own up. So I needed to get a very clear message to the offender that "Ok this other woman has made these allegations against you and she in my opinion would have no reason not to tell the truth, so here's your second message and it's from me." It was my way of getting my message to the offender. (D. Johnson, 2008)

Johnson says she tested Phil Taylor thoroughly before agreeing to tell him her story. First, she spoke to him on the phone to see what he was like and find out what he knew. It is clear that at this stage she was very delicate, and sensitive to any sign that he was too casual or uncommitted to doing the story justice.

The biggest question was what do you know? Because I wanted to know that he had an understanding [of where he was coming from].

If he had an understanding of these allegations that were going on throughout the country then obviously he had taken enough interest that he would be worth speaking to. I was very wary of speaking to him and had sort of agreed to it and then thought no I'm not going to. And then he emailed me ... and explained things [so] that I knew that he was committed to following this through. (D. Johnson, 2008)

Johnson was especially cautious because she knew that in this story the stakes were high, but also because she felt Taylor "got" how serious she was.

Because of who the allegations were against ... if you can't trust the police who have you got left to trust in this country? They are your protection and that's the end of it really. So for me who ever I was going to speak to would have to have fully guaranteed me that they believed me, because if they didn't believe me, I wasn't prepared to waste my time or my 20 years history on telling you my story. It was as simple as him saying "Donna, I am committed to getting a very thorough perspective of what you have been through and obviously what other women have been through. This isn't just going to be 'We'll get your story and I don't care what happens to you.'" And I think that was pretty much how he said it. He gave me his assurance that it wasn't going to be that way and it wasn't. (D. Johnson, 2008)

But as Johnson explains, she was initially reluctant to talk, and checked both journalists as much as she could.

I had just felt so pressured by the Commission of Inquiry, because everything had all started at the one time and I just felt so very pressured, my whole life is going to turn upside down and I had finally spent 10 years of hiding from Shipton. Initially I was concerned with the media that everybody would be there to just get

a story from me and give absolutely no thought or consideration to what we were going through or what we had been through for 20 years. So to me I wanted to test and see whether there was sincerity and genuineness about the media, or whether they were just there to make a quick buck of a story and sell a few more newspapers but meanwhile turn our lives into a bit of a circus that we didn't need, crossed with the fact that I had the fear of the media being controlled by the police and being controlled by other organisations so I needed to verify myself that things were different. So I did a lot of checking before I could satisfy myself that "No the police aren't giving the media [orders] in what they are saying now." (D. Johnson, 2008)

She did the checking by asking questions and getting replies in emails, and also built up trust through conversations. For example, she had a couple of phone calls off the record, where Taylor told her information but asked her not to reveal it.

That was a trust thing. He trusted me enough to tell me and not to tell anybody else. I think that's what it boiled down to, was trust. That's something that we haven't had for 20 years so that was very, very important. ... I felt that I had built the trust with him. (D. Johnson, 2008)

She also liked the fact that Taylor was at the High Court for the trial of Nicholas's rape accused, but not just to get a story. Eventually, after a period of testing and checking Taylor, she decided she could trust him.

There needed to be an awful lot of trust built with the journalist that we were dealing with and I believe that we certainly got that ... I just felt safe. He had given me enough reassurance by email. To me, if you put something in writing to someone, that's as good as concrete, really. When I had spoken to him over the phone I said I would

prefer that you put anything you want to talk to me about in writing so that's an assurance that there can be no misunderstandings. I just knew that both of them meant what they said and that as I say they both put stuff in writing to me ... If there were things published in media that I felt weren't right I would email them and say where are they getting that from, how can somebody say that, it's so unfortunate and they would just do the journalist [thing] – "I know how you must be feeling, it's not us who are running that story" - so it was just the assurance all the way that we believe what you say. (D. Johnson, 2008)

At first, after talking to the news media, Johnson was concerned that one of those she named would hunt her down. She was so concerned she hired a security company to protect herself and her children. Nevertheless, she could not protect herself from more subtle forms of intimidation. On one occasion, a co-accused of Shipton, Warren Hales, made an appointment with a real estate agent to visit her house when it was for sale. Hales's brother Steven had previously resigned from the police after illegally accessing her police file (Anon, 2008a). However, she decided to not be deterred by those actions.

That [intimidation] was something that I was concerned about, but then I had alienated myself from my community for 10 years while I lived in fear. So for me it was OK, now I'm not going to alienate myself anymore because I have to push myself to walk down that street and say this is what I allege publicly and I stand by what I allege and I'm going to walk down the street that Councillor Shipton has walked down and hold my head up high.

My message was to the offender. You have nothing to fear if you are telling the truth. It can't be misinterpreted in any other shape or

form. The only person that could misinterpret that truth is myself and the offender. I know my version and he knows his version.

However, he doesn't recall there being a version, so I guess that's how it is.

(D. Johnson, 2008)

She says five to eight women who have been through similar abuse from the offenders have contacted her, but they don't want to go public, because of the impact on their families. She is pleased she spoke out, but she says the publicity hasn't been entirely beneficial:

For me it's lifted a weight off my shoulders. My situation is embarrassing for me. But I feel that there's nothing hidden now. The truth has been told. I have no regrets. If it had have been misinterpreted it could have had an impact on my life. I just knew that I had told my story, it's been printed and that's how it was. So I could look back at that story at any time and say that's how it was. That feels really good. The media have given us an opportunity to say it how it was, because so much of it hasn't been heard in court. The media has shown respect in a lot of ways, to our personal situation. And I think they have very fairly dealt with the story, with us and our victims. I found that by speaking with the media, it actually made it a lot easier for me to cope myself with what was actually going on at that time. As I was going through my story with them I was actually becoming more and more determined to myself, because there was so much in the media ... that I felt at that time was incorrect. So I felt it was my opportunity to say it how it was.

The downside for it being in the media, is that the longer they [are in the media] the harder it's for them [the offenders] to back down. So there have been positives and negatives. (D. Johnson, 2008)

Johnson was not paid for any of the stories written about her. For her, the motivation was to get her truth out there. And it is clear that her view of the relative power of the police and the media has changed:

I have got no regrets ... It's not about money. Why would you want to be paid? It's your life. It's relaying your message, your truth. And someone's prepared to take your message and try to assist you to portray it to the country of how it is. The media have done us a service in many ways.

If you are writing a story about someone, you put yourself in their position as to what you could do with that story because the media have got the power to do a lot of damage. To me the media have as much power as what the police do. I don't know if you agree or not, but I guess it's not about that. (D. Johnson, 2008)

6.3 Analysis

Like Smith and Nicholas, Johnson also appeared to make two main decisions; whether to speak and who to speak through. The first decision had essentially been made by the time she spoke to him; she was determined to give evidence to the Beazley Inquiry, and thus had worked through any concerns she had about that kind of public exposure. However, she was much more reluctant about speaking out through the mainstream media, because of attitudes formed by previous experience. So effectively, her main decision was whether she should speak out through Taylor.

Taylor's message to Johnson was similar to Kitchin's – she needed to speak out to stop this sort of thing happening to others: "I probably told her the importance of it was that it took some brave people to speak out to send a message out that these things go on behind closed doors" (P. Taylor, 2009). This was an argument she already agreed with. In terms of the two-step source decision-making process in the previous two cases, she had already made the decision to speak out; she did this by contacting the Commission of Inquiry. Her main reasons for doing this were to support Nicholas, and to prevent this sort of thing happening again, particularly to her own daughters. The next question for Johnson was whether to speak to the news media, and in particular, who in the news media.

This case has interesting similarities, and some fascinating differences from the Nicholas case. The source in this case was also a victim of bullying (in this case sexual and emotional and implied physical), and by the same people. Yet she talked to another journalist, allowing interesting comparisons to be made between their approaches. Unlike Kitchin in the earlier two cases, the journalist in this case used an approach which did not rely much on peripheral factors (such as dressing to impress her). His message was also not very personally involving – based as it was around the need to protect society. It was one-sided and did not end with a question. He emphasised some PRP factors – that he was an expert, and that he could be trusted, though he did not appear in person initially and so could not really use social attractiveness, although in this case it appears the photographer fulfilled some of that role. So his message and general approach were much more low-key and operated on fewer levels than Kitchin's message to Nicholas.

Although a reasonable case can be made for Johnson having both the motivation and ability to use CRP, it doesn't necessarily mean that there was a message there from Taylor that required it. He could have pitched a message to her that she was happy to process peripherally, or heuristically. For example: "You can trust me, I'm an expert." However, a good case can be made that Johnson did process Taylor's

argument that she should speak out through him using CRP. Johnson clearly had high involvement; the message asked her to expose herself publicly, on a matter of deep personal importance; that of her own credibility and character. It thus fulfils Perloff's criteria for achieving involvement, that the issue must be "personally relevant or bear directly on their own lives"(2008, p. 184). Johnson also appeared to have had the ability to process Taylor's message use CRP – Taylor was explicit about giving her time to open up to him, and not pushing her. Johnson refused to talk to Taylor at first, because she felt pressured. She asked him to email his questions, and took time to "check him out" and consider his questions, and ask questions of her own, before deciding to do the story with him. The level of sophistication she brought to her analysis of this process is admirable. Instead of being controlled by her fears, she devised her own process for testing the veracity of Taylor's message. She did this quite methodically and systematically. First, she made him repeat his questions in writing – knowing this would require further commitment from him – then assessed his level of knowledge about the case, to see whether he had taken enough interest to be likely to get the details right. He showed by his persistence, and commitment, that he was concerned and interested enough to get the details right. That answered the first part of her question – would he get the story correct? Her next step was to answer the second of her concerns – would he and his paper be independent of police pressure? She concluded – based on his answers to her questions and his manner on the phone – that in fact he was unlike other journalists, and determined to know for himself, and get the story right. She deduced correctly that someone who was sceptical enough to check her story carefully, and was not simply after a quick hit, was independent and strong-minded enough to resist pressure to dilute or suppress her story. Johnson thus appears to have had both the motivation and the ability to process his message – both key requirements for CRP. Her excellent recall of this process, the large number of thoughts it generated, and the durability of her changed attitudes about the news media are further evidence

that this decision was made using CRP. She is now positive about the news media, and about the integrity and value of some journalists. This contrasts strongly with her stated anxieties and beliefs prior to doing the story, and suggests that her attitudes had been changed. Of course, they were probably as much or more changed by her experience rather than Taylor's message prior to the story being done; but the main point is that it was Taylor's message and consequent actions that did change her attitude enough for her to act on those changed attitudes.

Another interesting difference in this case was that Johnson did not meet Taylor until the rape trial of those accused by Nicholas. Thus her judgment of him was unlikely to have been much influenced by social attractiveness (although she may have gained some impressions through talking to him on the phone). In any case, since this issue was one of high involvement for Johnson, factors such as message sender credibility and attractiveness were less important than the substance of the message, and any impact would have been greater before the message was processed (Seiter & Gass, 2004).

As was noted in Chapter Three, an argument made using CRP may still not be effective, despite the recipient having the motivation and ability to process it, if it conflicts with some strongly held attitude or value. In this case, like Smith and Nicholas, Johnson did have a strongly held attitude, that the news media could not be trusted to be independent, because they were controlled by the police.

Perloff (2008) suggests that such attitudes can be overcome if the message sender persuades the recipient that they share the same values, and their values do not conflict. Just as Kitchin made it clear to Smith that he was not like other reporters, through his behaviour as much as what he said, Taylor's behaviour towards Johnson showed her he implicitly, if not explicitly shared her attitudes about the importance of the media standing up to power. He showed he shared her values about the truth needing to be out there, to support Nicholas, and to stop the same thing happening

to others (in particular, her daughters). He also explicitly agreed with her that some media could not be trusted. Taylor thus neatly short-circuited one of Johnson's biggest worries; he showed he shared her values, and made it clear that their values did not conflict.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory also provides some interesting insights into how Taylor made her decision. There is no doubt that Johnson did undergo an attitude change; for someone who so believed so strongly the media were controlled by police, the revelations on the *TVNZ Sunday* programme about Nicholas must have come as a surprise. As Johnson stated, she became aware that "people from outside" were involved, and that this may help crack the silence around the case (D. Johnson, 2008). She also tells us she experienced psychological discomfort. She said this was due to the fact that she felt she had to speak out, but that this was going to be difficult for her. No longer could she tell herself that there was no point in speaking out, because the media would not publish her story. Nicholas's revelations had disconfirmed this belief. Now her actions (or her lack of action) were in conflict with her strongly held value that she should not turn her back on the truth, or helping others. Unless she came up with some new reason why she should not speak out (the media helped Nicholas, but they won't help me) she was bound to experience cognitive dissonance, motivated by psychological discomfort; she should speak out, but had not done so previously because no one would listen; now they would listen, and she had no reason not to speak out. To resolve this psychological discomfort, she had to either change her belief about the need for people to speak out about injustice and support others, or change her belief about the news media. As we have seen, it is the latter cognition that she changed.

Although Johnson does not appear to have had such a strong value to overcome as the previous two women, she still seems to have had to access some deep emotion to help make the final decision to become public. Her involvement level increased dramatically when she realised that speaking out publicly affected her personally, in

the sense that it could affect her standing in her community and her daughters' safety. By her own account, Johnson says her motivation was mainly to get a message through to Shipton. It was also to ensure that people knew the truth. This increased involvement probably helped give her the motivation to think systematically about Taylor's message – that she needed to speak out *in the media*, and by implication, that some of the media needed to be trusted. Four possible explanations for this impact of emotion on decision making are discussed here.

The Cognitive Functional Model (CFM) also seems to apply here. Johnson's anger at the idea that Shipton would walk unchallenged in her community helped change the level and direction of her processing; she went from questioning her right to challenge him, to being emphatic about it. In CFM terms, the message-related goal (confront Shipton) aligned with the action tendency (approach, attack) of the message-induced emotion (anger). However, this interpretation doesn't explain why her anger arose when it did. Secondly, in terms of the Anger Activism Model, Johnson was aided in processing the anger appeal (that she should speak out) by the intensity of her feelings and her feelings of efficacy, which had been enhanced by Taylor's provision of a way of doing something about them. Thirdly, in terms of Cognitive Dissonance Theory, Johnson wanted to speak out, and believed she should, but held a belief that all news media were controlled by police so there was no point. By showing this was not true; Taylor provoked dissonance in Johnson, because her actions were suddenly no longer conforming to her beliefs. She could only eliminate this discomfort by making her actions conform with her beliefs – by talking to the news media. It is not so apparent that her social support network supported her belief about the news media, but certainly some in her circle (the abusers, and possibly her mother) did. While CDT does provide a logical explanation for her surge of emotion, as a result of a sudden realisation of the inconsistency of her beliefs with her actions, it does not explain why it happened

when it did, and not earlier. Nor, as with Nicholas, does it show a mechanism by which Johnson's changed attitudes led to action.

As in the Smith and Nicholas cases, the best fit seems to be that offered by the IRM. This model holds that an emotional episode is a result of a combination of low-level sensory input, evaluated in accordance with an individual's cognitive structures, including various appraisal criteria such as coping or legitimacy, and other goals, attitudes, and representations, including the facts (topography) of the situation itself. A change in an individual's appraisal criteria, or any of these other factors, can thus result in the same situation triggering a different emotion. It is clear that Johnson did feel fear for a long time, and that this changed into something else; if not anger, then at least a determined resolve.

That [intimidation] was something that I was concerned about, but then I had alienated myself from my community for 10 years while I lived in fear. So for me it was OK, now I'm not going to alienate myself anymore because I have to push myself to walk down that street and say this is what I allege publicly and I stand by what I allege and I'm going to walk down the street that Councillor Shipton has walked down and hold my head up high. (D. Johnson, 2008)

In this case, unlike Nicholas, the actual topography of the situation did not change much; unlike Nicholas or Smith, Johnson did not learn new facts about her abuser that dramatically changed her opinion of him. However, she did change her attitudes about what could be done. She went from fear, and a belief the media were beholden to the police, to a belief that at least some of the media were independent. It seems likely that this in turn fed into a change in her own appraisal criteria, particularly around coping and efficacy – her power to do something about the situation. The fact that she had already tried to complain earlier suggests that legitimacy criteria were not so relevant; she already knew Shipton's behaviour was

wrong. The question was whether she felt strong or efficacious enough to challenge it. Taylor's interaction with her persuaded her that she could. This meant that when she reaccessed the memories of her experience with Shipton, it was reprocessed and the resultant emotion changed from fear, to anger or determination, which helped her process Taylor's message. The key new factor, as with Nicholas, was that Johnson now had an outlet that she believed in. She had tried to do something previously (visit the Papamoa Police, talk to a local newspaper) but these outlets had not enhanced her feelings of efficacy – quite the reverse in fact. It does seem that the more she realised Taylor was the real deal, and could get results, the more angry she became, and the more likely she was to process his anger appeal and decide to go ahead with the story. While there is less explicit evidence of extensive recursive processing – that she cogitated often and for some time about the situation – the fact that her attitudes changed suggests that she did experience at least some reworking of the same material, into a new emotion.

Relationship effects

Turning to the development of the relationship with Taylor, how well does it fit the pattern of the Investment and Therapeutic models outlined in Chapter Three? Taking the Investment Model first, most, if not all, the factors seem to be apparent. Taylor did have, or want to have, a dependence on her; he had no alternatives if he wanted to do the story, as he did not have access to Nicholas, and at that stage no other women had come forward. He also had the prospect, at least, of high satisfaction, if Johnson agreed to do the story. As he became more involved, his satisfaction level must have increased, initially at least, as he realised that it was an important and interesting story. So in the early stages, he had the makings of a successful relationship; potentially high satisfaction levels, and no available alternatives. Increasingly, he also had investment; he had put time and effort into her story, and thus can presumably be said to have some interest in wanting to see a result, his undoubtedly stronger interest in the truth notwithstanding. Once he had

published the first story, without her name, the exit costs, and thus investment level, increased; it would become more embarrassing – though clearly quite possible - to drop or even retract the story. He had thus invested further in the story, and thus his commitment level increased.

Johnson, for her part, had the first two prerequisites of dependence; no ready alternative (she had already tried another newspaper and been disappointed) and potentially high satisfaction levels (she was determined to have her long-ignored story told). Increasingly, as her engagement with Taylor developed, she developed the third leg of the stool; investment. She engaged with Taylor, and told him the details of her story. At first, she asked him not to use her name. It could be suggested that her level of investment was lower as a result; but she could also not stop him using her name if he had decided to do so anyway. Thus her level of exposure was high. At this early stage, her satisfaction levels could not be high, but like Taylor's there was potential for them to be if she got the result she wanted; if it turned out that she could trust him to be independent, to get her story right, and not to be intimidated by the police. As the relationship progressed, the answers to these questions came in a series of tests, or what the literature calls diagnostic situations. These tests were not explicitly identified as such by Johnson or Taylor, but they functioned in that way nevertheless. These included her request to him not to use her name in the story; her initial reluctance to reveal all the details of what happened; and her assessment of his independence. In terms of the investment model, trust comes when we make ourselves vulnerable to another and they do not take advantage of this vulnerability. Johnson made herself vulnerable when she told Taylor about her story; although he probably wasn't aware of it, she also made herself vulnerable when she trusted him with her story, because of her fears about police pressure on the media. Not being aware of her background with Shipton, Taylor couldn't have known then how much of a risk she was taking; that her experiences and preconceptions about the media led her to expect him to let her

down; she was taking a risk by asking him to put her needs ahead of his own, by not using her name; the fact that he did so helped increase her trust of him, and thus her commitment to the relationship. This commitment is measured by the fact that she eventually opened up enough for him to do a full story using her name and many details she had previously withheld. However, it needed to be demonstrated by the journalist before she would reciprocate; in this case Taylor showed his commitment by agreeing to do the story without her name; and by checking out her side of the story with the former policeman, thus demonstrating his commitment to accuracy and detail. In the same way that Kitchin's message to Nicholas, that he needed to be able to trust her, helped her trust him, Taylor's making clear to Johnson that he would check her story helped reassure her that they shared the same goal; revealing the truth.

This case therefore seems to demonstrate the Investment Model's key claims; that commitment is associated with persistence and longevity. Clearly the relationship has persisted; we know this because both still speak highly of each other, and express no doubts or regrets about the story or each other whatsoever. Taylor's commitment also helped him engage in behavioural maintenance mechanisms; (accommodation, willingness to sacrifice, forgiveness of betrayal). He accommodated her, by avoiding reciprocating her potentially destructive doubts about the relationship (her reluctance to reveal to him, her unwillingness to let him use her name in the story). Instead of reacting by distancing her, or threatening or trying to bully her, he accommodated; likewise he was willing to sacrifice his own time and effort to gain her trust. For Johnson's part, she showed a willingness to sacrifice her justifiable fears about how he may do the story.

Undoubtedly both Taylor and Johnson did engage in what has been called the mutual cyclical growth of this relationship. They did become more dependent, and more willing to be dependent on each other, as trust grew. Trust grew because both were committed to making the relationship work; this helped them negotiate the

delicate and sometimes worrying diagnostic situations that arose. As their trust grew, their level of investment grew, helping cement the interdependence they shared, increasing their willingness to be dependent, and thus their level of commitment. It seems inarguable that Reis et al.'s "congenial pattern of mutual cyclical growth" (2002, p. 628) was established here; the relationship progressed well; the stories were published; both upheld their sides of the bargain; both remain well-disposed towards the other. The mediating factor which drove the increasing willingness to be dependent on each other was commitment; Taylor's commitment to this relationship enabled Johnson to relax and commit to it as well. As has been earlier stated, commitment had to be demonstrated by the journalist before the source would commit to it as well; clearly that was so in this case. Johnson speaks explicitly of Taylor's "commitment" to her telling her story satisfactorily; for her, commitment was essential to maintaining and developing the relationship. Like Nicholas and Smith, the relationship, and trust, was a work in constant progress. Although she made the decision to trust Taylor, and tell her story through him, she was still gauging him when she met him at the High Court. She liked his approach, his manner, and this confirmed the validity of her earlier decisions. In her mind, he had passed a further series of tests, or diagnostic situations. Above all, these diagnostic situations allowed Johnson to develop increased trust in Taylor. As discussed in Chapter Three, trust is often defined as a willingness to place oneself in a vulnerable position in regard to another. Johnson certainly did this, in allowing her "embarrassing" story to be told, using her real name. She developed this trust by gradually testing Taylor, through his response to her questions, and by asking him to let her set the rules of how the story was done. When he agreed to do this, to relinquish some power and make himself vulnerable to her – she reciprocated this by opening up more to him.

The case can also be seen as an example of the Therapeutic Model. Taylor provided a safe, collaborative client-centred relationship – all hallmarks of this model. He

ensured that disclosure was at a pace set by Johnson, and followed her lead on questions about his approach and method. He also communicated well, and honestly.

6.4 Conclusion

Johnson did undergo a two-step decision-making process; firstly whether to speak out, and secondly who to speak out through. Unlike Smith and Nicholas, the first decision was made largely independently of the journalist's approach. Yet, as has been shown, it has clear parallels to those other cases in the level of thought involved. Like Nicholas, Johnson had previously attempted to take action, and been put off. Like her, she had to be convinced to try again. Unlike Nicholas, she had begun that process before the journalist arrived, by deciding to talk to the Commission of Inquiry into Police Conduct. While this would suggest the journalist wasn't essential to the first decision of whether to speak out, it's clear that speaking out to a newspaper was a much bigger deal for her than doing so to the Commission, in part because of her own negative experiences of and ideas about the media.

The second decision for Johnson involved who to speak out through. This case demonstrates that message or argument quality did not appear to make much difference; the recipient constructed her own reasons for accepting the message and acting on it. The crucial thing was to allow her the time to generate high enough involvement to start doing so, and build her ability to process it through education about the media. Once his message had been delivered, Taylor gave her time to process it. He also helped increase her ability to process the message, by being available to answer her questions about how he believed the media operated.

We can infer Johnson did use CRP, because she generated many thoughts, scrutinised Taylor carefully, and shows excellent recall of the process. However the cognitive effort she engaged in was only partly about his message, and more on whether he could be trusted, and whether he was independent of what she perceived to be police influence over the news media. She was motivated to think about these factors because the issue was highly personally relevant, because a) her

daughters could become victims and b) she was determined the offender would know she wasn't intimidated.

Anger certainly helped drive her motivation. Four explanations for this surge of emotion were discussed. In terms of the Cognitive Functional Model (CFM), Johnson's anger at the idea that Shipton would walk unchallenged in her community helped change the level and direction of her processing; she went from questioning her right to challenge him, to being emphatic about it. Secondly, in terms of the Anger Activism Model, Johnson was aided in processing the anger appeal (that she should speak out) by the intensity of her feelings and her feelings of efficacy, which had been enhanced by Taylor's provision of a way of doing something about them. Thirdly, in terms of Cognitive Dissonance Theory, Johnson wanted to speak out, and believed she should, but held a belief that all news media were controlled by police so there was no point. When this was discredited, Johnson experienced dissonance because her actions were suddenly no longer conforming to her beliefs. She could only eliminate this discomfort by making her actions conform with her new beliefs – by talking to the news media. As with Nicholas and Smith, the fourth explanation, the IRM, seems the best fit. Johnson's interaction with Taylor changed her appraisal criteria and attitudes so that the next time she accessed the memory of her experience with Shipton, in conjunction with the facts of the situation, the data was perceived differently and resulted in not fear, but either determination or anger. The fact that, unlike Nicholas's or Smith's cases, the topography of the situation did not change much suggests it was her appraisals that may have changed. The fact that she had already tried to complain about Shipton, and failed, suggests that the key change came in her coping and efficacy appraisals, rather than those around legitimacy – she already knew the behaviour was wrong. The resulting anger then helped motivate the processing of Taylor's message and her decision to speak out. This case also shows the application of the models of relationship maintenance. In line with the Therapeutic Model, Taylor laid the basis for Johnson's safe disclosure

of her abuse by being collaborative and client centred (giving her control over the pace and type of disclosure, such as whether to use her name), and being reliable and safe. The Investment Model also applies here. To gain dependence, Johnson needed high satisfaction levels; she also needed there to be few alternatives and to invest in the relationship. Taylor's careful nurturing of Johnson and exemplary performance as a journalist increased her satisfaction. Other journalists' behaviour was poor enough to eliminate the possibility of alternatives. Taylor also invested in the relationship, with time and effort, which helped drive his commitment and kept him going when Johnson appeared to pull back and did not want to use her name. Likewise, Johnson invested, by telling Taylor more and more as time went on and eventually trusting him with her story, published under her real name. As she invested more, her commitment grew. She tested Taylor in a series of diagnostic situations, such as her gauging his level of interest in the story and his independence through her emailed questions. In particular, his willingness to let her establish some rules about how the story was done demonstrated that he was willing to put her interests ahead of his own, thus passing a crucial test that allowed her to increase her trust in him. By making himself vulnerable to her, Taylor built his trust of her, just as her trust of him grew as she made herself more and more vulnerable and he did not abuse her trust. His commitment helped Johnson invest in him and thus, according to the model, increase her dependence on him. Johnson was able to build a set of relationships with journalists she trusted that were more satisfying than the relationships she had with other community figures, such as the police.

Chapter Seven - Fionnuala Kelly

7.1 Introduction

7.2 The case

7.3 Analysis

7.4 Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

Fionnuala Kelly was an employee at Rimutaka Prison, in Wellington, in November 2005, when she spoke out about what she saw as unsafe work practices. She first blew the whistle internally, invoking the Protected Disclosures Act by contacting the Head of the Department of Corrections with her concerns. After discussions with a journalist, she then contacted a newspaper and later that year and early in 2006 appeared on radio and television. Her revelations helped prompt an official inquiry which made recommendations for changes to prison procedures. Kelly lost her job and later settled a claim for constructive dismissal from the prison.

7.2 The case

Fionnuala Kelly's story (Kelly, 2010) is different from the others in this collection, because she did not form a strong relationship with a particular journalist. Like Smith, the wrongdoing she wanted to expose was not deeply personal, but of workplace corruption. Some aspects were personal – such as how she was targeted for standing up against unfair practices. However, it does fit the definition of an investigative story; it helped expose issues of public interest, and did result in

changes. An official inquiry was conducted partly as a result of her allegations, and two senior managers were later suspended from the service (Hill, 2007).

Kelly was employed as a human relations advisor at Rimutaka Prison, near Wellington, in November 2005. Rimutaka is one of New Zealand's largest prisons, with a mixture of low, medium and high-security inmates. Kelly's job was to help recruit and advise management of various staff procedures, including investigating employment complaints, and ensuring workplace health and safety as required under the Health and Safety in Employment Act (1992). The professionalism she applied to her work, in particular this last role of ensuring a safe workplace, would lead to the breakdown of her relationship with her employer and a great deal of personal anguish.

Her crisis arose when she tried to investigate a number of serious incidents threatening workplace safety, and then challenged other workplace practices that were non-compliant with department policy or employment law. One such incident involved a staff member who bullied a female staff member and made sexual advances towards her. What Kelly calls the "tipping point" was an alleged assault of a staff member by another, who was also the wife of the regional manager of the prison service. Kelly was well aware of the prison's statutory obligations under the Act and that she was partly responsible for ensuring they were complied with. When she felt there was an unsafe culture amongst prison staff, she raised her concerns firstly with the managers of the staff responsible. They told her to mind her own business. When she then approached her own manager for support, he did not back her. Instead, he began bullying her, mostly by giving her formal warnings on spurious grounds, including comments such as "Fionnuala needs to stick to matters that concern her" (Kelly, 2010).

Kelly was asked to sign documents based on a summary of facts that she thought incorrect. She refused to sign the documents and was told they were going on her

file anyway. She then tried to contact Dave East, the regional manager, who did not return her calls. Fed up, she then tendered her resignation, noting that it was effectively a constructive dismissal in the circumstances and wrote to the chief executive of the Department of Corrections, Barry Matthews, outlining the reasons for her resignation and her concerns about the prison culture. That action triggered the Protected Disclosures Act, giving her some protection as a whistleblower. The same day, East contacted her. Kelly says he told her to leave that day and saw that she was escorted off the premises: "He said it's clear you are very unhappy, I think you need to leave now. It was a particularly horrible way to leave" (Kelly, 2010).

About 10 days later, she went back to the prison, as she was invited to have a conversation by the deputy regional manager to air her concerns. She says she went, partly because she wanted to stop a petty rumour campaign about her, including the suggestion that she had stolen a toaster.

The matter could have remained as an internal employment matter, but events soon took another turn. A Dutch couple, Mark and Ingrid Rijniers, who had been recruited to work as corrections officers at the prison, went to the news media claiming corruption was rife at the prison and that it was run by gangs. Those allegations were added to by another Dutch recruit, and together with Kelly's own concerns, prompted the Department of Corrections to announce that an independent review of the allegations would be conducted by Wellington barrister David Patten. Kelly received a letter asking her to agree to an interview with Patten. She was disappointed with the interview, which she felt was too narrow in focus, and did not give her the opportunity to air her concerns.

Meanwhile, Kelly had been telling an acquaintance of hers, Kathryn Ryan, about her situation. Ryan is a journalist who hosts the *Nine-to-Noon* programme on *Radio New Zealand National*, probably the most widely-heard programme on New Zealand

radio. Ryan suggested to Kelly that her experiences would make a good story, and that she should consider going to the media.

I remember her [Ryan] saying this is a really good story and I should leak it, it should be investigated. She said would you be willing to talk to me about it on the radio. I thought if you are going to do this, you may as well just be brave, so I did. (Kelly, 2010)

At about that time – December 2006 – she decided to take her story to the news media. That was partly prompted by her realisation that she would have to take an employment claim against the department. Kelly contacted Wellington's daily newspaper, *The Dominion Post*. She was interviewed by reporter Patrick Crewdson and the next day an article appeared outlining her concerns. She didn't allow him to use her name. She also did an anonymous interview with Ryan on her show. Kelly says there were two main reasons she went to the news media:

The first one was to get some balance to the story [of] the Rijniers. Their allegations were so outrageous, I didn't want the serious concerns or the credibility of those that were really happening to be undermined by them. There would have also have been definite personal reasons ... because the department were clearly stifling me, obstructing me, and had treated me so badly/unfairly.

I had a strong sense of grievance over how the department was acting. Once it became clear that the whole place was going to collude and shut this up I thought that the media might be able to put some pressure on it and crack it open a bit more, as my appeals to senior management to have the situation resolved and me re-instated, were being ignored. At that point I was fairly sure that it would be fine and that it would be reworked and that it would be

revisited and that all would come out happily for me. But that was just a little silly. (Kelly, 2010)

Over a year later, the Patten investigation report was released. Kelly felt disappointed. She had hoped that the investigation would uncover factual material that would help her own employment case. That had been part of her reason for going to the news media. She believes the Department kept a lot of facts from Patten, partly to limit evidence available to her and other employment claimants.

I also was very disappointed as I had specifically asked David Patten to see a draft report prior to release, but that had not occurred. If it had done I would have been able to address many inaccuracies around my statements etc, and also provide examples to substantiate other claims. (Kelly, 2010)

When the report came out, she was contacted by a TV reporter (who wishes to remain anonymous). She had already done one anonymous interview with this reporter. On the day the report was released, she did an interview in which she finally agreed to reveal her identity. Looking back, it is a decision she is not entirely comfortable with. It is clear she felt (somewhat) pressured into it.

I can't remember how I started talking to [TV]. I really can't remember, not exactly ... I had a concern where they were saying [they wanted me to use my name. I was reticent about that. He said initially we could shield your identity. I had agreed to it on those terms. He must have subsequently persuaded me to do a full interview to camera. It must have been along the lines ... I said yes I guess it makes it more credible if I show my face. I wish I hadn't. I think I am really uncomfortable about it.

[But I thought] If you are going to do this you need to be brave and need to have the courage of your convictions. And that means

disclose this as yourself. If I tell the truth it will come out. By me speaking out I will surely get this stuff out there.

I do remember thinking to myself if you are going to do this you have to be brave and have the courage of your convictions. And a bit of it was self-serving, so a lot of it was me but there was a greater issue of the Department, I thought if you are going to take this stance you have to be accountable for it and be able to back it up. And there was this thing, thinking you have to be brave. If you are going to do it and you really think these things you are talking about, and you have begun this process you have to do it. I felt that the department had really bad people getting away with some really serious things and that a lot of other people were in quite a lot of danger about these things. Particularly that guy she had assaulted ... he had just come from Holland. I just thought that was so wrong and it shouldn't be glossed over.

I think I thought if I'm going to position myself, I thought if I'm going to make a stand, I'm going to have to be brave and confront it. But it was [mixed] with a strong feeling that I have been treated so badly and that the department was so ... dishonest. I probably didn't realise how big it was. I thought if I gave this [to the news media] something has to be done fairly. And also I thought nobody was going to listen to me ... so I thought why the fuck not. (Kelly, 2010)

Using her name was a significant step for her. She wondered if speaking out would be dangerous.

Once you see the article, with your name in it, and you said this, it does cause a bit of an intake of breath and you think oh shit ... it's

quite black and white when you see it like that, you really are in it. I was thinking I have probably fucked off some people with some strong interests here. I wondered if someone would do something against me. Intimidatory stuff. Nothing like that actually happened. (Kelly, 2010)

But she says another motivation for revealing her identity and continuing to speak out was because she wanted people to know that the report's laundering of events was not the whole truth. She was worried what people would think of her, if they accepted the report's version of events over hers.

At the bottom of that there was the fear that they might laugh. It was really when the report came out that I thought people could read this and think I just made the whole thing up, because I'm some nutty feminist. (Kelly, 2010)

Around this time she also spoke to newspapers, and did another interview with Ryan, where she also used her name.

In hindsight, I was very unhappy with the interviews I gave post the report's publication. I think mostly I was not thinking very straight. I was extremely disappointed in the contents of the report and the slightness of its findings that were made. But if I had been more prepared and able to take a step back, I felt I could have more cogently outlined my objections to the report. (Kelly, 2010)

Kelly went to mediation with her former employer and eventually reached an out of court settlement. But she remains critical of the department's culture, which she believes hasn't really changed. And she is generally unimpressed with the way the media handled her story. She suspects some journalists must have passed her phone number on to others, and one in particular was careless in the use of off-the-record information. Only the TV reporter and Crewdson, the first reporter from *The*

Dominion Post, bothered to meet her. But she is most critical of the lack of follow-through on the concerns she raised.

What I found surprising about it is that it begged investigative journalism and yet there was none. Nothing more than here's the allegations and here's the department's response. No critical investigation of how the department was running. Why the police weren't investigating these matters. It's a bit sloppy ... I understand ... [there are] only ... so many hours in the day and that's the modern newspaper. But actually it's crappy journalism. (Kelly, 2010)

She says, in hindsight, she would have handled her relationship with journalists differently. She is annoyed that when the report came out she wasn't well enough prepared to state her case. She felt she hadn't given herself enough time to read it, and didn't say things as clearly as she would have liked to. She hasn't established a long term relationship with any of them.

I would talk to them again but I think I would want to make sure it was about what I particularly wanted to get across. If I had a stronger relationship with a particular journalist I would have talked to them about how they would approach it. I was probably naïve not to even ask that. Because of the whole stress of the thing, I probably just didn't think as clearly as you do when you aren't clouded by all the grievances and stress. Because unlike Louise Nicholas it wasn't my personal character that was called into question. But in a way, in the end – I felt it was. (Kelly, 2010)

Like the other women in this study, anger was an important factor in triggering her decision to speak out. Unlike the others, however, it ignited before she talked to a journalist.

When I first got really angry? When I tendered my resignation. I said these [letters you want me to sign] are unreasonable, and phoned Dave East saying it. That was around the end of October. I didn't get to the media until the end of December.

My tendering my resignation was like, this is everything now. But I still kept trying to remedy it. [I got angry] when it became quite clear that management were not going to deal with it, and that they were determined to get rid of me or drive me out.

I think the other thing I realise very clearly now is that while the experience was so very stressful, what happened to me in terms of my employment was so very stressful that basically I lost my job because of this environment, and I lost my job because I stood up for what I thought was right. And they were being sloppy and negligent in terms of the way they were handling work place issues. And I was probably not in the greatest mental state either. And it certainly took its toll. That wasn't the fault of the media, that was the situation.

(Kelly, 2010)

Unlike the other three women in this study, Kelly did not form a strong relationship with any of the journalists she dealt with. The most influential, in terms of persuading her to speak out about her experiences, was Kathryn Ryan. She had known Kelly from school, and the two had kept up intermittent social contact. Through this socialising, Ryan became aware of Kelly's problems at work. She knew it would make an interesting story, and suggested that if ever wanted to speak about it, to get in touch (Ryan, 2010).

I clearly indicated that it was a matter that the media would be interested in. But a lot of the public interest stuff was clearly coming from her. Which isn't to say that I wouldn't point that out or

reinforce it. She was clearly frustrated by what was happening, she thought what was happening was wrong. She was frustrated by a lack of action by her superiors. And that felt genuine, alongside the fact that she was in an employment dispute. I don't remember needing to encourage or push her. That's not normally an approach that I take anyway. My approach is if you are going to talk, here's why we're the people to talk to. (Ryan, 2010)

Ryan says she has found trying to persuade people to speak does not usually work. Her approach to sensitive sources is much more hands-off:

If someone's already there, that's fine, but I am a great believer that you don't pressure people to do things that will affect their lives without being absolutely upfront about the consequences. For me I'm just not a pushy journalist in that respect. I'd much rather people got there on their own account. And actually you have far more success, if you get yourself a reputation as being a fair trader, if you operate that way. If you take time persuading them to do it, they are far more likely to bail on you in the end anyway. If you let them get there themselves, if you play straight and play fair with them, and give them time and space, when they do come to you they are ready to go. They have just come to that conclusion themselves so they are sure of it. Whereas if you push them, they have come to it under pressure and they think actually no at the last minute. You certainly keep up contact, you certainly stay in the frame, but you don't push.

For me personally and ethically as a journalist, but also as a matter of strategy, I prefer to let people get there themselves, but give them the reasons why we are the outlet to talk to when they are ready. If

there were a truly compelling public argument that would involve safety ... that would be a different matter. (Ryan, 2010)

Like the other journalists Kelly spoke to, Ryan is concerned not to get too close to sources. She believes it is important not to develop relationships with sources of a supportive or personal nature, but is aware that long-running investigations with a long build-up of trust could become problematic.

There are tiers of relationship, but mine always remain pretty formal ... I've never been in that situation where I felt a dependence from a source or felt an obligation to a source for their well-being. With a whistleblower it's different again, but you cannot compromise your telling of the story, you cannot compromise your judgement of what's happened which may not always reflect well on your source. Especially in a small intimate society like New Zealand it's a very delicate dividing line and you just have to stop yourself from getting too involved or becoming too concerned beyond a professional standing. (Ryan, 2010)

Ryan says that while some of the people she deals with as a journalist understand the journalist must be independent, others tend not to.

The people that don't understand it are those who are not experienced with the media. Which is why you have to be particularly cautious around whistleblowers or people who are coming up to tell a personal story, because they will presume that you are on their side and really you are not. You want to treat them fairly and well, but you can't actually be on their side because at that point you are losing your independence and your judgement of their story. And in that situation it's very useful to be up front and say that I'm going to ask all the appropriate questions, and you need to

understand what my job is. And for some people it might be appropriate to précis that. And you might be précising what the reaction of other media might be. I think that's entirely appropriate.

[But what's not appropriate] is getting to the point where you have beyond empathy a sympathy that affects the fair telling of the story or affects your own judgement of what you're reporting or not reporting or how you're reading what's happened. (Ryan, 2010)

While Ryan was the main journalist that helped encourage Kelly to come forward with her story, two other reporters were also involved at important stages.

Dominion Post reporter Patrick Crewdson took the call from Kelly when she rang the newspaper. He met her in a café and took down her story. He does not remember a great deal about the interaction, as he only interviewed her once. However, he recalls that very little persuasion was required for her to do the story – unsurprisingly - as she had rung the paper. He did suggest she go on the record:

"I guess the message that I would want to try to impart is that the person is speaking to us for a reason ... to be heard and taken notice of, and the most effective way to do that is for them to be visible behind their words" (Crewdson, 2010). However, he accepted her decision not to do so, and emphasised to her that the paper did too.

"It's important that they know you're upfront about protecting their identity, and they can see you sticking to the promise that you make." (Crewdson, 2010).

After talking to Ryan, Kelly also appeared on television. The television reporter she dealt with does not want to be named, but agreed to be interviewed anonymously (Anon, 2010).

This reporter persuaded Kelly to appear on camera. He spoke to her on the phone at first, then met her, where he outlined the reasons he thought she should go on camera.

I told her exactly how television works, that it would only be certain sections of the interview that we end up using, but that obviously I felt, as she felt that it was important for her to talk out. If she had concerns, and they were serious concerns that she raised, and she basically got told to keep quiet, then the person either remains silent, and doesn't say anything, or speaks out, and can enact change. And in this case, that's what she did, which was courageous ... I just reiterated that to her, that the importance of her doing it, is obviously not also contributing to the secrecy which was around what was going on at the prison ... that without her a lot of this wouldn't have come to light, and she agreed that that was the reason she had spoken out, and agreed to do the interview. (Anon, 2010)

The reporter says he got the feeling Kelly was not so concerned about speaking out, as about being on television.

I think she was more concerned about going on camera not because of what she had to say, because her comments had already been canvassed publicly by this stage, but more so because of just being on television, of having her face on television, for many people you interview in television there's some reluctance to have their face and then talking on television and it's just a sort of nerves thing I guess. (Anon, 2010)

The reporter says he aims to build a rapport with whistleblowers. He likes to meet them, discuss the issues, and then propose the idea of doing a story which could lead to change in how things are run. He says he is careful not to apply pressure to get them to cooperate with a story.

As a journalist, it's your job to ... well not find whistleblowers, but it's your job to find interviewees and talk to them and then ask them

if they would like to participate in the story. If they say no, or if they have concerns about it, then in the case of Fionnuala I would have said: “Well look, here’s my details, if you decide over the next couple of days, call me and give me a call first.”

I leave them and then maybe the next day, call them back. You don’t want to be harassing a person, but it’s your job, you have got to give them a call back and at least say “What do you think?” and if they say “Look, I’m really not interested”, you say that’s fine, and then you move on and investigate other avenues. (Anon, 2010)

Unlike Ryan, this reporter is much more explicit about building a relationship with the potential whistleblower.

I did do two stories with Fionnuala and they were spread about 15 days apart, and I kept in touch with her the whole time and I think that’s important, especially if you have got a source like Fionnuala, you have to keep in touch.

This is a personal thing of mine but I think it’s important to all journalists. You have to show respect to your sources, and you have to be able to build a rapport, and ensure that they trust you. And so after stories, I’d often call up people and say: “Look, how are you doing, did you see the story?” and even now, there’s a lot of people or sources for stories who I keep in touch with on a weekly basis over an impending story, one which may not happen immediately, but I think it’s important to build that relationship. (Anon, 2010)

He says it was a pity Kelly felt rushed, but says she was agreeable to doing the interview and she got her main points across. He agrees it would be good if there was more opportunity for a more in-depth analysis in daily news, but says that is often not possible.

In daily news often you don't get the opportunity to spend two or three days or a week looking at things. And also because of how the Corrections Department operates, once the CEO has made comments about the report, it's difficult to go back and re-request an interview on certain things to probe a bit deeper and really look at it. I guess this is something that as a journalist ... you face almost on a daily basis, you are trying to get a story out, you have a limited time period, and at the same time you know that if you don't get that story out, your competitor probably will. And also questions will be asked of you after six o'clock if you don't manage to get the story out. But I think that Fionnuala had real concerns, I'm not saying her concerns weren't real, but if she needed more time to look at the report, the interview would still have been conducted on her terms if she wanted to have more time. But I guess at the time as a journalist I stressed look it would be great if we could do a story today and I wanted to do a story for tonight's news, do you think that's possible, and we met. (Anon, 2010)

He believes the story was important and did produce results, in that four other whistleblowers came forward, that some Corrections staff eventually faced disciplinary action, and that the culture of the Department itself was challenged.

7.3 Analysis

Kelly's case has some interesting parallels, but even more interesting differences from the previous three cases. It certainly meets the criteria for investigative journalism, in that it involved issues that would not have come out otherwise, in which there was some public interest in coming out, and which resulted in some kind of change; in this case an inquiry and recommendations for change in the way

the prison was run. Like the other women, Kelly was vulnerable, somewhat afraid, and had been subject to bullying or abusive behaviour, though obviously not to the same degree as Nicholas, Johnson or Smith. However, Kelly's approach to deciding which journalist to speak out through was rather different.

Like the other women, Kelly also had to make two decisions – firstly to speak out, and then who to speak to. Her decision to speak out in public, like Smith's and Johnson's, was preceded by an earlier decision to take action. Smith had already made the decision to help police, before she faced the decision to help the news media. Johnson had already decided to speak to the Beazley Inquiry. Kelly had already decided to complain about her manager to the head of the Department of Corrections (and thus invoke the Protected Disclosures Act) before she decided to talk to the news media. She then faced the decision of who to speak to.

The ELM provides a useful framework for analysing Kelly's decision-making process. It seems clear that the initial decision to challenge management was a CRP decision. She knew what was happening in the prison was wrong, and that she could do something about it. Her decision to invoke the Protected Disclosures Act was accompanied by a surge of anger. It generated a lot of thought, she has clear recall of the reasons, and she has durability of attitude (still believing it was the right thing to do) – all clear indications of a CRP-based decision.

The two subsequent decisions – to speak out through the media, and who to do it through, are less straightforward. Kelly says she decided relatively quickly to go to the media after Ryan suggested she do so. The way she describes her decision-making process seems to suggest it was a CRP based decision. She did it for three main reasons; firstly because what was happening at the prison was wrong; secondly because some of the claims coming out from the Dutch recruits were outlandish and she feared they were smearing all prison staff; and thirdly because she felt that the Department needed to be pressured to do something about the

problems at the prison. The fact that she has clear recall of these reasons, and still mostly holds these attitudes (although she recognises she may have expected too much) is suggestive of CRP. The reasons on which she based this decision indicate that Ryan's message was only partially effective. Like the other whistleblowers in this study, Kelly had a raft of personal reasons for the decision to speak out, of which the journalist's message – of it being good for society to hear about this – was only one. This seems to confirm, as do the previous three cases, that the decision to speak is a) carefully thought through, using CRP and b) often made for personal reasons that are only partly to do with the journalist's message.

Further evidence that the decision to go to the news media was CRP-based comes from the fact that peripheral factors seem to have played little role. She doesn't recall a lot about the role of Ryan's credibility in her decision to go to the media. She clearly did not dwell on Ryan's credibility very much; she does not recall anything about whether she trusted Ryan, or why, or how expert she was. She simply seems to have accepted that going to the media was a good idea. When pressed during the interview, she struggled to recall much about this aspect of the process. Does this lack of recall mean that her decision to go to the news media was PRP-based, rather than CRP? No, because we know that the actual reasons for speaking out are clearly and strongly held, and were clearly her own. Although she has some doubt now about whether it was a good idea – she says now that some of her beliefs were "silly", in the sense not that they were irrational or unreasonable, but perhaps optimistic, or naïve. So although it is difficult to say exactly where on the elaboration continuum Kelly's decision to speak out was, on balance the strength of recall of her main reasons and underlying persistence of the attitudes suggests more CRP than PRP on the decision to speak out.

The decision of who to speak to seems to have been PRP-based, however, as is evidenced by her lack of recall of much about the reporters she spoke to; as well as not mentioning anything about Ryan's credibility, she did not remember the name of

Crewdson; she remembered that the TV reporter was “good-looking”; but did not remember his name.

While her decision to become a whistleblower, and go outside normal channels to enact change in her workplace were carefully thought through, the actual detail of who to do this with were not; she seems to have accepted, once she had decided that going to the news media was a good idea, either that the choice of actual reporter was not something that required so much thought, or possibly it was not something she could have much influence over; in any case, once the reporters she spoke to told her she could trust them, and that they would do a good job, she seems to have accepted this and gone ahead without testing them or scrutinising their credibility to the degree that Smith, Nicholas or Johnson did. So on balance, it appears that while Kelly’s decision to speak out was CRP-based, the decisions of who to speak to were not. It is unclear why Kelly made this decision this way, where the other women were much more rigorous about deciding who they spoke to. The ELM would suggest that Kelly did not reach a high enough level of involvement – she did not think this decision would affect her personally. She may have thought this because the first stories about her did not name her. Once the story got going, it became more difficult for her to control her level of engagement, and she found herself pressured to speak more publicly and more often than she really wanted.

To process a message centrally, Kelly had to have reached high involvement, and had motivation and opportunity. We know she had involvement, and thus motivation, because she says she saw the personal benefit to her own employment case from speaking out in the news media. Motivation also came from her anger at the way management had responded to her attempts to point out problems at the prison. She says she reached a “tipping point” when her particular concern at the role of the wife of the prison manager was sidelined. The role of anger seems to support the CFM (Cognitive Functional Model) in that it enhanced the depth and direction of her processing. In the very first instance, her anger at the “tipping point”

moment helped decide her to take action by going over the head of her managers to the head of the Department; it thus certainly changed the direction of her thinking from a) accepting the situation to b) not accepting the situation. It also seems to have enhanced the depth of her processing, as we can see from the clear and cogent reasons she developed for doing so, and for later going to the media. Can Ryan's message to her be seen as an anger appeal? Yes, in the sense that it suggested Kelly should not just accept the situation, but do something about it; act on her anger, in fact. Ryan's message certainly did not diminish Kelly's motivation to act; if anything it enhanced it, and supported her outrage at the work situation. Ryan's message can also be said to have changed the direction of Kelly's processing, in the sense that it introduced the idea of using the news media. Again, the message-related goal (approach the media) aligned with the action tendency of her dominant emotion (anger).

The Anger Activism Model also seems relevant here. This suggests that the extent to which an individual processes an anger appeals depends on the depth of the emotion and the feelings of efficacy. In one sense Kelly already had efficacy; as a lawyer, she was better equipped than most to look after herself in such a situation. She had already contacted her Department head, Barry Matthews, and invoked the Protected Disclosures Act. And she certainly had strong feelings. Yet it was already becoming clear to her that her appeal to Matthews was not having much impact, so any feelings of efficacy she had were diminishing, while her feelings of frustration were not. Ryan's message promised enhanced efficacy by suggesting a new route for action. In terms of the AAM, Kelly's case differs from the previous three in that the journalist only became involved after she was provoked to anger and speaking out (firstly, to her employer). This suggests that the journalist was not a prerequisite for anger release, and deciding to speak; that enhancement of efficacy is not as strong a contributing factor to the decision to speak as the other three cases might suggest.

The IRM also provides some interesting insights into this case. The fact that Kelly's motivating anger came before journalistic intervention suggests she did not need any change to her appraisal processes to change how she perceived the situation and what emotion was constructed from it. As an employment lawyer she had a strong sense of right and wrong, and a strong sense of efficacy, or coping, or self-esteem, that helped ensure the situation was quickly identified as a threat, or infringement, and thus sparked anger. It was the suddenly changed topography of the situation itself – her realising that her managers were unwilling to do anything - in conjunction with her own attitudes and appraisals – that aroused anger. The journalistic intervention from Ryan may have affected her coping appraisal (the sense that she could do something about it), but did not come into play at the time she actually felt the anger.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory does not seem such a close fit in this case as in previous cases. It could be argued that Ryan's message about speaking out provoked dissonance in Kelly; something along the lines of: "If you think this situation is wrong, why don't you do something about it?" Yet, as mentioned above, Kelly does not seem to have had any great block to the idea of speaking out; no strong belief which was suddenly challenged, nothing to generate the friction of dissonance which only action could release.

Relationship effects

This case differs from the previous three in the nature and quality of the relationship that developed between the whistleblower and the journalist, or in this case journalists. In fact, it is probably more accurate to say it differs in that there was no relationship, in terms of the definition given in Chapter Three: "two people [exerting] strong, frequent and diverse effects on one another over an extended period of time" (H. H. Kelley, 1983, p. 4). Kelly herself says she did not have a relationship with any of the journalists; likewise Ryan questions the idea of a

relationship between a journalist and a source; only the TV reporter puts the interaction with Kelly in the context of anything like a relationship. Yet Ryan did exert some effect on Kelly, in that she prompted her to go the news media; she also had her on her show twice. Crewdson had only one interaction with Kelly, and can thus be discounted. The TV reporter did have more than one interaction; he interviewed her twice, the first time anonymously, and the second time on camera; he also persuaded her to let her name and face be used on camera. Yet Kelly does not describe any of this as a relationship; nor does she feel positive about how her interaction with the news media worked out. What can we conclude from this in terms of the relationship theories outlined in Chapter Three?

Firstly, according to the definition above, it does seem reasonable to conclude that there was a relationship of sorts, between Kelly and Ryan, and Kelly and the TV reporter. Yet the quality of this relationship was considerably different from those Kitchen and Taylor had with Smith, Nicholas and Johnson. According to the Investment Model, investment is the factor that sustains the relationship through difficult periods; what causes it to persist when satisfaction levels drop or alternatives present themselves. Kelly's level of investment was similar to Johnson's; she started off anonymously, then gradually agreed to let her name and face be used. It could be argued that this increasing investment in the relationship helped drive her commitment. However, this investment was not matched by the journalists, at least not to the extent that Johnson or Nicholas felt it was. The actual outcome for Johnson was quite similar to Kelly; there was a public inquiry, and her story was published in a newspaper, but neither resulted in a criminal trial. However, Johnson's account was largely vindicated (by the inquiry, and the trials that showed Shipton was a rapist, if not of her, then of others) whereas Kelly felt the official inquiry did not vindicate her; on the contrary it left her character exposed and her word called into question by not vindicating her. Of course it is not the responsibility of the journalist to ensure an official inquiry reaches a certain result; but for these

women, the crucial factor seems to be a commitment to ensuring their story is the more credible one; to go beyond mere allegation and denial and establishing some kind of truth. What seems to be lacking for Kelly was a sense of commitment from the journalists to the relationship; to go beyond mere allegation and denial, and commit to pursuing this story, to ensuring the full truth is told. Smith, Nicholas and Johnson all felt they had this from their journalists; Kelly clearly did not. The journalists in her case justified this on the grounds of not wanting to become too involved, or due to the daily routines of news journalism; yet this left Kelly feeling disappointed. It thus seems commitment, or lack of it, was the key difference.

The Therapeutic Relationship model seems relevant here too. This requires that a relationship be collaborative, client-centred, and safe. Kelly's interaction with Ryan did seem to fit this criteria. She was careful to let Kelly make her own decision, but did collaborate with her in making it; it was client-centred in the sense that Kelly made her own decisions, and set the pace of her self-revelation. In no sense was she pressured by Ryan. It also appears safe, in the sense that Kelly made her own decisions about when and how often to go on air. Likewise, the interaction with Crewdson appears to meet the same criteria. However, that with the TV reporter does not. Kelly clearly felt pressured to reveal her name and face; although she agreed, she subsequently wished she hadn't; and she felt she was not given enough time to think through this decision. This is not to say the TV reporter could or should have done anything different; in the context of the news cycle, he was quite right to point out that she would have maximum credibility if she used her name, and that the topicality of the item meant she had to decide that day. It simply means that the nature of the relationship was different, and this may explain some of Kelly's disappointment with the outcome.

7.4 Conclusion

The whistleblower in this case had already made the decision to speak out against her managers, by invoking the Protected Disclosures Act as an internal whistleblower. However, she then made two significant decisions as a result of interaction with journalists. The first was to go to the news media with her story, and the second was who to go to. The ELM provides a convincing explanation of the process by which she made these decisions. It seems clear that she used CRP for the first decision (to go to the news media), because of the clarity of recall of the reasons for the decision, and persistence of the attitudes which underpinned it. However it is more likely the second decision was PRP-based, for almost identically inverse reasons. Also, unlike the previous cases, this whistleblower did not dwell on the credibility of the journalists; she did not generate a significant number of thoughts about this. Anger played an important role for this whistleblower, in helping motivate her to speak out; this case seems to affirm, like the previous cases, the applicability of the Cognitive Functional Model in that the anger changed the direction and depth of her processing, by helping her change her mind to speak out. Likewise the Anger Activism Model seems applicable, in that Kelly's ability to process the journalist's anger appeal seemed to have been enhanced by the intensity of her feelings and the fact that the journalist enhanced her feelings of efficacy, by giving her an outlet for them, at a time when she was becoming quickly disillusioned with other outlets. However, the fact that her anger was triggered much earlier, before the involvement of the journalist, and after she had decided to blow the whistle about her manager (albeit within the organisation), suggests efficacy enhancement from the journalist was not a crucial factor in deciding to speak out. The IRM provides an interesting explanation for the difference in her case compared to the other women in this study; the speedy arrival of her anger at her managers' inaction, without any input from a journalist, suggests it was the suddenly changed topography of her situation, rather than any change in her own

appraisals/ attitudes, that caused the emotion. There is less evidence of the lengthy reprocessing of the situation that other cases engaged in, but this does not rule out an IRM-based explanation.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory does not seem a good fit in this case; as there seemed little evidence any strong conviction that was suddenly challenged that required a change in action or belief to disperse.

The case is also interesting in terms of relationship models; the Investment Model seems to explain well why this whistleblower was disappointed by the interaction with journalists. The key difference appears to be lack of commitment from journalists. While Kelly committed, with consequent investment, she felt they did not commit. Some of these journalists also had concerns about attachment which would prevent them getting too close; they seemed to differ in the extent to which they were prepared to commit to getting the truth out there, compared to Kitchen and Taylor. This is not to say that Kitchen and Taylor compromised themselves; simply that their sources felt they were more committed, and responded to that. The study also demonstrates the applicability of the Therapeutic Model, in that Kelly seemed most comfortable with those journalists that kept the relationship client-centred and collaborative, and let her set the pace of revelation.

Chapter Eight - Discussion

8.1 Introduction

8.2 Persuasion effects – ELM and CDT

8.3 Message and other factors

8.4 The role of emotion in the ELM and CDT

8.5 Relationship effects

8.6 General effects

8.7 Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

The analysis of each of these four cases in light of the theoretical models discussed in Chapter Three provides interesting and useful insights into the process reluctant whistleblowers follow in deciding to speak out. Collectively they form a subset of an important type of whistleblower – vulnerable, usually threatened, and in unique possession of information that, if revealed, could prevent further public harm. Each case also differs from each other in ways which provide interesting insights into the applicability of the chosen theoretical models. Taking each of the theoretical models in turn, what conclusions can we draw?

All these woman fit Vandekerckhove's (2006) criteria for whistleblowers; they engaged in non-obligatory disclosure to the public record of information about non-trivial illegality at an organisation or community they were involved in, to an external entity with the potential to rectify the wrongdoing (i.e. the public, and the Government). Three of the four also all fit the criteria for the research questions of

being reluctant, vulnerable, at-risk people. They were all whistleblowers on significant, high-impact, controversial issues which exposed their own behaviour and intimate details of their lives to potentially hostile public scrutiny. The fourth person, Kelly, provides a useful control in terms of application of the theoretical models; although she also fits the criteria of being a whistleblower, on a significant issue of public interest; she was less reluctant to speak out, and less vulnerable (the issue did not require her to reveal such sensitive information about herself). Like many whistleblowers, all were worried about the consequences of speaking out; all managed to overcome that in part by getting angry. Like many whistleblowers, a powerful motivation for all was also to ensure that the truth be told, and for three of the four, to stop the same thing happening to others, particularly their own children.

However, these typological factors do not give us much insight into why or in what order they made their decision to speak, or why they chose a particular journalist to speak out through, or indeed whether the journalist influenced their decision in any way. Based simply on the above, there is no reason why they couldn't have decided to speak out independently at some point. Yet all spoke out through a journalist, apparently as a result of their intervention. Why? To explore these questions further we will now compare these cases, first within the framework of the theoretical paradigms explicated in Chapter Three, and secondly in more general terms, to see what insights they give in response to the research questions.

8.2 Persuasion effects

The analysis of each case in terms of the ELM shows that this model can provide useful insights into the highly-specialised field of journalistic persuasion. These cases show that the decision-making process is best seen as a two-stage process; first to speak out, and secondly who to speak out through. The first decision, whether to speak out at all, was for all these women an important decision, requiring CRP-

based processing of the arguments for and against, and requiring generation of significant emotion to generate the motivation to process these arguments. These cases confirm that the decision of vulnerable whistleblowers to speak out is usually a highly personal, high-involvement decision, and as the model would predict, one that therefore requires systematic analysis of the arguments (CRP). Relying on peripheral cues, such as liking and attractiveness, or reciprocity, or simply expecting the source to trust the journalist, were, as predicted by the ELM, of limited effect when persuading someone on such a highly involving topic as the decision to tell the story of one's life in public. Rather, the appeal to talk on such a clearly personally relevant topic generated high involvement and required CRP, which in turn required recipients to have the motivation and ability to process the message.

For CRP to occur, each potential whistleblower had to gain the motivation and ability to process the message. To gain the ability to process the messages, the key factor appeared to be time, with knowledge about the implications of speaking out also important. Time was needed to scrutinise the message, the journalist, and subject them to the series of tests that three of these four whistleblowers quite systematically put the journalists through. Time also gave each source the ability to gain the extra knowledge needed to process the message. For motivation they relied on emotional arousal in a complicated process for which there is still no clear theoretical explanation. These factors will be discussed further below.

On the second decision, of who to speak out through, all the sources except Kelly engaged in CRP on the issues presented by the journalists. They needed to be convinced by clear argument, backed by action from the journalist. As the ELM literature makes clear (e.g. Booth-Butterfield & Welbourne, 2002; Dillard & Pfau, 2002; Perloff, 2008; Seiter & Gass, 2004) any one variable can act either as a peripheral or central route cue. The role that a variable takes depends on the level of elaboration (Dillard & Pfau, 2002, p. 161). Trustworthiness, expertness and independence, in particular, while normally peripheral factors in terms of the ELM,

were in three of these four cases (Smith, Nicholas and Johnson) subject to systematic thinking and testing by these women to a greater or lesser extent. It is not surprising they become subject to CRP since they formed a core part of the journalists' messages. It seems that only Kelly made her decision about who to speak to by using PRP. The most likely explanation is that she did not personally involved enough at this stage; perhaps because she was not named in the initial stories, she did not think the choice of journalist would have much impact on her personally. Later, once she realised her employer knew she was speaking out in the media, she decided she might as well be named, but in speaking to a range of different journalists found herself disappointed about the subsequent coverage. The implication of this is that journalists wishing to ensure that a source will speak to them needs to ensure the source understands how it could affect them personally if the wrong journalist is chosen, and thus try and ensure that for a source the decision of who to speak to is a CRP-based decision.

8.3 Message and other factors

All the journalists in this study used similar message factors to persuade their sources to talk, though Kitchin also emphasised some additional, peripheral factors. All used a common journalistic plea (See e.g. Spark, 1999) about the importance of speaking out for the good of society and that they could be trusted. Kitchin also mentioned his expertness as a journalist to all three women, and used peripheral factors such as liking and social attractiveness. But he also used a CRP-based message; with Nicholas, it was more sophisticated; two-sided, ending with a question, and using evidence. Likewise, his message to Smith involved evidence – he showed her the documents and asked her to confirm them. What can we say about the role of message factors based on these cases? Clearly, as the ELM predicts, on a topic of high personal relevance (as exposing one's story in public surely is) the message being delivered will need to rely on factors that appeal to CRP.

Another interesting point about the message is that the content of the journalists' messages was quite similar in nearly all cases, and followed the common appeal to speak because it is good for society. Yet this message content, while it was reasonably effective at changing attitudes, was not so effective at translating attitudes into action. In all cases there were other reasons why the women decided to go public – to “get the truth out there”, to stop the same thing happening to others, to send a message to the offender, or to advance their personal agenda. It is quite striking that in all cases they only reached high involvement and thus maximum motivation to process the message, when other factors came into play. For Smith, this was hearing herself bad-mouthed in public; for Nicholas it was realising that Rickards may go unchallenged unless she did something; for Johnson it was realising that Shipton may go unchallenged in her own community unless she spoke out; for Kelly it was a determination to right an injustice, but also to protect newly arrived prison officers she felt were being mistreated.

So we can conclude that journalists need to think carefully about the kind of messages they construct. Clearly “getting the truth out there” is effective – but given the range of reasons, message appeals should ideally suggest, or at least not preclude, other possibilities. Only in Nicholas' case was the appeal more sharply focussed, and specifically about the content of her case. As she says, it was very effective – she agreed on the spot that he was right, but that didn't mean she agreed to take the next step to go public – that was something she wanted to think about. So even when journalists persuade a source of the merits of the argument, that doesn't imply they will automatically agree to go public. That is a separate decision.

PRP factors have limited impact at the beginning, as Kitchin's approach to Smith and Nicholas showed. They liked him, and were prepared to hear him out, but were not prepared to go out on a limb on the basis of his kind eyes and good handshake or a nice cup of coffee. PRP factors may have got his foot in the door, but it was the strength and quality of his message that gained him a seat on the couch. The

exception to this is credibility, defined here as involving trust and expertness. While usually considered peripheral factors, in these cases they were a fundamental part of the message of both journalists, and were subject to careful scrutiny that amounted to CRP by all sources. All sources generated numerous thoughts and could clearly recall their thinking on their decision to trust these journalists – strong indicators of CRP. Their ability to trust them with highly personal information was of course personally relevant, an essential factor for CRP to occur.

Each of these sources elaborated on the trustworthiness of the journalist to a greater or lesser extent. At the lesser end of the scale, Kelly largely seemed to take it for granted. Johnson tested it with written questions and graduated revelation; Nicholas tested it with requests; Smith not only tested it with requests but also asked around.

One interesting point, predicted by the ELM but not mentioned in the journalism literature, is the extent to which the journalist's expertise was important to the source. Smith, Nicholas, and Johnson all gave careful consideration to the competence of the journalist, and tested it by a combination of asking around, checking on the Internet, and observing their responses to specific questions. As the ELM predicts, the extent of this elaboration on credibility factors depended on the involvement level of the source; the higher the personal stakes, the more it was pondered. For Kelly, revelations about workplace problems did not directly affect her self-image, until later when she became concerned that people might think she had exaggerated. For Nicholas, Johnson, and Smith, the revelations involved highly personal material with potentially very damaging effects on their image if it was interpreted by the public in the wrong way. For Smith, intensive elaboration did not really begin until she realised the issue was personally relevant to her, when her own reputation was slandered. Until then, it seems she processed the arguments peripherally. However, once she did engage, she undoubtedly engaged in CRP, at a sophisticated level, of not just the journalist's core message of needing to speak, but

also on the non-core, usually peripheral issues of his trustworthiness and expertness as well.

Since the journalists' trustworthiness and expertness were clearly so important to their stories being presented correctly, it is not surprising these factors were given systematic thought by the sources. Again, while many experienced journalists may expect to have to prove their trustworthiness, the extent of elaboration on their expertness, or competence, and independence would probably surprise many.

Thus it is clear that journalists dealing with potential whistleblowers should emphasise not only their trustworthiness, and their independence, but also their ability to see the story through to publication despite intimidation or setbacks.

Another useful insight provided by the ELM is that around argument quality. The depth and range of arguments marshalled by the journalists in these cases varied considerably. All invoked some element of public good, of stopping abuse of power, and the trustworthiness of the journalist. But while the pitch to Nicholas was very well-argued, based on evidence, and anticipated counter-arguments, that to Kelly, Smith and Johnson was mainly about the need to speak out to stop further abuse of power. What is interesting is that all the sources in this study also developed their own arguments, for their own personal reasons, none of which were anticipated or presented by the journalist. Kelly wanted to advance her own employment case; Smith wanted to stop the Huatas' personal attacks on her; Johnson wanted to send a message to the offender that she was no longer intimidated; Nicholas wanted to encourage other women to come forward, among other things. It is unlikely any journalist could have anticipated all of these complex personal reasons for speaking out. What all the journalists did do, however, was give the sources the time to develop and process these personal reasons, and provided encouragement and support where it was needed. The ELM literature makes clear that the role of argument quality in persuasion is still very much up for debate (Dillard & Pfau,

2002). Nonetheless we can conclude from this study that in terms of the ELM, that while argument quality in the journalists' message is of limited impact, argument quality overall may still be very important. What is important is not that the sender anticipates all possible arguments, but that they do not preclude or negate self-generated arguments when negotiating with the message receiver.

It is important to understand how potential whistleblowers process persuasive arguments from journalists, because as the ELM literature makes clear, the kind of processing that is used has a direct effect on the strength and durability of the resulting attitude change, and the likelihood of attitude change leading to behaviour change. It is clear from these cases that journalists need to understand that potential whistleblowers will be using CRP, and construct their approaches to take this into account. From a journalist's point of view, it is more desirable if potential whistleblowers do use CRP, because the resulting attitude changes will be more durable, reliable, and more likely to result in action. Simply identifying the depth and style of processing potential whistleblowers undertake when processing arguments about the need to speak out is one of the major findings of this study and should inform journalistic behaviour.

Finally, in terms of the ELM, it is clear that while journalists will need to expect sources to engage in CRP, and present arguments and evidence to support this, and not rely on PRP-based processing to persuade sources to talk, peripheral factors such as liking and attractiveness can still play a role. They can buy the time and attention to begin the process of engaging with the source, and opening the door to systematic processing of the complicated arguments required. The decision to speak out is difficult, effortful, and involves generation of a great number of thoughts; all indicators of some kind of central route processing. And that for all these women, the number of supporting arguments and their quality during the decision-making period did make a big difference.

8.4 The role of emotion in the ELM and CDT

For journalists, getting sources to gain the necessary involvement with the issue may require an understanding of the process of emotional arousal. All these whistleblowers had to become angry to overcome their personal barriers to speaking out. Three of them, Smith, Nicholas, and Johnson, had significant blocks to processing the message. For Smith it was not wanting to speak ill of others; for Nicholas concern about the effect on children; for Johnson it was concern that the media was untrustworthy. The ELM literature suggests that showing a message sender shares the same values can help overcome such value blocks (Perloff, 2008). But anger seemed a much more significant motivating factor, by their own convincing account.

The role of mood in the ELM is still a matter of debate. However, it is hard to ignore the role that anger played for all of these women. Anger seemed to be vital to help them marshal the arguments necessary to overcome a deeply held belief or value. Smith became angry when criticised by the Huatas in public; this forced her to challenge her own belief about not speaking ill of others. Nicholas became angry – or at least most angry – when weighing the costs of speaking out on children of the abusers; her anger helped her overcome her strongly held and understandable value about the risks to children. Johnson had long been afraid when thinking about whether Shipton's version of the truth could be questioned; she transformed this fear into something like anger, or at least determination to overcome her fears about the police control of the news media. Kelly was most angry when considering the effect on other employees of her employer's apparent carelessness; this challenged her beliefs about the worth of trying to work within the prison system to effect change. The whistleblower literature is clear that anger is often associated with the decision to speak out, and that this anger is often what helps whistleblowers overcome fear of the consequences of doing so (Hersh, 2002; Jos, et al., 1989). More recently, researchers have begun to propose models that can explain the role of emotion in

whistleblower decision-making, but these models have yet to be tested (Blenkinsopp & Edwards, 2008; Edwards, et al., 2009; Gundlach, et al.; Henik, 2008; Turner, 2007). This study goes further, firstly by providing an empirically-based explanation of how and why that anger may be generated, with reference to some of the models proposed, and secondly by explaining the role of other actors – in this case journalists – in this process.¹²

Four possible explanations are offered here. The first three come from the literature on the role of emotion in persuasion, particularly in relation to the ELM. The three dominant models suggest that emotion (in this case anger), can either a) act as heuristics “guiding decisions with minimal information processing or thought” (Nabi, 2002, p. 299) b) under conditions of moderate or high elaboration, affect the direction or depth of message processing, respectively, or c) under the Cognitive Functional Model, determine the depth and direction of information processing, depending on the type and intensity of emotion experienced. The CFM holds that once a message –induced discrete emotion is experienced, depth and direction of information processing is determined by the type and intensity of the emotion experienced, in conjunction with the expectation of whether the message content will help to satisfy the emotion-induced goal. Whistleblowers who experience message-induced anger are more likely to process those messages more carefully, and may change the direction of their thinking as a result of a message.

It seems clear that a) does not explain the processes at work here. All these women clearly thought hard about the issues, particularly when angry. They were thinking hard before they became angry, and may have come to a decision quite quickly after anger was ignited, but this should not be interpreted as meaning they were thinking

¹² (Whether or not journalists can or should deliberately try and arouse anger to empower sources to speak out is another ethical issue. If done safely and with support, there are good grounds for doing so. None of these women appear to regret their actions. However this may not be the case for all whistleblowers.)

heuristically rather than systematically. As is shown above, all can remember quite clearly how anger drove their decision; surely not a sign of heuristic-led thinking.

The second model, b), suggests that under the conditions of high elaboration involved here, the anger influenced the depth of elaboration; it helped these women gain the necessary involvement level to process the arguments around speaking out. This would explain why Smith, Nicholas and Johnson prevaricated before agreeing to speak; it implies they were simply unable to gain enough motivation to process the arguments about why they should speak out until that point. But there are two problems with this explanation. Firstly, it implies that these women did not consider the merits of the arguments until they became angry; something that doesn't seem convincing. Nicholas, for example, was quite able to process Kitchin's initial message about Dewar's deceit, without becoming angry; she simply said "You got me". The tone of her description of this is more akin to a wince than rage. Likewise, Smith was able to comprehend Kitchin's argument for speaking out; she simply did not think it convincing enough in comparison to the costs of doing so in terms of her own values. Johnson also could see the merits of speaking out; she just needed the extra motivation of deciding that she didn't want Shipton to go unchallenged in her own community to take action on that belief. All seemed to be processing the arguments; it is simply that they didn't entirely agree with the conclusion, that they should take action. The fact they didn't agree with the conclusion does not mean they didn't understand or process the arguments. The systematic and calculated way in which all these women tested the journalists on issues of trust suggests they were more than capable of thinking coolly and rationally and making decisions without the impetus of anger. It seems more likely that anger played a role in helping them overcome a deeply held value, than in aiding cognitive processing per se.

It seems clear from these cases that the third explanation, c), is a better fit. All these cases were already thinking hard about the message. Anger helped them overcome strong blocks to the message, such as strongly held values. Anger seemed to

motivate them to think not necessarily harder – they were already doing that – but also in different ways about the messages; it changed the direction of their thinking. Nicholas considered whether she should remain silent rather than challenge the police hierarchy, embodied by Rickards, and concluded to do so would be wrong; Johnson went through a remarkably similar process in relation to community hierarchy, embodied by Shipton, with similar result; Smith considered whether she should maintain her belief in not speaking ill of the Huatas, and came to the same conclusion; Kelly's anger came at an earlier stage, when she was confronted with management inaction, but again anger helped her think through the implication of abdicating to hierarchical pressure and decline to do so. Kelly's case is also different in that the journalist arrived after the angering process, but still provided the same role, of providing an efficacious outlet for her feelings. By a process of deduction, we can conclude that the journalist's messages do not spark the anger by themselves; it comes from the whistleblower's own processing of their experiences, together with external prompts (e.g. seeing Shipton on TV). It does not matter when the journalist arrives, as long as they arrive soon enough after the anger to provide an outlet for it.

What gives this explanation further heft is its close relationship to Turner's Anger Activism Model, which proposes that "the extent to which people will process an anger appeal depends on the intensity of their angry feelings, and their perception of efficacy:" (2007, p. 115). We know that whistleblowers often need to feel anger in order to surmount their fear of speaking out (Glazer, 1999; Hersh, 2002). In these cases the journalists did not make an anger appeal; but, consciously or otherwise, they did make sure they were around often enough so that when one did come, they could enhance the sources' feelings of efficacy, by giving them an outlet for their anger. As Nabi (2002) has pointed out, we don't still don't know enough about the process by which emotion causes attitude and behaviour change to say clearly how emotion operated. But there is enough here to advance a proposition that one key role of journalists who interact with reluctant whistleblowers is to enhance their

efficacy, so that when the abused person's anger finally ignites, they have an outlet available.

The fourth explanation of the way in which emotional arousal affects the decision to speak out comes from Cognitive Dissonance Theory. All sources in this study mentioned occasions when they became angry, and that this coincided with critical moments of decision. All of these sources, except perhaps Kelly, experienced the psychological discomfort associated with CD at key points. Smith was upset at the Huatas' public criticism of her, and whether she should respond; Nicholas when confronted with evidence of Dewar's deceit, and later when deciding to challenge Rickard; Johnson when trying to decide whether to trust a journalist, when she was so distrusting of the news media; Kelly to a lesser extent when she realised she may not be believed in the public eye. For all of these people, this discomfort was associated with a decision to take a step to resolve this discomfort, by acting. In all cases, an argument can be advanced that each source was experiencing cognitive dissonance provoked, if not explicitly by the journalist, then by the situation the journalist helped create. How can we say this? Because in each case the anger and discomfort were around the source's perceived right to speak out. In Smith's case, she became angry at being excoriated in public, a situation that required her to defend herself, but which would require a direct conflict with her own value of not speaking ill of people she knew well. She resolved this by changing her value. For Nicholas, one strong moment of discomfort was when she considered the effect of publication on her abusers' children. She also experienced anger (she "got her shit rag out"), when she perceived that some may have thought she should not expose Rickards because he was in authority. Johnson experienced discomfort close to anger at the perception that she should not challenge her abuser in his own community. The fact that these perceptions were not explicitly mentioned by the journalists or anyone else does not really matter – they were clearly real for the sources themselves. And it is unlikely that any of these situations of discomfort would have

arisen if publication was not under consideration. Thus we can conclude that journalists can best aid the decision-making process not by anticipating and countering all arguments against speaking out, but by inducing cognitive dissonance. They can do this by simply suggesting that speaking out is something the potential whistleblower can and has a right to do, and leave them enough time and space to process their own internal arguments for and against this proposition. Ideally, they will remain in touch enough during this process to assist with any queries the source may have, or to help dispel any unhelpful beliefs that arise. In each case, to varying degrees, besides evidence that the message provoked discomfort, other factors indicating CD were present; an issue important to the individual and touching on self-belief; free choice of the subject behaviour; beliefs subject to disconfirmation, social support for these beliefs, discomfort that required extensive thought to resolve, and above all, eventual attitude change AND behaviour change.

The CDT disconfirmation bias paradigm does provide a neat explanation of the way in which each of these women overcame their relative difficulty in speaking out. Most of these women can also be described as holding a questionable belief which was subsequently discredited or disconfirmed. Smith believed (implicitly) the Huatas would not speak ill of her; Nicholas believed Dewar was her friend; Johnson believed the news media could not be independent. When these beliefs were challenged, all would have been required to construct a new belief to sustain the questionable belief. However, to do so would have required their support network abet the construction of such a belief. Kitchin, by enrolling Smith and Nicholas' close family in the process, ensured this could not happen. It is less clear that Johnson had a similar belief underpinning her previous silence, because she makes no mention of having to discuss overcoming it with her support group, in the way that Smith and Nicholas did. One possibility though is her mistaken belief that the news media was always in the pocket of police. Taylor was able to disprove this without her

apparently needing to consult her family, though she may have done so. Kelly does not appear to have had any such beliefs – she proceeded quickly from Ryan’s prompt to talking to the media.

Dillard and Pfau (2002) suggest that the role of cognitive dissonance is still not cemented in the persuasion literature, and any conclusions must be drawn tentatively and with caution. There are too many variables at play here to state such a hypothesis with much certainty. We don’t know enough, for example, about the nature of dissonance, such as whether it is simply anger by another name, or something more complex. Nor do we know much about which variable controls the decision to speak; the hypotheses advanced above suggest it is the ability to reduce a disconfirming belief; CFM and AAM suggest it is to do with providing an efficacious outlet for feelings, and learning to think in different ways about the message. But it is possible, until then, to consider both explanations in parallel, where CDT explains the impact of the dissonance, and predicts some of the conditions under which it will result in speaking out, and the CFM and AAM suggest the nature of the dissonance, and explain why it leads to action.

However, the most convincing explanation of the elicitation of emotion in these cases is provided by the IRM. It seems mostly likely that Smith, Nicholas, Johnson and Kelly’s experience of anger in the whistleblowing process depended on how and when they reprocessed the memories of their experiences in conjunction with their changed perceptions of those experiences, the changing topography of the situation (as new facts emerged), and their changed values and attitudes that resulted from their interaction with the journalists. For Smith, her interaction with Kitchen helped her see that the Huatas’ behaviour was wrong, regardless of how well she knew them, and that she could stop it; it thus he changed not only her appraisals around efficacy, but also legitimacy (when it is OK to speak ill). This meant that the next instance of Huata bullying her resulted in a reprocessing of those stimuli, but this time not into fear, but into anger; and, in line with the CFM and AAM, helped

motivate her to take action, in the form of speaking out. For Nicholas, a similar process occurred. Her interaction with Kitchen changed her perceptions of her self-efficacy and about whether it was appropriate to speak out when it could affect children (legitimacy); these changed appraisals meant that when the memory of Dewar and Rickards was next accessed, in conjunction with new information about Dewar's deceit, the information was reprocessed not into fear, but into anger. This was a crucial moment in motivating her to process the decision around speaking out. In Johnson's case the topography did not seem to change – she did not learn new facts about her abusers – but certainly her attitudes about what she could do about the situation did – perhaps indicating a change in her coping appraisals. Kelly's case is different in that the main eruption of anger came before the journalist was involved. She did not need any interaction with a journalist to help her see the abusive action in a different light, or unearth new facts which were then reprocessed into anger rather than fear. Kelly also differs from the other three women in that she was, at least on the surface, much better equipped to stick up for herself. Unlike the others, she was not coming from a position of having been sexually abused or criminalised; she was a lawyer, with a very good knowledge of employment law. The fact that her anger was not delayed, as in the other three cases, suggests that her coping (and possibly legitimacy) appraisals were relatively high and helped her quickly process the threatening situation into anger rather than shame or fear.

Another striking difference between the first three cases and Kelly's is that Kelly does not seem to have had an underlying value or belief that impeded her decision to speak out to the news media. She does mention a concern not to come across as shrill; and was partly motivated in her decision to speak by wanting to balance what in her view were the unfair public accusations of the Dutch prison officers. But unlike the others, she did not seem to need the anger to overcome any strongly held value; the anger simply helped confirm her in what seemed a logical extension of the path she was already launched on. The first three only became angry some time after

journalistic intervention, and they needed that anger to overcome a value or attitude that hindered their motivation to speak out. It would be wrong to conclude that a change in their appraisal criteria or attitudes initiated by the journalist was the sole reason, but it does seem likely that this in conjunction with a changed topography (i.e. new facts), often thrown up by the journalist, did make a difference. It is impossible in a study design such as this to isolate which factors tipped the balance, but the beauty of the IRM as an explanatory model is that it allows for many factors, provided there is opportunity to reprocess these. For at least three of these women, there clearly was the opportunity (i.e. time) to do this.

It thus appears that by provoking the potential whistleblower to access memories and perceptions of their abusers, and of abusive situations, but this time in a context which included new facts and new perceptions of their own efficacy, and of the legitimacy, coping and possibly other criteria with which to appraise the experience, some of the journalists here made it more likely that the information was reprocessed into anger rather than fear. This anger then helped motivate the sources to speak out. How sustainable the resulting changed emotional state was in part depended on the reliability and sensitivity of the journalist in remaining alongside the whistleblower and supporting them while they learnt to live with the new emotional experience. In a sense then, these journalists must act as a good therapist; they should accept that their interaction is going to provoke strong emotion, and possibly change that emotion for the better, but such deep changes in individuals must not be taken lightly. Like any good therapist, they should accept that once entered into that process, they have a duty to see it through. The way that relationship can develop is discussed in the next section.

8.5 Relationship Effects

It is striking that the three women in this study who remain most positive about their experience of speaking out are also those who had the most satisfactory relationship with a journalist. The length of time and effort involved in the decision to speak out, and the amount of interaction that took place between these journalists and sources suggest strongly that this interaction does meet Kelley's oft-cited definition of a relationship of two people exerting "strong, frequent and diverse effects on one another over an extended period of time" (1983, p. 4) and therefore in an exploratory study such as this one it would be worth considering relationship theory for the light it casts on the quality and direction of this relationship.

The Investment Model holds that the durability of relationship depends not only on satisfaction and availability of alternatives, but on the level of investment. This is mediated by commitment. Commitment emerges "as a consequence of increasing dependence" and is defined as "intent to persist in a relationship, including long-term orientation toward the involvement as well as feeling of psychological attachment to it" (C. E. Rusbult, et al., 2006, p. 618).

Based on these criteria, it is clear that Smith, Nicholas and Johnson all felt themselves in a committed relationship with the journalist. Kitchin and Taylor also seemed to reciprocate those feelings. While Taylor doesn't call it a relationship, and is more traditional in the way he talks about the interaction with the whistleblower, his commitment is clear. Both these journalists stuck with the relationship, despite demands that required them to compromise their goals. Kitchin explicitly mentions his feelings of attachment to Nicholas, and wonders about their propriety, in professional terms. He doesn't explicitly mention an attachment to Smith, but he describes her in sympathetic terms, and went to considerable lengths to help her even after her story had been published (Kitchin, 2008). Taylor also showed intent to persist; agreeing to Johnson's preconditions for publishing the story,

accommodating her anxieties, and making the effort to go and meet her even after her stories had been published. He does not mention any attachment to her, and upholds traditional journalistic values about detachment (P. Taylor, 2009) but at the very least appeared to hold favourable views towards her. Nonetheless, the degree of attachment is hard to quantify and would benefit from more precise measurement in later studies. In each case, the journalists demonstrated commitment to the relationship. Commitment was vital for the relationship to grow; it helped both parties through the diagnostic situations which arose in which trust was challenged and eventually strengthened. This commitment can be explained in terms of lack of alternatives – Smith was alienated from other journalists by their pushiness and bias; Johnson was suspicious of all of them; while Nicholas did not know any when Kitchin met her. Likewise, both Kitchin and Taylor needed these women, as they lacked any alternatives. Thus, as the Investment Model holds, lack of alternatives helped drive commitment.

The Investment Model also holds that commitment is mediated by investment in the relationship. Three of the four women here – Smith, Nicholas and Johnson - required the journalist to invest in the relationship, in time, and through taking a professional risk. In Smith's case, this was to delay publication, in Nicholas's it was to take her word on trust, in Johnson's it was to publish her story initially without the insurance of her real name attached to it. In return, each of these women invested more in the relationship; Smith gave the verification help Kitchin needed; Nicholas took greater steps to help gather the evidence, including wearing a concealed microphone; Johnson gave up her anonymity. As Rusbult (2006) asserts, this investment helped drive their commitment, and their growing commitment was a mirror of the deepening trust between these women and the journalists. What seems strikingly apparent about these three cases is the extent to which diagnostic situations were the crucible in which trust was rendered. Diagnostic situations – such as Smith asking for a delay in publication, or Johnson asking Taylor to persist with her despite not

giving him what he wanted initially - allowed all three women (Smith, Nicholas and Johnson) to use the relationship as a vehicle to test the trustworthiness and to a lesser extent competence of the journalist. It was only through this testing and response over a period of time, in particular through actions rather than words, that they gained the trust they needed to follow through on the requested behaviour. Each of the women explicitly mentioned trustworthiness and commitment as being vital to the establishment of their trust.

The Investment Model does seem a good explanation for this collaboration of factors. However it is possible there are other relationship models that could apply. Another way of looking at the relationship is as a therapeutic relationship. For Smith, Nicholas, and Johnson, it was collaborative, client-centred (in the sense that their needs were, if not paramount, at least not discarded) and provided a safe environment in which their experiences could be elucidated through guided questioning. All these three women felt the quality of this relationship was important to them. They also felt warmly towards the journalist as a result, and say that having some control over the rate of disclosure helped gain a greater degree of disclosure. Kitchen and to a lesser extent Taylor were prepared to commit to the potential whistleblower in a way that other journalists, constrained by the journalistic norm of detachment, were not. Kitchen, in particular, was prepared to take responsibility for educating and guiding frightened and vulnerable people through the unknowns of media exposure.

Although the strength of these relationships and their importance to these women is clear, their importance in a person's decision to speak out is less so. Simply being in a relationship does not predict action. Kelly seemed to enjoy no such close relationship. Apart from Ryan, she clearly did not feel any close relationship with any of the journalists. Some of them treated her quite cavalierly, by her own account. Yet Kelly is a clear example of the fact that a whistleblower can decide to speak out with people she hardly knows and can in no sense be described as being in a

relationship with. In particular, on a key point of the disclosure of her identity, she did not enjoy the degree of control and the amount of time to decide to do this that the other women did (except with Ryan and Crewdson). This did not prevent her revealing her identity, although it clearly did affect how she felt about it afterwards. It could thus be argued that the quality of the relationship may not make any difference to the degree of disclosure, and just slow down the rate. However, the nature of the information Kelly was disclosing was not as personal or potentially damaging both for herself and others as that of the other three whistleblowers. It may well be that in cases of such high risk, the quality of the relationship is important; further studies could look at whether degree of disclosure is mediated by quality of relationship, with degree of risk as a controlling variable. What we can say – and this violates a commonly espoused journalistic canon - is that a more committed, collaborative relationship does not preclude disclosure by vulnerable, at-risk individuals, and may well be a precondition for it.

8.6 General Effects

As noted in Chapter Three, consideration will also be given to these four cases in a general sense, outside the theoretical context. What factors stand out as important for these women in speaking out? Firstly, for the decision to speak, these cases do affirm the key points noted in the whistleblower literature; namely they all had to become angry at one point or another to get over their blocks to going public; three of the four acted to stop what they saw as wrongdoing happening to others; in a sense they did act, as the literature suggests, to uphold an image of themselves as moral people. Something that comes through strongly, and this is not something emphasised in the whistleblower literature, is the desire of all of them to “get the truth out there”; to put their truth on the public record; to not let the offender’s version go unchallenged. As the literature suggests, for all these women, anger was a

crucial motivating factor; each had to get angry in order to summon up the strength to overcome internal inhibitions about speaking out. In all cases this anger was provoked by the actions or idea of a specific person; for Smith it was the Huatas speaking ill of her; for Nicholas the idea that Rickards would go unchallenged because he was in the police; for Johnson the idea that Shipton would be back in her community unchallenged; for Kelly the actions of her managers in sidelining the concerns of her and her co-workers. There is a strong sense of personal betrayal in the way these women tell their stories; their trust in these people, or the institutions they represented, was betrayed. Like any betrayal, this resulted first in disbelief, and disappointment, before anger energised a reaction. As with a coiled spring, the shock of betrayal is first absorbed by compression and withdrawal, before the stored energy is released and the spring recoils. It is also clear that these women needed to find time to process the message about speaking out, and eventually become angry in their own time. Again the question is raised; why did their earlier anger not lead to action? One is drawn to the conclusion that the journalist was the key new variable; by providing an outlet, the journalist made the anger useful. However, it is also possible that the journalist acted in other ways to facilitate action, such as by boosting the confidence and self-esteem of these women.

As far as who to speak to, the cases affirm the emphasis in the journalism literature on the importance of trust. The trust Kitchin and Taylor established with Smith, Nicholas and Johnson was clearly highly valued by them, and they believed it helped them speak out. However, Kelly's more distant relationship with journalists raises the possibility that a highly trusting, close relationship is not essential for speaking out. It may be that some other variable explains this difference; perhaps, as has been mentioned, the fact that the abuse Kelly witnessed and experienced was not as bad as the other three women; and that for serious abuse cases, a close trusting relationship is vital. Certainly, it does not stop people speaking out. For Smith, Nicholas and Johnson, the honesty, communication and integrity demonstrated by

the journalists they dealt with was very important to them. But what also stands out, as much or more than the trusting relationship, is the degree of scrutiny three of these women put the journalists through; they assessed them for their independence, expertise, and commitment. If they were going to tell their stories in public, they wanted someone with guts and determination to see it through properly. Kelly also wanted this, and clearly felt disappointed. Although Ryan pursued the story at some length, it didn't result in the same sense of public affirmation, that something had been proved, that could be said of the other cases. It seems that if someone is considering putting their story out there, they want it to be believed. Smith, Nicholas and Johnson all felt vindicated; their truth was clearly publicly accepted over that of those they accused. Kelly felt not so, and attributes her disappointment in part to this. Thus it could be argued that what whistleblowers want from journalist is not just a good relationship, but also a result.

8.7 Conclusion

What can we conclude from the above cases? Firstly, blowing the whistle to a journalist is at least a two-step process, requiring two distinct decisions. The first is to blow the whistle, and these cases show that it is likely to be a CRP-based decision, requiring a message that is constructed to appeal to CRP-based processing. Thus it should be factual, logically persuasive, evidence-based, and should be delivered in a way that maximises the opportunity and motivation for the potential whistleblower to process it. These cases show that for the potential whistleblower, that usually involves careful consideration of the impact and consequences of the decision on the whistleblower, their family, the potential target, their families and society at large. Journalists need to be aware that reluctant whistleblowers will potentially have a wide range of reasons for doing so, and construct their arguments on a number of levels. Ideally they should show what they have concluded about the facts of the

case, as Kitchin did with Nicholas, and construct a two-sided, open-ended message on this basis. The appeal to speak out should emphasise the need to “get the truth out there”, not just claim that their speaking out will help society. The notion that only the whistleblower can help stop a wrong activity is also clearly an effective argument. Journalists should also take account of potential blocks that potential whistleblowers may have, and help them through these. These blocks may include notions that they shouldn’t speak ill of others, or that they are being disloyal, or causing harm to their abusers’ families. That is not to say journalists should manipulate potential whistleblowers around these, but at least they should present an alternative argument to these understandable concerns. In a similar vein, they should be aware that some potential whistleblowers may have very personal reasons for speaking out, and show that these are acceptable and not mutually exclusive to other motivations.

The second decision, about who to speak through, is also often, but not always, a CRP-based decision. While for some whistleblowers this is not given too much thought, for others it is clearly a highly strategic decision involving consideration of the journalist’s competence, trustworthiness and independence, and to a lesser extent their likeability. Although the ELM usually classifies these as PRP factors, for this kind of decision they clearly go to the core of the argument and are thus often assessed as CRP factors. In other words, the whistleblower will not simply take a journalist’s word for it that they can speak out through them, because they have come to trust and respect the journalist; they will weigh up carefully whether the journalist is in fact trustworthy and expert, and often seek other opinions on whether the journalist is or not. While trustworthiness is often emphasised as an important journalistic quality, the importance these whistleblowers placed on assessing journalistic competence as a factor in their decision about who to talk to is something this writer has not seen in the literature. Journalists may be tested and scrutinised and checked discreetly to hitherto unknown level, often without realising this is

happening. Potential whistleblowers have so much to lose they can behave with a degree of sophistication and determination which would come as a surprise to some journalists.

Yet many are understandably nervous and unsure about the workings of the news media. The challenge for journalists trying to persuade someone to tell their story is to make the point that how a story comes across – how expertly it is told – is very important in terms of how it is finally perceived in the public mind. An untruth will not be corrected if the journalist is not up to the task of presenting it forcefully. Thus the journalist's task is to persuade – albeit not in so many words – the potential whistleblower that the decision of which journalist is chosen is a central route question; one that has a direct personal consequence for the source; in this way, the competent journalist will be tested and judged on their competence and trustworthiness, rather than on factors such as dress, behaviour or some other less significant factor.

As both decisions are usually CRP decisions, in ELM terms, they require careful processing of a range of arguments, some of which will not be able to be anticipated by the journalist. The high personal stakes for the whistleblower make it more likely that both decisions will be weighed carefully, using CRP. CRP requires both motivation and ability, and these cases show that until sources are sufficiently motivated and able, they may avoid facing these two difficult decisions. Journalists can influence the latter in two crucial ways; by educating sources about the news media, keeping them as fully informed on their investigation as possible, and helping them with questions of ethics and other issues that may arise as they are pondering whether to speak; and secondly by giving sources the time to think through these issues, as Kitchin and Taylor did with Nicholas, Smith and Johnson. Motivation is more difficult; factors that can help it are reminding the source that only they can stop the wrongdoing, that it can affect their public image, and that they may wish to do it for the sake of their children. However, as these cases show,

gaining the courage to speak often requires the source to access a deep anger in order to change the depth and direction of their cognitive processing sufficiently to overcome deep personal values or fears about speaking out. It is still unclear exactly what sparks this anger and it difficult to deduce from these cases why sources become so angry at particular times and not at others. The best explanation seems to come from a combination of the IRM, CFM and AAM. In other words, iterative reprocessing of memories of past events, in the light of new facts introduced by the journalist and others, and probably changed attitudes about self-efficacy (coping) and notions of what is right and wrong (legitimacy) combine to reprocess this information into a new emotion – (usually anger) instead of the fear/ shame / resignation which had earlier been associated with such memories. This anger then influences the depth and direction of processing of arguments around speaking out, making it more likely that they will do so. A journalist who is already alongside the whistleblower and in a trusted relationship with them makes it more likely that the source will talk to them if and when anger strikes.

These cases also have implications for development of ELM theory. While not representative of more than the narrow group here, these cases collectively do suggest that argument quality is important, but its importance depends on the time at which it is presented. Secondly, they affirm the central role of emotion in CRP. There is evidence here that the messages and arguments used by journalists to persuade an individual to speak out can, over a period of time, also stimulate a transformation of emotion by changing the way the individual appraises their earlier experiences. The transformed emotion – especially from fear or shame to anger – can then motivate processing of the journalist's messages and also change the direction of processing. These cases also affirm the complicated way in which usually peripheral factors such as credibility (trustworthiness and expertness) can act as CRP factors if they are central to the issue at hand. They also suggest that journalists can play a role in igniting the anger that is often a precondition for whistleblowers'

speaking out, by enhancing their sense of efficacy about such action. Journalists can be important – though not essential – actors in this process because by offering an action-related outlet for the anger, they enhance the potential whistleblower's feelings of efficacy. Journalists can increase the likelihood that the potential whistleblower will speak out by demonstrating that anger-related action will be successful, through publication of a story which results in change.

The applicability of CDT is less useful. It is clear that there is dissonance, but that tells us little about how or why or when that dissonance results in a need to resolve that dissonance by speaking out. The above explanation using the IRM seems more useful here. However, one factor mentioned raised by the CDT disconfirmation paradigm is strikingly apparent here; the way in which a whistleblower's support network can play an important part in helping them decide to speak out by helping to disarm unreasonable beliefs that may obstruct publication.

Relationship effects may not be essential to persuading reluctant whistleblowers to speak out, but they do not impede it, need not compromise journalistic values, and almost certainly help. These cases also show that relationship models such as the Investment Model and the Therapeutic Model can be applied and offer useful insights in the journalistic setting. They affirm the central role of commitment in trust-building, particularly in carrying both journalist and source through difficult moments in the relationship. The Investment Model's proposition that the investment by both parties helps sustain this commitment seems to hold here. Similarly, these cases demonstrate that the central tenets of the Therapeutic Model apply well to good journalistic-source relationships. Keeping the relationship client-centred, collaborative and safe did not ultimately conflict with journalistic objectives, except perhaps to slow the pace of revelation, and may have enhanced its depth, and certainly the durability of the whistleblowers' satisfaction with the decision to reveal.

Beyond these theoretical effects, it is clear that whistleblowers, once approached, need time to think through the implications, and often to gather their own courage to speak out. This gathering may involve accessing a repressed anger and turning it to useful effect. When it comes to deciding who to speak to, these whistleblowers wanted trustworthy, independent and effective journalists committed to seeing the story through.

Chapter Nine - Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

9.2 The findings

9.3 A model of best practice: The Informed Commitment Model

9.4 Strengths, limitations and implications of this research

9.5 Implications for the ELM

9.6 Implications for whistleblower and witness literature

9.7 Towards a new theory of whistleblowing

9.8 Implications for the journalism literature and journalistic practice

9.9 Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

The literature on investigative journalism is growing fast, reflecting the growth in the practice of the genre over the past 40 years. There is also a growing body of literature on news sources, particularly those who foster professional relations with journalists to advance a news agenda. But so far there has been little about another important group of news sources – those who do not interact with the news media regularly, but who come forward, perhaps for the one and only time in their lives, to tell an important story that the public needs to know. These people are often vulnerable and reluctant, yet decide to risk careers, reputations and even the threat of physical harm to help journalists shed light on matters of public interest. Yet for every person that does come forward, there are likely to be many that would like to but don't. We need to know more about how those that do step out into the public

space think, and what they need from journalists and others to make that step safely and confidently.

This study has attempted to answer those questions through the analysis of four cases in which reluctant, vulnerable whistleblowers risked retribution to speak out about matters of significant public interest. It applied established theories on persuasion, emotion and relationships to explain the motivations and decision-making process of these people, and in particular the role of the journalist in that process. It compared the relevance of these theories in explaining this process, and concluded that some of these theories do help explain how and why these people decide to speak out. This study shows that the decision-making process is much more complex than has previously been shown, and in some cases requires a much higher level of commitment, engagement, integrity and neutrality from journalists than previously explained. It shows that some journalists do this, but as a matter of craft knowledge, and often instinctively, rather than consciously. This study explains how and why their good practice is successful in persuading people to speak out, and doing so in a way that does not exact unacceptable compromises from either journalist or source. It then builds on these explanations to produce a theoretical model of best practice for journalists wishing to persuade reluctant and vulnerable sources to speak out, and do so safely.

Although the establishment of a model of best practice was one of the primary aims of this study, there are other useful suggestions here for the theoretical literature. In particular, this study suggests a new way of looking at the role of emotion in whistleblower decision-making, and suggests the current emphasis on dual-process models in persuasion may need modification in the light of recent work on iterative models of cognitive and emotional processing.

9.2 The findings

This study compared four cases of investigative journalism, which relied on the testimony of whistleblowers for the story to emerge. All four cases involved reluctant, vulnerable sources, although the degree of reluctance and vulnerability varied across the cases. In each case, the journalist who persuaded the source to talk was interviewed about their approach to the source, and then the source was interviewed. The results were analysed in the light of established theories about persuasion, emotion, and relationships, using a coding sheet that identified key factors for each. As this was an exploratory study, a working hypothesis was deliberately avoided, to prevent occlusion of other relevant factors, which were included where appropriate.

Turning now to each of the research questions, in turn:

1. How well does the ELM explain the decision-making process of reluctant and vulnerable potential whistleblowers to speak out? AND:
2. How are messages, particularly from journalists, processed by the potential whistleblower and what impact do they have on attitude change (the decision to speak out)?

This study has shown that reluctant whistleblowers considering talking to journalists have to make two separate decisions; whether to speak out, and who to speak to. The Elaboration Likelihood Model is a useful way of understanding how sources make each of these two decisions. Although a widely-accepted model of persuasion effects, it has not been applied to the field of journalistic persuasion before. This study shows that it provides a convincing explanation of the processes at work. The ELM is a useful framework for looking at this process because it helps illuminate why and at what point individuals become highly motivated to think about the process of whistleblowing, and provides a framework for predicting what kinds of message factors will be influential under what circumstances. The ELM

proposes two routes to processing of persuasive messages. One is central route processing (CRP), for highly personal, high-involvement decisions that have significant impact on an individual's life. The second is peripheral route processing (PRP) for less significant decisions. The model holds that CRP decisions are made on the pros and cons of the argument, while PRP decisions are more likely to be influenced by peripheral factors such as the credibility (consisting of the expertness and trustworthiness) and attractiveness of the message sender. The ELM holds that to undertake CRP, individuals need motivation (M) and ability (A). Motivation comes from personal involvement, usually defined as something significantly affecting an individual's life. As the model predicts, the decisions of reluctant whistleblowers to speak out was a high involvement issue thought through carefully and systematically, using central route processing (CRP). All the sources here engaged in CRP on the issues presented by the journalists. To do that, they often needed to gain motivation and also often improve their ability to process the complex and highly important arguments involved. Identifying the style of processing used by reluctant whistleblowers is one of the major findings of this study, because it explains how, why and to what extent journalists' messages can influence this decision. As the ELM predicts, factors such as the credibility or attractiveness of the journalist were of less importance for this decision than questions relevant to the issue, such as; will my speaking out make any difference? Will it be effective? Is my point of view correct and will people believe me? Is it ethically justified to speak out given the effects it will have on other people? What will people think of me? If I don't do it, will anyone else? Can I do it safely? These are the kinds of arguments journalists need to speak to when persuading reluctant whistleblowers to make the first decision, to speak out.

However, journalists in this study used a common message; speak out because it is good for society. Journalists also emphasised their trustworthiness and expertness, and to a lesser extent their attractiveness. Neither of these messages was very

effective on the decision of whether to speak – in all cases the reluctant whistleblowers decided to go public for other reasons – to “get the truth out there”, to stop the same thing happening to others, to send a message to the offender, or to advance their personal agenda. The ELM provides a convincing explanation for this. The ELM predicts that on a topic of high personal relevance (as exposing one’s story in public surely is) the message being delivered will need to rely on factors that are convincing under CRP. Under the ELM, the credibility (trustworthiness, expertness and to a lesser extent attractiveness) of the message sender usually functions as a peripheral cue. These peripheral cues were, as predicted by the ELM, of limited effect on these whistleblowers engaged in CRP. In other words, it didn’t matter much that these women trusted the journalist, liked the journalist, and thought they were expert on the issue of whether speaking out was good for society, if they were processing the “good of society” argument centrally (on its merits), rather than peripherally, or if they were in fact processing some other argument centrally. In many cases, as we have seen, the key argument for these sources was something quite different and unforeseen by the journalist, such as whether to speak ill of others. However, this is not to say credibility was not thought through carefully by the whistleblower; the journalists’ trustworthiness, expertness and independence were subject to systematic thinking and testing by them to a greater or lesser extent on the decision of who to speak to. As any one variable can act either as a peripheral or central route cue, with the role that a variable takes depending on the level of elaboration, the extent of this elaboration on credibility factors appeared to depend on the involvement level of the source; the higher the personal stakes, the more it was pondered. These women were mostly highly involved; therefore they did elaborate on journalists’ credibility when it was relevant; i.e. on the second decision. (In particular, it is interesting that journalistic independence was so important to many of these sources) However, clearly these factors, in particular trustworthiness, although important, were not as central to these women on the first decision as the journalists thought, and the ELM explains how and why this was so.

Thus journalists need to think carefully about the kind of messages they construct. It is clear that journalists dealing with potential whistleblowers should emphasise not only their trustworthiness and expertness, but also their ability to see the story through to publication despite intimidation or setbacks (their “independence”). Also, clearly “the good of society” and “getting the truth out there”, and that “if you don’t do it, no one else can” are important and useful messages. However, given that all the whistleblowers in this study also developed their own arguments, for their own personal reasons, many of which were not anticipated or presented by the journalist, message appeals should be careful not to limit other internal arguments. One example would be the case of personal advancement; a message which posited that social good was the only reason for doing anything would possibly deter a potential whistleblower who was also keen, as in Kelly’s case, improve their chances in an employment case. While journalists will need to expect sources to engage in CRP, and present arguments and evidence to support this, and not rely on PRP-based processing to persuade sources to talk, peripheral factors such as liking and attractiveness can still play a role. They can buy the time and attention to begin the process of engaging with the source, and opening the door to systematic processing of the complicated arguments required.

The ELM is also useful because it highlights the crucial role of motivation in deciding whether these sources spoke out. As the ELM literature makes clear, even powerful arguments can fail if a receiver has strong personal values that block processing of the message. It is quite striking that three of these four women struggled to overcome significant personal value blocks to speaking out. They only overcame these blocks by accessing strong emotion, especially anger (the fourth woman also became angry, but it happened earlier and did not appear to play such a crucial role in overcoming a personal barrier to speaking out). While the role of emotion in the ELM is still unclear, these results suggest that it was vital in helping

message recipients gain enough involvement, and thus maximum motivation, to process arguments that conflicted with strong personal values.

Given the limitations of this study, it is not clear that journalists can influence this motivation level (although it is possible that they do, as a theory below suggests). What all the journalists did do, however, was give the sources the opportunity (by providing time, and enhancing their ability by helping with questions that arose) to develop and process these personal reasons.

These cases also highlight how journalists enhanced the opportunity for these sources to engage in CRP. They gained the opportunity to process arguments through being given time to ponder the costs and benefits of speaking out, and also by being educated in how the media works and how they could do a story with a journalist with minimum personal risk. Time was essential to this process; many of these had to process a complex series of thoughts, retrieve long-buried memories, process powerful and often hurtful emotions, while also integrating new information about the events and personalities involved. For many, the consequences of speaking out also affected their families, which required consultation and therefore more time. As these sources often had little experience of the media, or even a negative experience, they also needed the opportunity to learn how it could function to their benefit. As this study shows, journalists often helped them gain this experience in a safe and constructive way, through conversations and sometimes assistance in dealing with other more intrusive journalists, before they had to take the more difficult step of putting their own name and story out in the public domain. This learning process in turn enhanced the source's ability to process and evaluate the messages about speaking out and who to speak to.

On the second decision, who to speak out through, factors such as the credibility and attractiveness of the journalist were more important. The choice of journalist was usually a high involvement decision, requiring CRP. Although the credibility of the

message sender (in this case the journalist) is usually seen as a peripheral factor in the ELM, for three of the four women in this study – also those with the highest personal stakes – credibility was elaborated on extensively because it was a fundamental part of the message the journalist was delivering. As such they were subject to careful scrutiny by the source, involving generation of a significant number of thoughts. These women tested journalists for independence, expertness, reliability and trustworthiness, often in a thoughtful and systematic way.

To put this another way, the journalists' message that these women should speak out through them relied heavily on the journalists' claims that they were trustworthy and expert at their jobs. Three of these women weighed these arguments carefully and systematically tested and checked on the journalists over a period of time to gauge whether they were in fact trustworthy and expert. Only the fourth woman, Kelly, made her decision of who to speak to quickly and without a period of testing. She took the journalists mostly at their word that they were trustworthy and expert – evidence of a more PRP-based decision.

The ELM thus explains the differing effect of journalists' messages of trustworthiness, expertness and attractiveness under different conditions (see below, under RQ 2). The ELM also provides a useful context for understanding the role and impact of self-generated argument and emotion in the decision-making process. This is particularly important as in these cases both of these seemed more important factors than the arguments about trust or social good generated by the journalists. Reluctant whistleblowers often needed to overcome powerful internal arguments against speaking out, based on values and opinions unique to each, which could not be predicted or anticipated by the journalists. Emotion played an important part in each gaining the motivation (in ELM terms, the "involvement level") required to process these internal arguments. The ELM also explains the role of time in the decision-making process – and why these reluctant whistleblowers, even those apparently convinced by a journalists' argument, still needed time to come to a

decision to speak out; the reason was that they were often processing these complex internal arguments.

The ELM is useful in explaining how and why sources thought through the messages journalists gave them about the need to speak out, and how to speak out. It is particularly useful in that it provides a framework for illuminating the level of detail and effort sources needed to think through these very important decisions. It helps us see how hard-headed these whistleblowers were, and how carefully they thought, rather than simply felt their way through an often frightening, confusing process.

Identifying the depth and style of processing potential whistleblowers undertake when deciding whether to speak out and who to speak through is one of the major findings of this study and should inform journalistic behaviour. It is clear from these cases that journalists need to understand that these will usually be high-involvement decisions, and thus thought through carefully using CRP. Journalists should thus construct their approaches to take this into account. From a journalist's point of view, it is more desirable if potential whistleblowers do use CRP, because the resulting attitude changes will be more durable, reliable, and more likely to result in action.

3. How and when does emotion, particularly anger, arise in potential whistleblowers after their interaction with journalists, and to what extent does this appear to be influenced by their interaction with journalists?
4. What theory or combination of theories best explains the way in which emotion, especially anger, influences the potential whistleblower's decision to speak out?

This study affirms an observation from the whistleblower literature that anger is often a crucial motivating factor for potential whistleblowers contemplating speaking out. For all these women, the eruption of anger coincided with the decision

to speak, in particular to overcome significant internal concerns about the effects of speaking out that had previously inhibited them from going public.

The role of emotion in persuasion, and also in whistleblowing, is still not well understood. One of the unanswered questions from the whistleblower literature is how and why emotion erupts, often quite some time after the abusive situation has occurred. This study takes this further by providing an explanation, drawing on the persuasion and emotion literature, as to how and why anger plays this crucial role. The ELM holds that to use CRP, people need motivation and opportunity. For these women, motivation came when they realised the cost of not blowing the whistle, either through a threat to those they love, to their sense of themselves, or to how they would be seen by people they cared about. This motivation came in its own time, in response to external cues, rather than to specific messages from the persuader (in this case the journalist). However, identifying the overt reasons why they became angry does not explain exactly why it erupted when it did, or the more complex psychological factors that drove it.

The best explanation this study has found for the way in which strong emotion, and particularly anger, is elicited during the process of deciding whether to speak out comes from the Iterative Reprocessing Model (IRM). This model holds that an emotional episode is a result of a combination of low-level sensory input, which is evaluated in accordance with an individual's cognitive structures, including various appraisal criteria such as coping or legitimacy, and other goals, attitudes, and representations, including the facts (topography) of the situation itself. A change in an individual's appraisal criteria, or any of these other factors, can thus result in the same situation triggering a different emotion. These four women experienced anger at different times during the process of considering whether to speak out, and in each case it appeared that a different mix of the above factors ignited their anger. It is difficult or impossible in a study such as this to gauge changes in representations or physiological arousal, but these women's accounts strongly suggest that new facts

they learnt about their situations (the topography) and changing ideas about legitimacy and their ability to enact change (legitimacy and coping appraisals) resulted in a long-held resignation, shame, or fear suddenly boiling over into anger. For some, the new facts they learnt seemed to be the major cause; for others, it was seeing old behaviours in new ways. The IRM seems the best fit because it explains how all these factors - rather than only one or two - could interact with and affect each other. Also, its emphasis on recursive processing leading to different emotions at different times explains how the gradual influence of new facts and appraisals/ attitudes could gradually transform an individual's perception of a situation and thus the associated emotion it evokes. It thus seems the most holistic and complete explanation.

Once activated, for all of these women, anger seemed to be vital to help them marshal the arguments necessary to overcome a deeply held and quite understandable compassion and concern for the effects of their speaking out on others. Anger helped them overcome strong blocks to speaking out, such as strongly held values. One convincing explanation for this effect comes from the Cognitive Functional Model. The CFM holds that once a message –induced discrete emotion is experienced, depth and direction of information processing is determined by the type and intensity of the emotion experienced, in conjunction with the expectation of whether the message content will help to satisfy the emotion-induced goal. Whistleblowers who experienced message-induced anger were more likely to process those messages more carefully, and change the direction of their thinking as a result of a message. Anger motivated them to think not necessarily harder – they were already doing that – but also in different ways about the messages. Turner's Anger Activism Model also helped explain why this anger not only changed thinking, but led to action (speaking out). This model suggests that the extent to which whistleblowers process an anger appeal will depend on the intensity of their angry feelings and their perception of efficacy. Journalists in this study did appear to

enhance the potential whistleblowers' perceptions of efficacy by giving them a way of acting on their feelings (speaking out) which promised results. Neither of these models is as well-grounded empirically as the IRM, and these findings need to be interpreted with caution. But by using these as building blocks together with the most recent thinking about the elicitation of emotion, some observations can be made on the role and function of emotion in whistle-blowing.

It is proposed that accessing strong emotion, particularly anger, is often essential in the decision by whistleblowers to speak out, because it helps motivate them to process arguments around doing so, and in particular it helps them to overcome a strongly held value or inhibition against doing so. This anger is often sparked by a direct or perceived threat to their freedom of expression, although the underlying causes may be wider. It is proposed that the reason why a potential whistleblower may suddenly feel anger about a situation that had previously aroused different emotions, such as shame or fear, is because their interaction with the journalist and others sparks a period of intense cognition, that includes a process of cognitive adjustment of attitudes and possibly appraisal criteria, that combine with representations (such as memory) and the emerging topography of the situation to help them to reprocess the emotion associated with the experience from one of fear, shame, sadness or resignation into a different emotion such as anger. These reappraisals may be around coping – the journalist may help strengthen the whistleblower's ability to cope with the situation – or legitimacy – they see more clearly how wrong a situation they had tolerated was. There may also be other appraisal criteria not identified by this study. It is proposed that journalists or others who interact with the whistleblower set the process in motion by suggesting the action of speaking out, and can significantly influence the process by engaging and discussing the situation with the whistleblower as they reprocess their experiences. Once these re-appraisals have taken hold, the original situation – along with any new facts - is evaluated differently and may suddenly evoke powerful new

emotions, such as the anger seen in this study. This anger helps change the depth and direction of thinking of potential whistleblowers, often in the direction of speaking out, rather than silence. If we accept, as the IRM proposes, that this processing is an iterative process, then it seems likely there will be a cumulative effect.

The observations above explain the crucial impact of emotion on the decision-making process of the women in this study, particularly why anger erupted at a time quite distant from the event, and how others close to the individual may have influenced that process. It also explains how journalists can increase the likelihood that the potential whistleblower will act on that anger by demonstrating that anger-related action will be successful, through publication of a story which results in change¹³. These findings are tentative, and based on a theory (the IRM) that is itself new, in an area – emotion – that is still not well understood. Further work is needed to operationalise and test this theory under conditions that prove or disprove the causal relationships argued here.

5. How well does Cognitive Dissonance Theory, in particular the disconfirmation paradigm, explain a potential whistleblower's decision to speak out?
6. Can journalists influence this process, in particular by enlisting the close support networks of potential whistleblowers?

CDT holds that people act to reduce dissonance (a state of psychological discomfort) produced by messages that highlight inconsistent beliefs. The disconfirmation paradigm holds that people may intensify beliefs that block their incentive to process CD-producing messages. Such beliefs are more likely to be subject to disconfirmation if an individual's support group does not support them.

¹³ Obviously whether a potential whistleblower should act on that anger raises ethical issues that the journalist should take into account. These issues are discussed further in the context of the relationship between the journalist and the whistleblower.

This explanation does provide an explanation of the way journalists interacted with sources in these cases. Just as a good therapist can encourage discomfort in a safe setting, and help the patient process their emotions safely and overwrite thought processes distorted by abuse, so some of these journalists fulfilled some of the same role. It is clear that their message of speaking out did provoke discomfort, which the sources did seek to resolve. Some of them also had beliefs that were stopping them speaking out. By enlisting the whistleblowers' support groups in two of the cases, the journalists also helped identify and counter these beliefs.

The question then becomes why did they need to act on that changed narrative, by speaking out in public? CDT offers a crude explanation of this. For a source to gain a belief that their viewpoint is legitimate, but then silence it to avoid disturbing or challenging a publicly stated counter-belief, would have been irrational, and caused psychological discomfort (dissonance). As we have seen, some sources managed to reconcile this dissonance by intensification of other beliefs (it would hurt the children to speak out; journalists won't listen anyway; don't speak ill). When these other beliefs were shown to be false, the sources were, as CDT predicts, left with no option but to resolve the dissonance by speaking out. It is interesting that with two of the most vulnerable, reluctant whistleblowers, the journalist involved (Kitchin) did enlist the whistleblowers' support groups, and they were cited by them as influential in making their decision.

However, while this may explain the *results* of the process, it doesn't really explain the *mechanism*; or why psychological discomfort led to a decision to act to remove the discomfort. Given the likelihood of retribution from speaking out, it could be just as dissonance-limiting to concoct a reason for not speaking out. Given the limitations of this study, it is difficult to make an overwhelming case for the application of the CDT, CFM, AAM or IRM. However, on the facts here, the IRM does seem the best explanation of the way in which emotion is elicited in this process.

7. How well does the Investment Model explain the interaction between journalist and potential whistleblower?
8. How well does the therapeutic relationship model explain the interaction between journalist and potential whistleblower?
9. What role does the quality of relationship (e.g. level of investment and commitment, or safety of relationship) play in the potential whistleblower's decision to speak out?

The ELM and CDT models do not explain why journalists and sources persist with each other when it seems the message is not being processed, or being processed and producing an unsatisfactory answer. The participants in this study did not simply meet, discuss the idea of doing a story, then go off to think about it. Often the source thought about it, decided no, and told the journalist so. They did not say: "I've sat down and processed your message, and gone through all the pros and cons and here is the answer." The process was more tidal, ebbing and flowing, with the source at times appearing keener to talk, and then backing off. Although these whistleblowers wanted journalists to demonstrate their independence, they also expected a level of commitment from the journalist. The anecdotal literature shows this is a problematic area for journalists, who often struggle to define a boundary between encouraging the whistleblower and showing they want to believe them, and reserving the right to check what they say. Often this dilemma is couched in the language of objectivity and attachment, as when Kitchen worried about become too "attached" to Nicholas. As this study shows, successful journalists managed to negotiate this by demonstrating commitment to the truth, while reserving their independence; a position entirely acceptable to many of the whistleblowers interviewed here. The Investment Model provides a good explanation of what kept the journalist and source engaged through this at times nerve-wracking process.

The Investment Model was developed in part to explain why parties persist in sometimes unsatisfying relationships. It holds that the level of investment by both parties helps cement their commitment to the relationship; this commitment helps them keep going through bad times and builds trust. As this study has shown, this is a convincing explanation of the relationship dynamic described here between source and journalist. Both parties invested in the relationship; the journalist put in time and effort, and sometimes bet their professional reputation on the source's word, in the expectation that a credible story would result. The source invested time and effort in thinking about and remembering often painful events, and then in risking public odium through their publication. This investment helps both parties stay in the "relationship"; it kept the journalist going when the source appeared to be indifferent or unhelpful or unwilling to risk publication; it kept the potential whistleblower committed when they wondered about the journalist's or news organisation's commitment to the story, and the effects of publication. Once they had effectively begun a relationship with a journalist, the journalist's commitment was vital to ensuring trust developed. The journalist's commitment was, as the Investment Model would suggest, a result of their dependence on the source; they had few alternatives, often great investment, and the hope at least, of high satisfaction. This, as the model holds, affirmed their commitment. This commitment helped these sources develop the desire to increase their own dependence on the journalist. This commitment was demonstrated through "diagnostic situations" in which one side or the other made themselves vulnerable, or put something at risk. The source would often withhold co-operation, until they had observed how the journalist performed in such diagnostic situations; when the journalist demonstrated commitment by risking something to stay in the relationship, the source was able to develop trust and increase their dependence. Thus commitment did appear in these cases to be the moderating factor that drove dependence by both parties. Commitment did not mean unqualified support; but a determination to persist with the relationship, even when it had costs for each party.

This model did provide a neat explanation of how successful journalists built sources' trust, by allowing sources their times of doubt and withdrawal, and not threatening or cajoling or otherwise prioritising their own needs over those of their sources. For these whistleblowers, blowing the whistle was as much about leaving one set of relationships as it was about forming another (with a journalist). The costs of doing this were often high; some had invested much effort and time in their previous situation. It seems logical that journalists needed to demonstrate that this level of investment, and the resulting dependence, could be transferred into the new relationship with the journalist.

The kind of relationship that developed between these journalists and whistleblowers can also be seen as a therapeutic relationship. It was no coincidence that the three women in this study who were most positive about their experience of speaking out were also those who had the most satisfactory relationship with the journalist. For Smith, Nicholas, and Johnson, it was collaborative, client-centred (in the sense that their needs were, if not paramount, at least not discarded) and a safe environment in which their experiences could be elucidated through questioning. All these three women felt the quality of this relationship was important to them. They also felt warmly towards the journalist as a result, and felt that having some control over the rate of disclosure helped them to a greater degree of disclosure. Nonetheless, as Kelly still decided to speak out, without the backing of such a solid relationship, it could be presumed that the quality of the relationship made no difference to the degree of disclosure, except to affect the rate. However, the nature of the information Kelly was disclosing was not as personal or potentially damaging both to herself and others as that of the other three whistleblowers. It may well be that in cases of such high risk, the quality of the relationship is important; further studies could look at whether degree of disclosure is mediated by quality of relationship. What this study does show is that a more committed, collaborative

relationship does not preclude high-risk disclosure, and may well be a precondition for it.

10. Overall, what is best practice for journalists wishing to persuade reluctant, vulnerable whistleblowers to speak out?

These expert investigative journalists clearly followed some common practices when approaching and persuading reluctant, vulnerable sources to tell their stories in public. Firstly, when approaching sources, they had an intuitive understanding that speaking out was often a high involvement issue for sources, requiring intensive, thoughtful processing, and allowed sources the opportunity to do this processing. This usually involved both time and assistance in learning about the role and capabilities of the news media, as well as the pros and cons of the various arguments that arose around the issue of speaking out. These journalists may not have been aware of what factors their sources were elaborating on, but they helped as best they could. What is important was not that the journalist anticipated all possible arguments, but that they did not preclude or negate self-generated arguments when negotiating with the message receiver.

They also allowed time for the emotional processing involved in speaking out to take place, and knew how to support that. They did this by remaining in close contact with the whistleblower while they were deciding whether or not to speak out, and by being available to talk through issues that arose. Viewed from the perspective of the IRM, they helped the whistleblower go through a process of reappraising situations according to new ideas and values, in the light of their own representations and the changing topography of the situation, and experience the subsequently changed emotions that arose. From the perspective of Cognitive Dissonance, they helped the whistleblower by helping to disarm beliefs that obstructed the path to publication, and often did this in conjunction with the whistleblower's close friends and relations.

They also showed an understanding that engaging with a potential whistleblower involved entering a relationship, and was seen by the whistleblower in that way. They understood that imposed requirements on the journalist. In particular, this required committing to the relationship and to taking the time to understanding the source's perspective thoroughly. They also understood that demonstrating that they would if necessary put the source's interests ahead of their own (without compromising truth) was essential to building trust. They demonstrated this by being alert to and performing well in the various diagnostic situations that arose during the course of the relationship. Journalists also understood the importance of the basic principles of the therapist/ client interaction, including collaboration, safety, client-centredness, communication and guided questioning. This commitment to the relationship included guiding the source through the often scary process of publication and post-publication media attention.

Successful investigative journalists are indeed “master practitioners”, but the arts they practice are not arcane, or unique; rather they are founded in empirically proven theories of persuasion and relationships.

9.3 A model of best practice: The Informed Commitment Model

This study now proposes a model of best practice for approaching and persuading reluctant, vulnerable sources to tell their stories in public. This model has been named the Informed Commitment Model, as it seems to encapsulate the values underpinning good practice – informed consent, and commitment to getting the truth out there.

1. Journalists should approach reluctant and vulnerable sources in a non-threatening way, if possible by asking a trusted intermediary for an introduction.

2. Journalists should take the time to explain the reasons for doing the story, and the potential risks and benefits to the source. Journalists may lay out the reasons in their own way, although it may be that two-sided messages – which provide alternative scenarios - may work best. Journalists can and should emphasise their own credibility, such as their trustworthiness and expertness and independence, but they should not rely on these factors alone to persuade the source. They should be aware that a decision to speak out is a highly personal one for a source, and will thus require persuasion on the merits of the argument, regardless of how much they like or trust the journalist. They should also inform the source that the decision about which journalist they speak out through can have important consequences, and should be thought through carefully. Journalists should ideally ensure that the source's support group is included in this process, and that they also understand the reasons for doing the story.
3. Once the message has been delivered, journalists should give the source the time and opportunity to process it. They should be available to answer further questions during this time. This does not mean they cannot tell the source of their own deadlines and expectations, but they should not pressure or harass the source into making a decision before they are ready.
4. Journalists should be aware that by asking the source to consider their message, they have entered a relationship with the source, and it should be treated as such. They should commit to this relationship, which includes a commitment to being honest, to understanding their story as fully as possible, and if possible, seeing it through to publication. They should at all times be honest with the source, keep any commitments that are made, keep them informed of developments in the story, and inform them of what they can't tell them, such as confidential details of other sources, for example.
5. Journalists should be aware that during the decision-making process, the source may test them, by asking for more information, or making other

requests, and they should accommodate these as much as they are able to or explain clearly why they cannot.

6. Journalists should be aware that the decision-making process for a source to speak out is intensive, often agonising, and may involve the stimulation of intense emotions such as anger. This emotion may be vital for the source to gain enough motivation to process the arguments for speaking out, and to overcome personal inhibitions about doing so. Journalists should be aware that it is critically important that they remain available during this time, as in others, ready to answer any questions or help the source process internal arguments that may arise.
7. Once the source has decided to tell their story, the journalist should ensure that it is told fully and truthfully. They should also remain available to the source through the stressful period of publication and post-publication media attention, and not refrain from giving advice on dealing with other media. They should recognise that the source has placed a great deal of trust in them, and this trust necessitates an ongoing commitment of support. By providing this support freely in the early stages in particular, the journalist can help the source move more quickly through an often intense and stressful period and gain confidence in their new more public self.

9.4 Strengths, limitations and implications of this research

This study focused on a small and narrowly defined group. All were women, and all were vulnerable, often through sexual abuse or workplace bullying, and all were anxious about the consequences of speaking out in the news media. Although the ELM and whistleblower literature suggests that gender differences may not be significant, and thus broaden the applicability of this study, it is possible that these findings may only apply to similar kinds of whistleblowers in similar situations. It will fall to later researchers to test some of the theories proposed and delimit their

applicability. Nonetheless, there is enough here to show this is an area worthy of further study.

Further studies that looked at the role of the ELM in journalist/ source interaction would be particularly useful, especially ones measuring what kinds of arguments sources find persuasive, how different kinds of sources see the relationship, how they make decisions, and the role of emotion in decision-making. Although no causal link between relationship satisfaction and the decision to speak out has been demonstrated here, it is worth noting that three of the four women in this study did feel a satisfactory relationship with the journalist was important to helping them tell their stories. Further work which explored this association for different kinds of whistleblowers would be useful.

In some ways, the source's decision to enter into a relationship with a journalist has some parallels with romantic involvement. It often involves a decision to downgrade or break one set of relationships, in order to strengthen another. Such decisions, if they are to be meaningful and lead to lasting, satisfying relationships, are not usually lightly taken. Even if one disputes the role of ELM, CDT or the Investment Model in Smith's, Nicholas's and Johnson's decision-making, one cannot dispute that their decisions were the result of long, hard, careful – and ultimately very shrewd – thinking.

9.5 Implications for the ELM

Although not operationalised in a way that allows direct comparison to much experimental work using the ELM, this study affirms the basic applicability of the ELM to the journalistic field, and suggests it would be a useful paradigm for further research into journalistic persuasion. This study has also highlighted some areas that may be of interest to ELM researchers. Firstly, it affirms the powerful effect an underlying value or belief can have in obstructing CRP, and shows this can be

overcome through the activation of a powerful emotion, particularly anger. Secondly, it supports the CFM proposition that anger acts to change the direction and depth of processing, rather than just the level of elaboration. Thirdly, if the IRM is shown to be a reliable model of emotional elicitation and processing, it suggests the dual-process paradigm used in cognitive models such as the ELM will need to be rethought. If the brain's cortical processing centres interact recursively with its emotion centres, as the IRM proposes, then it is conceivable that cortical processing centres may interact recursively with each other, rather than there being separate routes for different kinds of cognition, as the ELM holds. Likewise, the impact of emotion on cognition is likely to be an area of further development. If cortical processes do not simply regulate emotion, but help form it and constitute it, as the IRM proposes, then it seems conceivable that emotion in turn helps constitute cognitive processing. This is a complicated area beyond the scope of this study, but one worthy of further research.

9.6 Implications for the whistleblower and witness literature

Although not the central focus of this study, the analysis of these cases provided above provided some useful insights into some of the issues identified in Chapter Two in the whistleblower and witness literature.

With regard to the whistleblower literature, these cases show the value in bringing established psychological theory to bear in an area which has only recently seen attempts to incorporate it. Specifically, they affirm that more recent models which attempt to explain the role of emotion in whistleblower decision-making are worth exploring further. In particular, the role of anger seems most worthy of further study. This study confirms earlier whistleblower studies (Hersh, 2002; Jos, et al., 1989; Mesmer-Magnus, 2005; Uys, 2000) that found it is central to the decision to speak out. Earlier studies have not explained in much detail what the cause of this

anger is, or exactly how it affects whistleblowers' thinking. This study extends earlier work by showing that anger may change the direction and depth of cognitive processing of messages to speak up, as Nabi's Cognitive Functional Model (1999, 2002) suggests. Further work using experimental models which controlled the variables would be needed to validate this finding. The exact spark for anger is another interesting issue. This study confirms earlier work that suggests it is essential to getting over deep inhibitions against speaking out, and goes further by showing that the eruption of anger that coincides with the decision to speak is often sparked well into the decision-making process. But what causes it to come when it does? This study suggests it surfaces when individuals realise that the decision to speak would conflict with very deeply held personal values or beliefs, which have so far prevented them speaking. In this study these values included not speaking ill of others, not challenging authority, and not doing anything which could harm children. It is still not clear how or in what way this deep inner conflict compels individuals to act, but it is clear that in these cases, these women suddenly reached a moment of decision to speak, and that moment coincided with strong feelings of anger around these issues. Whatever the range of factors which spark and fan the flames of anger, it does seem to result in more intensive, and more effective cognitive processing that quickly results in a decision to act.

This study adds to the literature by showing how other actors – in these case journalists – influence this process. This study has shown that reluctant, vulnerable whistleblowers can overcome such blocks with a combination of support from loved ones trusted individuals – in this case journalists – who have earlier established their credibility. Furthermore, the journey of three of these four women – Smith, Nicholas and Johnson - has shown that such changed beliefs can be sustainable and empowering. For the fourth woman, Kelly, the decision to speak was not regretted, but some of aspects of how it was done were. The difference in her case seems to have been the level of support and quality of relationship with the journalists.

Further work which identified the kinds of deeply held beliefs that can block individuals from acting, and what kind of reassurances and arguments would help them in the decision to speak out, would be useful.

One limitation of this study was that it concentrated on the role of the journalist in persuading the whistleblower, and did not consider in depth the role of their support network. Nor, given the limitations of the study design, could it say much about the relative importance of these different people. Another related effect that would be worth examining in future studies would be that of media coverage of people in similar situations. Journalists have long known that one story can encourage others to come forward (see e.g., Glover, 2000). One theory worth exploring to explain this effect is Spiral of Silence Theory (Noelle-Neumann, 1964). This holds that individuals withhold opinions if they perceive them to be unpopular, and has usually been used to explain the apparently perverse results of elections compared to those predicted by public opinion polling. It has not been applied in a journalistic context. Nevertheless, it is interesting that two of the whistleblowers in this study did come forward partly as a result of media coverage, and it seems clear that Johnson at least was pleasantly surprised to discover she was not alone in wanting to take action. For the Spiral of Silence Theory to hold here, it would have to be shown that discovering they were not alone helped motivate them to speak out, as well as the other factors mentioned, such as the need to provide support to others or correct untruths. This would be worth bearing in mind for future researchers.

9.7 Towards a new theory of whistleblowing

Several reviewers have pointed out that whistleblowing research has not yet been able to produce a reliable model for predicting whistleblowing behaviour (Gundlach, et al., 2003; Henik, 2008; Hersh, 2002). More recent models have attempted to redress this by building on psychological theory, particularly cognitive

theory, to explain and predict the role of emotion in the whistleblowing process (Gundlach, et al., 2003; Henik, 2008). These have relied on dual-process cognitive models implying cognition regulates emotion, which recent research suggests may not capture the nuances of how emotion interacts with cognition (Clore & Ortony, 2008; Cunningham & Zelazo, 2007). Other models, such as the Anger Activism Model, have emphasised the role of one kind of appraisal structure – efficacy – in empowering whistleblowers to speak. This study suggests that legitimacy appraisals are also important for potential whistleblowers and any predictive theory should include these as a variable. Furthermore, it suggests that any predictive model must take account of the iterative nature of the decision making process, and allow for the role of new facts, changing appraisals and/or attitudes, and memory in iteratively reconstituting emotion and thus cognition over the course of the decision making process. It is beyond the scope of this study and the author's expertise to propose a detailed model. However, based on this study, it seems likely that the likelihood of a whistleblower speaking out depends on a) being convinced it is the right thing to do b) that it will do less harm than not doing so c) that they can do it effectively, and d) gaining the courage to overcome fear of any consequences. Gaining the courage will usually require accessing strong emotion, which in turn depends on having the time to cogitate on these various factors in a supportive environment. It seems likely that the most promising model for incorporating these factors would be a version of the IRM, which included detailed criteria for measuring perceptions of coping and self-efficacy, legitimacy, and the type and level of emotion. It seems likely that a longitudinal study would be required.

9.8 Implications for the journalism literature and journalistic practice

These four cases together have significant implications for the practice of investigative journalism. By mapping, for the first time, the decision-making process

of reluctant, vulnerable whistleblowers, this study should inform the establishment of practice guidelines for dealing with such individuals; guidelines which are lacking in journalism textbooks. An outline of what these guidelines might look like is provided above. Besides this professional application, this study colours in the broad picture of the art of “thinking in doing” and the virtues of social practice that sociological studies of the field have sketched out (Aucoin, 2005; Ettema & Glasser, 1998). As such they can be seen as a step towards professionalising a craft; an assertion that the art of best practice can be analysed, explained, demystified and above all shared. Furthermore, the fact that these guidelines arise out of professional practice, rather than being imposed by industry or government, is in itself an assertion of an autonomy within the journalistic field that is part of a maturing of the profession itself.

This concept of the role of work practices in understanding the development of the profession is central to James Aucoin’s explanation of the development of investigative journalism in the United States of America (2005). This study also agrees with Aucoin’s emphasis on ethical practice as central to good investigative journalism, and with his assertion of the applicability of MacIntyre’s social practice theory – the idea that good work is a result of a person acting virtuously. And in an important facet of investigative journalism, dealing with reluctant, vulnerable sources, it takes his analysis further by demonstrating how ethical practice is practically as well as morally essential to good work.

Custodians of Conscience (Ettema & Glasser, 1998) is still the definitive sociological study of investigative journalistic practice. Its application of Schön’s reflective practitioner theory (1983) seems particularly apt. The way the successful practitioners in this study operated can all be seen as examples of “thinking in doing” (p. 58) and sustaining a “conversation with the situation” (p. 132). This study takes these broad concepts further by exploring exactly what kind of thinking the journalists do, and showing how and why this works in one key area of practice by comparing it to the

thinking of those they are thinking about – their sources. While much of this thinking by journalists is instinctive, albeit an instinct honed by experience (what Schön called a “repertoire of examples, images, understandings and actions” (pp. 58, 138) and Schudson calls “mature subjectivity”; it also shows the value that itemising and replicating this repertoire could have for journalistic practice.

One of the other interesting questions raised by Ettema and Glasser is their notion of the intersection of fact and value in investigative journalism. Or as they put it: is it “possible to know and tell what is important about human affairs without also knowing and telling what is right?” (1998, p. 10). Did these investigative journalists in this study make value judgements; take sides even, in their reporting?

Undoubtedly they formed opinions about the people they were reporting on.

Undoubtedly their moral judgements about what was worth reporting on, what was a story, informed their choice of which facts to focus on. But it didn’t stop their attempt to get the other side of the story; it didn’t make them deliberately exclude facts which were inconvenient to any moral crusade they may have been on. A more interesting question, which is implicit in Ettema and Glasser’s question, is whether journalists need to commit to one side of a moral question before a source will speak out. This is a very delicate area, which this study does not attempt to answer definitively. However, some observations can be made. Certainly, this study suggests that some particularly sensitive individuals want and need a degree of commitment from journalists which goes beyond the normal objective stance of many reporters. However, the commitment they need seems to be more to getting the truth out there, and to seeing the story through, rather than to telling only their side of the story. So fact and value do intersect, yes, in the sense that the reporter’s values determine which *stories* should be pursued and published, but not in the sense that they prescribe which *facts* about those stories see the light of day. The commitment sources need is to taking the time to understand their perspective properly.

As Johnson says:

It was as simple as him saying “Donna I am committed to getting a very thorough perspective of what you have been through and obviously what other women have been through. This isn’t just going to be ‘We’ll get your story and I don’t care what happens to you.’” (D. Johnson, 2008)

It can be inferred from the above discussion that this study agrees with Zelizer’s (2004b) proposition that sociological interpretations of journalistic practice have tended to over-generalise . By exploring the psychological processes at work within individuals, this study also extends and colours in the essentially determinist explanations provided by some studies of the journalist-source interaction (Ericson, et al., 1989; Schlesinger, 1994). With respect to Ericson et al., it affirms that such interactions need not be seen simply in terms of power and control, or as one interest group vying for supremacy; that “non-professional” sources, who are not trying to advance their organisation’s interests, have quite different needs within the journalist-source relationship. It extends Schlesinger’s analysis by describing the decision-making process for “non-official” individuals, with little or no media experience, who are more reluctant, and not trying to systematically and routinely influence the public discourse. They show that the mechanics of the decision-making process about speaking out may be influenced by a myriad of factors other than power relations. These include the personal experience and values of the individual, the nature of the journalist’s approach, the nature of the relationship with the journalist, and the individual’s relationships with their support group. Furthermore, these cases provide an explanation of how these factors interact and influence the decision to speak out.

With regard to the role of sources, this study shows that non-professional sources such as these women have some similarities but also significantly different concerns

and priorities to those who dealing with the news media in the course of their work (Ericson, et al., 1989; Schlesinger, 1994). This study agrees with Ericson et al.'s conclusion that sources do not necessarily hold the whip hand over journalists. As in their study, these sources did seem to work interdependently with the journalist to produce knowledge. Yet while these women also scrutinised and tested journalists carefully for trustworthiness, it was not conflated with dependence, as they suggest. Ericson et al. argued that a source felt they could trust a journalist only "when she can take for granted that regardless of what she says it will be construed reasonably, even favourably ... that is, in accordance with the source's values and interests" (1989, pp. 379-395). For these women, trust came when they saw a journalist was *not* going to simply take what they had to say at face value; journalistic independence went hand in hand with trustworthiness. Another difference is that these women were not concerned with promoting an occupational or professional agenda, but in correcting what they saw as public misperceptions. They could thus be seen as *reactive* sources, rather than the kind of agenda-setting sources Ericson et al. mostly covered. Another clear difference seems the level of emotion generated; either earlier studies did not capture this, or these women went through a much more intense and difficult decision making process in deciding to talk to the media. This is probably due to a combination of the more personal nature of the information involved and the fact that they were publicly attached to it; Johnson was happy to reveal some details to Taylor anonymously, but wanted a great deal more confidence in him before she would let him attach her name to them. Kelly's trajectory from relatively indiscriminating on the choice of journalist to more critical as she realised the extent to which her own credibility was at stake suggests that this could be an argument journalists could use to recommend sources choose journalists carefully.

9.9 Conclusion

Firstly, the journalist/ source relationship *is* a relationship, and must be seen in this context. Sources feel safer and stronger about speaking out when they have a good relationship with a journalist. The requirements for building such a relationship are the same as in any relationship; good communication, honesty, integrity, reliability, and good boundaries. Journalists do not need to sacrifice their independence; on the contrary, the cases in this study show that the journalists' assertion and protection of their integrity and independence is precisely one of the qualities that builds the source's trust of them.

Secondly, blowing the whistle through a journalist is a two-stage process, requiring at least two significant decisions; firstly to speak out, and secondly who to speak out through. While the journalist can have some influence over the latter, the former is often a much more complex decision, often made for more personal reasons. Some whistleblowers make highly calculated decisions, thought through over a long period of time, about the decision to speak. Potential whistleblowers often need to become angry in order to overcome an internal block to speaking out. It is not clear exactly what causes individuals to become angry when they do, although the IRM suggests that learning new facts about a situation combine with memory and the change in appraisals and attitudes due to interaction with journalists and others over the course of the decision making process to transform prior associated emotion into a new emotion. In this way, as an individual begins to realise they now have the power to resist a behaviour they have tolerated for years, fear may turn into anger. When that moment of anger comes, it often helps trigger the decision to speak. The decision is made easier and more likely if, at the moment anger strikes, there is already in place a journalist established as a reliable, honest, effective operator. It could be that establishing an efficacious outlet is essential before individuals allow themselves to become angry again over a long-suffered grievance. By providing this

outlet, journalists may play a vital part in triggering the process of removing blocks to speaking out.

The decision about who to speak out through can involve rigorous assessment and testing of the journalists' trustworthiness, competence and independence, often in the form of "diagnostic situations". The quality of relationship the journalist established with the source may not be essential to the decision to speak out (though it may well be for especially vulnerable individuals), but it certainly affects how the source feels about the story. Journalists can show commitment to sources, and can do this without compromising their independence. Indeed, this commitment is sometimes vital to persuading the source that they can speak out. Journalists who want to persuade a vulnerable, reluctant whistleblower to speak out, and especially who want them to feel empowered rather than embittered by the process, need to forget journalistic norms about detachment and independence and take responsibility for educating and guiding frightened and vulnerable people through the unknowns of media exposure. As these cases show, such commitment need not compromise their independence; in fact it may well strengthen it. Journalists who prize detachment for fear of attachment lose the ability to test the truth of their source's convictions. Real truth-seekers do not want a lap-dog; they want a watchdog.

One person speaking out also encourages others to come forward, to give support, or to correct and balance, or simply because they no longer feel they are in a minority. While this study has not demonstrated a theoretical model that explains why people do this in various situations, it suggests that they do.

Lastly, while these cases affirm some truisms of journalistic tradecraft, they also show that some of that tradecraft is successful by accident rather than design, and that the process of getting vulnerable people to expose corrupt practice and to challenge abuse of power is a highly complex, difficult and delicate process that

requires a considerable investment of time, effort, and emotion, as well as personal integrity at a level beyond that advocated by the mainstream journalistic textbooks reviewed here. It demonstrates the gap in good practice between top journalists and most others is wide; it also shows that even the best journalists may have only a limited understanding of the complexity of the decision-making process for vulnerable whistleblowers. It shows that a greater understanding of the dilemmas and vulnerabilities of people considering a challenge to power would be of great benefit in helping journalists understand how to support and encourage other potential whistleblowers through this process.

The decisions to speak out, and who to speak to, are difficult, effortful, and often involve the generation of a great number of thoughts. It has often been observed that journalists need to give sources time, and to build trust, and that this often leads to them deciding to tell their stories. This study helps show us why time and trust are so important, and highlights many other factors that are highly relevant to potential whistleblowers. These include the competence, honesty, integrity, reliability, and independence of the journalist, but also their determination. Journalists need to be aware of how closely they will be scrutinised, and prepare accordingly. While some journalists are too cavalier with such sources, other journalists probably make the mistake of trying to be too caring and nice, of needing approval, when in fact the sources are scrutinising them for their resilience and ability to make up their own mind. Potential whistleblowers, like all of us, want to know they are listened to, understood, and accepted, and want to know that the commitment being asked of them is reciprocated. They need someone who, like a good therapist, is willing to stick alongside them while they go through the effortful, sometimes painful period of reprocessing earlier emotional experience into new emotions which can motivate a decision to speak out. But they do not need an unquestioning supporter; more a combination guide, mentor, and efficient operator. They need a friend, but not an unquestioning friend; just as importantly, they need someone who will get the job

done. If they are going to stick their necks out to blow a whistle, they want to make sure it will be heard.

Appendix One: Sample Interview Schedule and Information Sheets

INFORMATION SHEET – 08-72

Investigative Journalism in New Zealand: methods of investigative reporters

An Invitation

You are one of a small (15-20 people) group who are being asked to take part in a research project on investigative journalism in New Zealand. You have been chosen for this invitation based on your involvement with the news media on a topic of public interest. It is anticipated the results of the project will be of international interest. If you agree to take part, your participation will contribute to improving the practices of journalists in New Zealand and overseas.

This project is being undertaken by the researcher, James Hollings, to meet the requirements of a Doctor of Philosophy at Massey University. The project supervisors are Drs Wendy Bacon (UTS Sydney) and Nikki Hessel (Massey). The name of the project is Investigative Journalism in New Zealand. The purpose of the research is to explore the methods and approaches of investigative journalists in New Zealand, with a view to establishing best practice, particularly when it comes to establishing and maintaining relationships with sources – the people that talk to journalists. It will also explore the way in which knowledge is produced, and the role and impact of New Zealand investigative journalists. The research will involve interviews with various members of the media industry and people who have come into contact with them. The interviews will be used as source material for the PhD thesis mentioned above. They may also be published in relevant academic journals, or in a journalistic form, such as a book or film documentary. They may also be used as resource material for teaching journalism.

How do I participate in the research?

As a participant in this research you will either be approached by the researcher, or will be offered the opportunity to participate by a third party known to you. You can either agree to an interview with the researcher, or can opt to answer the questions on the attached questionnaire.

How will my privacy be protected?

The interview focuses on professional issues. If you inadvertently include irrelevant personal comments, they will be treated as confidential. For those who wish to remain anonymous, please see the section below.

What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?

You have 10 working days to consider this invitation.

How do I agree to participate in this research?

You can agree to participate in this research simply by signing the Consent Form and returning it to James Hollings by email or in person (j.h.hollings@massey.ac.nz).

What if I want to remain anonymous?

Some of you may wish to remain anonymous. In this case you will be offered a questionnaire through a third party you know and trust. All you have to do is give your oral consent to the third party. The third party will record your answers to the questions attached on the questionnaire. You should not sign or write anything yourself.

Will this cause me any discomfort or are there any risks to me from being involved?

It is considered that there are no risks to you from being involved. The questions are not intended to explore or question any of the substance of the stories with which you may have been involved. They are entirely focussed on your relationship with the journalist who did the story. Furthermore, if you wish to remain anonymous, the only person who will know you have participated is the third party who gave you this invitation, who will be someone known to you and who it is understood you have a trusting relationship with. However, it is possible that answering the attached questions may cause you some discomfort, in recalling details of events from your past. Or you may feel unsure that your privacy will continue to be protected. If this is the case, you should feel free to pause, or withdraw from the project at any time. If you wish to discuss these concerns, please discuss these with the third party who contacted you in the first instance. If you wish to discuss them further, please contact the researcher.

How much time will this take?

It is expected that if you agree to an interview, or to answer the questions on the confidential questionnaire it may take 30-60 minutes.

Data Management

- The data gathered in this project will initially be used for the completion of a PhD thesis on Investigative Journalism in New Zealand, and subsequently in further publications, such as a book, academic articles or film documentary. It may also be used as teaching resources at Massey University. The researcher undertakes to use the data in a fair and balanced way which does not distort or misrepresent the views of participants or take them out of context. If used for teaching or subsequent publications, the researcher undertakes, where possible, to contact participants to obtain approval of the further uses to which the data has been put.
- Data will be analysed thematically and a coding schedule drawn up. A comparison analysis will be undertaken to draw out common themes and these will be cross-referenced with data gained from other participants in the project, such as the investigative reporters. It is hoped that general conclusions can then be drawn about best practice for journalists dealing with sources, particularly confidential sources.
- Data will be stored at Massey University under the supervision of the project supervisor for a minimum of five years. It may then either be destroyed or passed to a suitable archive as appropriate.
- Participants will be sent a summary of the project findings upon completion of the thesis project. It is anticipated this will be mid-late 2010. However, participants are welcome to contact the researcher before this for an update if required.
- The data will be screened to ensure confidential participants have not inadvertently revealed any identifying details. In the case of any such details being found, a copy of the data will be made with identifying details removed, and the original document will be destroyed.

Participant's Rights

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study at any time
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
- be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded.
- ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview.

If you decide to participate anonymously, then the completion and return of the questionnaire implies consent. You have the right to decline to answer any particular question.

What do I do if I have concerns about this research?

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Nikki Hessel, N.A.Hessel@massey.ac.nz.

Whom do I contact for further information about this research?

If you have any questions about the project, please contact the researcher(s) and/or supervisor(s)

Researcher Contact Details:

James Hollings

Email: j.h.hollings@massey.ac.nz

Phone: 04 8015799x 6589

Project Supervisor Contact Details:

Nikki Hessel

School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing

Massey University

Palmerston North

Email: N.A.Hessel@massey.ac.nz

Phone: 04 8015799

Ethics approval statement:

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application ___/___ (insert application number). If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Karl Pajo, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 04 801 5799 x 6929, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz

Appendix Two: Sample Interview Schedule

Interview Protocol

For journalists:

Topic areas

Chronological recount of story

How did the story come out?

What were stumbling points, how were they resolved

Thoughts/ impressions on story / craft with benefit of hindsight

More specifically:

What message do you remember giving to the whistleblower about why they should talk

What was your approach to them?

Is that usual – anything you did differently from normal, is so why

On method:

What are important factors - what makes for good investigative journalism?

- Looking back, what have been factors in your success,
- What made the difference in getting story out
- What have you learned about what is important
- Getting people to talk , how do you do that
- What makes people want to talk
- How important is a team approach?
- what role does community play
- collaborative process with the community or driven by the individual?

What is that drives you to do this work?

Questions to the whistleblowers:

How did you come to hear from the journalist – ask to recount narrative of how approached, method/ manner etc. As much as they remember as possible, prompt gently where necessary

- What was journalist's message?
- What was their (own) reaction?
- Why did they cooperate?

Stumbling blocks?

How do they feel now?

Appendix Three: Master coding and data sheet

Source	Smith	Nicholas	Johnson	Kelly
Persuasion Effects - ELM factors				
Journalists' messages				
Content	Need to provide evidence to expose corrupt behaviour,	Need to speak out, for society, evidence of deception	Need to speak out, for society	Need to speak out, for society
Personally relevant?	No	Yes	No	No
One or two sided?	One	Two	One	One
Type of evidence used?	None	Docs, narrative	None	None
End in question?	No	Yes	No	No
Generated high/low involvement?	Low, then high	High	Medium	Low
What message content did generate thoughts?	Need to speak out, trustworthiness of journalist	Need to speak out, facts of case, trustworthiness, expertness of journalist	Need to speak out, trustworthiness and competence of journalist	Need to speak out for society
Overall impact of journalists' messages	Medium	High	Medium	Medium
Others' message effects				
Content	Get truth out there (from husband) Speak ill of others (from Huatas)	Stop this happening to others, avoid letting offenders escape censure	Stop this happening to others, avoid letting offenders escape censure	Personal advantage, benefit to society, get truth out there
Generated high/low involvement?	High	High	High	High
Change level of elaboration or direction/depth of processing?	Both	Both	Both	Both
Overall, what messages were most important in helping make decision	Need to get truth out there, esp. about self	Need to get truth out there, protect others, encourage others to come forward	Need to get truth out there, protect others, send message to offender	Personal advantage, benefit to society, get
Message processing - central route				
Evidence of processing of message?	Yes, CRP	Yes, CRP	Yes, CRP	Only of decision to speak out, not of who to speak through
Evidence of motivation and ability to process centrally?	Little at first, but grew	Strong, and grew	Strong, grew	Ability, but not motivation
If not, was this due to message, or deeply-held value?	Value blocked acceptance of message	Value block to message acceptance	No	None
Produce attitude/behaviour change?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Good resistance to attitude change?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No – source now questions decision
Generated many thoughts in receiver?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ease of recall	Yes	Yes	Yes	Some details hazy
Message processing – peripheral route				
Sender trustworthiness mentioned?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Expertness a factor?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Social attractiveness?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Resultant attitude change not persistent?	No	No	No	Yes
Recall hazy?	No	No	No	Yes
Cognitive Dissonance				
Evidence that disconfirmation of beliefs provoked discomfort?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Led to attitude or behaviour change?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Emotion effects				
Type	Fear/shame, anger	Anger	Yes	Anger
Cause	Further bullying by employer, perception that it was wrong	Perception that abuser needed to be held to account	Perception that she could now challenge abuser's story	Perception that manager not interested in rights/ wrongs
Timing during decision-making process	Late	Late	Late	Early
Impact	Helped overcome value blocks to speaking out	Same	Same	Important, but not in overcoming value blocks, more in affirming decision already taken
IRM effects				
Evidence of recursive processing	yes	yes	yes	yes
Evidence that one or all out of representation (memory), changing topography of situation, physiological affect and appraisals/ attitudes changed (possibly by journalist or other)	Topography, attitudes	Same	Attitudes	Changed topography, but appraisals not changed because had not interacted with journalist by then
Relationship Effects - Investment Model				
Investment (emotional, financial, time) by either/ both parties	Yes	Yes	Yes	Less from journalists

Diagnostic situations? Built trust?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Role of commitment – was it important to one/both?	Yes, to both	Yes, to both	Yes, to both	No
Relationship effects - Therapeutic model				
Was relationship collaborative?	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Client-centred?	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Reliable / attentive?	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Evidence of guided questioning?	No	Yes	Yes	
Honest, good communication?	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Summary				
Do theoretical models offer useful insights into how and why source decided to speak out?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
How much variance between journalist and source perceptions of what was important?	Some - source had own internal arguments journalist was unaware of	Little - journalist and source kept in very close contact	Some – role of diagnostic situation very important to source.	Considerable, role of relationship more important to source
Any other factors which appear to be important?	Difficulty for source of justifying their own behaviour – their guilt at having to expose someone/	Source's desire to have her say in public, get truth out there, see justice done, prevent same thing happening to others.	Source's desire to have her say in public, get truth out there, see justice done, prevent same thing happening to others.	Source had own goals that partly drove decision. Source had already made decision to blow whistle and acted on it so choice of journalist appears less important.
Comparison to traditional journalistic lore/tradecraft?	Time, patience and courtesy of journalist were vital, source checked out journalist	Level of engagement by journalist very high. Need for journalist to demonstrate independence and integrity very high	Importance of letting source come to decision to be named in her own time. Need for journalist to demonstrate independence, commitment to source.	Importance of making source aware of consequences of publication, being more engaged than usual
Overall, what factors seem most important in persuading source to speak out?	Time, collaboration, emotional arousal (anger), commitment by both parties, client-centredness, reliability, attentiveness.	Time, collaboration, emotional arousal (anger), commitment by both parties, client-centredness, reliability, attentiveness.	Time, collaboration, emotional arousal (anger), commitment by both parties, client-centredness, reliability, attentiveness.	Time, collaboration, emotional arousal (anger), commitment by both parties, client-centredness, reliability, attentiveness.

Reference list

- ACC. (2008). *Sexual Abuse and Mental Injury: Practice Guidelines for Aotearoa-New Zealand*. Wellington: ACC.
- Allen, M. (1998). Comparing the persuasive effectiveness: One-and two-sided messages. In M. Allen & P. RW (Eds.), *Persuasion: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 87–98). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press
- Allison, G., & Zelikow, P. (1971). *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown
- Alverson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive Methodology*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Anderson, J., & Boyd, J. (1980). *Confessions of a Muckraker: The inside story of life in Washington during the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson years*. New York: Random House
- Angle, H., Malam, S., & Carey, C. (2003). Witness satisfaction: Findings from the witness satisfaction survey 2002. *Home Office Online Report*, 19(03). Retrieved from <http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/rdsolr1903.pdf>
- Anon. (2002, December 20). MP under fire over tax money, *Dominion Post*.
- Anon. (2004, October 10). Rape claim against police under investigation, *NZ Herald*.
- Anon. (2007, August 11). Out of the Shadows, *New Zealand Herald*, pp. 2-3.
- Anon. (2008a). House visit intimidation says police complainant. Retrieved April 18 2010, from Fairfax NZ Ltd <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/575506>
- Anon. (2008b). Interview with Hollings, J. [Edited transcript]. Wellington: Massey University School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing Archive.
- Anon. (2010). Interview with Hollings, J. [Edited transcript]. Wellington: Massey University School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing Archive.
- Aucoin, J. L. (2005). *The evolution of American investigative journalism*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Backman, C., & Secord, P. (1959). The effect of perceived liking on interpersonal attraction. *Human Relations*, 12 (4), 379-384.
- Behrens, J. C. (1977). *The Typewriter Guerrillas: Closeups of Twenty Top Investigative Reporters*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Berkowitz, D. (2007). Professional views, community news: Investigative reporting in small US dailies. *Journalism*, 8 (5), 551-558.
- Berkowitz, D., TerKeurst, J. (1999). Community as interpretive community: rethinking the journalist-source relationship. *The Journal of Communication*, 49(3), 125-136.
- Berkowitz, L. (2003). Affect, aggression, and antisocial behavior. In R. Davidson, K. Scherer & G. HH (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 804–823). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berkowitz, L., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2004). Toward an Understanding of the Determinants of Anger. *Emotion*, 4 (2), 107-130.
- Blenkinsopp, J., & Edwards, M. S. (2008). On not Blowing the Whistle: Quiescent Silence as an Emotion Episode. In N. Ashkanasy, C. Hartel & W. Zerbe (Eds.), *Research on Emotion in Organisations: Emotions, ethics and decision-making* (Vol. 4, pp. 181-206). Bradford: Emerald
- Booth-Butterfield, S., & Welbourne, J. (2002). The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion: Its Impact on Persuasion Theory and Research. In J. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice* (pp. 155-175). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Brown, A. J. (2008). Whistleblowing in the Australian public sector: Enhancing the theory and practice of internal witness management in public sector organisations. Canberra. Retrieved from http://epress.anu.edu.au/whistleblowing_citation.html
- Burgh, d. (2000). *Investigative journalism: Context and practice*. London: Routledge.

- Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(5), 752-766.
- Clore, G., & Ortony, A. (2000). Cognition in emotion: Always, sometimes, or never. In R. Lane, L. Nadel, G. Ahern, J. Allen, A. Kaszniak, S. Rapcsak & G. Schwartz (Eds.), *Cognitive neuroscience of emotion* (pp. 24-61). New York: Oxford University Press
- Clore, G., & Ortony, A. (2008). Appraisal theories: How cognition shapes affect into emotion. In M. Lewis, J. Haviland-Jones & L. Feldman Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 628-644). New York: Guilford Press
- Cordell, M. (2009). What is happening to investigative journalism? A pilot study of ABC's Four Corners. *Pacific Journalism Review*, 15(2), 118-132.
- Crowdson, P. (2010). Interview with Hollings, J. [Tape recording]. Wellington: Massey University School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing Archive.
- Cropp, A. (1997). *Digging deeper: A New Zealand guide to investigative reporting* Wellington: New Zealand Journalists Training Organisation.
- Cunningham, W., & Zelazo, P. (2007). Attitudes and evaluations: A social cognitive neuroscience perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11(3), 97-104.
- Denzin, N. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage
- Devine, P. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56 (1), 5-18.
- DiGiuseppe, R., & Tafrate, R. (2007). *Understanding anger disorders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dillard, J., & Pfau, M. (2002). *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Dindia, K., & Emmers-Sommer, T. (2006). What partners do to maintain their close relationships. In P. Noller & J. Feeney (Eds.), *Close relationships: functions, forms, and processes* (pp. 305-324). New York: Psychology Press
- Edwards, M. S., Ashkenasy, N., & Gardner, J. (2009). Deciding to speak up or remain silent following observed wrongdoing: The role of discrete emotions and the climate of silence. In J. Greenberg, Edwards, M. (Ed.), *Voice and silence in organisations* (pp. 83-111). Bingley: Emerald
- Eisenhardt, K., & Graebner, M. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (1), 25.
- Ericson, R., Baranek, P., & Chan, J. (1989). *Negotiating control: A study of news sources*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Essex, C. (1994). Nurse in New Zealand reinstated after whistle blowing. *British Medical Journal*, 308 (6932), 811.
- Ettema, J., & Glasser, T. (1998). *Custodians of conscience: Investigative journalism and public virtue*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fazio, R. (1986). How do attitudes guide behavior. In R. Sorrentino & E. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 204-243). New York: Guilford Press.
- Feeney, J., Noller, P., & Roberts, N. (2000). Attachment and close relationships. In C. Hendrick & S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook* (pp. 185-201). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Feldstein, M. (2006). A Muckraking Model: Investigative Reporting Cycles in American History. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 11(2), 105-120.
- Festinger, L. (1956). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H. W., & Schachter, S. (1956). *When Prophecy Fails*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Flick, U. (2007). *Designing qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. London: Sage
- Flynn, K. (2006). Covert disclosures: Unauthorised leaking, public officials and the public sphere. *Journalism Studies*, 7 (2), 256-273.

- Freud, S. (1958). *Recommendations to physicians practising psycho-analysis*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Fyfe, N., & Smith, K. (2007). Victims and witnesses in criminal investigations. In T. Newburn, T. Williamson & A. Wright (Eds.), *Handbook of criminal investigation* (pp. 450-465). Cullompton: Willan.
- Gass, R., & Seiter, J. (1999). *Persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glaser, B. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley CA: Sociology Press.
- Glazer, M. (1999). On the Trail of Courageous Behavior
- Sociological Inquiry*, 69 (2), 276-295.
- Glover, S. (2000). *The Penguin Book of Journalism*. London: Penguin.
- Greenberg, J., & Edwards, M. (2009). *Voice and silence in organizations*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (Vol. 2, pp. 163-194). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Gundlach, M. J., Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2003). The Decision to Blow the Whistle: A Social Information Processing Framework. *The Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), 107-123.
- Hager, N. (1996). *Secret power*. Nelson: Craig Potton.
- Hager, N. (2010). [Interview with Seymour Hersh].
- Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jeffereson, T., Clarke, J., & Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state, and law and order*. London: Macmillan.
- Hamlyn, B., Phelps, A., & Sattar, G. (2004). Key findings from the Surveys of Vulnerable and Intimidated Witnesses 2000/01 and 2003. *London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate*, 128.
- Harmon-Jones, E. (2002). A cognitive dissonance theory perspective on persuasion. In J. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice* (pp. 99-116). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Harvey, J., & Wenzel, A. (2006). Theoretical perspectives in the study of close relationships. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 35-49). New York: Cambridge University Press
- Henik, E. (2008). Mad as Hell or Scared Stiff? The Effects of Value Conflict and Emotions on Potential Whistle-Blowers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(1), 111-119.
- Hersh, M. A. (2002). Whistleblowers - heroes or traitors? Individual and collective responsibility for ethical behaviour. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 26 (2), 243-262.
- Hill, R. (2007, April 1). Prisons under fire: Corrections boss accused of bullying, *Sunday Star Times*.
- Holmes, J. G., & Rempel, J. K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. *Review of personality and social psychology*, 10, 187-220.
- Houston, B., Bruzzese, L., & Weinberg, S. (2002). *The Investigative Reporter's Handbook: A guide to documents, databases and techniques* (4th ed.). Boston; New York: Bedford/ St. Martin's.
- Hunter, M., Hanson, N., Sabbagh, R., Sengers, L., Sullivan, D., & Thordsen, P. (2009). Story-Based Inquiry: A manual for investigative journalists. Retrieved from http://markleehunter.free.fr/documents/SBI_english.pdf
- Iorio, S. (2004). *Qualitative research in journalism: Taking it to the streets*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Johnson, B. T., & Eagly, A.H. (1989). Communication and attitude change: Causes, processes, and effects. In D. Albarracin, B. Johnson & M. Zanna (Eds.), *The handbook of attitudes* (pp. 617-669). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Johnson, D. (2008). Interview with Hollings, J. [Videorecording]. Wellington: Massey University School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing Archive.
- Jos, P. H., Tompkins, M. E., & Hays, S. W. (1989). In Praise of Difficult People: A Portrait of the Committed Whistleblower. *Public Administration Review*, 49 (6), 552-561.

- Jubb, P. (1999). Whistleblowing: A restrictive definition and interpretation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 21 (1), 77-94.
- Kelley, H., & Thibaut, J. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kelley, H. H. (1983). Love and commitment. In H. H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J. Harvey, A. Huston & G. Levinger (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 265-314). New York: Freeman.
- Kelly, F. (2010). Interview with Hollings, J. [Edited transcript]. Wellington: Massey University School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing Archive.
- Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (2001). Social functions of emotions. In T. Mayne & G. Bonnano (Eds.), *Emotions: Current issues and future directions* (pp. 192-213). New York: Guilford Press
- Kidder, L., Judd, C., & Smith, E. (1986). *Research methods in social relations*: Holt McDougal.
- Kitchin, P. (2002a, December 28). ACT MP's stomach op investigated, *Dominion Post*.
- Kitchin, P. (2002b, December 20). MP under fire over tax money, *Dominion Post*, pp. 1-3.
- Kitchin, P. (2007, August 9, 2007). The Dewar Trial, *Dominion Post*, pp. 2-3.
- Kitchin, P. (Writer). (2007). Donna Johnson, *Close Up*: TVNZ.
- Kitchin, P. (2008). Interview with Hollings, J. [Videorecording]. Wellington: Massey University School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing Archive.
- Kitchin, P., & Mirams, C. (2002, December 21). Police probe ACT MP's spending, *Dominion Post*, pp. 1-3.
- Kuppens, P. (2009). Anger. In D. Sanders & K. Scherer (Eds.), *Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences* (pp. 32-33). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langley, A. (1999). Strategies for theorizing from process data. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 691-710.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York: McGraw Hill
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lindlof, T., & Taylor, B. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods*. London: Sage
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Manning, P. (2001). *News and news sources: A critical introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McGuire, W. (1985). Attitudes and attitude change. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology: Special fields and applications* (3 ed., Vol. 2, pp. 233-346). New York: Random House.
- McLoughlin, D. (2005, August 24). Guilty, *Dominion Post*.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Case study research: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mesmer-Magnus, J., Chockalingam V. (2005). Whistleblowing in Organizations: An Examination of Correlates of Whistleblowing Intentions, Actions, and Retaliation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62 (3), 277-297.
- Miceli, M., & Near, J. (1992). *Blowing the whistle: The organizational and legal implications for companies and employees*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Montazeri, A., & McEwen, J. (1997). Effective communication: perception of two anti-smoking advertisements. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 30(1), 29-35.
- Morse, J. (1994). *Critical issues in qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nabi, R. L. (1999). A cognitive-functional model for the effects of discrete negative emotions on information processing, attitude change, and recall. *Communication Theory*, 9 (3), 292-320.
- Nabi, R. L. (2002). Discrete Emotions and Persuasion. In J. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nicholas, L. (2008). Interview with Hollings, J. [Videorecording]. Wellington: Massey University School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing Archive.
- Nicholas, L., & Kitchin, P. (2007). *Louise Nicholas: My Story*. Auckland: Random House.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1964). *The Spiral of Silence: Public opinion, our social skin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Nord, L. W. (2007). Investigative journalism in Sweden: A not so noticeable noble art. *Journalism*, 8 (5), 517-521.
- Norris, F. H., Friedman, M. J., Watson, P. J., Byrne, C. M., Diaz, E., & Kaniasty, K. (2002). 60,000 disaster victims speak: Part I. An empirical review of the empirical literature, 1981-2001. *Psychiatry*, 65 (3), 207-239.
- Northmore, D. (1996). *Lifting the lid: A guide to investigative research*. London: Cassell.
- O'Keefe, D. (1999). How to handle opposing arguments in persuasive messages: A meta-analytic review of the effects of one-sided and two-sided messages. *Communication yearbook*, 22, 209-250.
- Ochsner, K., & Feldman Barrett, L. (2001). A multiprocess perspective on the neuroscience of emotion. In T. Mayne & G. Bonnano (Eds.), *Emotion: Current issues and future directions* (pp. 38-81). New York: Guilford.
- Ojo, T. (2007). The Nigerian media and the process of democratization. *Journalism*, 8 (5), 545-550.
- Patterson, M. J., Russell, Robert H.,. (1986). *Behind the Lines: Case Studies in Investigative Reporting*. New York: Columbia Press.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Pearson, D., & Anderson, J. (1968). *The case against Congress: A compelling indictment of corruption on Capitol Hill*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Perloff, R. M. (2008). *The dynamics of persuasion: Communication and attitudes in the 21st century* (3rd ed.). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Petrak, J., & Hedge, B. (2002). *The Trauma of Sexual Assault: Treatment, Prevention and Practice*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Petty, R., & Cacioppo, J. (1984). *The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion*. New York: Academic Press.
- Petty, R., & Cacioppo, J. (1986a). *Communication and persuasion: The central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. New York: Springer-Verlag
- Petty, R., & Cacioppo, J. (1986b). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 19, 123-205.
- Petty, R. E., Brinol, P., & Priester, J. R. (2009). Mass Media Attitude Change: Implications of the Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion. In J. Bryant & M. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (3 ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Pilger, J. (2004). *Tell me no lies: Investigative journalism and its triumphs*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Platt, J. (1992). Case Study in American Methodological Thought. *Current Sociology*, 40 (17).
- Protest, D. L., Cook, F. L., Curtin, T. R., Gordon, M. T., Leff, D. R., McCombs, M. E., & Miller, P. (1987). The Impact of Investigative Reporting on Public Opinion and Policymaking Targeting Toxic Waste. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51 (2), 166-185.
- Protest, D. L., et al. (1991). *The Journalism of Outrage*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Reis, H., & Rusbult, C. (2002). *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Reis, H. E., & Rusbult, C. E. (2004). *Close relationships* (3rd ed.). New York: Psychology Press
- Rosecrance, J. (1988). Whistleblowing in probation departments. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16(2), 99-109.
- Rosenberry, J., & Vicker, L. (2009). *Applied mass communication theory: A guide for media practitioners*. Boston: Pearson.
- Rosner, C. (2008). *Behind the Headlines: A History of Investigative Journalism in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Rothwell, G., & Baldwin, J. (2007). Ethical Climate Theory, Whistle-blowing, and the Code of Silence in Police Agencies in the State of Georgia. [10.1007/s10551-006-9114-5]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 70(4), 341-361.
- Roy, M. J. (2005). *Novel approaches to the diagnosis and treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder*. Washington DC: IOS Press.

- Rusbult, C., & Martz, J. (1995). Remaining in an abusive relationship: An investment model analysis of nonvoluntary dependence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 558-558.
- Rusbult, C., Olsen, N., Davis, J., & Hannon, P. (2004). Commitment and relationship maintenance mechanisms. In H. E. Reis & C. E. Rusbult (Eds.), *Close relationships: Maintenance and enhancement* (pp. 281–303). New York: Psychology Press.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16, 172-186.
- Rusbult, C. E., Coolsen, M. K., Kirchner, J. L., & Clarke, J. A. (2006). Commitment. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruvinsky, M. (2008). *Investigative Reporting in Canada*. Ontario: OUP.
- Ryan, K. (2010). Interview with Hollings, J. [Tape recording]. Wellington: Massey University School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing Archive.
- Scherer, K. (2009). Appraisal. In D. Sanders & K. Scherer (Eds.), *Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences* (pp. 45-46). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Schlesinger, P. (1994). *Reporting crime: The media politics of criminal justice*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*: Basic Books.
- Schudson, M. (2002). *The sociology of news*. New York: Norton.
- Schudson, M. (2005). Autonomy from What? In R. Benson, Neveu, E. (Ed.), *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Schwartz, J. (2002). *Associated Press Reporting Handbook*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Seidelman, W. (1996). Nuremberg lamentation: For the forgotten victims of medical science. *British Medical Journal*, 313 (7070), 1463.
- Seiter, J. S., & Gass, R. H. (2004). *Perspectives on persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Shuster, E. (1997). Fifty years later: The significance of the Nuremberg Code. *The New England journal of medicine*, 337 (20), 1436.
- Sloman, S. (1996). The empirical case for two systems of reasoning. *Psychological bulletin*, 119 (1), 3-22.
- Smith, E., & DeCoster, J. (2000). Dual-process models in social and cognitive psychology: Conceptual integration and links to underlying memory systems. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(2), 108.
- Smith, E., & Neumann, R. (2005). Emotion processes considered from the perspective of dual-process models. In L. Barrett, P. Niedenthal & P. Winkielman (Eds.), *Emotion and consciousness* (pp. 287–311). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Soanes, C., Stevenson, A., & Pearsall, J. (2004). *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* (11th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spark, D. (1999). *Investigative reporting: A study in technique*. Oxford: Focal Press.
- Spencer, S. (2001). *Reluctant witness*: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (Vol. 3, pp. 443-446). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tanner, S. (2002). *Journalism: Investigation and Research*. French's Forest, NSW: Longman.
- Taylor, P. (2004, October 30). Woman told to shut up about sexual violation, *NZ Herald*.
- Taylor, P. (2007, March 3). Shipton faces new sex allegation, *NZ Herald*.
- Taylor, P. (2009). Interview with Hollings, J. [Edited transcript]. Wellington: Massey University School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing Archive.
- Travers, M. (2001). *Qualitative research through case studies*. London: Sage.
- Tuchman, G. (1980). *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. New York: The Free Press.
- Tully, J. (2008). *Intro: A beginner's guide to professional news journalism* (3rd , with revisions ed.). Wellington: New Zealand Journalists Training Organisation.

- Turner, M. M. (2007). Using emotion in risk communication: The Anger Activism Model. *Public Relations Review*, 33(2), 114-119.
- Ullmann, J. (1995). *Investigative Reporting: Advanced Methods and Techniques*. New York: St Martin's.
- Uys, T. (2000). The politicisation of whistleblowers: A case study. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 9 (4), 259-267.
- Uys, T. (2008). Rational Loyalty and Whistleblowing: The South African Context. *Current Sociology*, 56 (6), 904-921.
- Vandekerckhove, W. (2006). *Whistleblowing and organizational social responsibility: A global assessment*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Vohs, K., Baumeister, R., & Loewenstein, G. (2007). *Do emotions help or hurt decision making?* New York: Russell Sage.
- Weick, K. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Weiss, H., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in organizational behavior*, 18, 1-74.
- Whitehead, E. (2001). Witness satisfaction: findings from the Witness Satisfaction Survey 2000. *Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate*.
- Williams, M. (2002). Generalisation in interpretive research. In T. May (Ed.), *Qualitative research in action* (pp. 125-143). London: Sage.
- Wilson, E., & Sherrell, D. (1993). Source effects in communication and persuasion research: A meta-analysis of effect size. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21(2), 101-112.
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2006). *Mass media research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Wood, W., Rhodes, N., & Biek, M. (1995). Working knowledge and attitude strength: An information-processing analysis. *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*, 283-313.
- Woodward, B. (2005). *The Secret Man - The story of Watergate's Deep Throat*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Yin, R. K. (2002). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zajonc, R. (1984). On the primacy of affect. *American Psychologist*, 39 (2), 117-123.
- Zdovc, S. M., & Kovacic, M. P. (2007). The paradox of Slovenia: Investigative journalism during socialism and democracy. *Journalism*, 8 (5), 522-529.
- Zelenski, J. (2007). The role of personality in decision making. In K. Vohs, R. Baumeister & G. Loewenstein (Eds.), *Do emotions help or hurt decision making?* New York: Russell Sage.
- Zelizer, B. (2004a). *Approaches to qualitative research: A reader on theory and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zelizer, B. (2004b). *Taking journalism seriously: News and the academy*. London: Sage.
- Zipparo, L. (1998). Factors which deter public officials from reporting corruption. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 30 (3), 273-287.
- Znaniecki, F. (1934). *The method of sociology*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart.