

A BREED APART?

A comparative study of investigative journalists and US journalists

Gerry Lanosga , Lars Willnat, David H. Weaver, and Brant Houston

This study reports selected comparative findings from two national surveys of 861 self-identified investigative journalists and 1080 US journalists drawn from the profession as a whole. The study examines possible predictors of journalistic roles and support for controversial reporting techniques, including demographics, organizational context, and journalistic attitudes. It finds notable distinctions in demographic factors, perceptions of journalistic roles, and attitudes toward controversial reporting practices. As expected, investigative journalists are more likely to express support for the adversarial function of journalism. Among US journalists, those who support the adversarial approach are characterized by significant attitudinal differences. The study suggests the need for more research that analyzes distinct practitioner groups identified by the kind of journalism they produce.

KEYWORDS comparative research; investigative journalism; journalism; journalistic practice; journalistic roles; survey

Introduction

In February 1980, David Burgin of the *Peninsula Times Tribune* nominated the newspaper's stories about mismanagement at veterans' hospitals for an award in the annual contest sponsored by Investigative Reporters & Editors (IRE).¹ Describing the work of the two reporters on the project, Burgin wrote in his nominating letter:

There is indeed such a thing as an investigative reporter, a person apart from the rest because he or she has the courage and the will to dig and check, dig and check, and the intelligence and the integrity to see wrongdoing, to define the problem, to discern the import of it and to write about it coherently. The investigative reporter is a special breed who is central to the longevity of our democracy and his kind should be encouraged. (Copy of letter in authors' possession)

Burgin's letter reflects a heroic vision of the intrepid investigative journalist that is pervasive in contemporary discourse about journalism. Investigative journalists are viewed as the apotheosis of the profession—"custodians of conscience" (Ettema and Glasser 1998) who pursue "the journalism of outrage" (Protess et al. 1991). They are "courageous fighters of corruption and injustice" (Marshall 2011, xiv) practicing journalism "at its most politically vigorous and methodologically rigorous" (Ettema and Glasser 2007, 491). Investigative reporting is what makes journalism "powerful when it is powerful, independent when it is independent" (Starkman 2014, 9). In these formulations, investigative

Journalism Studies, 2017

Vol. 18, No. 3, 265–287, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2015.1051570>

© 2015 Taylor & Francis

journalists are portrayed as possessing different attributes than other journalists. They are bolder, morally indignant, less risk-averse, and more willing to confront powerful interests to expose hidden vices and change society for the better. Moreover, it is often urged that *all* reporters ought to attempt to develop an “investigative mentality” (Berry 2009).

The notion that investigative journalists are a breed apart is commonplace even among journalism scholars, yet it has not been adequately explored in studies of the profession. That is a significant lapse in view of the importance ascribed to investigative journalism in democratic governance (e.g., Starr 2009). This study addresses that shortcoming through an examination of demographics, perceptions, and attitudes among self-identified investigative journalists and US journalists as a whole. Using new data from two national representative surveys of more than 1900 journalists in all, the study reveals that there are indeed notable differences between the two groups. Though similar to other journalists in some basic demographic categories, investigative journalists tend to have higher incomes and educational attainment and are less likely to state a political preference or religious background. Investigative journalists also put more emphasis on roles such as helping people and influencing politics. Moreover, the surveys support notions of investigative journalists as more inclined to accept an adversarial role for journalism in relation to political and business institutions and more willing to embrace professional practices in pursuit of news.

These comparative findings come from two broad national surveys conducted during the same time-frame in late 2013 using identical questions of both investigative journalists and a general population of US journalists. The general survey reflects a national representative sample of 1080 US journalists, with results compared to 861 journalists sampled from the membership of IRE, a national association and educational organization representing several thousand members. The few previous surveys of investigative journalists have had limited value for comparative research because of the chosen sample frames and questionnaire designs. This study includes investigative journalists representing the widest possible range of individual and organizational factors.

Related Studies

Much is known about the perceptions and practices of journalists as a whole. The American Journalist surveys conducted over the course of three decades have yielded a rich longitudinal picture of US practitioners (Weaver and Wilhoit 1986, 1996; Weaver et al. 2007). More recent research on a global scale has identified some significant cross-national differences among journalists (Fredriksson and Johansson 2014; Hanitzsch 2011; Hanitzsch and Berganza 2012; Plaisance, Skewes, and Hanitzsch 2012; Reich and Hanitzsch 2013; Weaver and Willnat 2012; Willnat, Weaver, and Choi 2013). The consideration of distinctions among journalists, however, has not extended much into differences based on specific journalistic genres such as investigative reporting.

Only a few efforts have been made to quantify investigative journalism specifically. A small survey of US managing editors conducted more than three decades ago (Harmening 1977) reported that 32 of 174 newspapers in the sample had at least one person on staff carrying the title of investigative reporter, with larger newspapers much more likely to have such dedicated positions. The editors were asked their views on practices such as whether a reporter should identify himself or herself when dealing with sources (68 percent said yes), but investigative reporters themselves were not surveyed.

Although investigative reporting is often associated with specific teams or units within news organizations, studies have shown that investigative practices have been spreading because of their adoption by beat reporters or generalists (Kaplan 2008; Protesse et al. 1991). As Walton (2010) noted, this development makes it challenging to identify investigative journalists because many of them do their work outside the confines of a full-time investigative team. Walton cited a 2006 survey by Arizona State University students that found only 39 percent of the largest US newspapers had an investigative team, and about a third had no full-time investigative reporters at all.

The only previous broad survey of investigative journalists was conducted more than 25 years ago by Protesse et al. (1991). The sample was drawn from the membership of IRE and included 927 respondents out of 2741 members. More than half of the journalists worked in markets of 500,000 or more. The survey included basic background questions, but because respondents were not required to answer them, the study offered only sketchy demographic data that the authors did not attempt to contrast with profiles of journalists as a whole. Moreover, while the survey asked about investigative journalists' work routines and output, it did not probe their views on specific reporting tactics and ethical questions.

A more recent but smaller-scale survey (Kaplan 2008) attempted to build on the Protesse findings, exploring US investigative reporters' attitudes toward issues such as job satisfaction and the impact of investigative reporting on public policy, as well as a limited range of controversial reporting practices. Kaplan surveyed 281 print journalists who had worked on investigative reporting projects within the previous two years, following up with 10 in-depth interviews. In terms of reporting practices, two-thirds of respondents said they would be comfortable going undercover to get a story, but two-thirds also said they would not use deception. A fifth of the journalists indicated they would be willing to use *any* of the techniques mentioned. Unlike the Protesse study, respondents were limited to newspaper journalists, with most working at mid-sized newspapers (Sunday circulations from 100,000 to 500,000). Kaplan's subjects were selected primarily through an invitation email sent by IRE to its members, postings in several IRE discussion forums, and snowball sampling from the initial respondents.

Although Kaplan attempted to look at investigative journalists over time, neither his study nor previous surveys offered a comparative portrait of investigative journalists and journalists as a whole. Protesse et al. gathered only limited demographics—age, gender, and race/ethnicity. Kaplan added a narrow measure of educational background. Despite the lack of comparative data, it can be surmised that there should be significant differences between investigative journalists and journalists as a whole. For instance, given the prestigious status of investigative journalism in the profession, it seems reasonable to expect that such journalists would tend to be older, more experienced, and more highly paid than journalists overall. Both surveys reported here collected the full work-up of demographic factors, including age, sex, income, race, party identification, education, and religious background.

H1: Investigative journalists will be significantly different from US journalists overall in demographic characteristics, including age, years of work experience, and income levels.

The American Journalist surveys find that there are different perceptions of appropriate professional roles among journalists, including the four broad functions of interpretive,

adversarial, neutral disseminator, and populist-mobilizer (Weaver et al. 2007; Weaver and Wilhoit 1996). Previous surveys of investigative reporters generally have not explored these role perceptions, but given the distinct job descriptions and work focus of these reporters, it stands to reason that their role perceptions would diverge from those of journalists in general. The adversarial function has generally received the least support among journalists overall. However, it might be the function most apt to align with the outlook of that subset of journalists who think of themselves as investigative.

H2: Investigative journalists will be more likely than US journalists overall to consider the adversarial role of journalism to be important.

If indeed there are divergent role perceptions, it is important to explore whether the differences can be accounted for by demographic, organizational, and attitudinal factors. Both the IRE survey and the American Journalist survey included questions aimed at measuring those variables. Organizational factors include job title, number of years working in journalism, job satisfaction, perceived autonomy, and media type. Attitudes include the importance of helping people, the importance of influencing public affairs, and perception of the outlook for journalism as a profession.

RQ1: What are the demographic, organizational, and attitudinal predictors of professional role perceptions among investigative journalists and US journalists overall?

Only one effort to place investigative journalists in this comparative context with other journalists can be found in the literature. In a study focused specifically on religious beliefs and practices, Underwood and Stamm (2001) surveyed 432 US and Canadian journalists, including 75 IRE members, 89 members of the Religion Newswriters Association, and 258 other journalists selected from a random sample of newspapers. The study found that investigative journalists were more strongly motivated than the other groups by a reformist orientation based on morally activist notions of social justice and exposure of corruption. That finding is in line with qualitative studies that have examined investigative journalism as a distinctly moralistic practice. Aucoin's (2005) historical analysis used the prism of moral philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre's social practice theory to argue that investigative reporting has thrived because of committed practitioners who are motivated by virtues such as justice, truth, and courage. Also Ettema and Glasser (1998) used ethnographic research, in-depth interviews, and analysis of prize-winning stories to describe investigative reporters as being engaged in a moral inquiry dedicated to the exposure of societal ills.

This line of research is suggestive of a distinct mindset among investigative journalists, an issue explored in a study of ethical decision-making by journalists and other professionals. Coleman and Wilkins (2004) identified the practice of investigative reporting as a significant predictor of higher moral development among journalists. Investigative journalists in their study scored significantly higher on a quantitative test of ethical thinking than journalists who did not do investigative reporting. The authors speculated that the difference could be related to the fact that investigative journalists, by the nature of their work, tend to be more practiced in the skills of ethical decision-making. One implication of this might be that investigative journalists are more apt to avoid reporting practices that are sometimes viewed as unethical, such as using deception or hidden cameras. However, popular and professional notions of journalistic investigators as bolder, more aggressive, and less risk-averse than regular journalists suggest that investigative journalists would be more, rather than less, comfortable with such techniques.

Moreover, an earlier study of ethical decision-making identified three distinct clusters of investigative reporters, one of which was strikingly more willing to endorse reporting practices such as deceiving a source, wearing a disguise, and even eavesdropping or stealing (Whitlow and Van Tubergen 1978). The study used Q-methodology to analyze how 34 US journalists attending an IRE conference responded to 53 scenarios that might pose ethical dilemmas for an investigative journalist. One cluster of respondents was willing to use “almost any means to obtain information.” Such a mindset suggests that some investigative journalists might be more supportive of ethically controversial reporting tactics deemed indefensible by a majority of respondents in previous American Journalist surveys. Those tactics include paying for confidential information, using documents without permission, claiming to be someone else, abrogating confidentiality agreements, badgering informants to get a story, and using hidden cameras.

H3: Investigative journalists will be more supportive of aggressive newsgathering techniques than US journalists overall.

Again, to the extent there is a significant difference here, this study considers whether it can be attributed to something else other than identification as an investigative journalist:

RQ2: What are the demographic, organizational, and attitudinal predictors of using controversial newsgathering techniques among investigative journalists and US journalists overall?

Methods

To test the hypotheses and research questions listed above, in the fall of 2013 we conducted two national online surveys, one of US journalists and one of self-identified investigative journalists. Many of the questions followed the wording used in the earlier American Journalist surveys, and some questions were included to mirror those of the earlier surveys of investigative journalists. These parallel surveys present a rare opportunity to test differences among distinct cohorts of journalists with a set of questions that can be compared directly.

The 2013 American Journalist survey included 1080 full-time journalists from print, broadcast, and online news media in the United States. The survey employed the same basic sampling methods used in the previous surveys of US journalists done in 1982, 1992, and 2002. It was based on a multi-stage sampling procedure, which first draws a representative sample of media organizations in the United States and then, in a second step, samples of journalists from within each of the selected organizations. The sample of online journalists was created by identifying online journalists within a representative selection of traditional media organizations and by obtaining lists of journalists from online-only media organizations and news websites. The response rate was 32.6 percent.²

The investigative journalist survey, on the other hand, was sent via email to the membership of IRE. The list comprised academic and professional members from all media types and included both international and US journalists. The final sample consisted of 861 respondents, which represents a 30.6 percent response rate. Because this was a nonprobability sample, the findings are not strictly generalizable, but using IRE—the only organization specifically devoted to investigative reporting—is the most feasible way to target a

large and varied population of self-identified investigative journalists. Further, fully three-fourths (75.6 percent) of the IRE respondents indicated that they do investigative work at least part of the time in their jobs.³

Both surveys contained a set of identical questions that focused mostly on journalists' job satisfaction, perceived levels of freedom in their jobs, journalistic role perceptions, journalistic practices, and demographics. Most of the questions used in the 2013 American Journalist survey were asked in previous studies of US journalists and therefore can be compared over time. The analysis presented in this study focuses on how US journalists overall and investigative journalists specifically think about journalistic roles and what factors might predict these perceptions.

Variables

Journalistic roles. To gain a better understanding of how US journalists overall and investigative journalists think about journalistic roles in society, both sets of respondents were asked to state how important (1 = not really important, 4 = extremely important) they considered a number of professional roles that have been identified in prior research. Journalists were asked, for example, how important they thought it was to "get information to the public quickly," "provide analysis and interpretation of complex problems," or to "investigate claims and statements made by the government."⁴

Organizational context. To measure how the journalists' organizational context influences their perception of journalistic roles, both surveys included a series of questions that assessed the journalists' relative job position and perceived freedom in their professional work. The final analysis included a set of variables that allowed us to identify (1) whether journalists work primarily for print, broadcast, or online media, (2) whether they work as reporters or supervisors, (3) how many years they have been in journalism, (4) how satisfied they are with their jobs, (5) whether they think their story ideas usually get covered, (6) how much freedom they think they have in selecting their stories, and (7) how much freedom they think they have in deciding which aspects of a story to emphasize.

Journalistic attitudes. Journalists' general attitudes toward their work were assessed with nine questions that asked them to rate the importance of (1) the chance to influence public affairs, (2) the chance to help people, (3) the chance to develop a specialty, (4) the chance to get ahead in their organization, (5) the importance of their organization's editorial policy, (6) the importance of pay, (7) the importance of their job security, (8) the importance of their job autonomy, and (9) the importance of their pay (1 = not too important, 3 = very important). In addition, journalists were asked on an 11-point scale how much influence they thought the media "have" on public opinion and how much influence they thought the media "should have" on public opinion in general (0 = no influence, 10 = great influence). Finally, journalists were asked whether they thought that journalism in the United States is going in the right or wrong direction (1 = wrong direction, 0 = right direction).

Approval of reporting practices. To assess how widespread the acceptance of controversial reporting practices is among US journalists overall and among investigative journalists, respondents were asked to indicate, given an important story, whether they would

approve any of 12 reporting practices such as “paying people for confidential information,” “claiming to be somebody else,” or “badgering unwilling informants to get a story.” The journalists were able to indicate whether they thought that their use “would be justified on occasion” (coded as 3) that they “would not approve” (coded as 1) such methods under any circumstances, or that they were “not sure” (coded as 2).⁵

Demographics. Both surveys included an identical set of standard demographic control variables that assessed respondents’ age, sex, education, political party affiliation, income, marital status, race, perceived importance of religion, and whether they majored in journalism in college. To allow direct comparison of these variables across the two datasets, all demographic control variables (except income and education) were coded the same way for the final analyses.⁶

Findings

Demographics

H1 predicted significant demographic differences between investigative journalists and US journalists overall. As shown in [Table 1](#), the two groups are quite similar in terms of gender, age, race, and marital status, but investigative journalists have somewhat higher educational attainment and income as well as greater variability on religion and political party affiliation. While 92.1 percent of US journalists reported attending or finishing undergraduate studies, for investigative journalists the figure was 99 percent. Similarly, 30.6 percent of US journalists attended or finished graduate school while nearly half (48.9 percent) of investigative journalists did. In addition, journalists were asked to choose an income range. Among US journalists, 42.9 percent said their incomes were \$60,000 or more. The corresponding figure for investigative journalists was notably higher at 61 percent. The disparity here is reflected in the median income, which is \$50,028 for journalists as a whole compared to \$69,734 for investigative journalists.

Though journalists, like many other people, are often reluctant to discuss their personal views on religion and politics, both surveys sought such information from respondents. When it comes to politics, more than half of both groups reported that they consider themselves to be Independents. US journalists as a whole were somewhat more likely to identify with a major political party, whereas significantly higher proportions of investigative journalists indicated they had no preference or fell into the “other” category. Considering religion, fewer investigative journalists reported being brought up Christian than US journalists (59.8 versus 69 percent). Conversely, more investigative journalists answered “none” to the religion question—20 versus 14 percent for US journalists.

One other notable demographic distinction between the two sets of respondents involves career longevity. US journalists as a whole reported having many more years in journalism on average (21.4 years versus 15 years for investigative journalists). This could mean that investigative journalists tend to leave journalism earlier, or it could reflect more experienced investigative journalists dropping out of IRE membership (and thus from the sample frame) as they move into management or other roles in their newsrooms. In fact, US journalists surveyed do report having slightly more time in their current jobs (13.9 years on average versus 12.7 years for investigative journalists).

TABLE 1

Demographics of investigative journalists and US journalists overall (percentages, unless otherwise noted)

	US journalists (N = 1080)	Investigative journalists (N = 861)
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	62.5	59.0
Female	37.5	41.0
<i>Age</i>		
18–24	4.8	2.0
25–34	19.4	23.4
35–44	19.3	21.2
45–54	29.2	22.3
55–64	23.2	24.1
65 and older	4.2	6.8
Median age in years	47	47
<i>Race</i>		
White	91.5	87.6
African-American	4.1	3.3
Asian	1.9	3.9
Hispanic	0.6	3.9
Other	1.9	1.3
<i>Education</i>		
Some/finished undergraduate	92.1	99.0
Some/finished graduate	30.6	48.9
<i>Party affiliation</i>		
Democrat	29.5	22.6
Republican	7.5	2.6
Independent	52.8	52.6
No preference	8.0	14.7
Other	2.2	7.5
<i>Income</i>		
Less than \$20,000	4.4	3.1
\$20,000–39,999	34.7	12.7
\$40,000–59,999	17.9	23.3
\$60,000–79,999	14.4	22.5
\$80,000–99,999	8.2	15.8
More than \$100,000	20.3	22.7
Median income in \$	50,028	69,734
<i>Marital status</i>		
Married	63.2	63.0
Widowed	0.7	1.2
Separated/divorced	7.7	9.4
Unmarried/single	28.4	26.4
<i>Religion</i>		
Christian	69.0	59.8
Jewish	7.9	9.1
Muslim	0.4	1.1
None	14.0	20.0
Other	8.7	10.0
<i>Other variables</i>		
Majored in journalism	51.5	48.5
Years in journalism (mean)	21.4	15
Years in current job (mean)	13.9	12.7

To further explore distinctions between US and investigative journalists, both groups were asked about the type of media and business model where they work and their attitudes toward a variety of occupational issues (see Table 2). About a third of each group works in daily newspapers, but more than half of the US journalists work in print while the investigative respondents are more spread out among media types. For instance, 21.8 percent of investigative journalists work in television, versus 12.2 percent of US journalists; and 19.5 percent of investigative journalists work primarily online versus 8.5 percent of US journalists. There is also a marked difference between the two samples in terms of business model. Slightly more than a quarter (26 percent) of investigative journalists report working for a nonprofit compared to only 7.6 percent of the general population of US journalists. This disparity is a clear reflection of the growing trend toward nonprofit investigative organizations in the United States.

In terms of journalistic attitudes, there are some striking differences between investigative journalists and US journalists as a whole. The former seem to place more importance on issues such as editorial policies (66.2 versus 63.8 percent), autonomy (63.4 versus 42.7 percent), and the chance to help people (62.9 versus 53.5 percent) and influence public affairs (45 versus 38.2 percent). The latter are more likely to emphasize pay

TABLE 2

Media type and journalistic attitudes of investigative journalists and US journalists overall (percentages)

	US journalists (N = 1080)	Investigative journalists (N = 861)
<i>Type of media</i>		
Daily	33.1	32.5
Weekly	22.0	4.6
Magazine	5.6	4.9
Television	12.2	21.8
Radio	9.0	3.7
Online	8.5	19.5
Other	–	13.0
<i>Business model</i>		
For profit	92.4	74.0
Nonprofit	7.6	26.0
Influence media have on public opinion	7.4	6.7
Influence media should have on public opinion	6.2	6.9
<i>Journalistic attitudes</i>		
Importance of pay (very important)	30.3	26.6
Importance of fringe benefits	19.7	16.0
Importance of organization's editorial policy	63.8	66.2
Job security	51.4	38.2
Chance to develop specialty	24.0	39.5
Importance of job autonomy	42.7	63.4
Chance to get ahead in organization	26.1	19.9
Chance to help people	53.5	62.9
Influence public affairs	38.2	45.0
Follow up on ideas (almost always)	33.6	30.4
Freedom to select stories (almost complete)	33.6	32.3
Job satisfaction (very satisfied)	23.3	40.0
Journalism is going in wrong direction	59.7	44.7

(30.3 versus 26.6 percent) and benefits (19.7 versus 16 percent), job security (51.4 versus 38.2 percent), and the chance to get ahead in their organizations (26.1 versus 19.9 percent).

Further, while US journalists are more likely to think the media have a strong influence on public opinion (mean of 7.4 versus 6.7, on an 11-point scale), investigative journalists are more inclined to think the media *should* have a stronger influence on the public (mean of 6.9 versus 6.2). This incongruity is not necessarily unexpected, and it conforms with the findings regarding the respondents' views of the populist-motivator role, reported below. As Protess et al. (1991) showed, investigative journalism often produces reforms on the basis of cooperation between journalists and policymakers rather than through journalistic mobilization of the public. Thus, this finding may reflect both investigative journalists' understandings of real-world workings of policy agenda setting as well as an idealistic desire to see their work gain more traction with members of the public.

Finally, US journalists and investigative journalists differ significantly when it comes to job satisfaction and views of the future prospects of journalism. Less than a quarter (23.3 percent) of journalists as a whole described themselves as very satisfied with their jobs while for investigative journalists the comparable figure was 40 percent. Also, asked whether they thought journalism is going in the right or wrong direction, well over half (59.7 percent) of general journalists said the wrong direction while only 44.7 percent of investigative journalists gave that answer.

Role Perceptions

Table 3 indicates that there are statistically significant differences in how important investigative journalists and US journalists in general consider four of the six professional roles included in this study (H2). For investigating claims and statements of government officials, US journalists overall are somewhat more likely (78.2 percent) than investigative journalists (67.3 percent) to consider this role "extremely important," but less likely to consider it "quite important" (18.9 versus 27.9 percent). This is a curious anomaly among the general findings that indicate investigative journalists tend to be more assertive than other journalists.

For the adversarial roles, for instance, investigative journalists are more likely than US journalists overall to consider these extremely or quite important, with the largest gaps evident for the "extremely important" category (28.1 versus 21.6 percent for being an adversary of public officials, and 26.6 versus 18.7 percent for being an adversary of businesses). Thus, H2 is supported.

For the populist-motivator role (urging ordinary people to get involved in public discussions of important issues), investigative journalists are substantially less likely (25 percent) than US journalists in general (38 percent) to consider this extremely important, perhaps because investigative journalists are more concerned with uncovering wrongdoing than motivating people to discuss issues.

There was no significant difference between investigative and other journalists in the perceived importance of the interpretive role (providing analysis and interpretation of complex problems), which was rated the most important of all the roles, or in pointing people to possible solutions to problems, which was rated among the least important roles.

Table 4 indicates that the six professional roles cluster into three more general functions of journalism for both groups of journalists, consistent with earlier studies of US journalists (Weaver and Wilhoit 1986, 1996; Weaver et al. 2007). The adversarial function (being

TABLE 3
Professional role perceptions of investigative journalists and US journalists overall

	Extremely important (%)	Quite important (%)	Somewhat important (%)	Not really important (%)	Chi-square (df)	SD	Levene's test
Provide analysis and interpretation of complex problems	68.4	27.0	4.2	0.4		0.58	
Investigate claims and statements made by the government	68.8	25.6	5.1	0.5	1.36 (3)	0.60	0.83
Be an adversary of public officials by being constantly skeptical of their actions	67.3	27.9	4.4	0.5	29.40*** (3)	0.52	63.30***
Be an adversary of businesses by being constantly skeptical of their actions	28.1	33.1	29.7	9.1	33.03*** (3)	0.95	13.00***
Motivate ordinary people to get involved in public discussions of important issues	21.6	31.6	29.1	17.7	44.17*** (3)	1.01	13.39***
Point people toward possible solutions	26.6	35.7	27.2	10.4	70.93*** (3)	0.93	38.39***
	18.7	31.1	30.4	19.9	1.13 (3)	0.95	1.00
	25.0	30.9	27.6	16.5		0.93	
	38.0	32.8	22.5	6.6		0.95	
	31.6	35.8	23.9	8.6		0.93	
	31.7	36.5	24.5	7.3		0.93	

Upper row represents investigative journalists, lower row US journalists overall. *N* = 1080 for US journalists and 681 for investigative journalists. ****p* < 0.001.

TABLE 4

Factor analysis of professional role perceptions for investigative journalists and US journalists overall

	US journalists (N = 1080)			Investigative journalists (N = 681)		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
<i>Interpretive function</i>						
Investigate government claims	0.166	0.824	0.110	0.171	-0.035	0.795
Provide analysis of complex problems	0.064	0.870	0.051	0.043	0.160	0.806
<i>Populist-mobilizer function</i>						
Motivate people to get involved	0.073	0.023	0.859	0.127	0.862	0.037
Point to possible solutions	0.037	0.135	0.839	0.036	0.878	0.088
<i>Adversarial function</i>						
Serve as adversary of government	0.965	0.121	0.063	0.958	0.074	0.136
Serve as adversary of business	0.962	0.131	0.064	0.956	0.107	0.111
Eigenvalues	1.465			1.323		
Total variance (%)	80.78			79.33		

Extraction: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation: Varimax with Kaiser normalization.

an adversary of both government and business) is the most tightly clustered for both groups, as indicated by the factor loadings and its placement on the first factor. The interpretive function (investigating government claims and analyzing complex problems) is a bit more tightly clustered and important for US journalists in general than for investigative reporters and editors, which is not too surprising, given the difference between the two groups on investigating government claims. The populist-mobilizer function (motivating people to get involved in discussions and pointing to possible solutions of public problems) appeared on the third factor for journalists in general and the second for investigative journalists. Overall, however, the clustering of these more specific professional roles into more general functions of journalism was very similar for both groups of journalists, supporting previous studies of US journalists in general.

Table 5 compares possible predictors of the three identified journalistic functions for all US journalists and investigative journalists using a series of identical hierarchical regression models (RQ1). For each group of journalists, demographics, organizational background, and general attitudes toward journalism are regressed against the three professional functions identified earlier. The results indicate that for both groups, journalistic attitudes are generally stronger predictors of professional functions than demographics or organizational context, as measured by the changes in the incremental R^2 values.

There are some differences between the significant predictors for the two groups that are worth pointing out, however. In the demographics block, being female is a positive predictor of the interpretive function for investigative journalists, but not for journalists in general. This is consistent with the finding that for all US journalists being a woman was a negative predictor of the adversarial function, but among investigative journalists being female was not a significant predictor of this function. The perceived importance of religion is a negative predictor of the adversarial function for US journalists in general, but not for investigative journalists, perhaps because being an investigative journalist requires a more adversarial or skeptical mindset than other areas of journalism.

TABLE 5

Predictors of professional functions among investigative journalists and US journalists overall

	Interpretive function		Adversarial function		Populist-mobilizer function	
	US journalists	Investigative journalists	US journalists	Investigative journalists	US journalists	Investigative journalists
<i>Demographics</i>						
Age	-0.01*	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01
Female	0.02	0.19*	-0.31**	-0.20	0.10	0.01
Education	0.06	0.01	0.08	0.12	0.03	0.07
Democrat	0.08	0.12	0.12	-0.05	0.20	0.16
Income	0.02***	0.03	0.04***	-0.01	-0.03***	-0.15***
Married	-0.02	-0.01	-0.11	-0.06	0.15	-0.18
Minority	-0.01	-0.21	0.15	-0.14	0.18	0.39
Importance of religion	-0.04	0.05	-0.16**	-0.01	0.01	0.08
Majored in journalism	0.10	-0.03	0.16	-0.01	0.01	0.04
Incremental R^2	4.9***	2.3	4.6***	0.4	2.0*	3.1*
<i>Organizational context</i>						
Reporter	0.05	-0.02	0.14	0.38	-0.16	-0.21
Supervisor	-0.05	-0.22	-0.12	0.35	-0.02	-0.18
Years in journalism	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
Job satisfaction	-0.02	-0.06	-0.08	-0.13	-0.02	0.05
Freedom to choose subjects to cover	0.05	0.12*	0.01	-0.15	-0.01	-0.06
Freedom to select stories	-0.01	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.11	0.08
Work for print media	-0.04	0.07	0.22	-0.25	-0.22	0.14
Work for broadcast media	-0.21	0.01	-0.18	-0.03	-0.16	-0.12**
Work for public media	0.18	0.07	0.60*	-0.20	-0.37	-0.09
Incremental R^2	0.8	2.3	1.2	1.8	1.3	2.5
<i>Journalistic attitudes</i>						
Importance of pay	0.07	0.16**	0.25*	0.13	0.01	0.03
Importance of organization's editorial policy	0.03	0.13*	0.04	0.08	-0.09	0.02
Importance of job security	-0.08	0.05	-0.13	0.09	0.30***	0.02

(Continued)

TABLE 5
(Continued)

	Interpretive function		Adversarial function		Populist-mobilizer function	
	US journalists	Investigative journalists	US journalists	Investigative journalists	US journalists	Investigative journalists
Importance of job autonomy	0.09	0.13	0.13	0.04	0.06	0.06
Chance to get ahead in organization	-0.07	-0.01	-0.16	-0.10	-0.11	0.13
Chance to help people	0.15***	0.14	-0.05	0.09	0.40***	0.40***
Chance to develop a specialty	0.04	0.04	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.05
Chance to influence public affairs	0.21***	0.06	0.30***	0.30**	0.59***	0.50***
Journalism is going in wrong direction	-0.01	0.07	0.12	0.19	-0.02	-0.06
Influence media have on public opinion	-0.03	0.02	-0.09*	0.10*	-0.01	0.07
Influence media should have on public opinion	0.08***	0.05*	0.15***	0.05	0.10***	0.19***
Incremental R^2	9.7***	7.4***	4.8***	4.8***	20.2***	16.8***
Total R^2 (%)	15.4***	12.0***	10.6***	7.0***	23.5***	22.4***
<i>N</i>	888	642	888	629	888	625

Cell entries are unstandardized ordinary least-squares regression coefficients (*b*).

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Turning to the measures of organizational context, there are very few statistically significant predictors of the three journalistic functions. More freedom to choose subjects to cover is a positive predictor of the interpretive function for investigative journalists, but not for all journalists in general, and working for broadcast news media is a negative predictor of the populist-mobilizer function for investigative journalists but not for journalists in general.

Among the measures of journalistic attitudes, there are many more statistically significant predictors of the three functions, and more similarities between the two groups of journalists, which is not surprising considering that attitudes and values are likely to be rather strongly correlated. The strongest predictors are the perceived importance of the chance to influence public affairs and the chance to help people. Both are fairly strong positive predictors of the populist-mobilizer function, and for journalists in general both are moderate positive predictors of the interpretive function. The chance to influence public affairs is also a positive predictor of the adversarial function for both groups of journalists. The belief that news media should have more influence on public opinion is a positive predictor of all three journalistic functions for journalists in general and of interpretive and populist-mobilizer functions for investigative journalists.

Looking at these patterns of predictors in another way, it is possible to say that among US journalists in general, those who consider the interpretive function more important are likely to be those who are slightly younger with slightly higher incomes who consider important the chance to help people, to influence public affairs and to think that news media should have more influence on public opinion. Among investigative journalists, those who consider the interpretive role more important are likely to be women, those who have more freedom to choose subjects to cover, those who consider pay and editorial policies more important, and those who think the news media should have more influence on public opinion.

Among US journalists overall, those who consider the adversarial role more important are likely to be men with slightly higher incomes, those who consider religion less important, those who work for public news media, those who consider pay more important, those who think the chance to influence public affairs is more important, and those who think the news media do not have much influence on public opinion, but *should* have more. Among investigative journalists, those who consider the adversarial role more important are likely to be those who think the chance to influence public affairs is more important and who think that the news media do have more influence on public opinion.

Among US journalists in general, those who consider the populist-mobilizer role more important are likely to be those with slightly lower incomes (perhaps because they work for smaller news media), those who attach more importance to job security, those who consider more important the chance to help people and to influence public affairs, and those who think the news media should have more influence on public opinion. Among investigative journalists, those who consider the populist-mobilizer role more important are likely to be those with lower incomes (again perhaps because they work for smaller news organizations), those who are less likely to work for broadcast news organizations, those who consider more important the chance to help people and to influence public affairs, and those who think the news media should have more influence on public opinion.

Reporting Practices

H3 predicted that investigative journalists would be more willing to use controversial newsgathering techniques than US journalists as a whole. The findings reveal strong support for this hypothesis. For an overall view, the 12 reporting practice measures were combined into a *controversial newsgathering techniques* index ranging from 12 (= low acceptance) to 33 (= high acceptance). The mean score for investigative reporters was nearly two points higher than that for US journalists overall (Cronbach's alpha = 0.65, mean = 17.84, SD = 3.80 for US journalists and Cronbach's alpha = 0.59, mean = 19.60, SD = 3.70 for investigative journalists).

Overall, the results show that for both groups, journalistic attitudes are generally stronger predictors of these values than demographics or organizational context, as measured by the changes in the incremental R^2 values. However, Table 6 indicates that

TABLE 6
Approval of controversial newsgathering techniques by investigative journalists and US journalists overall

	Justified on occasion (%)	Would not approve (%)	Not sure (%)	Chi-square (df)	SD	Levene's test
Paying people for confidential information	6.3 4.5	88.7 90.3	5.0 5.2	3.06 (2)	0.69 0.31	2.49
Using confidential business or government documents without authorization	82.0 57.7	12.1 29.9	5.8 12.4	129.93*** (2)	0.62 0.70	229.08***
Claiming to be somebody else	15.3 6.7	78.8 89.6	5.8 3.6	45.11*** (2)	0.46 0.32	100.26***
Agreeing to protect confidentiality and not doing so	3.5 2.3	95.2 96.8	1.3 0.8	3.32 (2)	0.39 0.18	6.84**
Badgering unwilling informants to get a story	40.8 37.7	49.5 50.1	9.1 10.9	2.85 (2)	0.47 0.64	0.14
Making use of personal documents such as without permission	43.8 24.9	41.8 59.4	14.4 15.7	80.12*** (2)	0.49 0.63	83.32***
Getting employed in a firm or organization to gain inside information	35.0 25.2	52.3 61.1	12.7 13.7	22.00*** (2)	0.69 0.61	28.76***
Using hidden microphones or cameras	65.8 47.4	26.1 42.5	8.1 10.1	66.99*** (2)	0.67 0.66	7.85**
Using re-creations or dramatizations of news by actors	19.2 11.7	68.5 76.6	12.2 11.6	21.82*** (2)	0.75 0.48	39.60***
Disclosing the names of rape victims	21.5 15.2	68.8 77.3	9.7 7.5	17.65*** (2)	0.40 0.47	30.83***
Accepting money from sources	0.1 0.2	99.5 99.3	0.4 0.6	0.60 (2)	0.09 0.47	1.35
Publishing stories with unverified content	3.4 5.9	94.2 90.8	2.5 3.3	7.92* (2)	0.39 0.30	16.06***

Upper row represents investigative journalists, lower row US journalists overall.
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

there were significant differences between the two groups. Investigative journalists are much more likely to justify using business or government documents without authorization (82 versus 57.7 percent of US journalists), claiming to be somebody else (15.3 versus 6.7 percent), using personal documents without permission (43.8 versus 24.9 percent), getting employed to gain inside information (35 versus 25.2 percent), using hidden microphones or cameras (65.8 versus 47.4 percent), using re-creations or dramatizations (19.2 versus 11.7 percent), and disclosing the names of rape victims (21.5 versus 15.2 percent).

There was also a statistically significant difference on the question of whether it would be justified to publish stories with unverified content. While an overwhelming majority of both groups would not approve doing so, slightly more US journalists thought it could be justified on occasion (5.9 versus 3.4 percent of investigative journalists). There were no statistical differences when the journalists were asked about accepting money from sources, badgering unwilling informants to get a story, agreeing to protect confidentiality and not doing so, and paying for confidential information.

Table 7 compares possible predictors of the likelihood of using these newsgathering techniques among investigative journalists and US journalists in general (RQ2). As before, we evaluated possible predictors by developing two identical hierarchical regression models that regressed the journalists' demographics, organizational background, general attitudes toward journalism, and journalistic role perceptions against the possible use of these reporting techniques in situations where they might be justified. The dependent variable was constructed by combining the reported likelihood of using any of the 12 newsgathering techniques shown in Table 6. Overall, the findings indicate that the journalists' demographics and professional role perceptions are the best predictors of using these reporting techniques in both groups. Among US journalists, more general attitudes toward the profession also play a significant role in predicting the use of these techniques.

While these results show that the main difference in the willingness to use these controversial reporting techniques might be related to attitudes that center around job security and job autonomy, a number of other predictors point to important differences between the two groups of journalists.

As shown in Table 7, the willingness to use controversial reporting techniques is less pronounced among younger US journalists who consider religion an important part of their life—associations that were not found among investigative journalists. Also while higher income is associated with greater approval of these reporting techniques among US journalists in general, female journalists in both groups are less likely to justify controversial reporting techniques than men. In addition, investigative journalists who are married show slightly less enthusiasm for the use of aggressive reporting techniques than their single colleagues.

As mentioned earlier, our analysis found little support for the notion that organizational-level characteristics are associated with journalists' approval of controversial reporting techniques. The one exception is US journalists working for public media organizations (such as public broadcasting), who tend to be significantly more likely to approve of these newsgathering techniques compared to their colleagues working in the private media.

More general attitudes toward the profession, on the other hand, proved to be significantly associated with the possible use of controversial reporting techniques—at least among US journalists in general. As Table 7 shows, US journalists who are more concerned

TABLE 7

Predictors of controversial newsgathering techniques among investigative journalists and US journalists overall

	US journalists	Investigative journalists
<i>Demographics</i>		
Age	-0.05***	-0.02
Female	-0.58*	-1.65***
Education	0.10	0.12
Democrat	-0.28	0.11
Income	0.09***	0.02
Married	-0.23	-0.65*
Minority	0.16	0.51
Importance of religion	-0.31***	-0.21
Majored in journalism	-0.17	-0.23
Incremental R^2	5.7***	6.0***
<i>Organizational context</i>		
Reporter	-0.50	-0.06
Supervisor	-0.21	-0.31
Years in journalism	0.01	-0.01
Job satisfaction	0.17	-0.30
Freedom to choose subjects to cover	-0.16	0.05
Freedom to select stories	-0.06	-0.32
Work for print media	-0.26	-0.35
Work for broadcast media	-0.49	-0.04
Work for public media	1.35**	0.64
Incremental R^2	1.6	1.8
<i>Journalistic attitudes</i>		
Importance of pay	0.02	-0.24
Importance of organization's editorial policy	0.03	-0.01
Importance of job security	-0.74***	-0.33
Importance of job autonomy	0.43*	-0.10
Chance to get ahead in organization	-0.08	0.18
Chance to help people	-0.52**	-0.39
Chance to develop a specialty	-0.28	-0.08
Chance to influence public affairs	0.24	0.23
Journalism is going in wrong direction	0.21	-0.04
Influence media have on public opinion	0.19*	0.19*
Influence media should have on public opinion	0.21***	0.10
Incremental R^2	3.8**	2.5
<i>Journalistic roles</i>		
Adversarial	0.22***	0.24***
Interpreter	0.15***	-0.08
Populist	0.09	-0.10
Incremental R^2	2.5***	1.4*
Total R^2 (%)	13.6***	11.7***
N	885	599

Cell entries are unstandardized ordinary least-squares regression coefficients (b). Level of support for controversial newsgathering techniques is measured on a scale ranging from 12 = "low level of aggressive reporting accepted" to 33 = "high level of aggressive reporting accepted."

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

about their job security and the "chance to help people" are actually less likely to approve of these reporting techniques, while those who considered job autonomy an important aspect of their work and who believe that the media have (or should have) a significant

influence on public opinion tend to be more likely to use these techniques. The fact that this is not the case among investigative journalists might be a reflection of our findings that US journalists overall are much more concerned about job security and less about job autonomy than their investigative colleagues.

Finally, journalists in both groups are more likely to approve of using controversial reporting techniques if they see themselves primarily in an adversarial role. This result is expected, of course, given the connection between role perceptions and views about practices of journalism. However, the findings also show that perceptions related to an interpretive professional role are associated with higher approval of these techniques among US journalists in general. Thus, despite the fact that role perceptions contribute less to the overall explained variance than journalists' demographic background variables, these findings indicate that professional role perceptions might indeed have an influence on the daily practice of journalism in the United States.

Conclusions

An oft-heard refrain among investigative journalists is that *all* journalism ought to be investigative (Berry 2009). Nevertheless, this study shows that those who identify themselves as investigative journalists are distinct from journalists as a whole in important ways. Although the two groups surveyed here are similar in some general demographic indicators (namely age, race, gender, and marital status), they differ in key measures such as education and income. Higher incomes among investigative journalists could be partly a reflection of additional educational attainment, but might also reflect the prestige placed on the practice of investigative work within the profession. Additionally, investigative journalists are more likely to work at larger news organizations that pay higher salaries.

Differences on religious and political measures hint at an independent streak of mind among investigative journalists, who are less likely to indicate a political party preference or a religious upbringing. Investigative journalists are also much less likely than journalists as a whole to be concerned about workplace status issues such as benefits and job security. Rather, they tend to place higher importance on issues related to journalism's role in society, such as helping people and influencing public affairs.

In terms of journalistic roles, these surveys confirm the intuitive sense that investigative journalists tend to support adversarial roles more so than journalists as a whole. Investigative journalists who think that it is important to influence public affairs and who believe that the media have a significant influence on public opinion are especially likely to consider the adversarial function as more important. The same is true for US journalists overall. Among those journalists, additional factors are associated with the adversarial function, including higher income, being male, working for public media, and placing higher importance on pay and less on religion.

As expected, our surveys also show that investigative journalists are more supportive of controversial reporting tactics such as using documents without permission, deception, or using hidden cameras. In general, the best predictors of using these techniques are demographics and role perceptions for both groups. Among US journalists, more general attitudes toward the profession also play a significant role in predicting the use of these techniques.

We also found that female journalists tend to be less likely to approve of controversial newsgathering techniques than their male colleagues. This tendency toward a more cautious

journalistic approach was especially pronounced among female investigative journalists. Because our regression model controlled for the potential effects of age, income, years in journalism, and the perceived importance of job security, this association is unlikely to be driven by factors such as journalistic experience or fear of losing one's job. This is a puzzling finding, especially because such a relationship between gender and aggressive reporting practices was not found in previous survey studies of journalists. However, our results show that female investigative journalists are *not* less likely to subscribe to an adversarial role (unlike female journalists in general; see Table 5), which indicates that these gender differences simply reflect discomfort with specific controversial reporting techniques.

Among investigative journalists overall, the greater willingness to employ these practices could be viewed as evidence that they have lower ethical standards than US journalists, contrary to suggestions in the literature. Alternatively, however, it could be argued that investigative journalists are more likely to take situational views of ethical dilemmas, justifying certain controversial practices when they deem them necessary in investigating matters of public importance. This notion would be consistent with investigative journalists' higher rate of non-religious upbringing and reinforced by the opposite finding among US journalists—those who consider religion important in their lives are less willing to endorse controversial reporting techniques.

The goal of prompting reform of problems and wrongdoing in society, which is at the heart of investigative journalism, also serves to explain the seeming incongruity in investigative journalists' views about influencing public opinion. As noted, they are less likely to think the media have a strong influence on the public but more likely to believe there should be a stronger influence. This could well reflect investigative journalists' understanding that policy reforms are more often brought about through collaboration with policy-makers than mobilization of public opinion. One intriguing consequence of this is that while investigative journalists are generally more adversarial toward public officials than journalists overall, they are also more likely to work with officials to spur policy change.

Finally, although many of the findings here involve differences between investigative journalists and journalists overall, it is notable that US journalists who view themselves in an adversarial role are similar to investigative journalists in their willingness to justify controversial reporting techniques. While this study shows the value in contrasting genres of journalistic practice, it confirms that role perceptions remain a key prism for understanding these differences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors extend thanks to the School of Journalism at Indiana University for its support of both surveys and to IRE for its cooperation.

NOTES

1. Gerry Lanosga and Brant Houston are members of IRE, and Houston previously served as the organization's executive director.
2. The findings we report come from online interviews with 1080 US journalists working for a wide variety of daily and weekly newspapers, radio and television stations, news services

and newsmagazines, and online news media throughout the United States. These interviews were conducted from August 7 to December 20, 2013. The journalists were chosen randomly from news organizations that were also selected at random from listings in various directories. The response rate for this sample was 32.6 percent (AAPOR RR1), and the maximum sampling error at the 95 percent level of confidence is plus or minus 3 percentage points. Because this study was intended to be a follow-up to the 1971, 1982, 1992, and 2002 national telephone surveys of US journalists, we followed closely the definitions of a journalist and the sampling methods used by these earlier studies to be able to compare our 2013 results directly with those of the earlier studies. In drawing these samples, we had to make estimates of how many fulltime journalists were working in the mainstream US news media. We compared our final main sample percentages with the overall work-force percentages from these estimates and found a relatively close match for all seven media types. The largest differences were found for the online news organizations, the major wire services of Associated Press and Reuters, and for newsmagazines, which we oversampled because of their relatively small numbers. In the end, the main random sample of 1080 included 358 daily newspaper journalists, 238 from weekly newspapers, 132 from television stations and networks, 97 from radio, 92 from online news organizations, 103 from the wire services, and 60 from newsmagazines.

3. The investigative sample includes 13 percent educators, who were included because many of those who teach investigative reporting also produce it on their own or with their classes. The sample also includes a small proportion (8.5 percent) of international IRE members.
4. *Journalistic Roles:* Next, we'd like to ask you how important you think a number of things are that the news media do or try to do today. For each of the following statements, please indicate how important or unimportant you think they are: (1) Provide analysis and interpretation of complex problems; (2) Investigate claims and statements made by the government; (3) Be an adversary of public officials by being constantly skeptical of their actions; (4) Be an adversary of businesses by being constantly skeptical of their actions; (5) Motivate ordinary people to get involved in public discussions of important issues; (6) Point people toward possible solutions to society's problems (coded as: 1 = not really important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = quite important, 4 = extremely important).
5. *Journalistic Practices:* Next, we would like to ask you a few questions about journalistic practices. Given an important story, which of the following, if any, do you think may be justified on occasion and which would you not approve under any circumstances? (1) Paying people for confidential information; (2) Using confidential business or government documents without authorization; (3) Claiming to be somebody else; (4) Agreeing to protect confidentiality and not doing so; (5) Badgering unwilling informants to get a story; (6) Making use of personal documents such as letters and photographs without permission; (7) Getting employed in a firm or organization to gain inside information; (8) Using hidden microphones or cameras; (9) Using re-creations or dramatizations of news by actors; (10) Disclosing the names of rape victims; (11) Accepting money from sources; (12) Publishing stories with unverified content (coded as: 1 = would not approve, 2 = not sure, 3 = justified on occasion).
6. *Sex:* Are you: male/female. *Age:* In what year were you born? *Education:* What is the last grade or class that you completed in school? Grade 1–8; High school incomplete (Grades 9–11); High school graduate (Grade 12 or GED certificate); Technical, trade, or

vocational school after high school; Some college, no 4-year degree (including associate degree); College graduate (B.S., B.A., or other 4-year degree); Post-graduate training or professional schooling after college. *Race*: Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino? (yes/no). In which one of the following racial groups would you place yourself? White (Caucasian); Black or African-American; Asian or Asian-American; American Indian or Alaska Native; Pacific Islander; Other. *Importance of Religion*: How important is religion or religious beliefs to you? Very important; Somewhat important; Not very important; Not at all important. *Marital Status*: What is your marital status? Married; Widowed; Divorced; Separated; Unmarried, but living with partner; Single (never married); Other. *Political Party Affiliation*: In politics today, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or Independent? Republican; Independent closer to Republican; Independent; Independent closer to Democrat; Democrat; No preference; Other. *Income*: Finally, we'd like to ask you some financial information. Would you please tell us what your total personal income was, before taxes, from your work in journalism during 2012? Less than \$15,000; \$15,000 to less than \$20,000; \$20,000 to less than \$25,000 ... \$150,000 and over. For investigative journalists: 1 = less than \$20,000; 2 = \$20,000 to less than \$40,000; 3 = \$40,000 to less than \$60,000; 4 = \$60,000 to less than \$80,000; 5 = \$80,000 to less than \$100,000; 6 = more than \$100,000.

REFERENCES

- Aucoin, James. 2005. *The Evolution of American Investigative Journalism*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Berry, Stephen J. 2009. *Watchdog Journalism: The Art of Investigative Reporting*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coleman, Renita, and Lee Wilkins. 2004. "The Moral Development of Journalists: A Comparison with other Professions and a Quality Model for Predicting High Quality Ethical Reasoning." *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 81 (3): 511–527. doi:10.1177/107769900408100304.
- Ettema, James, and Theodore Glasser. 1998. *Custodians of Conscience: Investigative Journalism and Public Virtue*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ettema, James, and Theodore Glasser. 2007. "An International Symposium on Investigative Journalism." *Journalism* 8 (5): 491–494. doi:10.1177/1464884907081043.
- Fredriksson, Magnus, and Bengt Johansson. 2014. "The Dynamics of Professional Identity: Why Journalists View Journalists Working with PR as a Threat to Journalism." *Journalism Practice* 8 (5): 585–595. doi:10.1080/17512786.2014.884746.
- Hanitzsch, Thomas. 2011. "Populist Disseminators, Detached Watchdogs, Critical Change Agents and Opportunist Facilitators: Professional Milieus, the Journalistic Field and Autonomy in 18 Countries." *International Communication Gazette* 73 (6): 477–494. doi:10.1177/1748048511412279.
- Hanitzsch, Thomas, and Rosa Berganza. 2012. "Explaining Journalists' Trust in Public Institutions across 20 Countries: Media Freedom, Corruption and Ownership Matter Most." *Journal of Communication* 62 (5): 794–814.
- Harmening, Thomas E. 1977. *The Status of Investigative Reporting in American Daily Newspapers*. Center for New Communications Research Report No. 1. Bloomington, IN: School of Journalism.

- Kaplan, Andrew. 2008. "Investigating the Investigators: Examining the Attitudes, Perceptions, and Experiences of Investigative Journalists in the Internet Age." Doctoral diss., ProQuest. (3341370).
- Marshall, Jon. 2011. *Watergate's Legacy and the Press: The Investigative Impulse*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Plaisance, Patrick Lee, Elizabeth A. Skewes, and Thomas Hanitzsch. 2012. "Ethical Orientations of Journalists Around the Globe: Implications from a Cross-national Survey." *Communication Research* 39 (5): 641–661. doi:10.1177/0093650212450584.
- Protess, David L., Fay Lomax Cook, Jack C. Doppelt, James S. Ettema, Margaret T. Gordon, Donna R. Leff, and Peter Miller. 1991. *The Journalism of Outrage: Investigative Reporting and Agenda Building in America*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Reich, Zvi, and Thomas Hanitzsch. 2013. "Determinants of Journalists' Professional Autonomy: Individual and National Level Factors Matter More Than Organizational Ones." *Mass Communication and Society* 16 (1): 133–156. doi:10.1080/15205436.2012.669002.
- Starkman, Dean. 2014. *The Watchdog that Didn't Bark: The Financial Crisis and the Disappearance of Investigative Reporting*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Starr, Paul. 2009. "Goodbye to the Age of Newspapers (Hello to a New Era of Corruption)." *The New Republic*. <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/goodbye-the-age-newspapers-hello-new-era-corruption>.
- Underwood, Doug, and Keith Stamm. 2001. "Are Journalists Really Irreligious? A Multidimensional Analysis." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 78 (4): 771–786. doi:10.1177/107769900107800410.
- Walton, Mary. 2010. "Investigative Shortfall." *American Journalism Review*. <http://www.ajr.org/article.asp?id=4904>.
- Weaver, David H., Randal A. Beam, Bonnie J. Brownlee, Paul S. Voakes, and G. Cleveland Wilhoit. 2007. *The American Journalist in the 21st Century: U.S. News People at the Dawn of a New Millennium*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Weaver, David H., and G. Cleveland Wilhoit. 1986. *The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. News People and Their Work*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Weaver, David H., and G. Cleveland Wilhoit. 1996. *The American Journalist in the 1990s: U.S. News People at the End of an Era*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Weaver, David H., and Lars Willnat, eds. 2012. *The Global Journalist in the 21st Century*. New York: Routledge.
- Whitlow, S. Scott, and G. Norman Van Tubergen. 1978. "Patterns of Ethical Decisions among Investigative Reporters." *Mass Communication Review* 6 (1): 2–9.
- Willnat, Lars, David H. Weaver, and Jiyang Choi. 2013. "The Global Journalist in the 21st Century: A Cross-national Study of Journalistic Competencies." *Journalism Practice* 7 (2): 163–183. doi:10.1080/17512786.2012.753210.

Gerry Lanosga (author to whom correspondence should be addressed), The Media School, Indiana University, USA. E-mail: glanosga@indiana.edu. ORCID  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1807-5866>

Lars Willnat, The Media School, Indiana University, USA. E-mail: lwillnat@indiana.edu

David H. Weaver, The Media School, Indiana University, USA. E-mail: weaver@indiana.edu

Brant Houston, The College of Media, University of Illinois, USA. E-mail: houstonb@illinois.edu