

Professional Journalism and Self-regulation in Lithuania

Jolanta Mažylė, PhD

Lecturer, Institute of Journalism,
Faculty of Communication,
Vilnius University, 7 Maironio Str.,
LT-01124 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: jolanta.mazyle@kf.vu.lt

Abstract

The article discusses legal framework of the media and self-regulation of professional journalism in the Republic of Lithuania. The main provisions and structure of the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers are analysed. The results of the empirical research – survey of regional press employees (N=120) over professionalism of journalists and their self-regulation – are analysed. The research was carried out using sociological and systematic research methods, as well as content analysis and quantitative and qualitative data analysis. Insights regarding development of professional journalism and self-regulation in Lithuania are presented.

Keywords: journalism, professionalism, regional press, media, legislation, ethics, self-regulation

Introduction

After the restoration of Lithuania's independence in 1990 not only new media ownership relationships emerged, but also professional competence of journalists changed, leading to qualitative changes in journalism. Although the changes in the mass media system are mostly linked to social alterations and political transformations, technological and economic progress also made a significant impact (Balčytienė, 2009 b; Vaišnys, 2003). Theorists of journalism note in their works that the main changes in Lithuanian journalism began with radical shift of ownership forms of the media (Jastramskis, 2009; Nugaraitė, 2008 a; Pečiulis 2010 a; 2010 b). Thus, we can discern external and internal factors that predetermined changes in the whole mass media and its system not only in economic and juridical aspects, but, most important, in the essence of content and form of journalism.

Objective

The objective of the article is to discuss the legal framework of the media and the situation in self-regulation of professional journalism in the Republic of Lithuania; to analyse the results of the survey of regional press employees (N=120) over professionalism of journalists and their self-regulation; upon assessment of external and internal factors, to present insights regarding professionalism of journalism and development of self-regulation of the media.

Theoretical framework

As the realities of economics and political life change, so do the functions of the media, the forms of its interaction with the audience, the forms of presentation of journalistic texts and information - in general, the culture of communication in the public sphere changes. The impact of the media on the reader in communication, political, ethical and other aspects was studied by the following scientists: Aleknonis (2010), Balčytienė (2008 b), Juraitė (2008), Nugaraitė (2008 a), Pečiulis (2010 a; 2010 b), Vaišnys (2004, 2008). Legal acts regulate the principles how the media operates, its rights, duties and responsibility. While analysing legal aspects of activities of the media and journalists, we must turn our attention to the fact that they are exclusively under national jurisdiction. Legal problems of the media are analysed by Meškauskaitė (2004; 2005) and Norkūnas (2001; 2002; 2003). However, having in mind that frequently the main axis in this branch of the law is the infringement upon personal rights, the works of Lithuanian legal scholars Mikelėnas (2002; 2003), Jočienė (2001; 2007), Kūris (2001 a), Žiobienė (2005) are very significant in this aspect. Their works examine the principles of constitutionality and moral values, application of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in the national law, as well as the practice of the European Court of Human Rights. Frequently, even on global scale, there are attempts to explain (and justify) the present situation by the ownership of property, “liberalisation” of the mass media, by claiming that law and ethics are not compatible with the conditions of the free market, and so on (McQuail, 1992; Moore & Murray, 2007).

The Lithuanian Human Rights Monitoring Institute in its yearly analytical reviews¹ thoroughly discusses how the right of self-expression is realised in Lithuania, how the rights of citizens to privacy of life are guaranteed. This is a valuable material for studies and making prognosis on what steps should be taken to ensure respect and protection of human rights, especially in the public sphere. The Inspector of Journalist Ethics annually presents reports on the activities and once in two years prepares analytical reviews on the activities presenting extensive information about the situation in the mass media sector in Lithuania². However, all the information of monitoring and regulation institutions usually just ascertain the existing situation that the Lithuanian mass media not always responsibly exercises the rights granted by the public.

An expert on media law Liudvika Meškauskaitė in her works distinguishes the issue of the legal status of journalists in modern society and the problem of balance between journalists’ rights and duties (2004:320). It should be said that a number of Lithuanian universities prepare professional journalists – Vilnius University, Vytautas Magnus University, Klaipėda University and Kazimieras Simonavičius University. Whereas Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences and Šiauliai University offer students of the Lithuanian language programme to choose an additional specialisation in journalism. According to Statistics Lithuania, 513 journalists and information specialists completed their studies in Lithuania’s higher education institutions in 2013³. Two trade unions represent professional journalists – the Lithuanian Journalists’ Union and the Lithuanian Journalists’ Society.

Scientists Aleknonis (2010), Balčytienė (2009 a), Juraitė (2008), Nugaraitė (2008 b), Pečiulis (2009), Vaišnys (2004) widely discuss the topic of professional competence of journalists. Yet, the lawmakers are reluctant to give a more concrete definition on the legal status and competence requirements, especially regarding education, for the members of this profession who are responsible to society. Even though the first version of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public was adopted in 1996, it was later fundamentally amended several times (2000, 2006, 2010) but the notion of the journalist has not changed in

¹ Non-governmental organisation Human Rights Monitoring Institute, established in 2003, prepares analytical reviews since 2004. Available: <http://www.hrmi.lt>

² Inspector of Journalist Ethics is obligated since 2001 by the Law on Provision of Information to the Public to prepare analytical reviews on the activities every two years.

³ Statistics Lithuania. [Online] Available: <http://www.stat.gov.lt>

eighteen years. The author believes the problem is as if pre-programmed since 1996 to this day, because the notion of the journalist is defined in rather abstract terms by the Law on Provision of Information to the Public. Therefore, even halfway through the second decade of the 21st century, Lithuanian journalists, i.e. people who are active in public sphere, participate in public discourse and are paid for this, do not have to meet any education requirements or professional standards. Inspector of journalist ethics Romas Gudaitis already in his 2002 activity report noted the need to appropriately define the notion of the journalist. According to him, establishing professional status would be advantageous to journalism, enabling a more in depth analysis of the phenomena of the state and public life. The inspector believes that such media would better reflect the state and public life, whereas trust in the media would only grow⁴.

Speaking about responsibility of journalists as members of a professional community, it is worth mentioning that their accountability is directly linked to their duties. Article 41 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public describes journalists' duties that precondition their responsibilities as well⁵. Professional ethics standards for journalists are presented in the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers. Nonetheless, specific features of journalistic activities include one very important thing – personal moral responsibility to the professional guild and to the readers.

The aim and scope of the article:

1. To review legal framework regulating the activities of the media in the Republic of Lithuania;
2. To introduce self-regulation system of the Lithuanian media;
3. To analyse the structure and contents of the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers;
4. To analyse the results of the empiric research – the survey of Lithuanian journalists.

Research methodology

The following research methods were used: logical, comparative and complex source analysis, critical descriptive and analytical method, as well as the sociological and systematic research methods, content analysis, quantitative and qualitative data analysis, descriptive statistics.

1. Legal framework regulating the activities of the media

Legal sources on public information. When defining the legal environment of journalistic activities, the main legal sources on public information, international and national laws, should be mentioned. International agreements have the force of law in Lithuania since 1993, when the country became a member of the Council of Europe. The main international legal act in the area of public information is the European Convention on Human Rights (hereinafter – the Convention). The European Court of Human Rights is important in practical aspect, when self-expression and violations of the rights of the individual are examined. Therefore, as regards the activities of the media, focus falls on Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention, ensuring the right to freedom of expression (the freedom of speech) and guaranteeing the right to respect for one's private and family life. These fundamental provisions of a person's rights and freedoms are consolidated in the national legislation as well. Another crucial international document is the 1993 Resolution on the Ethics of Journalism adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. The Lithuanian Parliament (the Seimas) ratified the resolution on 26 September 1995.⁶

⁴ Gudaitis, R. 2001-2002 analytical review. *Demokratinės visuomenės informavimo kultūros plėtros gairės*. [Online] Available: <http://www3.lrs.lt/owa-bin/owarepl/inter/owa/U0113703.doc> (6 July 2014).

⁵ *Visuomenės informavimo įstatymo pakeitimo įstatymas. Valstybės žinios*. 2006, Nr. 82-3254.

⁶ Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo 1995 m. rugsėjo 26 d. nutarimas Nr. I-1046 „Dėl pritarimo Europos Tarybos Parlamentinės Asamblėjos rezoliucijai dėl žurnalistinės etikos Nr. 1003“, *Valstybės žinios*, 1995, Nr. 85-1918.

National legal sources on public information include: the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania (hereinafter – the Constitution), the Law on Provision of Information to the Public, rulings of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania regulating the freedom of self-expression and specifying legal provisions in the area of public information, and the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers (hereinafter – the Code of Ethics). Liability of producers of public information, both journalists and media outlets, is regulated by the Civil Code, the Criminal Code and the Code of Administrative Offences, just as any other legal or natural persons. These laws and their application, when cases related to the media are heard, rely on case law⁷ and are also attributable to legal sources of public information.

The Law on Provision of Information to the Public (hereinafter – the Law) regulates provision of information to the public, defines the right to receive and disseminate information, express one's ideas and convictions freely, the right of legal or natural persons to protect honour and dignity when the disseminated information is false. The Law establishes procedures for collecting, preparing, publishing and disseminating public information. It also includes the rights, duties and liabilities of public information producers, disseminators, journalists and institutions governing their activities. The Law also implements legal acts of the European Union, which are named in the annex of the Law. Therefore, there is no doubt that the Constitution, national and international laws and agreements define provision of information to the public in Lithuania clearly and constructively. The Law regulates functioning of free and responsible media in the country and the legitimacy of the disseminated information.

Institutional mechanism of regulation and self-regulation of the media. Naturally, seeking for a functional and vibrant model of a democratic society, principles of regulation and self-regulation of the media are consolidated in the Law on Provision of Information to the Public. The Law establishes competences for regulatory and self-regulatory bodies of public information producers and disseminators. First of all, the Government Authorised Institution has to be mentioned, in this case, the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania. It is obligated by the Law to co-ordinate the implementation of state policy in the field of providing information to the public (Article 45 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public). One of the self-regulatory institutions is the Ethics Commission of Journalists and Publishers whose primary function is to *focus on the education of the professional ethics of journalism* (Article 46 of the Law). Another self-regulatory body is the Radio and Television Commission of Lithuania that is primarily responsible *for regulation and control of the activities of radio and television broadcasters and re-broadcasters falling under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Lithuania* (Articles 47-48 of the Law). The implementation of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public is supervised by Inspector of Journalist Ethics. He is appointed by Parliament on the nomination by the Ethics Commission of Journalists and Publishers (Articles 49-50 of the Law). Both regulatory and self-regulatory institutions perform certain functions in their field of competence established in the Law on Provision of Information to the Public.

The Radio and Television Commission of Lithuania (hereinafter – the Commission) is authorised to control the activities of radio and television broadcasters and re-broadcasters. The Commission is an independent institution accountable to Parliament. The Law not only denotes the legal status of this institution but its expertise competence as well: the Commission participates in the formation of national audio-visual policy, it acts as a body of experts for Parliament and the Government on the issues of radio and television broadcasting and re-broadcasting (paragraph 1, Article 47 of the Law). Moreover, paragraph 1 of Article 48 of the Law appoints the Commission additional radio and television broadcasting and re-broadcasting duties.

The Inspector of Journalist Ethics is a state officer appointed by Parliament on the nomination by the Ethics Commission of Journalists and Publishers. The main function of the inspector is to supervise the

⁷ Case law is shaped by the rulings of the Supreme Court of Lithuania.

implementation of the provisions of the Law. Since a recast of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public took effect on 1 September 2006, Articles 49 and 50 stipulate the competence and functions of the Inspector of Journalist Ethics. Circumstances of the time, the discourse of the media and the law, examination of the amendments to the Law on Provision of Information to the Public⁸ and activity reports of the Inspector of Journalist Ethics⁹ suggest that competences of this state institution, together with requirements for a state officer, have significantly expanded since 2000. Powers of the institution were widened even more in 2006, when the revised version of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public was adopted¹⁰.

The rights and duties of producers of public information. Chapter IV of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public deals with the legal status and activities of producers and disseminators of public information. The term **producer of public information**¹¹ that is used in the Law also encompasses the definition of **the journalist**. Paragraph 87 of Article 2 defines the term journalist as *a natural person who, on a professional basis, collects, prepares and presents material to the producer and/or disseminator of public information under a contract with him and/or is a member of a professional journalists' association*.¹² Despite the fact that the journalist is involved in specific activities and is granted by the law certain rights and duties, the very same law does not demand of the journalist any specific education or qualifications requirements unlike in the case of other professions¹³.

Taking into account the practical aspect of the activities of editorial offices, it has to be pointed out that often the cause behind numerous legal and ethical disputes is the journalists' copyrighted work that comprises the content of any given publication. Professional responsibility of the journalist is directly related to the duties that are stipulated by Article 41 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public. Journalists are not subject to exceptional liability. They are liable for legal offenses in the area of public information similarly as any other citizen of the Republic of Lithuania. Nonetheless, it should be noted that violations of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public incur liability in accordance with the procedure established by laws, whereas any damage caused due to violations is compensated in accordance with the procedure of the Civil Code.

Moreover, professional responsibility of the journalist has specific characteristics arising from Article 43 of the Law that deals with professional ethics in providing information to the public. The Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers establishes professional ethics standards. Emphasis should be put on paragraph 1 of Article 43, which stipulates that producers and disseminators of public information, and journalists have to adhere to professional ethics' norms established in the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers. In addition, in their activities they have to follow the principles of the Resolution on the Ethics of Journalism adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe as well. Nonetheless, it has to be underscored that the specifics of professional journalism have one more additional aspect – moral responsibility of a person that foremost depends on personal culture, education, experience and psychological well-being. This dimension is not legislated but is instead determined by moral and ethical values of a journalist.

⁸ Prior to the version of 2000, the Law on Provision of Information to the Public had been amended 8 times.

⁹ The duty to publish analytical reviews every two years was established in the the Law on Provision of Information to the Public of 2000. // *Valstybės žinios*, 2000, Nr.75-2272.

¹⁰ *Visuomenės informavimo įstatymo pakeitimo įstatymas // Valstybės žinios*, 2006, Nr.82-3254.

¹¹ Paragraph 75 of Article 2 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public defines the term as *a provider of an audio-visual media service, a broadcaster of radio programmes, a publishing house, a film, audio or video studio, an information, advertising or public relations agency, an editorial office, a manager of the information society media, an independent producer, a journalist or any other person producing public information or submitting it for dissemination*.

¹² *Visuomenės informavimo įstatymas // Valstybės žinios*, 2010, Nr.123-6262.

¹³ For example, the Law on the Bar, the Law on the Prosecutor's Office, and the Law on Courts that provide strict qualification and education requirements for representatives of certain professions.

2. Self-regulation of the media

Lithuania's media is self-regulatory and its self-regulation system is on a substantial part focused on professional ethics. Paragraph 1 of Article 43 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public stipulates that the norms of professional ethics which have to be adhered to by producers and disseminators of public information, and journalists are defined by the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers, the Resolution on the Ethics of Journalism adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe¹⁴, as well as by international agreements of the Republic of Lithuania regulating production and dissemination of public information, and in the Law on Provision of Information to the Public. The Law also provides for the procedure of approval, amendment or supplementation of the Code of Ethics (paragraph 2, Article 43). Item 2 of the Resolution No. 1 of 15 May 1998 of the Senate of the Supreme Court of Lithuania also provides for the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers to regulate ethics of journalists and publishers in the area of public information¹⁵.

Primary self-regulatory body of producers and disseminators of public information is the Ethics Commission of Journalists and Publishers (hereinafter – the Commission). Its competence area includes professional ethics of producers and disseminators of public information. Founding and functioning principles of the Commission show that in essence it does not carry any other aspects except of ethical (paragraphs 1, 2 and 7 of Article 46). The Law stipulates that the Commission is a collegial¹⁶ self-regulatory body of producers and disseminators of public information concluded of 15 members. The Commission consists of 15 members with one member delegated by each of the following: the Lithuanian Centre for Human Rights, the Lithuanian Psychiatric Association, the Lithuanian Bishops' Conference, the Lithuanian Periodical Press Publishers' Association, the Lithuanian Radio and Television Association, the Lithuanian Cable Television Association, the Regional Televisions' Association, the Lithuanian Journalists' Union, the Lithuanian Journalists' Society, the Lithuanian Journalism Centre, the National Radio and Television of Lithuania, the National Association of Creative Journalists, the National Association of Publishers of Regional and City Newspapers, the Association of Communication and Advertising Agencies and the Association of Internet Media. The members of the Commission are appointed for a term of three years¹⁷.

Based on Article 46 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public, the Ethics Commission of Journalists and Publishers is responsible for: cultivation of professional ethics of journalists; examination of violations of professional ethics committed in the course of provision of information to the public by journalists, producers of public information or responsible persons appointed by their participants; examination of disputes between journalists and producers or publishers of public information regarding violations of the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers.

The Law stipulates that the Commission is funded by the Media Support Foundation. On 30 September 2010, paragraph 2 of Article 46 of the Law was amended¹⁸, i.e. a representative delegated by the Association of Internet Media¹⁹ would join the Commission. In addition, the revised Law provided for organisations that delegated representatives to the Commission to convene at least once in calendar year with at least three delegates of each organisation attending. It should be noted that amendments to Article 46

¹⁴ Europos Tarybos Parlamentinės Asamblėjos rezoliucija „Dėl žurnalistikos etikos“ Nr.1003 (1993) // *Valstybės žinios*, 1995, Nr.85-1918.

¹⁵ Lietuvos Aukščiausiojo Teismo senato nutarimas Nr. 1 // Lietuvos Aukščiausiojo teismo biuletenis. *Teismų praktika*. V., 1998, Nr.9.

¹⁶ Such formulation emerged after amendments of paragraph 1 of Article 46 of the Law of 14 July 2008. After the Law Amending the Law on Provision of Information to the Public took effect on 1 September 2006, the Commission was defined as self-regulatory body having its own seal and a bank account.

¹⁷ Visuomenės informavimo įstatymo 46 straipsnio pakeitimo įstatymas // *Valstybės žinios*, 2010, Nr. 123-6263.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ The association was founded in October 2008, but by 1 March 2011, the Commission was still concluded of 14 members, as the association still had not delegated a member.

of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public²⁰ established a novelty – the Activity Regulations of the Commission that have to be approved by the meeting of representatives. It is yet unclear if the Activity Regulations will replace the currently valid rules of procedure²¹, based on which the Commission operated in 2000-2014. It seems that the legal status of the Commission will be the principal issue when solving this question. It is noteworthy that the Commission is not a legal person that has legal capacity under the Civil Code, which causes certain legal problems. Consequently, it is doubtful that the rules of procedure would transform its functioning, as in essence it operates based solely on ethical aspects. Perhaps the organisations that have delegated representatives to the Commission also have similar doubts due to the fact that in four years (by the end of the third quarter of 2014) this provision of the law has not been implemented.

Next, what raises additional questions is the valid practice set by the legislature enabling producers or disseminators of public information who disagree with the Commission's rulings to appeal its decisions to Vilnius Regional Administrative Court²². Meanwhile, a natural person that reports the actions of the information society media to the self-regulatory body does not have the possibility to exercise such option. It is assumed that the paramount goal of the Commission should be to become the moral authority for members of the media.

Throughout the discussed period this collegial self-regulatory body organised its activities based on the rules of procedure that it itself drafted. The Chairman organises the work of the Ethics Commission. The Commission elects its Chairman for a one-year term. Any interested persons (even members of the Commission) can refer to the Commission over violations of the Code of Ethics made in the last 12 months. State institutions can also address the commission over violations of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public.

Hearings of complaints, decision-making and announcement are subject to the rules of procedure. Complaints have to be heard no later than in 60 days, sittings of the Commission are public²³ and every decision²⁴ made at a sitting is announced publicly on the Commission's website.

The Commission makes decisions related to breaches of the Code of Ethics and violations of paragraph 4 of Article 46 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public, as well as personal referrals to Information society media, publishers and editorial offices.

If the Commission finds a complaint unjustified, it dismisses the complaint of an applicant as such and does not consider the matter. The ruling of the Commission stands for a period of one year after the decision is made. The rules of procedure of the Commission stipulate that it may exercise the right granted by Article 71 of the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers and consider the question of categorising certain media as a producer of public information breaching professional ethics. The Commission may consider this if the same media outlet was deemed to have breached the Code of Ethics at least twice in twelve months. The Commission's decisions concerning violations of professional ethics or other violations must be published immediately *without any amendments*²⁵ in the same media wherein the Commission has established these violations. The decisions have to be published in the same place, of the

²⁰ *Valstybės žinios*, 18-10-2010, Nr. 123-6263.

²¹ The rules of procedure of the Commission were approved on 18 December 2000. Editorial amendments adopted on 21 November 2005, 5 November 2007, 9 June 2008, 14 January 2009. [Online] Available: <http://www.lzlek.lt/index.php?lang=1&sid=369> (19 August 2014).

²² *Visuomenės informavimo įstatymo pakeitimo įstatymas // Valstybės žinios*, 2006, Nr.82-3254.

²³ If any of the disputing sides submits a request to the Commission asking for a hearing behind closed doors, or if a rapporteur proposes to do so, the Chairperson brings the matter to a vote.

²⁴ Decisions made behind closed doors are also published on the Commission's website.

²⁵ The formulation is probably the result of the media publishing summaries or interpretations of the decisions by the Commission // Decision No. 55 of the Commission dated 27 November 2000 over the daily *Vakaru Ekspresas* that published the Commission's decision of 6 November 2000.

same size and in the same form (in case of television and radio – on the same day of the week and at the same time)²⁶.

In theory, the mandate of the Ethics Commission of Journalists and Publishers is not political or legal. The primary document that the Commission follows when hearing applications of natural or legal persons and taking decisions is the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers (2005). However, decisions made by this self-regulatory institution can have an affect on activities of the media via economic sanctions that the Commission is not directly related to. The legislature (Parliament) has provided for revoking 9 percent exemption on value added tax for the media that the Commission categorises as violating ethics. Next, for example, the Media Support Foundation does not even accept applications to participate in project support competitions from media outlets deemed by the Commission as having breached the Code of Ethics. The public sector also takes the similar stance when announcing public procurement tenders.

3. Provisions and structure of the Code of Ethics

The first code of ethics regulating honest actions of Lithuania's journalists and publishers was adopted in 1996. The Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers (hereinafter – the Code of Ethics) that is in force today was adopted on 15 April 2005 at the conference of representatives of journalists' and publishers' organisations²⁷. In its content and form, it is in essence an entirely different document.

The name of the document itself suggests that it is a code of ethics for journalists and publishers (producers of public information). Although Chapter V of the code discusses mutual obligations of journalists and managers of editorial boards (producers of public information), nonetheless, taking into consideration that most Lithuanian journalists working in mass media are hired employees, and that de facto most of them work only under authors' contracts, it is difficult to fathom how the same document can apply to dissimilar public information participants. Meanwhile, global practice can offer numerous examples when different professional groups (publishers, editors, journalists) have separate codes of ethics that they comply with in their business-related activities.

The Code of Ethics for journalists and publishers of Lithuania and the codes for journalists of other Baltic States²⁸ emphasise fundamental provisions on public information in a democratic society – independence, the rights of a source and responsibility. While assessing these three dominants the somewhat differing level of responsibility should be considered. The ethical code of Latvian journalists separately addresses the relation between the journalist and the public, while the Estonian code of professional ethics for journalists underlines separation of advertising from authors' publications and the importance of the provision of information to the public. In this regard, the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers differs from equivalent documents of other Baltic States. Perhaps the main reason behind this is that the Code focuses not only on professional ethics of journalists but also of publishers²⁹ and, thus, it is their joint code of ethics. The Code of Ethics consists of 7 chapters and 75 articles. From the standpoint of proportionality, the document concentrates on general provisions of the rights and duties of journalists and producers of public information, and the relation between the journalist and the source of information. It also partially describes requirements for publications. Independence and transparency of the journalist and producer of public information is regulated by 12 articles, substantial attention is devoted to protection of

²⁶ Regrettably Lithuanian media outlets often ignore this provision established in paragraph 7 of Article 46 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public, but it is a topic for a separate discussion.

²⁷ As stipulated by the Law on Provision of Information to the Public.

²⁸ Referring to the codes of ethics of Latvian and Estonian journalists.

²⁹ In the Code of Ethics they are referred to as public information organisers.

personal honour, dignity and privacy (22 articles), which are the natural rights protected by international and national laws.

Seeking to ascertain what norms, ethical or legal, are included in the document and what are the peculiarities of their application, the author researched the provisions of the Code of Ethics in several aspects, i.e. content analysis method was used to examine the requirements of the Code of Ethics on the following levels:

1. The requirements (duties) for journalists and producers of public information.
2. The relation between the journalist and the source of information.
3. The requirements for journalistic publications.

The method of comparative analysis was used to compare provisions established in the Law on Provision of Information to the Public and in the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers.

The requirements for journalists and producers of public information. According to the Code, both journalists and producers of public information have to propagate true and correct news as well as a full range of opinions; must not disseminate opinions which are in breach of law and ethics; have to assess their information sources in a critical way, scrutinise facts with due diligence on the basis of several sources; information has to be gathered in ethical and lawful ways. The exception allowing to publish unverified information is provided only when the public interest calls for it, when the delay to propagate such information would cause damage to the public, thus, in exclusive cases this action would not violate Article 7 of the Code of Ethics. Yet, the same article states that in such cases *the unverified nature of the published information has to be indicated*. The public interest is underscored in Article 16 of the Code of Ethics, which stipulates that when publishing information a journalist or producer of public information has to distinguish which information is justified by the public interest and which satisfies human curiosity solely.

The Code of Ethics lays down a number of prohibitions, hypothetically one could say that it has been done so seeking to protect the public sphere from detrimental information and negative impact. Article 17 of stipulates that journalists or producers of public information cannot publish information that directly or indirectly incites to crime, violation of public order, emulating aggressive conduct. The aforementioned article additionally prohibits to publish information promoting or reflecting in an attractive manner on smoking, drinking, drug-use and other substance abuse. The next article, Article 18, is similar to item 9 of paragraph 8 of Article 22 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public. It word for word reiterates the provision of the Law stating that producers of public information *may not promote supernatural, unreal characteristics of people or their groups or paranormal phenomena, with the exception of cases where such information is presented for entertainment or as a research object. They may not create an impression that astrologers, chiromancers, clairvoyants and bioenergetics specialists can provide advice on the future, health, money, etc.*³⁰

After the Civil Code of the Republic of Lithuania³¹ took effect on 1 July 2001, enjoyment and exercise of specific civil rights of natural persons was established. These rights include the rights to a name, an image, privacy and secrecy, honour and dignity. Talking about prohibitions established in the Code of Ethics, Chapter III should be noted. As much as 22 articles of the chapter regulate protection of personal honour, dignity and privacy, thus reiterating legal rules of laws in force in Lithuania. A journalist or a producer of public information is not allowed to publish information about an individual's private life without his consent (Article 36), they have to follow the presumption of innocence (Article 37), are prohibited from publishing groundless, unverified accusations not supported with facts (Article 38). Furthermore, provisions of the Code of Ethics prohibit publishing commercials under the guise of impartial

³⁰ Valstybės žinios, 2006, Nr.82-3254.

³¹ Valstybės žinios, 2000, Nr.74-2262.

information or otherwise concealing commercials (Article 31). Half of the ten prohibitions listed in Articles 40, 41, 42, 43 and 50 of the Code of Ethics are directly related to the Law on Legal Protection of Personal Data. Article 8 of the Law on Legal Protection of Personal Data stipulates that the Inspector of Journalist Ethics supervises the processing of personal data by the media for the purpose of providing information to the public, artistic and literary expression. Consequently, this creates conditions for a certain self-regulatory institutional conflict, which may arise when offences of the same type are investigated.

Articles 44, 45 and 49 of the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers carry a “softer” linguistic tone, they directly, linguistically, do not prohibit but rather recommend that personal data on the individuals who have committed minor crimes and have been lightly punished *should not* be made public; journalists and producers of public information *should not* recall old crimes committed by an individual who has served the sentence³², *should not* mention the name or other particulars related to suicides or attempted suicides. As we can see, provisions of the Code of Ethics talk about protection of personal data and privacy. The content of Articles 36, 46, 51, 52, 53, 56 and 57 is similar, as they deal with the protection of personal privacy, natural rights and freedoms of a person.

Talking about the requirements for the journalist or producer of public information as a whole, it should be emphasised that seven articles of Chapter IV of the Code of Ethics are devoted to professional solidarity and fair competition. It also should be noted that provisions of Articles 58 and 59 of the Code of Ethics³³ essentially meet globally recognised ethics standards (Lusting, 2004). Rules of professional solidarity and fair competition are outlined in Articles 60, 61, 62, 63 and 64. Accordingly, it should be stated that some regulations in these articles of the Code of Ethics are directly related to Article 21 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public and to provisions of the Law on Copyright and Related Rights.

The relation between the journalist and the source of information. Provisions of the Code of Ethics define the relation between the journalist and the source of information. Article 9 of the Code of Ethics, similarly as item 6 of paragraph 2 of Article 41 of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public, states that when requesting information, the journalist has to identify himself, specify the editorial office and his position, and warn the individual that his words may be published in the media. Article 14 of the Code of Ethics prohibits the journalist the use of audio and video recording devices if the private source providing information is opposed to the use of such devices. The Code of Ethics just like the Law of Provision of Information to the Public establishes the confidentiality of the source of information. Comparison of the provisions related to the journalist and the source of information in the Code of Ethics and the Law of Provision of Information to the Public revealed that 12 articles of the Code of Ethics regulate relations of the producer of public information and the journalist with the source of information. 8 out of 12 of these articles of the Code of Ethics reiterate provisions of 4 articles of the aforementioned Law.

Next, the research found that there are separate provisions in the Code of Ethics that are essentially ethical in nature, dealing with positive behaviour and have not been taken from any laws or regulations. For instance, Article 12 of the Code of Ethics stipulates that before publishing the information obtained from an individual under stress, shock or in a helpless position, the journalist and producer of public information must ensure that publishing of such information will not violate the rights of such individual and have to make efforts to foresee any likely negative impact on the individual. Additionally, Article 21 of the Code of Ethics provides for the journalist or producer of public information to take care not to cause additional suffering and pain to the victim and innocent part, when publishing information about criminal acts, accidents and other cases when material or non-material damage is caused to individuals. While assessing

³² The rule does not apply if a person takes the position related with the committed offence or if a person is a candidate for a high position in society.

³³ Article 59 of the Code of Ethics stipulates that journalists and producers of public information should not publish critical works for purposes of revenge.

the relation between the journalist and the source of information, it is crucial that the Code of Ethics sufficiently clearly outlines the limit of criticism regarding a private individual (Article 22). Based on this article, the limits for criticising a private individual are much narrower compared to a public person. When publishing information about private individuals, priority, according to Article 22, must be given to the protection of private life, and when publishing information about a public person - to the public interest. In addition, the criticised individual always has the right to reply, i.e., he is given an opportunity to justify himself and explain or deny incorrect information. The article indicates that in case of failure to have such a possibility or if the person concerned refuses to exercise it, the public has to be informed to this effect. Evaluating the relation between the journalist and the source of information, the author distinguishes and highlights the exceptionality of Article 10 of the Code of Ethics. It stipulates that *the journalist is not obligated to adjust the final version of his creative work with the informant unless this contradicts a previous agreement between the journalist and informant to agree upon the information before it is published*³⁴.

The requirements for journalistic publications. In the aspect of the content, provisions of the Code of Ethics can be categorised into three groups. These include requirements, prohibitions and recommendations for journalistic publications that are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The requirements for journalistic publications set in the Code of Ethics

Requirements	Prohibitions	Recommendations
To clearly identify news and opinions as such.	To publish data on pre-trial investigations.	To rectify the mistakes and inaccuracies made that might insult particular persons without waiting for the insulted individuals' request to do so.
To present as many opinions as possible.	To publish information about people in a state of distress or at death's door.	Not to publish artificially manipulated photo arrangements, false signatures under photos that might insult the individuals portrayed.
To uphold the presumption of innocence.	To publish personal data without the individual's consent.	Not to publish information about family conflicts.
Not to publish groundless, unverified accusations not supported with facts.	To publish information about the individual's private life without his consent.	Not to abuse pictures of catastrophes, road traffic accidents, deaths, assault or aggression that may hurt the feelings of the persons concerned or their relatives likewise the sensibilities of readers and (or) spectators.
Not to abuse the weaknesses and immaturity of an individual, not understanding of his rights and freedoms.	To directly or indirectly provoke discord or incite hatred.	Not to publish critical works for purposes of revenge.

Source: compiled by the author

³⁴ This is believed to be a topic for a separate research, especially relevant to today's journalism.

Item 7 of the Resolution No. 1 of 15 May 1998 of the Senate of the Supreme Court of Lithuania underscores the necessity to differentiate news from an opinion. Such distinct clause to identify news and opinions when supplying public information is not included in the Law on Provision of Information to the Public. Therefore, the consolidation in the professional document of ethics of the requirement to clearly identify news and opinion as such is deemed to be highly important. Article 4 of the Code of Ethics also requires from journalists and producers of public information to ensure that an opinion is presented fairly and ethically, without any distortion of facts or data.

Prohibitions included in Table 1, in the meantime, are clearly defined in the Law on Provision of Information to the Public and the Law on Legal Protection of Personal Data, consolidating the provisions on protection of personal identity, private life, seeking to guarantee the impartiality of judicial authority, including a concrete prohibition to publish the data of a pre-trial investigation³⁵. Provisions of the Code of Ethics that the author conditionally refers to as recommendations, distinctly demonstrate that these are purely ethical requirements for authors of publications. All of the aforementioned provisions are a matter of a free choice of a journalist or producer of public information, foremost depending on their values. Thus, it may be concluded that Articles 19-20, 46-47 and 50 of the Code are most consistent with the principles of professional ethics.

4. The results of the survey of Lithuanian journalists

The French scientist Claude-Jean Bertrand in writes about the relation between legal and ethical aspects of the media, highlighting the possibility of quality control or effective self-regulation. Bertrand proposes to apply Media Accountability Systems, M*A*S, to ensure the quality of media, based on the combination of the market, law and ethics (2000:124, 164). The scientist distinguishes two interrelated variables – responsibility of the media to the public and the public's trust in the media. The essence of the media responsibility concept is the efforts of journalists themselves to control the quality of the media. In the case of Lithuania, this would be effective self-regulation of the media. Examining the codes of ethics of various countries, Bertrand raises a rhetorical question, who composes these codes if they are not adhered to voluntarily. These insights by the scientist are highly relevant analysing the situation of Lithuanian regional periodicals and their staff throughout 2010-2014.

Based on Bertrand's Media Accountability System, the author came up with the design of the sociological survey of editors and journalists of Lithuanian regional press. The target audience of respondents was chosen purposefully because regional press accounts for 88 percent of the total market of newspapers and magazines in Lithuania³⁶. The survey of 120 employees of 40 randomly selected regional press editorial offices was carried out in December 2013 – February 2014. The questionnaire aimed to elicit views of employees of regional and local media on some of the issues of self-regulation and professional ethics in the media sphere. It is also essential to examine how media employees perceive factors that influence the occurrence of ethical and legal violations in regional periodicals. This part of the article presents the results of the survey. The data of the survey was processed applying the methods of descriptive statistics, statistical software package SPSS 13.0, and Excel spreadsheet.

Participants of the survey were asked about the level of correctness of the media in their region/district when publishing information about political events, economic and social issues in their region/district. Possible response options included: *high, low, no such problem*. 37 percent of respondents

³⁵ The Code of Ethics provides for certain exclusions related to the public interest. However, the author believes this topic requires a separate discussion.

³⁶ Statistics Lithuania. [Online] Available: <http://www.stat.gov.lt>

indicated that in such cases correctness of the media of their region/district is high, 23 percent said the level of correctness of the media is low, while 40 percent of the polled indicated that there is no such problem.

When asked if publications violating protection of private life and other ethics standards occur in regional/district press, 35 percent of the polled gave a positive answer, 44 percent said such situations do not occur, and another 21 percent said they do not notice such publications. The research attempted to establish the reasons leading to emergence of such publications in regional (local) media. Respondents were asked two questions naming hypothetical causes of violations of legal and ethics standards: *first*, it is related to election campaigns; *second*, it is related to the general poor professional level of modern journalism and pursuing cheap sensationalism. 34 percent of respondents indicated that violations of ethics and law in regional and local press emerge due to election campaigns, 49 percent opposed such idea, while 17 percent did not express their opinion on the matter. However, it is worthwhile noting that the hypothetical statement that the reason behind such violations is ***the general poor professional level of modern journalism and pursuing cheap sensationalism*** was supported by 58 percent of respondents, opposed by 34 percent, while 8 percent had no opinion on the matter.

There is increasingly widespread global practice for every media outlet to have its own internal code of ethics and an employee responsible for the ethics of publications also known as the readers' editor. By the way, Article 65 of the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers adopted in 2005 stipulates that the producer of public information must have in-house rules of procedure and (or) in-house code of ethics. Article 65 also states that at least one document approved by the producer of public information should define the rights, obligations, responsibility, employment relations of the journalist as well as his protection against possible restriction of his rights. A recast of the Law on Provision of Information to the Public entered into force on 1 September 2006, providing for the producer of public information to have rules of procedure and (or) internal code of ethics³⁷. Paragraph 1 of Article 23 of this law states that *at least one of these documents approved by the producer of public information must establish the rights, duties and responsibility and official relations of journalists as well as the protection of journalists against the possible restrictions of his rights*³⁸.

The survey attempted to ascertain how provisions of the Code of Ethics and the Law on Provision of Information to the Public are being implemented in practice. Respondents were asked whether there were media in their region/district that had an internal code of ethics. 63 percent of the polled indicated they were unaware of this, 30 percent answered negatively, while 7 percent said that media outlets of their region/district do have such code. Those that gave a positive answer were asked to name concrete media outlets that have their internal code of ethics. Only 8 respondents indicated that the following media have internal codes of ethics: *Alytaus Naujienos, Joniškis, Giružis, Šiaulių Kraštas, Šviesa, Kalvotoji Žemaitija*. Some scarce replies also said that *editorial offices have an unwritten code of ethics*.

When asked if editorial offices should have their internal codes of ethics, 65 percent of respondents gave a positive answer, 18 percent had no opinion on the matter, while another 17 percent did not think this was necessary. Therefore, both those that answered positively and those that answered negatively were asked to support their opinion on the necessity of the code of ethics for an editorial office in an open question. Respondents (78) who said that editorial offices should have the code of ethics indicated such arguments:

³⁷ Lietuvos Respublikos visuomenės informavimo įstatymo pakeitimo įstatymas Nr.X-752, Žin., 2006, Nr.82-3254.

³⁸ In this case, this can be regarded as the transfer of the provision from the Code of Ethics to the Law on Provision of Information to the Public.

- 1. It is modern;**
- 2. It would increase the responsibility for work;**
- 3. It is necessary for the self-regulation of the staff;**
- 4. It would facilitate agreement between the publisher and the journalist.**

The percentage distribution of responses revealed a certain gap between two of the arguments that are in fact closely related - *it would facilitate agreement between the publisher and the journalist* (37 percent) and *it is necessary for the self-regulation of the staff* (14 percent). Moreover, the statement that the internal code of ethics *would increase the responsibility for work* (26 percent) could as well be categorised as an argument for the self-regulation of the staff. Thus, it can be concluded that respondents' answers, even though they expressed their arguments in different ways, could be grouped under one argument conditionally titled *optimisation of the work of an editorial office*.

Respondents' answers over the necessity of the internal code of ethics could be categorised into two groups. According to the polled, regional/district media should have the internal code of ethics because *it is a self-regulatory instrument for an editorial office* (77 percent) and because *it is modern* (23 percent).

It is worthwhile noting that even though some participants of the survey denied the necessity of such document for an editorial office, yet, they essentially agreed over common rules of conduct of the professional community. In addition, they believe that *internal code is in force in all editorial offices, while not necessarily official, but determined by the values of an editor*. Journalists' answers that they follow their own unwritten rules show the rather lax attitude of editorial office staff towards formal documents on the rules of conduct. Answers to these questions suggest that most employees of editorial offices of regional or local newspapers take no interest and are unaware of the latest changes directly related to their work.

When asked *have you encountered obvious violations of journalist ethics in your region/district*, 35 percent of respondents gave a positive answer, while 65 percent said they had not noticed such violations in their region/district. Those that replied positively (42) were then asked in an open question *whether any sanctions were imposed against violators after an obvious breach of journalist ethics and what were they*. After the analysis, the answers were categorised into 3 groups:

- 1. No sanctions were applied (69 percent);**
- 2. Were not informed about any sanctions (21 percent);**
- 3. Did not report violations (10 percent).**

As much as 29 respondents said they had encountered violations of journalist ethics but no sanctions were applied, 9 respondents said they were not informed about any sanctions against journalists who breached ethics, meanwhile, 4 respondents said that despite noticing ethics violations they did not report them to anybody. When asked if an editorial office should have an employee (a position) to analyse readers' complaints, 19 percent of the polled gave a positive answer, 22 percent did not have an opinion, but the majority, 59 percent, said that such position is not needed. Some of the polled remarked that this is one of the tasks of the editor.

When asked who the journalist should report illegal actions against his person (including the behaviour of the employer or colleagues), most respondents named *the court* (35 percent), 23 percent named *the Journalists' Union*, 18 percent - *the Ethics Commission of Journalists and Publishers*, 13 percent indicated *other*, and only as little as 11 percent named *the Office of the Inspector of Journalist Ethics*. Besides, in some cases respondents who chose the option *other* submitted additional remarks that *no one protects the journalist, it is better to leave the editorial office, there is no justice anywhere*.

Because 22 people indicated all of the possible options, they were asked in an open question to explain, *what will determine the choice of the bodies named by them, if they believe all options are possible*. Two responses can be distinguished: *first*, it was highlighted that this would depend on the

situation, *second*, such options, according to the polled, are determined by the pre-trial dispute procedure. 59 percent of the interviewed opted for a pre-trial dispute referring to all of the regulatory bodies.

The polled stressed that the court is the most effective body dealing with such questions, although some were disappointed with all institutions. Participants of the survey were asked how they would assess an independent arbitration when solving cases related to the media. 43 percent approved of this, 49 percent had no opinion on the matter, and only 8 percent said such body is unnecessary. In an open question, respondents were asked to describe *how the composition of such court should be formed if it was legalised by law* and *who* should be its members. None of the interviewed responded about the procedures *how* such body should be formed, however, they provided plenty of proposals on what professions could be included in the activities of such body. Most frequently mentioned as candidates for the arbitration commission were members of the academic community, professionals – lawyers, journalists, ethics’ specialists and in general people who the public regards as moral authorities. Based on percentage distribution, respondents gave preference to moral authorities (64 percent), professionals (22 percent) and members of the academic community (14 percent). Respondents were asked in an open question who from their region/district they would propose to include in this institution if it was created. The most replied that *there are few such figures in the region*.

Respondents were also asked if they were *familiar with the experience of the European countries in the area of self-regulation*. As much as 70 percent of the polled answered negatively. Consequently, the fact that 55 percent of the polled indicated that the experience of the European countries should be applied developing Lithuanian media’s self-regulatory system seems rather odd. By the way, 8 percent disagree with this idea and 41 percent had no opinion on the matter.

Having conducted statistical analysis of the survey, its results may be summarised. It suggests said that:

1. regional press employees are trying to follow the standards of professional ethics;
2. violations of law and ethics in regional press are related with the general poor professional level of modern journalism and pursuing cheap sensationalism;
3. violations of law and ethics in regional press are related with the lack of internal codes of ethics in regional and local media;
4. according to the polled, regional media does not need an employee examining readers’ complaints;
5. regional journalists give preference to the proposed arbitration over the already existing self-regulatory bodies;
6. regional journalists support the idea that self-regulatory bodies should be developed on the basis of the experience of the European Union member states.

Conclusions

1. The research and document analysis has shown that documents regulating professional activities of journalists do not specifically define professionalism of journalists and requirements for their professional competences in terms of education. Thus, this creates preconditions for violations of law and ethics in the field of public information.
2. The Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers regulating professional ethics of journalists and publishers in the area of public information only partially meets general principles in terms of the content and form of professional codes of ethics. The Code of Ethics is controversial in nature because it is devoted to two essentially different professional groups. It does not incorporate universal ethics postulates, but, instead, reiterates legal provisions found in the Law on Provision of Information to the Public, the Law on the Protection of Minors against Detrimental Effect of Public Information, the Law on Legal Protection of Personal Data

and the Law on Copyright and Related Rights. This contradicts the principles of the interaction of law and ethics.

3. Other factors leading to the occurrence of publications in regional media that breach legal and ethics standards were determined as well:
 - a. regional journalists do not feel part of the professional community united by solving professional matters and issues;
 - b. regional press employees do not trust the powers of self-regulatory bodies to protect creative freedom of the journalist and his right to expression from the dictate of the media owner;
 - c. regional press employees believe that self-regulatory mechanism of the media in the country is excessively bureaucratic and ineffective;
 - d. owners of the media ignore the Law on Provision of Information to the Public and the Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers requiring to have an internal code of ethics;
 - e. regional press employees have insufficient knowledge of media law.

References

1. ALEKNONIS, Gintaras (2010). Komunikaciniai teisės žinoti ir laisvės informuoti aspektai. In *Socialinių mokslų studijos: mokslo darbai*. Vilnius: Mykolo Romerio universiteto Leidybos centras, Nr. 2(6), p. 7–21.
2. AN ARSENAL FOR DEMOCRACY: media accountability systems (edited by c. J. Bertrand) (2003). Hampton Press, Inc. , 420 p.
3. BALČYTIENĖ, Auksė, LAUK, Epp (2009). Some reflections on journalism education and journalism culture. In *Žurnalistikos tyrimai (Journalism Research): Vilniaus universitetas*, No 2, p. 5–12.
4. BALČYTIENĖ, Auksė. (2009). *Žiniasklaidos sistemos transformacijos procesai demokratinėje Lietuvoje* (habilitacijos procedūrai teikiamų mokslo darbų apžvalga; Socialiniai mokslai: Sociologija). Kaunas: VDU leidykla. 2009.
5. BALČYTIENĖ, Auksė (2008). Changing journalistic discourses in the Baltic States – How to deal with cheap journalism? In: Jakubowicz, K., Sükösd, M. (eds.). *Finding the Right Place on the Map. Central and Eastern European Media Change in a Global Perspective*, Intellect, p. 213–226.
6. BERTRAND, Claude Jean (2000). *Media ethics & accountability systems*. New Brunswick, N.J : Transaction Publishers, 164 p.
7. JASTRAMSKIS, Deimantas (2009). *Žiniasklaidos organizacijos nuosavybės struktūros ir žiniasklaidos priemonės šališkumo raiškos santykis (Lietuvos nacionalinių dienraščių tyrimas 2004 m. Lietuvos prezidento rinkimų kampanijos metu)*. Daktaro disertacija: Humanitariniai mokslai, komunikacija ir informacija (06 H). Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, 208 p.
8. JOČIENĖ, Danutė (2001). Europos žmogaus teisių konvencijos 10 straipsnio taikymo praktika. In *Teisė: Vilniaus universitetas. Mokslo darbai*, Nr. 39, p. 33–51.
9. JOČIENĖ, Danutė (2007). Europos Žmogaus Teisių Teismo jurisprudencijos įtaka nacionalinei teisei bei jurisprudencijai, tobulinant žmogaus teisių apsaugą. Konvencijos ir Europos Sąjungos teisės santykis. In *Jurisprudencija: Mykolo Romerio universiteto Leidybos centras. Mokslo darbai*, 7(97), p.17–27.
10. JURAITĖ, Kristina (2008). Media Power in Lithuanian News market. In *Informacijos mokslai: Vilniaus universitetas*, t. 47, p. 121–132.
11. KŪRIS, Egidijus (2001). Lietuvos Respublikos Konstitucijos principai. In *Lietuvos konstitucinė teisė*. Vilnius: Lietuvos teisės universiteto Leidybos centras, p. 205–208.

12. LUSTING, Andrew B. (2004). Natural Law and Global Ethics. In Mark J. Cherry (ed.) *Natural law and the possibility of a global ethics*. Springer, p. 125–140.
13. MCQUAIL, Denis (1992). *Media Performance: Mass Communication and the Public Interest*. London: Sage Publ., 350 p.
14. MEŠKAUSKAITĖ, Liudvika (2004). *Žiniasklaidos teisė: visuomenės informavimo teisė: teoriniai ir praktiniai aspektai*. Vilnius: Teisinės informacijos centras, 320 p.
15. MEŠKAUSKAITĖ, Liudvika (2005). Žiniasklaidos pažeistų asmens konstitucinių teisių gynimo būdai. In *Jurisprudencija: Mykolo Romerio universiteto Leidybos centras*. Mokslo darbai, t. 64(56). Vilnius, p. 114–123.
16. MIKELĖNAS, Valentinas, et al. (2002). *Lietuvos Respublikos civilinio kodekso komentaras. II knyga. Asmenys*. Vilnius: Justitia, 435 p.
17. MIKELĖNAS, Valentinas (2003). *Prievolių teisė. Pirmoji dalis*. Vilnius: Justitia, 531 p.
18. MOORE, Roy L.; MURRAY, Michael D. (2007). *Media law and Ethics*. 3 edition CRC Press, 803 p.
19. NORKŪNAS, Algis (2002). Kaltė kaip civilinės atsakomybės pagrindas. In *Jurisprudencija: Mykolo Romerio universiteto Leidybos centras*. Mokslo darbai, t. 28(20). p. 119–123.
20. NORKŪNAS, Algis (2003). Sąžiningumo principo įgyvendinimas. In *Jurisprudencija: Mykolo Romerio universiteto Leidybos centras*. Mokslo darbai, t. 42(34). p. 5–11.
21. NUGARAITĖ, Audronė (2008). The Lithuanian media landscape. In *European media governance: national and regional dimensions*, Chicago: Intellect books, p. 387–397.
22. NUGARAITĖ, Audronė (2008). Žurnalistų kompetencija: darnaus vystymosi aspektas. In *Žurnalistika, 1990–2007: almanachas*, V., p. 59–62.
23. PEČIULIS, Žygintas (2009). Laiko ženklai: profesionalų ir mėgėjų kovos. In *Žurnalistika 2008: almanachas*, p. 17–21.
24. PEČIULIS, Žygintas (2010). Visuomeninis transliuotojas: nepriklausomumas ir politinės valdžios įtakos problema. In *Informacijos mokslai: Vilniaus universitetas*. Mokslo darbai, t. 54, p. 73–86.
25. PEČIULIS, Žygintas (2010). Mission (im)possible. The case of Lithuanian Public Service Broadcasting. In *Central European Journal of Communication*, vol. 3, no 1(4), p. 81–94.
26. VAIŠNYS, Andrius (2003). Spauda ir valstybė: informacinės politikos istoriniai aspektai. In *Informacijos mokslai: Vilniaus universitetas*. Mokslo darbai, t. 24, p. 46–52.
27. VAIŠNYS, Andrius (2004). Draudimų filosofijos paveldas komunikacijos ir informacijos politikos raidoje. In *Informacijos mokslai: Vilniaus universitetas*. Mokslo darbai, t. 31, p. 11–17.
28. VAIŠNYS, Andrius (2008). Nusidavimai mūsų periodikos raidoje: draudimų diegimas, draudimų vengimas, draudimų tradicijos kūrimas. In *Žurnalistikos tyrimai: Vilniaus universitetas*. Mokslo darbai, Nr.1, p.64–80.
29. ŽIOBIENĖ, Edita (2005). Aktualios konstitucinės teisės į privatų gyvenimą apsaugos problemos. In *Jurisprudencija: Mykolo Romerio universiteto Leidybos centras*. Mokslo darbai, Nr. 64 (56), p. 124 – 131.
30. ŽVALGOMASIS ŽINIASKLAIDOS ATSKAITINGUMO TYRIMAS (2009). „Transparency International“ Lietuvos skyrius. Prieiga per internetą: http://www.transparency.lt/new/images/tils_ziniasklaidos_atskaitingumas_zvalgomasis_tyrimas_2009.pdf

SOURCES

I. Laws and other legal acts

1. The Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania. *Valstybės žinios*, 1992, Nr. 33–1014.
2. The Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania. *Valstybės žinios*, 2000, Nr. 89–2741.

3. The Civil Code of the Republic of Lithuania. *Valstybės žinios*, 1964, Nr. 19–138.
4. The Civil Code of the Republic of Lithuania. *Valstybės žinios*, 2000, Nr.74–2262.
5. The Republic of Lithuania Law on Legal Protection of Personal Data. *Valstybės žinios*, 1996, Nr. 63–1479; recast – *Valstybės žinios*, 2008, Nr. 22–804.
6. The Republic of Lithuania Law on Copyright and Related Rights. *Valstybės žinios*, 1999, Nr. 50–1598.
7. The Republic of Lithuania Law on the Protection of Minors against Detrimental Effect of Public Information. *Valstybės žinios*, 2002, Nr. 91–3890.
8. The Republic of Lithuania Law on Provision of Information to the Public. *Valstybės žinios*, 1996, Nr. 71–1706.
9. The Republic of Lithuania Law Amending the Law on Provision of Information to the Public. *Valstybės žinios*, 2000, Nr. 75–2272.
10. The Republic of Lithuania Law Amending the Law on Provision of Information to the Public. *Valstybės žinios*. 2006, Nr. 82–3254.
11. The Resolution of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania on the Appointment of the Inspector of Journalist Ethics. *Valstybės žinios*. 2001, Nr.18–544.

II. International Agreements

1. The 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. *Valstybės Žinios*, 1999, Nr.83 –2455.
2. The 1950 European Convention on Human Rights, partially amended with protocol No.11, and with additional protocols No.1, 4, 6 and 7. *Valstybės žinios*, 1996, Nr. 15–386; 2000, Nr. 96 –3016.
3. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe Resolution 1003 (1993) on the ethics of journalism. *Valstybės žinios*, 1995, Nr.85–1918.

III. The Codes of Ethics

1. The Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers. Vilnius: Danielius, 1996, 12 p.
2. The Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers. Vilnius: LŽS, 2005, 16 p.