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Abstract
The aim of this study is to determine whether the interviewed journalists and reporters in Thailand are able to uphold their code of ethics while under the censorship implemented military rule since May 2014. The research is based on 9 empirical interviews with journalists and reporters working in Bangkok, one informant interview, and 9 surveys conducted in the end of the empirical interviews. The theoretical framework of this study is based on McQuail’s Normative Theory of Media and Society, McQuail’s Theory of Pressure and Demands in media organizations and Friedmann’s (Dis)Empowerment model.

The research shows that the journalists and reporters have trouble maintaining their code of ethics while working under censorship and military rule, and the majority of them feel the need to self-censor in order to be able to do their work. The interviewees claimed that the pressure to self-censor came both from business, arguing that economic pressure is the reason for self-censorship, as well as from the military government’s restrictions, claiming to not want any troubles with the government as the reason for self-censorship. We conclude that there is a gap between theory and practice that hinders improvement of livelihood and empowerment in the Thai society. This is further confirmed in our created model on external influence.
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1. Introduction

Journalists have a certain code of ethics that works as guidelines, or even rules, within the profession. One example is to “not give in to external pressure intended to hinder or limit justified publicity or intended to create publicity that is not journalistically motivated” (SJF, 2014). When restricted because of censorship, we believe it could be inevitable to break these specific code of ethics. It is our understanding that journalists in general take great pride in maintaining the code of ethics, therefore, we find it interesting to learn how and if journalists are able to uphold their code of ethics during censorship.

Reporters Without Borders state that freedom of information and expression is the most important freedom in the world (RSF, 2014). Freedom of expression is explained by SIDA, The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, as essential in a democracy (SIDA, 2014). Further, the UN states access to information and media freedom as an important step towards empowering people, where empowerment can only be achieved through the access of accurate, unbiased and fair information (UN, 2014b). John Friedmann supports this in his (Dis)empowerment model in which he defines empowerment as fulfilling eight bases of social power. One of these eight bases is appropriate information, which would prove why freedom of press is necessary for empowerment (Friedmann, 1992).

This qualitative research aims to study a number of Thai journalists and reporters’ way of working under the media restrictions implemented by the military government after the coup in May, 2014.

The need of freedom of press to reach empowerment, as mentioned by the UN and Friedmann, further emphasizes the significance of a study that examines the above stated issue. It is our preconceived opinion that it is absolutely necessary for journalists to uphold their code of ethics. If journalists fail to do so, the general public will not have access to accurate, unbiased and fair information which, as stated by the UN, hinders empowerment. Therefore, it is of great interest and importance to learn what different approaches there can be amongst journalists during censorship.
First of all, we present previous research on the issue of the journalistic profession and journalistic work under the pressure of censorship. Thereafter, the problematization along with our theoretical framework is outlined, where the theories presented are McQuail’s Normative Theory of media and society, McQuail’s Theory of pressure and demands on media organizations, and Friedmann’s (Dis)Empowerment model. Following the problematization, our research purpose and issue is outlined and clarified. Thereafter, a well-needed background on Thailand’s media landscape, politics, social issues and cultural characteristics are provided. The background section is finalized with a presentation of the restrictions affecting media, implemented by the military government.

Chapter 6 contains our material and method presentation, along with our methodological issues. Thereafter, the results are presented in an extensive manner, focusing on the journalistic ideals, the current situation and structures and the strategies used by the interviewees. Thereafter, a summary of the results is provided. Finally, we present the analysis, including the conclusion, and suggestions of further research.
2. Previous research

In this chapter we will present previous research in the area of journalistic values and identity, as well as within the area of journalistic work under censorship. Due to shortage of research in these areas regarding Thailand specifically, we have decided to present other case studies that can be applied to the circumstances and the journalistic values in Thailand.

2.1 Journalistic values and identity

What journalists perceive that they should do, as well as the actual journalistic practice have been researched a number of times in different countries and contexts, both as comparative studies as well as studies within single countries, some of them are mentioned in this and the following chapter (2.2). Some of the research claims that the relation to the journalistic ideals and the journalistic ethics, meaning whether journalists are able to uphold the journalistic ethics in practice and what they consider themselves obliged to do, depends on structural forces such as the media business (Wiik, 2010), while others claim that it is influenced by historical and/or cultural traits of a country (Stigbrand and Nygren, 2013) (Steele, 2013).

Jenny Wiik (2010) researched the change of the journalistic identity in Sweden between the years 1989-2005. Wiik emphasizes that she found changes in the professional identity amongst journalists in Sweden that implies that the “organizational identity” wins over the professional identity more often now than before. The more competition the media company is in, the more power is given to the organizational identity. She states that the findings in this research show that the journalists more tend to gather around the theoretical understandings of the traditional journalistic ideals, but that there is a gap between theory and practice. (Wiik, 2010)

Stigbrand and Nygren (2013) interviewed teachers and students from Sweden, Poland, Estonia, Finland and Russia about journalistic professionalism and professional values. What they found was that the teachers in Finland and Sweden were more unanimous than the others. Stigbrand and Nygren claim that the journalists from the other countries seem to be a product of their historically different eras. One example of culture and the relation to journalistic ideals concerns the ideal mainly emphasized by each country.
The ideal of monitoring governmental powers and acting as watchdogs was found the strongest in Sweden, Finland and Estonia. In Russia on the other hand the educational ideal was emphasized instead. Something Stigbrand and Nygren argue might be due to Russian tradition in which, they explain, the academics are head of society. (Stigbrand and Nygren, 2013)

2.2 Journalistic work under censorship

Concerning the issue of journalistic work under censorship, several studies has been made and the issue has been researched extensively. One important result, frequently appearing as a practice carried out by journalists under pressure, is the use of self-censorship. Self-censoring practices have been implemented by journalists working in restricted media environments for a long time. It is an issue broadly investigated by different scholars, such as Cook and Heilmann (2013), Tapsell (2012) and Yesil (2014).

Studies regarding the effect of self-censorship on the journalistic profession have, for example, been conducted in Turkey (European Commission (2012), Finkel (2011) and in Russia (Pasti (2005, 2007) and Vartanova et al (2010)). The use of self-censorship is mainly a result of exerted pressure from governments, economic and social stakeholders put on media organizations and journalists (Yesil, 2014:71).

This invisible threat means that journalists either should censor their information that could harm the interests of the stakeholders affected by that information, or they should face the consequences of not implementing self-censorship - often harsh measures, and even death (ibid). The government and private sectors also control the media organizations with the placement of their advertising funds, along with pressure on the media owners, which in turn put more pressure on the journalists to cut out information which might be troublesome for the investors (ibid).

The practice of self-censorship is a major threat to press freedom in several countries worldwide (Lee and Chan, 2009:112).
3. Problematization

In this section we would like to define a few terms for clarifications and to introduce the chosen theoretical framework. Primarily, censorship is defined by McQuail as when public authorities control any kind of transmission or publication. This is usually done through in some way examining the material before it gets published. (McQuail, 2010:550) Secondly, McQuail defines codes, in relation to journalism, as standards through which the journalists self-regulate their content and conduct. He further explains that both national and international associations of journalists have adopted these professional codes. (McQuail, 2010:550-551)

In order to outline the general expectations on media, we would like to introduce McQuail’s Normative theory as a way of defining and discussing the issue. Further, he presents notions on what external pressure could be affecting the media, including an objectivity perspective which we also considered relevant, especially in the context where media are under censorship. The consequences of media’s action under censorship could then be discussed with the assistance of Friedmann’s (Dis)empowerment model, where he discusses the correlation between access to accurate information and being able to empower oneself to, in the long run, improve one’s livelihood.

We will on the basis of above stated, outline the Normative Theory of Media and Society - the external pressures affecting media - including the objectivity concept, followed by McQuail’s Theory of Pressure and Demands on media organizations. This chapter will be finalized with a presentation of Friedmann’s (Dis)empowerment model.

3.1 Normative Theory of Media and Society

McQuail (2010: 162-185) presents an extensive picture of the so called “Normative Theory of Media and Society”, which entails ideas of how the media should, or are expected to, be organized and act in the wider public interest. When speaking of Normative Theory, McQuail refers to “the ideas of right and responsibility that underlie (...) expectations of benefit from the media” (McQuail, 2010:162). He outlines opinions that have surfaced in debates concerning the relationship between media and the society. Primarily, regarding the structure and conditions of the media, it is widely agreed that
freedom of publication is essential, where “freedom consists essentially in the absence of advance censorship (...)” (McQuail, 2010:166). Plurality of ownerships as well as diversity in terms of channels, information, opinions and cultural content are also emphasized as important.

When outlining the criteria for the content of media, we find the support of maintaining public order and security of the state, meaning that the media should take ethical precautions when reporting on war and other sensitive issues, not reporting in an intimidating manner. Following the ethical precautions appeal, the “quality of cultural provision” is also emphasized as important. To support the democratic process, in terms of publishing full, fair and reliable information as well as to offer a variety of points of views and giving access to many voices in society is also one important criteria. Last but not least, the meeting of informational human rights obligations is also considered as a significant criteria.

McQuail (2010) presents a number of frequently stated principles of journalistic codes, regarding ethics. The code of ethics refers to a set of conventions of professional conduct. These are, truthfulness of information, clarity of information, defence of the public’s rights, responsibilities in forming the public opinion, standards of gathering and presenting information and respecting the integrity of the sources (McQuail, 2010:173).

McQuail further (2010:192) presents a number of standards and criteria of quality, applied to mass media, within normative theory. He claims that, despite the vast diversity within normative theory, there are a some distinct values which are usually highlighted when public communication is discussed. These could be summarized in the headlines of freedom, equality, diversity, truth and information quality and social order and solidarity. Given our research focus - code of ethics and censorship - we find “truth and information quality” most relevant to focus on, even though all criteria are highly important within mass communication.

There is a shared interest, according to McQuail, of having access to relevant and useful knowledge and information, distributed from trusted sources. The benefits from information quality would be, for example, the contribution to an informed society, the
supply of a knowledge base for democratic decisionmaking as well as the guarding against propaganda.

Not to be confused by the notion of truth - although being a variant of it - is the importance of objectivity when discussing the quality of information. Objectivity, a special method of media practice regarding the collecting of, processing of and dissemination of, information. Objectivity entails the positioning of oneself as neutral in relation to the matter of reporting, as well as not taking any side in disagreements or to act biased. One main presumption of objectivity is the detachment from motives to a third party or stakeholder, and it also requires the devotion to criterias such as accuracy and relevance. This presented version of ideal reporting has become the most dominant version for the role of the professional journalist. (McQuail, 2010:200)

Westerstahl’s model of objectivity

Westerstahl presents, (in McQuail 2010:201-202) a framework for objectivity research and theory, providing criteria components. The model admits that the notion of objectivity has to deal with values, in addition to facts, and that facts are also in need of evaluation. One part of an objective reporting in this model, factuality, refers to information that one can control in contrast to sources, and are cited clearly independent from any comments. Factuality involves criterias such as accuracy as well as an aim of not misleading what is relevant information. Secondly, the other main aspect of factuality is relevance, relating rather to the choice of presentation, instead of the design of presentation. The aspect of relevance demands that the selection is carried out
through prioritizing what is significant for the intended receiver. In general, McQuail states, what is considered most relevant is usually correlated to what is affecting the majority. The other notion of an objective reporting is impartiality, presupposing a neutral attitude to be achieved via a merger of balance and between different points of view and versions of different events, as well as neutrality in display.

One added notion in the criteria of factuality is informativeness, giving importance to the greater meaning of objectivity. Informativeness refer to the quality of information, in order to enhance one’s chances of disseminate information across an audience, to be remembered and understood. (McQuail, 2010: 201-202)

3.2 Pressure and Demands on media organizations

When looking to what effects mass media, it is important to discuss not only the internal features but also the external pressure. It has been discussed whether, for example, content is affected to a larger extent by organizational routines and practices than by personal factors, or whether content is influenced by ownership and control (McQuail, 2010:277).

In order to further be able to discuss the effects of power exercised, both internal and external to the media organization, a hierarchy of levels affecting the content could be useful, for example the one presented in McQuail (2010:279). There is no hierarchy of power, but the hierarchy rather serves the purpose of focusing on the society, of which media organizations are dependent upon. The hierarchy consists of the individual in the center, followed by the organization, the medium or institution, the societal level and last but not least, the international level (ibid).

It is now noted and concluded that power flows within and across the boundaries of the media organization, and, taking on the approach of Gerbner (McQuail, 2010:280), mass communication operates under pressure from different external “power roles”, of which includes, for example, advertisers, competitors, authorities (especially legal and political) experts and the audience itself. It is though important to keep in mind that, even though not all pressures necessary are constraining but could also be supportive, the lack of external pressure would probably indicate insignificance (McQuail, 2010).
Engwall takes the above presented notion into further development (McQuail, 2010:281), explaining that the media organization consists of three dominant work cultures; management, technical and professional. The external pressure comes from partly economic pressures; competitors, news agencies, advertisers, owners and unions, and partly from the social and political pressures; legal and political control, pressure groups and other social institutions.

3.3 (Dis)Empowerment model

John Friedmann’s (Dis)empowerment model is part of the idea of alternative development that, instead of focusing on pure economic aspects of development, mainly focuses on people and the environment that they are in. Alternative development is hence based on civil society and life spaces, and that through the perspective of the household seeks to answer the question of improving the conditions of life and livelihood. The pursuit towards life and livelihood is, according to Friedmann, dependent on access to three different kinds of power, political, psychological and social power. Political power, he explains, concerns to what extent the household can access the process of decisionmaking regarding issues directly affecting them. Psychological power refers to the sense of ability or potency, in other words self-confidence, which is often shown as a result of increased social or political power. Further, social power concerns access to certain bases, which is what the (Dis)empowerment model comprises. (Friedmann, 1992)

According to John Friedmann, the (Dis)empowerment model is based on the assumption that the reason why poor households are not able to improve the situation of its members is due to lack of social power. But before explaining the model itself he stresses the importance of defining poverty and states that poverty for a long time has been understood as something dirty and dumb that concerns people who need to be controlled, managed and institutionalized. (Friedmann, 1992) Friedmann (1992:66) concludes that the perception of poverty and poor people in the alternative development instead is that they are people who “(...) despite enormous constraints are actively engaged in the production of their own lives and livelihood.”. He also stresses the importance of understanding that poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon that can not be explained through simply the lack of income. (Friedmann, 1992)
Social power, Friedmann explains, is related to the civil society and because of political, state and economic powers it is limited or restricted. The (Dis)empowerment model contains eight bases of social power that are distinct but at the same time interdependent; Social networks, Appropriate information, Surplus time, Instruments of work and livelihood, Social organization, Knowledge and skills, Defensible life space and Financial resources. Friedmann explains that the interdependency of the bases is because they all are a part of what he refers to as the spiraling process of increasing social power, they all look for means that in turn will help obtain other means. (Friedmann, 1992:67-69)

The visuals of the (Dis)empowerment model can be explained as two circles, one small in the core of the model and one outer circle. The core is the absolute poverty and the point zero of the bases of social power. The outer circle holds the eight bases and an imagined complete access. The access to each social power will be determined according to how close the household is to absolute poverty compared to complete access. All bases besides social organization and social networks can be improved through state action, meaning that means offered by the state could meet the household in the struggle for certain social powers. (Friedmann, 1992:67)

In relation to our research issue, appropriate information is the foremost relevant base out of the eight. Appropriate information is explained by Friedmann as accurate information that can help in a households struggle for livelihood. This can be seen as information concerning things that can help improve all other bases of social power, for example access to information about medical care, wage-paying opportunities, public services that are available and the changes in political configurations. Friedmann emphasize that if the household lacks access to relevant information the skills and knowledge of that household, as a resource for self-development, is as good as useless. (Friedmann, 1992:68)
4. Research purpose and issue

Up until the millennium, Thailand was considered to have one of the most free media sectors in South Asia. However, since then, journalism in Thailand has suffered from recurring censorships. Most recently in May 2014, after the Prime Minister Yingluck Shinawatra was overthrown in a military coup, the National Council of Peace and Order issued a comprehensive censorship on all media, stating for example; “All state and private radios and televisions and cable and satellite televisions are asked to suspend their normal programs and only broadcast the link of the Army’s radio and television” (SEAPA, 2014a).

After the coup, the military closed several hundred websites. Several television and radio stations, both those critical of the government and those that were government friendly, were shut down. However, the implemented censorship does not seem to apply to the general press in the same extent as it does for broadcasting media. (Landguiden, 2015)

As stated in Article 19 in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights implemented by the UN, the freedom of opinion and expression is something everyone should have the right to. This includes the freedom of holding opinions without interference, and through the usage of any media, seek and receive information and ideas, regardless of borders. (UN, 2014a) Yet, according to Reporters Without Borders, almost half of the world’s population is still denied freedom of expression and information (RSF, 2014).

With this in mind we find it highly relevant to research the issue of journalism in relation to censorship in Thailand. The general purpose of this research is to answer the following question;

Are the interviewed journalists in Thailand able to uphold their code of ethics during the censorship implemented by the military government?
We will therefore interview the journalists about their own theoretical understanding of their code of ethics, as well as their journalistic work in practice, and compare the two. Due to this, we have decided to narrow the focus to the following questions:

- What is their perception of the journalism code of ethics?
- What responsibilities do they consider themselves having?
- In what way, if at all, are they affected by the censorship?
- Are there other structures that affect what they can and cannot write about, besides the censorship?
- What strategies do the journalists use to perform their daily work during the censorship?
5. Background

We consider a background presentation of Thailand necessary to provide a comprehensive view of the situation. The areas we will outline are the media landscape, ICT, government and politics, social issues, culture and the restrictions set in place by the military government.

5.1 Media landscape

The history of media in Thailand is, as stated in Chapter 4, characterized by military coups where the military government would implement restrictions on the media. The issues began deteriorating during former Prime Minister Thaksin’s time of power (2001-2006), as he was sensitive of criticism and tried in different ways to pressure the media into presenting a positive picture of his government. (Landguiden, 2015)

5.1.1. Journalists in Thailand

Warren and Khotanan (1990) state that journalism education in Thailand is not a new phenomenon, and the number of students attending journalistic educations have been increasing. Communication is seen, within the developmental sector, more as a partner with the government rather than contesting or opposing the government as seen in libertarian systems (ibid).

Regarding statistics on journalists working in Thailand, these are put in the periphery due to the massive information flow of announcements and articles discussing the general situation of journalists in Thailand under the censorship, and we are hence not able to present any.

5.1.2. Broadcasting media

Thailand was the first country in Southeast Asia with broadcasting back in 1955. The broadcasting media in Thailand consists of three branches; terrestrial, cable and satellite based channels. The terrestrial channels are state-owned (Landguiden, 2015) but in december 2013 The National Broadcasting and Telecommunications Commission (NBTC) auctioned out 24 licenses for national commercial digital terrestrial television. Most of those who won the auction were already established broadcasting medias.
According to SEAPA (Southeast Asian Press Alliance), the auction meant a significant change in the television landscape in Thailand since the winners of the auction are the first private owners of terrestrial television in Thailand. (SEAPA, 2014b) In 2011 the four largest TV-channels was calculated to hold almost 94 percent of the audience share, and according to UNESCO these major channels were all Public channels, meaning none of them was run by a private owner (UIS, 2015).

The terrestrial analogue radio is state-owned, just like the terrestrial television channels, and much of it are in the hands of the Prime Minister’s office and the military (SEAPA, 2014b). Most of the radio channels, though, are controlled by the military who in turn is renting some of them to private actors. (Landguiden, 2015)

5.1.3. Printed media
The newspapers in Thailand are not owned by the state but solely by private actors. This, in general, makes the newspapers more aggressive when it comes to news reporting (SEAPA, 2014b). The most important newspapers in Thailand are Matichon, the sensationalist Thai Rath, Daily News supported by the military government, and the more serious Siam Rath, all of the above Thai speaking. The Nation and Bangkok Post are the most important of the English speaking newspapers. (Landguiden, 2015)

5.1.4. Social and alternative media
SEAPA state that the rise of social media in Thailand occurred after the military coup in 2006 (SEAPA, 2015c). The new medias possess a prominent role, and the authorities have examined and closed a large number of websites and blogs, the reason being illegal criticism of the royal family, but restrictions of the freedom of expression has been made with reference to the turbulent political situation in the country. (Landguiden, 2015)

5.1.5. Information and Communication Technology
With an increasing middle class in Thailand the access to internet and mobile phones is also increasing significantly, mostly due to cheap alternatives from China (e-Marketer, 2015). However, even though the number of users is increasing by each year the number of internet users in Thailand in 2013 was calculated to about 26,1 million people (NBTC, 2015b). Thailand’s population was just over 67 million people in 2013.
(Landguiden, 2015), meaning that the number of people who had internet access would only calculate up to 39 percent, hence 61 percent of the population still lacked access to internet.

Numbers show that in 2012 about 70,2 percent of the Thai population were using mobile phones (eMarketer, 2015), with that said, numbers also show that of those mobile phone users the percentage of “on-net” subscribers, meaning people with the possibility to use internet through the mobile phone, has decreased significantly in 2014 and was in the last quarter of the year down at 69,96 percent (NBTC, 2015a). There are several arguments to be found that say that due to the lack of access to internet within the Thai population, the traditional media such as Radio, TV and newspapers still should be considered more effective when it concerns reaching the the mass audience of the country (Asian Correspondent, 2015).

5.2 Government and politics

For a long time the political climate in Thailand has been very turbulent. Since the beginning of the 21st century the politics in Thailand has been divided into two sides, which can be summarized as sides where people are either pro or against the politics of former Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra. Thaksin Shinawatra was elected Prime Minister in 2001 based on his promises of tougher measurements to fight crime and social benefits for the poor. His party also won the elections in 2005 but he was overthrown after a military coup in 2006 and he is now living in exile. His party was forbidden after allegations saying they rigged the votes in the 2005. For many years the Thaksin followers tried to establish a new party but without success due to new allegations of rigged elections and the parties being declared invalid. (Landguiden, 2015)

In 2011 a united pro Thaksin party was able to participate in the election and won, this time with Thaksin's sister Yingluck Shinawatra in lead. She was Prime Minister up until May 2014 when, as stated above in Chapter 4, she was overthrown in a military coup. One out of several events that eventually came to build up to the military coup in 2014 was the bill suggested by Yingluck that offered amnesty to those who were guilty of committing crimes in conjunction with the political unrest that followed the military coup in 2006. This started massive demonstrations with people from different social
movements, all though many of the demonstrators were members of the yellow shirts. Their claim was that the bill in fact was for Thaksin to be able to return to Thailand and hence they demanded the resignation of the government of Yingluck Shinawatra. (Landguiden, 2015)

5.3 Social issues
There are great social and economic differences between different groups of the Thai society. Most distinct are the differences between the urban and the rural population where the rural population of the northeast and the south of Thailand are especially deprived of social and economic development. (Landguiden, 2015) Thailand has had several decades of high economic growth which in many ways have reduced the poverty (UNDP, 2015), moving the country from a low income country in the 1980s to a upper-middle income country by 2011 (World Bank, 2015). The issue with the economic growth is that the benefits are unevenly distributed amongst the population (Landguiden, 2015). Numbers from 2012 show that 12.6 percent of the Thai population fall below the national poverty line (UNDP, 2015) and about 80 percent of that group live in rural areas of the country (World Bank, 2015).

5.4 Culture
Thailand is considered a collectivistic country according to Samovar et al (2010) who provides a chart over countries and if the country highly values individualism it has a low score and vice versa. Thailand ranked between number 39-41 out of 50 countries compared to Sweden that ranked between number 10-11. (Samovar et al, 2010:199) Further, they explain that collectivistic cultures approach conflict with the idea of saving face in mind, meaning that the focus on the conflict must be of actual issue and not on the individual (Samovar et al, 2010:323). Since conflict in a group could also damage the harmony of the group, it is considered important to avoid conflict in collective cultures as much as possible. Due to the idea of saving face, the use of direct, open, and forthright communication can be considered inconsiderate and rude by collective cultures. (Samovar et al, 2010:218-219)

5.5 Restrictions
One of the military government’s biggest freedoms they have taken to themselves are the many announcements they have issued, prohibiting the freedom of expression in
many ways. The issuers of the coup, the National Council for Peace and Order (NCPO) issued order 103/2557 in replacement of order 97/2557, which prohibits any dissemination of false information of the NCPO (HRW, 2014). What determines what is false information is not stated but up to the NCPO. Instead of facing shutdown as stated in 97/2557, the new order 103/2557 states that violation on the ban on criticism of NCPO and the military rule will “face an ethics inquiry by relevant media associations”. (HRW, 2014)

The Martial Law was implemented two days before the coup, with the army commander-in-chief stated that the intervention will continue “as long as possible”. The law allows for the government to, without judicial oversight, prohibit activities, censor media, outlaw meetings, occupy areas as well as detain people without charge for up to a week. (HRW, 2014b) Recently, the Martial Law was lifted but replaced by Article 44 which gives pretty much identical powers to the military (Time, 2015).

Article 112, or Lèse Majesté, is another, frequently used order by the Thai authorities. This is used to prohibit insults on the monarchy. Authorities use Article 112 to arrest people who are accused of expressing critics, or speaking ill, about the king and the royal family. The denial of bail of these people awaiting trial for “insulting the monarchy” is just one of the many ways in which human rights are being suppressed. (HRW, 2014c)
6. Material and method

The most important factor in how we got our material is the help we received from Aim, the vice president of foreign affairs at Thai Journalists Association (TJA), situated in Bangkok. We got in contact with her when we reached out to different organizations in Thailand that work for the freedom of press. Thai Journalists Association, established in 1955, arranges seminars and training courses to educate journalists and reporters, whilst they are also campaigning for press freedom; not only the freedom from political influence but also from business influence (Interview with Aim, 2015). Besides her volunteering at TJA, she also works as a journalist herself.

6.1 Material

We chose to go to Thailand first and foremost because of the country’s history as one of the most free media sectors in South Asia, but that now suffers from restrictions through censorship.

Our material is based on interviews during the spring of 2015, with 10 journalists and reporters from different media organizations in Bangkok, but we will only use 9 of them in our empirical material, this is further explained in the section 6.1.2 below. Besides the main 9 empirical interviews we also interviewed our contact person, Aim, in terms of an informant, and not as a journalist. The informant interview with Aim helped us get a solid foundation in regards of Thai history and current situation. In addition to the material from the interviews we also use material collected through surveys conducted in connection to the interviews.

The journalists vary in age, gender and in their field of work. We interviewed four women and five men, between the ages of 24 and 52, working within different types of media; radio, broadcasting, print, online and alternative media. They covered areas ranging from politics, business and social issues to translation of international news.
### Demographics of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee number</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Main media</th>
<th>State/private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of our interviewees had a university education. The majority of them had communication or journalism as a focus in either their Bachelor degree or their Master degree. Regarding the interviewees time in the industry of journalism, it varied quite a bit, mostly depending on their age. Our youngest interviewee for example, 24 years old, had been in the industry for 3 years, while our eldest, both of the 52 years old men, had been in the industry for 30 years each. This concludes that they all started working within journalism around the same age, when they were 20 years old. Looking at the age and time in the industry of our other interviewees, we find that the same applies for them. Broadcasting and print were the two medium the majority of our interviewees are working with today, and radio were a medium many of them had started working with but have later moved on to print or broadcasting.

Given our area of research being focused on specific journalists and reporters’ work, we found the material gained from the interviews enough. The material from these interviews that we decided to include in our presented research was recurring statements made by different interviewees as well as statements that oppose another interviewee or the interviewee him/herself. These chosen statements were within the frames of our interviewguide specifically created to answer our empirical research questions.

During our interviews the issue of verifying information was discussed several times, which could be understood as modifying information. Regardless, we decided to use the term “verifying information” instead of “modifying information” since this was the exact way the interviewees expressed themselves. The term verifying information is further explained and developed in chapter 7.3.2.
6.1.1. Selection strategy

Our research area and our questions in this study are focused on journalists and reporters in Thailand. This led us to approach our contact person in Bangkok, Aim, in order to get in contact with appropriate interviewees. Regarding our selection process, we have worked with snowballing and targeted selection strategy.

Snowballing means that you as a researcher initially get in contact with a smaller number of people, relevant to the study. Further on, you use those people in order to get in contact with other relevant people. In our case, we contacted Aim, through whom we got in contact with relevant people whom helped out out further.

When we tried to find an organization to help us on location we used targeted selection which according to Bryman (2008:392) means that you choose cases or participants for your study in a strategic manner so that the sampled persons are relevant for your research questions. Our target was organizations that is working within the field of press freedom, resulting in our contact with Aim at TJA. Aim arranged 8 interviews and through snowballing we managed to get 2 more.

The selection process of interviewees was not in our hands but is depending on Aim’s network and whoever feels comfortable talking about their work and the media environment in Thailand today. Since Aim is working at TJA she has a firm standpoint on press freedom, which might mean that her network share those values. This might lead to the empirical findings not being the most diverse, given that we don’t have a network of our own in Thailand, this was the most realistic option. All though aware that this could have caused less diversity we still believe that the results show no signs of impact of being a part of the same network. Aim managed to set up interviews with a variation of profiles to give us a broad field of perspectives.

6.1.2. Loss within the selection process

Considering our loss in the selection process, there is mainly two things to mention. First, we have no knowledge of how many journalists Aim approached, and how many of those who said yes or no meaning we know nothing of potential loss in that sense. Second, we did conduct one interview that we are not able to use in the thesis because of language barriers that made the interviewee difficult to understand, and in addition to
this it came to our knowledge that the interviewee was not working as a journalist, but as a manager, which we considered less relevant in regards to our research issue.

To conclude, we did conduct 10 interviews but will only include 9 of them in our empirical material. This is to strengthen the credibility of the study, since the 10th interview, due to its possible misunderstandings because of language and because of her not working as a journalist, might mislead our results and hence weaken the strength of the study.

6.2 Method
Since it is a qualitative study, the intention is not to generalize, but to outline and present the work of these individuals rather than the work of journalism as a profession within Thailand - that would have been too big of a study for us to conduct.

We have to conducted interviews with journalists and reporters in Thailand to see how they work under the restrictions on media set in place by the military government, and will compare this with their view of a journalist’s code of ethics. As mentioned, Aim agreed to assist us in contacting these journalists and reporters.

All the interviews have been conducted in English, and we have been assisted by a translator in six of them. The translator have been either Aim, or a co-worker at the state owned organization whom both speak advanced English. Important to note is that not all of the interviewees whom were assisted by translators needed help during the entire interview but received occaional language support. The interviews were between one and one and a half hours long, and were conducted mostly in various office areas depending on the interviewees requests, such as TV stations and the TJA office, amongst other places.

As stated by Alan Bryman (2008), a qualitative research approach focuses more on what there is to find in terms of others viewpoints on an issue, rather than to find a result that can be generalized and compared, which is in accordance with what we want to achieve. It is not in our interest to find out how many journalists think this and that, but rather to find out what possible viewpoints there are.
Another reason why we have chosen a qualitative research is because of language. One way to avoid misunderstandings that can affect the result is to have unstructured or semi-structured interviews where potential misunderstandings can be sorted out as we go. Since we do not speak Thai and will use English, quantitative surveys which would need standardization could generate misleading results, depending on the English skills of the participants.

We chose to use semi-structured interviews in order to collect our material. This was to keep the interview within our chosen topics, but at the same time, let the interviewee and ourselves feel free to keep a flowing conversation, in terms of follow-up questions on our general topic or other potentially interesting perspectives on things mentioned by the interviewee.

We decided to construct an interview guide circulating four main topics that were inspired by our research questions: the demographics of the interviewee, the code of ethics, the current situation and their strategies. The reason why we found demographics of the interviewees to be an important aspect was to ascertain a variation of interviewees. The aim with having a variation of interviewees was to increase the trustworthiness of the research. Given that the overall purpose of the research is to find out whether or not they uphold their code of ethics during censorship it was essential to learn their theoretical understanding of the code of ethics in order to see if they are able to uphold it or not. The topic current situation was chosen to find out if and how the interviewees are affected by the censorship in their daily work. This topic enhances the understanding of the strategies used by the interviewees to perform their daily work, which was the last topic. The topics were followed by a few set questions, mainly to give ourselves an idea of what to ask the interviewees, rather than to ask those exact formulations. We revised the interview guide after a few interviews when we noticed the frequent use of self-censorship and wished to elaborate further on that topic since we considered this a possible strategy. The interview guide in its primary and secondary form can be found in Appendix A and B.

In addition to the interviews, we also decided to conduct a small survey in the end of each interview. This was partly to compare the interviewees’ answer during the interviews with the statements in the survey and see whether they matched or not, but also to get an overview of the interviewees’ general positions. This survey covered 13
statements about how they believe a journalist should behave. One statement is, for
example "I believe that a journalist should investigate those in power". The interviewee
would answer on a scale from 1 to 5 whether they found the statement important or not,
where 1 would indicate "not important" and 5 would indicate "very important". This
survey was inspired by a survey used by Stigbrand and Nygren (2013, Appendix C).
The results can be found in Appendix D.

We decided to use the topics from the interview guide, apart from the demographics, to
present our result as well as our analysis. This was mostly due to pedagogic reasons
since it creates a cohesiveness that makes the content of our research easier to grasp and
understand.

6.2.1. Methodological issues
Before we left for Thailand we took some precautionary measures, with in mind that our
main issues with our research would be matters of safety. For example, we told our
contact person that set up the interviews that we did not need to know the name of the
interviewees to make sure they would be completely anonymous. However, once we
were here our contact person told us all the names anyways and we did not meet any
issues with safety. Whether that was because of our precautionary measures before we
left or because it did not generate a safety issue to the extent that we had predicted is
hard to say.

Another issue that we encountered instead was that of language. We had anticipated
minor language difficulties, so it was not a surprise, however it made some things a
little bit harder. Most interviews went without any trouble language-wise, especially
during the help of translators. But some parts of the interviews with people that lack
verbal skills in English it is difficult to grasp what they say and the meaning of that. We
are aware that because of these language issues information might have been lost.

None of the translators that we used were professional translators but co-workers of
some sort to the interviewee or our contact person Aim that they all knew in various
ways. In terms of dynamics we did not get the impression that the translators made
anyone uncomfortable, rather the opposite. One could argue the fact that the translators
could both affect the views of the interviewee by specific wording during translation
and/or that the translator could translate a subjectively interpreted version back to us.
However, some of the interviewees in need of a translator understood English far better than they could speak it, meaning that from time to time the translators was only used as help to verbalize what the interviewee could not and the interviewee understood the translation given back to us in English. None the less, we understand the relevance of considering the impact that the translator might have on our results, we cannot be certain that the translations back and forth were one hundred percent accurate and held all the information.

Further, given the fact that we are foreigners to the interviewees, and are not sharing the same cultural behaviour, we would like to highlight that this could have led to misunderstandings or lack of information which is beyond our consciousness. Since Thailand is considered a collectivistic culture, and hence have cultural traits different from ours, the interviewees could for example have been avoiding direct information since the act of speaking directly can be considered insensitive.

One critique is that we got tunnel vision after outlining our research questions. Because of this, it is possible that we have missed out on relevant information and perspectives due to our mission of keeping the decided structure. One example of this is the cultural aspect of the issue, had we not been so focused on our set topics we might have been able to conduct an ethnographic research as well as to immerse ourselves in the cultural impact on the work of the interviewees. The issue really was our lack of flexibility, which in a way was also dependent on the given time frame and location.
7. Results

In this chapter we will outline the results from our qualitative interviews with 9 journalists, as well as from our completing surveys in the end of each interview. There are three main sections to be outlined. Primarily, we will present the journalist's’ view of the role of journalists, as well as their opinions on the journalistic code of ethics. Involved in that section is first and foremost a presentation on what characteristics a journalist should incorporate.

Secondly, following the section of journalists’ role in the society as well as their code of ethics, is the results regarding the current situation and the structures present within the media environment in Thailand. We will present the journalists’ opinions on the atmosphere before and after the military coup in May 2014, as well as their opinions on who has the power over content in media today.

Last but not least to be presented is the strategies the journalists have been discussing. This will primarily entail the self-censorship practices used by almost all of our interviewees, as well as what we find is a milder form of self-censorship - the careful and accurate way the interviewees are verifying their information. We will also present the strategy of the non-use of bylines.

7.1 Journalistic ideals and code of ethics

Under this headline we will outline the results from our interviews and the survey concerning ideals that the interviewees relate to the journalistic profession as well as of what they consider being the code of ethics.

7.1.1. Journalistic ideals

One of our questions during the interviews concerned the interviewees thoughts on essential characteristics of a journalist, which we interpret as their views on journalistic ideals. This was also a recurring topic during the interviews. Comments varied from person to person, some highlighted the importance of being fair, others highlighted being eager to know, but nevertheless there were a few characteristics that recurred repeatedly.
7.1.1.1. Objectivity

Objectivity was mentioned in different ways during the interviews, for example in the context of balance. Some of the interviewees talked about the term objectivity and its importance, it was mainly highlighted by Interviewee 3 and Interviewee 9 that had different views on the meaning of objectivity. Interviewee 3 linked objectivity and neutrality with the same meaning and explained it to be the basic code of conduct. Interviewee 9, however, concluded that he did not believe that it was necessary for a journalist to be in the middle which he interpreted as neutrality, while he stressed that objectivity was highly important. This statement is supported by Interviewee 2.

Our Informant interviewee mentioned differences in reporting from foreign and Thai media on certain events, mostly regarding the Thai government. One of her examples was a statement made by the Prime Minister a while ago when talking about media in Thailand he had said, according to her, something close to “What can I do with you? Execute?” She explained that, in her opinion, Thai media was not pleased with that but that they knew he would not really do that. However, she continued, foreign media take that seriously. The reporting on the matter would hence appear very different between the Thai media and the foreign media according to Aim.

Our Informant interviewee stressed that the Thai media were unhappy with some of the sometimes threatening statements made by the Prime Minister and that he does not show as much respect as he should. Nevertheless, she emphasized that they also see that it is not always correct to depict the Prime Minister like that, what she describes as painting him in a color.

The most recurring word during the interviews was balance, in the sense that the reports of a journalist should be from a balanced perspective. Interviewee 4 were the one of the interviewees that expressed most concern about balance and that stressed its importance more than anyone, he explained balance like this:

“(…) in reporting there’s always someone who does something to someone, and there’s always someone who actually gets the impact of that action so when reporting, um, (he) will try to report from a balanced point of perspective. (…) So in any news report, in any news piece, if (he) interviews a government official (he) will have to interview a civilian to make it balanced.”
Four of the nine interviewees specifically mentioned balance as necessary for a journalist when we asked about the essential characteristics of a journalist, and almost all of the interviewees talked about balance of this kind in various ways during other parts of the interviews.

7.1.1.2. Change and education

Another recurring aspect of characteristics that was considered essential for journalists was the will to change the society. A way of changing the society is explained and highlighted on several occasions by Interviewee 3 that amongst other things stated the following:

“(…) you have to have passion, to, not just to communicate but to feeling like you want to change the society for better. I think that is very important. You have to do something to help, to educate people. To educate the people of the society. (…) the media should make the people more better, not more stupid.”

Interviewee 8 emphasized the importance of helping people to reach social change and in that sense change the society. She states that she believes that Thailand has an issue of inequality and explained that inequality in the country was why she began working with journalism in the first place, she wanted and still wants to try to contribute to equality and social change. We interpret her way of looking at her possible contribution to this social change as that of providing information and hence educating the public, as stated by Interviewee 3 above. She stressed that journalists need to report on things that can help people find new opportunities and new ways to reach that social change.

The most important characteristic according to Interviewee 7 is to stick with why he became a journalist in the first place, and for him that was because he wanted to see a change in Thailand. Similar to Interviewee 8 he also noticed a lot of inequalities, not only in Thailand but in all of the world, which according to him is due to capitalists benefitting from society more than others, for example more than the labor force.
7.1.1.3. Public interest
A third recurring characteristic was looking after the public interest. Interviewee 9 argued the significance of seeing public interest as the priority and the same is stated by Interviewee 5 who stressed the importance of:

“Putting yourself in the place of the people, what they would want to hear. Not what you want to ask (...)”

Interviewee 8 emphasized that if it was of public interest it had to be publicized. Once again Interviewee 2 was the one who did not agree, but instead saw the public interest as a potential obstruction or maybe even interference in his journalistic work, claiming that a journalist might get stuck on a topic because the public has an interest and that not being able to move on to new news stories is a negative effect on the journalistic work.

7.2 The current situation and structures
In this section we will initially present their picture of the media environment before and after the coup in May 2014, discussing the presence of military in the editorial rooms, as well as outside the buildings. We will thereafter present the interviewees’ view on where the power over content lies.

7.2.1. Before and after May 2014
When talking to our interviewees about how they are able to do their work right now, and if something has changed from before the military coup in May 2014, the answers were widespread. Many of the interviewees say they do not experience any significant difference, but they still emphasize that they need to be more careful about what they are writing about, in order to avoid possible libel or troubles with the military government, or in the worst case - imprisonment.

Most of the interviewees state contradicting facts, like Interviewee 3 who claims that, “We don’t want to have any problem with the military rule of, for any regulation that rules. It’s judging on us. So what we can do is avoid presenting or reporting controversial (...) about politics.”, and at the same time states that “I’m quite free to do my job, um, regarding my responsibility reporting the news about ASEAN. I’m quite free. I can do anything under my, you know, authority, ok.”.
Another example of contradicting statements made by our interviewees was Interviewee 6, who first claimed there was nothing she avoided reporting about, but then also stated that her newspaper’s policy did not allow any negative comments about this government to be published. To not publish any negative comments about the military government was something Interviewee 5 also mentioned as very important.

A majority of our interviewees stated that they aimed for balanced reporting, but claimed that this was harder to accomplish since the military coup in May 2014. A number of reasons for this were stated, but lack of unbiased information was emphasized by Interviewee 5, who works with political news. She claimed that balanced reporting was hard to accomplish due to the only information available was from one side - from the government. She also expressed her concerns of her media organization not receiving any information from another side of the government, but concluded by herself that since her media organization is owned by the state, they operate directly under the Prime Minister.

Interviewee 4 also emphasized balancing information as a priority, but claimed this was impossible to do under the military government, that they are not “happy under the control of the soldiers. We cannot see everything balance.”. He also stated that before the military government, the politic news took up 60 percent of the news broadcasting, but after the coup this number decreased to about 30 percent. He guesses that the media were not happy to report about politics since they could not balance the information, and hence chose to report other topics. Interviewee 4 expressed frustration with not having media freedom and explained that even though all previous governments or political mobs have tried to seize control over the media in Thailand, they still enjoyed more freedom before the military coup. Interviewee 5 confirms this by expressing her opinion in that whichever government comes into power, they will direct the media, but claiming that this military government has more control than other civilian governments might have.

Another consequence of the military coup is the presence of soldiers both inside the media organizations but outside of them as well. The interviewees who worked at a state owned organization (Interviewee 3, 4 and 5) talked especially about this, most likely since the soldiers have been present in the broadcasting rooms since the day of
the coup up until, at least, the day of the last interviews (2015-04-17). All of them stated that they are no longer affected by their presence, nor frightened or worried.

The Interviewees who work at a state owned organization claimed to have a quite relaxed relationship to the soldiers present inside and outside the buildings. Interviewee 3 stated that “They do, they do their job because the, they were ordered to do so, they were ordered to come here.”, and Interviewee 5 are comparing them to camouflage, and stating that for whatever reason they are present, they are very polite. She also compared them to strangers to whom you always have to smile to when you meet them.

Interviewee 8, whom also had soldiers stationed outside her office building, expressed a kind of compassion for the soldiers whom had to stand outside in the heat, while she could sit inside in the air condition. She mentioned that some of her colleagues even offered food to the soldiers, feeling empathy for them.

7.2.2. Power over content
One area of discussion during most of our interviews circulated the issue of power over content, and whether capitalism and the media business or the military government and its implemented censorship had the power to decide what to be published or not, or at least which of the two sides that affected our interviewees the most.

One view many of our interviewees shared was the increased influence of the business side to their work. Interviewee 2 expressed this concern as the media freedom is “(...) limited, affected, by the capitalist and by the media owner, who yield to capitalist, who yield to their sponsors.”. Interviewee 2 continued by stating that “(...) nowadays, the survival of the media business is more important (...)".

Interviewee 3 further expressed his concerns about the government’s restrictions affecting journalists work in Thailand, stating “(...) we don’t enjoy much of our, you know, freedom of speech and freedom of expression”. Interviewee 3 is, as mentioned before, one of the three interviewees who work at a state owned organization, explained that since they are under state control, they are being affected by the government directly. At the same time he stated that they know what to do - referring to their use of self-censorship - in order to “keep our business smoothly, go on smoothly”, leading to what seems to be equal impact of government and business, at least in his organization.
Another interesting point of view expressed by Interviewee 4, is the claim that the Thai population have got such great access to news, online and on their cellular devices, that the military government’s announcements does not really matter. He believes that people will get the news from other sources than television and print.

As stated by Interviewee 4, one important factor, giving the government a lot of power, is the Article 44. This article replaced the Martial law, giving the Prime Minister the power of contacting media organizations and threatening them to close if they would not fire an employee who would have offended the Prime Minister or the government in his or her reporting. There will be no negotiation, the Prime Minister’s word here is final.

Interviewee 8 and 9 both stated that, in the light of recent development within the new media landscape with higher competition between media organizations, the main influence on the content came from the business. Interviewee 8 stated that the new media landscape implies the competition and the careful consideration of costs. Another point of view expressed by our interviewees in terms of power over content, is the power which the military government has over media through its restrictions and laws. Interviewee 2 stressed, in addition to his statements above, that “(...) the government’s control will not come into the journalist work, but to the organization right.”, meaning that the journalist is indirectly affected by the government, through the businesses cautiousness. The pressure experienced by Interviewee 8 and 9 as deriving from the media business could hence also be deriving from the military government, disguised as business influence. For example, the different newspaper policy’s mentioned by our interviewees are seen to be business influence, but are deriving from the military government’s restrictions, leading to the newspaper’s implementation of this policy.

All in all, it is clearly a struggle between business and the government in who has the power over content, but one thing is for sure - it is not the journalists themselves.

7.3 Strategies
Following results are certain strategies that we, based on the interviews, found that the interviewees used in order to perform their work under the restrictions that follows the
current censorship in Thailand. The most distinct strategy was that of self-censorship which we consider the final stage after verifying information which was also a recurring topic in the interviews. Besides these two strategies, one interviewee also talked about the use and non-use of bylines that we recognize as another strategy.

7.3.1. The byline
Interviewee 2 explained that in Thailand it have been custom to remove bylines from the Thai newspapers to protect the journalists so that the editor will be the only one responsible for the published content. This has been a way for the editors to protect the journalists and hence a more subtle way to fight for press freedom.

However, Interviewee 2 explained that with the current law not only the editor but the journalist as well can be held responsible for the published content, meaning that journalists can be sued if whoever the journalist have been reporting on finds out who did the reporting. It does not come across in the interview if this changes the conditions of the byline or not.

7.3.2. Verifying information
As explained above based on the information received in the interviews we consider the strategy of verifying information to be a first step towards self-censorship. Interviewee 1, the one of the interviewees who started working within journalism most recently, explained how her team helped her check her scoop after she wrote it, telling her what should be changed in terms of wordings to avoid being sued.

This could imply that journalists and reporters from an early stage are schooled by seniors in how to check the information and what to look for in order to avoid being sued or other consequences.

Interviewee 8 mixed up the meaning of verifying information and self-censorship but received help from the translator to understand the basic meaning of the two. From this explanation she concluded as long as it is public interest she examines the information but she does not censor it, she would leave the censoring up to the editor.

Her inability to separate the two terms could be seen to confirm the close link between this kind of verifying information and self-censorship. The intimate link between
verifying information and self-censorship is also confirmed by Interviewee 5 who stated that the process will be in two steps, first she will verify her information and go through the material to make changes and then the final censoring will be made by the editors after she hands it in.

7.3.3. Self-censorship
Our interviews showed that all interviewees to different extents, in different ways and due to different reasons imposed self-censorship. Some self-censored because of the military government, some because of the policy of their media business which in a way can be seen as a direct consequence of the military coup and finally some only self-censored when it concerned the royal family. Libel was on the table a few times but it was never clear what could be considered libel and what people that were the main concerns regarding libel.

Interviewee 6 made very contradicting statements at first, saying that she did not avoid anything in her reporting and later saying the following:

“I agree with self-censorship. I think this is the way for the good journalist to do their work.”

After this comment she explained, as mentioned in Chapter 7.2.1 above, that the media business that she worked for had a policy saying that they cannot post things that are negative about the government. Since she is working for the foreign news department this concerns things such as negative comments from foreign countries on the Thai government, one example that she gives of comments to avoid is “the government in Thailand is not democratic”. This also concerns comments from foreign countries that are negative about the royal family.

Another issue besides policies of media businesses is explained by Interviewee 5 who states that she feels like it’s her responsibility to self-censor for the survival of both herself as a reporter but the media business as well. If she were to stop self-censoring that would hurt the media business and in turn hurt herself. The wording survival also recurred with one of her co-workers, Interviewee 3, who said:
“(… we know what we have to do and the current situation, we have to self-censor. For our business but also survival were we do not want to have a problem, any problem with the, with the military rule.”

Interviewee 3 explained that one way that they self-censor is by avoiding controversial issues in their stories and regarding political news they try to tone it down. He clarifies that they do report on political news but in a compromising way. Like stated above, in Chapter 7.2.1, Interviewee 4 mentioned that the amount of political news in their broadcasting was heavily reduced. This could be viewed in different ways, both as censoring and as opposing the censorship. It could mean that they avoid controversial issues like Interviewee 3 explained or it could mean that since they are not able to provide balanced reporting to the same extent they make a statement by not reporting on the issue at all. Further Interviewee 4 also mentioned that they are not allowed to report on opinions that differ from those of the soldiers, of the military government.

Both Interviewee 8 and Interviewee 9 emphasized that the main reason for their self-censoring is the Lèse Majesté law that makes reporting on the royal family extremely sensitive since the outcome of overstepping the line in this regard leads to imprisonment. Interviewee 9 expressed that this, according to him, is likely the main reason for self-censoring amongst the media in Thailand. This is contradicted by Interviewee 3 who states that he agrees that it is a sensitive issue but that claims that they do not have a problem with that. Interviewee 3 further explains that in his media business many people are very loyal to the royal family of Thailand and this might imply that the reason why they do not have a problem with reporting on the royal family is because they are not looking to criticize them. Interviewee 8 emphasized that self-censoring depends on the conscience of the journalist or reporter, she also stressed that one reason why she will not touch issues about the royal family is because it’s about people's fate, she elaborates this reasoning with stating:

“(… if the monarchy institution (...) is destroyed, the country will lose its stability.”

What becomes interesting because of the findings regarding the use self-censorship is the results presented from the survey that showed that the statement “I believe that a journalist should stick to the truth no matter the consequences” scored 4,1 out of 5. Some of the interviewees stress that they verify their information so that the content in
general is the same but modified. But one could ask the question whether this is the truth or the modified truth? Interviewee 2 touches the subject of truth:

“(...) for the political protest, you have different groups, and each group will have their set of truth. And yes, there will, (he) will publicize each side’s statement. But (he) cannot say whether, which one is the real truth or not. But for like in the case of fishery industry, he will think about the consequences, because there will be some information that he cannot reveal.”

He continues with saying that it is the duty of journalists to report the truth. Most of the other journalists would agree with this statement, one of these is Interviewee 3 who stated that sticking to the truth is the basic code of conduct and that one must be ready to face consequences. However, he adds to this that reporting the truth takes very skillful reporting. Ironically, the truth about what Interviewee 3 means with skillful reporting does not come across, but it is easy to assume due to the other findings that he is referring to skillful in terms of being good at verifying the information.
8. Summary of results

The main traits of our results could be summarized as three concepts; self-censorship, business influence and military government influence.

Primarily, important journalistic ideals according to our interviewees was balance in their reporting, the will to change and to educate society and to look after the public interest. Objectivity and balanced reporting appeared several times and is therefore considered as some of the more important traits. The will of changing society was at one point expressed as "helping people to reach social change" (Interviewee 8) which would foster societal change. The public interest characteristic was the third most recurring trait, and motivated by a sense of "putting yourself in the place of the people” (Interviewee 5).

The situation of our interviewees before and after the coup in May 2014 is claimed relatively unchanged, but the majority stated they need to be a bit more careful with their reporting afterwards, due to the military government’s restrictions, as well as the Lèse Majesté law. Many contradicting statements were made by interviewees who claimed that they do not avoid reporting about anything, but at the same time stated that negative comments about the military government was strictly prohibited to report at their media organization. Many of our interviewees also said it had been harder to balance information after the coup. Regarding the military’s presence at the different media organizations, those interviewed who were affected claimed some empathy for the soldiers, saying that they only do what they are ordered to do.

Concerning the power over content, there seemed to be a struggle between the business itself, and the military government and its restrictions. Many of the interviewees claimed the business and capitalism as the main influence source, but equally many times mentioned was the fear of causing trouble with the government, leading to self-censorship.

Lastly, our results showed strategies which we believe the journalists use in order to do their daily work. Primarily, the choice of not putting the byline at the bottom of articles is a strategy of protecting the journalists, and also as a way of fighting for press freedom. Second, self-censorship practices used by almost all of our interviewees is
another strategy, which we have divided into two phases. The first phase is the verifying of information, sorting out what could be used in order to sue the organization. The second phase is self-censorship. This is the conscious act of withholding, censoring, information for mainly two reasons; the fear of the military government or the policy or survival of the media business.
9. Analysis

In regards to our results we found it evident that the interviewed journalists struggle to uphold their code of ethics during censorship. We will further analyze this statement throughout this chapter with the help of the theories presented earlier as well as a model that we created with inspiration from McQuail’s Theory of Pressure and Demands in media organizations and previous research mentioning influence on media and journalists.

The model shows that the individual journalist suffer from influence in many different ways. Not only the direct influence deriving from political, social, economic (business) and cultural factors but also indirect influence from those factors that affect the media organization. With this being said, the four factors hence directly and indirectly affect the journalists theoretical comprehension of the code of ethics as well as, if not mainly, the implementation in practice. Globalization is mentioned in the model as an aspect that both can affect the four factors and the journalistic code of ethics. With this we first and foremost refer to the theoretical understanding of the codes. As explained within Normative theory there are internationally agreed upon code of ethics applied to journalism. Things that are perceived as something that a journalist should do. But as our analysis will show, regardless of the international agreement on what these code of...
ethics should be, the meaning of them might not be defined the same way across the
world.

9.1 Journalistic ideals
When looking at our results concerning what the journalists perceive as journalistic
ideals, what we can also refer to as code of ethics or of conduct, we found four main
traits they considered being important. These are to stay objective and balance
information, to change or to educate and to serve the public interest. Roughly, this
correlates to the international picture of what is expected by the journalist profession in
accordance with the described Normative theory, where the defence of public’s rights
and truthfulness of information are mentioned as frequently stated principles of
journalistic codes.

The notion of balance was mentioned in several ways during the interviews, and is also
found correlating to objectivity in Westerstahl’s model of component criteria of
objectivity (found in chapter 3.1). The interviewees aim to present a balanced point of
view in terms of not being influenced by other special interests as well as presenting
different opinions, sharing the view of Westerstahl. In Westerstahl’s model, the
importance of impartiality presupposes a neutral attitude in order to achieve objective
reporting, which would be achieved through a union of balance and different points of
views as well as different versions of events and of neutrality in presentation.

The other important half of Westerstahl’s model, factuality, is comprised of relevance
and truth. The notion of truth within factuality refers to accuracy, and to not suppress
what is relevant information. This was agreed upon during our interviews, in different
ways. One example is the results from the survey that gave a distinct illustration of the
views on truth held by the interviewed journalists. Especially revealing of this
standpoint was the sixth statement “I believe that a journalist should stick to the truth no
matter the consequences” where the total score was 4,1 and more than half of the
interviewees stated this to be of great importance. Interviewee 3 emphasized that
reporting the truth takes very skillful reporting, which can be related to what some of
the other interviewees explained concerning verifying the information to the extent that
the content of the story is the same in general but solely contains the hard facts. This
could also imply that the interviewed journalists are skillful enough to act as gatekeepers and decide the relevance of the soon to be published material.

The situation explained by Aim where the Thai and the foreign media had different perceptions of a statement made by the Prime Minister of Thailand can, according to us, be seen as differences in terms of the Thai and the foreign media’s perception of relevance. The foreign media’s decision to report on this certain statement while the domestic media chose not to could imply that the two held different opinions on the relevance of the statement. The notion of truth and objectivity can hence be debated, even though journalists across the world might agree on its importance they may not agree on what it entails. This is further stressed by Interviewee 2 who stated that there are a number of truths and no way to know which is the “right” one.

This is also confirmed in our model. Since culture is one of the four factors that affect both theoretical understanding of code of ethics as well as the implemented practice it is relevant to suggest that culture might be the cause of the different understandings of relevance. According to Samovar et al Thailand is a collectivistic culture within which some specific cultural traits are saving face and avoiding conflict. This could affect the view of the relevance of the statement because it results in the Prime Minister losing face and could also lead to conflict. However, since we have not conducted an ethnographic research of any kind and do not know enough about the culture of Thailand to make such an analysis we will leave it as a simple reflection.

Examining our results further in terms of what journalists find important regarding journalistic ideals, the will to change and to educate the society was mentioned several times throughout the interviews. The importance of media in terms of change in the society and education is supported both in the normative theory explained by McQuail as well as in the (Dis)empowerment model by Friedmann. McQuail emphasizes that one benefit from information quality, that can be related to above stated regarding relevance and truth, is the contribution to an informed society which in the long run would supply a knowledge base for democratic decisionmaking. This is in line with Friedmann’s (Dis)empowerment model in which he stresses the importance of access to accurate information in order to reach self-empowerment and social change. McQuail further supports this notion when stressing the importance of access to relevant and useful knowledge and information, coming from trusted sources.
Friedmann further explains that the accurate information that people need to access could concern changes in the political sphere or knowledge about health and medical care. This could be considered typical issues of interest to the public, which was also one of the journalistic ideals mentioned by some of the interviewees. However, some of the interviewees claim to avoid reporting on political news which could be considered contradicting the notion of public interest. According to Friedmann, if one is deprived of information concerning issues of public interest one cannot improve other essential bases of social powers needed to reach self-empowerment. McQuail would agree and possibly argue that not taking public interest in consideration would mean disappointing the ideals of the journalistic profession.

9.2 Current situation and structures

The main traits of the effects of the censorship on the interviewees come across in terms of contradictory statements, where many of the interviewees state that they do not avoid reporting on anything, but at the same time, claim that either their media organization have a policy of what is considered safe to publish, or that the media organization did not wish to have any troubles with the military government and in that case chose carefully what to report on and not.

When discussing the power over content, it became clear to us that the interviewees are facing a tug of war between the influence of legal and political framework and of the media business. On the one hand there is the implemented censorship and the Lèse Majesté law, and on the other hand the media businesses facing increased competition which in turn is affecting its priorities for survival. The external forces experienced by the interviewees are found in Engwalls explanation of external forces affecting the media organization, that as mentioned above inspired our model. Engwall claims that the external pressure comes partly from economic pressures, and partly from political pressures, which correlates to the statements made by the interviewees.

As mentioned when presenting the results concerning power over content the pressure experienced by the interviewees as deriving from the media business could instead, as mentioned by Interviewee 2, be pressure coming from the government. The latter statement is in accordance with our model that shows that the four factors affect both
the individual journalist as well as the media organization, meaning that the journalist is also affected by the four factors through the media organization. We recognize the existing economic influence on the media organizations and in turn the journalists, as mentioned in Chapter 5 Thailand has seen a significant change in their media landscape that has enhanced the competition between media organizations. The effect that business has on media is also recognized by Wiik whom further concludes that the business influence has an effect on the journalistic code of ethics. However, in this case we would like to claim that the more influential force is deriving from the political pressure further elaborated below.

Most of the interviewees claimed no particular difference in their ability to perform their work comparing their situation before and after the coup in May 2014. One of the interviewees stated that whichever government in power they would all to a different extent try to control the media. Keeping in mind that Thailand has experienced a history of a turbulent political sphere, together with this statement on the different governments general wish of controlling the media, we believe that the reason why the interviewees claim no particular difference is due to the fact that the main external force, for a long time, has been the legal and political pressure. If instead the main influence of external pressure would have been the rising competition within the media sector, we emphasize that the interviewees would have experienced a significant shift in source of influence after the censorship was implemented by the military government.

One example to confirm the statement above is the presence of soldiers in some of the media businesses after the military coup. The interviewees that talked about the presence of the soldiers expressed that they did not appreciate them being there, however, their presence did not worry the interviewees. It is our belief that Swedish journalists, in a situation where soldiers would be present at their workspace in Sweden, would not feel the same compassion for the soldiers as mentioned by the interviewees but instead feel significantly violated and uncomfortable. This because, according to us, the main influence on media in Sweden is the economic pressure, not the legal and political pressure like here in Thailand.
9.3 Strategies

When looking at the strategies the interviewees use in order to perform their daily work, we find that some of them support, while some of them neglect, the journalistic code of ethics. One strategy supporting the code of ethics would be the non-use of bylines in Thai speaking newspapers as mentioned by Interviewee 2. The strategies neglecting the journalistic code of ethics is the strategy of verifying information and self-censorship.

The non-use of bylines in the Thai speaking newspapers allowed the journalists to report more freely since they were anonymous and protected by the editors. This gave the reporters the opportunity to uphold the code of ethics, for example, to investigate those in power and to report objectively. It does not come across whether this strategy is still in use after the implementation of a law stating that the journalists themselves are responsible for their published content. We would like to stress the importance of this strategy since it is a subtle way of fighting for press freedom and therefore hope that it is still valid and can be used for this purpose.

Verifying information could be interpreted as a way of simply confirming facts, however, in this case we would like to stress the fact that verifying information entails the screening the information for facts that could be considered sensitive and removing them. We would like to argue that removing those “sensitive” facts also implies removing relevant information. Remembering Westerstahl’s model of objectivity, this action would mean that the interviewees are deviating their code of ethics when only focusing on factuality, not implementing impartiality. Their theoretical understanding of objectivity hence differs from their implementation of objectivity in practice.

It is unclear to us how this strategy appears, where and when it begins, but most interviewees seemed to have a relaxed approach towards verifying information. This led us to believe it might be inherent in the organizations. Interviewee 1 stated that her seniors assisted her in controlling her script, telling her what changes should be made. If it happens to be according to this statement, this could mean that the process of disposing the strategy of verifying information would be difficult to implement due to its deep roots within the organizations.
The strategy of self-censorship was the most distinct strategy and also the one that we consider most threatening to the journalistic code of ethics and the empowerment of the marginalized parts of the Thai population. All of the journalists imposed self-censorship but in different ways and due to different reasons, but the majority used self-censorship because of the fear of upsetting the military government causing trouble for themselves and/or the media business.

Interviewee 6 stated that she believed self-censorship to be the way for a good journalist to do his/her work. We would like to argue that avoiding criticism of the royal family and avoiding diverse opinions regarding the government of Thailand to escape troubles with the military government is a serious offense to the professional journalistic code of ethics. However, we recognize the situation that they are in, regardless it is not the way for a good journalist to do their work.

Lack of access to accurate information, according to Friedmann, will reduce the possibility of empowerment. In this case, the first and foremost reason that the people of Thailand are deprived of accurate information is the implemented censorship, which in turn is manifested in the journalists use of self-censorship. Seeing as Thailand have great social and economic differences between certain groups in the society where 12,6 percent of the population fall below the national poverty line, self-censorship would affect the possibility for the marginalized part of the population to improve their livelihood. One of the interviewees stated that people in Thailand could get information from elsewhere through the developing ICT in the country, but the facts prove him wrong. Numbers showed that only 39 percent of the Thai population had access to Internet and that even though the access to mobile phones increased there was a significant decrease in on-net subscribers amongst the mobile phone users. These numbers stress the relevance and importance of traditional media in Thailand and hence the importance of reducing and removing self-censorship. The use of self-censorship practices do not only deprive the marginalized groups of the society of their access to information but do also result in the reporters not upholding their code of ethics in terms of sticking to the truth, staying objective and educating the society. Self-censorship practices also contradicts what McQuail states on the importance of information quality as guarding against propaganda.
Concerning the avoidance of political news, we have not defined our position in terms of what it means. It could mean that the avoidance of political news is a way of opposing censorship through protesting the inability to balance the reporting. On the other hand, it can also be seen as a self-censorship practice due to the fact that they indeed are avoiding to report on sensitive issues. We understand the idea of not reporting on political issues as a way to stand up against the government and the intention of hurting the government by not reporting their biased information.

However, we also recognize a second party that might suffer from the lack of reporting on political news, this second party is the already mentioned marginalized parts of the Thai population. The consequences of not having access to political news, would be argued by McQuail as not receiving the proper knowledge base for democratic decisionmaking. The dilemma in this scenario is whether the marginalized population is better off with biased information rather than no information at all. Friedmann would argue that no matter biased information or non existing information, none of it falls under accurate information and hence hinders the improvement of livelihood. McQuail on the other hand, given his stand on objectivity would possibly argue that no information is better than biased information. On the other hand, taking McQuail’s firm standpoint on code of ethics into consideration, he could be caught in this dilemma just like us.

9.4 Conclusion

The general purpose of this study is to research whether or not the interviewed journalists are able to uphold their code of ethics while under the censorship implemented by the military government. This issue, as shown by our results and analysis, is a very complex one. Even though the interviewees share the general understanding of code of ethics as explained by McQuail, the implemented practice of the code of ethics differs from their theoretical understanding due to external forces. The same, although under different circumstances, was concluded by Jenny Wiik when researching Swedish journalists. She referred to this as a gap between theory and practice, a concept that we would like to adopt in our own conclusion.

This gap implies that the interviewees have the theoretical understanding of what they should do according to the code of ethics but that they, due to the restrictions in
Thailand, are not able to uphold them in practice. If the inability of the interviewees to uphold their code of ethics would apply to all or to a vast majority of the journalists in Thailand, this would be prohibiting the improvement of livelihood and empowerment of the marginalized parts of the Thai population, like argued above. Therefore, it is our belief that the empowerment of the marginalized groups will not take place until the gap between theory and practice is reduced.

Two obstacles that we consider essential to overcome in order to reduce the gap is the sensitivity concerning criticism of the royal family as well as the extensive influence from the military government. The law prohibiting people in Thailand from criticising the royal family is in direct conflict with the journalistic code of ethics as well as freedom of expression, hence could be considered a violation against human rights. At the same time, Interviewee 8 expressed that the royal family is of such great importance for Thailand as a nation and that this is the reason why she chooses not to report about them. We interpret that this statement means she would not report on them even if she could, which in turn could imply that the significance of the Lèse Majesté law can be challenged. Because of this we would, once again, like to highlight the importance of culture in this context. However, the issue of lacking ethnographic research remains and hinders us from elaborating this further.

All in all, the biggest threat towards journalists being able to uphold their code of ethics is the censorship itself. In a way, the interviewed journalists are obliged to neglect their code of ethics because of the censorship, leading to a downwards spiral where the deprived are the marginalized groups of Thailand. It is a threat to freedom of expression, freedom of press, the reduction of the gap and finally a threat to empowerment.

9.5 Further research
Seeing as we have highlighted the possible importance and significance of acknowledging culture in this matter we would like to suggest further research approaching the question whether the culture of Thailand plays a part in the journalistic practice. We encountered this interesting perspective several times throughout the process, but given our research issue we decided to focus on the foundation of the issue instead of the cultural aspects.
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Appendices
Appendix A Interviewguide 1

Background of interviewee
• Age?
• What kind of education (if any) do you have?
• How many years have you been in the industry of journalism?
• What kind of media are you working with? - by choice, or because what you want to do is prohibited so you ended up with X

Code of ethics
• Why did you start working with journalism?
• What characteristics do you consider essential for a journalist? (Journalistic Identity)

Current situation
• Describe a “normal” day at work - tasks, limitations, etc.
• What restrictions are there? How are you affected?
• What do you perceive that the organization expect from you?

Strategies
• How do you relate to the expectations that your media organization has on you?
• If you were to refuse to follow the restrictions of the censorship or the expectations from your media organization, would you have enough support to do so? Who would you turn to and why?
• In what way(s) do you oppose the censorship? (Depending if the interviewee is a censorship rebel or not..)
• How did you work the week following the military’s takeover? Differences from the week before?
Appendix B Interviewguide 2

Background of interviewee

- Age?
- What kind of education (if any) do you have?
- How many years have you been in the industry of journalism?
- What kind of media are you working with? - by choice, or because what you want to do is prohibited so you ended up with X

Code of ethics

- Why did you start working with journalism?
- What characteristics do you consider essential for a journalist? (Journalistic Identity)

Current situation

- Describe a “normal” day at work - tasks, limitations, etc.
- What restrictions are there? How are you affected?
- What do you perceive that the organization expect from you?

Strategies

- Where would you say the power over content lies - corporations/business impact, or government’s restrictions?
- How did you work the week following the military’s takeover? Differences from the week before?
- Have you ever had to self-censor your work? Can you give examples? What do you think of self-censorship?
Appendix C The journalistic role in society

Rate the importance of following tasks from 1-5, 1 being not important and 5 being very important, or choose the “I don’t know”.

I believe that a journalist should…

1. ...Educate the civil society.

2. ...Inspire/trigger new ideas.

3. ...Investigate those in power.

4. ...Act as a representative of local public opinion.

5. ...Criticize injustice.

6. ...Stick to the truth no matter the consequences.

7. ...Ascertain the success of the media business.

8. ...Assist in understanding between cultures.

9. ...Remain neutral.

10. ...Amuse the public.

11. ...Affect public opinion.

12. ...Put across a variation of opinions.

13. ...Not be influenced by other special interests.
Appendix D Survey results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>