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Introduction

ONLINE HARASSMENT AND ABUSE OF WOMEN JOURNALISTS DAMAGES OUR SOCIETY. TOGETHER WE CAN HELP PREVENT IT.

These guidelines have been developed for media organisations including news outlets and online content producers to guide them on how to address and prevent targeted harassment of journalists. These guidelines apply a gendered and identity-based abuse lens to moderation, because research shows that when journalists are harassed the abuse is often directed at multiple, intersecting aspects of their identity. While they recognise existing social media community standards will govern some forms of platform moderation, these guidelines are designed to supplement in-house moderation policies.

We know editors and publishers are often extremely rushed for time and resources, so this document explains how these guidelines might be implemented in real-world scenarios. It can be used as a quick reference guide as well as a support document for organisations who wish to advocate for further resourcing for online content moderation.

We would like to acknowledge the contributions of the following people to the development of these guidelines, we are grateful for your time and attention to detail: Anonymous Focus Group Participants, Clare Arthurs, Dr Jen Beckett, Jane Canaway, Associate Professor Fiona Martin, Isabelle Oderberg, Venessa Paech, Karen Percy, and Adam Portelli.

THIS REPORT IS STRUCTURED:

1. Background to the guidelines – why and how they have been developed
2. The Guidelines – a quick reference guide
3. Explanation of each guideline – a detailed guide
1. **Background**

In 2019, GEN VIC commissioned the ‘Don’t Read the Comments’ report looking at how bystanders on social media might be able to help support women journalists when they are experiencing gender-based harassment. Consultations with journalists revealed they were grateful that members of the public would like to step in to help them, but that they felt workplaces and media organisations needed significant reform to prevent and manage their exposure to abuse in the first instance. ‘Don’t Read the Comments’ outlined six recommendations to guide media organisations towards ensuring online safety for women journalists.

---

**‘DON’T READ THE COMMENTS’ RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. A whole-of-organisation approach to address systemic and structural sexism in the workplace. This should tackle unequal gender representation at senior levels, workplace cultures that promote harmful or exclusive displays of masculinity (e.g. a ‘boys’ club’), and reporting and commissioning that reinforces gender bias and negative stereotypes about women.

2. Training on gender, implicit bias and bystander intervention for all staff, not just those responsible for moderating online comments and social media, as one step towards Recommendation 1.

3. Treating gender-based abuse against women journalists on social media and websites as an issue of workplace health and safety and taking responsibility for ensuring that women journalists (both salaried and freelance) are supported in the aftermath.

4. Moderation guidelines and training that explicitly address gendered and other identity-based abuse as a subset of abuse that requires a strong response from the organisation, both to minimise the risk of harm to women journalists and bystanders and to send a message that such abuse violates social norms.

5. Requiring audience members to complete a simple comprehension quiz before they are permitted to comment.

6. Requiring media organisations to provide specific support for freelance journalists even after the story has been published and invoices paid, including training and free access to appropriate counselling services where needed.

---

...**WORKPLACES AND MEDIA ORGANISATIONS NEEDED SIGNIFICANT REFORM TO PREVENT AND MANAGE THEIR EXPOSURE TO ABUSE IN THE FIRST INSTANCE.**
Following the release of the report, GEN VIC and media trade union, the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance (MEAA) held an industry roundtable where representatives from the ABC, Australian Community Media, The Conversation, Maurice Blackburn Lawyers, News Corp, Nine Publishing, North Central Review and Private Media showed support and commitment to implementing the recommendations. It is essential that workers from across the media industry including journalists, lawyers and union organisers work together to ensure journalists feel safe and supported in doing their work. If this is done effectively it will lead to a more gender equitable future for our media.

There is currently a fraught debate around the level of responsibility mainstream, social and news media organisations have to protect their users, audiences and readers.

The 2019 report and subsequent roundtable show an appetite in the Australian media sector to show leadership in creating strong and healthy community debates online that do not reinforce existing power differentials and dynamics.

This document addresses Recommendation 4: gender and identity-based moderation guidelines. These guidelines have been written in partnership with the MEAA, online community and moderation experts Australian Community Managers (ACM), and industry and academic experts in journalism and online content production. They are designed to supplement existing in-house moderation guidelines where available and provide an industry-standard framework for addressing gender and identity-based hate speech towards women journalists.
Online abuse and harassment of journalists is a global problem. Journalists and the media system in which they operate are a vital part of a healthy, functioning democracy. Journalists have an imperative to report on events and issues that affect citizens. Maintaining an online presence is increasingly an essential requirement for journalists and if they are to engage with audiences about their reporting, online and in person, employers need to ensure that the online work environment is just as safe as the newsroom or other workplaces.

Women and gender non-binary journalists, as well as reporters from marginalised communities, are more likely to experience violence online. Research also shows that it is frequently systematic, organised and promoted by networks of online social media users. This demonstrates that it needs a co-ordinated and concerted response.

It is the responsibility of media organisations, news outlets and social media platforms to ensure journalists are protected from all forms of abuse, denigration, harassment and vilification. Ensuring these protections are an essential step towards balancing the essential freedoms of expression and the rights of journalists to do their jobs safely.

MEAA members engaged in journalism commit themselves to:

- Honesty
- Fairness
- Independence
- Respect for the rights of others

For these guidelines we use Fiona Martin’s definition of moderation as a multi-dimensional governance practice. Moderators encourage participation and knowledge sharing through good governance and consistent application of participatory guidelines. This involves monitoring discussions and ensuring that comments meet community standards of civility, fairness, accuracy and inclusion. They may remove, edit, demote or hide comments that violate policies, or attach disclaimers. Moderators can suspend discussion where it becomes discriminatory. They may also intervene to suspend or ban users who repeatedly breach policies, or work with police to track those who post illegal content. (Martin, 2021).

While most media organisations and outlets have in-house moderation policies, the guidelines below are suggested as a way of ensuring that a positive gendered and identity-based lens is applied to moderation of comments and other contributions to news communities. This includes journalists’ own social media platforms where they are often targeted with abuse.

These guidelines are written with an understanding that online abuse is often targeted at multiple, intersecting aspects of an individual’s identity.

In the interest of fostering fair and respectful public discussion online, media organisations must hold commenters and contributors accountable for their expression and actions. This should be enacted within the boundaries of organisational resources and capabilities to moderate online comments.
THE MODERATION GUIDELINES

1. Posts that are abusive towards, or denigrate or threaten journalists, other contributors or moderators should be removed.

2. Posts that are discriminatory on the basis of personal characteristics (such as gender identity, Indigeneity, race, ethnicity, religion, sexuality, class, age or disability) should be removed. Records of discriminatory posts may be kept by moderators and organisations to escalate to relevant authorities or to assist with questions arising after deletion.

3. Contributors who persist in posting material that is abusive, discriminatory or designed to incite aggression against others should be blocked from posting, and may have their accounts removed.

4. Moderators should make reports and keep records of any forms of abuse. Organisations may escalate their reports to relevant authorities if required.

5. Comments seeking to deliberately undermine expertise or qualifications of journalists may be removed.

6. Fostering debate, an important function of journalism, will not come at the expense of members of vulnerable or marginalised communities.

7. Debates on issues affecting vulnerable or marginalised communities should be led by members of those communities wherever possible.

8. Moderators should wherever possible question or correct false or misleading information, and take care to address errors and issue corrections as soon as is practicable.

9. Where it is verified that community members have posted other’s private information (doxing) moderators will act to remove it in a timely fashion and may block those members from posting, and possibly remove or suspend accounts.

10. Organisations should do their utmost to ensure respectful contributor conduct within their communities. This should include the creation of relevant guidance for members in producing a healthy discussion culture.

FURTHER SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

• Media organisations have a responsibility to support women journalists in making reports to the police. Organisations should ensure they are keeping detailed records and provide institutional support where necessary when women journalists make complaints.

• Media organisations have a responsibility to provide transparency and accountability in moderating public discussion. Companies should provide detailed guidance to the community about what content and conduct is prohibited, including examples of permissible and impermissible content and the guidelines used by reviewers.

• Contributors should agree to abide by a code of conduct and, wherever possible, be required to verify their identity prior to commenting. Journalists should be briefed about what the organisations’ guidelines are prior to completing their work.

• Companies should also provide an explanation of how both automated and manual detection is used to moderate content.

• Moderation guidelines should clearly state penalties for breaching the conditions of public discussion and contribution, including legal steps that will be taken to prosecute discrimination and threats of violence.
3. Guideline justification and examples

Online harassment and abuse of journalists and participants in public debate damages our communities and our democracy. Together we can help prevent it.

These guidelines are explained in detail below in order to aid their implementation. Examples of what we consider best practice are outlined, some of which are based on real-world examples and should be considered only as a guide.

1. POSTS THAT ARE ABUSIVE TOWARDS, OR DENIGRATE OR THREATEN JOURNALISTS, OTHER CONTRIBUTORS OR MODERATORS SHOULD BE REMOVED.

Journalists, particularly those who identify as women or gender-diverse, are often subjected to abusive or threatening comments online, with around 41% of women journalists in Australia reporting online harassment, trolling or bullying (Women in Media, 2016). These can include threats of physical violence, including rape. It can also include other online violence such as doxing, where offenders post personal information to a public forum or swatting, where offenders make false reports to authorities so the victim’s home is raided by security personnel. This kind of violence can make the targets feel deeply unsafe (Jane, 2018), and may be especially intense for freelance journalists who don’t have the office support available to employed staff.

Sometimes these threats can become so serious that they require intervention from the police and other regulatory bodies like the Office of the eSafety Commissioner. These comments constitute some of the most serious and unsettling forms of online abuse because the rhetoric can be so vicious. During consultations for GEN VIC’s ‘Don’t Read the Comments’ report, journalists described how they found reporting on issues of gender inequity or violence against women were particularly prone to this kind of attack. Journalists are often reading these comments alone in their own homes. Due to the highly traumatising nature of these abuses, it is strongly recommended that all abusive comments are removed as soon as possible.

AN EXAMPLE OF POSITIVE INTERVENTION:
A freelance journalist who identifies as a woman of colour writes an article about the prevalence of domestic abuse during the COVID-19 pandemic. Her article is picked up by far-right trolls online and she is sent threats of rape and other violence to her personal phone number and email, particularly targeting her ethnicity. She tries to ignore it but she relies on these communications for her work. She contacts the publication she wrote for and their online hate policy swings into action. They delete all the abusive comments on their social media pages, provide her with access to a free employee counselling service, and keep detailed records of all the threats she receives including the metadata behind the posts in case she needs them in the future. The organisation supports her to lodge a complaint with the police and the eSafety Commissioner.

2. POSTS THAT ARE DISCRIMINATORY ON THE BASIS OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS SHOULD BE REMOVED. RECORDS OF DISCRIMINATORY POSTS MAY BE KEPT BY MODERATORS AND ORGANISATIONS TO ESCALATE TO RELEVANT AUTHORITIES OR TO ASSIST WITH QUESTIONS ARISING AFTER DELETION.
While journalists are often targeted on the basis of gender, often this gendered hate speech is compounded with other identity-based hate speech. Ultimately, the abusers are trying to force women offline. Women of colour report that hate speech frequently mentions race as well as gender, for example. Moderators should keep examples of such hate speech to ensure they are aware of the complex nature of these forms of discrimination. An intersectional feminist approach (Crenshaw, 1989) accounts for how social discrimination and oppression are experienced simultaneously, which makes harassment more intense and sometimes harder to address (Dhamoon, 2015). In these guidelines we acknowledge the likelihood and frequency of posts or comments that are discriminatory on the basis of multiple personal characteristics. This kind of discrimination is systemic and difficult to change because it can be such a large part of workplace and other cultures. This means that the impact of discrimination is not flat or static, it often changes depending on who is reading or hearing the words.

It is essential therefore, that moderators keep records of the kinds of posts that harass, intimidate or cause offence to journalists so they can better understand what constitutes discrimination and how they might better prevent it. These records can also be used in the enactment of Guideline 4.

**AN EXAMPLE OF POSITIVE INTERVENTION:**
An Aboriginal woman journalist becomes the target of online harassment after writing an article about the systemic over-policing of Aboriginal communities. Moderators ignore it because they don’t understand how the comments are dehumanising based on the intersection of the journalist’s Aboriginality and gender identity. After the journalist makes a complaint to their editor, the organisation deletes the comments causing offense and makes a public statement about what they have learned and how they are going to prevent it in the future.

Their plan should ensure that all its staff have cultural safety and awareness training, and that employees and freelance journalists are heard when they make complaints to management staff and HR.

**3. CONTRIBUTORS WHO PERSIST IN POSTING MATERIAL THAT IS ABUSIVE, DISCRIMINATORY OR DESIGNED TO INCITE AGGRESSION AGAINST OTHERS SHOULD BE BLOCKED FROM POSTING, AND MAY HAVE THEIR ACCOUNTS REMOVED.**

Media organisations should, wherever possible, require users and commenters to register with contact details so their identity can be verified. This would help organisations prevent and respond to harassment because it may make it less likely that users will be abusive in the comments (Shanahan, 2017; Stoeffel, 2014). Requiring users to register therefore makes it easier for organisations to monitor and block abusive commenters who do not abide by codes of conduct.

**AN EXAMPLE OF POSITIVE INTERVENTION:**
A commenter posts an aggressive comment on a story about women’s sport. Using a registration system, the organisation which published the story can see this commenter has posted abusive comments on similar stories. The comments are deleted and the account is blocked for 30 days. Before resuming access, the commenter agrees abide to a code of conduct. If they violate the code, their account is removed.
Moderating comments, while a highly professionalised job in some cases, is often done by journalists and editors in smaller organisations or when there is insufficient organisational support for professional moderation. Our recommendation is that moderation should be done by an expert and professional moderator who will be able to keep detailed accounts and reports of abusive comments. These reports can then be used to support women journalists who need to escalate instances of abuse and harassment to the relevant authorities. The reports can also be used to inform and improve codes of conduct. When moderators and commenters know the code of conduct they are expected to adhere to, it creates a stronger and safer community for journalists, commenters, contributors and moderators (see Guideline 10 for more detail). Keeping records also enables media organisations to provide strong institutional support to women journalists when they make complaints.

It is important that journalists, moderators and Community Managers are offered counselling and institutional support in the aftermath of online abuse and harassment.

**AN EXAMPLE OF POSITIVE INTERVENTION:**
A moderator keeps a record of the instances of deleted comments, including the reason the comment was deleted. In these reports, the moderator records the frequency of the various reasons a comment may be deleted. During this, they notice there has been a high frequency of comments deleted because they are transphobic. The moderator sends these reports to the editors and senior managers of the media organisation who decide to review the code of conduct to ensure it is clear about the organisation’s rejection of all forms of transphobia and suspend the accounts for 30 days of any commenters who post transphobic comments. By recording instances of abuse the organisation is able to support women journalists making reports to the police.

**4. MODERATORS SHOULD MAKE REPORTS AND KEEP RECORDS OF ANY FORMS OF ABUSE. ORGANISATIONS MAY ESCALATE THEIR REPORTS TO RELEVANT AUTHORITIES IF REQUIRED.**

No one expects people to agree on everything, and robust debate is a good sign of a healthy democracy. However, when commenters decide to deliberately sow discord by ignoring the expertise or qualifications of women journalists then moderators need to step in and direct the commenter to the Code of Conduct. It is important people feel safe to write and comment on articles in which they have some knowledge without their ideas or contributions misrepresented.

**AN EXAMPLE OF POSITIVE INTERVENTION:**
A First Nations woman anthropologist writes an article about how some “wellness” advocates have appropriated some of their wellness products from the cultural traditions and practices of some First Nations cultures. The first comment is from a white person who accuses the writer of advocating for “alternative medicine” and claims it’s all useless nonsense. While this comment is not abusive, it wilfully misinterprets and misrepresents the author’s argument. The media outlet’s moderation team step in to remove the comments intending to misrepresent the author’s original argument, and refer commenters to their Code of Conduct.

**5. COMMENTS SEEKING TO DELIBERATELY UNDERMINE EXPERTISE OR QUALIFICATIONS OF JOURNALISTS MAY BE REMOVED.**
Our media serves a vital function of fostering debate on the most pressing contemporary issues facing us as a society. By offering a space for debate, the media enables us to address pressing concerns and find common ground and solutions. Debating the methods by which we might achieve an equal society is sometimes dominated by some of the loudest voices in the media. While engagement is an important metric for demonstrating the importance of journalism to its readers, publications should not pursue engagement where it fosters division and discrimination. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the media to ensure that contributors are respectful of the autonomy and personhood of all communities, particularly those that may be perceived or represented as vulnerable and marginalised.

**OUR MEDIA SERVES A VITAL FUNCTION OF FOSTERING DEBATE ON THE MOST PRESSING CONTEMPORARY ISSUES FACING US AS A SOCIETY.**

**6. FOSTERING DEBATE, AN IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF JOURNALISM, WILL NOT COME AT THE EXPENSE OF MEMBERS OF VULNERABLE OR MARGINALISED COMMUNITIES.**

**AN EXAMPLE OF POSITIVE INTERVENTION:**
A popular morning news program invites a divisive politician onto their show to provide commentary on a current social issue. While they are on the show the politician makes unverified and discriminatory claims about members of marginalised communities. The news program hosts express shock and disagree with the politician, and the program’s social media team discusses whether they should tweet the footage to their followers. One side argues it will foster debate and discussion, while the other side argues that members of the communities affected will feel exposed and vilified by the media and as though they need to defend themselves. Ultimately, the program decides not to tweet the footage and posts an apology for the politician’s offensive comments going to air via their social channels.
7. Debates on issues affecting vulnerable or marginalised communities should be led by members of those communities wherever possible.

A lack of diversity in Australian media means that often the communities most affected by a social issue are not able to lead public discussion of this issue. Given that this is a problem in both entertainment and news media, it is essential that media outlets and organisations take concrete steps to provide more opportunities for communities most affected by issues such as racism, ableism, transphobia and homophobia to voice their opinions and contribute to public debates in ways that are safe and respectful.

Community-led media is often effective at creating and developing community solidarity and participation in media (Sweet, Pearson & Dudgeon, 2013).

An example of positive intervention: IndigenousX is a powerful force for change in Australia’s media landscape because it provides a platform for Indigenous Australian writers and activists to be heard within mainstream news through a collaboration with the Guardian Australia. The community-led initiative challenges normative representations of Indigenous Australian communities, thus helping to change broader community attitudes towards Indigenous Australians. The strength of IndigenousX also lies in how contributors form part of a corpus of experts mainstream media can call on to contribute to issues affecting Indigenous Australians. While this could be done more consistently, particularly by commercial media outlets, it is important to recognise the vital contributions that IndigenousX makes to contemporary media in Australia. Their practices should serve as examples for the rest of the media industry in Australia.

8. Moderators should wherever possible question or correct false or misleading information, and take care to address errors and issue corrections as soon as is practicable.

While every effort is taken to prevent them from publication, there are instances where mistakes and factual errors can make it into articles. Online comments sections and social media posts are also rife with mis- and disinformation. Media organisation websites and social media pages often do not have dedicated fact checkers to ensure the validity of every claim due to lack of resources. It then becomes the responsibility of the social media audience, online community and journalists to correct errors. This can be more effectively achieved with two steps: creating a mature community and ensuring comment and social media moderation is done by a professional.

We recommend media organisations employ professional moderators and community managers because evidence shows advanced online communities generate value for organisations (The State of Community Management, 2020). By being active and involved in the discussions on their pages, and Community Managers can help foster connections within communities and therefore ensure the discussion remains civil and productive. Correcting false or misleading information then becomes a collective responsibility undertaken by the community.

An example of positive intervention: A major news outlet has a problem with misinformation posted in the comments under articles on their website. Their journalists are often responsible for moderating and addressing the comments on articles, but they cannot keep up with all
of the extra work this entails. The organisation decides to hire a dedicated Community Manager to support the online discussion spaces. The Community Manager checks the comments and social media regularly, monitoring comments for abuse and misinformation. They are a visible and approachable presence in the online space, making it easy for community members to deal with any issues that arise, and over time regular commenters feel they can help address misinformation. When false information about gay marriage leading to child abuse is posted under an article, the Community Manager corrects the commenter and directs them to a reliable information source and the organisation’s commenting Code of Conduct.

“BY BEING ACTIVE AND INVOLVED IN THE DISCUSSIONS ON THEIR PAGES, MODERATORS CAN HELP **FOSTER CONNECTIONS WITHIN COMMUNITIES** AND THEREFORE ENSURE THE DISCUSSION REMAINS CIVIL AND PRODUCTIVE.”
THOSE WISHING TO **SERIOUSLY THREATEN** ANOTHER PERSON ONLINE CAN CAUSE GREAT FEAR, ANXIETY AND TERROR BY POSTING INFORMATION LIKE SOMEONE’S ADDRESS OR PHONE NUMBER ONLINE.
Posting personal information about another person online has emerged as a dangerous online practice in the last decade. Those wishing to seriously threaten another person online can cause great fear, anxiety and terror by posting information like someone’s address or phone number online. Doxing has also been shown to create a “chilling effect” on journalists’ freedom of expression (Ferrier and Gurad-Patkar, 2018). Due to increasing casualisation of the workforce, women journalists who experience doxing are often being targeted while at home, which can make the experience even more distressing (Gender Equity Victoria, 2019). It is essential therefore that all media organisations take adequate steps to ensure the safety and privacy of their journalists’ personal information. Organisations can play a central role in this by first ensuring a moderator has removed and blocked members who post personal information about journalists on organisation-owned or run platforms, and second by ensuring the journalist feels safe and supported in pursuing legal action if necessary.

**AN EXAMPLE OF POSITIVE INTERVENTION:**
A woman journalist with two small children reports for a major news publication on an organisation that is implementing a gender quota throughout its leadership structures. The article attracts mostly positive comments on social media, but in a reply to the publication’s tweet is a link to the journalist’s home address. It is late in the evening, so the journalist is at home alone with her children. She contacts the publication’s moderator who implements their doxing action plan. They record the details of the tweets, take down and blocks the poster from replying to the publication’s tweets in future. The organisation provides institutional support for the woman journalist in making a report to the police about the doxing. They also ensure that the journalist and her children feel safe, encourage her to review her home security, and support her to access counselling.

**10.** ORGANISATIONS SHOULD DO THEIR UTMOST TO ENSURE RESPECTFUL CONTRIBUTOR CONDUCT WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES. THIS SHOULD INCLUDE THE CREATION OF RELEVANT GUIDANCE FOR MEMBERS IN PRODUCING A HEALTHY DISCUSSION CULTURE.

Reporting and journalism has shifted in recent years to a more participatory model, with audiences invited to directly contribute to conversations via comments, pictures, stories, and sharing the articles with their own audiences on social media. These developments have in many ways enriched our public sphere and created greater opportunities and spaces for public discussion. However, this interactivity has also enabled the proliferation of public displays of misogyny, racism, and other identity-based abuses. These abuses can be distributed across platforms and cause harm not only to the intended target, but also bystanders and readers. These harms can be reduced with effective community engagement and management.
Previous research into “flaming” on YouTube, where comments are written to provoke a reaction or argument, recommended a collaborative, community-centred approach to crafting community Codes of Conduct and guidelines (Nycyk, 2012). Doing this helps promote civility because it helped create consensus on what constitutes offensive language and therefore created greater community buy-in. Australian Community Managers, a professional body for online Community Managers, has also developed a range of guidelines for how to create effective guidelines that build community and enhance healthy discussion (Australian Community Managers, 2020). Because the majority of media organisations see their communities, both in-house and on social media, as channels for brand awareness, it is essential that the safety of those communities is a priority. Effective community management can help create positive social change, which can contribute to gender equity.

It is also strongly recommended that journalists, moderators and Community Managers are offered counselling and institutional support when necessary after moderating abuse and harassment.

AN EXAMPLE OF POSITIVE INTERVENTION: A broadcaster’s social media team posts an article written by a woman about the gender pay gap. The comments are quickly dominated by men who argue that the pay gap exists only because women take time out from the workforce to raise children and that the organisation needs to stop pointing to problems that don’t really exist. A social media manager steps in to respond to some of the comments, requesting that the commenters review the code of conduct. They reply to comments saying that the existence of the gender pay gap is acknowledged by governments, economists and countless women who experience it. The inflammatory comments are allowed to remain on the page with the input from the social media manager to ensure the rest of the community knows the kinds of conduct that is expected.

EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT CAN HELP CREATE POSITIVE SOCIAL CHANGE, WHICH CAN CONTRIBUTE TO GENDER EQUITY.
PREVIOUS RESEARCH INTO “FLAMING” ON YOUTUBE, WHERE COMMENTS ARE WRITTEN TO PROVOKE A REACTION OR ARGUMENT, RECOMMENDED A COLLABORATIVE, COMMUNITY-CENTRED APPROACH TO CRAFTING COMMUNITY CODES OF CONDUCT AND GUIDELINES (NYCYK, 2012).
THE 2019 REPORT AND SUBSEQUENT ROUNDTABLE SHOW AN APPETITE IN THE AUSTRALIAN MEDIA SECTOR TO SHOW LEADERSHIP IN **CREATING STRONG AND HEALTHY COMMUNITY DEBATES** ONLINE THAT DO NOT REINFORCE EXISTING POWER DIFFERENTIALS AND DYNAMICS.
Resources

ACOS ALLIANCE newsroom self assessment tool: https://static.wixstatic.com/ugd/c1a6a6_86a36f8820dc47fc-82f451440ac77e69.pdf


Heartmob: https://iheartmob.org/resources/org_process

Trollbusters: https://yoursosteam.wordpress.com/about/


UNESCO Building digital safety for journalism: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232358

Pen America definitions: https://onlineharassmentfieldmanual.pen.org/defining-online-harassment-a-glossary-of-terms/

Pen America best practices for employers: https://onlineharassmentfieldmanual.pen.org/best-practices-for-employers/


IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT WORKERS FROM ACROSS THE MEDIA INDUSTRY INCLUDING JOURNALISTS, LAWYERS AND UNION ORGANISERS WORK TOGETHER TO ENSURE JOURNALISTS FEEL SAFE AND SUPPORTED IN DOING THEIR WORK.