

Attacks on Journalism as an Occupational Hazard

VALÉRIE BÉLAIR-GAGNON*
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, USA

KATHLEEN SEARLES
University of South Carolina, USA

EMILY VRAGA
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, USA

AVERY E. HOLTON
University of Utah, USA

EDSON C. TANDOC, JR.
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Journalism research has shown that while attacks on journalists persist and intensify, countermeasures have largely been at the individual level, meaning that the burden of attacks has been left to journalists themselves. This article amplifies the need for systemic change by examining attacks on journalism from an occupational hazard lens. It draws on the case of violence against Filipino journalists to articulate a framework for institutional intervention.

Keywords: expert, harassment, hostile attacks, journalism, journalist, occupational hazard, occupational risk, trauma, public health

Experts with specialized knowledge or skills in particular fields, including journalism, academics, and scientists, are increasingly targeted and attacked for their professional work. These attacks can come from many actors (e.g., institutions, groups, or individuals) that maliciously or inadvertently exploit experts' vulnerabilities. These attacks take many forms, including extra layers of scrutiny from their employers, funders, or state actors as well as online attacks, such as harassment, abuse, and even physical threats to

Valérie Bélaïr-Gagnon: vbg@umn.edu

Kathleen Searles: ksearles@lsu.edu

Emily Vraga: ekvraga@umn.edu

Avery E. Holton: avery.holton@utah.edu

Edson C. Tandoc, Jr.: edson@ntu.edu.sg

Date submitted: 2024-01-11

Copyright © 2024 (Valérie Bélaïr-Gagnon, Kathleen Searles, Emily Vraga, Avery E. Holton, and Edson C. Tandoc, Jr.). Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial No Derivatives (by-nc-nd). Available at <http://ijoc.org>.

their person and family. Journalism studies scholars have used terms including “mob censorship,” “digital safety,” “hostile attacks,” and “digital harassment” (Henrichsen, 2020; Macaraig & Hameleers, 2022; Tandoc, Sagun, & Alvarez, 2023; Waisbord, 2020) to qualify these attacks. These attacks can have dire consequences, particularly by slowing or stopping work, ultimately leading to the silencing of experts.

While not new, the rise of social media and artificial intelligence tools has made it easier for various actors to attack experts. These actors, including the state, lobbies, think tanks, and activists, have gained greater access to a larger public through social and digital media, which creates opportunities for the public to target experts. Many factors have contributed to the surge of attacks on expertise, including social stratification within academia, the actions of conservative state legislatures, and the rise of populist governments (Brint, 2021; Waisbord, 2019). For example, opponents have criticized and physically threatened those working in public health, especially for vaccination programs (Van Noorden, 2022; Yusufzai, 2014). Though traditionally more siloed, academic experts have also experienced a surge of attacks, even as public engagement is increasingly used as a criterion for promotion (Chinn, Hasell, Roden, & Zichettella, 2023; Shapiro, 2023). These attacks on expertise often target the people involved in producing and providing access to knowledge, specifically journalists (Henrichsen & Shelton, 2022; Waisbord, 2020). This article focuses on attacks on journalists as a case study to articulate the need for a broader understanding of how to build institutional resilience to attacks—that is, the capacity of institutions to resist and recover quickly from difficulties.

Journalism studies research has shown that while attacks on journalists persist and intensify, countermeasures have largely been the responsibility of individual journalists (Miller, 2021; Nelson, 2023). However, researchers have increasingly argued for adopting a more systemic approach to defending journalists against these attacks. Such a shift includes understanding that attacks are more than the sum of their parts and implementing solutions to support journalists institutionally (Miller, 2021; Nelson, 2023). For example, scholars point to the need for appropriate state institutions, such as the judiciary, to safeguard journalism safety and security (Bossio, Bélair-Gagnon, Molyneux, & Holton, 2024; Bélair-Gagnon, Bossio, Holton, & Molyneux, 2022) and for news organizations and platforms to mitigate mob censorship and improve journalism safety and security (Bélair-Gagnon, Holton, Deuze, & Mellado, 2023; Henrichsen & Shelton, 2022). Associations and civil society groups like the Online News Association (ONA) and the Coalition Against Online Violence have stepped into this gap by producing resources and offering services, often relying on philanthropy to offset the costs of coordinating while calling for state-level and institutional changes. Practitioners and scholars have also advocated for media organizations to develop codes of practice and policies for journalists’ well-being (see Arnold & Wade, 2015; Kaufman, 1983; Sturmberg & Martin, 2024). Building on these calls, this article articulates the need for institutional interventions in journalism. To do so, it draws on a well-documented case in the academic journalism studies literature: the case of hostile attacks on Filipino journalists. Previous studies have used case studies and examples from the scholarly literature to build theory and understand the challenges journalists face (Lewis & Westlund, 2015; Mitra, Høiby, & Garrido, 2021; Reese, 2015). As such, using an underdeveloped concept in journalism studies—the sociological concept of occupational hazard, defined as a risk accepted as being part of a profession that requires a systemic approach—we offer a framework to change systems in response to attacks on journalism.

Literature Review

This section unpacks the journalism studies literature on attacks on journalism. It then introduces the sociological concept of occupational hazard, which we leverage to build our conceptual framework.

Attacks on Journalism

The literature on attacks on journalism—from a focus on harassment to digital safety—has explored the actors, tools, coping mechanisms, and, to a certain extent, the consequences for individual journalists and journalism. As media work is increasingly performed online, journalists are exposed to, or are the targets of, abusive comments, hate speech, sexual harassment, dogpiling, and violent threats (Posetti, Bontcheva, & Shabbir, 2022). Mob censorship, or the ability of actors (including citizens, corporations, and state actors) to exert power through discursive violence over journalists, has increased over the last decade because of the capacity of these actors to leverage technological actants and infrastructures (Henrichsen & Shelton, 2022; Holton, Bélair-Gagnon, Bossio, & Molyneux, 2023; Waisbord, 2020). Though not new (Gonzalez, 1988; Nerone, 1994), the delivery of attacks on journalists is now multimodal. Hateful speech is delivered via e-mail, voicemail, and social media platforms, where abuse is often rampant and unchecked. Attacks can be experienced while reporting a story or as part of audience engagement with that story (Hughes & Márquez-Ramírez, 2018; Jamil, 2018; Miller, 2021). Threats can migrate offline from online spaces and vice versa, so journalists often feel that they must always be on high alert (Glaser, 2022). Advocacy organizations that work to support journalists have done the difficult work of documenting the various types of attacks and creating interventions in response to such attacks. In addition to the Coalition Against Online Violence, organizations such as PEN America, the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF), the Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ), and Reporters Without Borders (RWB) provide digital safety guides, which include tools such as encryption and secure messaging (Committee to Protect Journalists [CPJ], 2019; Electronic Frontier Foundation, 2024; Reporters Without Borders, 2022).

Online abuse is often identity-based, meaning that journalists are attacked because of their race, sexual orientation, and gender identity. Therefore, much of this work has focused on the experiences of journalists and media professionals identifying as women, people of color, and LGBTQ+ (Nelson, 2023). For example, the CPJ found that 90% of women journalists in the U.S. cited online harassment as the biggest threat they face (Westcott, 2019). Similarly, a UNESCO report found that most (73%) of female journalists experienced online violence, acknowledging the difficulty of getting access to data or reports from individuals experiencing online violence. The report documented two prominent forms of such attacks, contrasting high-volume coordinated campaigns of abuse with the “slow burn” of constant online harm, both of which can result in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and anxiety (Posetti et al., 2022).

Research shows that the effects of these attacks may be both acute and cumulative. Of particular concern is the potential for self-censorship, which can involve removing controversial words from stories, avoiding controversial topics, and, at its most extreme, burning out or leaving the profession entirely (Kempner, 2008; Waisbord, 2020). A survey conducted by the International Women’s Media Foundation (IWMF) and Trollbusters found that because of increasing online abuse, one-third of women journalists have considered leaving the profession and 40% say it affects what they report on

(Ferrier, 2018). Posetti et al. (2022) also reported that journalists self-censor in response to online violence (30%), with 20% reporting that they withdraw from online interactions. Reports from Pakistan (Media Matters for Democracy [MMD], 2020) and Syria (Syrian Female Journalists Network [SFJW], 2021) confirm that women journalists act with more restraint, censor themselves, and limit their professional experiences in efforts to mitigate online violence.

Similarly, research in journalism studies has explored this phenomenon, underscoring how mob censorship and harassment are effectively different modes and actions aimed at suppressing expert voices (Bhat & Chadha, 2022). Journalists have also reported experiencing blame, guilt, and stigma (e.g., having thick skin as a badge of honor or needing to work long hours) when reporting harassment within and outside newsrooms (Blumell, Mulupi, & Arafat, 2023; Chen et al., 2020; Voss, 2007). These self-reports likely underestimate the effects, as journalists may be unaware of the consequences of these attacks on their personal and professional environments (Magnavita, Congedo, Di Prinzio, & Iuliano, 2021).

Journalists cope with these attacks through various mechanisms, including positive or wishful thinking, self-controlling, talking to colleagues and family members, dissociating or detaching from their job, denying or avoiding the situation, reducing journalistic standards, using macabre humor, and exercising, among others (Barrios & Miller, 2021; Chinweobo-Onuoha et al., 2022; Ivask, Waschková Císařová, & Lon, 2023; Panievsky, 2022). Walulya and Nassanga (2020) showed that to protect themselves from safety risks, Ugandan journalists reported self-censoring and leaving out critiques or politically charged information about powerful people who may come after them. Other scholars pointed to women starting “to fill in for each other when a female expert needed time off” (Nölleke, Leonhardt, & Hanusch, 2023, p. 672; see also Sarikakis et al., 2023).

These coping mechanisms underscore how media organizations fail to adopt systemic approaches to support journalists under attack, and when they do, they often cause more harm. Many of these coping strategies in response to harassment add to the emotional labor that journalists are tasked with (e.g., Deavours et al., 2023; Miller & Lewis, 2022). For example, research shows that social media policies have been presented as a way for news organizations to mitigate risk and reputation rather than to support workers (Nelson, 2023). This failure leads to journalists facing further victimization because sharing past experiences is prohibited (Obermaier, Wiedicke, Steindl, & Hanitzsch, 2023), which Salamon (2023) argues is necessary for worker happiness. Moreover, research suggests that attacks are taken more seriously when the costs are associated with professional norms and practices, such as objectivity and free speech, rather than psychological (Waisbord, 2020). Overall, research shows an absence of organizational and systemic efforts and the need for further governance at the international and institutional levels (Martin, 2018). There have been some efforts to conceptualize attacks on journalism (or journalism safety) in the academic literature. Building on political and sociological theory, Slavtcheva-Petkova et al. (2023) argue that power dynamics are the root of safety threats to journalism. Slavtcheva-Petkova et al. (2023) propose a framework that distinguishes between the cause and symptoms of attacks, types of actors, factors, and the role of intersectionality as part of a tradition of similar work (see also Gomez, 2023; Nelson, 2023; Simorangkir, 2020). Still needed, however, is a framework that reveals institutional solutions for journalism. We address this gap by setting forth a conceptual framework for intervention.

We draw on sociological theory to advance a systemic approach from an occupational hazard perspective, a rare vantage point among journalism scholars and news organizations (Adjin-Tettey & Braimah, 2023; Deuze & Kotišová, 2021). Such an approach builds a common language for scholars and practitioners seeking to support journalists under attack without burdening those experiencing harm. This approach also sees attacks on journalism as a systemic problem that needs to be treated as a risk inherent in fields that provide access to knowledge.

An Occupational Hazard Framework

This conceptual article proposes that attacks against journalists are an occupational hazard with serious consequences for journalism. This section provides an overview of occupational hazards for two reasons: First, to define a key concept in our framework, and second, to make the concept of occupational hazards more accessible so that media organizations can incorporate it into their risk assessments (Mustajbegović, 2008; The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), 2023; Obermaier, Fawzi, & Koch, 2016). Centering occupational hazards institutionally in such protocols can produce more effective interventions for journalists navigating hostile landscapes. Our framework offers one path.

The sociology of work has long-defined risks, such as ergonomic, chemical, biological, safety, physical, and organizational hazards, as part of the profession (Eakin, 1992; Montano, 2020; Skillen, 1996). Several mediators and moderators of exposure to occupational hazards lead to different inequalities of hazard control, including exposure to multiple hazards and attitudes toward safety procedures (Montano, 2020). Relatedly, vulnerabilities, including sociodemographic determinants such as low-income occupations, may expose certain populations to increased risks (St-Denis, 2020). Such hazards can be introduced over time as work and processes evolve, when new tools are introduced without understanding the tools or their maintenance, or when workplace housekeeping practices are neglected (NIOSH, 2023). Without regular auditing, documentation, or categorization of potential risks, journalists experience heightened occupational hazards. While identifying potential professionals' risks to hazards is difficult, in no small part because of system complexity, we show that the consequences of attacks on journalists constitute occupational hazards in our current environment.

Professional associations have long taken a holistic approach to developing risk assessments to identify and analyze hazards' risks. In the context of journalism, associations from The World Association of News Publishers (WAN-IFRA), the International Journalism Foundation (IJF), and the ACOS Alliance (A Culture of Safety Alliance) have sought to create assessments for safety risks potentially occurring on the job (e.g., protests, arrests, targeted attacks) and their consequences, including trauma or diseases. These assessment solutions range from individual (e.g., free training, workshops, learning how to support journalists) to organizational (e.g., creating a safety culture, providing insurance) responses. Similarly, the United Nations (UN) has developed a plan of action for journalists' safety and against issues of impunity. This plan involves six areas: raising awareness; standard setting and policymaking; monitoring and reporting; capacity building; and research and coalition building in collaboration with governments, media hours, professional associations, and nongovernmental associations among other stakeholders (UNESCO, 2024a). As another example, the ACOS Alliance, in collaboration with the Dart Center Asia Pacific (2024), developed a series of guides, including one for editors and managers, encouraging psychological safety

through resilience in the context of trauma. Many of these assessments are also available online. These associations have a specific focus, with an emphasis on trauma.

Building on this work, this article takes a broader view that centers on attacks on journalism as an occupational hazard. This argument necessitates that organizations, and their interventions, support journalists not just in crises (e.g., detention and kidnapping trauma, as highlighted in the ACOS/Dart guide), or through the support of advocacy and professional associations, but in ambient and constant attacks on journalistic work that require an institutional duty of care. This approach is thus a conceptual framework of occupational hazards as they are represented in journalism and a potential pathway for testing interventions.

We classify these hazards into three categories: psychological (e.g., health and injuries such as trauma or burnout because of online engagement), professional (e.g., change in the journalistic process and ethics such as self-censorship or changing social media habits to avoid attacks), and physical (e.g., workplace agents, factors, or circumstances that affect one's body such as death threats to journalists). These three categories of hazards are not mutually exclusive but often reinforcing. For example, constant threats to a journalist's physical safety may elicit psychological distress or require journalists to shift their professional routines and how they work.

Labor conditions must be conducive to accepting risk as part of an employee's role (Salamon, 2023). In other words, occupational hazards occur due to the work journalists perform and because they require a professional response. We propose a framework to evaluate actors, tactics, countermeasures, and consequences. We build from the public health approach to suggest that, in the case of trying to understand complex systems such as this, one may use the scientific method to approach their analysis (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2022; Skillen, 1996). This approach involves defining and monitoring the actors and tactics (who, what, when, and how), identifying risk (characteristics that increase the likelihood a person experiences attacks), and protective factors (characteristics that decrease the likelihood a person experiences attacks), developing and testing prevention strategies (from the literature on need assessment, surveys, collaboration, and design of prevention strategies), as well as assuring widespread adoption (through training, networking, assistance, and evaluation).

As such, the following section lays out our conceptual framework using a case study and academic literature. This section shows that support for journalists experiencing attacks requires a systematic approach to institutional change rather than individual solutions.

Attacks as Hazards

The risks journalists experience in their work are occupational hazards because they are part of their work. Many journalists have accepted that dangerous attacks are intrinsic to their jobs (Holton et al., 2023; Perrault & Bélair-Gagnon, 2024). For various reasons, including economic ones, their workplace creates conditions under which that risk is deemed acceptable, even if these conditions are part of a larger sociocultural context, including platforms and historical precedents.

This section explores how tactics and actors, such as subpoenas for state actors or hateful social media messages for individuals, contribute to the hazards. We do not propose causation or linearity in our argument. Rather, we describe hazards as psychological, professional, and physical (e.g., poor performance, audience distrust, limited professional experience, self-censorship, job satisfaction, acute stress, PTSD, and departure from the profession). These actors (e.g., institutions, groups, individuals) may or may not coordinate their tactics (e.g., cyberattacks, harassment, physical threats, lawsuits). They, too, may evolve throughout the experience, counterstrategies (e.g., paradigm repair, individual solutions like turning off from social media), and consequences (see Bodrunova, Litvinenko, & Nigmatullina, 2021; Kerševan & Poler, 2023; Mesquita & de-Lima-Santos, 2023; Relly & González de Bustamante, 2014).

By proposing this novel conceptual framework, building on a case study approach and academic literature, we hope to support conversations that move attacks from individual responsibility to an institutional duty of care. Journalists “are professional observers, and bearing witness has its impact” (Newman in Hardee, 2021, n.p.). Within an occupational hazard framework, institutions are responsible for risk assessment and supporting their professionals (UNESCO, 2024). Next, we outline why we used the case of journalists in the Philippines to illustrate the framework.

Methods and a Case Approach

This article builds on a case study of attacks on journalists in the Philippines. The case of attacks on journalists in the Philippines has been well documented in the international academic and press freedom literature, particularly since the late aughts, when the Philippines was identified as one of the most dangerous countries for journalists to live in (Macaraig & Hameleers, 2022; Tuazon, Diaz, & San Diego, 2017). As such, this is a useful case to illustrate our framework, as it is familiar to academics and journalists alike. A case study approach helps shed light on how an occupational hazard framework may be deployed to understand the risks that journalists face. At the same time, it highlights the differences between an individual approach and the need for a systemic approach. The case we present below demonstrates that journalists are more at risk because of the diversity of hazards they experience in the workplace.

To explore the case, we surveyed all available academic literature on the topic using library databases, including Academic Search Premier and Google Scholar. The selection criteria included journalism and the Philippines. The analysis was conducted through a three-step iterative process. First, the first author of this article read the corpus of the selected articles multiple times, looking for recurring themes. As such, the author conducted an open chronological coding of the literature. Second, using the occupational hazard framework, the first author conducted axial coding by identifying the resonance and consistency of the themes until they reached theoretical validity. Finally, the first author engaged with the co-authors to ascertain that the selected themes were relevant and aligned with the framework. The first author identified examples and quotes to help reflect the conceptual framework during the selective coding process.

A single case study is helpful, as hazards in journalism need to be understood at the local level. It is important to note that the attacks on Filipino journalism are not new. When President Ferdinand Marcos declared Martial Law in 1972, all newspapers and broadcasters were shut down. The dictatorship “saw the rise of the so-called mosquito press that questioned the government, resisted media censorship, and

provided an alternative to mainstream media that were friendly to the regime" (Gonzalez, 1988, p. 33; Maslog, 1994). Members of the critical press—a genre rooted in the history of colonial rule by the Spanish, Americans, and Japanese—were arrested under the Marcos regime. Marcos' dictatorship used the media as his mouthpiece. The "free press" only took shape at the end of his dictatorship in 1986, with "envelope journalism" gaining traction in 1998, which refers to the various practices of bribing journalists so that one can gain favorable coverage (Coronel, 2001; Neilson & Ortiga, 2023).

Since then, the Filipino media landscape has been characterized by its connection to large corporations controlled by a few wealthy families (Guioguo, 2015). Since the 1991 state decentralization, contestations over state positions and resources "show that journalists murdered for their occupation (classified as 'motive confirmed') did not threaten the interests of the state as a state but rather the interests of local power-holders" (Aguilar, Mendoza, & Candelaria, 2014, p. 649), putting at risk local radio journalists who were most vulnerable because of their popularity with the public (Rosales, 2006; Tandoc, 2020).

Against this backdrop, in a study on Filipino journalists' perceptions of problems in their work, low pay and threats to professionalism were identified as major problems among all respondents, with violence being a more salient concern among reporters (relative to editors and managers; Tandoc, 2020). Like other contexts where right-wing populists have challenged institutional media legitimacy, attacks on Filipino journalists highlight how actors, tactics, countermeasures, and consequences have become occupational hazards (CDC, 2022; Skillen, 1996). The experiences of Filipino journalists offer an important context for understanding the actors (including their motivations), tactics, counterstrategies, and consequences of attacks on journalism, which are at the heart of the occupational hazard conceptual framework (Rosario-Braid, Maslog, & Tuazon, 2012).

Actors, Tactics, and Consequences

First, we define the actors (institutions, groups, and individuals) and tactics (who, what, when, and how) involved in the attacks on Filipino journalists. After Rodrigo Duterte's election in 2016 (a political actor using institutional and citizen-oriented actors), his administration and supporters (including the political elite) targeted journalists in various ways. As Neilson and Ortiga (2023) wrote, "Online harassment perpetrated by mobs against Philippine reporters is not simply an extension of state censorship" (p. 1924). Duterte supporters and "click armies" bullied journalists with death threats and trolling escalating to physical harm. Fake accounts and bots posted "online comments or content that tend to be disruptive, aggressive or inflammatory, to provoke a reaction from an audience" (Escartin, 2015, p. 169). Media influencers and personalities also supported the administration by targeting journalists using terms on social media like "presstitutes." Influencers were later given positions within the Duterte administration (Neilson & Ortiga, 2023):

A television reporter also experienced being harassed through calls made to her personal mobile phone. A vlogger got my personal number and called me on my phone. When one of my relatives answered the phone, the caller started shouting insults. So, we dropped the call. But then, seconds after, we received multiple phone calls. It turns out that the vlogger had flashed my personal phone number on his YouTube channel. (as cited in Tandoc et al., 2023, p. 1210)

Duterte Diehard Supporters (DDS) have emerged as a violent online subculture among Duterte's online fans. The group—the name is a play on the acronym of the real-life vigilante group the Davao Death Squad, which murdered thousands of people under Duterte's pacification efforts as mayor of Davao City—has no clear membership or hierarchical structure. Instead, members are trolls, distrust the media, support the Duterte regime, and mimic online rhetorical styles (Neilson & Ortiga, 2023).

These actors use many diverse tactics, including the delegitimization of journalism through populist discourse, legal threats, online and offline harassment, abuse, security threats, and breaches. Populist delegitimization of journalists is represented in expressions that journalists are corrupt, biased, or enemies of the people, online or offline. For example, journalists were given the "fake news" designation (Macaraig & Hameleers, 2022). Journalists were demonized and depicted as unpatriotic (Posetti et al., 2022).

Lawfare was also used as a tool to delegitimize and limit the work of journalists. According to a 2022 report, Duterte's presidency lawfare led to Maria Ressa's 2020 conviction on a criminal "cyber libel" charge, with 10 arrest warrants in less than two years and two detentions in six weeks (Posetti et al., 2022). At the time of the International Journalism Foundation/UNESCO report, Ressa was fighting nine separate cases, which could have led her to spend the rest of her life in jail. Sixty percent of Ressa's attacks were from Facebook and X/Twitter, and they focused on undermining her credibility; 40% attacked her personally. Attacks were sexist, racist, and misogynistic (Posetti et al., 2022). This networked abuse, or mob censorship (Waisbord, 2020), also included memes, manipulated images, and disinformation (Posetti et al., 2022). Additionally, digital abuse tactics included (Tuazon & Torres, 2020):

- Doxxing: The intentional extraction and publication of private and identifiable information to cause harm.
- Denial of Service (DoS) attacks: Digital attacks that overwhelm a website, rendering it inaccessible, using one computer and one Internet connection.
- Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attacks: A type of DoS attack that overloads a website and makes it inaccessible globally
- Malware: Malicious software that gains unauthorized access to a computer system and damages it.

An important risk noted throughout the literature is the intersectionality of actors, with women being more at risk across multiple levels: individually, interpersonally, and professionally. Sexism was used as a tactic (Robles, 2019), with the president making sexist jokes and demeaning women. For example,

These Rappler people . . . "You sons of a bitch, your—smell! I just can't say it, your underarm or your—'. Yes, I'm being rude towards them. 'You leave me with no recourse.'" [Duterte] said, stopping short of directly mentioning vaginas. (as cited in Go, 2019, para. 4)

As such, women journalists who were perceived as anti-Duterte faced systematic harassment on social media, including Facebook and X/Twitter. They received rape threats, demeaning memes, and insults like "presstitute" (Neilson & Ortiga, 2023, n.p.; Tandoc et al., 2023).

A major part of our framework is identifying risk, meaning the presence of both (1) risk factors that increase a person's vulnerability to attacks and (2) protective factors, which may decrease the likelihood of a person experiencing attacks. This case reveals myriad risks that increased Filipino journalists'

vulnerability to attacks, including individual characteristics, such as gender and media type (Posetti et al., 2022). Reported consequences include trauma (Ellao, Roxas, & Tomez, 2021) and self-censorship (Almario-Gonzalez Mariquit, 2018). Next, we turn to developing and testing prevention strategies.

Counterstrategies

The literature points to Filipino journalists' counterstrategies or coping mechanisms as being largely led by individuals (Tuazon & Torres, 2021). These strategies include "getting used to it" or establishing emotional distance, getting words of support from editors, organizations issuing public statements, sending journalists to counseling, and providing resources from supplying a personal driver to supportive messages from the public (Tandoc et al., 2023).

Research has also shown how Filipino journalists have undertaken paradigm repair strategies, meaning that the press undertook efforts to protect news paradigms (Ogbebor, 2020). For example, journalists have adopted reporting practices that, without commensurate institutional strategies, reinforce labor conditions that facilitate occupational hazards (Macaraig & Hameleers, 2022). For example, journalists embraced error correction and fact-checking; they ensured ethics and accountability. Journalists produced more data and investigative stories; they also improved and negotiated transparency by producing FAQs on ownership, explaining editorial processes, organizing media literacy events, and distinguishing between legitimate queries and trolling. Journalists also advocated for press freedom by protesting, denouncing attacks, and filing legal petitions. They expressed and sought solidarity by crowdfunding a community and collaborating with international press freedom organizations (Macaraig & Hameleers, 2022). Media organizations have also provided safety training (Mitra et al., 2021). These counterstrategies reinforce the role of journalism through ethics and practice.

Outside of the paradigm repair strategies outlined by Macaraig and Hameleers (2022) and training (see Mitra et al., 2021), little evidence exists in the literature pointing to collective prevention strategies. Given the individualization of solutions, absent from this case, as with others, is the notion of systemic change through the widespread adoption of training, networking, assistance, and evaluation. That is not to say that systemic changes have not been suggested. Gomez (2023) proposed building a gender and development unit, an ethics investigation committee, and a local cybercrime division in the company. Posetti et al. (2022) also proposed several solutions for platform companies and transnational organizations. Such solutions included platforms to "Continuously review their policies, algorithms, and moderation processes, to address the evolving nature of gender-based online violence" (Posetti et al., 2022, p. 32) and "Retain[ing] data documenting attacks to aid targets wishing to access and use it for research or legal action" (Posetti et al., 2022, p. 32). A bill authored by a lawmaker in the Filipino Congress proposed a strategy that may support such efforts by providing insurance and hazard pay to journalists. However, in 2023, the bill was still pending (Philstar, 2023).

Conclusion

The academic literature shows that the status quo, in which journalists and media professionals are asked to bear the costs of industry stressors, is not conducive to developing effective strategies to

support journalists experiencing occupational hazards. Examining occupational hazards in the context of the experience of Filipino journalists provides insights into how actors, tactics, countermeasures, and consequences constitute hazards or risks accepted as part of news work. This article uses the Filipino case to flesh out an occupational hazard framework as part of a broader effort to address this problem at a systems level (Kaufman, 1983) and, ultimately, to better understand how hazards play out in professional contexts like journalism. Our framework also underscores the extent to which these risks are occupational hazards that cannot be mitigated through individual-level solutions.

By taking a systemic approach, we can offer a unique perspective on the occupational hazards journalists face while centering journalists within institutions obligated to a duty of care. Practically, this framework provides the language for understanding how increasingly common attacks create occupational hazards with devastating consequences for journalism and other experts charged with knowledge creation and access. Since media organizations socialize risk as part of their work, they must adapt institutional support to help journalists persist in hostile spaces.

What practical and academic implications can be drawn from the occupational hazard framework? Work that relies on a systemic or public health approach emphasizes the need for an approach toward healthy systems (Satcher & Higginbotham, 2008). Similar to infectious disease or domestic violence, two problems often tackled in the public health literature, it is unproductive to focus on a single determinant when problematizing hazards in journalism. Consider the COVID-19 pandemic: Although a vaccine was an important piece of mitigating the spread, such technology would not have been useful in the absence of mechanisms to produce and deliver lifesaving research, policies to protect public safety, and communication to motivate prosocial behaviors. Similarly, and perhaps unfortunately, the issues that journalists face will not be ameliorated by risk assessments and field safety training. Rather, the Filipino case makes clear that these risks are made possible by a set of complex circumstances specific to the profession and compounded by changes in information delivery, digital and economic precarity, historical antecedents, and political contexts. Targeting one lever may provide temporary relief for some media organizations and journalists, but a multipronged approach is needed to sustain long-term change in the industry.

Further extending the public health analogy, we can consider the need for such a multilevel approach to necessitate actions to prevent harm, preemptive identification of risks, and access to support and resources following attacks. In journalism, this may look like a media organization offering digital and physical safety training paired with creating assessment policies (and capacity), all before asking journalists to engage in risky work. It also looks like implementing holistic care procedures after the experience of harm, both in the short- and long-term. Even then, risks still have consequences: The professional boundaries of newswork are defined by some level of risk acceptance (Waisbord, 2022).

We hope this article continues to motivate conversations within the newsroom and the academy to reimagine how we support journalists experiencing hazards. What does it look like for a newsroom to implement policies that move beyond piecemeal procedures and a physical safety focus? How can researchers and industry co-create an agenda that centers on the holistic needs of news workers? How can we contribute to a public health approach that acknowledges occupational hazards and consequently builds in support to ensure individuals do not just persist but thrive in their profession? While at first glance such

efforts are about supporting journalists experiencing attacks, they are also about shoring up the most deeply seated values in journalism: objectivity, fairness, and independence. As much as journalism researchers and practitioners care about these values, we must recognize that there is a duty of care when it comes to the occupational hazards that result from attacks on journalism.

While future research should develop interventions, we hope that this article provides key ideas on how a systemic approach may be developed at the institutional level. We contribute to the literature by situating attacks on journalism in the context of occupational hazards and emphasizing the need for systemic approaches. The occupational hazard framework underscores the consequences of procedures that focus on individuals bearing the burden of care in the aftermath of attacks. Certainly, attacks on journalists represent a unique challenge, particularly salient given their visible work (Miller & Lewis, 2023). However, it is easy to imagine this framework extending to other types of knowledge work. We propose an analytical framework for understanding attacks as a collective issue in journalism rather than an individual one. It offers a system view of how organizations can support their experts. With the framework in hand, potential solutions may be better aligned with the needs of experts impacted by these threats.

Ultimately, with this call, we hope to shed light on the inequitable engagements and outcomes experienced by journalists and other knowledge purveyors and knowledge access workers more broadly, such as librarians, data archivists, academics, and researchers. In doing so, we wish to amplify the need to destigmatize discussions around the effects of attacks resulting from work, conversations, and costs that have, for far too long, been relegated to individuals to manage on their own.

References

- ACOS Alliance. (2024). *About*. Acosalliance. Retrieved from <https://www.acosalliance.org/about-acos>
- Adjin-Tettey, T. D., & Braimah, S. (2023). Assessing the safety of journalism practice in Ghana: Key stakeholders' perspectives. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(1), 1–16. doi:10.1080/23311886.2023.2225836
- Aguilar, F. V., Mendoza, M. P., & Candelaria, A. L. K. (2014). Keeping the state at bay: The killing of journalists in the Philippines, 1998–2012. *Critical Asian Studies*, 46(4), 649–677. doi:10.1080/14672715.2014.960719
- Almario-Gonzalez Mariquit. (2018). The night watch: Filipino TV journalists and Oplan Tokhang: Experiencing coverage of the Duterte administration's bloody campaign against illegal drugs. *Pacific Journalism Review*, 24(2), 42–63.
- Arnold, R. D., & Wade, J. P. (2015). A definition of systems thinking: A systems approach. *Procedia Computer Science*, 44, 669–678. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2015.03.050

- Barrios, M. M., & Miller, T. (2021). Voices of resilience: Colombian journalists and self-censorship in the post-conflict period. *Journalism Practice*, 15(10), 1423–1440. doi:10.1080/17512786.2020.1778506
- Bélair-Gagnon, V., Bossio, D., Holton, A. E., & Molyneux, L. (2022). Disconnection: How measured separations from journalistic norms and labor can help sustain journalism. *Social Media + Society*, 8(1), 1–4. doi:10.1177/20563051221077217
- Bélair-Gagnon, V., Holton, A. E., Deuze, M., & Mellado, C. (2023). *Happiness in journalism*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bhat, P., & Chadha, K. (2022). The mob, the state and harassment of journalists via Twitter in India. *Digital Journalism*, 11(10), 1788–1808. doi:10.1080/21670811.2022.2134164
- Blumell, L. E., Mulupi, D., & Arafat, R. (2023). The impact of sexual harassment on job satisfaction in newsrooms. *Journalism Practice*, 1–20. doi:10.1080/17512786.2023.2227613
- Bodrunova, S. S., Litvinenko, A., & Nigmatullina, K. (2021). Who is the censor? Self-censorship of Russian journalists in professional routines and social networking. *Journalism*, 22(12), 2919–2937. doi:10.1177/1464884920941965
- Borders, R. W. (2022). *Digital safety*. RSF Resource for Journalists' Safety. Retrieved from <https://safety.rsf.org/chapter-4-digital-safety/>
- Bossio, D., Bélair-Gagnon, V., Molyneux, L., & Holton, A. E. (2024). *The paradox of connection: How digital media is transforming journalism labor*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Brint, S. (2021, March 30). *Intimidation, silencing, fear, and academic freedom*. Berkley Center for Studies in High Education Paper Series. Retrieved from <https://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/intimidation-silencing-fear-and-academic-freedom-steve-brint-cshe-421-march-2021>
- Centers for Disease, Control and Prevention. (2022, November 16). *Public health approach*. Centers for Disease, Control and Prevention. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violence-prevention/about/about-the-public-health-approach-to-violence-prevention.html>
- Chen, G. M., Pain, P., Chen, V. Y., Mekelburg, M., Springer, N., & Troger, F. (2020). "You really have to have a thick skin": A cross-cultural perspective on how online harassment influences female journalists. *Journalism*, 21(7), 877–895. doi:10.1177/1464884918768500
- Chinn, S., Hasell, A., Roden, J., & Zichettella, B. (2023). Threatening experts: Correlates of viewing scientists as a social threat. *Public Understanding of Science*, 33(1), 88–104. doi:10.1177/09636625231183115

- Chinweobo-Onuoha, B., Tunca, E. A., Talabi, F. O., Aiyesimoju, A. B., Adefemi, V. O., & Gever, V. C. (2022). Modeling journalists' coping strategies for occupational hazards in their coverage of protests against police brutality (ENDSARS protests) in Nigeria. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics: JOSE*, 28(4), 2439–2446. doi:10.1080/10803548.2021.1999651
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2019, July 30). *Digital safety kit*. Committee to Protect Journalists. Retrieved from <https://cpj.org/2019/07/digital-safety-kit-journalists/>
- Coronel, S. S. (2001). The media, the market, and democracy. The case of the Philippines. *Javnost—The Public*, 8(2), 109–124. doi:10.1080/13183222.2001.11008774
- Deavours, D., Heath, W., Miller, K., Viehouser, M., Palacios-Plugge, S., & Broussard, R. (2023). Reciprocal journalism's double-edged sword: How journalists resolve cognitive dissonance after experiencing harassment from audiences on social media. *Journalism*, 24(11), 2454–2473. doi:10.1177/14648849221109654
- Deuze, M., & Kotišová, J. (2021, September 22). *Journalism as an occupational hazard: Understanding the mental health and well-being of journalists* [blog]. Retrieved from <https://deuze.blogspot.com/2021/09/journalism-as-occupational-hazard.html>
- Eakin, J. M. (1992). Leaving it up to the workers: Sociological perspective on the management of health and safety in small workplaces. *International Journal of Health Services: Planning, Administration, Evaluation*, 22(4), 689–704. doi:10.2190/DNV0-57VV-FJ7K-8KU5
- Electronic Frontier Foundation. (2024). *Surveillance self-defense*. EFF. Retrieved from <https://ssd.eff.org/>
- Ellao, J. A. J., Roxas, E. F., & Torres, T. P. S. (2021). Dealing with sexual harassment: Are women journalists silenced at work? In S. Jamil, B. Çoban, B. Ataman, & G. Appiah-Adeji (Eds.), *Handbook of research on discrimination, gender disparity, and safety risks in journalism* (pp. 24–42). Philadelphia, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-6686-2.ch003
- Escartin, M. C. P. D. (2015). Rogue cops among rogues: Trolls and trolling in social networking sites. *Philippine Sociological Review*, 63, 169–190. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24717164>
- Ferrier, M. (2018). *Attacks and harassment: The impact on female journalists and their reporting*. IWMF and Trollbusters. Retrieved from <https://www.iwmf.org/attacks-and-harassment/>
- Glaser, A. (2022, March 4). *Tips for newsrooms to support journalists targeted by online harassment*. Media Manipulation Casebook. Retrieved from <https://mediamanipulation.org/research/tips-newsrooms-support-journalists-targeted-online-harassment>

- Go, M. G. (2019). Sexism is the president's power tool: Duterte is using violent language and threats against journalists, Rappler's news editor explains. *Index on Censorship*, 48(4), 33–35. doi:10.1177/0306422019895720
- Gomez, A. C. (2023). Defending women journalists in the Philippines from threats and intimidations. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(11), 3980–3988. doi:10.11594/ijmaber.04.11.18
- Gonzalez, H. (1988). Mass media and the spiral of silence: The Philippines from Marcos to Aquino. *The Journal of Communication*, 38(4), 33–48. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1988.tb02068.x
- Guioguo, R. (2015). *An overview of the mass media situation in the Philippines*. Media Ownership Monitor. Reporters Without Borders. Retrieved from https://philippines.mom-rsf.org/uploads/tx_lfrogmom/documents/7-167_import.pdf
- Hardee, H. (2021). *Occupational hazards: When reporters bear witness to traumatic events*. Center for Journalism Ethics, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved from <https://ethics.journalism.wisc.edu/2021/03/10/occupational-hazards-when-reporters-bear-witness-to-traumatic-events/>
- Henrichsen, J. R. (2020). Breaking through the ambivalence: Journalistic responses to information security technologies. *Digital Journalism*, 8(3), 328–346. doi:10.1080/21670811.2019.1653207
- Henrichsen, J. R., & Shelton, M. (2022). Expanding the analytical boundaries of mob censorship: How technology and infrastructure enable novel threats to journalists and strategies for mitigation. *Digital Journalism*, 11(10), 1848–1867. doi:10.1080/21670811.2022.2112520
- Holton, A., Bélair-Gagnon, V., Bossio, D., & Molyneux, L. (2023). "Not their fault, but their problem": Organizational responses to the online harassment of journalists. *Journalism Practice*, 17(4), 859–874. doi:10.1080/17512786.2021.1946417
- Hughes, S., & Márquez-Ramírez, M. (2018). Local-level authoritarianism, democratic normative aspirations, and antipress harassment: Predictors of threats to journalists in Mexico. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 23(4), 539–560. doi:10.1177/1940161218786041
- Ivask, S., Waschková Císařová, L., & Lon, A. (2023). "When can I get angry?" Journalists' coping strategies and emotional management in hostile situations. *Journalism*, 25(10), 1–18. doi:10.1177/14648849231199895
- Jamil, S. (2018). Safety threats, impunity and professionalism: Journalists' dilemma in Pakistan. *Sociology and Anthropology*, 6(7), 571–578. doi:10.13189/sa.2018.060702

- Kaufman, R. (1983). A system approach: A redefinition. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 16(6), 17–23. doi:10.1016/S1474-6670(17)64340-4
- Kempner, J. (2008). The chilling effect: How do researchers react to controversy? *PLoS Medicine*, 5(11), e222. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050222
- Kerševan, T., & Poler, M. (2023). Silencing journalists in matters of public interest: Journalists and editors assessments of the impact of SLAPPs on journalism. *Journalism*, 1–19. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/14648849231210695
- Lewis, S. C., & Westlund, O. (2015). Actors, actants, audiences, and activities in cross-media news work: A matrix and a research agenda. *Digital Journalism*, 3(1), 19–37. doi:10.1080/21670811.2014.927986
- Macaraig, A., & Hameleers, M. (2022). #DefendPressFreedom: Paradigm repair, role perceptions and Filipino journalists' counterstrategies to anti-media populism and delegitimizing threats. *Journalism Studies*, 23(16), 2078–2096. doi:10.1080/1461670x.2022.2138949
- Magnavita, N., Congedo, M. T., Di Prinzio, R. R., & Iuliano, A. (2021). War journalism: An occupational exposure. *BMJ Case Reports*, 14(10), 1–4. doi:10.1136/bcr-2021-245165
- Martin, F. (2018). Tackling gendered violence online: Evaluating digital safety strategies for women journalists. *Australian Journalism Review*, 40(2), 73–89. doi:10.3316/informit.222297051926912
- Maslog, C. C. (1994). *The Metro Manila Press*. Manila, Philippines: Philippine Press Institute with funding from the Konrad Adenauer Foundation.
- Media Matters for Democracy. (2020, December 1). *Women journalists and the double bind*. Media Matters for Democracy. Retrieved from <https://www.cpd-pakistan.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Women-Journalists-and-the-Double-Bind.pdf>
- Mesquita, L., & de-Lima-Santos, M.-F. (2023). Blurred boundaries of journalism to guarantee safety: Approaches of resistance and resilience for investigative journalism in Latin America. *Journalism Studies*, 24(7), 916–935. doi:10.1080/1461670x.2023.2185078
- Miller, K. C. (2021). Hostility toward the press: A synthesis of terms, research, and future directions in examining harassment of journalists. *Digital Journalism*, 11(7), 1230–1249. doi:10.1080/21670811.2021.1991824
- Miller, K. C., & Lewis, S. C. (2023). Journalists, harassment, and emotional labor: The case of women in on-air roles at US local television stations. *Journalism*, 23(1), 79–97. doi:10.1177/146488491989901

- Mitra, S., Høiby, M., & Garrido, M. (2021). Medium-specific threats for journalists: Examples from Philippines, Afghanistan and Venezuela. *Journalism Practice*, 15(1), 80–98. doi:10.1080/17512786.2019.1696697
- Montano, D. (2020). Social distribution of occupational hazards. In T. Theorell (Ed.), *Handbook of socioeconomic determinants of occupational health: From macro-level to micro-level evidence* (pp. 1–21). New York, NY: Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-05031-3_1-1
- Mustajbegović, J. (2008). Workplace hazards. In W. Kirch (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of public health* (pp. 1467–1469). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Springer Netherlands. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-5614-7_3783
- The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (2023, December 4). *National Institute for Occupational Safety & Health*. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/index.htm>
- Neilson, T., & Ortega, K. (2023). Mobs, crowds, and trolls: Theorizing the harassment of journalists in the Philippines. *Digital Journalism*, 11(10), 1924–1939. doi:10.1080/21670811.2022.2126990
- Nelson, J. L. (2023). “Worse than the harassment itself”: Journalists’ reactions to newsroom social media policies. *Digital Journalism*, 11(8), 1456–1474. doi:10.1080/21670811.2022.2153072
- Nerone, J. C. (1994). *Violence against the press: Policing the public sphere in U.S. history*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Nölleke, D., Leonhardt, B. M., & Hanusch, F. (2023). “The chilling effect”: Medical scientists’ responses to audience feedback on their media appearances during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Public Understanding of Science*, 32(5), 546–560. doi:10.1177/09636625221146749
- Obermaier, M., Fawzi, N., & Koch, T. (2016). Bystanding or standing by? How the number of bystanders affects the intention to intervene in cyberbullying. *New Media & Society*, 18(8), 1491–1507. doi:10.1177/1461444814563519
- Obermaier, M., Wiedicke, A., Steindl, N., & Hanitzsch, T. (2023). Reporting trauma: Conflict journalists’ exposure to potentially traumatizing events, short- and long-term consequences, and coping behavior. *Journalism Studies*, 24(11), 1398–1417. doi:10.1080/1461670X.2023.2216808
- Ogbebor, B. (2020). *British media coverage of the press reform debate*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Panievsky, A. (2022). The strategic bias: How journalists respond to antimedia populism. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 27(4), 808–826. doi:10.1177/19401612211022656

- Perrault, G., & Bélair-Gagnon, V. (2024). The lifestyle of lifestyle journalists: How reporters discursively manage their aspirations in their daily work. *Journalism Practice*, 18(7), 1641–1659. doi:10.1080/17512786.2022.2111697
- Philstar. (2023, January 10). House bill seeks additional insurance coverage, hazard pay for journalists. Philstar Global. Retrieved from <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2023/01/10/2236677/house-bill-seeks-additional-insurance-coverage-hazard-pay-journalists>
- Posetti, J., Bontcheva, K., & Shabbir, N. (2022). *The chilling: Assessing big tech's response to online violence against women journalists*. UNESCO. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000383044.locale=en>
- Reese, S. D. (2015). Globalization of mediated spaces: The case of transnational environmentalism in China. *International Journal of Communication*, 9, 2263–2281. Retrieved from <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/3849>
- Relly, J. E., & González de Bustamante, C. (2014). Silencing Mexico: A study of influences on journalists in the Northern States. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 19(1), 108–131. doi:10.1177/1940161213509285
- Robles, C. (2019). Being a woman in gendered situations: A case study of female journalists in Southern Philippines. *Asian Congress for Media and Communication Journal*, 6(1), 73–92.
- Rosales, R. G. (2006). Shooting the messenger: Why radio broadcasting is a deadly profession in the Philippines. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 13(1), 146–155. doi:10.1207/s15506843jrs1301_10
- Rosario-Braid, F., Maslog, C. C., & Tuazon, R. R. (2012). *Crimes and unpunishment: The killing of Filipino journalists*. Manila, Philippines: Asian Institute of Journalism and Communication.
- Salamon, E. (2023). Happiness in newsroom contracts: Communicative resistance for digital work and life satisfaction. *Media Culture & Society*, 46(2), 252–271. doi:10.1177/01634437231191353
- Sarikakis, K., Kassa, B. E., Fenz, N., Goldschmitt, S., Kasser, J., & Nowotarski, L. (2023). "My haters and I": Personal and political responses to hate speech against female journalists in Austria. *Feminist Media Studies*, 23(1), 67–82. doi:10.1080/14680777.2021.1979068
- Satcher, D., & Higginbotham, E. J. (2008). The public health approach eliminating disparities in health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(Suppl 1), S8–S11. doi:10.2105/ajph.98.supplement_1.s8
- Shapiro, N. (2023, December 10). Attacked by conservatives, UW misinformation researcher gears up for 2024. *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/politics/attacked-by-conservatives-uw-misinformation-researcher-gears-up-for-2024/>

- Simorangkir, D. N. (2020). Work-related sexual harassment and coping techniques: The case of Indonesian female journalists. *Media Asia*, 47(1-2), 23-33.
doi:10.1080/01296612.2020.1812175
- Skillen, D. L. (1996). Toward a social structural understanding of occupational hazards in public health. *International Journal of Health Services: Planning, Administration, Evaluation*, 26(1), 111-146.
doi:10.2190/RW4J-X1LU-4EPF-NLW3
- Slavtcheva-Petkova, V., Ramaprasad, J., Springer, N., Hughes, S., Hanitzsch, T., Hamada, B., . . . Steindl, N. (2023). Conceptualizing journalists' safety around the globe. *Digital Journalism*, 11(7), 1211-1229. doi:10.1080/21670811.2022.2162429
- St-Denis, X. (2020). Sociodemographic determinants of occupational risks of exposure to COVID-19 in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology = Revue Canadienne de Sociologie*, 57(3), 399-452.
doi:10.1111/cars.12288
- Sturmberg, J. P., & Martin, C. M. (2024). From theory to practice: The pragmatic value of applying systems thinking and complexity sciences in healthcare. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 30(2), 149-152. doi:10.1111/jep.13979
- Syrian Female Journalists Network. (2021). *Syrian women journalists and human rights defenders in the digital space: Risks and threats*. Syrian Female Journalists Network. Retrieved from <https://media.sfn.org/en/digital-safety-is-a-right/>
- Tandoc, E. C. (2020). Watching over the watchdogs: The problems that Filipino journalists face. In E. C. Tandoc (Ed.), *What journalists are owed* (pp. 101-116). London, UK: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003006398-7/watching-watchdogs-edson-tandoc>
- Tandoc, E. C., Sagun, K. K., & Alvarez, K. P. (2023). The digitization of harassment: Women journalists' experiences with online harassment in the Philippines. *Journalism Practice*, 17(6), 1198-1213.
doi:10.1080/17512786.2021.1981774
- Tuazon, R. R., Diaz, P. H., & San Diego, T. P. C. (2017). Philippine and global research on news media safety: Crossing disciplines, bridging gaps. *Media Asia*, 44(1), 8-16.
doi:10.1080/01296612.2017.1379813
- Tuazon, R. R., & Torres, T. P. S. (2020). Digital threats and attacks on the Philippine alternative press: Range, responses, and remedies. In S. Jamil (Ed.), *Handbook of research on combating threats to media freedom and journalist safety* (pp. 1-22). Philadelphia, PA: IGI Global.
doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-1298-2.ch001

- Tuazon, R. R., & Torres, T. P. S. (2021). Threats and attacks on women journalists in the Philippines. In S. Jamil, B. Çoba, B. Ataman, & G. Appiah-Adjei (Eds.), *Handbook of research on discrimination, gender disparity, and safety risks in journalism* (pp. 43–59). Philadelphia, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-6686-2.ch004
- The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024a, May 14). *Safety of journalists*. UNESCO. Retrieved from <https://www.unesco.org/en/safety-journalists>
- The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024b, July 1). *UN plan of action on the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity*. UNESCO. Retrieved from <https://www.unesco.org/en/safety-journalists/un-plan-action>
- Van Noorden, R. (2022, April 4). *Higher-profile COVID experts are more likely to get online abuse*. London, UK: Nature Publishing Group UK. doi:10.1038/d41586-022-00936-4
- Voss, K. W. (2007). Resources for telling the stories of contemporary women's page editors. *Journalism History*, 32(4), 240–242.
- Waisbord, S. (2019). The vulnerabilities of journalism. *Journalism*, 20(1), 210–213. doi:10.1177/1464884918809283
- Waisbord, S. (2020). Mob censorship: Online harassment of US journalists in times of digital hate and populism. *Digital Journalism*, 8(8), 1030–1046. doi:10.1080/21670811.2020.1818111
- Walulya, G., & Nassanga, G. L. (2020). Democracy at stake: Self-censorship as a self-defense strategy for journalists. *Media and Communication*, 8(1), 5–14. doi:10.17645/mac.v8i1.2512
- Westcott, L. (2019, September 4). "The threats follow us home": Survey details risks for female journalists in U.S., Canada. Retrieved from <https://cpj.org/2019/09/canada-usa-female-journalist-safety-online-harassment-survey/>
- Yusufzai, A. (2014). Health workers murdered as Pakistan vaccinates 8.4 million children. *CMAJ: Canadian Medical Association Journal = Journal de l'Association Médicale Canadienne*, 186(9), E302. doi:10.1503/cmaj.109-4776