

followers to comment on the blog posts with the names of all of the media outlets responsible for the accusations, with the intention of boycotting them. This blog can be seen as an example of the watchdog blog as a media accountability instrument having success in holding the media to account for its error; some media outlets including MSN admitted that parts of the information reported on the Sandy Hook massacre were incorrect, citing the pressure in today's media climate to be the first to report new information as a justification for the errors (Moore: 2012). However, it can also be argued that this particular instrument only has limited power in holding the media to account for mistakes. For instance, only a small number of the media population involved in the false reporting actually corrected or apologised for their error in naming and publicising the wrong man, perhaps due to the small audience that the watchdog blog itself can actually reach. Therefore, in order for such an instrument to prosper in truly holding the media accountable for its actions, more independent watchdog blogs should perhaps combine their work to create a smaller number of blogs targeting a larger audience, making the audience more aware of which blogs they can visit in order to hold the media to account for any misdemeanours.

Another way in which the Internet has increased the media audience's possibilities in holding news media to account is through increasing the levels of transparency from the media itself, and providing more opportunities for response for the audience. Transparency and responsiveness are key principles of the concept of accountability (MediaAct Final Report: 2013), and in an ever-changing and tumultuous media climate it is more important than ever that news media can be trusted.

Traditional media accountability instruments such as ombudsmen and press councils are still in use, but due to the fast-paced nature of the media system following the popularity of the Internet, are beginning to be considered outdated and slow. Furthermore, they are not always successful in garnering accountability; for example The Romanian Press Club has a heavy focus on journalists' code of ethics, however there have been instances in which violations of the code have been made and the journalists in question have not received any penalisation from higher powers for their actions (MediaAct: 2013).

Therefore, some publications have been utilising their online platform in order to give their audience more opportunities to hold news media to account, through more transparency and responsiveness. The consideration of these key principles of accountability has often come as the result of reflection of the behaviours of not just these individual publications themselves, but also of the national medias in question. One such example of this comes from British newspaper The Guardian; following the scrutiny on the British media in the wake of the phone hacking scandal and Leveson inquiry, the newspaper conducted a survey with the question "do you believe that it is important for The Guardian to be open with readers in the way it makes editorial decisions and operates as a business?". The results of this survey showed that 95% of Guardian readers and 90% of its online users answered that this was in fact important (Confino: 2011). In light of this, and the microscopic analysis of the British media following the phone hacking scandal, it has been argued that the news media should be held to account for its actions as it would be hypocritical not to do so. This point was made by Rupert Murdoch in his apology to the British press, in which he stated: "For a business that prides itself on holding the powerful to account, we failed when it came to one of our papers." (Abbas: 2011)