

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

Panel 2: Integration

How is the traditional newsroom reacting to online journalism?

Moderator:

Rusty Todd, Professor, Department of Journalism, College of Communication, University of Texas at Austin

Panelists:

Paul Cox, News editor, The Wall Street Journal Interactive Edition

Barry Glenn, Arts & Entertainment Editor, The Orlando Sentinel

Steve Sullivan, Consultant, Principal, Advanced Interactive Media Group, formerly with Tribune Co.

Susan Scott Wilson, News Editor, Fort Worth Star-Telegram on the Web

Nanci Wilson, Investigative reporter, The Texas Network

RUSTY TODD: We are going to talk about how the newsroom is integrated with the Web product today and get these peoples' experiences, and they do have some.

Paul Cox is the news editor of the Wall Street Journal Interactive edition. **Susan Scott Wilson**, news editor of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram's Web site, is a veteran of StarText, one of the legendary online sites, one of the very early ones. **Steve Sullivan**, consultant and principal of Advanced Interactive Media, is a veteran of the Tribune Company. **Nancy Wilson** is an investigative reporter for the Texas Network. And finally **Barry Glenn**, the Arts and Entertainment editor for the Orlando Sentinel. Just to kick things off, I need to give full disclosure. I am active in an Internet publishing company. I designed a system and another company sells it now, but it is primarily designed for smaller and moderate sized dailies who do not have the budget to have million dollar Web sites. And we have about 50 some papers on the Web now. So that is one of the reasons I suppose I was chosen for this panel. By way of introduction, here in journalism school we find it quite easy to teach our students how copy flows at a newspaper.

There is a fairly standard model that applies more or less in all newsrooms across the industry. Certainly we are not there yet on the Web in terms of how the news is processed and flows into a Web product. We have everything from the totally separate operation that is free-standing and the news is sometimes a minor

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

component of a Web site. We have shovelware for the Web site that is primary and it is just slopped onto the Web. And in between those two poles, we have a wide variety of different approaches to intraday updates for Web sites and otherwise enhancing it with multimedia. We see the beginnings of Web sites that involve groups, the Tribune is a good example, where their television and newspaper people contribute to get a wide variety of people pumping content into a Web site.

One of the problems I think we have in organizing copy flow in the newsroom for Web purposes is that we don't fully understand yet what our product is going to be. We have all of these options for it, like adding multimedia. We have these options for interacting with readers, bring our reporters and editors in to talk with the readers, defend their work, comment on their work. We have lots of questions about the Web news cycle. When is it really important that we get information onto the Web? Immediately? There are questions about editorial control. Who says what goes on the Web and when? Questions about our archives. How we handle them? How do we correct errors. How do we make payments? I think that is part of the problem that we have now - there is no model yet, because we don't fully understand what our product is going to be out in the marketplace.

That is sort of where I see us in the development of a news cycle and a news production schema for a news out of a newspaper newsroom. I would like to start with Paul and have the panelists reflect on their experiences building a Web site and relating to the newsroom. And how they have gone about integrating output from the newsroom and perhaps changing newsroom procedures as they go about putting together a Web product. It is clear that we would like to have questions from the audience at any point. Interactive is the buzzword, so let's make it real.

PAUL COX: I consider myself fortunate to be working at an Internet news publication that is finding a lot of success as we are now at about 280,000 paid subscribers. While I certainly think about a lot of the issues that were discussed in the first panel, I've largely been insulated from that and had the opportunity to mostly think about how to do the news in this new medium. I thought that I would talk a little bit about how at the Wall Street Journal Interactive Edition we have done that, and certainly I will talk about it, but my boss Rich Geroslaski, our managing editor, and editor Neil Buddy, and a lot of people have a lot more to do with this, so I am describing processes that were put in place by people above me.

I think that if there is one thing that we have done that is most important is to try to take the Wall Street Journal's values and standards for doing news and to take them into the new media. I think that applies to almost everything that we do as we try to think what would be the Wall Street Journal way to do that and to apply that. I think like most places we have taken the approach where it takes a news staff. We have our own news staff, about 60 people now. It is important to ask to come over from the newspaper, obviously. Rich, our managing editor, was a long-time writer and editor for the Journal in Washington. Having that credibility back to the newsroom is important, but then largely we have a lot of people that we hire from the outside. I am sort of a fence sitter. I worked at Dow Jones before so I was somewhat a known quantity, but not entirely. I think it is very important that the Web site draw from the news gathering of the core newspaper product.

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

The best thing we do is news and the taking from that process is important. But then it has to be different. Everybody talks about you can't just use shovelware and put up what is on a newspaper - that is not going to work. And it does not work in a couple of ways. One it has to be faster, as people know that the Web site can be updated constantly. We publish two or three times an hour, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. I think people expect that when they come to a Web site. They don't want to see yesterday's news, they want to see what has just happened. So, it is important to set up ways to do that.

The second most important thing is depth. People know, which was talked about earlier, that print news holes are shrinking. We are theoretically unlimited. You have to take advantage of that depth. People want the background, they want the related story, they want underlying text, the document that links to Web sites, etc. Let me just briefly talk about how we have done that. Hopefully some people here have seen the Interactive Edition, but maybe some have not looked at it at all. Of course it all starts with the newspapers. We have the full content of tomorrow's Wall Street Journal going up tonight some where between 11 p.m. and 1 a.m., if the systems are working properly. With that depth we also include the full content of the European Journal. We also include full contents of the Asian Journal and the Americas Pages, which are inserts in South American newspapers.

But that is just the start. We are staffed seven days a week, 24 hours a day, and we are constantly updating it. When a major business story breaks world wide, we use the Dow Jones news wire and other wires to construct an early version of that story and then edit that copy into Wall Street Journal style. We use background, context with editors, so whenever you come in you are getting a fresh version of that. We look to do the add-ons to things that are not in the paper.

Our audience probably is ever hungry for technology news, so we have a constantly updated technology area that is not in the print paper. Market Place Extra is a home to a lot our original content stories and also the place where the new weekend Journal copy goes. Our average reader took 24 business trips last year, so we have an area dedicated to business travel because our readers just can't get enough of that. We have an area dedicated to small business and it is a combination of the Journal's coverage and some of our own coverage. I think that this is a great medium for summing things up at the end of the week, to sum up what happened in the world of business. It is a quick read to catch up on the week, but also with this medium you can link back to the story itself. If somebody sees, okay here was this story that is important to my job or my life I need to read more about that and in this medium in a summary you can quickly link back to that.

SUSAN SCOTT WILSON: I have been with the [Star-Telegram](#) for about 15 years, about five years with the Star-Telegram.com, and Star Text. Ours is kind of different. We started with a service that was already in place with our BBS. We grew our Web site out of that, so we already had procedures on how we took news from the newspaper and put it online and then eventually onto the Internet. We put as much as our content from the newspaper online, usually because of space considerations. A lot of stories get lopped off up there on the cutting room floor and we are allowed to put the whole version on, which makes a lot of reporters happy. Additionally, we

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

put the photos on that sometimes the newspaper doesn't pick and doesn't have room for. We supplement our coverage with surveys, forums, and questions. We just redesigned our site and there is now a question that is changed twice a week. It is just a general question, yes or no.

We supplement this with special sections, which I am in charge of. The special section could be a news event, or last year we did a whole series on "The Hell of Heroin," when a heroin crisis kind of broke out in Plano and the Richland Hills area of northeast Tarrant County. We put all that content online and supplemented with additional stories, links, and photographs that we could not get in the paper. So our site has much more depth than what the paper puts out everyday. We also update about 18 hours a day. We supplement it with the [Knight Ridder](#) wire, [The New York Times](#) wire, and [AP wire](#).

STEVE SULLIVAN: I actually have very little to do with any Web site production. However, my background involves finding ways to integrate the various newsroom cultures that contribute to the various synergies that might take place in a news company or within a newsroom. Back in the early '90s, I was brought in to work for the [Tribune Company](#) in Chicago when they were about to start a local 24-hour cable channel that was going to rely heavily on contributions from the staff of the [Chicago Tribune](#). Tribune Company, like a lot of other media companies around the world, had a lot going on, a lot of ways to distribute information. But each of the newsrooms was really sort of a sovereign place that had little to do with any of the other new units that were at the company.

As a matter of fact, in Chicago where they had television, newspaper and radio, each of those units looked at the other as competitors, they still do, and that is healthy. But historically they had very little interaction with one another. Even when Chicago and CLTV was conceived and being built, they chose to put the main studio for the news channel 20 miles west of downtown Chicago so that the channel and the newspaper culture would not clash head on. However, I was selected to go into the main newsroom in downtown Chicago with a television camera and bring newspaper content and newspaper reporters in front of the camera to make daily, multiple daily contributions, to the news channel. There was a lot of concern about that, and a lot of resentment from the newspaper staff. People would come to me and say, "Well exactly how are we going to do this?" At the time, all I could do is throw up my hands and say, "I do not know. We will let you set the ground rules and we will see what we will do."

Very happily, when CLTV signed on in '93, we were able to, I think very, very easily incorporate a lot of the news staff from the Tribune into the field TV news product, just by going slowly and paying attention to the concerns of the reporters from the newspaper. Their deadline situations, the news dynamics in that newsroom, we played that up as best we could with the dynamics of a 24-hour news channel which has a voracious appetite for news all throughout the day. It was a constant reeducation for us. We were trying to find ways to introduce the newspaper's staff to the television process and we were trying to introduce the television's staff to the newspaper's news flow. It was not easy, especially when people kept coming to and leaving the company. It was an ongoing process and it is still ongoing.

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

An example of how things were going, when we first signed on at CLTV we were hit immediately with a lot of very big stories, nationally and locally. One of the huge local stories was when Bears coach Mike Ditka decided he had had enough and he resigned. I had a frantic call from the assignment desk at the news channel saying, "Can we get a football writer right now to sit in front of the camera in the newsroom and talk about Ditka?" I said, "No, he is not here. He is out covering the story." The instinct was good. It was, call downtown and see if the Tribune has somebody who is versed on this, who can sit in front of the camera. Well they did not realize or they probably just did not take the time to think that this guy is not going to be there sitting on the phone covering it. He is going to be up at the Bears' office listening to Ditka talking about it or he is going to be sitting down with the coach himself. It was that kind of an education curve that we had to go through and there are examples going back the other way too, which I can get to later.

But, about two and a half years into our relationship between the news channel and the Tribune, things have progressed so well that we also started to serve as content liaisons between the newspaper and WNTV and WGN radio. The online group started to play into that as well. We were finding ways to try to balance everybody's demands for content with everybody's need to go out and report, find the information, come back in and produce for their own particular medium. Again, it is something that people are still trying to figure out the best way to do. It varies from newsroom to . Because this is still such a new process, it is constantly something that the same techniques that were being taught back in 1992-1993 are new to people who have never done this before. They still have to learn how to do it.

NANCI WILSON: I am an investigative reporter and a former news consultant for [CBS New Media](#), which is why I am here. The Web for broadcasters is a little bit different, because a news site is only as good as the content that you have on it. So your natural inclination would be to tell your reporters just write something up for the Web. It doesn't quite work that way because broadcasting is a different style of writing than print. You don't use commas as much you use dot-dot-dot, you leave words out that you normally wouldn't say, but you would write to make it grammatically correct. So when we saw that happening it was pretty ugly.

Plus a script is much different in broadcast. You know there are still sites that I see every now and then that have cues to role the tape at a certain time. You will see the script and it will have roll VO/SOT. And you think, somebody forgot to take the tape commands off of the script. What they were doing is scanning the scripts in and sending it straight to the Web, making it very difficult to read unless you are in news and you know what all of that stuff means. I have found a lot of broadcast journalists afraid to make the transition for a lot of different reasons. And it is very, very slow. One, because of the time commitment that it takes to get a story on the air. There is that sigh of relief after you get that story on the air and it is edited. The last thing anybody wants to hear is, "Can you do us a different version for the Web?" That is like saying, "Can you work another eight hours other than the one you just finished?" So there is a lot of reluctance to do it.

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

Another model is to have a separate news department that works with the reporters. I am not so sure that works either because you have one reporter who is deep into the story, who has just put it on the air, and someone else who is just starting say, "Now, what does this mean?" The more complicated the story, the more difficult it is to transfer and to put it on the site. I am working for a brand new service. We have been on the air since January and we have been doing dry runs for our Web site to make sure that it works as well as it can. We provide all of the content. It is not like we have other sources of content helping us.

I do computer-assisted reporting, so I have boxes and boxes of files and documents to back up the stories that I do. They want to put all of that online and I am looking at the boxes thinking, "Are you crazy? Do you know how much?" I have 100,000 records we sorted through on this. But, I think where that really works well is not with 100,000 records, but let's say you are doing a story that the mayor was just indicted. There was a 20-page indictment. What you see on the air is at most one minute saying blah blah blah about a 20-page indictment with 700 counts of bribery, or what ever it is. Later on you get a letter saying, "Boy you sure were biased about that." I think putting the 20-page document on the Web site, and letting people read it themselves, takes away a lot of that perception of bias. I think it backs up what we are saying, because as we all know there has been a lot of criticism in broadcast lately about accuracy and biased reporting. Back up everything we say with hard copy proof.

I am an advocate of scanning it in so viewers actually see what that indictment looks like, and we are not retyping the information. I think it helps our viewers to get a better picture and decide for themselves rather than get the 15 seconds. News consultants say too many people with attention deficit disorders are watching television news, so let's not lose them by spending two minutes on a subject. So we see shorter and shorter stories to where literally I have seen 15 stories covered in about two-minute time. And they say, "Well we brought you all of the days news in one minute." And you think, "But you did not tell me anything on it."

I think that what we will see is what will appear to be the headline on the news cast and the rest of the story will be on the Web site. It is almost "your news" because you are picking and choosing what it is you are going to read more about. But, you are also getting kind of a capsule of everything else. To me that is one of the drawbacks I see of "personalized news." If I have to check off a list of news I want sent to me, there are a lot of things I am not going to put on there. I don't want to know everyday, I don't want to know the sports scores. I am not going to have sports on there. But, when I am reading through the newspaper and all of the sudden as I am moving, finished with one and I see the sports, there may be a story there that grabs me because of the picture or the headline. All of the sudden I am really engaged in it. I am thinking that was a really great story. I would have never of known about that otherwise. So I do want to know what is available. I just want to choose what I want to know more about.

I think that the Web really gives us the opportunity to do that. Is to be able to get that capsule of information and then we decide what do we want to see the details

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

on. I also advocate links at the end of stories on how to find out more information about something. Often the media will almost drop a bomb and then we drop the story. We tell you about this terrible tragedy that happened in the east part of town and that is it. We don't ever say anything more about it. Where do you get more information? What if you are outraged by this, who do you complain to? We do a story about a doctor who was a child molester and we drop it. If you are the patient of that doctor you want know what you are supposed to do. I think as a public service we need to offer those links.

Not to say here go call these people, but if you want more information on the reporting process for a doctor convicted of this, this is the agency for you, or this is the phone number to call, or this is the Web site to check into that. I think that is not normally how we think through doing stories when we report. We do what we can and then we drop it and the next day it is a whole other story about a whole other issue. We do have people who say, "What ever happened on that? Did you follow up on that?" And then we do a follow-up story on it. But by thinking it through it helps us to help the viewer to follow up if they are interested in it. That way we can also get an idea on whether people are interested.

It helps us to gauge interest because you know exactly how many people are going for information. It would have been real easy for the [San Antonio Express-News](#) not to keep running stories on (athiest Madalyn Murray) O'Hair because basically this week nothing is happening on it. But last week it was very, very busy. But, if I am thinking about it and I want to go back this week and look at it, it is all there on the Web. They have done a great job at laying out everything you need to know on it. I think that is a good model, because some times you don't have time to do it. Being able to go back later to do it is a good thing.

I think that also helps us as journalist both in TV and print to put things in perspective. I am one that says if a plane goes down and crashes, and it is a 737 or one maybe we are not familiar with, I think it is our job to put that in perspective, because that means there is 1,500 flying and two have crashed. I should not really worry about it. Or are there 10 flying and two have crashed? I don't think I want to get on that plane. I think all of those statistics and information is easily available to us and it is free. You can get all of that information if you know where to go on the Internet and pull it off. The government puts it up there for us to use. But just being able to put information into perspective is important because another criticism that we get as the media is that we sensationalize everything. "Oh my gosh, the world is coming to an end." And you find out, well that was one case of one guy who ate a hamburger and got sick it is not like we all need to stop eating hamburgers. I think that it would become so sensational that people would quit taking us seriously. This is a good way to put our news coverage into perspective that means something to the general public rather than just making it a headline grabber.

BARRY GLENN: As Arts and Entertainment Editor for the [Orlando Sentinel](#), I oversee the online calendar, which is our entertainment site launched in November. Calendar online was a bit different than other sites at the Sentinel. Other entertainment sites that the Sentinel launched were based under a division called Orlando Sentinel Interactive. For this product we kept it in editorial, so it is based in

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

news features. There is an online editor, producer, and a listings coordinator. We don't break a lot of news back there, but we assemble incredibly important information. If it is outdated or inaccurate people are not going to come back to your site. It is extremely important to be on the money with this stuff and we run into problems everyday as far as how to make sure that these listings are still current. or making sure that a map is not guiding someone to a wrong location, things that can make people lose trust in you.

Out in the Sentinel newsroom, outside of news features, it is hard to miss the Sentinel as a multi-media company because when you walk into the newsroom we have a gigantic, it has been called a spaceship, sitting out in the middle of the newsroom on a raised platform. That is our multi-media desk. The city editor, the online editor, and the liaison with our Central Florida News 13, a television station venture that we have with Time-Warner Communications, sit there. We have a graphics editor there, a photo editor and everyday at 11 a.m. the budget meeting is held up on that platform. The managing editor leads it, the television folks talk about what they have got going, what they would like to pick up from reporters. The online editor talks about the thing he would like to get online as soon as possible that he needs reporters to write a few graphs on, or a short story, so we can get it online for our mid-day update. It pops up probably at about noon or 1 p.m. each day with stampedes of things that are going on both nationally and locally.

It really is a multi-media world there at the Sentinel. Have the reporters bought into it? Yeah, I mean they had no choice really. It was tricky at first. One of the big things is, as I mentioned, we have this television station, CFN13, which is competing, well not competing. But you have three mediums that people are working at every day, print, online, and broadcast. In a given day a reporter is going to work on all three of those.

Just recently in my area, for instance, when the Monica Lewinsky book came out we did not get our review copy that morning. Our book critic went out and bought it about 11 a.m., read it, wrote up a review. While I was editing the review, she went to the little TV studio we have in the newsroom and did what they call a talk back with the anchors for CFN13 about whether the book was any good. Then she came back, I finished editing it and we pushed it to online. We got it up on that site and the next day it was in print. So, she was in all three mediums. Our theater critic has one review a week on television. Our movies critic has two reviews a week on television. Our restaurant critic is on there, well his face isn't on there, but his reviews are. Our transportation writer, I have even been on there filling in for somebody. So, you never know when you are going to get called on. It used to be a really big shock to do things like this, but not anymore.

And it is not a big shock to a reporter for you to say, "Hey, I need you to crank out 10 or 12 graphs on this story." We had an example last week where a businessman who had disappeared several months before in Orlando at a hotel, was found in Georgia and he claimed that he had been held as a sex slave for three months. So our reporter found out about that and wrote up 10 or 12 graphs that got up on the

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

Web site. There is really not a lot of holding back as far as getting this information up there.

I was a little bit uneasy when Calendar Online started concerning when should our reviews go up. If we put these reviews up early, if we put our center piece for our Sunday sections up early, is that going to blow it? Is nobody going to go to our paper to read it? At first I was saying, "Yeah, let's hold on to that for a while. Let's not put that up, because that is our big splash for Sunday." But more and more I am saying, "Yeah, let's go ahead and put it out there." Sometimes four or five days before it is going run in print, whenever it is ready, because people need to know about this. Whether it is a guide to a theater festival or a review of a Shakespeare festival play. Whatever. It is important to get it out there as soon as possible. And I think that we have all bought into doing that.

RUSTY TODD: What has just been said commonly read throughout all of the answers is that somewhere off to the side of the existing news production process, there is another staff of greater or lesser size that takes content from the newsroom, from the television newsroom, from a variety of sources and repackages it, or for want of a better word, enhances it. News enhancement was a buzzword at Dow Jones for a good long time. There is a lot of different ways of doing this, and the fact that it is being done has lots of implications for labor issues, the news cycle, a lot of other stuff. But I would like to turn our attention to whether the creation of these multi-media products implies the need for a different kind of journalist, both at the reporter and editor level. Some of you people here have seen Max Headroom at one time or another. I would like to sort of poll the panel and see if we are headed toward an age when journalists are trained to do multiple things and multiple media.

Perhaps even to the Max Headroom stage. It is not as far-fetched as you might think. Some of you will remember the digital ink experiment, which literally had reporters running around with little cameras attached to their heads. That did not go anywhere in the short term, but it is still interesting for the long term. What I would like to poll the panel on now is whether we need a new type of reporter and a new type of editor with skills to operate in many media at once and how do we go about producing those people over time.

PAUL COX: I don't think we do need a different kind of reporter. I guess I would say this: at the bottom line if you have good people covering their beats, and they are knowledgeable about whether it is a geographical beat or a subject area beat, they know a lot about that beat, they know what the news points are, they are developing different stories for different things. I think that you are just asking them to think a little bit more broadly. Reporters for a print paper were always getting the underlying document anyhow. They were getting the transcript, they were getting the supporting material. It is just that now there is a way to display that in terms of multi-media and radio. I sort of went through it thinking I don't do much of that now, but in previous lives I have gone on radio and TV at various times. I used to prepare for it and do all of this great research. At some point I figured out what other people in the room have figured out before, if you cover something and you are knowledgeable about it, if you just talk about what you are doing, to that audience it appears new and fresh.

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

The most important thing is good reporters who can know their beat and know the people on their beat. They come up with good stories and scoops and things like that. If they just think a little bit more broadly about how that can play out into the different media. I don't think that special skills in the online world or special skills in terms of radio and TV are necessary, unless you want to be Peter Jennings or someone like that. That is a different story, but the much more important thing is good reporters come up with good stories. The rest of it, I think follows along.

SUSAN SCOTT WILSON: I kind of disagree because I think journalists are going to have to get with it, either learning to record sound, learning to record video, taking more pictures, better pictures, keeping their eyes open on all possibilities of what can go online. This is thinking graphically. I really truly believe that the copy editing job will change, most of all, because my job right now is that I have to take all of these elements and put them into an HTML format and that is taking being able go into color to correct a photo which I never learned in college. I learned this on my own. Learning graphic design. Learning what is cutting edge. Learning audio. I did some audio and some video in college, but nothing like I think is going to be needed in the future. I think we are going to have to be more well-rounded. We are going to have to be diversified on what can do and what we can achieve. I think that this is going to be a constant learning process. This is all changing way too fast and I think it will continue to change. I think it is really going to be an evolutionary project of a process of how we get our news and how we gather it and how we put it online, how we present it to the public.

STEVE SULLIVAN: I think the fundamentals of what a reporter or an editor is looking for are pretty much the same no matter which discipline you are working in. Where people need to develop some versatility is in the execution. Having said that though, I am a firm believer though that there is always going to be a place for a single-medium specialist. Some people just excel in one form of communication and maybe just an award winning newspaper writer who simply can't talk into a radio or a microphone or a television camera. That is fine. I think those people will still be out there. And the same for broadcasters who do not know where to put a comma and do not know what is capitalized and what is not.

I think it is very important though, that even if you are planning to specialize in one particular medium that you still need to broaden your experience to understand what happens in the others. Even if you are not going in front of a camera and you are working at a newspaper you still may have to make a phone call over to a television partner and just on a day-to-day basis cooperate with them, collaborate with them in the background of the story. That kind of stuff I think everybody is going to experience in one form of another.

I do think that those people who can be versatile enough to do it all are going to be more valuable to the corporate journalism companies. There are already people who are being hired with that expectation. We are bringing you in here as a movie critic for the newspaper, but part of our expectation is that you will do a weekly review for the television stations, you will also go on radio whenever needed. So those things are already finding their way into the media world. This is true for not just the

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

reporters, it is also true for photographers. I think that if you are planning on shooting for a newspaper you better learn how to shoot with a video camera as well, because what you might end up doing is going out with a camera that captures motion, coming back and grabbing stills for your newspaper or your online service and then turning a camera over. There are techniques that are different for video shooting than for stills.

Again, it is going to be valuable to be familiar with all of that. I see Howard (Witt, Associate Managing Editor/Interactive News, [Chicago Tribune](#)) shaking his head back there. That was one of our great failed experiments, but that is what it taught us. That there are very different techniques that you should be familiar with. And copy editors too. There are going to be systems that are available that I think people will be working on that will have at their fingertips, content from all over the place. For example, at a company like Tribune. you might have stored in a system your text for the newspaper. You might have stills. You might have video. This is archived, or fresh, whatever, but just knowing it is there, knowing how to use it, knowing when to use it, those are all going to be very, very valuable skills to the copy desk. Copy desk and the edit booth at a television station, production desk at a Web site - specializing isn't dead. Specializing is still good, but versatility I think is probably going to be a very valuable thing to have in the next few years.

NANCI WILSON: Well I agree that there will be a lot of changes in ability. If any of you have ever watched a small market television newscast, you have no doubt at some point seen the reporter with her head cut off by the top of the screen. That is because of a term called "one-man banding." That is where the reporters went out by themselves and shot the story and did their own standup by having someone look in the camera and tell the reporter if her head is cut off.

Or they will put the light stand up and look and say, I am about this tall and they will go stand in the way. When most broadcasters start out in small markets, you have to do everything. You have to edit, shoot, write, everything. As we move up the ladder you do less and less until you get to the network and some of them do not even write their own stories anymore. We all start out learning all of those things and it makes us more valuable as we go because we understand things a little bit better. But I think what Steve was saying was imperative, that we will need to be trained in a broader perspective of what we are doing. It is more than just knowing where the commas go or what proper grammar is in written text versus speech.

Another thing that I am really noticing is that if you tune into a CBS news site at CBS.com you will notice on certain foreign stories you will have a lot of stills in there. What we have started doing when we went on the air is we would give those little digital cameras to reporters. They would be out walking along the road and whatever foreign country and they would just snap a still. I mean they are not perfect, they are not going to win any awards for perfectly taken photographs. But, it gives you an idea and it is immediate and they will just call it and feed it back and we will put in on the Web site. They enjoy it too. It is different than shooting video. I also believe that we will be seeing video on newspaper sites before long. I am sure that there are some ready to do that now.

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

I have spoken so many times to different broadcast news groups about that. That is a very serious threat to television news because we have always just kind of dismissed any real kind of competition in that. We say we have got visuals. We have emotion. We have got sound. Well, everybody has got that now. So how do we make ours any different? If we are just looking at pictures that could be evened out pretty easily print, traditionally, has had better reporters, better writing, better research. In fact, you will see a lot of the investigative shows, Dateline, 20-20, 60 Minutes, most of their producers have come from the print side. That is a big trend right now, people moving from print into broadcast because of those skills.

I think any reporter or copy editor that goes into a newspaper or a station and doesn't crosstrain on everything they can is making a choice not to be in the industry very long. If you are management trying to decide on a budget, you will consider people's abilities. "I have got one who can only do this and I have got one who can do this and this and this. I may not need them to, but if I needed them to they could go do that. I know what I am choosing. I am going to cover myself in case there is ever a need down the road."

So, I think that it is good career planning to be able to look at things and say, "Okay, I am going to learn how to put HTML tags on this. I hope that I don't ever have to do it. I hope that I don't, but I have a feeling that some point in my career I am going to have to write a story and I am going to have to put the tags on there and know how to put that up on the Web. It is just one of those things I am going to have to learn just like I did on editing videotape. It's not something I like to do, but in the event that it's news breaking and we are about to go on air, I know my story can make it because I know I can do that. And that increases my value and that's why I choose to do it.

I think that you'll see more and more of the network affiliates using still photographs. We are seeing a lot of that now. If you'll watch stories, a lot of that is digital photographs that they are using in addition to the video being shot. So I think the mediums are really colliding and either we'll have a lot of competition where it splits us apart or you'll see a lot of merging between papers and broadcast and radio stations to team up together. The [Austin 360](#) has some of that going on, and Cox Interactive all rolled in. I see that as a partnership that may happen.

BARRY GLENN: I definitely think the multi-media journalist is here. I think the key to it is to get people excited about what they are doing, to get them excited about multi-media. I think the key to that is to give them the proper tools to work with. If you have reporters who are working on outdated computers, or the only way they can get on the Internet is to stand in line between 10 other people who are waiting for the one station within your area, they are not going to get that excited about it. They don't look at your online product, they don't look at their online product. But if you have at each desk a super fast computer with a 21-inch screen, the ability to get on the Internet, you give them that ability, they feel like a part of it. They are going to call that up, regularly, just like a story. They are going to feel more a part of it.

It's the same thing with TV training. If you are going to expect these people to get up in front of a camera and do a talk-back or whatever, give them enough training

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

so that they can do it. They are not going to look glamorous at first, and maybe they will never look glamorous. But you can give people enough training to where they are not going to embarrass themselves and they are going to seem like an authoritative presence on there.

Give the reporters laptops so they can take them out to the scenes, so they have docking stations in the newsroom, so that they can work from home. We have just installed these docking stations and laptops in our newsroom, or we are in the process of doing it, and it makes it so much easier in my area for the theater critic, or movie critic, or music critic who keep odd hours because of the presentations that they see. In this way they can go home and write on this laptop, just carry it around wherever they need it, and send it to me when I arrive in the morning. They don't have to come in at 10 a.m. and be there until 7 p.m. There is a lot more work going on outside the newsroom. The key I think is you have to give people the proper tools to work with, and make sure it's high quality stuff. Then they know you are serious about them being multi-media journalists and they are going to be serious about it.

RUSTY TODD: If I heard that correctly, the journalist of the future will be an excellent writer and editor in the print medium, and will be able to write competent scripts for broadcast, will be able to take audio and audio-video working independently without a crew in the field, will be able to come back to the newsroom and prepare the print product, and sit down and put together a broadcast product, and then perhaps have lunch and do it all again in the afternoon.

NANCI WILSON: On \$12,000 a year salary. (laughs)

RUSTY TODD: That was my next comment. I think the most important tool you can give a journalist like that is a very attractive salary, that's always an important tool for a working journalist. Are there questions? Anybody burn to take issue with what was said?

Comment from **Howard Witt:** Give a reporter a digital camera and you are going to get a lot of crappy pictures. You give a still photographer a video camera and you are going to get a lot of crappy video. You give a videographer a camera and tell him to take some random still shots and you are going to get a lot of crappy still pictures. What you are talking about is a formula for mediocrity. Now, the financial pressures that I mentioned in the previous panel are definitely there for us to do that, but it has nothing to do with creating great journalism.

NANCI WILSON: Can I take issue on that, too. The reason why I say that, I just worked with a videographer who was a still photographer for about 20 years and really wanted to learn videography and he is an incredible photographer on video because he understood composition in a photograph. He had to learn how to take a composition of a photograph and marry them together, like almost in frames. So he said it took a little bit of re-education.

When I say that, I don't mean to say send someone out who has never taken a photograph before and say, "Here, I want to take something." We have to do some

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

training, and I think that as we go and move into other things, it's going to take training. Just like someone had to train me to use an avid-editor. It took a month of learning how to do it, just practicing what-not, to do it where it looked good.

Comment from **Janine Warner**: (Managing Editor, MiamiHerald.com) The thing that I haven't heard up here that I really struggle with is that most people in media are really good at working independently. They are not good at working as a team. That's the challenge that I face a lot in my office. I have a programmer, and a writer, and a photographer, and an HTML person, they have to work together. I call myself a techie translator because my challenge is to try and help them work with each other. One of the things you can really do as students is learn just a little bit about those other skills so you understand what other people are doing, and then specialize in the one you are passionate about.

PAUL COX: I'll circle back to my point. In the last presidential election they said, "It's the economy, stupid." Well, "It's the story stupid." If you don't have a good underlying story no matter what you do to it, it's not going to get there. I guess that's my point of getting to journalists capturing compelling stories and that's my job on the desk to guide that, if there are ways we can enhance them to do that. All those things become irrelevant if you are not coming with stories. I think that's why people come to our site, it's they come to expect the news told well, the news told in a timely fashion. That starts on the ground up. The extras, we need to learn how to enhance it and make it part of that, the bottom of it is you can get lost in your Photoshop training, or I don't even know what an avid-deck is. You can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. You need to get that story first.

Comment from **Glen Golightly**: ([Houston Chronicle's](http://HoustonChronicle.com) Virtual Voyager Coordinator) I actually have some experience about what has been talked about here, and I take issue and agree with all this stuff so I'll try to keep that in mind, and I don't want to steal from the next panel I'm on.

I think you have to work in teams. We started this thing called the Virtual Voyager four years ago and I got put in charge of it because I was standing in the right place, or the wrong place depending on how you look at it. The concept was we'll send one reporter out with a laptop, a cell phone, a modem, a camera, all this other stuff and they'll produce all this great copy constantly and take e-mail and answer all these questions. Well, it didn't even work from the very first project because it's true, a good writer is a good writer, a good photographer is a good photographer and you can't do eight things at once.

So when we threw in audio and video as part of the mission it just fell apart completely. Now we work in teams. "You are going to be the writer and the reporter, you'll write the print piece. You will write the video piece, and voice it, and the other person will be the shooter and editor." That's really how it has to be done because unless I've learned how to get audio and edit it and shoot video and edit, I would hate to do all four or five things at once. So I think the thing in the future is going to be teamwork because you can train someone to do this. I started out as a newspaper reporter and I thought radio and TV were black magic, or some kind of

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

rocket science, and it's really not. It's just practice. I can shoot video, but I probably won't win an Emmy, or Pulitzer.

RUSTY TODD: Maybe we can move along to the matter of editorial control, which was in our briefing notes for this discussion. I'd like to approach by posing a hypothetical to the panel. Let's suppose that each of us is working at a Web medium that involves a partnership with a television station and a newspaper. Let's say the newspaper reporter working a city hall beat comes up with a very good piece proving malfeasance of some kind by a prominent politician in town. You know about this story fairly early in the day and it comes back to the city editor at the newspaper. The hypothetical I'd like pose to you is in terms of editorial control and the news cycle and the flow of information, how do you handle that?

Can the newspaper's managing editor say, "This is our story. It will not be on that Web site until after midnight when our competition has gone to bed." Or, will there be some process, some outside editorial control over that managing editor which might force that hot story into text and onto the Web and might alert the television partner to the story so that appropriate footage can be shot and spot produced for that evening's cast. I'd like for folks to try to deal hypothetically with this question, who decides what goes and when?

PAUL COX: It doesn't even have to be hypothetical because we do that all the time. The decision process at the Journal, this is print [Wall Street Journal](#), this Dow Jones wire service which is for traders, there's us, and we have a partnership with CNBC now both domestically and overseas. When one of their reporters has a scoop, which happens fairly often at the Journal, they go through a decision-making process about "will it hold." The reporter is usually the best one to know that. He knows what his sourcing is, he knows what the dissemination points are.

We make judgments all the time. We have a set of embargoes both for the wire and for us, and for the TV station. Some of them will hold until 11 p.m., some will hold until 2 a.m., some to 4 a.m. in terms of not wanting to alert the competition. Some times you know it's not going to hold. The Wall Street Journal being Monday through Friday obviously has a big Friday problem. If you are a reporter and you come up with a scoop on Friday in the traditional sense you were SOL, as Howard said, until Monday. But now we can preserve that scoop and put a Wall Street Journal name on it with the Web site, we can put that reporter on CNBC to talk about it, and with the wire services we have dissemination. So we just take it on a case-by-case basis. It goes all the way up to Paul Staiger, the managing editor of the Wall Street Journal, and based on the best information they make a judgment and some times they hold it, some times they disseminate it, some times they go with a middle-ground embargo. We go through that every day.

SUSAN SCOTT WILSON: I agree with Paul. It's made at the managing editor level, and they'll make a decision either to embargo it or go ahead and put it on. Our embargo is pretty much after midnight, that's when they would want it to go on if they do decide to embargo it. If it's a really breaking story, they may go with it. But it's really up to the managing editor in our situation.

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

STEVE SULLIVAN: These are rule sticky situations, each one has to be looked at individually. There are different ways to tipping off stories that might blow your partner's scoop out of the water. We had some times where as we were trying to decide how we were going to deal with embargoed situations, the newspaper might have a story, we knew about it for online, we knew about it for the television and radio stations and what could we do sitting, knowing that it wasn't going to appear in the paper until the next day? How could we prepare for it? When could we get to the information? How could we package it to use it?

Again, you have to look at every situation by itself and determine what it is exactly you can do and sometimes you can't do anything. We found that out by sometimes having somebody from one of the other newsrooms make a call to a source just to check out and say, "Boy, we heard this is happening, what do you know? We aren't going to run it until tomorrow, but what do you know?" That source gets spooked and gets one of the other media outlets and blew the exclusive. You have to be very, very careful about how you deal with these.

There is also sort of the funny situation of scooping yourself, which again if you've got a story and you are working on the newspaper and you think there may be more strategic value in putting it online, or putting it on the television channel before the paper comes out the next day, have you scooped yourself? Even if you get full credit for the reporting and for the story, what is the perception of the audience? I'm a firm believer if that you've got something that your competition can't recover and match before the next day in the newspaper, then go with it. But, to give a specific example when that backfires, when the Philadelphia Inquirer had a nightly newscast back in the mid-90s, it was a newscast that ran at I believe 10 to 11 p.m. in Philadelphia on WPHL. The thing was a newscast that was totally driven by content from the Inquirer. It was branded "Inquirer news tonight." All the stories that came from the Inquirer, "Philadelphia Inquirer is reporting that blah blah blah."

I was out there watching a newscast one evening and they broke a fairly big story, it was the lead story on the newscast. Graphics come up, it's the masthead of the newspaper, it's the "Philadelphia Inquirer news tonight." First thing out of the anchor's mouth, was "In tomorrow's Philadelphia Inquirer it's reported that blah blah blah." The reporter was featured in the news story. It was just attributed to death, you could not do any more attribution to the story, give the newspaper any more credit. The next morning, I went back into the television newsroom and looked at the regional wires. In one of the briefs it said, "Last night Channel 17 reported that . . ." And it was the newspaper's story credited to the TV channel. It didn't mention the Inquirer and of course the people at the newspaper were furious, but the television station couldn't do any more than they did to make sure that everybody knew where the story had come from.

So, as you look at these situations and you are trying to decide where the value is, do I go with a story early, do we put it online, release it on to the news channel, these are situations that you have to look at. Especially, when you've got sort of a mixed brand that you are dealing with. When you've got Austin American-Statesman that might release a story on [Austin 360](#), does your visitor to the Web site recognize that's a newspaper story, not a 360 story? Do they make that

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

connection, does the credit go where credit's due? Who cares in the end whether who gets credit as long as it's all in the same family? These are tricky, delicate situations and they are constantly being negotiated at high levels in all these newsrooms.

NANCI WILSON: I would say every situation that is sensitive like that you have to take on its own merit. I don't think there is a blanket thing that you can say. I do know that from working in the industry long enough, I'll bet that whomever on the wire service was that attributed to Channel 17 got that tip from Channel 17. They didn't say we got it from the newspaper because generally that's how those work. They call and say, "You guys got any thing?" "Well oh yeah, as a matter of fact we had this tonight . . ." And so I think it was more of a breakdown in the communications of those individual people doing it rather than they didn't get credit for it.

Last week, I have four televisions in my family room because I watch all the network news and I keep up with everything, every station in Austin ran with the story that said the "San Antonio (Express-News) is reporting Madalyn Murray O'Hair blah blah blah." Now, I wanted to find out how many hits to their Web site from Austin they did have. I'll bet they had a bunch because everybody led their newscast with their name on it. Now where would you go if you wanted more information? I wouldn't go to that station's Web site, I'd go to the source, I'd go to the San Antonio (Express-News) to see what else they had.

So I think it depends on your partnership between the mediums and how you handle those situations because one can definitely drive the other. I mean if I'm a broadcast station and a reporter has given me a tip and said, "Listen, I'm going to have this really long in-depth thing, but here's enough for you to do your story and we gotta stay with the trust, I know that it's real and I've confirmed and all that," I know good and well that my story is going to drive people to either buy the paper or check their Web site. And they know that, so it works for both of us because in the bottom line they want to sell newspapers. In the bottom line, I want to have an exclusive that tells my television audience that keep coming back because we are going to keep telling you things you don't know, that are new and fresh.

So it works for all of us in the media. These are partnerships that I our stations and papers don't have, but as reporters we recognize that the best way to get our story out there is work with one another on it. Now, when I have an exclusive do I call up the newspaper and say, "I'm going to do this tonight." No. But after I do it, am I willing to share my information and it's not an ongoing? I usually am. It's like, "Sure, come on over here and I'll show you what I've been doing or what-not." By establishing those, it benefits all of us and it helps me to get more of my story out. We go on the Web next week so I may not be as free because we'll be putting it on our Web site but they can get it on that. But I think by looking at those partnerships can be a benefit to media companies. As we see more and more conglomerates buy newspapers and TV, much like the Belo companies, we are going to see a lot more of that happen.

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

BARRY GLENN: It's kind of a little bit more complicated because it used to be before the advent of TV that the discussion might go something like, "Well, we put it out there at 9:30, the other TV stations in town aren't going to have time to anything on it substantial, so let's put it out at that time." Well, now we are TV so that doesn't work any more. That said, yeah, it's a case-by-case basis. A lot of things that you think might be a really important exclusive, maybe people don't care that much? I was talking to our online editor the other day and we were discussing this, about whether to hold something or not. Journalists might be sitting there saying, "This is a huge story, what do we do? What do we do?" But to the average person, maybe it's not that big a deal so just go ahead and release it. I think in the great majority of cases the stories get online as soon as they are ready. With an exclusive, an investigative piece, yeah that has to be considered. But a lot of things might not be quite as important as we think they are as far as holding them back.

Comment from **Doug Feaver:** (Editor washingtonpost.com, Vice President, Washingtonpost.Newsweek Interactive) I think the question of who is scooping whom is getting more and more interesting as time goes on. As our number of unique users continues to climb it's not going to be too much longer, frankly, before we pass the newspaper circulation list. Now the question is when (to publish vis-a-vis the print edition). I have to say, from what Paul is describing over there, we almost never scoop the Washington Post when it has an exclusive. Although we have on occasion. If you'll exclude the Matt Drudge leak, the most notable would be the Lewinsky story and the fact that that investigation was underway which was on the Web site before the paper was of the press because there was significant pressure to do that. Everybody was quoting washingtonpost.com the next day, and that was wonderful for us, and we are very happy to have it. But there were strategic reasons why we needed to get it out at 12:15 in the morning, which is not exactly prime viewing time for Internet sites on the East Coast.

But I really do wonder as Web sites that work with newsrooms continue to get closer and closer together, the question is whether it matters. Whether it's on the Web site first, whether it comes off the press first. "Did you see it first in the Washington Post?" is the identification I hope and truly believe is going to happen, quite apart from the broadcast partners which raises another issue.

Comment from **Linda Ash:** (New Media Managing Editor, [San Antonio Express-News](http://SanAntonioExpress-News.com)) I just want to explain a little bit about how ExpressNews.com puts their news up. We put the burden of putting the online news online to the editorial department. Whenever they typeset the story it goes online and they have the option of putting up a publication date, or holding the story. Of course every once in a while if there is an exclusive they don't want to get up until 10:30 or 11 p.m., then they will mark that story "not for online." Of course, every once in a while an online editor doesn't hear that and then after a frantic phone call takes it down.

One of my focuses this year, in addition to team news, is breaking news. We are in a separate building from our newsroom, we are that far part right now. Hopefully, we'll get closer together as time goes by. When breaking news happens in San Antonio and if our AP bureau reporter there in San Antonio picks this story up and can get it out in half an hour, we'll put the AP version online with a San Antonio dateline rather

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

than waiting until 11 p.m. that night for our own version of the story. I just think it's important to get out there and we haven't had any problems from the newsroom yet on this. When we do see a story that maybe AP does not have, we'll call the newsroom and ask them can you give us a few graphs and they are just starting to do that now.

They are still not geared for online deadline reporting. I wish we had all the reporters over there who could work for AP, you know, if they can get it out real fast. That's the future.

NANCI WILSON: You know one thing that she brought up I think is real important is when you are on online news, people expect you to have it. They expect to go to your site and see the breaking news right then. They don't expect to wait. I think that's a good point, why newsrooms should be together so when you've got one reporter team going out to cover the thing, you've got another team typing it in to say we are on the scene, or whatever. I know when something breaks, I go to a site and I see, okay, nothing's on there. They have nothing on it. I think, "Are they not covering it?" Which I know that's not the case. When I saw the (astronaut and senator) John (Glenn) taking off and they had Webcasting what-not, or the Clinton vote on the impeachment, all the Web sites immediately had the vote what it was. That's what I expected. I didn't want to applaud it because I expected to see it, and that's something we all need to do, know about on breaking news.

RUSTY TODD: I'd like to ask one last sort of general question, maybe we can sail through it. This concerns money. What we've talked about here this morning in every case has involved mobilization of assets that are expensive. We've been talking about sort of large shop operations, and I just wonder what each of you sees as the prospects of a small daily newspaper. One that I work with is the Galveston Daily News, which is in the shadow of the (Houston Chronicle) "Chron.com", a mega-site. There is a vast difference in the resources of one newspaper and in resources of the other. I wonder if any of you see, sort of a have and have-not division going on within our own profession. Those newspapers that can afford to do this sort of sophisticated stuff and those who can't, and what happens to those with say a 12,000-a-day circulation, how do they effectively play this game?

PAUL COX: I'm obviously on the other end of the scale, we are kind of working for those "Wall Street millionaires." I live in a small town in New Jersey in one of those commuter towns and you take the train in. The local weekly isn't very good but I read it because it's got local news in it. I think there will always be value in local news and that can be done well on the Web too. With the low cost of Web publishing it could probably be done at a fairly low cost. I think there's a place for that, whether whoever does that comes from newspaper routes or whether they come from radio or TV or somebody above the others, I think there will be a market for local news on the Web. You want to know what's happening on your local school board, your local cop news, and whether they are going to fix the streets and bridges, things like that. That's important and big publications can't or won't cover that. Maybe they'll swoop in once in a while, but on a regular basis they are not going to do that. So I think there's room for that on the Web.

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

SUSAN SCOTT WILSON: I agree that there is room for local news on the Web. On the have and have-not, I mean, I can see it just from this group right here because I come from a newspaper that we basically take the information from the newspaper. In listening to Orlando down there talking about working with a TV station and that, being able to do the multi-media, we are not even to that stage yet.

That's very expensive equipment that you have to get in to start doing that and it does cost time and training. You get into those issues of are we going to take the time and train our current staff or are we going to hire people in. On medium-sized newspapers and small-sized newspapers, we are going to have to decide how we are going to cover and what we are going to cover. Local news rules in my opinion. I know they come to my site for news that they cannot get from a national site. I still say, there is going to be plenty of room but it is going to be a difference between what you see at the Washingtonpost.com and what you see at the Galveston Daily News.

STEVE SULLIVAN: I think that one thing the Internet has done, at least for me, is given me a different way to think of how I get my news when I wake up in the morning. Rather than just picking up a paper out in my front yard and looking at it, what I generally do any given morning is log on and take a look at selected elements from a variety of sources. It might be media columns from both the Chicago papers, obits from hometown newspaper, local information here in Austin where I live now, and certain franchise things like Tony Kornheiser from the [Washington Post](#), and other things whether from some other source. I think if you have good franchises within your newsroom and really capitalize on those, realize it's not just someone sitting two miles away from me who is liable to pick up on this and read it. But also, for the people who are in your backyard, don't neglect global information. Local information isn't going to fit in the newspaper, and online is the best receptacle for that. Whether it's where you live now, or where you did live, those are all valuable places to go.

NANCI WILSON: I think with all the graphics programs, and all the new Web site programs that are out now and coming out, it makes it a little bit easier for smaller (papers) or weeklies, or public stations to get on the Web and to have something that looks decent. It's not like some mediums where money really shows. I mean, if you have a talented graphic artist, which there are in school right here that I've come across that are students, that are just incredibly talented.

I've seen people, interns, students doing work for stations that looks great. I totally agree with the local part of it. You have to ask yourself, "What information am I delivering that they can't get any where else?" Because they can find information, a lot of stuff, in a dozen other places. I want to know what time my kid's carnival at school starts, "Is it 10 or 12 or 2 or whatever on Saturday?" Well, I know where I can go and find that information. Now, it may be a very select few that can do that, and it's broken up by communities, but that's what the weeklies are all about. Probably, if we put it out now, "you need to have a weekly newspaper," most of us would say, "What are you talking about? Weekly? What is that going to offer?" I read my weekly every week, for that very reason. I think there's very much an application on the Web for that, for that information that you'll never get in a larger paper.

1999 – International Symposium on Online Journalism

BARRY GLENN: I think it's important that (with) a lot of small newspapers, one solution might be to design areas within the site that are a one-time venture but you can go in and freshen them up. For instance, if your town of 12,000 has a yearly festival, you design a one-time site then go in and freshen it up. You are not having to re-invent, you don't have to use staff to create something new every year. Establishing links to other sites, that type of thing. There is some debate as to whether establishing links is a good idea, to lead people off of your site. Will they come back?

Well, yeah I think they'll come back because they know you are the place they got the link at so they are going to come back for some other neat links. It seems that the issue, we talk about advertising, its influence on editorial with smaller newspapers that could be an even bigger issue because if you are starved for money, you might want to enter into some agreements that might seem a bit questionable as some of the things we talked about with the first panel. It's an interesting issue. But I think if you can design these sites and just be creative as far as updating them and changing the look of them without having to use a lot of staff, that's one secret.