Day 1, April 1, 2011
Research Panel: *All About the Tweet and More*

Panelists:

- ***Chair:*** **Cindy Royal,** Texas State University, San Marcos
- **Dale Blasingame,** Texas State University, San Marcos
- **Dr. Carrie Brown,** University of Memphis, and others
- **Marcus Messner,** Virginia Commonwealth University, and others
- **Elvira Garcia de Torres,** Universidad CEU Cardenal Herrera, Spain, and others

---

Cindy Royal: I think we're almost on time. Like, is this a world's record? Pretty good. Hi, everyone. I'm Cindy Royal, and I teach at Texas State University, which is just 30 short miles down I-35. I am, however, a resident of Austin, Texas and a proud graduate of this program--University of Texas. Actually, the year before I even started in the program Rosental invited me to the very first international symposium in online journalism. So I've seen a lot of these over the years, and [it's] always nice to see old friends again and keep up with Twitter followers and followees.

Rosental Calmon Alves: You haven't missed one.

Cindy Royal: I have not missed one, yeah. I've been to every single one that you've done. It's just been so interesting to see how this has grown over the years. And again, what a wonderful job you've done year after year after year assembling this awesome group of people. [Applause.] So yeah, obviously.

So, the final research panel that we have of the day—and commendations to all of you who are still hanging in there this afternoon—is a really exciting one. And we've all been using Twitter all day long. I think we're going to break the 4,000 record, like today, before you know, even the second day kicks in. But this is about, it's called *All About the Tweet and More*. And it's really focused on how newsrooms are using Twitter and using maybe a few other tools as well. And so I think you'll see some really innovative uses or maybe, like some critiques of uses and some recommendations of how newsrooms can improve what they are doing with Twitter. It goes hand-in-hand with all the innovation things that we've been talking about, because obviously something like Twitter has a lot to do with APIs and data on the backend and potential programming implications.

So, we've got four panelists today. And I'll start with the first one, somebody that I know quite well. Dale Blasingame is a masters student at Texas State

University and he just defended his thesis which is based on this topic on Wednesday--successfully defended his thesis. So… [Applause.] And I was the chair of his thesis committee, so I know this research quite well. So his paper is called *Twitter First: Changing TV News 140 Characters at a Time.* Dale.

Dale Blasingame: All Right. So yeah, my paper is called *Twitter First: Changing TV News 140 Characters at a Time*. And I was actually sitting right over there last year when I got the idea for this paper. So do you want me to stop right there on a high note or…? [laughter] So, I was listening to several panels last year of newspaper people talking about the web first mentality. And TV and newspaper people don't always get along [and] don't usually have the same ideas. But I was sitting over there thinking, you know, this actually does still apply to TV. There's a web first mentality there as well. I'd hear all the time in the newsroom that, you know, we need to get something up on the web, especially during breaking news or spot news coverage. So I was thinking about that. You know, it's really an admirable process. It's a definite upgrade, but it's simply not good enough anymore, in my opinion, and here's why.

I'm sure these pictures are very familiar to you. That's the "Miracle on the Hudson." This guy, Janis Krums, had 20 followers when he tweeted that picture that ended up winning photo of the year. And he was the worldwide -- his photo was the talk of the world. He beat mainstream media by ten minutes getting pictures from the crash. On the right-hand side, you had the Discovery Channel gunman. Lauren Reese essentially tweeted as a reporter from inside the building and someone else in the building took that photo, which was the only photo of the gunman until he was finally arrested.

So you have news consumers doing this well. So the question is, are news stations doing this well? And so, I came up with this idea of not web first, but twitter first. Not breaking any news here that Twitter has emerged as a go-to tool for journalists. It's perfectly suited for breaking news. You know, the real-time nature and breaking news or spot news coverage just mesh perfectly. And the biggest thing now is that news doesn't wait until 5, 6 or 10 anymore in TV terms. You know, people, especially online people want it immediately.

So I framed my study on gatekeeping--and we've talked about this before, so I won't spend a lot of time about it--but the key word in there is the process. I specifically looked at the flow of information--and this is specific to TV newsrooms--during a breaking or a spot news story. The story usually emanates from the assignment desk who hears a call on the scanners, gets a phone call, or in bad cases, sees it on another station, dispatches a photographer, sometimes with a reporter. Sometimes the photographer will ask for a reporter to come out later. That information is usually given to a producer who either decides to put it in the show, write the story, something like that. Then the anchor ends up being the one who delivers it to the audience. This is the model that we all know in TV days.

How many of y'all have heard of the term 'gatejumping?' Anybody? One or two? So I'm going to introduce this term as an alternative to gatekeeping now with Twitter. Chris Brogan termed this in his book *Trust Agents*, and he said gatejumping is marketing yourself in a new way on the Internet--finding a new way to do something. So an example is: radio station is a gatekeeping…radio is a gatekeeping industry. Podcasters are gatejumpers. I'm using it in a much more literal sense. Twitter allows early gatekeepers—the assignment editors, the photographers, the reporters—to jump the gates, jump the producer, jump the anchor and deliver the news directly to the audience. So this is actually the gatejumping model I came up with. You can see that at any time, anyone along the flow of information can deliver it directly to the audience.

So I studied two things: Basically, how is this happening? And then, the second question is, is it really happening? I won't bore you with the long questions but those are the nuts and bolts of them. And I'm not going to spend a whole lot of time on my methodology, but I do want to point out two things. I studied San Antonio specifically for this for several reasons…there was precedence set by Dan Berkowitz. I also worked in the San Antonio news market for ten years, so I had a lot of personal and professional ties already established there that made this research easier. I'm not sure how many I'll have left now that the paper is out, but I did at the time. I also thought San Antonio was important because going into this I thought there was a little bit of the good, bad, and ugly when it came to TV stations using Twitter--just my initial impressions going in of what I've seen over the year. And I'm not inferring that this happens in every market, what happens in San Antonio. So I thought that was really important that other markets may be able to relate to one station or the other to see that that's how they're doing in their market.

So I answered the two questions. The first one I answered with a case study. I found a triple murder/suicide that actually broke on Twitter and the story developed on Twitter more so than TV. Can't do a study on San Antonio news without some blood and guts, so I thought that was important. And the second one I did a quantitative analysis. I coded 2,293 tweets over a 10-day random period from all the newsroom employee accounts at the four San Antonio TV stations.

So here's the case study. And there were several more tweets in this. I just kind of picked the ones that I thought were important. The story actually broke at 8:32 from an assignment editor. So that kind of proves the point right there. Relayed scanner information, which normally does not go out over the air, on Twitter, in a little looser guidelines. So she didn't have much to say, but she broke the story. 30 minutes later, KABB reporter Grace White arrived at the scene. She posted this picture. It's not the greatest picture in the world, I'll fully admit that, but you can see at the bottom there's a little crime scene tape, and you've got a light and not much more to it than that.

About 30 minutes later, a photographer from KSAT, one of the other stations there, arrived. He basically just announced he was there but he published a map and a better picture with the flashing lights and stuff like that. So you start seeing the story unfold.

I thought this tweet was important. This is an anchor at the CBS affiliate. So she's typically the late gatekeeper in the original model and she's the one asking for information in this model. So I thought that was important to point out that the ones who are typically delivering the information, in this particular case, are actually asking the public for information.

And then Twitter went kind of dark for a while as they prepared for the ten o'clock newscast, which is to be expected. Around 10:15, they started tweeting again because police were holding a news conference. And from 10:15 to 10:35 or so, several reporters ended up tweeting the details of the story that weren't on the newscast. So this story legitimately broke on Twitter and developed on Twitter.

So, I do think this case study illustrates the potential of Twitter as a tool to deliver breaking news. It was delivered quickly and, most importantly, effectively. It's one of the critiques you hear when you have photographers or assignment editors, you know, "Yeah, well, they're not trained on what to do." But this shows that they can do it and they are gatejumpers in this case. But unfortunately it would be foolish to suggest that this happens on a daily basis, as we're about to see.

So, my analysis of the tweets over the 10-day period. This is for all the newsroom employees. So, to be expected, chitchat was the number one category. You can see KSAT actually had 728, more than just about everyone else combined for all the other tweets. That's to be expected. Twitter is a social medium, so you would expect that conversation would lead the way.

I was particularly interested in the number of breaking and promotional tweets. You know, it was kind of sad to see that there were more promotional tweets than breaking tweets. And non-breaking news over there-- that was for news that was pertinent--but it wasn't breaking news in San Antonio. It was, "Hey, it's snowing in Utah," or something from a weather producer. So we had some of those. And, in fact, in some cases, we had more non-breaking tweets than breaking. But I didn't really get a good enough answer from this, so I wanted to examine just the station accounts, just the four official station accounts and the numbers were pretty grim across the board.

One of the stations had 100% of its tweets promotional. They all came--in fact all the promotional tweets came from Twitterfeed, which is a service that automatically sends out a link when you web publish a story. Another news station had 99% of its tweets promotable. And then the two that did better

were 86% and 81%. So even those numbers [are] not exactly the greatest. You can see the other categories were almost non-existent.

So I want to close with two quick points. A Pew Center Study last year, late last year, found that TV viewership is on the decline, down 10% from '91 to 2010. And the same poll found that online news consumption is up 10% from 2002. I find that number incredibly low. And in fact, the Pew Center Study that Vivian referenced this morning has online news consumption up 17% since 2009. But what was important in that is that online news consumption is now more popular than radio or newspaper, so I thought that was important. And the reason that matters is that stations must now go to where the consumers are. Consumers are not coming to them anymore, so TV stations have to go find them and give them reasons to become viewers.

And this isn't some far-fetched idea. This story broke last week that a station in Utah is crediting its ratings win strictly to social media. They have 208,000 Facebook fans and the station readily admits Facebook is the reason why they won the ratings medal.

And the second point, I talked to author Mark Briggs, who was referenced earlier, regarding the promotion. And he said the key is to respect the relationship with users. He liked the 80/20 rule, where 80% of the time you add value, 20% of the time you promote. And I do believe this could be the standard stations use as they begin to not just use Twitter but actually embrace Twitter as a tool to deliver breaking news.

And that is all.

[Applause.]

Dr. Carrie Brown: All right. I'll try not to talk as loud as I normally do. Those of you that have had the misfortune, maybe of being in a bar with me, know that I'm normally very loud. So me with a mike is kind of frightening in some ways. Okay.

So, just to kind of set this up a little bit here and what got us interested in this is big fans of Twitter—more people probably know me as BrizzyC than by my actual name here—as I know many of you are based on how the hashtag has been blowing up today. We were really intrigued, of course, about what the potential of Twitter is for journalists, not only as a reporting tool, which is what I teach my students a lot about, but also as a way of spreading news and information. We were really intrigued by some of the very early studies of Twitter uses and gratifications that basically showed that, in addition to the social elements of Twitter, people really were using it as a source of information. That contrasted a little bit with the much larger number of studies on Facebook, since it's been around a lot longer, that are showing that people primarily use Facebook to connect with their offline friends. And

there is an informational component there as well, but on Twitter it seemed to be a little bit more powerful.

We were also fascinated… I'm sure a number of you have read some of the Pew Research Center studies on Twitter use and just how diverse Twitter is. Particularly in groups that journalists have typically under-represented as, you know, sources of news, still under-represented in staffs of news stations, and also in audiences as well. Minority Internet users are more than twice as likely as white Internet users to utilize Twitter. One-quarter of all online African-Americans use Twitter. Minorities appear more likely than whites to identify social media as a really useful source of information about what's going on in their neighborhoods and also to get information about what government is doing, which of course is something that as journalists we take great pride in being able to do.

Also, Twitter use spans income levels. We see very similar levels of use among lower income groups and middle income groups. A lot of this is maybe because Twitter is, you know, its roots are kind of in mobile, even though many of us are also using it on laptops. And because mobile use has exploded, particularly among diverse populations, you know, that may be part of what explains why Twitter has been so popular.

We kind of went a little bit minimal on the slides here. I guess I could have put all these stats and stuff up, but it just seemed like a whole lot of text. So, I don't know, it's in the paper, but I guess your stuff with listening to me blabber without a lot of fireworks going on up here.

Then the last part was, I'm a professor at University of Memphis. We have a really diverse student body, about 50% African-American, and I noticed that a number of my students that were using Twitter, like the ones outside of my class or before they got in my class and I made them do it, were using it very heavily and in very different ways than I was. And I was just kind of fascinated by that, and I just really wanted to know, you know, what's going on here? They were on it, you know, 24/7, talking a lot with their friends, having these kind of public conversations with their friends online, using a lot of hashtags, just doing very different things than I typically did.

So, we decided to do a study. We started out with in-depth interviews with a number of students. Before we did anything quantitative, we really wanted to, you know, go a little bit more in depth and hear what the students had to say for themselves about, you know, how they are using Twitter. And then we used that to inform a survey. I should really give this sort of big caveat with this study. This is very exploratory. We are not drawing any conclusions here. This is primarily descriptive. I think there is any number of critiques that you could give to this study, because I think this is something that we hope to take further and study more. So, you know, we certainly can't make any definitive statements of, "This is how this demographic group uses Twitter." You know, that would be sort of ridiculous. But I have some quotes

that I'm going to share with you today, because I think it's really interesting to sort of hear what the students have to say in their own words about how they are using this device.

These were our three research questions. The first one was, how do young people ages 19-29 use Twitter? Oh, and I should mention we did these in-depth interviews with a sample of people that were heavy Twitter users. You know, they had to use it on a daily basis. So this wasn't sort of dabblers or people that just occasionally pick it up. The first probably top use, interestingly enough, confirmed sort of what I had informally observed. It was basically informal communication with others. Constant conversations throughout the day primarily with people they already knew. This kind of blew me away.

Several of the students that I interviewed said…I asked, "How many of the people do you know on Twitter in real life?" And they said, "85 to 90%," which is very different for me at least. I mean, a lot of you I'm meeting right now for the first time after following you on Twitter for a long time. Here's a couple of quotes to that effect: "So I like to post what I'm doing and keep up with my friends during the day or when we're at different parties." "Most of my posts are where I am, what I'm doing, or making funny comments during classes." So there's a lot of just this banter going on … probably during my class making fun of me, I'm sure. "She's loud!"

I tweet a lot, so I'm on there the majority of my day, because it just gives me—I don't know—it's enjoyment, but it's informational. And I love that I can interact and talk with people all day about common interests and common viewpoints all day. So I'm just generally on there all the time.

Hashtags are certainly big. Primarily using them as kind of inside jokes. Sort of a sideline here is a lot of these students seem to view Twitter as kind of a semi -- it's a strange public/private balance that they're setting here. They sort of see it as a place where they can talk to their friends out of the gaze of authority figures that have now kind of come and dominated Facebook. Their friends may know who they are, but the general public, their real name may not be associated with their profile, so they're sort of in this pseudo-anonymous space.

Certainly, 'fun and entertainment' showed up to be one of the big uses. Not surprisingly, following celebrities, talking about TV shows that they're watching. There was a little bit of professional networking, which I think is how a lot of us in this room use it, but not necessarily that much, but they did have sort of some sense that they could, you know, use it in their professional careers. These were mostly college students though, so they probably had professors yelling at them about that, so that could be partly why that was true.

And so you're probably wondering, well, what about this information thing? That's what you started out with. That's what you were interested in here. And that was definitely secondary to these students in these kind of informal connections, but the good news is that it was really important. They were interested in that.

Here's a couple of quotes from them. "People retweet the traffic in the morning." "I've clicked on several links. Several from Katie Couric. And I'm like, this is really cool. It's instant. It's right there in my face, so I don't have to find a television or a radio station. I've got my WiFi and my computer everywhere. I've got it right here in my hand, what I need. Even the Egypt stuff, it was constant, so I got an update. I knew what was going on." And also just finding out random things going on, on campus. They were using it for that.

For the second research question, are there any differences in how white to minority groups use Twitter? Well, again, very small sample. Can't make any generalizations. We actually asked the students that though to see sort of what they thought. Some of them said they didn't notice many differences. Some of them said they did. But they definitely felt like they had much denser networks and that in some ways they were using it maybe in a more informal way. One of them said, "I know it's kind of weird, but I see the black community here as like a family, and we all kind of eat lunch together. And we'll all go in on a certain trending topic or we'll make our own. We'll just come up with a trending topic and start tweeting. Like, there's a song called 'Shake Life.' And about two or three weeks ago, we were sitting there and we made UT Shake Life, and we talked about party life at UT. And then these other schools started making their own." "I eat at the UC about three days a week, and those three days we all talk about Twitter. But they're always funny. I never participated in a serious trending topic. It's all goofy." And another student said the same thing, "I feel like my non-black friends on there are really serious sometimes and don't know how to just mess. Like, they're always trying to accomplish something or get something done. They don't chill enough." So that's very informal. Again, you know, I wouldn't draw too many conclusions from that, but I thought it was interesting.

And the last part was, do students utilize Twitter to share news and information and engage with their audiences? Are they more credible to these younger minority audiences? And the answer was, definitely yes! This gets back to kind of what Vivian Schiller was talking about this morning when she said, she quoted the young Latino woman that said, "Sometimes news feels like a party to which I've not been invited." These students were very receptive to getting news on their Twitter stream, but they did feel like--and this was an actual quote, and I got really excited about this one, because this is sort of my instinct; it's nice when it's occasionally somewhat confirmed--"It would be a little more effective if journalists engaged with people more on Twitter and built relationships, instead of just that person throwing out articles. I know some people haven't picked up a newspaper in years. So I

think that if journalists were to get on Twitter, it would help keep news alive. Journalism is kind of dying. If people did that more often, people would feel like people had a closer relationship with the person delivering the news."

So I think they are very open to the idea of news in their feed, but they also, you know, it's an interactive environment. They are coming at it with slightly different expectations than they do a TV program or a print product. So not that journalists have to be sort of constantly going back and forth, but if they totally don't sort of respect that interactive angle to it, it's just not as credible to them. But they do see opportunity there, and they were all very receptive to it.

Jeremy is going to talk a little bit about the survey portion of things.

Dr. Jeremy Littau: Is this on? Yeah. Anyway, I'm here to give us a two iPad presentation just to kind of make this as late as is possible. Anyway, Carrie mentioned it at the top that we did a mixed-method study as part of this thing, so what I'm here to do is talk about just a little bit of data [that] we just started going through. We just got our hands on the first wave of data that we've been looking over, so I'm going to talk a little bit just briefly about what this means and what we've found. One of the first things that jumped out, based on the user group as a whole, and this is that college group, is they are actually reporting more engagement with the news as a result of Twitter. We had a five-point scale asking [them], "Do you strongly disagree to agree?" Looking at, "Do you find yourself using more news and self-reporting?" You know, whether they're using more news post-Twitter use versus pre. And we had a mean score of about 3.77, so they're mostly reporting a little bit more engagement with the news, which is kind of reflecting a lot of what we were hearing in the qualitative data.

Generally more national news. I would imagine, probably if we actually took a look deep inside, we didn't really ask questions about it, but we probably would actually find that it's maybe celebrity driven, but it would be interesting next steps for us to think about…but generally encouraging to look at the fact that they are reporting more engagement with the news.

The second thing though, is I think one of the highlights of what we're seeing so far in the data we're going through, is that we actually took the Rogers WMI (Web Motivations Inventory) Scale to look at their motivations for actually why these kids are using Twitter. What we did with this data was we actually looked along the usual uses and gratifications, theoretical ways of approaching what the psychological and social needs people have are for using media. Usually it follows the lines of entertainment, information, social connections and then some sort of commerce aspect. And there's a few other things that tend to break down. So we actually took the Rogers Scale and we adapted it for what we were going to do, to see if it actually fit.

So we ran factor analysis on the 18 items that we actually asked about and we had four factors emerge, four motivations that people tend to bring to their use of Twitter. The first was connectivity. That's the social connection thing that people tend to bring to media. Second, was information. So they're looking for information in terms of research. They're looking to have things come across their purview. Third, expression… that they can express their opinion. They can have it saying something, comment on the news, and so forth. And then the last was entertainment. They're looking for fun to pass the time. Things like that.

Here's where it gets interesting as far as I see it. We broke down analysis using independent samples, t-tests between African-Americans and Caucasians and their use along these four different motivations. Found no difference between the groups for information—excuse me—connectivity and for entertainment, which means that they're both using it roughly the same in our sample for social connection and to be entertained by the media. What we did find though was that we actually had African-American students in the sample reporting higher use for information and expression than their Caucasian counterpoints in our sample. We found statistically significant differences between those two groups.

So what this means—we're still thinking about it; I don't know. This is our next step to think about what this actually looks like. But we are finding that there maybe are some subtle differences between the groups in terms of the way they approach this medium, and there may be some other factors we have missed in this study that we actually have to go back and ask again. So I'll take a look at the qualitative data. But one of the things I do take away is this, is that—this is kind of related to the beginnings of our study—is that news organizations are trying to think about, how do we get younger readers into the system reading and consuming our content? And then how do we engage with them? And what we're finding is we have a group of African-American students we studied in this, we sample in this research that actually say they want the information. They want to be engaged. They're really interested in that stuff. And so we have an under-served community from our news that actually wants to do these very things that are goals in news organizations. I will let Kerry finish up, I guess, in terms of the conclusions you got.

Dr. Carrie Brown: No, I think that's good.

Cindy Royal: That's fine.

Dr. Jeremy Littau: Okay. That's it? Okay.

[Applause.]

Marcus Messner: …graduate students Maureen Linke and Asriel Eford. And I teach in our multimedia journalism graduate program at VCU and I also

teach a social media class there. And they were doing this as a personal project with me. Maureen is a USA-Today online producer now and Asriel is actually, well, after she was in Richmond, she went to Dallas here, and she's working in PR there.

This study also had initially a very exploratory approach. When we saw the terror attacks in Mumbai in late 2008 and that plane that Dale showed us in early 2009, we were thinking, how do we study this? What are news organizations doing? All these citizen journalists are reporting the news [and] breaking the news. And so the question that we had was, how are traditional media journalists adopting social networks, Twitter, and social bookmarking tools? Which I think are important to also consider when you think about how to engage on social media. How do traditional news organizations actually enable their audiences to share news content on Twitter, Facebook, MySpace, and all of these other platforms?

So, we believe that social media, social networks, social bookmarking are great tools to increase web traffic. You can promote news content, which Dale referred to a little negatively. You can promote news content, drive traffic that way to the website to do true breaking news coverage, not just linking to the website, but breaking and reporting news on social media, and then building and engaging community. And we just heard about that in the two previous studies. So these are the three areas that we wanted to look at, and we wanted to see what's the adoption rate of Twitter by traditional media in the U.S. And we started this in 2009 and updated this last year.

So, just quickly for Twitter, you probably know all of this: Five years old. 7th most popular website in the U.S., 9th in the world. And every chance Internet user visits Twitter somehow every day. You know about all of these international news events where Twitter and other social media had a big impact. So that really led us to this study where we wanted to find out, what are traditional news media doing? And how are they using Twitter itself? And how are they using social bookmarking? So, we wanted to know the adoption for social bookmarking. We wanted to know what's the difference between the different tools? So, what's the difference between Facebook, MySpace, [and] Twitter? And then, are there differences among different traditional news media in the use of that? [We] wanted to know how they adopt Twitter. And then, is there a difference in the use of Twitter among different traditional news media?

So, we did two studies. We looked at social bookmarking on the websites of the news organizations, and we looked at their Twitter feeds. So, first study, we looked at social bookmarking and we sampled initially the top 100 newspapers in the U.S. and the top 100 TV stations—five national news organizations in broadcasting and then 95 TV stations from the top 24 markets in the U.S. We only have 99 newspapers, because actually one of the newspapers went out of business while we did the study. You might remember *Rocky Mountain News* ceased publication.

So, we went in there in the spring of 2009 and then again in August 2010, and we wanted to see how these platforms were adopted. And then we always chose the lead story on every website and looked at the bookmarking tools there for the Twitter use. We initially couldn't look at all 200, because not all 200, 199 news organizations had a Twitter account. That's almost un… you know, we're two years later now. It's almost unbelievable to think of a news organization that's not engaged on Twitter. There's actually… the last time when we went back in 2010, there was actually still one local TV station that didn't have a Twitter account. And so we looked, in total, we looked at close to 2,700 tweets from the 199, 198 Twitter feeds.

We looked at the news value. I wanted to know, is the tweet news related or is there a personal communication going on? And then we also looked at the hyperlinks. Was there a hyperlink? And where were they linking? Were they linking to their own website or was there some community engagement where they were linking somewhere else?

So as you can see, adoption of social bookmarking for Twitter was fairly low in 2009, and we went in there for the first time after that plane landing on the Hudson, which was kind of like that moment where everybody paid attention to Twitter, but before the Green Revolution in Iran, which really put it on the radar for everyone. So 36.7% in 2009, and then 91-92% in 2010. So we're still not -- every tenth news organization still does not allow social bookmarking for Twitter by last year.

Everybody allows email. That was no surprise, but we kind of wanted to have that as a comparison. And then almost, for both years, almost all news organizations allowed social bookmarking in general, but just not for every platform. One of the platforms that was not allowed for in 2009 was, for example, Twitter. The tools have greatly increased—an average of 16 and then an average of 110.

And so, what's the difference for all of these different social networking sites? Facebook already had a fairly high adoption rate in 2009. It's almost now fully adopted. MySpace had a fairly low adoption rate in 2009 and then grew to around 60%. And Twitter, which had a similarly low adoption rate in 2009 and is now at almost every tenth news organization.

Now if we look at differences among traditional news media, newspapers and television—that's how we broke [it] up—if you just look at 2009 and you look at the row for television, the television adoption was lower in 2009 than it was for newspapers, but then 2010, you can see that the adoption rate for television is higher for newspapers. So television has really picked up in the adoption for social bookmarking during that year. And also, television stations on average offer more tools than newspapers today.

Okay. Then we wanted to know… We went to the Twitter channels, to the Twitter accounts, and we wanted to know, how are they using Twitter? And every tenth news organization had -- 90% of news organizations had an account in 2009, and now, as I said, only one local television station didn't have an account. The average tweets for the study actually went down, but there's a limitation to that result because we didn't go in for a very long time, so that might have been circumstantial. However, what we found—and I think that's something that you find with the average user—they all get account, but then what? Okay? So what we found on the time when we went in, that in 2009, during that time period, every third news organization did not tweet when we collected content. And in 2010, it went down a little bit, but still every fourth news organization in our sample did not have a tweet when we collected data. So there is still a difference between having an account and then actually using it.

So, what were they tweeting about? So, we were interested in, how much personal communication is there actually on these main twitter feeds? And as you can see, 94-95% and 96% for both years was news related and very few tweets were overall personal tweets where you could say there's actually an engagement going on with the audience. Most of the tweets for both years had hyperlinks. And as you can see, almost all of the links that we found in the tweets were all internal links. And by that we mean that they just went to the website, okay? So almost all of the tweets that we analyzed, close to 2,700, they were just used as a promotional tool—something that Dale mentioned before—promotional tool for content on the website. We found very little difference in the adoption trends for Twitter between newspapers and television. As you can see, they were all posts at around 90% and the other posts at almost 100%, and they had very similar trends for news value of tweets links. So there, we did not find a difference between newspapers and television. They're basically doing the same promotional thing when they are engaging on Twitter.

Okay. So, Twitter is fully adopted. That was not the case in 2009, but now it's fully adopted. But we think that it's not used to its fullest potential, and it's more used as a promotional and automated tool with basically internal linking. So news does not seem to be broken on Twitter in these main Twitter feeds, but it's more a promotional tool of news that is first reported somewhere else on the website.

So, most tweets still today—and that was a little surprising for us to find for the second time—most tweets are still shovelware. They are not stand alone tweets. They are not engagement of the community, of the audience. And we think that's something very important to consider, especially for younger generations who are used to engaging [and] communicating, and they are not getting that, at least from these 199 news organizations that we looked at.

And then we also found not, a big disconnect, but there is still a disconnect between, you know, you have this Twitter channel and you might be tweeting in that, but you're not even allowing—so 10% of the news organizations—you're not even allowing your audience from your website to share news stories on Twitter. That was something that also surprised us the second time around.

So we think more attention needs to be paid to community building and engagement in the social network, because I think especially younger generations are expecting that. They're expecting to have a conversation and getting some feedback. And shovelware, while that's natural that we're sending out news content on Twitter, there needs to be a certain percentage of the tweets that should have more of a community engagement.

Future research that I'm planning right now is a more long-term study to look at, over longer periods of time, how does the content develop? Where is the community engagement? Then, of course, one of the criticisms of our study that you can have is that we only looked at the main Twitter feeds and we did not look at, of course, individual reporter Twitter feeds, which potentially could have more personal engagement. However, I think it's dangerous for news organizations to say, "We're just going to have shovelware on our main Twitter feed, and we'll leave the community engagement to our reporters," because as you know, reporters move, they get new jobs and then they're losing. The news organization is in danger of losing that community engagement and having to rebuild it from the beginning.

Okay. That's it from me for now, and I'll be glad to answer all of your questions once we all move up to the front. Thank you.

[Applause.]

Elvira Garcia de Torres: Thank you very much. I'm really glad to be back in Austin to share with you the result of our research. This is a collective paper, as you can see here, on the use of social media by 27 news outlets from nine regions in Argentine, Columbia, Mexico, Peru, Portugal, Spain, and Venezuela. This is the theme. I would like to say their names, then I will go quickly on the rest, because they have worked a lot. Lyudmyla Yezers'ka from the University of Piura, Carlos Arcila and Elias Sayid from the Universidad del Norte, Pedro Jeronimo from the University of Porto, CETAC Media, Concha Edo and Loreto Corredoira from the Complutense University of Madrid, Alejandro Rost from the National University of Comahue, Miladys Rojano and Mabel Calderin from the Andrés Bello Catholic University, Ana Serrano from the [Universidad de Cantabria], and Jorge Badillo from the National Autonomous University in Mexico.

And what we wanted to do is define how social media, specifically Twitter and Facebook. I did some interviews here in Austin in September. And one thing I

heard is that the community managers quite well hope to use and have some profit from Twitter, but not from Facebook. And I think this is one of the questions that motivated our research. We based our approach, very quickly, on Cardoso and Castells and also Bruns and Rost. Cardoso's approach, "A fourth model of communication emerges as a reflection of the current information model: mass self-communication and computer mediated communication gain prominence." And as a result, we hear individual voices. We have to classify very fast our experiences, both the users and the journalists. Also, there are changes in the language. That is something that Mario Tascón told us. And we can see now the development of social, molecular, and storified journalism.

Here you have some examples of one of the most known individual voices now, which is Andy Carvin, as Vivian Schiller pointed out this morning. And here you have an example of symbiotic relationship when he asks the users to provide him subtitles to translate one video. There are many Andy Carvins. I met one yesterday, which is Klaus from *La Jornada* in Mexico. This is another example of individual voice who is tweeting today. Another example of social journalism, "Rockville Central Moves to Facebook on March 1." And as we heard a moment ago, an example of molecular journalism by CNN with "Open Stories."

Our approach is based also on the work of these researchers, you can see here, especially on their findings on participatory journalism and the use of social media. And particularly, there is one interesting question, and it is that the findings, overall findings, show there is little participation, and that the reason that the news media allow the users to participate is basically for practical reasons. So when we get to Twitter and Facebook, this is a question that remains to be answered, why would we use Facebook and Twitter? It's for practical reasons. Can't we do something else with it?

And the research questions are: What kind of information is gathered and delivered through social media? What are the opportunities and the risks? And how many resources are employed?

To ask [those] questions, we selected 27 newspapers from several regions in the countries I mentioned, three [per] country. We cannot do comparative analysis because there is a great variety and diversity in the sample. And here you have the rest of the sample from Spain, Venezuela, Peru, and Portugal. Then as for the methods, we copied all the messages posted on Twitter and on Facebook for one week in February. And we especially stressed or wanted to look at the conversational messages, which are here as you see in the table—greetings, if the media invites participation or requests information, offers help or contents, as well as informal messages. And specifically on Twitter, we also look to the messages that the media sent to particular users as well as messages by the users.

Then we did some interviews, 22 interviews, with the people that were in charge of the social media. Some things, as you can see there--the editors, then maybe there's somebody else--community managers. We only found two community managers and one social media editor. Though there are some people that are in charge of those functions, but they do not receive that name, nor do they want to, and always—excuse me—newsroom managers, the owner, etc.

Then as for the results, here the results on Facebook is that we found there is a selection of messages on Facebook. We quoted 1634 versus 3376 on Twitter. Also, conversational messages on Facebook represent only the 5.6%. And Median comments per message is just 0.4 and for "like" 0.9. Most of the messages published both on Twitter and Facebook are based on headlines, as you have heard before, and to a greater extent on Facebook. A majority of most commented messages were conative, the kind of, "What do you think? Do you believe that?" [except] for Spanish outlet *Deia*. And we found five newspapers, but just for the week we quoted, of course, five newspapers that engaged in conversation with the users on the wall. We have them here: *Rio Negro, Diario de Alcala, Hortanoticias, Más por Más,* and *Região de Leiria*.

We also wanted to see which kind of messages were more attractive to the audience in terms of commenting or "I like it." And as you can see here, the 5.6 conversational messages attracted 32% of the comments on 22.1 of "I like it." Meaning the conversational messages have more potential to engage comments, but also referential messages based on headlines are appealing. It was found that in one of the interviews somebody said, "Well, our competitors have somebody that manages Facebook the whole day," but our results are that they're around them [ranked] fifth, and we don't have bumps.

Then as for the conversational items, as you can see here, in Facebook, there are differences between Facebook and Twitter. On Facebook, as you can see, the highest number of conversational messages are the ones that tend to offer contents in a promotional sense, plus link; also to invite participation, plus link; invite coverage, plus link, which we can see there is interest to get people to the website. And for Twitter, it is different. As you can see here, there is not so much in redirecting people to the web. You know, the number of messages that are not headlines is very little both on Facebook and Twitter, but even so, you can see differences here. There are RTs with tweets, which means relations with the recognizing of the users, 71. Also, the announcement of live coverage on the web, 22, without a link; and invites participation, yes, with link, [20]. And one important thing for us, do the news media use Facebook or Twitter to ask for information? We thought that would be an interesting [question] or would be more pressing than it is actually. Request for content, we find only in seven messages in Twitter. And overall in the interviews, we found also that most of the persons that

answered our questions said that they expected more answers from the users than they actually got.

Here, you have some examples of asking for information. “Dear Reader, if anyone is near the fire at San Felipe, please share picture. Journalists are on their way.” “Any reader to report on possible fire in San Felipe.” “Send us your pictures showing the main roads in Barranquilla.”

As for the interviews, none of the respondents cited other tools than Facebook or Twitter when we asked them to hierarchize all of them. It was always Facebook and second, Twitter or Twitter, second, Facebook or just Twitter or Facebook, but hardly anyone said more than Facebook or Twitter. Maybe YouTube. And then they also said some inconveniences they found in other social networks. Nobody expected any benefit from the use of social media. Some even laughed, because what [do] they expect these benefits from the website, from social media? And we found those other were little resources devoted to social media. Though during the interviews, at least two of them said they were creating posts especially to manage Facebook, because they think Facebook needs somebody to conform participation, but not Twitter. Some are using YouTube or are exploring other networks, local networks. Foursquare is out of their minds.

As for the uses to produce news, some of the questions that appeared in the interviews were: The development of social maps, which means informal crowdsourcing, but not a specialized crowdsourcing. Basically, as you can see here, difficulties in the area of road closures, schools, etc.. Also for active search of information, which was surprising, because you have all those users that can provide information, and what you are doing is using the social tools to go to traditional sources. I follow certain accounts that are interesting to me, such as Judicial Information Center, also, for obtaining documents--meaning mainly pictures--especially from Facebook. Somebody said, “Facebook is fundamental for us; it has faces. And we need the face of the person who does something—won a prize or traveled.” For scoops and alerts, too. And it was repeatedly mentioned: fires, but also riots, strikes, food shortage, floods, building collapses and something out of range, which is politics regarding local elections. Also, to give service to the community, to obtain information, to provide stories and to promote their own events and to report live.

We have seen a symbiotic model of relationships regarding the users, not competitive. They frequently talk about the use as a source of help for them. They give us the information first. The citizens themselves become journalists. They work as informants reporting live, help us to know, or provide everything. In one case, they mentioned that when the reporter [went] to the place, the picture was not as good as the one as a user had sent, so they decided to use the user’s picture.

We found there are no rules regarding the use of social media in any of the 22 news outlets we had interviews with. I'm not saying this is good or bad. It's simply there are no rules, and there is no planning of the activities regarding social media. In some newsrooms, they just talk about who is going to tweet what, they decide, and if they don't agree, they ask a superior, for example.

In some news outlets, they are not allowed to tweet on their personal accounts. They have to tweet on the news media account. And somebody said—an editor—"Well, their personal accounts are their problem. We are not going to enter there. We have our official accounts. They can do whatever they want in their own accounts."

As for how they see Twitter, well, basically, it's immediacy and speed. And you can see here some of the questions that we heard. This is interesting. "I can send my Facebook followers my recommendation to read a report, and depending on when they connect, they can see it maybe within a week. However, a Twitter follower will see it straight away." Somebody said, "It's more mature." As for Facebook, [chuckles], there are conflicting views. For example, somebody said, "It's mostly entertaining," but another said, "It's our eye on the city." Basically, the most interesting, I think, part of the profile of Facebook is that it allows the news media to get to the specific user they want to get to. They said this was important for local news media.

The present for them is in Facebook. In the future, maybe it will be Twitter. Or, [these are] suggestions that they made of social media that would be interesting to them: Local communication networks, applications for mobiles, and also to have a network of sources, you know. I think some media are gaining some steps in that direction.

And finally as conclusions:

- Conversational messages are by now a drop in the ocean.
- The doors are wide open in some news media who urge the journalists to twitter and to post and not so much in others. There are no rules.
- Community managers are usually free to post. Nobody controls what they do. Sometimes or most of the time they don't know what they are doing.
- Some media do have a conversational profile, regardless of circulation.
- Twitter ranks high in immediacy. The selection on Facebook is higher and its best assessments are participation, reach, and images.
- Each news media has reacted creating teams (not many), turns, feeds (partial or total), or some just abandon, especially Twitter.
- At the regional level, training for journalists is necessary to ensure the quality. Some of the respondents made a reference to congresses they have been [to]. Sometimes it's the leader who goes to the

> congresses and then comes back and trains the newsroom. Somebody mentioned courses, and we think this is one of the recommendations we would do now for the local newsrooms—to train the journalists and to prepare the newsroom to produce news in a mass self-communication environment.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

[Q&A Video 1]

Cindy Royal: …Marcus and Dale. I mean, all of you mentioned that they're not using these tools to the best of their abilities yet and that it's mainly because you can't assign any revenue to it. They really want to see some sort of monetizing value to this. What are they missing out that you could say indirectly would affect revenue? Or even in a broader sense, like, what are they missing out then that you could articulate to these news organizations by not using these tools more effectively?

Dale Blasingame: I asked that question specifically to some of the stations. And the monetization was one of the main reasons why one station in particular said they just don't put a lot -- it doesn't put a lot of time into it. I think you're missing out on a connection with the community most importantly. You're missing out on story ideas. Twitter is a great source of story ideas as a journalist. And you're missing out on opportunity to build brand loyalty. So if you just simply choose to do nothing but an automated feed, I think those three things could potentially lead to ROI, if you want to use that term, in the future by people either becoming customers of your station or of your website, whatever.

[Q&A Video 1 ends. Video 2 begins.]

Marcus Messner: …connection problem with that generation. They're playing with their future and the connection to that generation.

Elvira Garcia de Torres: In the sample we studied…[inaudible]

Man: Do we have a microphone?

Elvira Garcia de Torres: What is the stuff? They don't talk personally to manage Twitter or manage Facebook, so they have to put their piece on. So it's not the questions that they do not see the opportunities, cannot get the document. Sometimes there are the journalists that use their personal accounts or go to the agent, "I want to tweet this. I want to do this on paper," but they do not have the means to do it.

Dr. Carrie Brown: I would just kind of remind them that there is some first mover advantage here. And I think when the web first came up, I think newspapers said things like, "Oh, we'll never monetize that. It's not worth it." I mean, I think sometimes you have to innovate early, rather than wait until you've found all those strategies. Because if you're missing from that space, it'll be too late in five years.

Cindy Royal: And you could miss opportunities. Like, you can't just start up one day when there's breaking news and suddenly, you know, have your Twitter followers. You know, I talk to my students about that a lot. We have questions from the audience.

Man: Hi. Since there was so much emphasis on different uses of Twitter, I'm curious. This could be for anyone, but I think primarily to you. To over-generalize, broadcasters have -- broadcast outlets have generally been more okay and more promotional about the personalities and the individualities of their journalists. Whether you're an anchor or whether you're a person on the scene, you know, that gets played up. Newspapers have traditionally been a lot more reticent about that with a few exceptions, like metro columnists and sports columnists. I'm curious if you're looking at newspapers and broadcast outlets on Twitter, whether you've seen any sort of carryover, in that broadcast Twitter accounts or broadcast employees or journalist Twitter accounts are more conversational, more personality focused than might be the case for individual newspaper journalists.

Marcus Messner: For my study, we only looked at the main Twitter feeds, so we did not look at the personal anchor feed, but sure, that's an issue. But if we look at the broadcast Twitter feed that's the main Twitter feed, that's not an anchor. That's a producer, a web producer that does that. So there's probably not that personality, that outgoing personality. Overall with this shovelware issue and not having the resources to do it, in our study, we looked at the top 24 television markets and we looked at the top 100 newspapers. We did not look at some random weekly newspapers to find that they are not doing it right. So this is the top news outlets in the newspaper and the broadcast business. So that's my point—[it is] so surprising to us to find that there is not much more going on than the shovelware.

Dale Blasingame: And I did look at individual accounts. And you know, there was obviously more personality in those. The chitchat, as I coded it, were much higher in that situation. I think you lose -- there is a disconnect between that and then official station accounts, but there doesn't necessarily have to be. I know Rob's here from the Statesman, and I'm not just saying this because I know him, but you get his personality coming out through the Statesman account. So there are ways if you have the right people in place or if you have anyone in place. Because in a lot of situations, there's just no one running it. You can have a personality through an official branded station account.

Joe Ruiz: This message [is] for -- or this question is for Marcus and Dale.

Cindy Royal: Identify yourself.

Joe Ruiz: Oh, Joe Ruiz with NOWCast San Antonio. For Marcus and Dale, I know a lot of us in here are probably against shovelware and against promotional tweets and think we should be better engaged, but are these stations doing it not just because they don't have time, but because it's actually reflecting in their base metrics? Are they getting the traffic that they're looking for out of it, or is this just something to say, "Hey, we're on Twitter"?

Marcus Messner: I didn't do a survey, so I did not talk to them. I just looked at their content, so I cannot really answer that question.

Dale Blasingame: You know, I don't really have an exact answer to that. I know that links do work, because that's the reason why people use them. And I saw a couple of comments on Twitter as soon as I sat back down, but I'm not saying all links are bad. There's a huge difference between an automated Twitter feed link, where the message is cut off halfway because it ran out of space, than a news station updating and actually providing content and then providing a link for more or sending you to a live stream or something like that. I made a calculated difference between those two and the updates were actually considered breaking in my study, so I think there are, you know, noted differences in how you handle links. It's obvious, like I said, I mean, I think it's a combination of a lot of things. Yes, it's an easy way to fill content on Twitter and make it look like you have a presence. And they probably do work to an extent, but, you know, a lot of people also consider them spam. I know I do personally. That's why I follow very few TV newsroom accounts, because I don't like when four people all web publish three stories, their three stories for the day, all at 5:30, and all of a sudden I get 15, you know, spam, what I consider spam tweets from stations. So I don't know if that answered your question.

Cory Leahy: I'm Cory Leahy. I'm in the Communications Office here on campus at the Business School. I was wondering if any of you looked at social media policies by any of these organizations. I mean, Dale, the differences between, say, WOAI and KSAT was just striking that WOAI is completely self-promotional and KSAT is very, very chatty, and how much of a difference that made.

Dale Blasingame: Yeah, in mine, I got to interview three of the stations. KENS didn't participate. KABB and KSAT were both more hands-off in terms of their policies. Their policies on both hands were basically, "Just don't be stupid." To their employees, "Don't say LOL or OMG. Just report as you would in a typical situation." WOAI's policy is that every tweet has to see a second set of eyes. So, you know, I know WOAI has its reasons for that, and it came back to something else, but I just don't know how realistic that is. I

think it probably just encourages people to not tweet, which I did see in a lot of numbers. I believe Marcus mentioned that several of these accounts just weren't active anymore, and I think probably about half of my accounts weren't active, so there is a lot of that going on.

Jonathan Groves: Jonathan Groves with Drury University. Dale, this is for you. I was interested in your study. When you flashed up your case study, you had scanner traffic being tweeted. There's always that push of immediacy versus accuracy. I wondered in the interview, did ethical issues come up about putting stuff out there so quickly even before it's been verified?

Dale Blasingame: Yeah, I asked them about scanner traffic. And I asked for their broadcast policy regarding scanner traffic and then their Twitter policy. And all the stations, you know, I think it's pretty much a general rule across the board now that you don't use scanner traffic on air. All three of the stations noted that…

[Q&A Video 2 ends. Video 3 begins.]

Woman: …no longer look at RSS and I don't have a Yahoo news page or any of that stuff. It's incredibly convenient. And I was just wondering, has anybody done any research into how often those kinds of tweets get -- the different kinds of tweets get retweeted? What does the audience really want? Because I would maintain there probably is an audience for that. It's just not all you need to do.

Dale Blasingame: Yeah, I would agree. I mean, you're living proof that there's an audience for that.

Woman: Well, I mean, you don't want to do it just for me --

Dale Blasingame: No, but I…

Woman: -- as much as I would appreciate that.

Dale Blasingame: There are many more of you out there, so, you know, that would be an interesting study to look into, you know, to track. He might have more information on that.

Marcus Messner: No, we did not look at that. But I don't think… We are not saying don't tweet about the news that you have and link to your website. That's not what we're saying. I mean, that's, of course, the main traffic…

Woman: Well, terms like shovelware seem to kind of indicate that it's majority.

Marcus Messner: Yeah, but that's basically what it is. From the website, we're putting it on Twitter. And before, it was from the printed paper, putting it on the website. So that's what we mean by shovelware, that there is basically just a promotion to the website. But what we are trying to say is that there needs to be something beyond [that] to actually engage the community, because what they are doing, at least from the sample that we looked at, there's no reaction to --

Woman: Right. Yeah.

Marcus Messner: -- to any questions, any comments from users, which I'm sure they are getting.

Woman: Right. Now, weren't you the one that used social bookmarking? Wasn't that one of yours? [No audible response.] What do you mean by that? Because we had a whole conversation…

Marcus Messner: Social bookmarking is when you—I probably should have explained that—but when you go on a story on a website, that you have a little sharing tool.

Woman: So, a share. That's a share.

Marcus Messner: Yes.

Woman: Okay, thank you.

Dr. Carrie Brown: It's somewhat anecdotal, but I just got back from the Kiplinger Fellows Program in Ohio State, and they had -- it wasn't really an empirical study, but they had at least ten different cases where they were showing follower accounts being much lower on the institutional account, and then they look at the personality and it would be higher. So, I mean, I guess that's not [on] a massive wide scale, but they had many, many, many examples where they saw that.

Elvira Garcia de Torres: One of our next steps is to do focus groups with the users. See what is happening to them when they want to answer [and] what kind of messages they would like to receive through Twitter and also Facebook.

Cindy Royal: We have a few more minutes for questions if anybody wants to make their way to the microphone. I have one more that I can ask Carrie, since people didn't ask Carrie too many questions. When I was reading your paper, I didn't get this, and maybe I missed it in your presentation, but how did you select your sample? I mean, I see who you got, but how did you say, "You're going to be in it. You're going to be in it. You're going to be in it."

Dr. Carrie Brown: Mm-hmm. Yeah, I mean, it was somewhat… It was to a certain degree a convenient sample. I mean, we certainly did it at each one of our campuses, which are all very different, by the way. University of Memphis, you know, [is an] urban campus, kind of a commuter school. University of Tennessee, [is] a big state school. Lehigh [is] a smaller, private school. But it was kind of a convenient sample with people we knew, students that we knew were really heavy Twitter users outside of our class. And then we'd also, you know, ask for recommendations from them of their friends. But then when we did the survey, we really also asked these students to spread it within their network so that we could get away from, you know--our networks are kind of biased a little bit toward all journalism students--people that are already like news interested, so we were trying to use them to kind of get it out a little bit further than that.

Cindy Royal: Okay, good. I mean, I think sometimes we have to use those kinds of techniques that are maybe not traditional to get at this first cut of the research. Yeah, to have a baseline, yeah. Okay, go.

Demián A. Magallán: Demián A. Magallán from El Universal Mexico. My question is for Elvira. As a Spanish researcher, what do you think about *El Pais'* strategy of constructing a system such as Eskup, which is a Twitter-like system, as a means of engaging with their audience? Do you think traditional media should be using this kind of a strategy:

Elvira Garcia de Torres: I'd like to say yes.

Man: Microphone.

Elvira Garcia de Torres: Does it not work? Oh, yes, it's working. Sorry. I would like to say, yes, why not? I think you should have your own network of users that can give your information to you. Because what we found when we did some other interviews some months ago is that somebody said to us, "Well, we have users that can have a picture, a good picture. Then they don't know how to send it to us." So if you have your own network and it's something that went out during the interviews, you have your own network. You have people that want to work with you. They want to work for you. They want to help you. So, why not? El Pais has Eskup and one other news media from our sample, which El Correo has also its own network for pictures. And they said they were receiving inputs from their own social network, not from Facebook or from Twitter, so maybe it works.

Jake Batsell: Hi. Jake Batsell from Southern Methodist University. Just to continue the conversation a little bit from earlier about the headlines and shovelware, just as an avid user of news myself, I don't mind headline tweets as much as I mind the dumping of tweets, you know, where it's the one guy in the newsroom, and that's the ten minutes he's got, and he just shoots them all out, and there's 20 tweets in a row from NBC News or Channel 5. That, to me, is just a personal pet peeve as a user. I see that less

with newspapers because it seems like newspapers, probably because they are better staffed, have had more experimenting with appointing a social media editor, who actually, that's either their primary overall duties or they are given significant time to do that. So, was there any discussion, Dale and Marcus, in your interviews and discussions with TV stations? Is there any prayer of the local TV stations appointing a person, like a go-to social media coordinator or editor? Or, because of just the small size of the local news staffs, is that not realistic to expect that?

Dale Blasingame: I think it's… I'll speak first if you don't mind. I think it's important that… I actually asked Mark Briggs that question, and he said that stations have some tough decisions to make when it comes to staffing. You know, do they hire three new reporters or do they hire two new reporters and a social media person? Or, you know, do they continue paying a sports anchor or a weather anchor hundreds of thousands of dollars? So those are the questions that stations are going to have to ask. You know, newspapers do for the most part have more staffing and usually do have dedicated people 24 hours a day to their social media account. So, you know, that's a definite advantage they have. And unfortunately, it does happen in TV stations. We're creatures of habit, where, yeah, before I ran out the door, I web published my five stories. And unfortunately, if Twitter was around—Twitter *was* around when I was in the newsroom, but if we would have been on Twitterfeed at that time, they would have all been dumped at the same time. And that was what I was referring to earlier with, you know, I think people consider that spam, as opposed to, you know, timed out tweets that do add some content.

Marcus Messner: I didn't interview. But with the news organizations that I'm working with and that I'm in touch with in Richmond, also which is a mid-size market, you know, they all have a designated person that's responsible for social media if they don't even have a social media specialist. If you have a webmaster, that webmaster should at least be able to continuously post to social media, just shovelware. But what we also found was that even now one-fourth of the news organizations that we looked at did not post when we looked at the content. Okay? So, at least get the shovelware out. So, but I think, you know, if you have a webmaster, that webmaster should be able to have a continuous stream, and not what I also notice from some news organization and I follow, [that] at 7:00 p.m. I get dumped with like ten messages, right, and nothing throughout the whole day, and that's not effective.

Dale Blasingame: The two stations that ended up doing a little bit better of mine both have people watching the accounts during the day. It's usually members of management. But when they go home at night, a lot of times those stations turn into, you know, automated accounts, which that's a lot of time when the dumping happens, unfortunately.

Dr. Carrie Brown: It seems to me, though, that's linked to your sort of whole mindset about using Twitter, if you see it as like a…

Dale Blasingame: A last resort.

Dr. Carrie Brown: You know, well, yeah. It's like my final product, you know, goes online.

Dale Blasingame: Yeah.

Dr. Carrie Brown: I mean, instead, like these students, like the ones I interviewed, I mean, this is like a… I mean, I'm not saying it's constant chatter for journalists, but, I mean, it's part of your workflow. Like it should be something you're integrating in what you do, not like at the end of the day. And if you're using it that way, to me, you don't really get it.

Dale Blasingame: And that gives a peek behind the curtain to the news process, which I think a lot of people are fascinated with. And that's one more way to possibly build. Viewers actually watch you if they feel like they connect with your station somehow, because that one reporter always shows us her cameraman, you know, and little stuff like that that may go a long way.

Cindy Royal: Anything else? Any other questions? I think we may have exhausted our questions for the day. So thank you very much to our presenters. [Applause.] And again, if you care to join us at Dog & Duck Pub, which is just a couple blocks from here, 17th and Guadalupe, even if you're going out to dinner later, we can break off into smaller groups for dinner, but come on down and have a little festive activity after this is over.

Rosental Calmon Alves: Excellent. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]