

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Day 2, April 20, 2013: Afternoon Session - 11:30-12:45 p.m.
Beyond Content, Beyond Audience Measurement

Chair & Discussant: Homero Gil De Zuniga, Assistant Professor,
School of Journalism, University of Texas at Austin

Research Panelists:

- **Heather Heater, Anita Ford, Jeremy Lyons, Brad Beckwith, Kris Miller, and Robert Bergland**, Missouri Western State University: ***Website Features of the Top 100 Circulation U.S. Newspapers***
- **Amber Hinsley** and **Samantha Johnson**, Saint Louis University: ***'Sharing' the News on Facebook: Exploring the Differences Between News-Sharers and Non-Sharers on the Social Media Site***
- **Thomas J. Johnson**, University of Texas at Austin, **Barbara Kaye**, University of Tennessee, and **Aimee Meader**, University of Texas at Austin: ***Accept NO Substitutes! Well, Maybe Some...: Online Political Information, Credibility and Media Substitution***

Robert Bergland: ...as Rosental would say.

Rosental Calmon Alves: Yes.

Robert Bergland: Hello. Ola to our Spanish viewers and audience members. To our Texas one, I guess, howdy. [laughter] Rosental told us guys we could leave our ties at home, but I have this beautiful fish wrap newspaper tie that seemed all too appropriate for an online journalism conference, so I threw it on anyway. I'm here representing my research team. They are about 10 degrees of latitude north and about 25 degrees of temperature south—[chuckles]—of where we are, so I made sure to rub that in on Facebook this morning.

Anyway, I worked with a couple of different research teams at Missouri Western. We've looked at college newspaper website and their features, weekly newspapers. Two years ago, I had the pleasure of presenting here doing a comparative study of all U.S. daily newspapers compared to other English-speaking countries. So, we compared the websites to Canada, UK, Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand. The impetus for all of those really was this Bivings Report study done in 2006, which looked at the top 100 newspapers at the time, analyzing their features. You know, did they have X, Y, or Z features?

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

And so, our goal here was to look at these newspapers and say, what has changed here in the last six years? So, we wanted to update that data as well as edit. [microphone noises] I'm going to have to change here. [changes microphones] Update the data to add a lot of features. The Bivings Report looked at 14 categories. And then also, to basically provide a baseline, so when we or somebody else does this study again in five or six years, that again we'd have kind of a comparison.

I won't go into much depth as far as the other research that's been done, starting in basically 1997, kind of an infancy of Internet newspapers. Some of the other ones that have been done include, obviously, Greer and Mensing's longitudinal study, Sparks, Young, and Darnell's Canadian study, and a big one was Russial's study which used survey method of the top 210 newspapers.

As far as the methodology, really there's two ways of approaching this. One is to do the survey method, as Russial did, surveying newspapers. The other is to do an actual sort of content analysis actually looking at these newspaper websites. And because the Bivings group did this content analysis, we chose to replicate that method so we'd have apples to apples.

And what we did is, the only change we really made was to use a two-pass system, so instead of just going through one data and one reviewer, we used a two-pass system, so we had two different reviewers going over the same websites a week apart to, again, ensure kind of a reliability of data.

So, we first did a pilot test to inter-rater reliability. And then we did, again, the first pass and second pass in October. Frantically scrambling to get the paper in on time. Thank you for extending the deadline. It was much appreciated. And then adding in, again, data from the second pass.

You don't care about the methodology and the lit review, [laughter], so let's go on to the results, okay? Going to look at some individual features and then kind of open up to the broad features and more comparison data. As far as the multimedia, what we found among the top 100 newspapers, and again [these are] ones found during these two passes. So that isn't to say the other newspapers didn't have these features ever on their websites, but during these passes, these features were not found.

95%, near 100% on video as one would expect, of course, of the top 100 newspapers. In addition, 74% had Associated Press video on their websites. 27% had either ownership or partnership with a local TV station and had that information on their website, had those videos on their websites. As far as hosting, about a quarter used YouTube to host at least some of their video.

Other multimedia features, as you'd expect again, almost 100% had photo galleries of one sort or another. Interactive graphics, we've talked a lot about

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

the data graphics, and these are, of course, generally HTML-5 or Flash graphics, 59%. We did a recent study of newspapers looking at the ones under about 20,000 circulation, that number was about 8%. So, you can see the bigger newspapers, as you would expect again, have much more in terms of interactive graphics. 58% audio, 53% had podcasts, and 38% had audio slideshows that either had music or interviews or voiceover, VOBs.

As far as interactivity, again, 96% had a comment section. We heard a great presentation the other day or yesterday about the Christian Science Monitor basically shutting down their comment section. 96% of the newspapers in the top 100 circulation did have comment sections. 87% had an easy link to submit a letter to the editor. 89% either had a link or the actual email address at the beginning or the end of the newspaper articles where the reader could contact the reporter. And 72% had polls.

A couple of other things. Again, as far as blogs, newspaper blogs, these are ones done by either the editor or a reporter. Again, almost full saturation. 96% of newspapers had this. Another about half hosted reader blogs on their sites. So again, a real nod to needing to engage the readers. This is more of a distribution feature, but email digest sent out was at 80%. Links to related stories at the end of articles, again, 57%.

Where it really became interesting was the comparison with the 2006 Bivings Report. And again, I'll show you just a few features, and then open it up to a more broad view. As far as RSS feeds, even though some people aren't using RSS, of course, as much as they used to, 76%, jumped from 76 to 96%. The big change was in registration being required for comments or to view content, and there you can see tripling. And that's going to get... I'll talk about that in a little bit. Video, you saw, was 95%. That's a big jump from about three and five back in 2006. And for the podcasts, again, jumping not quite doubling, as well.

As far as interactive features, 96%. It was a little bit lower, of course, in 2006. The most popular, and that's either most popular, most commented, most shared, most recommended, if they had one of those features, jumping from 33 up to 92. Probably a byproduct as much as anything of some more mature content management systems that address that feature. And this is where the big thing came in. The comments on articles in 2006 was 19%. And one of the things the Bivings Report noted in their study was that some of these — more newspapers had comment sections, but shut them down because of, of course, as we know and as was pointed out yesterday, all the crap that accumulates there and also worried about it affecting their brand by having some of these more vitriolic comments on their websites. But as you can see, a real recognition of this need to have comments to engage the readers, of course.

So, just kind of an overarching view, as you can see, a real change, all of these features jumping up. Some of them jumping up very, very

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

significantly. And the last two, the registration required and the comments on articles, of course, are a little bit intertwined as well, so using registration as a means to kind of regulate some of those contents.

So, just some quick conclusions. Obviously, interactivity is increased, especially in terms of the comments. Self-produced video, of course, increasing as well. And again, tied in with this move toward paywalls as kind of an intermediary step as far as requiring registration and being tied in with content, comments, again, nearly tripling. And of course, the changes as result of advances in the content management systems as well.

As far as future research, just a couple of quick things. Obviously, one of the things that we want to do is analyze and break down. We look in the future [for] paper to look at the social media, which was basically, of course, non-existent in 2006. Looking at we have about five categories alone just for Facebook and Twitter, how newspapers are using that. Looking at maybe breaking down the information by ownership and size. You know, are the top 25 newspapers doing something different than the lower 25? And as well as following up perhaps with surveys. You know, our study really showed kind of a 'what' kind of a state. Here's the state of newspapers here in 2012 and kind of following up more to get the how and the why. And of course, again, maybe to repeat the study in another four or five years.

So, thank you.

[Applause.]

Amber Hinsley: As Homero said, I spent four years here in the wonderful city of Austin, so very excited to be back ... until I got up this morning and remembered how much springtime wreaks havoc with my allergies. So, I'm a little slow today, so I'm going to rely on my notes more than I normally do. So, be patient with me.

So, I'm presenting this paper as part of some research I did with my research assistant Samantha Johnson, so I wanted to say thank you and congratulations to her as well. This is her first conference paper and first journal article publication, and she's probably mortified right now. So, we'll go ahead and talk some about our research. Like Homero said, [it] was on sharing the news on Facebook. We've talked a lot about engagement here, and so one of the things that we were particularly interested in was, how are news consumers engaging with news organization in terms of sharing the news?

We're specifically looking at Facebook. This is part of a larger dataset that included Twitter users as well, and of course, not surprisingly, we found that there are very different uses. People have different motivations for posting news links on those two different platforms. And so, we're specifically focusing on Facebook with this. And then comparing the sharers, people who

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

share news links on Facebook, versus those who don't. And so, that's kind of where we're starting from today.

So, with this, we know that news organizations know how many followers they have on social media and which stories those users are sharing. But what they don't know is the psychology behind news sharing, and so that was really the driving emphasis in our research.

And so, previous research has shown us that Facebook users who shared news links may be different from those who don't, but a lot of this research was based on general Facebook use and not specifically on sharing news links. And so that's why we said what really was missing in the research was this focus on the motivations for sharing news links and then insight on the habits of those people who don't share news links. You know, is there some way to convert them, so to speak, to news sharers?

If any of you have ever taken an introductory level or undergraduate level com theory class, you've probably heard of uses and gratifications. So, this is kind of where we started from. We were looking at this. A lot of the previous research that's been done on Facebook and link sharing in general has found that most of the motivations for using news really fall into self-enhancement, self-expression, as well as information sharing. And so we wanted to see, of these four uses, for uses and gratifications in media use, did any of these hold true when you're specifically looking at sharing news links on Facebook?

Our lovely research questions here, which really boils down to comparing — the first two are comparing sharers to non-sharers in terms of their news preference, as well as demographic differences. And then the last one then really looking at what motivates people to share news links via Facebook.

[We] had an online survey. This was drawn from a national panel of U.S. adults. And as I have this little notation down here, these demographics that we had in our study are very similar to ones that have been found in Pew studies of other social media users. I just kind of wanted to note that. We did wind up with a final in of 248. We did have to kick out two of the responses because they weren't technically adults, and so we had a final 248 was the number we were working from.

What all [these] numbers up here boil down to is, one of the first things we wanted to look at was, with news sharers, how often are they signing into Facebook? What are they expecting when they sign into Facebook? So, these [are] people who are news sharers as well as non-sharers. What are they looking to get from their general Facebook experience? And some of the things that we found were that people who are news sharers sign into Facebook more often than those who don't. And they sign in with this specific intent of looking for news. It's not just, "I'm gonna see what my friends are doing tonight," kind of thing. Specific intention to find news. They had a higher percentage and it was statistically significant. They also had more

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

friends on the social networking site than the non-sharers, and so this gives them more people to share news stories with and so maybe a little bit greater motivation to do news sharing of their own.

Non-sharers conversely were more pessimistic about the ability of news to find them on the site. And one of the reasons, again, behind that may be because they have fewer friends with whom they are sharing news and getting news from. And they maybe haven't developed a reliance on news organizations to deliver news through the social media platform.

Another thing that I wanted to point out real quick, too, was that the Facebook users — I'm sorry — the news sharers on Facebook believe that they can be well informed even if they didn't actively seek out news. This idea of news will find me. They were using Facebook, relying on Facebook for that at a much greater level than the news non-sharers were.

In terms of their preferences for their most valued news organization, one of the things we did was we asked them not to think about every news organization they've shared a news story from or that they rely on to get news from, because they have very different reasons for following different news organizations, and so we said, think of the one that's most valuable to you, however you are defining value, think of the organization that's most valuable to you. And then, what type of organization is that? And you can see from here that both with the sharers and the non-sharers the highest ones were broadcast news organizations, you know, local, national, and cable news, is what we found with that.

Then we asked them the range of activities that they like that their news organization, the most valued news organization, does on Facebook. So, this is more just kind of a general, you know, news organizations trying to engage with consumers in different ways. What do they like that these organizations are doing? And again, [we] compared it to sharers versus non-sharers. And so, what we found was that overall the news sharers had a greater range — they liked a great range of all of these activities more so than the non-sharers did. Non-sharers generally went to these news organization. What they liked was the very traditional distribution of using Facebook to push out headlines, to push out information.

And so as news organization managers, one of the warnings from this is you want to engage people who are your news sharers who are more likely to like some of the things you are doing beyond just posting headlines and news stories. But you've got to worry about annoying the ones who don't want that. Again, we talked a lot about engagement here, and we talk about the audience, and we want to keep in mind that the audience isn't this big, singular entity. That one of the things this is showing us is that you have multiple audiences within the big audience for news organizations. And some of them just don't want to be engaged or at least they don't want to be engaged yet in the same way that others do.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

And so, by no means is this a way of saying abandon any attempts at engagement. That's actually the wrong thing to do. But just keep in mind that you really have to balance those things. That people are coming to you for different reasons on Facebook and sharing news stories for different reasons as well.

And so, let's see, a couple of things I wanted to point out with this is that the news sharers specifically liked responsiveness to public comments on the Facebook pages, so they liked that engagement. And I was kind of surprised that they liked the promotion of contests and discounts, which in the focus groups we did to prepare for building the survey, that was something people complained about. But this group that we had, at least in the sample, liked some of those things.

Let's see, quickly, to go through this, because I've only got a couple of minutes left. News sharers also were more active in their engagement with the organization doing things like reading, watching the news we chose that were posted on the Facebook pages. They don't do it with great frequency, but they were more likely to comment on news material on the site or questions on the site — on Facebook, that is — and to comment on other people's comments on the new organization's page. Sorry, I just flipped that and not this one. That's what I was just talking about.

Quickly, with the demographic differences, news sharers tend to be younger. The non-sharers are more conservative and [news sharers] tend to be minorities a greater percentage than the non-sharers.

Motivations for sharing. So the two big ones we found from this were people share news stories because they use it as a way to maintain relationships and to help others and themselves. And so what this.... I'm making sure I'm on the right one here. How this is different from previous research is that this is really showing two primary motivations for sharing news stories as opposed to multiple motivations that we've seen in the past. So, what this again is telling us is that sharing news stories, people use this as a way to preserve the real-world bonds they have with people. And so having Facebook be a platform, that then they feel like that's helping them maintain or further their friendships and relationships in the real world, not just in the online Facebook world. And then, too, to reinforce their personal values and identity; whereas, non-sharers, I think, probably feel less compelled to use Facebook as a way to construct their identity and so [they] don't use news sharing in the same way.

Then we had this other interesting set of questions, which you'll notice nothing is bolded here. These actually are what we call cross-loaded between the two factors I just talked about—maintaining relationships and helping self and others. And so, what this says is that it's messy in people's minds in terms of why they are sharing news stories. And so, they are interrelated. A

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

lot of these questions that are up here, these are interrelated, and so it spans both factors, both needs that I just talked about.

And so for the future, what we want to do is look at ways that we can parse apart some of these motivations to be more specific and have more nuanced reasons for why people are sharing news stories on Facebook as well as then on other specific social media platforms.

So, big takeaways with this are that there are differences, obviously, in the news preferences with folks. Like I said, the news sharers are more confident in relying on Facebook as a news tool. They are more active in their engagement with their most valued news organization on the Facebook page of that organization.

Demographic differences. Something to be concerned about is the digital divide that may be happening here with some of the news sharers and non-sharers. That may be overcome as the non-sharers get more used to using Facebook as a sharing tool, a news sharing tool.

And then lastly, the idea that news consumers really have two basic motivations for sharing news links on Facebook, which was maintaining relationships and helping themselves and others.

And so, going on from there, we'll be anxious to take your questions at the end. Thanks.

[Applause.]

Tom Johnson: Welcome. As I said, for those of you, how many of you are from University of Texas here? Yeah! Again, I want to introduce my authors. Aimee Meader is sitting right there. And if you're wondering why I'm presenting rather than her, I don't know either. Barb Kaye really wishes she could be here, but unfortunately she had an illness in her family. Her margarita blender has a broken propeller, so she couldn't make it here today.

I really was nervous coming up after Amber, one of our esteemed alums, because I knew I couldn't be as interesting as Amber. I couldn't be as clear as Amber. But I figured with a middle-aged paunch, I could at least appear almost as pregnant as Amber. [laughter]

As I said, our paper [is] "Accept No Substitutes." What we talked a lot this session about [is] the decline in newspaper subscription, the decline in newspaper revenue. One thing we haven't really talked about much is the decline in credibility of traditional media, which has really reached a 20-year low. And by 20 years, that's the last time that it was measured by Pew. And again, there's perhaps several explanations for it. One explanation might be, again, the rise of alternative sources of news—talk radio, parody news, blogs,

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

and others, which may be taking time away from the news as well as reducing credibility.

I think this is so cool. I mean, when I was growing up, I would spend hours opening and closing the garage door. [laughter] And so, our big theory here is media substitution. Again, media substitution is the belief that if a new media comes along and can offer features that are better, more efficient than existing media, it will take time away from it. On the other hand, if they see the new media as serving a complementary function, then it may either increase time or at least not change time with the new media.

So, what we're looking at is, whether perceptions of credibility affect both time spent with traditional versions of traditional media, so we're looking at the print version and the broadcast version, after controlling for several other variables. And for us, when we're talking about alternative media, we're talking about political websites. So that could be anything from Huffington Post to sites that present issues, political blogs, parody news shows, like Daily Show, talk radio. And again, I won't go into all the characteristics of what categorizes alternative media, but certainly the fact that they tend to be powered by ordinary citizens. Obviously, that doesn't take — parody TV doesn't follow. They tend to challenge existing power structures. That doesn't mean they are calling for the overthrow of it. I mean, shows like Daily Show certainly are highly critical of government and the media. [They] provide a platform for views of a citizen group. [They] usually appeal to a niche audience. So, several other characteristics.

So again, our main things we wanted to look at is, to what degree do these alternative media reduce time spent with broadcast and newspapers, as well as, how did it affect their credibility?

I won't go into a lot on the study variables. I'll just talk about the first two. We've used for a long time measures of media credibility being believable, fairness, accuracy, and depth of information. Time spent with traditional media was measured really by, since you've used the Internet, has the time spent with traditional media — and it goes from great increased to greatly decreased. And so, skip over some of the other stuff.

When we looked at credibility... I should say this is an online survey of politically interested Internet users. And so, among our survey people, blogs and websites were a bit ahead of traditional news. Broadcast news was [at] the bottom with parody news. And so that in itself isn't a great sign. Another thing I didn't put up here that people said [was] that since their time going online, that three-quarters of them are spending less time with TV news [and] two-thirds are spending less time with the traditional version of newspapers.

When we asked the question, do perceptions of credibility of alternative sources of news predict credibility of traditional source, we did find that

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

among broadcast news, that both parody news and talk radio actually led to increased credibility of broadcast news, while blogs led to reduced credibility. And I'm hoping, as I said, one of the things, some of these I understand, some of these I'm baffled for. And so when you ask questions during the answer session, well, first I'll pass them all off to Amy, but also if I have to answer them, a lot of them I'll say, "Hell if I know why we got the results we did."

Again, though, we also found that parody news sites had a major affect on the credibility. Newspapers, it actually increased the credibility of newspapers, where political websites, political blogs led to lower assessment of newspaper credibility. In terms of time spent, actually very similar results. The higher level of credibility of parody news and talk radio led to spending more time with broadcast news, and [credibility of] parody news led to more time spent with newspaper. Political blogs led to less time spent with newspaper.

So, kind of a summary. Political websites didn't do a lot, while parody news really increased time spent with broadcast news, reading papers, increased the level of credibility. Talk radio didn't have much of an affect of newspapers, so it doesn't act as a substitute, so talk radio credibility did increase time with broadcast news.

I'll first talk about a few of the kind of importance of the study. One of the things, the whole theory of media substitution is premised on the idea that if media are similar and one offers one better, then you'll spend more time with it. We found that blogs.... I mean, if you look at blogs, you look at newspapers, you look at broadcast TV, they don't seem to have very many similarities...yet. And indeed, it was taking time away. But still then we decided, okay, talk radio, it's leading to more time with broadcast news, more time, more credibility. Why is that? Hell if I know. [laughter] That's one thing. But it did show that.... One of our results showed a premise of the theory that they have to be functionally similar to take time away. We didn't find out that was the case that we had functionally dissimilar media that were taking time away from traditional media. So really, we didn't find a lot of support for the media substitution theory, but I thought we had some interesting results.

Amy, if I finish early, do I get to keep one of the cards there?

Rosental Calmon Alves: No.

Tom Johnson: No? Well, then, hell, I'm gonna take all the time I want then. [laughter] Some limitations and suggestions for future studies. One of the things, it may be that we were looking at things the opposite way. It may be that because of drops in credibility in time spent with traditional media, that might be boosting the credibility of the alternative sources. So, and one of the problems that was clear is we never knew.... You know, we used media

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

in general, so we don't know exactly what they're responding to. For political websites, where they're responding to Huffington Post, or for the traditional newspapers, The New York Times, we don't know. And so actually, what we have done in some later studies is look at specific media rather than just broad types. And again, so, you know, I think certainly we could include additional sources of political information. In fact, we have included in other studies social media. Also, news aggregators may be a possibility. We could also look at, for instance, steal from Amber's idea [and] look a lot at motivation and how that affects the credibility.

So, how much more time do I have? One minute? OK. So, if I want, I could stand here for a minute or I can end here.

Rosental Calmon Alves: You can stop.

Tom Johnson: Oh, I can stop. OK.

Rosental Calmon Alves: All right.

Tom Johnson: Well, thank you.

[Applause.]

Homero Gil De Zuniga: I guess that my role.... I was invited here today to, I guess, introduce the panelists and also be the discussant of a session. I don't know if you're completely familiar as for how other research conferences use the role of the discussant, but usually it's for me, my chance to rebuff all the papers and say what they're doing wrong and so on, so forth, which I can do. No. I'm going to do very slightly that role, but more than that, what I would like to do is to provide one overall holistic vision as for why I think it's important that they are conducting this sort of research, number one. Number two, I think if I provide that sensitive, non-useful critique, it wouldn't be that valuable today, because all these papers have been already published in the ISOJ Journal, so I don't think it would be very valuable to continue this line of research. In addition to that, I think it will be very useful today to learn about how can they farther develop their research agenda and their line of research. So, I'll take just a few minutes and then we'll go to a Q&A session. I think we'll have plenty of time to do that.

These papers, in my view, they relate to one important aspect. If I try to find a common ground as for why they are important and why they are doing this kind of research, it's that they all relate to this idea that the field is rapidly changing. We know this. You've been exposed for a couple of days now to a variety of reasons as for why the field is changing and technology is affecting this change. They are conducting efforts to understand or further understand in part why technology is so influential and in which manner technology is very influential. So, that's the common ground for the three papers.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

For the first paper, Robert [Bergland], what I find fascinating is, not many times [do] researchers take the opportunity to pass for a minute, go and look back [at] what other papers have found previously, and then try to compare data to see what things have changed and why are those changes important, if at all. And they did so, so I commend them for doing that. They realized a number of features that have evolved with time, and they have identified things as far [as] where is the field going and journalism is going when they are handling information.

My suggestion for future research would be, first, as you compare data across the studies, the percentages themselves were very revealing. I think they tell a story by themselves. However, you need to do and conduct more stringent analysis to realize whether or not those differences are statistically meaningful or important. By just looking at it, without knowing the specifics of the 2005 study, I was able to realize that most likely many of those differences, particularly when it came to interactivity, they were statistically significant. But you may need to conduct a more stringent test, like I don't know, like a presumed high score test, no parametric test, to really compare the difference of the percentages whether or not they are statistically meaningful.

As a suggestion for future research, and I think this also works for the rest of the papers, is the idea of we being passionate and taking time to explore and analyze what's going on. But I think we need to start taking time now to realize the powerful and the potential of, with this, what's going on? Understand what's the influence of that? What's going on [with] the audience? For instance, these differences in interactivity, what are the effects of those interactivity changes on the audience? Do they learn more about the information that new media outlets release to them? Are they really learning? Do they reflect on those stories and information they learn about? So, perhaps in the future, you can contrast survey data and analyze whether or not we are increasing by introducing these changes in the industry. Whether or not we are increasing our task of informing the public and becoming better informed. So, that would be one of the suggestion I have for you.

Let me with this move to the second paper by Amber Hinsley, et al. I think it's a phenomenal paper. And I say this because I think to some extent she has continued to develop the line of research. I worked with her when she was here, so it's a great area of research. [laughs; audience reacts] I found that the paper [was] very interesting as well and very fascinating. And again, I think you conducted a very solid analysis, statistical analysis, to see where we are in terms of why people share information or do not share information on Facebook. I would commend you and encourage you to continue this line of research and understanding, what are the implications of the result?

In the first paper we did together, we understood what were the differences between the public and the journalists themselves on certain information and why that was important. I would encourage you to do the same on, what are

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

the implications of this? I think you have a... It's a great, phenomenal, explorative analysis to understand that there are differences, but why are those differences important? I think you could devote a little bit of time in parsing that out in the near future.

And last but not least, thanks for the extra minute.

Tom Johnson: Yeah.

Homero Gil De Zuniga: That's why I can talk. [laughter]

Tom Johnson: Yeah.

Homero Gil De Zuniga: Tom Johnson, et all, Aimee Meader and Barbara Kaye, who I hope is fine and the blender is okay.

Tom Johnson: Yeah.

[Laughter.]

Homero Gil De Zuniga: But this paper, one of the things that I found fascinating, although he based or they based theoretically this paper on the idea of time display and theory and whether or not consuming some media outlets or some sort of information will take time away from consuming from other places, and I think it brilliantly works, it will be much more useful, in my opinion, to also take a look to the idea of media disassociation. And that's in part what you were saying, "Why this is happening, I don't know." I think you might be finding that you know with that one. It's the idea that not only if I consume blogs, I will tend to consume less TV, but whether the idea that I'm consuming blogs actively because I want to do so, and what are the implications of me doing that? I'm doing that because I'm getting disassociated from mainstream media. I do not believe the information is as useful as it should be. There are a number of things that might explain why I'm moving away from mainstream media. That's why one of the reasons is what you're finding, that in fact the more credibility I have in blogs, the less credibility I will have in mainstream media, obviously. That's why I'm moving away. So there is a nice line of research within the framework of media disassociation and what are the implications of using different media. I think it would be much more valuable for you to move forward your research based on that and you'll find explanations for why these things are taking place.

I hope I gave you just a little hint of what you can do and I didn't rebuff much your papers, because I found them interesting. And they have been already published, so congratulations on your publication. And with this, I would like to open a Q&A session.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Q&A Session:

Homero Gil De Zuniga: Hopefully somebody is very interested in asking a few questions to our wonderful panelists here. Anybody. Should I get it started, maybe.

Robert Bergland: No, we got one.

Homero Gil De Zuniga: No, we got one, okay. Go ahead. I like to ask questions.

Question: So, multi-screen is an interesting new phenomenon that I'm not sure was reflected in research I saw today. So, you know, particularly in people of a certain age group, the idea that they are usually on two to three screens at a time. It seemed to me that a lot of the research was positioned as an either/or proposition, but have you guys started to take a look at multi-screen and whether that's going to create a rebound effect for certain news brands?

Amber Hinsley: That's actually something that I have planned for the next study that I'm doing in looking at how are people using Facebook not only to share news but then to talk about it, using Twitter to share news as a multi-screen experience. Because that is something that even when I conceptualized this study a year ago, when I started putting it together, that wasn't the phenomenon that it is now. And you just see that continue to grow and understanding—again, we talked so much about engagement here—understanding that that's now a big way that people, especially of a certain age group, are interacting and engaging with news organizations and information in general, especially so. And actually from the dataset that I have, I've actually broken that apart then of the news sharers, looking at sort of young versus old and the very different [motivations]. And again, even within those two groups, their motivations for sharing news are so different. And so continuing to look at those things with the idea that multiple screen also plays a factor in that.

Homero Gil De Zuniga: Wonderful. I was tweeting. I guess that I don't have to do anything here any longer. [laughter] Perfect. You want me to stay there and tweet at the same time? OK. [laughter]

Brian Barrish: Barrish. Brian Barrish, University of Texas. Question for Amber and Tom and Aimee. I noticed that, Amber, your study showed—correct me if I'm wrong, if I remember wrong—but it looked like broadcast news was a favored news source for a lot of folks. And then Tom's study found broadcast news to be tied for least credible news source. Now, I realize you're using different methodologies and different populations, but I found that kind of suggestive, and I wondered if you had any thoughts about that particular juxtaposition.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Amber Hinsley: Well, you said that you found it suggestive. What did you find it suggestive of?

Brian Barrish: I just, well, it suggested to me that I ought to think about it some more. If there's enough of an overlap between your populations and your methodology that there are people who turn to broadcast news a lot, but don't really believe it, but don't really put much credence in what it says, then I'm wondering where are we — what does that mean? Does it mean anything? Is that something we should investigate more? More specifically.

Amber Hinsley: I would say one of the things I think is important to keep in mind is that, like in my study, I was asking, what's your most valued news organization on Facebook? It's not your most valued news organization overall or what do you see as most credible. But for whatever reason, that's what people see on Facebook, whether it's because their broadcast organizations have been generally about updating frequently on Facebook or interacting, engaging in better ways or ways that their viewers, their audiences want. Versus Tom and Amy and Barb's study, which wasn't specifically asking about Facebook. And so, you might want to talk a little bit about that.

Tom Johnson: Yeah. I'll say one of the things I think we looked at politically is the online users. And we were asking about in this study, particularly, traditional media use versus looking at newspapers online. So, I think that our traditional media were at a disadvantage in this study. So as I said, I think a lot of it is just the difference in methodology had a lot to do with it. But, I mean, I do think, certainly, there's a lot of evidence that as people go more and more online that they are having less and less trust in traditional sources of news.

Robert Bergland: I think one of the things that really surprised me is not only was broadcast the highest, but it was like, you know, 31% to like 6.

Amber Hinsley: 9.

Robert Bergland: Yeah, like 9, so it's like tripling. I wonder, you know, for me, I think maybe that's a byproduct of videos. That people are latching on to the video links that the TV is posting, and maybe, of course, obviously the newspaper is not doing that as much, so...

Amber Hinsley: Well, maybe, too, there may be a carryover effect where traditionally broadcast journalists themselves are much more engaged on Facebook than are print journalists and other types of journalists. And so there may be a little bit of carryover effect with that with people valuing the organization. Because I asked them about organization not individual journalist, but that people kind of see those as nested together. And so

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

because I interact with this journalist some on Facebook, I therefore value their organization more.

Homero Gil De Zuniga: If we don't have more questions, I think we're going to....

Robert Bergland: No, we've got that.

Homero Gil De Zuniga: Got more. OK. One gentleman right there.

Robert Bergland: Jake, you're standing between these people and lunch.

Jake Batsell: Sorry. Sorry. I hope it's an interesting question. Jake Batsell from SMU in Dallas. Question for Tom. For your study, when you found credibility to be equal between broadcast news and the parody programs.

Tom Johnson: Yeah.

Jake Batsell: I'm wondering in the way the question was worded, was it that the people trusted the credibility of the facts that were being reported or just sort of the essence? They kind of agreed with the credibility of the opinion that someone like John Stewart was giving.

Tom Johnson: Yeah.

Jake Batsell: I mean, were people actually saying they trusted John Stewart for the facts or they agreed and trusted his interpretation of the facts?

Tom Johnson: That's a good question. I mean, our measure, again, it's a broad measure. We asked about parody news and we asked to what degree. So, we asked about the media rather than the individual. So, it isn't a source credibility study. We asked about accuracy, depth, fairness, and believability. So, again, these are perceptions. So, it does suggest that they.... And again, I don't.... In some studies, we have actually broken it down among the five. We didn't do that here. So, for instance, if I remember, usually, for instance, in depth of information, parody news does usually pretty good, because it often goes beyond what you see in the news.

Jake Batsell: Thanks.

Tom Johnson: You're welcome.

Homero Gil De Zuniga: I think we're going to wrap up with that. Thank you so much for coming and making this presentation.

Tom Johnson: Phew! We survived!

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Homero Gil De Zuniga: Muchas gracias. Thank you.

[Applause.]