

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Day 2, April 20, 2013: Afternoon Session - 4:15-5:45 p.m. Innovative Approaches in the Global News Ecosystem

Chair/Discussant: Mark Deuze, Associate Professor, Indiana University, Bloomington

Research Panelists:

- **Paromita Pain:** *Finding Their Voice: Examining Some Internet-Based Initiatives that are Changing the Face of the Indian Media Industry: An Exploratory Study*
- **Donica Mensing and David Ryfe,** University of Nevada-Reno: *Blueprint for Change: From the Teaching Hospital to the Entrepreneurial Model of Journalism Education*
- **Philip Napoli,** Fordham University, *Revisiting the Church-State Separation: A Comparative Consideration of the Effects of Advertiser Pressure on Traditional and Online Journalism*
- **Jake Batsell,** Southern Methodist University: *The 'Original Platform': How Newsrooms Build Digital Loyalty and Generate Revenue through Face-to-Face Engagement*
- **Ahmed El Gody,** Orebro University, Sweden: *Diffusion and Use of ICTs in Egyptian Newsrooms: A Longitudinal Approach*

Paromita Pain: Why thank you, sir. My name is Paro, and today I am privileged to share with you some very unique media initiatives that are making a huge difference in the way the media is working and shaping up in India. Now, before we get into that, some background information which I warn you is not pleasant.

The Global Media Monitoring Project Report has said that 22% of the women journalists in India, in radio, television, and print, is just about 22%. Reiterating this research is the Washington-based International Women's Media Foundation that women were best represented in Europe and the worst in Asia.

But a slow transformation is happening over the Indian sub-continent. And this change is happening not in the glitzy boardroom of the nation's most influential English dailies or television networks, but in the deep rural interiors, where sometimes schools and toilets might even be hard to come by.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Facilitating this change is the ubiquitous mobile phone, which in India has risen by leaps and bounds in the last few years and which has facilitated access to cheap, fast, and reliable Internet connectivity.

The three initiatives I will discuss here today include the Khabar Lahariya newspaper, the CGNET Swara, and the WAVE Program. These three initiatives are striving to break new ground in perhaps the toughest market demographic in the world. And the best part is that they are tasting success.

We look at the CGNET Swara Project first. Now CGNET Swara is a very special project. Not just because it involves the very audience for which it makes its news in producing that news, but because it also ensures that the news and the audience understand what being tribal, unwanted, and displaced is all about. It works on essentially a very simple premise that content is most effective when produced by those who are its most immediate audience. CGNET Swara's coverage today has ensured that it is more than just media working along the principles of being media for and by the people. Resource-poor women are trained to record daily life here on their mobile phones, which are then uploaded onto a server, fact checked by a group of professional journalists, and then broadcast.

The next project on the agenda is the Khabar Lahariya newspaper. Now Khabar Lahariya is a completely women run newspaper aimed at local women. It has a staff of 12 women reporters from very marginalized communities, you know, like the Dalit, Kol, and Muslim communities in the Banda District of India. It's written in Bundeli language and it functions as a weekly. It is news of politics, and most importantly, it has news and features that is of immediate interest to its female reading public. It's Internet edition needs work, but the group is working on it to strengthen it and ensure that it reaches more women.

Now, Khabar Lahariya means 'news waves' in Bundeli. And it's got an interesting story. Khabar Lahariya actually was started with a group of women who didn't even know how to write more than their names. They were trained to read and write. And today, as reporters, writing daily news stories has not just made them more aware people, but has also polished their literacy skills.

The next project I'd like to talk about is the WAVE Project. WAVE stands for Women Aloud: Videoblogging for Empowerment. WAVE was designed to be a digital platform for young Indian women to voice their perspectives on issues of importance to them. Now, no media organization decided the importance. It was entirely personal and left to *these* women to take the decision on what issue they would like to speak or write about ... or rather, in this case, make video blogs about.

Now, WAVE first started in 2010, and their very first 11-day training session saw women from 50 states of India come and join. They had over 50 women

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

coming in to take part in sessions that included video blogging, scripting, camera work, editing, animation, and other program-based and creative workshops. After the program concluded, 30 women representing their states to make videos regularly were given a mentorship for a nine-month term. The participants were mostly selected based on commitment level, media background, community involvement, and income level. Of course, low income women were given priority. The participants were provided the equipment, the training, and most importantly, some spending money.

Now, why was this issue of spending money so underlined and emphasized? Low income women who had joined WAVE programs had actually left daily jobs, paying assignments, to come and be a part of this program, and WAVE wanted to make sure that they were not a drain on their resources.

Now, these three initiatives are only three among a lot of other initiatives that [are] happening in India at this time. And a quick study, a quick overall view of the women who've joined actually stunned us journalists when we went out to speak to them. These women have joined of their own initiatives. They've been given some training sessions, but mostly they joined because they believed they could make a difference. And once they figured out that it wasn't rocket science, their enthusiasm actually saw them through.

But these initiatives are in danger. Funding is one major issue. While newspapers pick up and often broadcast their stories and pick up ideas, they are yet to start paying for this content. Once maybe they start paying, the majority of the funding issues might get a little bit of reprieve. While these projects may be looked at in the light of the many citizen journalists initiatives in India today, the kind of change the reporters have brought about in their communities make them truly special.

To say that these women have overcome enormous odds to be where they are would be a massive understatement. Their work is the best testimony to their grit and courage.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

David Ryfe: Thank you for having me. It's been a great conference. Donica Mensing, my coauthor on this paper, is really the brains behind this particular project. I've just been tagging along really and privileged to do so. You should know though that that's not going to stop me from hanging that nice plaque I got yesterday on my wall in my office and telling everyone I know about my paper. That's just the way I roll. [laughter] And Donica knows this about me. She's watching on live video, so she's not going to be surprised by that.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

So, this is really a paper trying to reflect on a situation of American journalism schools. There are about 500 journalism programs, a little over 500 journalism programs in the United States. Slightly over 100 of them are AEJMC accredited. And we've just spent two days talking about all the disruptions in journalism. Well, think about what that situation means for journalism schools. We're used to teaching what is known. And apparently, we don't know a whole lot about the future of journalism, and so that means that we're not quite sure what we should be teaching.

And every journalism school in the country is having this conversation and tried to muddle their way through. I've talked to several people here and asked them what they are doing in their curriculum, what they're telling their students in terms of jobs and employment, etc., etc., and they all have a spiel, because we're all talking about the same things.

One of the — one strand of thinking that's become quite popular in the last few years is the idea that J-schools could transform themselves into what are called teaching hospitals. All right. So, a teaching hospital metaphor for the future of journalism schools. The idea was first coined by Nick Lemon in an article he wrote in 2009, but it's really associated with the Knight Journalism Foundation. Eric Newton, in particular, has written quite a lot about the teaching hospital metaphor, and we've read that with great interest.

It helps that ASU, the Cronkite School, is really just down the road from us in Reno. And they've really embraced that concept and implemented it in their school. And we've toured their facilities and looked at what they're doing. It's very impressive. Their students hold daily broadcasts, for instance, broadcast news program daily. And they also have a Washington bureau for the school that they send their students to, to produce news.

Now j-schools have always had their students producing news. The difference here is that we're really going to set up a production operation inside the school—a real production operation inside the school—and in part, to replace all the news that's being lost from the diminished newspaper. And so that's one of the animating thrusts of this idea. And because the Knight Foundation is behind it and we're always looking for money, because the ASU Cronkite School is interested in it, we really perked our ears up and thought, well, you know, does this apply to us? Is this something that we could do? And if it is, how could we implement it in our school?

And the first thing we had to think, of course, is whether the teaching hospital metaphor applies to us, and we quickly learned that it really doesn't. We consider ourselves an average journalism school. We have about 450 majors. We have about 12 to 15 instructors. That's probably about average. Maybe a little on the small side for j-schools in the country.

Teaching hospitals require an enormous investment of knowledge and labor and money. They closely resemble the workplaces where their students will

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

work. By the time students get to teaching hospitals, they have at least a four-year bachelor's degree and some of them have a lot more than that. They've committed themselves to a profession that's going to reward them greatly when they get their degree in terms of social status and in terms of their income.

Almost none of this describes the average j-school. We focus on undergraduate education, right? We work with students who take only a handful of journalism courses in their career at the school. And as an accredited institution, they are only allowed to take a few journalism classes. Most of their classes are in the liberal arts.

Compared to teaching hospitals, j-schools don't have nearly the level of investment of capital or labor. Most of them are in state universities. And if you think that journalism is being disrupted, you should see the state of public higher education these days in the United States. Most of our students don't have nearly the commitment to the profession that medical students do. Many are undecided about what they ultimately wish to do. Their prospects for a stable career are pretty low. So in all of these ways, you know, an average journalism school really doesn't reflect a teaching hospital.

Now, we think that advocates of the teaching hospital model probably know this, but we also suspect that they're drawn to the analogy nonetheless for symbolic reasons, if nothing else. The notion that journalism is like in some essential way the medical profession is deeply attractive to a profession that is unraveling as we speak.

As we see things with the teaching hospital now, we propose that j-schools ought to sign on to the task of helping the profession reestablish itself in its former role. And the fact that the newspaper industry is in many respects imploding [and] sends people to j-schools precisely to save the profession by using them to fill in the gaps in news coverage left behind by diminished newspapers.

Now, this might be a fine role for j-schools, and we think that some j-schools could actually accomplish this; particularly, some of the larger, more prestigious j-schools. But journalism isn't a settled profession any longer, as we've been discussing over the last couple of days. It doesn't have widely agreed upon norms, practices, or roles. It's a highly disrupted profession. And it may be time for j-schools to pivot away from socializing students into a profession that increasingly no longer exists and teach them how to be more open and to examine some of the assumptions that are embedded in that model.

The idea that journalists ought to be separated from their publics, for instance, like a doctor is separated from his or her public, might be questioned. Or that the work of journalism as a delivery system is to deliver content, we could think through that. Or that newsrooms garner authority

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

based on brand and institutional history, that could be put under some serious interrogation.

So, these ideas sent us off in search of other alternatives, and we landed upon the idea of an entrepreneurial model for journalism education. There are lots of places around the country that are engaging in entrepreneurialism. You see it in the CUNY system, for instance. You see it at ASU. ASU is big enough that it has a little entrepreneurial section in its school. There are lots of people who are advocating this. But if you read the literature and kind of look at what they're doing, they really haven't articulated the underlying assumptions of this model very well. And that's really what our paper tries to do.

Some of these assumptions are that journalism ought to look forward rather than backward, to embrace change rather than resist it. The assumption that journalists must adopt new values, practices, and identities, etc., etc. So, the entrepreneurial model would change journalism education in many ways, we think. And it's one that I think a school of our size, an average j-school, could adopt. It would mean most of all that j-schools privilege reflexivity over habit and experimentation over drill and practice. Now, we mean this in an expansive sense.

Oftentimes, when we think about entrepreneurialism and journalism, you're thinking about the creation of new products or the invention of new businesses. We think that entrepreneurialism can be extended across journalism. You could, for instance, think about it in terms of inventing new practices in storytelling, or new relationships with citizens, or new practices in traditional newsrooms. Certainly, an entrepreneurial perspective would lead j-schools to focus much more attention on the demand side of news as opposed to the supply side of news where the teaching hospital model would take us. And it would lead away from tried and true institutional networks and toward building new forms of social networks.

And so, we have adopted this model in our own school and tried to figure out how it would reorient our curriculum and how we interact with our students and what we'd ask them to do. Many other places around the country are experimenting in this area as well. In fact, Tom Rosenstiel had an essay on the Pointer website last week that gets into many of these experiments.

I don't have time to go through the entire list, but one thing, for instance, that we've begun to do is, think about partnerships in a more expansive way. And so traditionally, j-schools would partner with other media organizations in their communities. It's a very tried and true thing to do. Well, if you think entrepreneurially about where our students are going to end up and where they need to be inventive, you might think about collaborating with different kinds of institutions. And so, we've begun to collaborate with some startups in Reno. We've also collaborated with the City Manager's office in Reno to create new forms of journalism out of that office.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

And so, we don't know exactly where this is going to take us, but we do think that the entrepreneurial metaphor is probably a better metaphor. It fits better for the average j-school than the teaching hospital metaphor.

Thanks very much.

[Applause.]

Philip Napoli: My name is Phil Napoli. I'm from Fordham. A long title. My apologies for that. I'll tell you a little bit of the background of this project. I was asked to contribute a chapter to an edited volume, of the many that get put together on journalism, about the role [of] advertising pressures, the pressures to attract advertising, both sort of explicit and more implicit. How they might be affecting the nature of the journalistic content we see online. And so, it was one of those topics actually amidst all the work that's being done in the journalism space. Even though there's this really large body of research on the dynamics of advertiser pressures on traditional media, both these very direct and indirect influences, we haven't seen that kind of literature develop yet in the online media space. And I think that's because a lot of the focus has been on issues of economic viability, and we really haven't started focusing yet on going beyond that and investigating ways content might be being affected one way or the other.

So, I'd written this, and then as often happens with edited volumes—I'm sure people know this sort of routine—the project just sort of implodes. And I said, "Well, I'd love to share this," and this was a nice opportunity to do that. I don't think that book will ever see the light of day. That's too bad.

But anyway, so this is sort of a speculative piece then. That's what I was trying to do was sort of speculate. And on the one hand, first, of course, to highlight the need for some more research on this topic, but also to consider the extent to which existing research in the traditional media realm can potentially inform us going forward in trying to understand how the pressures to attract advertising in its various forms might affect online content, and then to put forth, drawing from that, some sort of speculative propositions about the dynamics of how advertiser pressures on online journalism might look and consider the ways in which they can interact and be interdependent with the production of traditional journalism.

A little background then. As we know, journalism dependence on advertising really began in full in the late 19th century and grew more pronounced over time. We had the traditional advertising support model that we all know, of course, undermined quite a bit in the 21st century. And there is this long tradition of concern about the ways in which pressures to attract advertising might affect journalistic output. And that's, of course, where that sort of church/state metaphor that we don't hear as much about anymore really sort of solidified.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Some of the things we do know from this tradition of research that has looked at our more traditional print and broadcast media are things like this:

- That we can attribute in part the emergence of the norm of objectivity to efforts to enlarge the advertiser base of readers by appealing to a broader ideological spectrum.
- There is some fairly powerful evidence that the decline in competition in local newspapers is a function of the extent to which local newspapers had become dependent on advertising. Some of you may be familiar with the circulation spiral research that shows some fairly compelling evidence that as advertising pages diminish in one paper, it creates this spiral of readership and advertiser support that allows for one of the competitors to die out or get bought and leave one single dominant paper.
- We know that's contributed to an increasing emphasis on serving and attracting desirable demographic segments, which certainly affects the nature of news coverage. It affects the nature of what topics get covered, what topics don't get covered, what kind of sections do newspapers provide or not provide, as of course the process of buying audiences has become more demographically driven over time.
- And we know that it's led in some cases—famous examples over the years—what happened out in L.A. with the L.A. Times, the creation of content specifically designed to serve specific advertiser needs.
- And that line between editorial and advertising content getting blurred. In some cases, that raised some serious ethical issues.

So, what is the relevance of some of this to online journalism? I think, for example, in the realm of the indirect influences, we have to recognize that a large portion of online news outlets still do operate as extensions of traditional news outlets, so those forces that are affecting the traditional news media sort of have ripple effects into the online space. And then in the opposite direction, which is in terms of the influence of traditional news outlets on online news outlets, in the nature of the actual content, in terms of agenda-setting effects and things of that sort. And then, of course, in the direct sense, the extent to which economic and institutional dynamics of online news are comparable, and that's where I think we start to see some important potential disconnects that I think would be very useful if research could sort of illustrate where the dynamics are similar here but different there.

And so in these cases, I've got the sort of positives and negatives to sort of identify some sort of speculative propositions about the direction of the effect in terms of it being a positive or a negative effect that advertiser pressures might be having relative to what we know about the positive and negative effects in the traditional media space. So, if we look in sort of the

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

organizational and procedural areas, we know today that we do have more journalism that gets produced outside of traditional commercial news organization, going from the university example to community groups, etc. And so on the plus side, that perhaps creates more context in which pressures to attract advertising dollars are a bit less pronounced.

However, on the other side, there is this issue. We don't hear this discussion of church/state separation, etc., as much in the realm of online journalism, because that sort of norm I don't think has become institutionalized in the same way. And innovative news organizations online are oftentimes — in part, what is innovative about them is that they don't begin from those sort of traditional separations that may or may not be important or as important as perhaps we thought, but maybe they really are. So, I think that comes from sort of a different normative basis in many cases. And again, I put these up here as propositions. These are the things I think it would be useful if this next generation of research that has examined these sort of tensions focused on.

Question of opportunities for a greater variety in innovation and revenue models. I think that's a huge positive in the online space that there are much greater opportunities to pursue different sources of funding that can in the grand scheme then potentially diminish the influence that the pressures to attract advertising revenues might have. And again, I imagine all these as starting points for I think sort of a line of comparative research that could be particularly useful.

And then on the negative side, of course, we have this documented, but now, of course, research shows that this is starting to break down, but they sort of assumed resistance to paying for online content, but now it's interesting to see how many new reports we've seen just in recent weeks that paywalls are working, that some of that, that we assumed was sort of this irreversible culture of resistance to paying for content online, seems to be diminishing.

Online news organizations are often smaller and less bureaucratic. Does that perhaps create a context in which they are less able to resist pressures or direct pressures from advertisers? Because that's another area that we've seen a lot of anecdotal examples of influence. Or, does it create less internal pressure to maximize profits and therefore insulate them from pressures to attract advertising revenue? Again, these sort of more sociological, almost, organizational, sociological propositions that I think would be useful to know more about, because there are logics here I think that could work in both directions.

The issue of the long tail of audience attention in advertising dollars. I think again here, the affects could be potentially positive, potentially negative. We do see this disproportionate clustering of advertising dollars around a relatively few sources online. That is the tail of audience of attention is long and the head can be fairly pronounced, but the head can even be more

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

pronounced when we map advertising dollars over audience attention. And how that affects content production I don't think we know a ton about yet in the online news space.

So, to wrap this up, important to emphasize that it's in some ways difficult and getting more difficult to really meaningfully parse traditional journalism from online journalism. It's a very complex ecosystem. This is something we were working on last year. And it was encouraging that the FCC is trying to understand how this news ecosystem works and what kind of policies could be directed at making it function better. But we have done some work to try to sort of propose that the FCC really adopt what we call an ecosystem model to understanding the production of community information—the information that meets the information needs of communities. [We] did this very long literature review for them on this topic, proposed all sorts of research directions, and they said, "Thanks," and that was that. Apparently, the money disappeared before the end of the fiscal year, and therefore, they're not doing any of the studies that we had hoped they were going to do, but it would have been neat if they did, but that happens a lot there.

But we understand these developments that are affecting the online platform also affect traditional platforms and this inter-platform competition also can have important effects in terms of pursuit of advertising dollars. But again, I think it's a comparative analysis approach that really looks to the extent to which this body of literature and these findings and these propositions that we see in the traditional media space holds up or does not hold up within these different organizational and platform characteristics in the online space [and this] would be useful to sort of extending what I think is an important line of research that our field has been engaged in over the years.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Jake Batsell: What I'm going to talk about today is called: The 'Original Platform': How Newsrooms are Building Digital Loyalty and Generating Revenue through Face-to-Face Engagement. And I'm a little bit terrified to show my slides [laughter] after Alberto Cairo's presentation this morning. I'm not sure where my graphic literacy, you know, rates in his book. But I'm going to give it a shot. So, I'm the last thing standing between you and your Mad Dog margaritas and your Shiner Bocks and I recognize that. And so, I thought we'd start it with a little bit of a party vibe here.

These are pictures that I took with my iPhone in June 2012 at a club in the SOTO District of Seattle. This is GeekWire. Who here has heard of GeekWire before? I see a few hands, but before I started this research, I had not heard of them either. GeekWire is a niche news site that covers the tech community in Seattle, which is obviously a huge tech hub. And they are kind of aiming to become the tech crunch of the Seattle tech community, not just

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

geographically centered in Seattle, because their impact actually has worked far beyond Seattle. But when I was there to do some of my field work for this paper, which is part of a large book project I'm working on, they had their summer bash. And you can see it was fun. The guy in the middle there, John Cook, is one of the founders. He dressed up like John McEnroe. He put a wig on. He's got the headband. He was doing the "you can't be serious" thing. But it was a competitive ping-pong tournament that also doubled as a networking event. And there were more than 500 Seattle techies that were there. There were 14 corporate sponsors, and tickets started at \$50. So, I was amazed just to see the community that turned out for this event.

And so, this is important. Why is this important? Well, not just because it's fun, but because it's making GeekWire money. GeekWire is a little over two years old. They had nine total events in 2012. There are private concerns. They wouldn't give me exact figures, but they said that 40% of their total revenue as an online news startup came from events in 2012, at a 20% profit margin. So, not only is it making them money, but perhaps even more importantly, these GeekWire events are becoming a physical hub for the tech community in Seattle. And so, they are not just fun, but they are efficient for networking. If you're in the Seattle tech community, you want to go to one of these events, because you know that all of the people who matter, the players, are going to be there. And it's going to be fun, but it's also going to be efficient networking.

So, I went amid the crowd and talked and interviewed people who showed up. These were not people supplied by GeekWire. These are people that I approached randomly and asked them. And I talked to a local tech executive who said that people in Seattle have a personal connection to this thing. "We kind of feed them and they feed us back." He told me that he throws them scoops sometimes. He throws them tips because of the goodwill generated from this. So, he comes and he pays, you know, he buys his ticket and he has a good time, but it also builds loyalty. And he keeps coming back to GeekWire, and he throws them tips when he comes across them.

So, I mean, that's just one anecdotal example, but in both the summer and in the fall, I was fortunate enough to be granted a research sabbatical from SMU, and so I took to the road as part of a larger book project I'm working on called Engaged Journalism about how audience engagement is changing the profession of journalism. And I visited almost two dozen U.S. newsrooms and did over 100 interviews with people, and these are some of the organizations that I visited.

And the LaQuinta gold card. This was like one of the most fun surprises of this project is about halfway through this, the LaQuinta gold card showed up in the mail. And I was like, I didn't know LaQuinta even had a gold card, but they do, and so, that was one of the other benefits of this research expedition. I'm now a LaQuinta gold member. [laughter]

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

But what I found going to these places is that, you know, there's just a real renewed interest in face-to-face engagement. And I went to enough places, I think, to see that newsrooms are really amping up their focus on face-to-face engagement. The paper, the title of the paper, *The Original Platform*, actually comes from Evan Smith of the Texas Tribune, you know, which we're all familiar with. But one of Evan's favorite quotes is that, you know, face-to-face engagement was the original platform. Before there were computers, before there were telephones, you know, people got in a room and talked to each other. And even in a digital world, there is renewed value in face-to-face engagement.

And so, this is just an example of some of the pictures that I snapped in my research journeys. Obviously, the Texas Tribune Festival, which is a big public policy festival they have here in this complex actually. This picture here some of you might recognize if you've gone across the way to the Blanton Museum, but this was the first night, the opening reception of the Texas Tribune Festival. But the Texas Tribune has brought in about \$850,000 in event revenue last year alone, but not everybody has that kind of success.

The upper left corner there is *The Morning Sun*, which is a digital-first newspaper in Mt. Pleasant, Michigan. And this was a much simpler event. It was an art walk, where the community engagement editor, they put together a tabloid that did generate some advertising revenue, but they had basically opened up a desk in downtown, satellite downtown newsroom, and just interacted with people coming in and telling them where to go to see all the different art work.

I went to a Politico Pro Trivia Night in Washington, D.C., which is part of one of the options that they offer their Politico Pro subscribers. This is the Kalamazoo Gazette's newsroom at the corner of a major intersection in downtown Kalamazoo. So, whether it makes money or not, the idea of face-to-face engagement is really emerging as an increasingly important complement to digital engagement strategies.

Now, there's been talk about public journalism, civic journalism, and I call up this slide, because this is actually still a live website that the Pew Center for Civic Journalism did. And the Pew Center was obviously really instrumental in building this movement in the first place. And so, the renewed interest in face-to-face journalism does owe a great debt to the civic and public journalism tradition, but it's not quite the same thing. And if you go to this website, you'll still see this definition that says, "At its heart is a belief that journalism has an obligation to public life, an obligation that goes beyond just telling the news or unloading lots of facts."

What I found in my visits to newsrooms is that, you know, face-to-face engagement doesn't have to be considered an obligation or even a half-hearted marketing exercise as some of these events have been in the past by magazines or by newspapers. But events are an opportunity to build

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

community and in some cases actually make some money as well. And so, I think it's just kind of an updated version of an approach to civic journalism.

Also, face-to-face engagement, if done well, it can help subsidize watchdog reporting, if it does generate money. You notice one of our presenters from earlier, from yesterday, David Skok, here with Clay Christensen, and their already legendary report on disruptive innovation and how it applies to the news industry. They identified events as one of three possible revenue sources that news organizations should pounce on. The other two were consulting services, which we heard Jim Moroney, my former boss at the Dallas Morning News, talk about yesterday. And then also the long-tail repurposing; things like repurposing archives, e-books, that sort of thing.

So, but the returns aren't always quantifiable. And this is something that I came across with some of the smaller scale engagement efforts that did not necessarily generate thousands of dollars in sponsorships or thousands of dollars in ticket sales. Some community news managers are really struggling with, you know, what's the ROI on this? You know, what's the ROI on this compared to going out and doing another story or doing another photo for that day's paper? But ultimately the folks that I talked to and their bosses felt that these efforts are still worth doing, because they help build community goodwill and show that they're part of the community and not just, you know, dispassionately reporting on the community.

And it made me think of, I used to be a business reporter. I covered the retail beat for the Seattle Times. And one of the companies that I covered was Nordstrom. And Nordstrom is sort of, you know, very famous for it's 'no questions asked' return policy. You can go buy something at Nordstrom and bring it back, and as long as it's in good condition, they'll give you a refund. What's the ROI on Nordstrom's return policy? You know, I guess they technically lose money every time somebody comes back and returns something, but they have a reputation for excellent customer service. So, the returns aren't always quantifiable, but the sentiment that I got from everyone I talked to is, they're struggling with it, but overall they still feel like these events are worth doing.

These are all diagrammed in more detail at the end of the paper, but I did arrive at a few common practices among all the different news organizations that were doing this:

- One is that you've got to designate a go-to person to do these events. Ideally, it will be a full-time event planner. Some of the bigger organizations that are most comprehensive when it comes to events do have a full-time event planner, but sometimes it's a part-time responsibility, but there needs to be a go-to person who's accountable.
- The real money in events is sponsorships. It's not the ticket cost. Tickets, admission costs usually cover your costs, your overhead, your

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

administrative cost, but the sponsorships are really where the money are.

- Networking is a prime draw. Just the idea of creating that *you have to be here* kind of vibe if you want to continue to have your finger on the pulse of the industry.
- Providing memorable experiences. I went into WBEZ-FM in Chicago, the NPR affiliate up there. They do things like Zombie movie nights and chef cooking sessions, things like that, that are memorable for people to come away from and build that affinity.
- But also not to think of events that they're going to be some kind of a golden goose. You know, GeekWire actually said that some problems with one of their events toward the tail-end of last year contributed to them being just short of profitability for the full year. They had actually turned a small profit in their first year of operation, which is pretty remarkable. But they take a lot of logistics. They take a lot of time. They take away from other things, especially if you're a small organization. But with an authentic approach, ideally, they can provide both revenue and audience goodwill.

And so, along those lines, I wanted to finish up with this slide here. This is another digital-first paper in Pontiac, Michigan, the Oakland Press. And I visited or sat in on one of their community blogger workshops, where in this case the outgoing community engagement editor, Karen Workman, who's now with Thunderdome in New York City, was sort of training her successor. And they did a workshop with these network of community bloggers that they publish on their site. And these were novices. These are people who just.... A lot of this was just the nuances of Word Press and how to add a hyperlink and what SEO, Search Engine Optimization, is. Very basic stuff.

But I ended up approaching one of these bloggers afterwards in the parking lot and just asking what this meant to them. It didn't cost anything. You know, there were no corporate sponsors. There were no ticket revenues whatsoever. But this woman had a blog she called Bye-Bye Clothes. She challenged herself. She had no background in journalism [and] had been doing this blog about what it was like to spend a year without buying any new clothes or accessories from the store. And I asked her about it and she really kind of summed it up for me, which she said, "The thing about these sessions is they come in, and they acknowledge us, and we acknowledge them." And to her, that's engagement. And I think that at its core, whether you're grossing hundreds of thousands of dollars in sales or you're just having a community blogger workshop at four o'clock on a Friday afternoon, you know, I think that's at the core of it — is actually having a face-to-face conversation with your audience.

So, thanks for your time and attention. And my slides are there. And I guess that closes us out other than questions, right?

[Applause.]

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Q&A Session:

Mark Deuze: Well, as this is kind of a research panel, I was given the opportunity to read the papers beforehand. And after listening to the last two days of sessions and especially these last couple of papers, I wanted to start off our discussion with just like a brief observation of what I feel — at least what for me the key takeaway has been, and what I would love this panel to reflect on as seasoned scholars in the field. Just think about it. During this conference, we went from a brief mention of legacy media in the beginning yesterday morning to sort of fully embracing the disruption, the potential for innovation, all the cool stuff that we can now be doing, the integration of different disciplines in what we used to call journalism. Very exciting. And this morning, we sort of raised the bar even further. We went through mobile, through data visualization, through all kinds of cool multimedia projects. So, a lot of excitement, a lot of enthusiasm, a lot of cool stuff happening. And through it all, increasingly, I began to get a distinct sense—I don't know if you share this with me—is that a conference on online journalism is not about online nor about journalism anymore. It's about something else.

And I think David signaled, you know, the problem for journalism schools is they used to be comfortable teaching what there is to know about journalism, but we're pretty unsure what there is to know about journalism. And I would definitely agree to some extent with that. However, there were, I think, a couple of moments, and especially today, where I think the key is to what we *should* know about journalism. And in some ways, it's seen also in these papers, and maybe we can start a discussion there.

Those three moments for me were this morning's the presentation of Ivo Burum anti-mojo. This sort of like using mobile phones for community journalism in Australia and elsewhere around the world where he gives workshops, including in other countries like Denmark or something like that. Or Allissa Richardson's work on teaching mojo, which also takes her around the world. South Africa she mentioned a couple of times going into the community. Simple tools that we all have in our back pockets can be used to produce really engaging multimedia storytelling that empowers the community and especially women and other members of marginalized groups in certain areas of the world.

And of course, Paro's talk today, in areas in India that we never hear about and that we never see about. And not just us here outside of India, but even in India itself, where women who couldn't read or write now empowering themselves and through their work empowering their own communities by producing newspapers and news websites and getting stronger in the process. And what ties that all together is something that was mentioned in David's paper as well at the end and that for me ties this all together is this passion. What these projects tried.... Yes, they use technologies in all kinds of

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

interesting ways. They don't have budgets of hundreds of thousands of dollars, but they have people behind them that are driven to do something. And they're not afraid of it. Technology is not this *thing* that they have to embrace in order to do good journalism. It's like, "To hell with it! We just use it! It's fun! It's creative! I mean, we're not afraid to feel." Something that was mentioned multiple times these two days—passion. Are we teaching passion in journalism schools? When you walk into a newsroom, do you sense passion? No. We don't. Generally we don't.

Jake, you signaled that the key to this kind of engagement that you're talking about is newsroom buy-in. You mentioned it very subtly at the end of your paper, but that, of course, is *everything*! What is newsroom buy-in? It's getting people to become *passionate* about the communities that they write stories for. And apparently, they are not. Not because journalists are assholes. [laughter] Well maybe some of them are. But, you know, there is something that we're not tapping into by perhaps focusing too much on the business models and the technologies, which are important, but we see them as sort of hurdles or handicaps, rather than moving through them to get at the core of what we want journalism to be.

And finally, one thing that came through [in] these multiple papers is that when we consider and reflect on all the disruption that's happening in our profession and in the profession that we study or teach, that I think the key to understanding disruption is not so much disruption because of or in technology or online, it's not so much like, "Oh, we don't know what journalism is anymore," it's just that what kept journalism together as a profession is generally a sense of shared professional identity, which got produced in newsrooms, and by interaction with people. Because we don't have boundaries around journalism, right? There is no pass system. You don't have to pass through a gate in order to qualify. What journalism is, is produced by journalists talking amongst each other about what journalism is. And we as scholars document that in books that we give fancy titles to and lots of words with three or more syllables. But basically, what we're doing is theorizing on the basis of what journalists told each other that journalism is.

However, that narrative is broken. Not because it's wrong or bad, but because it's fragmenting. Most of the journalism today doesn't get produced in newsrooms anymore. It gets produced by freelancers, and part-timers, and stringers, and correspondents, and by people in the outskirts of India or in the townships like Soweto in South Africa. I mean, that's also journalism, and in a lot of ways, better than any journalism that any of us can ever come up with. And so there's a fragmented sense of professional identity.

So, I think the new thing that would keep journalism together and that I would love for this panel to talk about from their own perspectives is passion. So, let's start with passion — or love for journalism. [laughter] I'm cool with love. Passion leads to lust and all kinds of mistakes that we're going to make after all those China boxes. But let's start with love.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

David Ryfe: Am I on? OK. So, one thing I've been telling my graduate students at least; although, I'm a little afraid of telling my undergraduates this.... I'm not sure how they'd handle it. And I think I might have tweeted this yesterday. To me....[feedback from sound system] That was him. That was not me. I just want to make that [clear]. So, one of the things that I've been telling my students is that part of the future of journalism is learning to love your communities more than you love your profession.

So, part of the dilemma that journalism is having right now is that there are lots of people producing news and only very few of them are journalists. So, now they're standing cheek to jowl with a whole bunch of other people who are very happily producing news. I mean, humans have always produced news. It seems basic to the human instinct. It seems like a basic human instinct. But only very recently have we begun to commodify the news, and only even more recently than that have we begun to put the commodification of news into news organizations, these bureaucracies. So, there are lots of different people producing news, but only very few people producing them in newsrooms.

And now, we've got to relearn. And it's a new habit, I think, for journalists to do this—relearn how to meet all these people who are very passionate about the news but aren't particularly interested in journalism. [chuckles] How do we teach them to do that is, I think, a really important question that we at least in our j-school are trying to reflect on. And how would we build a curriculum around that? If you have an answer, tweet me and let me know.

Jake Batsell: And I'd say absolutely passion is a link among all these things. But I would qualify that a little bit by saying, you know, passionate humility. Humility that you're serving readers, that to stay in business you've got to find ways to be useful and relevant to them with your journalism, but not *only* with your journalism, with physical events that can bring your community together. These events, you know, again, they served a role for these people. People came to learn something at the digital-first newspapers. People came to network at GeekWire. They came for personal motivations. It wasn't just something warm and fuzzy. And so, it's because these events were set up in a way of, how do we serve our audience, with a real sense of sincere humility. And I think if you're passionate about that, then chances are you're going to connect with your community and you're going to be sticking around a while longer.

Paromita Pain: Either this connection with the community that you just mentioned and this passion here, it raises some very important questions. And a lot of learning has come from the projects that, you know, I mentioned. Here are women who've never been to school, who have never learned to read and write, and we thought by empowering them to become journalists, you know, we'd get visions of their lives, like, "Today, I was denied this," or "This is what I want." And suddenly it wasn't 'I' journalism

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

anymore. It was more about, "My community needs a bridge so that all children can cross the river safely, so that all children can access school." So, sometimes the journalist plays a very important role in highlighting community concerns. So, a passion towards the community, for the community. This, I think, is going to be the basis of a lot of very effective journalism in the future.

Philip Napoli: I ended up coming from the perspective [of] I'm in an odd position of being in a business school, where my students I deal with a lot of times are just focused on issues of, "How do I make money? Where is there money to be made?" And one of the things I have to orient media students to, and we're lucky that journalism fits this mold quite well, is it's one of the few things that people are willing to produce without getting paid for. And to me, that goes to the issue of passion most directly. And we're so lucky to have seen that journalism. There are people willing to engage in the practice of journalism with zero expectation of meaningful financial return. I mean, it was amazing, right, when the Huffington Post let all their bloggers.... "We're not going to pay you anymore, but you're welcome to write for free." And a lot of people said, "Well, okay." [chuckles] And that tells us that, to me, that is what is allowing our journalistic system to not completely collapse in the face of the way that the established business models have sort of lost their vitality. So, from my standpoint, it's actually the economic engine that's keeping journalism functioning. [It] is the fact that it is one of those things that people are willing to do. You know, no one is willing really to dig ditches for free or to sort of fix cars for free. I wish that was the case. Or, you know, clean my house for free. Journalism, yes, and we're lucky that it's one of those where it fits.

Mark Deuze: I would definitely encourage people from the audience to step forward and ask questions of these researchers. I know they are willing to share more about their work than just yap with me about love and passion. [laughter] We have our first question right there.

Mike Humphrey: I'm willing to talk about love if that's really what's important to you. I'm Mike Humphrey from Colorado State. And I'm fairly new to education, so I wanted to ask this question. One of the things I've noticed about the motivations that bring students to the journalism school is they are very traditional. A lot of them want to come to write or they want to be on TV or they want to produce television. A lot of things that you're talking about when you talk about entrepreneurial approaches and engaging the community are very different than the concepts they had coming into the school. And I wonder if that means that we have to persuade these students to think differently or does it mean that we have to start recruiting a different kind of student into the j-school. And this approach is the question of coding and data and other things we've talked about over the last two days. What do you think is more important? Persuading the traditional students coming in for traditional reasons or really starting to redefine what we do and recruit different kinds of students into the schools?

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Philip Napoli: I think it goes to the issue which I kept waiting to see happen over these past few years, which is to realize that if we keep going on about how everybody is a journalist, to me, I thought then, why isn't some journalism education part of what every college student now goes through? I had to take history and astronomy and things that were of no relevance to my intended career path, but they were core. And I think in some ways we could argue that now journalism is core, because all of us could find the opportunity—we might not know what it's going to be—that we need to or want to engage in active journalism. And so to me, I was amazed when the discussion about what's happening to journalism schools, who's going to find this relevant anymore? Now to me, it's relevant in a different way. That it's part of what every citizen is likely to find themselves engaged in, in one way or the other. So, I see it sort of expanding the range of potentially, you know, the kind of student that necessarily does not want to be a professional journalist might come in with these very specific kind of motivations, which actually aren't going to turn out to be the motivations that lead to the production of most of the journalism anymore. So, I think it's about getting those skill sets in the hands of the kind of people who are not envisioning themselves as journalists yet, but will be.

David Ryfe: So, I think the easy answer is to say you need to do both, but the hard answer has to do with developing a coherent message about what a j-school is, does, could be for you. And that's the hard part, because of course faculty are like herding cats. Each of them have their own idea about what j-school is. And it's very difficult to get a coherent sense of what you're going to be able to achieve by going to this place. And so, that's one of the conversations we're having to have. And faculty really argue over two things. They argue over money and they argue over the curriculum. [chuckles] And so, we're really arguing over the foundational courses in our curriculum, where we give them the message, implicitly or not, about what they're going to experience here. And we need to have a better message about journalism to them than, "Look at this graph and this scary number." [chuckles] We have this scary line that's going downward. "You're not going to be working in the newspaper, but you will get to reinvent your own job."

We've got to move beyond that somehow to a more positive proactive message about, "This is what journalism school is about here." And I think that that message is going to be different at different j-schools, so that journalism education is going to fragment as much as journalism is fragmenting. And that we won't have a cohesive answer to that, because there are lots of different journalisms being practiced in lots of different places. And j-schools are going to have to choose which shard of that fragmentation they are going to follow. Some of them can try to map the entire fragmentation. So if you're at Missouri and you have 60 faculty, you might be able to take a lot of those shards, but the average j-school is going to have to choose what they are going to be excellent at. And that's going to be a tough conversation, but I think it starts there with the conversation on

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

the faculty. What kind of j-school? What kind of future journalism are you going to pursue?

Jake Batsell: I think entrepreneurial themes can be weaved into the existing curriculum. That's one thing that I tried to do with my digital journalism course; obviously, creating online personal portfolios using Twitter. I require my students to tweet one act of journalism a week and one act of engagement a week, where they — so that when somebody looks at their Twitter profile, they will see that they are savvy and they know how to do this stuff. But more recently, I've been lucky enough to team teach a media entrepreneurship class at SMU and really hammering home these themes of shaping your own destiny. And I think journalists are uniquely positioned to be able to do that. You know, you know how to research, you know how to be your own editor, your own worst critic to question your assumptions and keep digging deeper. Just the barriers to entry are so low now that, I mean, I have students in my media entrepreneurship class who have been.... You know, there's a real interest in fashion at SMU. I have students, fantastic students, who have been monetizing their own fashion blogs for two years already in school. And you know, that's just one example, but there's actually several in our program. And whether it's fashion, whether it's sports, whether it's public interest journalism, just this whole idea that you can't, you know, go through the curriculum and get your degree and expect a job at The New York Times to be waiting for you, but to take control over your destiny.

And if you're looking and struggling for ways how to instill this and inject this into your programs, if you're from universities, let me just plug the Scripps Howard Entrepreneurial Journalism Institute, which I think is going to be having its third year. It's sponsored by Arizona State University. I was lucky enough to go through that program the first year it was offered. And then Donica, David's coauthor, was in it during the second round. There's others here who have done it. But a great way.... Of course, Rosental. We were homies. We were in that inaugural class together. But he's been teaching it even longer. But anyway, it's a great way to kind of jumpstart and build momentum within your programs. You go to ASU for a week. You learn from Dan Gilmore. He brings in venture capitalists. He brings in, you know, friends like Jeff Jarvis, and Mark Briggs, and some of the other titans of entrepreneurial journalism, and you come away with a blueprint for how to do this kind of class in your curriculum. So, you know, check it out and apply if it hasn't been on your radar until now.

Cindy Royal: Cindy Royal from Texas State. And I normally would have a lot to say about journalism as education and inspiring passion in students, but I can talk to anyone about that at great length at another time. But my question is for Jake. And I tweeted a link from a David Carr article from The New York Times in 2009 that talks about South by Southwest and the relationship with the Austin Chronicle and the City of Austin. I can think of no better example of a revenue generating face-to-face engagement strategy.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

So, and they are mostly a print alt weekly, even though they have a web presence, and they obviously developed the South by Southwest model before they had a web presence. So, is there something different now with digital properties in these face-to-face engagement models? Any specific opportunities they can be taking advantage of that's different than when we had legacy print media in face-to-face engagement models?

Jake Batsell: Yes, I do think that it's different now; although, I'm glad you mentioned that, because I'm pretty sure it's in my lit review—that David Carr thing—because, yeah, because that whole thing, South by Southwest and the juggernaut that it is now, was started from an alt weekly here, a print-based alt weekly, the Austin Chronicle. But yeah, I think now obviously there's the tweet-ups and different things that you can do, but one of the appeals.... So, at the Texas Tribune Festival here in September which I came down for, you know, it's a three-day public policy. It's a Texas politicians just dream. You know, there's tracks, and transportation, and education policy, and immigration. And they had the governor here. They had Ted Cruz here before he got elected to the senate. They had Julian Castro right after he gave the keynote at the Democratic National Convention.

And the thing was, you know, I interviewed people who drove down from Dallas, who drove up from San Antonio or Houston, where they could have absorbed the content just by monitoring social media or, you know, seeing the video replays afterwards. So it wasn't so much the content, but they came here so that they could network and leverage, not just being here physically, but being here physically with and identifying the people who were tweeting, so that you could follow up and say, "Hey, I saw...." It's a lot like what happens here at ISOJ, right? I mean, you know, you can experience it by sitting in the audience. You can experience it by monitoring the back channel. But the combination of that, you build so much more deeper relationship, you know, with the back channel conversations that go on and then following up afterwards in face-to-face. So, I do think there's an added element.

And then I think when you walk away from an experience like that, you feel a real affinity to keep coming back. I mean, that's why I feel an affinity to keep coming back to ISOJ every year. And frankly, I find ISOJ more productive than South by Southwest. So, I do think that when you combine face-to-face engagement with digital engagement, it amplifies the impact that much more.

Mark Deuze: I want to quickly follow-up with all the panelists. So, we agree that love and humility for the job, passion for your community is crucial, right? Philip, you signal like this is one of the few jobs that people are willing to do for free, because they care so much about it. And look, I mean, obviously, journalists, individual journalists, even those — especially perhaps those who work in newsrooms have to be passionate. And of course they are, because otherwise how would they be able to survive? But there is a dark

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

side to people who really love what they do, right? Because they are willing to do it for free, we produce — and especially now with the discussion about the teaching hospital, we are increasingly beginning to produce free labor for a dying industry that as an industry, not as a series of individuals, but as an industry seems to be reluctant to truly embrace the sort of institutionalized, sort of 21st century, whatever you want to call it, disruptive model. Now, how do we prevent the free labor thing from becoming simply sort of a reductionist economic argument and protect the passion that drives ultimately good journalism?

Philip Napoli: I actually think it's almost analogous to what we've seen happen in academic journalism in some ways, right, which is that commercial publishers and the open-access journals, same sort of thing. You know, I guess the bigger picture question is, what if the future model of journalism doesn't have an industry component to it at all?

Mark Deuze: Right.

Philip Napoli: You know, is that viable, right?

Mark Deuze: Mm-hmm.

Philip Napoli: Or, as we sort of see in a lot of contexts, you know, going back to the sort of long-tail model, in most contexts, it operates under this sort of self-subsidy model, but there are these high-revenue subject areas, high-revenue markets, or this sort of cream-skimming model, sort of a two-tier journalistic model, which I'm not saying that necessarily a good thing, but my expectation is almost that's what we see. That, you know, some contexts are sufficient to warrant paid journalists and lots of other contexts aren't. And yeah, we depend on the generosity of this passionate group to fill in all those gaps. And I don't know where the dividing line ends up being, but I think ultimately it's become that sort of model, for better or for worse, going forward.

David Ryfe: I think he's right in two senses. First of all, the major mass media—the national, international—they're not going away. The New York Times is not going away. The BBC's not going away. Reuter's isn't going away. There's going to be opportunities for people to practice journalism pretty much as they've always practiced it, except for having these new, cool tools that they are learning. And so, at least in the United States, and I think you have to go state by state, nation by nation, because it's different, but in the United States, what's really hurting is the local and regional news system. The regional newspapers are getting smaller and smaller and there's less and less coverage.

I would make a distinction, Mark, between news production and journalism, because journalism is actually a very recent word. It only comes from the 1830's, 1840's. News has been around since the invention of language, but

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

journalism has been around only.... And it refers specifically to these organizations. And so, I think that the production of news is exploding and journalism is going to have to find its way.

And I think that at least if the current trends hold, we are going into this bifurcated system. At the national/international level, it's going to [be] the major, multinational news companies. At the local and regional level, we're going to have a lot more fragmentation, a lot more diversity. And then the question, of course, that everyone asks is, what happens to the institutional role of journalism in that context? And no one has an answer to that question yet. But remember, we're only ten years in. And so, it's not unusual that we wouldn't have an answer.

Philip Napoli: I'd add to that real quick. I think, too, that that sort of bifurcated model might not be just geographic too. It could be, you know, at more localized levels, sort of financial journalism remains viable —

David Ryfe: Yeah, yeah.

Philip Napoli: — in the traditional sense. Or, who knows, you know, there's going to be sort of higher value types of reporting for certain consumer groups.

David Ryfe: Yeah.

Philip Napoli: So, it could bifurcate across a lot of different dimensions, I think.

Mark Deuze: Paro, you want to mention?

Paromita Pain: Yeah. You know, since we are discussing this model of contributor networks and all the rest, I have a question here also. When we refer to the generosity of those contributing for free, we also perhaps need to keep an eye that this model doesn't become exploitative. And what boundaries do we draw in? What factors do we really need to keep an eye out for? And who draws the boundaries and who keeps the eye out? Especially if we are looking towards a future journalism which is far less institutionalized than it is today.

David Ryfe: Yeah, that's good.

Philip Napoli: Exactly.

David Ryfe: Just because more people can produce news doesn't mean that it doesn't reproduce to stratifications in your community, which is....

Mark Deuze: Next question.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Question: A quick question, and I just want to comment on, and maybe this is a false perception, but it's almost like we've got passion and love and the positive things over here, and then we've got, you know, over on the dark side, you know, commerce and lust and avarice. It's almost like the seven deadly sins versus the seven heavenly, iconic, wonderful things. And I know there's this tension between the commercial side and the editorial side, but I do worry about if we're communicating to students that there's sin in sustainable journalism, then I do worry about that. So, could you kind of outline...? There's got to be boundaries and ethical ways in which we can support journalism, but how do we instill a sense of entrepreneurial sustainability? Because as far as I'm concerned, you know, I'm a journalist, but I don't think there's any sin in being creative and entrepreneurial and excited about developing a new business model to support the public service mission that we do. And so, how, as academics, how do you communicate that to your students? Thanks.

Jake Batsell: I think, you know, to go with the idea of passionate humility, I think you have to be passionately humble. That if you don't fill a need for your readers, you know, you're going to be out of work. If you're not actually being useful for them, if you're pursuing your journalism in a way that is gratifying to you, but doesn't actually serve readers or fill their needs in some way, you're not going to have that job much longer. Those types of jobs were subsidized by the old models that are being blown away. And so, I really think that that's part of the passion that one has to have—is the passion to stay relevant and useful and to do journalism that not only matters, but really is journalism that readers want and that there's a market need for. So, I think that has to be part of the passion equation.

Philip Napoli: I think, in some ways, we're starting to see it in the way journalism schools think of themselves. It's interesting to me that you talked about that you have a media entrepreneurship program. We have an entrepreneurship program. And I think it's that you go back a few years when there was a discussion still about, should journalists even be getting taught the business end of things? It was always you go to a journalism school and then, ew, you might go get an MBA later, then you're going to be one of those. Well, that separation is just b.s. now. And I think that the students are learning the craft of journalism and learning issues of business models and how business model innovation happens. There's a whole new realm of training that I think is part of the core of how you train a professional journalist now. Again, it used to be that, oh, yeah, you go to the business school for that. Well, that's, you know, that doesn't work. That needs to be part of what journalistic education is. And like I said, I remember going to some journalism schools six, seven years ago, where folks were trying to bring some of that into the equation, and the old guard faculty just lashed out! I think we're past that now luckily. We need to be, that's for sure. But I think there are a lot of schools that are thinking a bit more creatively about what the scope of their curriculum should be. So, I think it's happened.

14th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

David Ryfe: Yeah. And so the way that we frame that for our students is, there are lots of things changing in journalism, but not everything is changing. The world isn't becoming completely different. And so, five, six years ago, the theme was "everything is changing." The real hard question is, if everything is not changing, but some things are changing, what from the past do we bring forward that was very successful? Mass media journalism, very successful at what it did, and they wrote lots of different things about audiences and about journalism. How do you bring that forward and combine it with the new things that we're going to necessarily need to invent? And then what will that look like? That's why I think in our paper reflexivity is so important. That's an academic word *reflexivity*. I got a couple of tweets asking what I meant by that. I meant exactly being able to search through that issue. What do you need to bring forward from the past? How do you combine it with new things to create new practices, new roles, new identities, new values? Journalists need to be able to think that through. And they are not going to be able to think it through if they go through trade schools in which the first thing they do is drill and practice. [chuckles] So, the first thing they need to do is start from the very beginning thinking about those things. And I think students who are interested in animated — to go to the gentleman's question over here — interested in animated and thinking through those things will stick and the rest maybe won't.

Mark Deuze: Final thoughts from the panel? Or shall I hand over the microphone to our great leader?

Philip Napoli: People are thirsty.

Mark Deuze: [laughs] To close us out today, join me in thanking the amazing panelists.

[Cheers and applause.]