Day 2, April 5, 2014: Session — 11:30 a.m. - 12:45 p.m.

Emerging Journalistic Practices in the Digital Age: Research Session

Chair & Discussant: Jane Singer, Professor at **City University London / University of Iowa**

Panelists:

- **Lisa Lynch,** Concordia University, Canada: ***A Huge Culture Change: Newsrooms at La Presse and The Montreal Gazette Reflect on the Shift to Digital-First***
- **Avery Holton,** University of Utah and **Logan Molyneux,** University of Texas at Austin: ***Branding (Health) Journalism: Perceptions, Practices, and Emerging Norms***
- **Adriana Barsotti,** Pontificia Universidade Catolica do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: ***Two Screens, Two Paths: News Production for Smartphones and Tablets on the Brazilian Newspaper Scene***
- **Matthew Powers,** University of Washington-Seattle: ***Can NGOs Do Journalism? Do They Even Want To? Understanding the Information Work of Leading Humanitarian and Human Rights NGOs***
- **Edward Kian** and **Ray Murray,** Oklahoma State University: **Curmudgeons But Yet Adapters: Impact of Web 2.0 and Twitter on Newspaper Sport Journalists' Jobs, Responsibilities, and Routines**

Lisa Lynch: OK, hi. So today, I'm going to talk about La Presse and the Montreal Gazette. If nothing else, you'll know a little bit more about Montreal papers when you get to EGMC. So, this paper is really a paper about -- as much about mistaken assumptions and exceptional circumstances as anything.

When I first got to Montreal in 2009, as an American scholar, I noticed that Francophone journalists were very publicly critical of online news in a way that I didn't feel like Francophone journalists were. And I was very surprised at that, especially coming from the United States, to see the level of distain that I saw from several journalists about online. And some Francophone Montreal papers around that time had scarcely any online presence and weren't interested in archiving [and] weren't interested in engagement. So, I wondered about what was going on. And I thought, *Well, maybe this is a case of digital divide,"* because we know that there are fewer Francophones online than Anglophones in Quebec; partially for economic reasons, partially for other reasons.

And so, I decided to pick two Montreal newsrooms—the La Presse and the Gazette—and go in and interview people about what was going on in the newsroom. So in Montreal, I picked two papers, first of all, that had a long history in this city. The Gazette calls itself one of the oldest continuously published newspapers in North America, and the La Presse dates back over 100 years. So, they both had long histories in the city, and they both are -- the workers at both papers are represented by labor unions, different labor unions with different labor traditions in the city. Francophone unions have traditionally been stronger than Anglophone unions. And I was wondering about what was going on there as well. And Anglo papers in Canada, as you might -- in Montreal, as you might imagine, compete with U.S. papers and national Canadian papers. Francophone papers don't. So, I wondered if that was connected to different attitudes towards online engagement as well.

So basically, I and a group of other folks went in and interviewed people at the Gazette and La Presse. And we wanted to find out how the workers, the people who were working in online specifically, differed in how they described the benefits and disadvantages of online news. And we wondered for them and for their own work practices and overall, and we wondered whether the differences would change over time as both outlets developed their approach to online news. So, we went in in 2010, and we went in in 2013. And during that time, as you'll see, both papers underwent big changes.

So, La Presse. La Presse was founded in 1884. It's now the flagship paper of a chain called the Gesca Group, a small chain. In 2009, just before we went in, they had a closure crisis. The publisher threatened to close the paper and achieved some later concessions to keep it open. In 2013, around the time that the interviewers were interviewing, they shifted to an iPad first production, which I'll talk about. You know, I can talk about it more in the questions period. But basically, they spent $40-million, hired over 100 people, new people, and shifted to a tablet-first, and in this case iPad-first—because they were using iPads—production. [They were] taking this gamble that tablet was going to be the wave of the future and convincing everyone on staff that it was important for the paper's survival.

So in 2010, when we went in in the wake of the closure crisis, there had also been a reorganization. And when the reporters and editors that we talked to talked about what life was like at the paper, they articulated a crisis that had been resolved. They said things like, "We arrived in a paper world where people didn't know what the web was. There was a lot of tension." But they described that tension as being largely over by 2010; although, some folks said that there was still residual tension. And they said that the tension had been resolved because of careful logistical planning, careful placement of where the digital news was in the newsroom, and by the enthusiasm and the efforts of the editors to integrate staff.

In 2013, we went back. And as I said, there had been this huge shift. And a shift, by the way, that La Presse did without really alerting many other Montreal news workers that this was going on, which is very difficult when you hire 100 people in a small town. And so La Presse was re-envisioned by the publisher as a tablet-first product and a product specifically to highlight what they felt were the strength of La Presse, so that the folks that had been working on digital stuff before were often given prestige projects within the tablet version.

When we went in, we heard several really interesting things. A lot of people said that they believed that the tablet would save the paper. And one of the ways that they talked about that was that they said that the issue was that advertising agencies were refusing to sell ads to print. That it wasn't the advertisers themselves that were the issue, it was advertising agencies that didn't want to sell to print anymore. So, they had to come up with a new platform in order to get ads at all, which I thought was pretty interesting.

And so, they talked about this renovation as potentially saving the paper. They also talked about, in some cases, this increase in staff had given some workers less work duties than they had before, less than the past, so a substantial number of reporters started talking about how they had more time to think, more time to produce, more time to produce longer content, longer investigative pieces, because on the tablet they were having more space and so much energy was involved in making this a prestige project.

At the same time, we noticed that there was a tension between the older digital workers, we'll say, and the new iPad folks, who were described in derogatory terms by some of the older workers as hipsters, people who do cocktail hours, people with tattoos on their arms. So, we noticed there was this new emergent tension between web and tablet. And also significantly, all of those 100 people had been brought on with different labor contracts as the rest of the newsroom. There was a provision in their labor contract that they could be laid off after a period of time if things weren't working out. And the web folks made sure that we knew about that.

OK. So, that's what we found at La Presse. At the Gazette, [it was a] very, very different situation. Gazette, as I said, [was a] very, very old newspaper. Up until the 1960s, [they] had fairly consistent ownership, but since the 1960s, it has shifted from Southam to Financial Press to Hollinger to Canwest to Postmedia. Lots of different changes. So, these changes have come with increasing staff reductions. So at the same time they were going through their online transition, they were going through many, many staff reductions. So when they talked about online, they talked about the limitations and the constraints, and they talked much more about overwork. They focused much more on problems rather than successes. And in 2010, they often talked about online as something that they didn't know why they were doing it. They didn't really understand what was going on. It didn't seem like anything

was different in terms of the paper. It just seemed for a lot of people like busywork basically.

So between 2010 and 2013, they went through—like La Presse—they went through much more of an updating and a revision to their site. But it was really a centralized system created by the Postmedia chain that owned them for creating a chain-wide look. And that centralized system led to a lot of further disgruntlement. People felt like the centralized CMS that they had to use was clunky. They were constrained in terms of what they could do with online. And they again articulated themselves in terms of limitations. They said things like, "We're still mostly a print paper. We're doing more things online, but [with] the reduction in staff, labor conditions are much more important than anything that happened online."

So at La Presse, the transition didn't create an unsustainable workload, so people were happy about that. Staff believed management had made an investment in the future of La Presse as an institution; whereas, at the Gazette, the push towards online resulted in overwork and digital decisions reflected the priorities of the chain and not the Gazette.

Now, there are a lot of limitations to what we did. You know, as I said, we went there when La Presse was going through this very unique period of transition—very remarkable. And we didn't look at other Francophone papers; for example, Quebecor's train has gone through a lot of digital transition and a lot of labor suppression at the same time. And we didn't talk to the iPad team, because we were following the same group of people in 2010 and 2013.

But I think one of the things that comes up in our study is that rather than confirming this additional idea of a digital divide, our interviews demonstrate this complex interplay between workplace attitudes and -- workplace conditions and attitudes towards online work. You know, things are a lot more complicated than just looking at markets.

Also, if anyone is interested in a longer version of this paper, because I cut it down by 4,000 words to squeeze it in, just give me an email and I can send it along.

[Applause.]

Jane Singer: Thanks, Lisa. Next up we have two scholars with close ties to Texas. We have Logan Molyneux, who's one of your very own UT journalism scholars. And he's presenting a paper he co-authored with Avery Holton, who's one of your alums. Their paper is about a kind of controversial topic about journalists and branding, sort of self-branding by journalists. In their case, health journalists. So, Logan.

Logan Molyneux: Thank you. Houston? OK, I'm on. [*laughter*] I have a bad feeling about this mission. [*laughter*] Sorry. I watched Gravity last night, and I really liked it. [*laughter*] So, she's right. I am Logan Molyneux, and I am here representing Avery Holton who's at the University of Utah right now or actually on his way back to the University of Utah right now.

Our research began as much research does with a hunch. We suspected that creating a personal brand is becoming a part of a journalist's job, and not just *a* part, but an important part of a journalist's job. This hunch came from a study that I had done of what journalists retweet. So, I went through and captured a huge pile of tweets that journalists had sent out during the 2012 presidential political conventions and analyzed what journalists retweeted. And a substantial portion of their retweets were things that other people had said about them. For example…[*some laughter*]…that is right. So, let's pretend that I am the journalist and you all are tweeting about my work here at this conference. So, you might tweet some commentary about me and my presentation here.

And if I were acting like the journalists that I had studied, then I might retweet some of those comments such as these. Journalists retweeted people who pointed out their work because they were saying that this journalist was going to appear or that this new story was up. They would retweet praise that they received, but they also opened their hate mail in public. So, we got to thinking, *What prompts a journalist to take the time to retweet praise and even the hate mail they're receiving?* In our minds, this was evidence of an effort to craft a public image, an effort to say, "Hey, this is who I am." This is only interesting, because for most journalists, the organization that they work for is more famous than they are. There's a few journalists who break this mold, and they can say, "Hey, I'm Andersen Cooper," and everybody immediately knows who they are. But for most people, they introduce themselves by saying, "Hi, I'm so-and-so, a reporter for the Washington Post." Right?

So, we set out to do a series of interviews with reporters to find out how much branding really is a part of their work and how widely are journalists branding themselves. Do they do it consciously? Purposefully? How important is it to them? And what motivates them to create a personal brand? We decided to center on health journalists, because sometimes these journalists in specialty areas tend to innovate more quickly and they are more closely tied to their beats, which is what we thought would drive a journalist to do branding in the first place.

So, what they told us is, yes, personal branding is an important part of their everyday jobs. In fact, all 21 journalists we interviewed said that they were familiar with personal branding [and] that they were surprised at how quickly it had become important to them. They said they realized that some of the responsibility to reach out to their audiences and sell their work falls to them, the journalist. In fact, they said it's their best shot to remain relevant. One

journalist said, "Maybe it's not something you learn in school or pick up in the field, but you sure better get with it and fast."

Interestingly, the pressure to do branding is coming from their colleagues a lot of times and not from their supervisors. So, there really isn't a unified approach to it. Actually, journalists told us that it seems like branding is something everyone is doing, but that nobody really knows how to do. And that's not entirely true. They did say they are getting almost no guidance from management about what *to* do. But in that void, they are finding room to experiment. For example, this first journalist here that I have quoted said he started giving short webinars related to his beat, and he called it a Live Lecture Series. [He] said it started out small, but that now he is constantly engaged in conversations with his audience.

Journalists also told us that they share and comment on other journalists work and even up about their jobs and their personal lives. They find that they audiences value transparency about themselves and about their jobs. So, they weren't afraid to talk about how they got a story, or who they couldn't talk to, or even link to other news stories on their beat written by other journalists. As one journalist said, "It lets my readers know that I actually care enough to put good news ahead of my own ego."

Our final important theme is that journalists said branding for them is about managing their own image and not about promoting the organizations that they work for. They work to be billboards for themselves, as this journalist said. And most of this happens on social media. Their goal is to connect with their audience and show them that they know what they're talking about to really establish their authority on their beat.

So, there's probably some of you out there crossing your arms and going, "Well, you know, of course journalists want to be recognized," or, "Great! Finally journalists are engaging with their audiences." But there's at least a couple of important challenges and implications that came up during our interviews.

The first one is that when journalists begin grooming a public image, is it possible that they become more concerned with that image than with their actual work? We are really fond of saying that journalists work in the public interest, but is it possible that even the audience could have too much influence on them?

Jay Rosen was mentioning this a little bit this morning when he was talking about this careful relationship about engaging the audience but also maintaining your independence. For example, might I skip a story if I know my constituents wouldn't love it? Would I be too willing to follow their news judgment instead of my own? Anyway, there are some of these questions surrounding how you maintain your independence while you're also trying to

form positive relationships with your audience. It's a balance that journalists will have to strike.

Second…. Oh, and this is a disappointment, because in the original presentation, I had the oval moving. You'll have to imagine. [*laughter*] Second, we see a subtle power shift occurring in journalism. As I said in the beginning, it used to be that news organizations held much of the influence, and most of that was because they controlled the news product. The Washington Post is a thing, and it's a powerful brand, right? But now, journalists are wanting to take more control over their own future rather than relying on their organizations. And partly that's because their organizations have failed them in many ways in this digital age, but also because they have a new way to reach their audiences. With social media, they can connect directly to others and form relationships with their audiences. That is, they can form a personal brand, and they are jumping at the chance.

Organizations will have to make a case for their relevance. I mean, maybe journalists would all be better off as freelancers, right? Probably not, because there are some 1st Amendment fights and some other resources that can only be brought to bear by a large organization. So, it's a fine line again between encouraging positive outreach that branding offers, while not letting journalists run away with the audience. So, if organizations can find that balance, and I think it's possible, then branding can bring about positive change as journalists engage with their audiences and own their beats.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Adriana Barsotti: Hello, everyone. I am Adriana. I'm Professor of Digital Journalism at Ibmec University in Rio de Janeiro, where I come from. And I'm also a PhD candidate at the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro.

My article discusses the differences between news production for smartphones and tablets in Brazil. I'd like to share with you the reason why I was interested in this subject. One day during a class, I accessed a newspaper mobile site, and for my surprise, what appeared on the screen—a headless soccer player. Yes, a photo of a famous soccer player without his head. We all know why these things happen. That's because the editing process for mobile sites—at least in Brazil—is totally automatic. But sometimes we researchers have to think about the obvious, and that's what I did.

So, I was interested in understanding why smartphones and tablets have had very different effects on the Brazilian newspapers scene. Although, both devices have very similar features and could bring opportunities to increase the audience and the profitability of media companies. But what we observed in Brazil is that mobile sites merely reproduce news that are published on

newspaper's websites. As I said, the editing process is totally automatic; therefore, there is no need for journalists.

On the other hand, the most important papers in Brazil have launched tablet-specific products since 2012. They all require manual editing, exclusive content, and dedicated teams in the newsrooms. Those products are Folha 10, O Globo Mais, Estadao Noite. Folha 10 is a weekly magazine published by Folha de S. Paulo, which is the largest paper in Brazil. O Globo Mais is published on weekdays at 6:00 p.m. by O Globo, which is the third largest paper in the country. A Mais means plus. Estadao Noite is also published on weekdays, but later, at 8:00 p.m. by O Estado de S. Paulo, which is the fourth largest paper.

Initially, the focus of my research was O Globo Mais, Estadao Noite, and the mobile sites of O Globo and Estado S. Paulo. But later, I had to include the print editions of both newspapers, since I noticed some overlaps between content of print editions and tablet editions.

Here are some pages of O Globo Mais. It has pictures of today, columns, exclusive articles, and all its pages are enriched with links, video, audio, and animations. And here is Estadao Noite. It's far less enhanced the O Globo Mais, but it also has pictures of today, columns, video, and audio.

My question…. My research was guided by these two questions: Have smartphones and tablets changed the production routines in newsrooms? Have these devices led to changes in journalistic language? If so, how?

But first, I'd like to highlight some numbers of the Brazilian market for smartphones and tablets. Brazil has the fourth largest number of smartphones in the world, behind only China, the U.S., and Japan. Brazilians spend more time using their smartphones than any other country: 84 minutes a day. In the first quarter of the last year, the sale of tablets grew by 164%. Among tablet users, no less than 45% prefer to read the paper on their devices rather than print versions. The subscriptions of electronic newspaper editions has increased 128% in 2002, which is the last number available.

So, let's move onto the research. I've done a one-week content analysis of Estadao Noite, O Globo Mais, the mobile sites of O Globo and Estado S. Paulo and their print editions. After that, I carried out interviews with the editors of O Globo Mais and Estadao Noite.

The hypothesis was that journalism for tablets is imposing limits on integrated newsrooms and is creating a new language. The tablet is not seen as another distribution channel for non-stop content, but rather as a new medium.

So, let's move onto the results. But first I'd like to explain how I came to these numbers. I've listed all the content published on each medium during the week researched. That would allow me to tally the amount of content they have in common, and therefore, the amount of exclusive content that has been produced.

This table shows how much O Globo Mais and Estadao Noite have in common with the mobile sites and the print edition of O Globo and of Estado S. Paulo. As we can see, there are still some overlaps between tablet, print, and mobile editions, but the table also shows that exclusive content has been produced for these devices.

So, let's move onto the analysis. Smartphones have not led to changes in the production routines. The 24-hour content production cycle automatically supplies cell phone screens and makes journalists unnecessary. Tablets have changed the production routines. Estadao Noite and O Globo Mais have their own teams for editing and producing the news.

Smartphones have not led to changes in journalistic language. Tactility could have been explored to develop a new language, but it's now merely functional on the devices. Tablets, on the other hand, have led to changes in journalistic language. Tactility has been applied to reveal content going beyond turning pages with a finger tap. Journalism for tablets brings emotive and sorrow experience which involves sight, hearing, and touch.

Let me explain what I mean. In the beginning with the papers, we could read the news. After that with the radio, we could listen to the news. Then with the TV, we could watch the news. On websites, we could read, watch, and listen to the news. But now with tablets, we can also interact with news using touch.

This new language [is] based on emotion, sensations, and that involves senses. It also seeks to entertain readers. Infotainment is no longer a taboo as it used to be for many newspapers.

Here are some examples from O Globo Mais. [In] this article on a diet recommended by a popular nutritionist, readers were invited to press the screen [and] to drag unhealthy food items out of the supermarket cart. Here, readers were surprised with the sound of lightening [and] thunder while an animation simulated a storm over the photo. Here, readers could run a finger over a current photo of the Flamingo Park, which is a tourist attraction in Rio de Janeiro, to reveal an older one from its inauguration 48 years ago. And finally here, readers were surprised with the sound of shots and shattered glass.

So to conclude, I'd like to present my final remarks. Tactility has brought changes to journalism. The technology is already on the way to digitally simulate smell and taste. Probably within a few years, we will be searching

how to use the nose and the mouth to access the news. Who knows. Meanwhile, a new generation of wearable gadgets will soon hit the market. As we have seen along history, journalism has always adapted to continuous technological changes. Novel ways to present news will certainly emerge with the new devices.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Matthew Powers: Great. Thank you. So, I want to talk about a group of actors that we don't typically associate with journalism. NGOs, so groups like Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and Oxfam are groups that we tend to think of primarily as advocates. They are advocates because we say they are partial. They have a point of view and that point of view seeks some sort of change. We may recognize that advocates need publicity in order to achieve this change, but we wouldn't claim that publicity constitutes journalism. And we'd made this distinction for a fairly simple reason. Journalism, we say, gives us an account of what's happening. Advocacy, we'd say, tells us how to think about and act upon what's happening. Whatever the merits of dividing journalism from advocacy were in the past, I want to suggest that it's a poor way of understanding the actual work that NGOs do today.

The three images you see here point to some of the ways NGOs do things that look and act a lot like journalism even as they retain important pieces of being advocacy. So on the left, you see an image of on-the-ground research being conducted in Guvecci, Turkey, which is a very small town on the Turkish side of the Syrian border. The top right you see video reports showing what they find on these research trips. And in the lower right, you see satellite imagery showing military movements around cities to which neither NGO professionals nor international reporters had access, but through satellite imagery Amnesty International was capable of showing military presence and military movements.

In all three, there is both an account of what's happening and a vision of how to think about these events. They are both, I'm going to suggest, journalism and advocacy. And rather than drawing lines between the two, I'm going to argue that we need to understand the types of journalism that different NGOs do.

For people interested in the future of news, there are important implications for thinking about these different roles that NGOs are playing nowadays. If on the one hand NGOs do provide credible reporting from locations around the world, then perhaps the future of international reporting isn't quite as bleak as we are often led to believe. On the other hand, if NGOs function primarily as advocates, then there may be cause for concern.

Reasonable people espouse different versions of these positions. Just last week, for instance, Dan Gilmore wrote a piece in Slate praising the reporting of NGOs. And somewhat less recently, the Columbia Journalism Review published an essay arguing that NGOs have organizational incentives to—as the author of that piece put it—quote, "present as gloomy a picture as possible in order to keep their donations flowing."

My own view is that the debate has started precisely where it should end up. That is, we've decided whether or not NGOs producing news is a good thing before we actually have any idea what they're doing. For several years, I've spent time in about a dozen NGOs trying to understand what sorts of news they produce. I've studied their reports, and their press releases, and their media strategies. And I've also tried to give some over time historical sensibility to it.

Today, what I want to do is I want to draw on that research to try and understand two things. There are more than two things that we could understand, but I'm just going to articulate two things that we might understand about NGOs as newsmakers.

The first thing I want to do is just present historical data to show the marked expansion in reporting capacities at two leading NGOs. These are human rights NGOs: Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch.

And the second thing I want to do is to draw on interviews with NGO professionals to show how NGOs balance the demands for reporting; that is, giving an account of what's happening with advocacy; that is, telling us how to think about what's happening, and how they do this in practice.

So, this slide offers a number of indicators showing the marked expansion in NGO reporting capacities over time. In an average week, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch each release one or two research reports. They do a lot of other things too, but this is on-the-ground research reporting. The average itself is just under two. To give you a sense of historical contrast, in 1987, for the entire year, Human Rights Watch published 14 reports. In a piece in The New Republic at the time, a journalist referred to that as, quote, "prodigiously productive." This year, 2014, Human Rights Watch produced 14 reports in just the months of January and February alone.

At the start of the decade in which Amnesty International would go on to win a Nobel Prize, Amnesty International's Secretariat employed 14 research staffers and reported on upwards of about 100 countries. Today, it has about 125 research staffers and reports on up to 150 countries. Similar increases can be seen at Human Rights Watch.

And so the first point to take away is simply that NGOs are providing more reporting from more places with more professionals than they ever did before.

Like journalists, NGOs are interested in telling stories. But the stories they tell are not simply accounts of what happened; nor, however, are they simply accounts of how to think about what happened. Instead, NGO reporting is guided by a search for what we might think of as specific types of credible causal stories. And these credible causal stories enable both the production of factual reporting and an account of what to do about it.

These stories have three primary components. And I'm going to go through each of the components and try and give a sense of what they are and what they mean.

The first is that there must be a credible, verifiable, human rights violation. Torture—to take a fairly straightforward example—is expressly prohibited in international human rights law. If a researcher comes across accusations of torture, there needs to be empirical verification of some sort that that violation occurred. And the means for doing this are multiple. All are based on gathering credible evidence. They include, for instance, conducting interviews with multiple victims. Asking each to describe the physical setting where the torture occurred, so that they can actually verify and crosscheck different people's accounts of where they actually were and make sure that they are describing the same thing [and] that the thing actually happened.

Second, there has to be an identifiable violator. NGO researchers must ascertain who committed the violation and, if possible, who ordered those types of violations to occur. And here again, credible evidence is essential. The victims, for example, are asked to name their torturers where possible. And individuals identified by multiple interviewees are then seen as violators. And the accused are often asked to respond to the allegations.

And so, the first two pieces are very importantly factual, empirically verified pieces of reporting. OK? And they are more than simply witnessing. More than simply, "I was there. Here's what I found." But, "I talked to people, and here's how I know what I know."

And the third piece of the credible causal story is that there has to be a remedy or there must be some plausible remedy. And this is the advocacy point that follows from the reporting. In cases of torture, the remedy is at least logically straightforward. The torturer must be stopped. The violator must be punished. But crucially, the advocacy point can only emerge after and from credible reporting.

Now, this is a model of a very particular type of journalism. It's a model of the journalism that NGOs do. And it's not an unproblematic model or one that's above reproach. For example, NGOs have been criticized for privileging

some human rights concerns, like torture, over others, like economic, social, and cultural rights. Oftentimes for the simple reason that it's much more difficult to actually figure out who's responsible for economic human rights violations; although, they do work on it.

And as with news organizations, some NGOs are more thorough and more credible than others. And furthermore, NGOs seek publicity not just for this reporting, but for a variety of other purposes, some of which often include fundraising and donations and branding.

But NGO journalism is not a model of mere advocacy. In fact, as I've tried to suggest, there advocacy is premised on credible reporting. And this requires as much a commitment of knowing what happened as it does require a view to think about what happened.

So in concluding, I would say that NGOs are not a panacea for the challenges facing journalism or for the challenges facing news organizations, but they are a component and, in fact, a key component of the emerging world of international news production. And as such, I think they deserve both our scholarly and our practical attention.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Edward Kian: Thank you. Ray Murray and I are old sportswriters, and about 90% of the research on sport media examines the content of whatever medium is producing it. So, we are looking more at the actual practitioners, where there's a dearth of research in that area. This was qualitative research to look at how they are adapting to various new tools in the new platforms. All right?

For more than two centuries, newspapers were the dominant medium in sport. That has changed a great deal, obviously, as newspapers have downsized, as you're hearing a lot about in this conference. Most of the top writers, columnists that you see on ESPN, Yahoo, CBS, etc., were former newspaper writers. Really the only two exceptions were Bill Simmons and Jay Glazer.

Now basically, new media are changing the way everything is done, distributed, and consumed in sport media. And internet readers tend to be younger, and they look for more multimedia content.

So, all of you know about Web 2.0. Basically, we use this Sherwood and Nicholson, Matt Nicholson, out of Australia on how Web 2.0 is impacting the roles and jobs of sport journalists. The biggest impact has been Twitter. If you are a sports fan and you're not on Twitter, then you're really not a sports fan. This stat shows it all: 1.2% of all U.S. TV programming is sports. I have

75 or 100 sport channels including all the packages. It's all tax writeable. I can write it all off. [*laughter*] But half of all tweets are sports related. OK? Go there during the game tonight and you'll see that.

Exploratory surveys showed most sports reporters use Twitter as a means to gather and share information, with younger journalists using it more often as a means of self-promotion. OK? Web 2.0 has also increased the amount of convergence in sport media, where newspaper editors and all types of editors, producers of TV, etc., want you to go beyond just reporting in your traditional medium.

The little amount of research that's out there on this has been surveys. There's actually a good number of them from the news side, but not in terms of sports. Most of it has just been surveys. So, what we're trying to do is a phenomenology where we interviewed actual newspaper sportswriters—and newspaper sportswriters are the most old-school style there is—on the impact of the internet, social media, and Twitter on their job, work routines, and responsibilities.

So, here's the four overriding research questions that we used in doing so for this phenomenology:

- RQ1: How has the advent of Web 2.0 impacted the job duties and work routines of these newspaper sports reporters?
- RQ2: How has the advent of Web 2.0 impacted the newspaper sports journalism profession?
- RQ3: What Web 2.0 platforms do these journalists use as part of their jobs?
- RQ4: What experiences have these journalists had with Twitter as part of their jobs?

The data collection, we used purposeful sampling. This was a good critique by the reviewers. They said, "Did you just ask your friends?" No, but we asked friends of friends, all right? That gave us better access. This was one of three studies in different areas, where we interviewed about 35 sportswriters over a year. So, you do have to ask friends of friends, but we had never met 8 of the 12 in person, and none of them were good friends.

Loose interview guide [was] based on previous studies in this area. The interviews were transcribed, coded, etc., to search for dominant themes. And of course, this subject is interpretive, but we did have two people coding.

Overall, the 12 participants: 11 men and 1 woman. You think, *Wow, that's awful!* Well, that's actually the reality of the field. And this study is not a gender-based study, but that is the reality of sports journalism which is a very hegemonic, masculine culture in addition to the actual statistical differentials.

Subject ages. We wanted experienced newspaper sportswriters, so all had spent at least seven continuous years in professional newspaper sport journalism, which is becoming a rare thing. Most people have been laid off now and moved around. So, these were all seven straight years at minimum up to 30-plus years. 31 to 64 [age range]. They had been all around the country in terms of jobs. This was an experienced group.

And the five dominant themes that emerged from this analysis:

1) ***The speed of Web 2.0 has changed reporters' jobs for better or worse.*** The idea of the better part [is], it's made researching stories so much easier and keeping up with what's happening on your beat or what you're covering [is] so much easier. However, the continuous theme was that you must put out the information quickly now through Twitter and/or the company's website or your own website or you could be beaten on it. One thing that came out is, "This is to fulfill the instant gratifications and wants of new-age users." One of them called it the "*gimme* now generation." You know, you've got to have it right now versus waiting till the next day. At the same time, Web 2.0 has reduced the consequences of getting beat in competition. So, for example, a major league baseball…. We used a condition of anonymity to interview these folks to get their best answers. But a major league baseball reporter in the Northeast, one of the beat writers, said basically from talking to the other guys on the beat, in the 90's, they would wake up in the morning and have the terror of reading every other newspaper to see whatever you missed. "I don't have that feeling anymore. Everything is broken on Twitter or online somewhere. You just don't miss much. If you do get beat with something, you are beaten for 15 minutes and no one really notices. The internet just puts it there. The value of breaking a story is really minimized. If you break it, it's your story for a matter of minutes, then you don't have it." All right? And that's true. They like to say, "Adam Shepard is reporting this," etc., but then everybody is going to report it quickly. And do you really know if he reported it or was it the person covering that team locally that did so? Because they are going to take credit for it on ESPN.

2) ***All journalists use Twitter for work, but most do not like interacting on Twitter.*** These folks were on Twitter all day long. The higher the level the journalist, the beat you're covering, they're on it all [day], even if they hate Twitter. Some of them said they do. They are on it all day long, reading, following, etc. Following the athletes they cover, etc. Even if you're a high school reporter, you are following the athletes and coaches on Twitter. However, most said they do not like interacting with fans or followers, because they feel it's a waste of time. And one of them said, "I don't want readers to know about my personal life." At the same time, the younger reporters that we interviewed were more friendly to the idea of interacting with fans and followers on Twitter. But the overall conclusion was that some thought that Twitter had dumbed down sports journalism, particularly in the area of credibility. Because

something could go out there or go viral and then everybody sees it. And this person claims to be a journalist, but doesn't have any kind of training in that area.

3) ***Web 2.0 hurts newspaper industry sales, but gives reporters individual power.*** We could sit here all day and talk about the downsizing of the newspaper industry and how much the bad reaction to the rise of the internet played into that and what-have-you-not. But there's no doubt that there are fewer jobs. I mean, a lot of people have been laid off and [there are] fewer jobs, fewer top-line jobs covering beats now, in that sense; although, it's making a little bit of a comeback right now. But the interesting thing about this study that really came out was more -- they believe they have more individual power, because your stories are being seen by a much broader audience. People are linking you out all over the place. You can show through webpage hits, through Twitter followers, etc., the impact you're doing. You're getting praise from other people in the profession when you break stories or write a good story. So, for example, one reporter that also covers professional sports teams said, "Most of the teams fans aren't reading our paper, but most of them are going to my blog once in a while, if not every day. They also go to my newspaper's internet site. My job security comes from that. My job is only still there for online journalism, because these media consumers could just pick up another paper's newspaper content." And he gave the actual names of papers on the teams he covers. "We offer more than just the basic stories at our online sites." So, he was specifically putting content like notes pages, things that the hardcore fans would want to see, on his website, and using that as a means for his newspaper to keep him employed, when they've gone through a series of downsizing, because he gets too many followers, too many hits in that area not to. All right? And so that was one thing they talked about. And Logan and Avery just talked about branding. Well, a lot of these reporters talked about the ability to brand their own name, etc., which is why I teach my young kids, "Don't put in the name of the paper you're working for or the media outlet in your Twitter feed. Use your name. Because when they fire you or lay you off, you can take that Twitter feed with you … or if you get ideally a better job." But a lot of people disagree that are in the industry on the management side.

4) ***You must now be a multimedia reporter.*** All 12 of these had learned different skills—multimedia skills. The one that they were most uncomfortable with was the older reporters learning how to be on video. They didn't mind being interviewed. They did not want to do video reporting. What was interesting was the younger reporters were more comfortable. They actually had better training. They were more comfortable and more adaptable in these areas. So that's sort of what we're talking about in journalism curriculum today. They've had more multimedia skills; whereas, the ones that have been in the industry for 30

years, they just wanted to write. OK? And they were less comfortable and less adaptive to these areas, but all of them have learned new skills.

5) ***Bloggers are not journalists, but they still hurt credibility of the profession.*** And finally, this was interesting. Bloggers. The only platform outside of newspapers and writing content for newspapers that is put on the website -- the only platform that all 12 of these had used were blogs. And what's interesting [is], it was by far the most vitriolic comments and they all hated blogs. I hope Jay Rosen isn't here after what he was talking about this morning, because the comments were -- one said, "First of all, blogging is so 1990's." Well, blogging was around before Web 2.0. But they were like war-and-peace type blogs, where you just see continuous text. Now, the best blogs are multimedia content. And the overall content was that any fan in a basement could be a blogger, etc. There was a lot of lewd language used when talking about blogs and people just not liking it. "You don't need to write well. You don't need to know any facts. You just need to put some words down. And there's certainly no accountability." One guy said, "You know, I'm a big fan of the 1st Amendment, but there probably needs to be some kind of law against blogging." The idea being that they hated it this much, but yet they are all required to do a blog or have been required to do a blog for their paper.

So, in discussion, journalists noted multiple ways that Web 2.0 and Twitter made them better reporters, especially in the news-gathering process. They are not going back to microfiche anymore or going to look at old copies of the paper. They're getting things quickly. But most also said the overall rise of Twitter hurt the overall quality of sports reporting due to the desire of disseminating info first and also who gets to count as sport journalists. Whereas, these reporters attributed many newspaper job losses to the rise of the internet. They noted Web 2.0 had enabled them to reach larger and wider audiences.

Finally, limitations. We only interviewed 12 U.S. newspaper sportswriters, so this could not be generalized to global or generalized at all when you're talking about qualitative research. Good mix of subjects, but purposeful sampling. And these were all veterans. These weren't part-time people. These had been continuous employees. So, they might have different opinions. And they were working for newspapers, which again has been historically the least adaptive to incorporating multimedia content of the various mediums.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Q&A Session:

Jane Singer: Questions here. One in the middle here, yeah. Please stand up and say your name so we can all hear.

Eric Jackson: My name is Eric Jackson. For Matthew, I'm just curious. You pointed out there were some potentially problematic incentives within an advocacy organization. But problematic incentives aren't actually new for journalism. I guess my question is, are those organizations -- do they have -- are they talking about how they avoid those conflicts? How they make sure that they maintain the kind of independence to make sure that the facts that they're gathering are good before they're doing the advocacy part?

Matthew Powers: Thank you. That's a great question. The short answer is, it varies incredibly from one organization to the next. And so part of the issue with NGOs is that we simply have the same questions about what constitutes a credible NGO, credible reporting practices. One of the things I would point out is that different NGOs tend to favor different information functions more than others and this tends to happen systematically. So for instance, if you look over a 20-year-period and you look at which NGOs systematically tend to show up more frequently in the New York Times than on cable television news or evening network news, it tends to be groups like Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, something like International Crisis Group, which are very systematically interested in reaching the power elite, right? They are really interested in reaching decision makers. Now, this in and of itself isn't unproblematic, because we might say that one of the things that NGOs ought to do is do more than simply reach the power elite and things like that, right?

But NGOs have a variety of different information functions. Some of them are reporting based. Some of them are advocacy based. Some of them are just about making sure that they get the funds and the branding that they need in order to get those funds, right? And there are different ways of securing their organizational autonomy for doing that. And I think one of the interesting things to study with NGOs is to sort of do a parallel of what we've done for a long time as scholars of journalism, which is to try and understand what types of organizations, what types of institutional settings, what types of economic arrangements and policy arrangements tend to secure the most trustworthy, civically-oriented news? And we have a really great literature about that. We actually don't have that quite so much in the scholarship NGOs, so I think that's actually one of the important things to do -- is to figure that out.

Jane Singer: Next question. Sorry, I didn't see you. Yes, please.

Woman: I don't know if it's actually a question, but I represent Oxfam Intermón, which is part of the NGO Oxfam in Spain. And I'm in the Communication Department. Every time I meet someone in this symposium,

saying, "What are you doing here? Because this is not your business." And actually, it is in a sense a business, not because I'm a journalist working in a communication department of an NGO, but actually because having an independent media and having media that are looking into social issues is actually really important. Not for our profit, but I think because our target is to denounce or to make public some of the things that are happening around the world, and we do, as you mention, have the resources and have the way to do it. So, I mean, thank you for this information, because I think was really very interesting. And we are actually working to see how we can work with journalists in a different way. Not to be perceived as, "I need some money," but, you know, "We are working on this. How can we make it available for other people to know some things that are happening around the world?" Thank you.

Jane Singer: Thank you. Another question?

Lisa Lynch: Can I…?

Jane Singer: Yes, please.

Lisa Lynch: I just wanted to say I found your talk great. I want to say that my program, my journalism program is thinking of remaking their journalism program—their diploma program—we have an undergraduate program and a diploma program—into a program, a global journalism program that in part trains people to report for NGOs. And I know that Canada has also the Munk School of Global Journalism and UBC has also gone a little bit in that direction, too. They have an international journalism program. So, I'm wondering—you know, we have a bunch of journalism academics in the room—whether other people have had conversations about (a) how do you deal with a group of students who are concerned about alternative jobs, you know, concerned about working in the industry? And that's one of the reasons we thought about it and about this increasing phenomena. So many people are working for NGOs, as you were talking about. Don't we need to think about maybe offering some training with that in mind, instead of excluding them from the conversation?

Matthew Powers: Yeah. So, I mean, very quickly, I would just say that I agree entirely. and also that it's really important to distinguish what types of work people actually want to do at NGOs, because NGOs do have communication departments that are interested in raising awareness for publicity stuff, but are also involved in doing PR type work in terms of donations and stuff like that. And then there's research jobs, which are in fact very importantly different and differentiated internally usually within these organizations. So, I think it's a huge opportunity. And I think that was one of the pieces of Dan Gilmore's piece Enslaved is that there is a real opportunity for j-schools here, and it's a question of whether or not we're going to pick up on it.

Jane Singer: Yeah, I would say University of Iowa, we have in the last three years, I think, started a philanthropy certificate program. And we have a lot of interest in that among the students, so a real interest in doing non-profit kinds of work.

Man: I have a question for Ed. So, I'm a reader of Deadspin, and what I love about Deadspin is the fact that (a) they call out a lot of the sportswriters on poor reporting or…[interrupted by someone in the audience briefly] I'll start again. This question is for Ed. I'm a reader of Deadspin, because (a) they call out writers when they don't report properly. Sometimes it's in poor taste, but also their articles are put in the form of sort of a comment system. You know, the readers are part of the conversation. And also as you said, athletes are breaking news themselves. Do you get a sense that the form of sports writing is changing in a sense where it's more collaborative between the reader and the writer? The sportswriters you talk to don't seem to be wanting to adapt to that. Do you think they will have to in due time? Because people want to know about athlete's lives and tattoos and different aspects of what's going on with them. Do you get a sense that this will have to change for the people that you spoke to?

Edward Kian: Yeah. I mean, I'm also a big fan of Deadspin, and I especially love the comment section where you'll get a lot of good wit in that area. It's interesting that one of the most experienced reporters we interviewed, I asked him about Deadspin when he was talking about blogging, and he refused to acknowledge the existence of Deadspin. [*laughter*] Just acted like he had never heard of it. It was comical in that sense. But really it was the younger reporters that liked Deadspin more, as you would expect. The older did not like it, and partly because of what you're saying. Awful Announcing also finds bad things in sports journalism and points them out, but doesn't get the negative reaction that Deadspin does. So, of course, you know about the history of ESPN not respecting Deadspin either. But, you know, the younger folks were talking about that through Twitter of interacting with -- it gives them a chance to interact with readers. And the older journalists did not like that. Maybe it's just the world that you grew up in. if you are younger and you're involved with social media, you're on Twitter already. You learned to be interactive. Whereas in the old days, it was you produced the news, you disseminate it, and then maybe you get some phone calls to complain or compliment you on the story. So it is changing, I think, with younger people. As far as Deadspin goes, I don't know if that type of journalism is going to catch on, but, hey, it's the most popular sports blog in the world. And they have broken major news like the Mark McGwire story and other areas as well. So, you'll see more people trying to spin off in that area as well.

Jacob: OK. I've got the mike. I'm Jacob. I'm from South Sudan. I'm over here. Sorry. You want me to get up? I've got something on my lap. [*chuckles*] Yeah, just to add something to what Matthew was saying as a confirmation. When it comes to Africa, NGOs and journalists are dependent

on each other. They are interdependent. NGOs want the big shots like CNN, ABC, BBC to report about what is happening. The journalists themselves in the 80's and 90's in Africa found it very difficult to actually find out what exactly was going on. Because the government, like the Ethiopian famine of '84-'85, would not allow them to go to those areas. So they were dependent to find out what the NGOs actually knew. It's exactly the same thing in Somalia, in the genocide in Uganda, and in the civil war in Syria. Practically throughout Africa, NGOs have been dependent on what the media reports back here in the West and the journalists were dependent on what the NGOs knew. Just in addition to what you said.

Jane Singer: Thank you.

Man: This goes to Matthew Powers. Sort of gets to the question of, who's a journalist? When you think about some of the training that publicists and public relations professionals go through, one of their marks of success is to be able to write like a good journalist. What's the difference here? I mean, what makes these NGO writers journalists or like journalists, rather than public relations practitioners?

Matthew Powers: So, my quick response would be that it would be a lot more useful to just start with, what types of information are they producing? So, you absolutely have PR functions within NGOs that are trying to tout some advocacy point, or trying to raise awareness because they need money, or sometimes they are trying to talk about a research report that's just not getting any attention. Right? Now, all of those have very different civic functions. They are very different types of news. And we need to understand each one for what it is. So rather than saying, "When are NGOs doing journalism and when are they doing something else?" I think a more productive question is to say, "What's the full panoply of things that NGOs are involved in producing?" Because sometimes these *things* are literally people who are actually going somewhere reporting on the ground. Right? Sometimes it's people sitting in an office saying, "We need to boost membership, and we need to boost our profile, and we need to find ways of doing that." Right? And sometimes it's stuff that involves the transmission of information to very specific targeted publics that really don't rely on the mass media at all. They'd actually prefer not to have the mass media involved. And I think that in order to understand these things, the most useful way is to just try and appreciate the different things for what they are, rather than saying either, "There's nothing new under the sun," or, "This isn't quite journalism."

Jane Singer: Can I just ask one? I have a question for Logan and maybe for Ed as well. So in your study, it was health journalists that you looked at. Do you have a—this is speculative—but do you have a sense of, does it kind of play out the same way for other kinds of journalists, do you think, or is this something that you might be…? Are there specific issues for the kinds of journalists that you looked at?

Logan Molyneux: My hunch is yes. We designed the study that way just as sort of a best case scenario. If we were going to find branding, would it be among a particular beat of journalists? Probably yes. So, that's why we designed the study that way. But my other study looked at political journalists, and I found them having some of the same behaviors. So, my sense is that, yes, it's a profession-wide thing and not specifically to a beat.

Jane Singer: We'll take one more. Yeah, way up in the top there, yeah.

Mark Coddington: Hi. [*loud at first*] Oh, sorry. Mark Coddington. I had a question for Ed, and it's kind of an extension of what Jane just asked Logan. I was pretty amazed at sort of the level of vitriol that your interviewees expressed towards blogging. Not that it was there, because we've seen it over and over and over again with journalists, but the degree to which this animosity existed, especially given that sports journalism, like you've said, has been really particularly involved in these new technologies. So, you might have expected sports journalists to kind of get over it earlier. But, I mean, it was really kind of absurd. It was like 2003 levels of bloggers versus journalists. And I'm wondering—and this is also speculative—is there something about the kind of sports journalist kind of professional identity or the sports environment that has allowed this animosity to continue much longer possibly and stronger than professional journalists as a whole?

Edward Kian: Yeah, I believe…. That's a great assessment. Basically, the idea being that newspaper sport journalism is one of the most competitive professions you could be in, in terms of not only on the beat, but also getting those jobs. If you worked in the newsroom, sometimes there were 15-20 applicants for a job covering crime or cops, and there were 250 for a job covering prof sports. And so, the idea being [that] a lot of them were people without college degrees that were sitting on barstools. But there were a lot of people out there that would take that job in a second, so I think they feel this is their terrain. And now you have from the internet—and this has been the case for more than a decade—all these external threats coming about. And you've got to remember, we interviewed -- these were people that had been in the field for at least seven years continuously. So in most of these cases, they were there when blogs started.

And the other thing that's interesting is that almost all newspaper sports reporters have been required to keep a blog online. It's one area that many of them really struggled with. "What do I put here? Do I put extra notes? Do I put an opinion piece? Well, how am I supposed to do an opinion piece when I'm covering a team and I need to remain objective?" And yet for bloggers, natural bloggers, that was an easy thing to do, because you're not worried about someone claiming you're not objective or something along that line. So definitely, I sensed some bitterness there, and it was more so again from the older folks that we interviewed, more established [rather] than younger. So, that's something that will probably change over time. But part of it is the

idea [that] you're still in their terrain as actual real journalists, real reporters, through their vantage point; whereas, a blogger, in many cases, has no journalistic training or even a press pass.

Jane Singer: We have to stop. I'm sure we could keep going. Thank you so much to our authors.

[Applause.]