15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Day 1, April 4, 2013: Afternoon Session – 4:30-6:00 p.m.

New Research Pathways in Digital News Content: From Preservation to Curation

Chair & Discussion: Amy Schmitz Weiss, Associate Professor, **San Diego State University,** Symposium Research Chair

Panelists:

- **Juliette De Maeyer,** University of Montreal, Canada: ***All the News That's Fit to Link: An Exhaustive Analysis of Links in Their Editorial Context***
- **Patrick Howe** and **Brady Teufel,** California Polytechnic State University: ***Native Advertising and Digital Natives: The Effects of Age and Advertisement Format on News Website Credibility Judgments***
- **Lisa Lynch,** Concordia University and **Paul Fontaine,** McGill University, Canada: ***Preserving the Unpreservable: Form, Content, Copyright and the Archiving of Born-Digital Newspapers***
- **Claudia Silva,** Nova de Lisboa University, Portugal: ***Back to the Future of News: Looking at Locative Media Principles in the Pre-News Era***
- **Vittoria Sacco,** University of Neuchatel, Switzerland and **Yanjun Zhao,** Cameron University: ***The Impact of Curation On Stories' Objectivity: Audience Criteria of Perceived Objectivity of Storify***
- **Alex Avila,** University of Texas at Austin: ***Bienvenido a Miami y Mas: Immigration Frames in English and Spanish Newspapers During the 2012 Florida Republican Primary***

Juliette De Maeyer: This presentation is going to be a huge disappointment for those of you who were expecting presentations about modern, cool, shiny, trendy things, because I'm going to talk about the oldest technology that exists in our world of online news -- that's the hyperlink. The hyperlink linking, it's been there since the beginning of the web, right, since the dawn of online news. That's a pretty boring topic. So, how relevant is that? Why do we want to talk about that?

Well, because it still seems to be a problem for some news organizations. You see this topic appearing in media news conversations from time to time, and you probably know those kind of headlines: *Why is it still so hard to get some media outlets to link? Why not link to sources? Why use website's own*

link? Hey, New York Times, where's the link? So, you see much criticism about the linking practices of news organizations, mostly mainstream, traditional news organizations.

And it's interesting, because with this criticism, those people have some explanation as to why news organizations don't link. And this is what I want to talk about today. And this is what I call the CMS problem, the Content Management System problem.

This is one of the explanations that you see, is that news organizations and especially legacy news organizations, they work with outdated tools. They work with software that is old, that is print-centric, that is not web-centric, so it does not allow a style of writing that is specific to the web, so it does not allow journalists to produce hyperlinks. So, this is the CMS problem. Of course, it's not the only explanation to the absence of links in news organizations. There are many other explanations, among which, for example, huge economic issues. And I'm not going to talk about that today.

But I think that this CMS problem is an interesting issue, because it all ties up to the broader issue of the relationship between journalists and the tools that they use. To what extent is the news determined by the software that journalists use? To what extent do machines shape the news that we see? It's the question of technology called determinism broadly. Or, if you think that technology of determinism is an insult, which is the case of many people, it's the problem of the workflow and the values that are embedded in the tools that the journalists use and the extent to which these values embedded in the software have an impact on the news that is produced.

Well, there are two core ideas in what I've just said. The first one is the news websites don't link, and the second one is that there is this CMS problem. And of course, I don't expect you to take those two assumptions for granted. And I have some empirical data to show [and] test those ideas. It turns out I have empirical data because I've spent four years of my life studying linking practices in Belgium. So, of course, nobody cares about news websites in Belgium. [*laughter*] And I can totally understand that. I'm talking about a foreign, exotic country because this is an international symposium. But hey, it's a real-life situation, right? I'm talking about those news organizations that operate in a very small market with many economic problems. It's a really small market. It's a real-life situation and I have empirical data about them.

So, let's look at the first assumption is that news websites don't link. Well, is it the case? I have analyzed all the articles published by six news organizations during more than a year. So, that's about 170,000 articles that I have analyzed and I have counted the links within them. And so, do they link? Well, sort of, right? You have 60% of the articles that actually have links, that actually contain links, and 40% of the articles contain no links at

all. Is it good? Is it bad? Well, it's not that bad. I don't know. I don't what the threshold [is] for enough links, but, well, that's the situation.

Of course, I must admit that it all becomes more dramatic when you look at the difference between internal links and external links. External links—those going to other websites—are often considered as the true links, right? And if you look at that, well, only 20% of articles actually contain external links. So, that's not a lot. And it means that the vast majority—80% of articles—do not contain any sort of external links at all. So, yeah, links are relatively scarce overall, especially links to the outside world. That's the first assumption that I wanted to test.

So, what about the second assumption? Is there a CMS problem? Do the tools that journalists use in the newsroom have an impact on the links that they produce or the absence of links that they produce? Well, to understand that, I have spent several weeks in two newsrooms, in two news organizations. And I was lucky, because these two newsrooms had very different CMSs, radically different CMSs.

How can I put it politely? [*laughter*] The CMS in Newsroom A was an old, cranky CMS that had been fixed way too often for its own good. It was really old and awful. And the CMS in Newsroom B was a shiny, new, state-of-the-art CMS, something like that. [*shows slide of an old bathroom sink and a new bathroom sink; laughter*] So now, let me walk you through the process.

Let me walk you through the process of adding a link to an article if you're a journalist in Newsroom A and if you're a journalist in Newsroom B. For this example, I'm talking about the simplest form of links. That's the in-text link, the one that you add in the text of the article. So, let's say that you're a journalist in Newsroom A and you want to add a link in your article. Well, that's a complicated process for you, because the system that you use to create your article, the system that you use to write is actually the system of the newspaper, so what you see on the screen is the page of a newspaper— literally. And you cannot add a link in that system. You just cannot do that. It's impossible but it's also strongly avoided, because any attempt at adding HTML in that system would not only not work, but also result in a newsroom crash of the system. So, you don't want to do that. You can. You can add a link, but you need to do it afterwards. After you have written your article, you have to log into another system, and then you have to wait for about five minutes before your article actually appears, because old pipes, you know, [it] takes time. Technology. And then there in that other system you can select a couple of words, click somewhere, and add the link, add a URL and add a link. So, it's a complicated and excruciating process that takes time.

Now, let's go to Newsroom B. You want to add a link. You're a journalist there. You want to add a link. What should you do? It's simply you select a couple of words, you click on the link icon in the menu, and you add a link.

As simple as that. It's a shiny, brand-new interface that looks like most of the blogging interfaces that you know. So it's pretty easy. It's just one click away. To put it shortly, the creation of links is easy in Newsroom B and incredibly difficult in Newsroom A. And Newsroom A looks like the case in point of the CMS problem, right? This awful tool that they use must explain why they produce so few links. However, if you look at the data, it turns out that Newsroom with the awful CMS actually produces more links than Newsroom B with the shiny, brand-new CMS. And I'm still talking about in-text links only in this case.

Still, it's not a lot of links, right? The majority of articles do not contain links. But 20% versus 80%, that's a big difference. Why is that so? You're going to ask, how do I explain that? Well, there are small differences in those two newsrooms that might explain. Of course, it's difficult to identify direct causality, but there are differences, let's say, in the way the management deals with the journalists, differences in the way journalists are trained, [and] differences in the time constraints. Well, we are still operating in the hamster wheel system, where they have to publish a lot and fast, but small differences that could explain why Newsroom A actually produces more links.

Well, it turns out that the CMS problem was too simplistic. Why? Tools, machines, and software, they have an impact. I'm not saying that they don't have an impact. Don't make me say that news organizations should keep the old CMSs. Don't tweet that, please. I'm not saying that. [*laughter*] But this impact of technology plays out in a wider set of factors that shape news production processes. So, that's too bad for the munition of machines over the world, but that's probably better for the future of the news.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Brady Teufel: Like Amy said, this presentation is called *Native Advertising and Digital Natives.* And I'm a native of New Zealand myself, but I live in California. So, I'm bring a special mix or blend to this presentation here.

So, I want you to first sit back and visualize something with me here. Visualize a Sunday morning where you're drinking your coffee. If I can advance it here…. (*a man helps him with the slide presentation*) Hey, hey, success! Thank you, sir! You're a life saver.

OK. So, back in action here. We're visualizing a scene, right? Sunday morning, you're drinking you're coffee. You've had a long work week. And it's time to consume some news at your favorite desk. So, here you are browsing through some websites. And you're cruising around. You're checking out headlines. You're checking out stuff that interests you that peeks your interest. And at some point, after Yahoo news, you know, the big aggregator, you get to [where] you're done with your news veggies, as my colleague

likes to say, and you get into some dessert here. Some chocolate covered cherries, BuzzFeed style. So, you're checking out BuzzFeed's homepage, and you notice something in the bottom right corner there. And it says, "Hollywood." And it says, "10 Things You Might Not Have Known About Los Angeles." And there's a little logo underneath that. And that logo is General Electrics. So, you pause for a second and think to yourself, now, what the hell does GE have to do with L.A. and liking it? Don't they make aircraft engines, and blenders, and light bulbs? So, you do a little more investigation. You start clicking the back arrow, and you start really scrutinizing these webpages. And lo and behold, you start noticing there's quite a bit of content on these pages that's affiliated with some kind of corporation. It's labeled differently. Sometimes it's called a sponsored post. Sometimes it's called *word from our sponsor.* Sometimes it's a little more insidious and hard to discern. But nonetheless, there it is, whether it's a logo or an actual phrase or an overt "sponsored by Xfinity" right there in red. So, there are a variety of ways that these native advertisements are revealed or not revealed.

So, the definition here of *native advertising:* Ads that are seamlessly integrated into a user's feed and are nearly indistinguishable from organic content. These can include everything from advertorials, branded content, sponsored product, sponsored video. This whole list. The list goes on, and it's expanding almost every day at an extremely rapid pace. It's only limited by essentially the creativity of advertisers and the willingness of journalistic organizations to integrate this type of advertising.

The rush is kind of on, too, with social media, social networking. We're probably all sick and tired now of Facebook style advertisements that appear in your feed and somehow profess to know what you want before you do. It's in Instagram. It's in Twitter. And these developments are really pretty [amazing] in the last couple of years.

So, this chart is essentially depicting how likely it is for marketers and advertisers to spend money on native advertisements in the next six months. And by the data in the chart, over 65% of ad agencies and marketers claim that they are somewhat likely or very likely to spend money on native ads in the next six months. So clearly, the rush is on. Prominent news organizations such as The Economist, Forbes, The Atlantic, Huffington Post, Washington Post, Time, Inc., New York Times, and Yahoo have all embraced or at least integrated some form of native advertisements in their editorial mix.

So, here's the problem. According to the Society of Professional Journalists, journalists should distinguish news from advertising and shun—keyword *shun*—hybrids that blur the lines between the two. So, native advertising is clearly falling into this category of a hybrid that's kind of blurring this line.

So, here's a good quote from -- I believe it was a Guardian article about native advertising. And I love the last phrase there: "At stake is the trust earned by the publication over its entire lifespan." And as we all know, [and]

I heard Jason Blair mention earlier, the credibility of your news organization is sort of a one-way street. You can build it up slowly, but once it's gone, it's very difficult to regain.

So, what we wanted to figure out was whether or not the presence of native advertising affected or how it affected the user's experience. Once you notice that the Hollywood article is sponsored by G.E., does that influence your perception of BuzzFeed, whatever it is to begin with? And would that perception be different if you saw a native advertisement, let's say, on the New York Times? So, we aimed to find out.

And here's what we did. We took the BuzzFeed page essentially exactly, duplicated it exactly, and we identified the native advertisement that was there. So, this is unchanged. This is a screenshot of the BuzzFeed page from the day we started our research. And what we did is run a -- put forth a survey that showed two mockups—one with the native ad and one with a more traditional advertisement. So, it's not couched in an editorial story. It's not a listicle. It's essentially right there in your face in yellow and blue, "Buy this Omni Freeze gear." So, we wanted to see whether or not, like I said, people would (A) recognize that—that there's a difference there, and (B) whether or not that recognition would lead to some kind of judgment on the website's overall credibility.

So, we asked a series of questions. And here's what we discovered at the end of our research. I think just under 300 people took this survey. There were two main age groups: 25 and under, and then 25 to 55, I believe. And we discovered some interesting things by using two age demographics in addition to the stuff we discovered about perceptions of credibility.

So, the first finding was this: That the presence of sponsored versus traditional online ads had *no* significant effect on the viewer's perception of a news website's credibility. So, this in some ways flies in the face of what I've been reading and hearing for a while -- that native ads are more attractive to people, to consumers. You like the website better if it's not traditional style ads. You'll appreciate it more. You'll appreciate that they're trying, so therefore, you might bestow more credibility on the site itself. Our findings disputed that.

"Regardless of the type of advertising type shown, respondents in the over 55 age group judged the site as *more credible* than did their younger counterparts," which was also a pretty interesting finding to us.

"Participants exposed to the traditional banner-type ad were more likely to report having noticed ads on the web page when compared to those who viewed the native advertisement." So, in that sense, native ads are working. They are more…. They are less overt. They are harder to distinguish.

And in the end, this left us with a bunch of questions [and] the revelation that the data was kind of flying in the face of popular sentiment that native ads are a good thing, and if you embrace native advertisements in your media organization, it will lead to less angst from readers and consumers. We didn't necessarily find that, and it kind of opened up a whole new realm of questions for us. And among them, these. [*See slide for the questions listed.*]

And as you can see, we go from nitty-gritty to, I think, what the most important theme or issue here is, and that's the last question: "How can the harm to an organization's credibility be minimized or nullified if in fact you continue to employ a native ad strategy?"

So, we think our research is important, obviously, to advertisers, in addition to journalistic organizations, because the jury is still very much out on how people are perceiving, treating, and reading into the different forms of advertisements that are appearing online.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Paul Fontaine: You can gather from the title that this isn't really a happy story. We offer at the end maybe a glint of hope. But in so many ways, we are in the midst of a bit of a crisis when it comes to archiving born-digital content. So, that will be the focus of the presentation.

So, the aim of the presentation is, first, to describe the prevalent practices important to born-digital newspaper archiving. And here, we have a little description of what born-digital is*: It's digital information originally created in electronic form.* And then we're going to turn Canada as a case study to illustrate the impasse that we face now in terms of born-digital archiving.

So, a little context first. Beginning in the 1990's, digitization emerged as a really exciting tool in terms of archiving. People thought by putting content online it would be accessible to an exponentially larger group of users. And over the past decade, there's been great successes in terms of archiving. Here, we see the British Library has preserved over 65-million news articles from archives dating back 300 years. The Library of Congress in an equally large program has collected newspapers from each state for its Chronicling America Project. Then finally in Sweden, the Swedish Royal Libraries have been collecting news websites since 1996.

So from the breadth of these projects, it might give the impression that digital technologies have offered us a way to capture, store, [and] preserve the output of the world's newspapers, but in fact, archivists today face challenges larger than any they have before.

So, what are those challenges? So, three of them and the ones that will be the focus of the talk are:

- First off, copyright concerns.
- Second off, technical hurdles.
- And third, a lack of consensus. And that's a lack of consensus over what gets archived and who will be doing the archiving.

So first, copyright. Now copyright, the issues around copyright have been framed mostly around public versus private interest. And these issues have been made more urgent by the fact that newspapers now see their own archives as a marketable good. This development is a relatively recent one in the history of newspaper archiving. It dates back to the 1980's when for-profit content aggregators convinced [the] news industry that old content might be digitally processed and indexed for sale in archived electronic databases. And since then, there have been many instances when news outlets have pushed back against projects that provide public access to historical newspapers. Now, the result has been that the copyright interest of newspapers has meant overwhelmingly the archiving of historical newspapers ends sometime in the first part of the 20th century. And in some cases, the copyright goes back even farther than that.

So next, the technological hurdles. I'm going to talk about two approaches. So, the first one is PDF archiving, and that's the collecting and processing of PDFs instead of digitizing [or] microfilming printed newspapers. So, the challenge that we found in the researching for the paper is that this approach requires a really close relationship between archivists and news media, and that hasn't been a harmonious one in many ways, largely because the PDFs would arrive to archivists either sporadically or missing metadata. So, it hasn't been a seamless back and for the between news industry and archivists. That's been one problem.

The next approach is web harvesting. So, the cool thing about web harvesting is that you're capturing a website in its totality, so you're seeing texts and images, as well as sort of multimedia aspects of it, and like everything, so it's great. But the problem with that has been that news sites behind paywalls can't be accessed, and that sort of approach doesn't work with paywall news outlets. And in Canada with the increasing number of, "Oh, let's go in behind paywalls," it's been a real challenge for archivists in Canada.

So, the third thing is consensus. And who's task is it? Now, the Center for Research Libraries, a North American consortium of university and public libraries, now recommends that libraries pursue neither PDF archiving nor web harvesting. They argue that libraries should work directly with for-profit archiving companies and newspapers as the primary means for archiving online content. This is part of a trend, because as both government and

foundation money has become more scarce, archiving projects have relied on public/private partnerships in order to secure funding.

So, as much sense as these sort of partnerships make, and as it represents the best option at present for jump-starting stalled efforts of born-digital archiving, what are the challenges that we are seeing here? And then, I'll go over two of them.

First, on the archiving side, the library archivists might be loath to give control over to those with commercial interests—to the media outlets themselves. And then second, on the side of newspapers, news outlets, the financial situation in many newspapers might discourage them from involvement in a project that has potential costs. So, those are just two of the sort of barriers that we have between long-term relationship between the two parties.

OK. So next, the Canadian context. So, I'll just start with the first point. Library and Archives kind of have long considered the archiving of newspapers to be provincial rather than a federal responsibility. Because of that, there hasn't been a lot of money thrown at the task of archiving news content in Canada at sort of a large-scale level, like the three that we saw early in the presentation.

In 2012, following budget cuts, the LAC's then head librarian and archivist, Daniel Caron, gave a speech titled, "The End of Archives is Nigh," where he described the library's plan to shift from preserving the online world to curating it. Now, you can imagine that for archivists working at the LAC, this wasn't embraced warmly. They saw it as a real challenge to their duty and to what they see their duty as, [which] is to archive content. So even after Caron's 2013 resignation, LAC still wasn't optimistic that the institution would change.

So with the library taking a backseat into digitization projects, a single non-profit remains as the probable contender to handle not only Canada's heritage digitization projects, but perhaps it's born-digital archiving as well. And that non-profit is called Canadiana. And then in 2013, a deal was announced between the LAC and Canadiana to digitize 40-million text images from LAC's archives, which is great news. That's a huge project and a big undertaking, but the downside is that the deal emphasized the LAC's own role in future digitization projects would be minimal. So, we're in sort of a problem in seeing what their role is going forward.

OK. Now, I'm going to talk a bit about the news media. So, interviews that we conducted with the Canadian news providers revealed that the question of how to archive material at the corporate level has been superseded by the question of what to archive. So, what goes forward when we switch from CMS's?

And first, the Globe and Mail. Having done a huge shift in 2009 from an in-house pub tool, which they used to archive news content, they moved to Escenic 4, which is sort of an outside provider. And then in 2012, they moved to Escenic 5. And where we're at with the Globe and Mail right now is, it's still in the process of prioritizing what material gets transferred. And in the meantime, a portion of their content remains in a dark archive accessible only to employees. And some of it won't get moved forward.

And then the second example we have is Sun Media, which up until 2007—or since 2007—has been using also an outside vendor, an outside technology, and they are also in a similar position. They are trying to consolidate databases from their various news outlets in hopes that content sharing will be made easier. But the problem is that they're also leaving behind content during the CMS shift and some will be lost and some just won't be brought forward.

So, limitations. There are many. First, in Canada:
- a weak library system,
- economically ailing news industry that is framed as a commercial enterprise rather than a public good, and
- a legal framework that has produced an unclear climate around copyright, and then
- an archiving community that has been largely unwilling to challenge copyright laws.

But [to now] offer some hope. Not this first part. [*laughs*] The failure to archive. We believe and we argue in the paper that the failure to archive born-digital news represents an abdication of responsibility towards an important part of the world's cultural heritage. However, as Canada is an active partner in the Center for Research Libraries, it's the hope that the momentum on the U.S. end will convince Canadian news publishers to partner with libraries and aggregators.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Claudia Silva: Before I start in my presentation, actually, I would like to clarify my connection with the University of Texas at Austin. So, I have been a visiting scholar here for over two years actually, and I would like to thank my advisor, Joseph Straubhaar. I don't think he's here this afternoon. Also, Rosental, who is my co-advisor. And actually, I would like to explain my motivation to pursue this research topic of locative media.

I remember the first time I went to Rosental's office, and I said, "Oh, I want to -- I'm thinking of studying this topic of locative media." And he looked at me [and said], "What is locative media?" And we kind of discussed this for

months. And I realized that was really important to come up with a concept or framework to explain to people actually what is locative media.

So today, I'm going to talk about this research project, which is called *Back to the Future of News: Looking for Locative Media Principles in the Pre-News Era.* And what I mean by that is, what can we learn by looking to the past of news? And how can we apply looking into the past of news for really fundamental principles? And how can we apply those fundamental principles into digital journalism practices?

So, my first point today in this presentation is the fact that our need to understand information through place, through location, through maps is not something new. Actually, [it is] something fundamentally rooted to the birth of news during the 16th and 17th centuries in Europe, mainly in France where newspapers first appeared. This behavior was replicated across the centuries.

So, if you look at this image, I don't know if you can see it really well, but it was taken in Paris in 1917. And you can see a man climbing a ladder to update a map in the middle of the 1st world war. So, you can see a crowd of people trying to understand what the latest news in the middle of the war. Actually, the map was given by this French newspaper, Excelsior, to the residents in Paris.

And today, we are here in Austin, Texas, 2014, and we all have our maps in our pockets. And we can navigate the map. We can share our location through Foursquare, with our friends, with our family. And we can attach information to the Blanton Museum. As you can see, this a screenshot of a mobile application called Field Trip that's owned by Google.

And just to emphasize this connection between maps and news, we have evidence from our past research that newspaper readers in France, they used to get lost by reading newspapers without looking at maps, until the newspaper sellers in the streets of Paris, they used to sell maps along with newspapers, or newspaper readers, they used to look at maps hanging in the bookstores in Paris. And again, that's the historic part of doing my research.

Today, we are not only able to see our location on maps, but we are able to see, for example, today, here at the Blanton Museum, the history of [the] museum. We are also able to see the picture of the building. And we can see all the information around the University of Texas at Austin, very locally.

So, I'm showing you this image today to convey the fundamental need to understand information through location, through maps. But the fundamental question I raised in this research is: What makes people look for information based on location in the past and today?

So, this is all about curiosity. Actually, during the 16th and 17th centuries, curiosity was not only a word as we use it today, but was a whole concept, a

whole culture that shaped scores, that shaped news and knowledge as a whole. So, curiosity was something inside a person that makes her or him to desire something, but also about those objects that make them desirable.

So, if you'll look at this image, it illustrates the cabinet of curiosities, which could be a piece of furniture, or a whole room where wealthy European families used to bring natural artifacts from the colonies. So, the cabinet of curiosities became a metaphor for everything—for news, for history, for knowledge as a whole—and it conveys the idea of bringing places before inaccessible audiences in Europe.

The question is, if you think about the relationship of curiosity with locative media, I don't know if you are familiar with this term, but it means the possibility of attaching information to a specific location through mobile technologies or maybe augmented realities, a more well-known term.

So, in order to understand this relationship between locative media and news, we should think about locative media in terms of three concepts: First, history. So first, you have to realize that during the culture of curiosities in the 16th and 17th centuries, again, the distinction between history and news was not absolute. So, when I talk about the history today, I talk about news and visa versa. In this sense, news was made in the collection of curiosities or inter-collection of fragments. In order that news was made in this collection of fragments, you were then to provide imaginary access to other times and places. Curiosity was mainly a way to legitimize news when people, when society didn't have the habit of reading news and the church, of course, was preventing society of learning everything. So, they had to come up with a way to engage readership when there was no habit at all of reading news.

And second, maps. Just location-based technologies change our perceived notion and boundaries of space by analogy to the cabinet or curiosities. News was explicitly used to transport the readers mentally to other places and to bring those places to readers' minds.

And the third concept [that is] very crucial to understand [about] this connection between locative media, news, and curiosities is sense of place. It's the fact that it illustrates the revival of the concept of place for news as a repository of information and also information delivery. So, I argue, I defend today that locative media is a possibility of exploring this potential of place as a repository of news.

So, Rosental was talking this morning about collecting all the past editions of ISOJ. And I was thinking, Blanton Museum is the place where this conference happens every year, so this is the repository of all ISOJ conferences.

So, how do the principles of the culture of curiosities resonate today? So, I'm going to introduce this concept of Foursquare as our cabinet of curiosities.

Foursquare is a cabinet of spatial information. So if you look at the center of this slide, you're going to see a tip left by the local newspaper in Austin, Austin Statesman, about the Blanton Museum. So, if you check-in on Foursquare right now, this is going to be the first information you're going to get on you smartphone. And then you can see also a tip left by the History Channel. So, Foursquare has been used by middleclass in the west in the same way as Facebook and Twitter. So, this is really a powerful way to engage young and mobile users, smartphone users, in the right location.

And to wrap up my presentation, I would like to pose this question. So, if you would think about this relationship between locative media and news and curiosity, how does it affect journalism? So, I first think that in order to take advantage of location-based knowledge, your location, or even Weibo technologies, which are really related to locative media, we first have to break with the preconceived ideas of what news should be. And once we do that, we became able to approach news from more in terms of the space rather than time. So, history here is really important, as I said before, historic information. So once we tie historical information of this place, Blanton Museum, to the location and you provide the user with this historic information, it becomes very powerful, because it changes your sense of place and you feel more connected with the place where you are.

And I also argue that approaching news from the curiosity standpoint might also be a way to engage young readership. So in the sense of rare, exotic, something that is hidden, so what about this building? How was this building 50 years ago? So, to approach news in the sense of unearthing, unlayering layers of information in the physical world.

And to conclude, I really believe that curiosity is a powerful strategy to engage and to recreate the habit of reading news, especially for the new generations of consumers, the millennials, by engaging them with the physical location of where they are, in their hands, and their sense of place.

So, thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Yanjun Zhao: Hello, everyone. I'll just give you a brief update. We are only two papers between you and the happy hour. OK? Actually, the happiest moment for me today already happened. It is the time when I met Dr. Johnson. Are you here? Yes, there. Yeah. He was my professor while I was a PhD student at Illinois. And actually, I really learned a lot from him. I learned how to be a better person. Maybe I even learned how to be a happy person. [*laughs*] Actually, I'm too happy today. [*applause*] So, in case I stutter today during my presentation, it's because I'm too emotional. It's because of him, okay? [*giggles*] Yeah, not my fault, yeah.

And back to the paper, I will make it really short. So, this is one of a series of big projects I worked with Vittoria. She is in Switzerland, and she's now in Australia. And actually, our paper has something in common with Professor Teufel's. It's more about how the format changes something. And there really are a bunch of papers on how the format on the new media will change the credibility and objectivity, and how people will communicate with like a crisis information, like the wars.

So, let me start. I want to ask you, how many of you get news from social media? All kinds of media. Okay, a lot. So, how many of you trust social media? Very few, yeah. Basically, that's what we're doing. And we are mainly -- this paper is mainly about how curating a story will impact people's trust or maybe give us a feeling about objectivity of online news. So, very often, actually, today, the younger people, they rely less and less on the traditional news format.

And there are a bunch of, like in my class, a lot of my students, even they are journalism majors, they don't really read like the very thick, traditional, hard-copy newspaper. And sometimes they call themselves *news-less*, the new generation. Maybe it's coming up. They get their news from all kinds of twitters and social media, but they don't trust them. They think it's like a big basket. Anyone can put anything there. And but at the same time, they are not really paying a lot of attention to like the big names, like The New York Times or other big newspapers.

So, what will happen under such a scenario? There are a lot of new kind of newspapers, like Storify or Paper.li, where you as a user, you can be an editor and you can make a newspapers just based out of software very, very easily. And we call that curation format. And the curated stories, it has a lot of strengths. For example, if you are a curator, you could gather a lot of information from different people. So, you get different voices heard. And on the other hand, many editors who are using curation, they are not really professional. They may not have the skills to edit or organize their stuff, so this is our main concern.

And we focus on the format called Storify. And it is one of a popular -- maybe more popular in Europe than here, so we focused on that. So, curation has been used by a lot of big news organizations already. So, our research question is: How will Storify impact just the format of presenting information? How will the format impact its perceived objectivity?

So, the literary review, we started with the different feelings or definitions of objectivity. I think I have one more. So, basically—sorry—objectivity, it has two dimensions. The first one is based on this. Say, here is a big story, and then you can cover mainly this side or you can cover both sides. So, objectivity means you need to cover it as complete as you can.

And there is another dimension. It's not just the facts. It's also the opinions. So, if you want to be really objective, you want to cover all the different opinions toward things. And very often, news is not just the basic facts. And very often, we will give background issues and a deeper analysis of different things.

So, we did an experiment with three scenarios. We made the first one just a very, very, very common, traditional online news with a professional author. Then we had two Storify formats. The first one, we had a professional author. On the second one, we had an amateur author. And then we basically compared these three formats.

The results showed the format did make a big difference. The traditional format showed a higher rating in objectivity. Also, the author profile also makes a difference. Like the professional authors, they were read even more. Actually, in our three groups, our single lines are saying, the contents are saying, just to the information of the author, we replaced it. So, actually, the content does not really matter as much as the author, as well as the format. That's the basic finding we found.

And then, we want to know, so we know author is a factor of objectivity, but that's nothing new. And we also know format is also a factor of objectivity. Then, between author and the format, which is stronger? Then, we did a follow-up analysis which is the format versus the author. And actually, our finding is actually format plays a bigger role than the author. So, with the professional author, there is a significant difference between traditional and the Storify formats. And with the Storify, with the same format, there is no difference between the professional and the amateur authors. That means the author does not make a difference with this new format, as far as we have found, okay?

Also, I want to say, [with] all the results, this is just our case study. The whole project is still in its initial stage. So, we are not saying this is the truth. This is just so far, okay?

So, for the discussion part, how do you judge the objectivity of an article? Actually, it depends on the format. And the format is even more important than the authorship in the case study. And some participants were experimenting. We asked them some open questions to let them give us some inputs. Here are some citations from them. They said, "Raw citations make it difficult to sort out and judge the quality of the article." That's why this Storify format is not recognized very well. And, "Raw information does not help to understand the event." Maybe the raw pieces from across the media, we got it too rapidly. The writing was not really edited very well. And, How does the authorship matter? "The writers from professional fields, they have better writing for sure, and it looks cleaner and more objective."

And the neutrality of the author, some participants said, "When the two parts of a conflict are exposed, none is judge better than the other." And someone said, "Absolute objective is just impossible." Actually, I agree with that.

And for implications for future study, we…. Actually, implications for journalists, the main thing we learned from this piece is the importance of a first impression. When you see something from a social media format, before you read the first row, you already lowered your estimation of it. And then if you see something, it's like you see something from Wal-Mart versus you see something from a high-end brand store. It's the format, yeah.

That's it. Thank you.

[Applause.]

Alex Avila: Let's start this presentation the way I like to start a lot of my class presentations—with a video. I hope we have volume.

> *Stephen Colbert: Mason, tonight is the all-important Florida primary. Now normally, I do my show live, but tonight I pre-taped at 7:30, because that is midnight for the average Floridian. [laughter] So, I don't know whether Mitt Romney or Newt Gingrich won, but we do know one thing for certain -- tomorrow both of them can go back to ignoring Latinos. [laughter] Now….*

Alex Avila: If it's a joke, Jorge Ramos of Univision would call it the Christopher Columbus Syndrome. Every four years, they would discover the Latino vote. [*laughter*] And it's an interesting thing. How do I get back to…?

So, back in 2000, as you'll recall, I'm sure many of you will, I was a producer at NPR's Latino USA during the contentious 2000 election. If you'll recall, first Gore was announced the winner. Then they said, "No, it's Bush." Then they said, "Uh, it's too close to call." And one of the reasons in our coverage, as we were looking at this, that they got it wrong, there was a lot of focus on exit polling. And they got the Latino segment of the exit polling very wrong, because they had over-sampled the Cuban influence of the Latino vote. And so, you know, a lot of people -- there was a lot of focus and they corrected a lot of the exiting pollings.

But to understand exit polling, you really have to understand the community that this is coming from. We've known for a while that there have been changes in the Latino community in Florida. Early on, it was dominated by Cuban—Cuban American politics. Cubans are all over the state, as you can see, but a greater concentration in the Miami Dade area, very exiled politics-related, and that meant traditionally more conservative.

At the same time, there was other sorts of immigration going on in Florida. There was a growing Puerto Rican population that was going there, not only from New York, but also from the island of Puerto Rico. I remember in 2003 when the Orlando Sentinels started having a full-time correspondent from San Juan as part of their staff. So, there was changing going on.

And that was important, because it was hard to predict now how this sub-group -- how this population was going to influence politics. Indeed, in 2004, Florida's Hispanic vote supported Bush. In 2008, they supported Obama. So clearly, but 2012, the Cuban Florida vote in Florida no longer defined what the overall Hispanic vote in Florida was going to be.

And there was also something interesting that was happening. In late 2011, Florida GOP moved its primary earlier in the calendar – to January 31 from March 6. And those of us who had been covering ethic politics, this was interesting, because a lot of the early states—Iowa, New Hampshire—not a lot of Latinos there, not a lot of Blacks there. And so, we had to wait till later on in the calendar to sort of study this thing. South Carolina, a large African-American community there. Then a week later, it was Florida, a large Latino population. And so, we could study this. We can look at this earlier in the calendar, in the political calendar.

So, I thought this would be, you know, we had a great opportunity here to look at two distinct Latino populations, both with strong political involvement, during a heightened political atmosphere. Both communities that I'm looking at—Orlando and Miami—they had influential daily newspapers that not only constituted a dominant market in the English language, but both produced sister publications in Spanish to deal with that segment of the population.

So, I set out to compare each community's coverage of Latino politics to compare it against each other, to compare it also by language, and obviously, I expected differences by regions. The politics of Miami Dade was going to be different from the politics of Orlando. But I also expected differences by language. And so I set out to do this. I set out to study this. Because I understood that most news organizations do target their audiences. They target their coverage to their audiences.

So, I decided to do a framing study. I thought that would work best. I chose to do a content analysis of each publication's coverage of Latino politics, and I chose to use the lens of immigration. Now, in the paper, it makes the case of why to use this lens of immigration. Immigration is a hot-button political issue. And actually, Latinos are not as liberal on the issue as many people think. So, they're not generally in favor of open borders or free and open borders. Most respect and desire the rule of law. But where they really get fired up is when politicians and the media all castigate Latinos as all immigrants. And therefore, somehow, underserving of all the rights and privileges of American citizenship. And that really then starts to tie immigration as an issue with civil rights in the eyes of many Latinos.

So, I chose to do a framing study, because how words are used and by whom reflect certain power dynamics. I wanted a paper that sort of dove— delved into those areas. So, these were my research questions. I focused my study during the month of the GOP Presidential Primary. It was January 2012. So, during that month, in all four publications, English, Spanish in both communities, I searched for everything in English and Spanish that had to do with the Latino vote or the Hispanic vote using the term *mixed*. And I gathered all those articles.

I did not create a dataset using immigration or immigrant or any of those words. But in 80% of all the articles I found—more than 80%—immigration was there. So, that sort of gives you a good hint, obviously, that the media had a role in perpetuating this frame of immigration in Latinos. So, I thought I was on the right track.

So, two bilingual coders. We identified 323 individual cases of what we called *immigration frames.* We called them frames. How they *framed* immigration. You can debate the definition of framing. We can go have a beer at the Dog & Duck and get into it if you want to—of what constitutes a frame and what doesn't—but anyway, these are the major areas that we agreed as coders: political issue, anti-immigrant, policy and enforcement. You know, we came up with these mega categories based on the 323 times we came across immigration frames.

Now, that's interesting, but we're academics. This is an academic panel. We got to do some kind of statistical analysis or we're not doing research, right? So, I compared just the English versions of the newspapers, and there were significant differences in the frames that each one used. If you look closely—I don't know if you can see—Miami, they were more focused on policy and enforcement. Orlando, they were more talking about illegal and undocumented immigrants. And the rest are kind of similar. You do the same thing in Spanish, and yes, we found significant differences. In Miami, at Nuevo Herold, it was more focused on anti-immigration. El Sentinel was political issue and more reformer stance; particularly, talking about the Dream Act.

There were some issues I had to take out. I also took out two of those (6 and 7) because of blank sales of zero. I take those out and I redo the numbers, and that 'P' value actually goes below 01, so it gets even more significant if you take out the missing values. That's just doing statistics.

Then I also wanted to test the English language version of a newspaper against its Spanish language sister publication. And I did not find statistical differences—significant differences—in Miami or Orlando. This was surprising to me. You would think there would be differences between English and Spanish.

So, what does all this mean? Obviously, different communities frame issues differently. If I were to do the same study in Houston or Los Angeles, a place with a big Mexican-American community, and Mexicans and Mexican Americans are the majority of Latinos in this country, I'm sure I would get different results. I would probably find the same frames being used. It would be very hard though to still compare sister publications. There are very few daily Spanish language newspapers in this country. There are even fewer English/Spanish sister publications published by the same entity. Mostly, what you get is one that will do an insert, a weekly. Even border places like in Laredo and in the Rio Grande Valley, they have a dominant English language newspaper and they have inserts that only come out three times a week, not the whole daily regimen.

But I will continue to do that sort of research. That's going to be the subject of my dissertation. I thought it was a very fun little paper, and I'm going to keep at it. We can slice this many, many different ways.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Q & A Session:

Woman: I was wondering on the archiving project if you only looked at newspapers or if you also looked at video journalism sources.

Lisa Lynch: We started to gather data on video and we have that, but for this particular project, we focused on newspapers, partially because we were concerned at looking at the already existing interventions into newspapers. Video is so much more chaotic…that it's a whole different story. You looked a little at….[*talking to Paul Fontaine*]

Paul Fontaine: Yeah, I talked to CBC, our national broadcaster, just about their archiving practices. It is very intricate. It is very complex. But I think we're still seeing the same issues in terms of what was being brought forward. They had different systems for their video, radio, and print, their online print. But we're still seeing the same issues and things not getting moved forward and things staying behind.

Lisa Olsen: I had a question for Alex. Lisa Olsen with the Houston Chronicle. I actually have two questions for you. One is, I was interested in you talking a little bit about the exit polling being so inaccurate. And I wondered if you could talk a little bit more about how they improved that. Because it seemed to me that the understanding of the evolution of Hispanic voters in the United States is phenomenally off base, in Texas as well, and I wondered how it's been tweaked. And the other question is, I wondered if in your research if you thought of looking at broadcasts since often, you know, a lot of Latinos get more news and so do non-Latinos from broadcast media.

It's been interesting to be in forums where folks from Univision talked about, for example, the way they cover news and the emphasis they put on voter education, for example, and community service news, and how that might influence their election coverage.

Alex Avila: Yeah, as a journalist, particularly in the nineties, I covered a lot of Univision issues. They aren't very public with what they do and how they do it. They are very evidently -- certainly are very successful, but they do issue a lot of control over their own internal information. It's hard to get information from them. In the case of 2000 in Florida, first of all, you know, Florida as a Latino state is very complicated to say the least. It doesn't represent the Latino community nationwide, because more than 60% of Latinos are Mexican or Mexican-Americans in this country. 5% are Cuban, but one-third of Florida is Cuban, 10% is Puerto Rican, not including the island of Puerto Rico, and that's one-third of Florida. So, it's very different, and it's changing very much.

What we did back in 1990, we talked to several pollsters, Sergio Bendixen, in particular, was our main source. And even he was saying how he was taken by surprise. And he's an expert. He's been polling for decades. And yeah, he was the one that said, "We need to do a better job." And it was soon after that, also, I know Ivan Roman, who is now the President of the National Association of Hispanic Journalists, NAHJ, he was at Orlando. He was one of the correspondents in Puerto Rico.

Lisa Olsen: Just to comment on that a little bit, when I was covering the elections here and the voter registration drives, the efforts to increase participation among Hispanics, one of the things people were most talking about was the difference between the generations of Hispanic voters.

Alex Avila: Right. Right. And that's not because I have not been a journalist now for—oh, my god—four years. I haven't been following it as much, but I used to follow Texas politics. I'm sure in the last four years, I've missed stuff now.

Amy Schmitz Weiss: I have a question for Juliette with your linking study. So, what other kitchen sinks are you going to be [*chuckles*] investigating? In terms of looking at your other linking, where are you going to take your study next, based on what you found so far at this point?

Juliette De Maeyer: Oh, wow! That's a big question, and it's basically over, because this was my dissertation. But there are many other things that I could not talk about today that were also appearing. And I brought up that CMS stuff because it's the only fun finding of my research, because the other findings are not that fun. And I explored, for example, what factors in the news -- could we find different linking practices according to different factors in the news? For example, are there more links in the sports sections or in the politics sections or things like that? But it turns out that, no, there are no

big differences. Not that many links everywhere. That's a boring finding in a way. [*laughs*] But yes, this is basically where this research went after that.

Amy Schmitz Weiss: And for Lisa and Paul, a question for the two of you. You brought this up as one of your points of opportunity, but challenge. How do you see—in moving forward in the future—the relationship between archivists and journalists moving forward…when we think about digital news content?

Lisa Lynch: Well, I mean, I think that the CRL, the Center for Research Library, if any of you are familiar with it, is trying to really become a player here. Burney Riley for the past two, three years has really been -- he's done a lot of case studies of archiving. He's met with folks at the New York Times. He's talked both to the Library of Congress and a lot of university libraries. I think he's been behind sort of instigating a lot of these pilot projects. So, if there are connections being forged, it's entirely really through his force of will. Without that force of will, you know, there's really been no conversations going on. So, you have university archivists in the states working on small pilot projects, but those projects aren't connected.

But one of the things that comes up in the paper that we didn't bring forward so much is the connection between this idea of news as a common good versus news as a commercial good and how that impacts archiving. So, you see in Scandinavia and in France much more of an interest at the state level and state archivists kind of investing in preserving news. And it really is connected to the way that news is seen within that media system.

Amy Schmitz Weiss: I think we had a question over here.

Sarah Peralta: Hi. I'm Sarah Peralta with Texas State -- a graduate of Texas State University. I had a question about native advertising. So, I think we can all agree that, you know, native advertising, yes, they say all these things about it, but your study confirms what many advertisers already know, which is, it is supposed to be sneaky. And I'm wondering if you think or maybe have some comments on, you know, advertisers, I think, know that—that it kind of flies under consumers' radar and that they don't recognize that they are reading ads. And I think that's part of the appeal for advertisers. And I don't know if you have any thoughts on that. I mean, I know I personally paid for, for my organization, native ads on social media platforms, and that's part of the appeal. So, I wonder if you have any thoughts on that.

Patrick Howe: Well, yeah, I do. Thank you for asking it like that. One of the things -- I was checking the Twitter feeds, and I saw that many people had tweeted out our finding that there was no significant difference in credibility judgments between people who saw the traditional ads and people who saw the native ads. And the one thing I guess I would -- if we could make this all into a tweet, the key part is also that it was less noticed. People

did not identify the sponsored content—the native ads—as ads. So, that's the big question mark in our study, I think, is, if you were to tell them, "Hey that was an ad you just saw," would that affect credibility or did it just fly completely under the radar unidentified? And so, I think that's like the big area of, you know, the big question to answer right now. I know I have my own view, which is, I suspect that at least for a certain demographic, I suspect people would then feel a little cheated.

Amy Schmitz Weiss: Any other questions coming yet? OK. I have a question for Claudia in regards to locative media. When we think about the idea of operationalizing curiosity in today's timeframe in looking at locative media, how do you think that will play out, as we've been hearing all day today in terms of looking forward at digital platforms beyond the current smartphone that we have? But even thinking about—if you've even started thinking in this direction—the possibilities of how locative media can play out with Live Paper, for instance, or even the wearable technologies that we saw this morning? If you could talk a little bit about that if that's something that you think would have a place within those digital platforms as well, aside from the smartphone currently?

Claudia Silva: OK. So, I really believe that this concept of curiosity is connected to location and history, because the big thing here about location is the fact that once you get the information when you are in the place, how [is] this information going to be useful for what you are doing there, right? So, the sense of curiosity is almost like attachable in a way that the user is, for example, a younger smartphone user is in a bar, and then this person discovered that that bar used to be a silent movie, right? The idea of curiosity is kind of like, as I said very briefly during the conversation, is the fact that you provide the user the location with some history, [like] here is the curious element of the narrative, so you provide the user with a topic even for conversation. Because another idea of the concept of curiosity and locative media here is that you provide a small piece of information on the application and you can lead the user to your website. But at the moment when the person gets the information, they have something. The person has something to talk [about] with a friend, for example. So, as I said, [it is] like the idea of changing your sense of place and being reconnected to the physical place. So, the idea here of locative media is bringing us back to the physical world, right? So, it's like kind of a hybrid reality. So, I would say that curiosity wouldn't work if you don't tie the information to the location where the user is. I don't know if that answers your question.

Amy Schmitz Weiss: Mm-hmm, it does. Thanks. Any other questions from the crowd? I don't want to keep you all from the happy hour. But let's give a round of applause to our researchers this afternoon.

[Applause.]