

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

Day 2, Panel 6: Citizen Journalism, User-Generated Content and Crowdsourcing: Who is Contributing to the Conversation and Why?*

Moderator/Chair:

Cindy Royal, Assistant Professor, Texas State University at San Marcos

Panelists:

Seth C. Lewis, Kelly Kaufhold, and Dominic L. Lasorsa, UT Austin
|| Thinking about Citizen Journalism: Perspectives on Participatory News Production at Community Newspapers

Elvira García de Torres et al, Universidad CEU Cardenal Herrera (Spain)

|| UGC Status and Levels of Control in Argentine, Colombian, Mexican, Peruvian, Portuguese, Spanish, U.S., and Venezuelan Online Newspapers

Shayla Thiel-Stern, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

|| When the Crowd Doesn't See the Value: Crowdsourcing, Citizen Journalism, and the Cultural Production of Local Online News

Na'ama Nagar, University at Albany-SUNY

|| The Loud Public: Readers' Comments in Online News Media

* Referred research papers (blind reviewed)

Cindy Royal: Okay. Good morning, everyone. We'll get ready to start our first research panel this morning. Thank you all for coming. My name is Cindy Royal, and I think that other than Rosental I may be the only one who has attended every one of the symposia since the beginning. [Laughter/Applause.] I was a PhD student here at UT, and I started in 1999, and Rosental was kind enough to invite me to the first symposium before I was even a PhD student here. I had been accepted and he was like, "Why don't you come to our program? This is your area of interest." So I came, and this really marked the beginning of a new career for me. So my ten-year anniversary of making that shift and going into academia and studying all the wonderful things that we've been talking about the past couple of days.

There are a lot of different things that, you know, have come up over the years at the symposium. And basically, back when I first started on my PhD, the thing that I was most concerned about, or the thing that I thought everybody would do, was communicate in some manner via html. Like

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

everybody would learn how to make a website. Boy, was I wrong. And we've seen so many things change over the years. We've seen things like go-to flash and learning how to use multimedia, to blogs, to microblogs, to the advent of social media. And I don't think anybody could have actually anticipated the level of participation that people have had, the level of interest and enthusiasm people have had to participate, in a way that we could not have understood, doing it for no money. There's this idea of social capital and understanding what motivates people to do this. And that was really the thing that brought me into this career to begin with, because I did not come at this from a journalism background. I had sort of a mid-life crisis, and I was the corporate type and decided that the Internet was an important enough thing to study on a communications basis, and so that's why I decided to go back to school and really never look back.

And I remember being at that first symposium kind of wide-eyed and bushy-tailed. And I remember seeing Janine Warner's presentation and being like, I want to be like her. I want to do that. And I think I even emailed you afterwards — you probably don't remember that — but I emailed several people at the symposium like, "What should a person studying this do?" And got good responses back from people. So it's really great to see the same faces and the same issues being discussed over the years and the same topics.

Got a few comments here on my iPhone. So, last year I did a paper on the social capital of social networking, and I was starting to get an understanding of why people do social networking. Because that's the question everybody asks, like, "Why do we do this? Why do we spend all this time online communicating without making any money, without any sort of expectation necessarily." So right before the panel, I went out and asked people, "Why?" So let me just refresh my things here and see what we have. So we have some of the comments that people made. This was one of my students Dee Kapila, who presented here two years ago. She says, "I use it to track interest, network, geek out with like-minded faults, create a life-stream." Another one of my students — they're all coming in here — "I use social media to stay networked and to be ahead of current trends in technology." Another one of my students who was here yesterday: "I use social media to stay connected to what's going on and where I'm not with people who are familiar, and strangers." Jim Coyle says, "I use social media to find and be found by old friends and colleagues, keep up with issues, trends in media, Catholic issues, interesting people." I mean, everybody had different reasons for using this. "To connect and share, have the pulse of a conversation." I think that was Alfred Hermida's that somebody re-tweeted. Yeah, there we go. And then Steve Fox: "I use Twitter in class as a reporting tool in an ironic twist when kids twittered '08-to-date. Realized needed more time." Sue Robinson, we'll have to go to her first one here, because she said, "I use social media to find out what parties I have not been invited to," first. [laughter] And then she came back up here and she says, "Seriously, social media and J classes exemplify journalism as process, notion of unfinished

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

story, community building." Steve Fox says, "I use social media to poke Susie." [laughs] And then Robert Rich says, "I made myself a Facebook fan page as a writer to shamelessly plug my work to get a job with at least a \$10,000 salary." [laughs] So there's a financial reason! [laughs] And then a social, C. L. Tomlinson, "Social media allows me to maintain relationships with hundreds of people conveniently and unobtrusively."

So people have a wide range of reasons for using them, but it's always about connecting with like-minded people, not necessarily people you know, but people who have the same interests. And I think we can see the power of using social media right now that 15 minutes before a presentation I can engage people and say, "What do you think?" about what we're about to talk about and get that response. So if you want to add to this, we can take one look at it again at the end of the presentation. If you want to send a tweet to Cindy Royal, just @CindyRoyal, and you can put the hash-tag ISOJ on that. We can look at those at the end.

So to kick off the panel here, we have a really great panel today called "Citizen Journalism, User-Generated Content, and Crowdsourcing: Who is Contributing to the Conversation and Why?" And our first presenter is going to be Na'ama Nagar, and she is with the University of Albany-SUNY, and she is going to do a paper and talk about a project entitled "The Loud Public: Reader's Comments in Online News Media."

Na'ama Nagar: First, thank you for having me here. I'm a political scientist, actually, not a communications scholar, but one chapter of my dissertation relates to online journalism, and therefore, I'm here. This paper is part of a dissertation project on the consequences of one particular interactive feature that is available now on news sites, and that is users' comments. In essence, the feature allows ordinary citizens to talk back to reporters, and hereafter I use the term "talkback" to refer to the feature. My point of departure is that talkbacks are an alternative source of public opinion, and they're generated through discourse. The audience's ability to engage in discourse with the media was not invented with the Internet, of course, but I argue that talkbacks are somewhat different from Letter to the Editors or talk radio, because they represent a spontaneous manifestation of opinions regarding current events and the selection process is far more inclusive. Also, unlike users' comments in other online spheres, talkbacks are displayed next to mainstream news sources and are thus associated with authoritative media organizations.

[Technical difficulties.]

Talkbacks are one of many interactive features, as I said, and I rely on like McMillan's multidimensional construct of interactivity to first assess the nature of the feature. McMillan highlights three dimensions of interactivity, two of which are the most relevant to talkbacks. First, talkbacks enable a user-to-user interaction, so direction of communication is both a one-way

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

from users to journalists and a two-way communication that is represented through discussions among the users themselves, which become rather — occur rather often, and therefore several news sites already structure the format as a forum, and they have threads and everything. It is important to mention that a few editors also consider to facilitate responsive dialogue, that the journalists will actually respond to the users' comments, but they say that it's still in developing stages. Talkbacks also represent content generated by users, which falls under the user-to-document interactivity dimension. The audience is considered active, however, its level of control is largely dependent on the moderation process.

The paper draws on two distinct literatures. First, the first one addresses the way interactive features are integrated and perceived by the online news media, and for lack of time, I will not go into it. The second literature refers to agenda building, which is part of the agenda-setting research program. I would like to briefly mention that in the context of the traditional media, the audience is not considered to have much influence on media content. Studies, however, show that this is all changing in the online environment due to the constant interactions between the journalists and the users.

Drawing on these two theoretical approaches, this paper asks the following research questions: first, how do online editors receive the talkback feature? And second, in what way and to what extent do talkbacks influence editorial decisions?

I have conducted semi-structured interviews with 19 online editors from Israel and the UK, mainly editors-in-chief and news desk editors. I focused on the news sites that are affiliated with leading national newspapers. And there are two additional sites in the UK, which is original and a local newspaper. And then in Israel, Walla.co.il is an online portal only, and it's the second most popular news site in the country. And J-Post, which is affiliated with the *Jerusalem Post*, an English-language newspaper that targets the Jewish Diaspora in the US, UK, and France.

Before I go into the results themselves, I'd like to briefly discuss the features' characteristics, which include the scope of content people are allowed to comment on, the anonymity level, and the moderation process. These characteristics will emphasize the differences between the Israeli and British news sites and also the variation across case studies. While in Israel, users are allowed to comment on all content in all major news sites, probably in all sites. In the UK, there is some discrepancy. *A* in the table stands for sites that allow talkbacks on all content; *L*, for limited content, which refers to opinion pieces and/or some news reports; and *B*, talkbacks only on journalistic blogs.

By level of anonymity, I mean the amount of information users are asked to provide before posting a comment. I identify three levels: full anonymity, users are not required to reveal any identifying information; partial

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

anonymity, users are asked to leave a valid email address and maybe a location, which they can always lie about; and C, partial identification, users are asked to register and log in before they can talk back to reporters.

All Israeli news sites in the study allow users full anonymity when posting a comment. In the UK there is slightly more variation, but I could not find a single site that allows full anonymity for its users.

Moderation is vital to editors, not only because of legal issues, but also because editors are concerned with maintaining the brand reputation. In Israel, all major sites employ a pre-moderation approach. Again, in the UK, there is some variation.

In the case of editor's perceptions about talkbacks, the most interesting finding [is] that no matter what they thought about the feature, they all stated that for commercial reasons, they have to allow talkbacks. And here are two representative quotes: an Israeli editor-in-chief, "If someone puts a gun to my head and asks me to leave only two features on the site, I would leave news reports and talkbacks." And a British editor-in-chief commented, "The commentators are part of the site now. The media landscape is changing with the sites of video, sites of audio, sites of comments. I think that if you do not have one of those things, if we did not have comments on the site, we will be dead." Sorry, I didn't show that. Ah! Oh, I suck! Sorry.

Editors mainly express their concern with regards to the quality of comments. Israeli editors were more severe in their criticism, but most of them did not present strategies to improve the quality. British editors, on the other hand, were also frustrated with some of the comments, but many of them stressed that they are constantly looking for ways to improve the discourse. Here is a quote by an Israeli editor about the quality: "Our policy in the beginning..." And I want to add here, that in Israel, talkbacks exist since 2000, okay? The first two websites adopted it from the beginning, from the day they went online, and then everybody had to catch up. In fact, 2003, all news editors in Israel had talkbacks in them, so they've been dealing with it for a while now. So, "Our policy in the beginning was to upload everything that is legal with very minimal selection, but I've reached a point when I've understood that the feature brings out the ugliest aspect of Israeli society, and by allowing that, I'm facilitating a rather violent public discourse." Editors, mainly in Britain, as I stated, mentioned two primary ways to deal with their quality of comments. Several editors talked about users profiles as a strategy. The profiles include users' past comments, and editors believe that the existence of such archive will preclude commentators from writing inappropriate or irrelevant comments. Some editors also said they're working on mechanisms to empower strong commentators, but I was asked not to reveal those strategies right now.

Man: [Inaudible.]

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

No, I know, but...

Man: [Inaudible.]

The study of agenda-setting is about the relative importance of an issue on an editor's agenda. With regards to talkbacks, I hypothesize that they may influence editorial decisions in two ways. First, the quantity of talkbacks on a given article serve as cues of issue salience. These cues are then taken into account in future editorial decisions. Second, comments may include information that could potentially lead to new stories and then function as traditional news sources.

I find three ways that — actually, I find three ways that they influence the media content. First, [a] few editors admitted that occasionally they will instruct journalists to cover an issue because it is likely to stir a debate. I also find that British editors, more so than Israeli, are likely to utilize talkbacks as news sources. And finally, the most concrete evidence that I found is that quantity matters. Almost all editors stated that they've asked journalists at least once or twice to follow up on a story because it attracted a large response. That being said, all editors stressed that talkbacks do not set their agenda. They argue that the exclusive coverage of issues that are popular among their users will significantly undermine the quality of their site.

I don't have time to read the first two, so you do it, but I do want to show an example for such follow-up. So it started with an article about a soldier who is sentenced to 21 days in the military prison for yawning in Yitzhak Rabin's memorial ceremony that received a small insignificant story from the editor's perspective. That received over 600 comments. A couple days later, they published another response with over 800 comments. An opinion piece a week later criticizing that decision, and then there was a fourth article about the soldier being released from prison. (I'm running because I don't have much time.)

First, I find that for commercial reasons the integration of talkbacks seem to be a matter of necessity. Also, the decision to incorporate talkbacks mainly was a function of the technical resources available to the sites and market forces. In other words, if the competition integrated the feature, you could not afford to stay behind. I also find some differences between British and Israeli editors, but I do not have the time to go into that.

To conclude, the online news media now have an audience that they can hear and see. This does not mean that users dictate news messages, but they have become one of many external forces that possess an agenda-building capacity. My future research will also look at the effect of talkbacks on the journalists, not just editors. We're also planning a quantitative analysis to examine the effect of talkbacks on the probability of follow-ups,

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

and there will also be a comparative. Another chapter in the dissertation is a comparative analysis on the quality of comments. Thank you.

[Applause.]

Cindy Royal: Okay. Our next paper is from Seth Lewis, Kelly Kaufhold, and Dominic Lasorsa: "Thinking about Citizen Journalism: Perspectives on Participatory News Production at Community Newspapers."

Kelly Kaufhold: Okay. Dominic Lasorsa is here with us in the audience, by the way.

Seth Lewis: All right. Well, it's great to be here, and it's nice to enjoy the home-field advantage of being here at UT Austin.

Man: Woo-hoo!

[Laughter.]

Seth Lewis: There you go, yeah. I would like to, if I could, just make a quick plug—a couple plugs, actually. One for the symposium blog: onlinejournalismsymposium.wordpress.com. Many of my students are blogging there and Rosental's students as well. They're doing a very nice job of summarizing the conference, so take a look, and I encourage you to look at that. The other thing would be, I teach a course, obviously, that deals with blogging, and right now we're dealing with media innovation and news innovation. Kind of building off what Rosental said, I'm looking for good ideas about how to teach these issues, about how to change the J-school curriculum such that we can think about teaching students to be individual entrepreneurs. So, that's a separate topic, but come chat. I'd love to talk about that.

And obviously, to acknowledge my co-authors, Kelly, here, is going to take over in a second, Nick Lasorsa is with us, and he played a crucial role in helping us develop some key findings from this study. I will say that, as you can tell from the title and the topic, it fits in nicely with sort of the mainstream of research presented here at the symposium as Amy talked about a moment ago. So these concepts of citizen journalism and how journalists reason through them and deal with authority issues are not necessarily new, but I would say that I think we bring two new elements to this process. One, is we look at community newspapers, which generally speaking aren't looked at all that much in mass communication research at all and particularly in the context of the digital age and how they are adapting to and adopting various technologies. Secondly, as Kelly will talk about, as we developed our findings, we found a rather interesting mapping or a model that we'd like to present of philosophical versus practical concerns and how editors deal with those issues. And I think it lends a new way of looking at and thinking about the conflicting impulses at the heart of larger

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

debates about, how do we integrate, or should we integrate, or in what way, user-generated content into the news production process?

So essentially, I think when we look at these issues, there's one central tension that I'd like to focus on, because it forms the core around which this paper is based, and that is that in the process of digitizing the newspaper, and in particular in recent years, you know, the fact that this symposium is ten years old suggests something about the short history of digitizing the news. And in particular, I think it's become apparent to us in the past couple of years [that] newspapers have gone from simply being *on* the web to attempting to be *of* the web. They're attempting to adopt a more web-centric mindset. And that is a true — that's a real shift of culture. It's not just a moving of technological levers of changing production patterns, but it represents a real fundamental shift in thinking about [the] web, perhaps, first, versus print. And in the process of doing that, of course, many papers have adopted web-centric types of activities on their websites, including opening the gates increasingly to user-generated content in various forms and different context. And what that does, of course, from a philosophical standpoint, it undermines the very gatekeeping function that is at the heart of professional norms, professional values, of the place and purpose of the press. And so, as we look at these things, we feel like gatekeeping then [becomes] a nice entry point through which to look at how journalists reason through issues of the participatory versus the professional, and where that — and that tension being so salient here.

Now in doing this, let me just clarify a couple of our concepts, the main concepts: citizen journalism, smaller newspapers, and gatekeeping as a theory. When we talk about citizen journalism, clearly, that's a rather generic term for the larger ecosystem of user-generated content in the news context. And a number of good papers and things have emerged recently from Alfred Hermida, Neil Thurman, David Domingo, some of whom are here with us and others, Jane Singer, Mark Joys, and others who have looked at these issues of how journalists reason through dealing with citizen-oriented journalism. But, in general, we use that term sort of generically. The reason we use that term versus participatory journalism, which is probably the more accepted term in the academic literature, is because it's the one more readily recognized by industry professionals. So in talking to editors, as we did in the study, we used the term 'citizen journalism.' We felt like that was the most appropriate to carry it that way.

Secondly here, when we look at smaller newspapers, again, this I feel like is one of the new ways in which — the new angle with which we can provide. Smaller newspapers are really, uh, they are singular, in a sense, because... And in this context here, they almost allow us to turn back the clock just a little bit, because of the way that diffusion of innovation works. Because they're smaller, because they have fewer resources, etc., they're a little bit behind the curve in terms of adopting web technologies and adapting to those things, so it offers us almost the chance to look back and look at sort

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

of the thought processes at the beginning, at the very kind of early stages of when they're – they haven't already implemented UGC, but they're thinking about it. So, if they're thinking about it, *how* are they thinking about it? And what's going on internally? And in that way, the study is less about, let's count how they do it, or how many different discussion groups they have, or how they allow comments, as much as, how do they think about it, and what implications does that have for the way we think about a professional orientation in journalism?

Finally, with gatekeeping, I've kind of already mentioned this, but if we look at gatekeeping as, I would say, a very base definition would be control over the flow of news information, control over content. And clearly, UGC implies a loosening, a lack of control over that content, and so there's the real rub, and there's the real tensions. How can gatekeeping theory help us understand the ways in which newspaper editors reason through these processes?

Oh, and I should mention, yeah, I want to back up to the... Yeah, let me dish it over to Kelly for a second to talk about small newspapers and one other way in which they are different and worth studying.

Kelly Kaufhold: Well actually, they're different in a couple of key ways. One of the other things you mentioned is diffusion, and many of these communities are smaller communities far from city areas. They're in rural areas. They're not served as much as big cities are by broadband, but it's coming, and they see it coming, so that's one of the reasons these editors are thinking about it.

Gatekeeping is perfect, because what we've found is these editors really, really matter. But let me tell you a little about the newspapers. I'm going to deluge with numbers real quick. Don't write them down. Don't think about it. I'm setting a stage for one important number, so don't panic. Texas has 518 total newspapers. Their circulation is about 3.75 million, so just under 4 million. In 2008, circulation dropped in total about 143,000. It's a pretty small drop, actually. It's less than a percent. Of those 518 papers, there are 90 dailies. Those 90 dailies out of 518 account for 99% of the circulation drop statewide. 141,000 out of the 143,000 decline in circulation were at these 90 daily newspapers. Weekly newspapers — and this is pretty remarkable — 366 weekly newspapers, about two-thirds of the papers in Texas, saw an increase in circulation last year. Now you're not hearing it anywhere else, right? It was a small increase. 1,300 total in the aggregate across all 366 papers. And it wasn't all of the papers. It was about a third of them saw an increase, but it was enough that in the aggregate, there was an increase among weekly papers. We looked at papers that were circulation 25,000 and below. It was overwhelmingly weekly and semi-weekly papers. And we found some real differences among these papers. Another key difference is their circulation has been pretty stable for years, and finally, they have a lot of young readers, not even just young adults, but teenagers,

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

who regularly read their papers because they serve their high schools so much.

Seth Lewis: Okay.

Kelly Kaufhold: So let me...

Seth Lewis: Let me...

Kelly Kaufhold: You want to skip that?

Seth Lewis: Yeah, let's go ahead and skip right to it. So basically, our research questions being, how do they think about these things? How do they think about issues in citizen journalism? And how do they negotiate that as a philosophical and practical concern today? To just kind of mention again, the reason gatekeeping is so salient here and works well is because these editors do have such gatekeeping authority over their local communities. With fewer media options, they truly have, presumably, greater control over discourse.

Kelly Kaufhold: Yeah. They consider themselves, and in many ways, they often are the authorities in their communities. So we looked at 29 papers, we did interviews with 29 editors. Again, all of the papers between 2,500 and 25,000 circulation. And [we] found they either agreed or disagreed on philosophical grounds. So either we think citizen journalism is a good idea or a bad idea, because we're the professionals or on practical grounds, and often [on] practical grounds, staff size was the issue. Either we can have people write for us or we can't. A lot these editors invited people to write for them, because they just didn't have the staff to cover stories themselves. They needed help. On the other side of that same coin, a lot of editors opposed citizen journalism because they didn't have the staff to go online and edit comments and police what the citizens said. So it all came down to the trust of the editors, which is why gatekeeping is so important.

I'm going to show you some examples, and it was really interesting. So again, these guys had these tiny staffs and different editors and different views. Davis McCauley from *The Bastrop Advertiser* said, "It doesn't make any sense. Reporting is professional and can't be done by just anyone." Brian Knox from *Wise County Messenger* [said], "I don't know if it's egotistical or what, but we're journalists and we need to be doing the writing." So this is typical of the folks who disapproved on principle and just said, "We're not going to hand over our paper to somebody else." People who disapprove for practical reasons. Again, this is different. They are open to the idea, but they just thought, we can't possibly babysit it; there's no way we can look at all this content. Two recurring themes in this group: either they didn't have time to fact check or they were concerned about libel. And a couple of the papers we talked to had active online presences where citizens could contribute, but they got problems. They had the same handful of citizens repeatedly posting,

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

and they would get in catfights online and start name-calling and stuff. And in one case, in one paper, some guy was upset because he was starting to tell people someone else had killed his dog. And it got into this, like, shooting match online, and it got pretty ugly in a hurry. So that editor said, "I'm not going to do it. I'm never doing it again. I've pulled it down. That's the end of it." Rachael Benavidez from *The Brownsville Herald* is really open to citizen journalism. Her paper has surveyed neighbors about what they want from their paper, includes their comments. She has this regular two-way street with people in her community. So, she was one of the people that said, "It's vital to engage people in the community," and that's important. Jessica Hawley-Jerome of *The Bandera Bulletin*. They encourage students to write for their paper, and they just do a little copy editing for their students, including high school students, and then run the copy in print and then finally approve on practical grounds. This was an interesting area, and this kind of makes sense if you think about it, some of these newspapers where there's an editor, and in some cases, a single reporter, and those two are the editorial staff. And in some of these other papers, it's a husband and wife team, publisher/editor, and they're the entire staff. So they'll take all the help they can get from folks in the community. And then, Dr. Lasorsa is the one who came up with this model, this rubric for which we are very grateful, but we ended up with a distribution fairly even across these different ways. I'll leave that up for a minute.

Seth Lewis: Yeah. So I think that, you know, it's hard to — it's not easy to sort of pin them in certain boxes. I think it's important to recognize that the editors and their thinking didn't always fit securely in one quadrant or the other, but the point was that — I think you can see from this — that there is a variety of opinions, you know, that diverge on different criteria in this case. It was interesting to see, too, that some editors could really strongly agree with citizen journalism on practical reasons — they need the help. And they could also, others could disagree with it, you know, have strong negative opinions of it, for the same concerns, so, on the same criteria. And that's it.

Kelly Kaufhold: Thank you.

Seth Lewis: Thanks.

[Applause.]

Cindy Royal: Okay. Our next paper is by Elvira García de Torres. It's "UGC Status and Levels of Control in Argentine, Colombian, Mexican, Peruvian, Portuguese, Spanish, U.S., and Venezuelan Online Newspapers."

Elvira García de Torres: [Laughs.] Thank you. [Technical difficulties.] Hello and good morning, afternoon, I don't know. Yeah. We are really glad to be here and present this research and trade with you. We are open to your comments, and I hope you will be nice and help me if I cannot find the right word. [Laughs.] This is a collective research. Here's all the people that have

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

been involved in doing the job. We are people from different universities from the United States, Portugal, Spain, Venezuela, Mexico, Peru, and Argentina, and you have all the people here. I wanted to show them because they appear as 'et al' in the program and this is all the 'et al' people that have been working with me very hard to be able to meet the deadlines and be with you at the symposium. Lyudmyla Yezers' ka, Miladys Rojano, Roberto Igarza, Jose Azevedo. We couldn't find a picture of him for this. Fernando Zamith, Nora Paul, Mabel Calderin, Jorge Badillo, Silvia Martinez, and Janet Rodriguez. Silvia and Janet are PhD students that work with me very, very closely. And here are all the centers we work for and sometimes we almost die for. [Laughs/audience laughter.] I would like to stress that there are so many news and not all of them compatible, so I think we should put interest in really trying to see what UGC journalism is and what it is not. For Bowman and Willis, it is a form of participatory journalism, but they didn't consider the web blogs were a part of UGC. Hermida and Thurman — you can correct me if I am not right — say it is a process, an opportunity to participate or contribute. For De Keyser and Raeymaeckers, the sum of participatory and citizen journalism. And we found a very interesting report by Wunsh/Vincent and Vickery, and they say that UGC, not for journalists, but in general, is characterized by it is published, it is a publication of something, it requires a creative effort, but it does not have to be an original. It can be an adaptation, it's something creative, and it is outside of professional practices.

While from a broad point of view, we can consider that participatory journalism is a part of the citizen journalism movement, and also all of them are UGC, but this implies that there is some kind of soft UGC when the people comment on news or they rate the news and a strong UGC. That the best example are the citizen channels. And in this context, we propose to analyze participatory journalism messages taking into consideration the relationship. And I want to stress that, because I have heard lots of things on the relationship and of feelings. For example, passion was mentioned this morning, and also by Janine. She asked the traditional media not be afraid of the users. So to explore this relationship between users and producers, as their relationship provides a context in which the messages acquire meaning. So it's really important.

We saw this morning the video with Rosental. He said it was — he thought it was interesting what he was saying ten years ago, but we were all laughing, because we were thinking ten years ago. So the image was important for us and that was the compass for what he was saying there. Our approach is based on the interactional view. I kind of developed it here. You have it in the paper. That looks into verbal and non-verbal messages to find out the rules of the relationships. There can be, for example, a pattern of authority/submission, which is the traditional pattern for us in journalism, or weakness/assistance, but we don't know here who is assisting who nowadays. Also, we can explore tacit messages and explicit messages on the relationship that, as I said before, acquire importance. Usually, relationship messages are expressed tacitly and non-verbally, and we have a lot of

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

experience in our everyday life about this, how strong these analytical messages are, more than what we say. We found them in the websites. We found them in the Terms of Use, Privacy Policies. Those are explicit. [We found them in] the more or less control of the users' [participation]. Those are tacit messages. And on the part of the users, the data on participation. They like us. They do not like us. Yesterday, it was said by the CEO of the Malaysiakini website about some users, "They do not like us, but they come to us because we have the news."

The purpose in this preliminary results [is] what we are showing here today, so in this approach, we seek to explore relational messages in the user-producer relationship regarding control and the recognition of UGC. The research questions are: Are there any patterns? Do media give visibility to the users' contributions? Is there a correlation — I think this is most interesting — between the control for comments on journalistic and amateur content? Which one is — is one of them more important than the other? How far do media get involved in producing a citizen reporter toolkit? That was a question that has occupied me for some time.

The method consisted of a survey of 24 websites of Argentina, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Portugal, Spain, U.S., and Venezuela. The sample takes circulation into consideration, and it is based when it is possible on circulation audits data and other sources when it was not, as it was the case in some Latin America countries. Here you have the whole sample. I will pass this quickly. *Diario Popular*; *La Nación* in Argentina; in Colombia, *El Tiempo*, *El Espectador*, *El Nuevo Siglo*; for Mexico, *El Universal*, *La Jornada*, *Milenio*; and you have the papers from Peru: *Trome*, *El Comercio*, *Ojo*. From Portugal — Fernando has tried to teach me to say this, but it's not easy for me — *Jornal de Notícias*, *Correio da Manhã*, (aquí tenemos) *Público*. We have *Público* there. And from Spain, *El País*, *El Mundo*, *ABC*. From the United States, *USA Today*, the *New York Times*, and *Los Angeles Times*. And finally from Venezuela, *El Universal*, *El Nacional*, and *Tal Cual Digital*.

The parameters where we have a coding seemed very ample, and it was based partially on a previous work that I am sure most of you know, by Domingo et al, but we put emphasis in the rules, the mechanism of control, and the recognition of UGC. For example, when we examine if the users had [been] invited to send a picture, we can code all these things you see here. If there is a moderator; registration; if the users can open the categories; if there is a conceptualization, what news is; for the users, if there are tips for them to improve their pictures; undesirable material; report abuse; if it is displayed in other sections; if there is monetary compensation; if users have to pay, because it is said in some terms of use that in this moment, the users don't have to pay, so I think that maybe this is going to change in the future; if the photos can be shared; if you can post a comment on the pictures; editing tools. You can see, this is only for the invitation to submit pictures. This is very interesting. If the users grant license on rights to the

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

newspapers; license for adaptations; if there is a minimum age to participate; etc.

For this Citizen Reporter Channel, we have another brief, because we were interested in this particularly. These are only the parameters. There are lots of items related to each of them. The rules, the formats, if this explains what news is, if there are some relation... Yes, thank you. I have two minutes, so I have to go very quickly. If there is some mention of something related to ethics, etc.

We wrote a codebook because we were a lot of people from different countries with different languages. We have to handle around 76 items. So the codebook, we had to study. It had 60 pages, which we can both use Spanish and English. And we did some tests of the codebooks first, and then we did some tests of reliability to be sure that we were all coding in the same way, and only when this was acceptable, we proceed with the analysis.

There was a... We created a wiki to be more — to feel that we were nearer to the others. Some of us don't know the other physically. We just have met virtually. The principal challenges were working at different hours along the day and language barriers. If I wanted to talk to someone directly, I have to go to 2 AM in the morning.

Conclusions. Results reflect duality regarding UGC status. There is a wide implementation of 2.0 tools, but the most accepted are those that allow users to work on the content provided by the newspapers, but not so much the tools to produce content. Here you have the data. You have [it] all in the papers, so you can check it there. I may proceed with the conclusions. I'm sorry.

Conclusion #2: At the same time, recognition of content provided by users is high regarding both the number of options given to them to be contributors and the publication of their contributions in the front page. That is a form of gratification for the user if they see what they do in the front page of the paper, and I think that is real important.

Conclusion #3: The most significant pieces in the puzzle of status is who retains the rights over content and if monetary compensation for contributions is given. This is a key for the status. And what we find — what we found is that there is little protection of rights for the users' contributions. You have here the numbers again. About 50% do give their rights to the newspapers, sometimes without knowing they are doing that, because it is said explicitly, but you don't have to read that to provide content. It is significant because they are not asked to accept the legal terms sometimes. You have an example of a newspaper that, for the blogs, asked the readers to read the rules, and it's a very big advertisement in the blog section. And then you have here the compulsory, that you have to accept necessarily the

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

rules, the terms of use to participate. This, well, this has many things that should be discussed.

Conclusion #5: The control is exerted through a variety of tools, some of them require a very active stance by the newspapers, such as moderation. Other means are more soft: rules, recommendations, prohibitions. You have here, again, the numbers. And you can see here, in the last, in the bottom of the table, that the moderator, moderation, rates higher than any other here, as you see, in the most strong mechanics for control. Also, you can see, well, you have daytime in the paper associated to each of the modes of participation.

And Conclusion #6: The newspapers present a high variance. We couldn't see patterns, in general, or models. It's too diverse.

#7: Problems arising from participation and attempts to solve them are well known, but the coordination of the actions, the code that the newspapers take care of the relationship. Why they use moderation for some tools and registration for some others. This requires further examination.

Citizen Reporter Channel, that was really interesting too. It was adopted by 8 of the 24 papers of the sample. There are different by countries. We couldn't find one in the United States. Two of the newspapers from Portugal and Mexico and one for the places you see here. And regarding ethics, only three of the eight channels mentioned something of ethics, and it was curious that truth was mentioned by all of them. It was not very well developed. And only one paper, La Nación and its channels had a tutorial about how to write in it.

Conclusion #9: And it is the last one. Research on the users' attitudes, perceptions, and activity regarding the options given by the papers, their knowledge of the legal terms affecting participation and its consequences, as well as privacy policies and rules, will contribute to greater understanding of the structures in the user-producer relationship. Well, thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Cindy Royal: Thank you. And our last presenter on this panel is Shayla Thiel-Stern. She's from the University of Minnesota, and her paper is entitled "When the Crowd Doesn't See the Value: Crowdsourcing, Citizen Journalism, and the Cultural Production of Local Online News."

Shayla Thiel-Stern: All right. So, yeah, there's the title again. I live in Minnesota, and I live in Minneapolis. And actually yesterday, a number of people kept referring to a pretty innovative local online news project that's going on there, called MinnPost. I'm not talking about MinnPost today. I'm talking about a couple of other things, but I feel pretty fortunate to have landed in the Twin Cities, because there's a lot of really cool stuff going on in terms of online media. I myself came from a pretty corporate background

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

before I became an academic. I feel like I worked for mainstream news organizations that were very well funded: WashingtonPost.com, Cars.com. And what actually fascinates me is how the more local kind of upstarts are able to make their way. I mean, I know how Cars.com and WashingtonPost.com have been able to do it, but what do you do when you're starting with limited resources? So this is kind of where I'm coming from with these two case studies. One is a publication called Twin Cities Daily Planet, and I didn't have — well, I actually called it up earlier. I may show you a picture of it later, but I don't want to go over time. And the other one is something called Locally Grown Northfield. I've actually been spending quite a bit of time working on research on both of these. I've really just started on Twin Cities Daily Planet. This is very much just ongoing research for me. But Locally Grown I started last October doing a case study of them, at their behest, actually, and I probably will continue it actually through the end of the year. So I'm midway through. These are my observations and kind of how I'm thinking about it. And mostly, I just want to tell you the stories of how they're operating, basically. I think that's the interesting part.

So at Twin Cities Daily Planet, based in the Twin Cities, Minneapolis-St. Paul, there's a combined population of about 3.5 million people. I'll talk a little bit more about the separate constituencies coming up. Locally Grown Northfield's a population of about 17,000, so it's about 30 miles south of the Twin Cities. Both are working on different models of citizen journalism. Both are sort of combining professional journalism and journalistic ethics into what they're doing, basically. And I'm looking at questions, and so are they, actually, of how their production and what they're putting out is valued, both culturally and financially. And I'd like to think that there's a link. I'm not sure I'm there yet.

So Twin Cities Daily Planet. It was established really to give voice to those who don't really have exposure in mainstream media. So it's kind of an outside source and for lots of marginalized people, I'd say, in the Twin Cities. It's made up of a number of things, including citizen-generated blogs. You can see a couple there. If you see the whole page, you can see there's an entire list of them. Community and ethnic member media stories. So the Twin Cities has a lot — a lot, a lot — of community and ethnic media. We have one of the highest Somali populations in the country, I think, if not *the* highest, and Mung populations. Also lots of Latinos. So it's a very diverse area, basically. And most of them have their own publications, either solely on paper or solely online. Most of them don't have both. They also see sort of Daily Planet as a training place for would-be citizen journalists, and these citizen journalists could be writing for Daily Planet or they could be writing for the other publications, basically. We'll talk about how they do that, but first I'll go into some research questions.

So how does the crowd or the participant themselves, the journalist — so I'm kind of looking at both ends — feel about the value of its contribution to a

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

news site? And how does the journalist or editor feel about the value of its contribution to the news site? Looking at both of those.

Daily Planet founded in very late 2006, early 2007, founded by a group called the Twin Cities Media Alliance, which is a very pro citizen journalism, collaborative reporting, collective of individuals, many former reporters and editors from mainstream news media, but just generally interested in this sort of work. They're supported primarily by grants and reader donations. They are overseen by a full-time editor and they do have a staff, including an Executive Director-Publisher, Jeremy Iggers. He maybe has spoken here before, I'm not sure, but he worked at *The Star Tribune* for 25 years before launching into this. They also have a couple of other full-time, local editors. They hire interns as well, so it's not entirely a citizen organization. There are some professional components. And they do sort of professionalize the way they do citizen journalism. What do I mean by that?

The news and feature stories that you see on Twin Cities Daily Planet — if you have your computer and you want to look it up, it's tcdailyplanet.net — are largely reported from reporters, bloggers, from the member sites, so member sites again are ethnic and community news media, though they're really working with professionalized journalistic norms in most cases, but also citizens trained to be journalists who work for Twin Cities Daily Planet. And the Daily Planet does offer workshops and classes and teaches them how to work as journalists. So that's part of something that they offer to their audience. They do open it to comments. Some of these folks in the panel have already talked about that. They don't use Crowdsourcing — a buzzword I will define later. I think a lot of you know what I'm talking about already, but if you don't, I'll get to it. And in this case, the reporters in this organizations have seen it very much as a win-win, in terms of how they're doing citizen journalism. The Daily Planet gets important stories, they get important content, and the other publications and the reporters themselves get exposure they would never have in this place that people go, so it's a bit aggregated.

This is actually one of my students at the University of Minnesota, and this was her quote. She was incredibly excited. She had a story that was published there that was originally published on a blog called Engage Minnesota, which covers the Muslim community of the Twin Cities, and she was really, really excited about it and is now trying to be an intern there.

Okay. So moving to the other case study I'm looking at, Locally Grown Northfield. It started as a blog and a podcast in Northfield in 2004, and it was established by a guy named Griff Wigley, who used to be an online community manager years ago for the Utne Reader, so he's coming into it with some more — he's really coming into it as an online journalist. He wasn't so much a professional before. It's a combination of soft news, I would say, opinion, discussion, video. And Locally Grown is part of a community radio show.

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

I should talk a little bit about Northfield, actually. So it's 17,000 people 30 miles south of the Twin Cities. It's a really unique community. Carleton College and St. Olaf College are both there, so it's an incredibly hyper-literate kind of community, and therefore, even though they have a local news source, *The Northfield News*, people really tune into this blog for a lot of their news needs, so it's very interesting. There are two other people who work in the radio show and do blog occasionally and are counted as part of Locally Grown Northfield, and they're community members, which is sort of interesting. So one is the Executive Director of Development for the community and another is a local business owner. She owns a rug shop. So, they've started soliciting advertising just recently, but largely they're volunteering to do this. It's a labor of love.

In the interest of time, I'm not going to show some of the blog posts, but they're generally very short. Griff usually writes them. Just commenting on what's happening in the community. Again, pretty typical kind of stuff for blogging. And they have a regular community. Again, many who read the blog, get online and look at it, and many, like a regular community of followers, who also listen to the radio show. Often, it's one in the same people.

So something interesting has been going on with Locally Grown, called the Representative Journalism Project, or RepJ. This guy is — this is Len Witt. He's a professor from Kennesaw State, and he was asking the question on his own blog, "What if blogs could hire and support their own communities by getting a professional journalist to cover the issues they find important for them?" Okay? I thought that was a really interesting question, and he actually wound up getting a grant from this. He wound up getting a \$50,000 grant to fund this from a small family foundation. So it was set up that they would hire a full-time reporter or reporters. They couldn't decide at first. There were questions about who this would be. Would it be somebody who already knows locally, knows Northfield, or would it be an outsider who maintains a more of an objective stance? They went with the outsider.

That's Bonnie Obremski. She came from Massachusetts and had worked at a community newspaper there for two years before coming to Northfield. So, she would go into the community [and] instead of doing blog-style posts, she would actually write stories pertaining to the community. And again, I'd like to show you some of these stories, but there's no time, so... Often it would be accompanied by a live chat. Sometimes the community radio station would have her on to talk about her stories. She'd keep a blog of her stories. And this one is the thing that makes me most interested. She would use community comments and community members to help her with the stories. And as an outsider, that was invaluable to her. Right? She didn't really know the lay of the land there. So she would say, "Here's what I'm doing. Here's who I'm talking to. Am I talking to the right people?" And citizens would respond and say, "No, you are," "Yes, you aren't," "Talk to this guy," that

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

kind of thing. So she would go into the stories in progress and use comments to follow and improve upon the stories. It was really a transparent type of reporting process.

So here's the buzzword again — crowdsourcing. It's a facet of citizen journalism. I'm not going to go into that. Elvira did a really nice job of explicating citizen journalism. And it's the act of taking on a job traditionally done by a professional and outsourcing it to the community. That's kind of the basic understanding of it. Jay Rosen's project, that most people in here probably know about, did a great job of this. I'm going to skip through this, pros and cons.

How's it working, though? I think that's what we really want to know. It seems to be working really well, actually, for Locally Grown. The audience does actively participate. They very often give her comments to her stories and suggestions of how she can report it better. The bloggers appreciate the benefit of the reporter being there to enhance their site. And this is where I started thinking of audience as cultural producer, borrowing from Pierre Bourdieu's idea of cultural production, that allows a person, a regular person within a hierarchy, in this case, I think if you think of mainstream media and local media and the citizen and sort of that hierarchical process as able to produce something that can elevate them and elevate their status. Something I think Cindy talked about last year in her paper. Could this translate to value within the use of citizen journalism? Because obviously we can see the value as the publication, right? It's fabulous! Right? I think you guys were talking about it, too. The readers themselves can contribute everything, but what are they getting back from it, and do they value it? And will the pay for it, I think, is a big question.

So I learned a lot from a town meeting that I went [to] and met many of the commenters in person, which is an amazing opportunity. By and large, in the comments, they felt that the contributions that they were making to Locally Grown were incredibly worthless, [laughs], which was hilarious, actually. They said, "I would never pay for something citizen-generated. Why would I do that?" [Laughs.] So I thought that was very interesting. A lot of them said, "Okay, we'll consider paying for a professional to do our news gathering, depending on sort of the format of how we pay for it. It could be maybe in a co-op or sort of like the idea that everybody's contributing to a community garden" — I'm sure they have a few of those in Austin — "or public radio, but I would never pay for a blog or something that I am required to participate in all that much."

And here are some comments: "I don't think you should hire a whole bunch of bloggers who are just following the whims of the readers of Locally Grown and the people who are always commenting on the stories. It's better to have Bonnie or some other reporter who knows the community and the important stories." "I definitely don't see that collaborative reporting is important here," somebody else said, "it's that we have a trained journalist."

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

So that was really interesting. In general, it was just dismissed. The cultural production and value. And people are really hesitant to talk about money in terms of this. I guess that's not really surprising in this economy.

Both publications do continue to maintain crucial community partnerships through all of this stuff, so I'm going to talk about what they're doing right now. Both of these online communities — online publications are quite progressive. They use Twitter, they use video, they use podcasting. They use all kinds of things to engage their readers and encourage them to continue participating. And both publications, of course, try to seek to remain funded. Both, like I said before, are funded primarily by grants at this point, though they're starting to think about more micro-funding. And both want to remain relevant, and so, Locally Grown has decided to — Bonnie, the reporter, has left, actually, and they've decided to start using local freelancers and Spot.us tools. Does anybody know what I'm talking about here? So they're going to start trying to fund their stories in advance from the community members and see how that goes. I'm really interested to follow this in particular, considering that the community said, "I'm not really all that interested" in these sort of alternative models of funding.

So, with regard to cultural production, I think it has a lot of implications. And I'm still asking questions about those, so I'm not giving you too many answers today. I'm sorry. But, while both editors strongly, strongly value the contribution of their citizens, their audience members, the citizens themselves just don't always see it that way. And I think that that's a real — it's an issue and it's something we should be thinking about here as we move into the future and talk about these sort of alternative models of funding. It really adds another dimension of how not to pay for at least some of the aspects of journalism.

And I have... I end with questions, actually, as so many of us do. So, can crowdsourcing, as we're thinking about it here, can it translate into crowd funding? That's the next question for Locally Grown for sure. Daily Planet will probably continue to operate in the same kind of way. I think it's really too soon to say, so I'm looking forward to see what happens with them. But I do really urge people to pay attention to the correlation between cultural production and cultural value, whether they're truly linked. And that's it. Thanks.

[Applause.]

Cindy Royal: Thank you for all of those. They were really great examples of how the audience is participating in the issues and challenges that media have and engaging them. So we have some time for questions now, Rosental?

Rosental: Yeah.

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

Cindy Royal: Yes.

Question (James Breiner, Centro de Periodismo Digital en Guadalajara, Mexico): For Na'ama. Tell us a little bit more about the differences between editors in Great Britain and editors in Israel and the level of acceptance of comments by... Oh, I'm Jim Breiner from the Digital Journalism Center in Guadalajara. The differences in those two...

Na'ama: What I did not have time to elaborate on.

James Breiner: Yes.

Na'ama: First, as I said, it's important to understand that they've dealt with this for the last nine years; at least three of the major national newspapers. And some of them were somewhat dismissive or very status — static about the feature, because one, the quality of the comments is not that good, and second, because of the amount of time that they've dealt with this. So they already know which articles will attract a lot of comments. That's what they tell me. They say that they're rarely surprised by users' comments. There are also... I also identify a difference between the British and the Israeli editors when it comes to utilizing the comments as sources, as news sources. And for that I have two explanations. One is the dismissive approach I just mentioned, and the second, they, in Israel, in most major news sites, they already have a separate feature for users to use to send news stories, and they actually take that feature rather seriously. And I mentioned in the paper that YNet.co.il, which is the most popular news site in the country, only in March, 19 stories were originated in the 'read' email. That's how they call it, which means that a citizen wrote an email, told them the story, and they went to check it out and cover it up — and covered it, sorry. [Laughter.] Not cover it up, yeah. And covered it. There was one extra thing I wanted to mention, but I can't remember what was it right now, but these were the two main differences.

James Breiner: Israelis seem much more open than the British or is it both?

Na'ama: Yeah, but what I found that only one, YNet.co.il — I should mention his name here — is that only he is thinking about the future and how to take the future and make it even better. And the rest reached to a point that, you know, it's there, we have to have it, but we have so many other problems, mainly financially, financial problems, that we could not deal with it anymore. And you have to understand this feature is extremely popular in Israel. The two major news sites each day received over 20,000 comments a day. There's only five million people in Israel, only three million surf the net, so if you do the calculation or if you compare to the UK or the U.S., the amount of comments is insane. And I've done this comparison, and I did not find a country that received — that the newspaper received as many comments in Israel.

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

Question: I had a comment about the presentation about the local Texas media and particularly small papers. I worked at seven different publications in the three-county area here, one of which was the *Williamson County Sun* in Georgetown. They still don't have a website. It's my understanding that the reason that they didn't put a website up is because it would undercut their subscription revenue, and it [was] simple as that. Do ya'll have any...? You didn't say anything about the business side of why they did or didn't go into the kinds of things that you explored. I'd like you to comment on that if you could.

Kelly Kaufhold: I mean, it's an interesting question, and we did not ask the editors about that. We didn't get into specific details about it. I don't recall it coming up in the interviews. We did speak with some people about, there's a project we're working on that accompanied this study called Capital News Service, and we're actually having students cover the capital and provide content to community papers around the state who can't afford Associated Press Subscriptions, who can't afford a bureau chief, who don't have the staff to cover the capital. So as part of that, we've talked to different editors and again doing these interviews. And I'll give you an example. There's one editor in particular I spoke with, and I said, "As part of this project we're offering, would you be interested in multimedia content? Narrated slideshows, video content." And she paused and said, "Have you seen our website?" [Laughter.] So even those with websites have very little posted yet. We also spoke with an editor in ... Brownwood? I'm trying to remember where it was. One of the other editors we spoke with was very excited because they had put the site together kind of with volunteer help from somebody who worked at the paper already who was familiar with it. They went out and got a video camera. They had ordered a video camera. It was in the mail. It hadn't arrived yet. And there was a fire nearby. Brushfire started catching up with some houses. They went to the store, bought a video camera... No, I'm sorry. The editor ran out with his camera phone, had a video on his phone, shot some video, posted it online, and it was the most hit, most tracked they had ever gotten on their website. In fact, their website crashed because so many people from the community were coming. So, we didn't get into the business side of it. And it's a very interesting point. And as we know, there was the gentleman from Finland yesterday talking about 5% of their content goes on the website, and they do that on purpose to preserve the sales integrity of their print newspaper, and that was a very interesting model. We didn't get into it, but it's a good point, I think.

Seth Lewis: I just want to add a quick thing to that. I do remember a couple of editors sort of mentioning that, you know, in terms of why they don't have great web presence, that came up a little bit. Usually it was more of a staffing thing. We just don't have enough people. And a lot of them, the sense was that they wanted — they all seemed to want to do more with the web, and they all felt like that's where they should be. That there were elements where they can engage with the community that they couldn't do in the paper. And also, too, it's important to note that some of the citizen-

2009: International Symposium on Online Journalism

journalism initiatives and things that were mentioned as we talked to the editors were actually in print, you know. In fact, a lot of them were people were submitting articles and columns and things that were getting printed in the paper. It wasn't that it was just citizen journalism online, but you really see sort of a hybrid of some of it in print, some of it online.

Cindy Royal: We have time for one more question.

Question (Chris Anderson, Colombia University, USA): Hi. I had a question for Shayla Theil-Stern. Did you find...? And I mean, you didn't talk about this much in your presentation, but I think this may be where you're going. Maybe I'm wrong. Did you see a big difference in the way that the contributors with The Daily Planet valued their contributions? And Locally Grown Northfield?

Shayla Theil-Stern: Yeah, I saw a pretty big difference. Now, if you read... My paper's up online, so you can see it. I just didn't get to a lot of that. There was a difference, but I hesitate to sort of privilege one over the other, so certainly the contributors that I talked to [at] Daily Planet, I was kind of getting to the fact that they were pretty excited about it. But what they were very excited about was sort of being a part of this very traditional journalistic model. Right? They've got a byline, all of that stuff that people valued, you know, 15-20 years ago that maybe we're saying they shouldn't value now. Well, they truly valued that. So that was kind of interesting. And I wonder if Locally Grown Northfield treated the way they used the transparent collaborative reporting process, maybe if they gave sort of traditional credit, maybe it would be valued more by those folks. But Griff, who runs Locally Grown Northfield, says that I just happen to get a batch of bad people. He said, "These guys are traditionalists, you know. They're the ones who are the most vocal." But I said, "You know, the fact that they're contributing and reading a blog and really taking it seriously and showing up to talk about it in person suggests something else to me." But he said I'm kind of making something more of it than I ought to be. But yeah, there was a pretty big difference. And yeah, that is kind of what I'm getting to.

Cindy Royal: Okay. I think it's time for lunch. Thank you all for your participation [applause] and your user-generated content and your attention. Great, great panel.