MA MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER

**Citizen Videojournalism in Professional Online News Media as a
Vehicle for Democracy**

Susan Lai

Professor Don Snyder

The Major Research Paper is submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Joint Graduate Program in Communication & Culture
Ryerson University – York University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

September 17th, 2010

Acknowledgements

Abstract.....	Page 4
Introduction.....	Page 6
Chapter 1: Terminology.....	Page 8
Acknowledgements	
Chapter 2: Theoretical Perspectives Surrounding the Concept of Public Journalism.....	Page 11
Chapter 3: History of Public Journalism.....	Page 12
Critique of Public Journalism.....	Page 13
Public Journalism as a Form of Democratic Production.....	Page 15
Chapter 4: Technical Aspects of Journalism.....	Page 17
Videojournalism.....	Page 17
Mobile Reporting.....	Page 18
Quality of Journalism.....	Page 19
Multi-skilled Staff.....	Page 20
Differences.....	Page 20
Chapter 5: Methodology, Interviews and Case Studies.....	Page 22
Interviews.....	Page 22
Research Question.....	Page 22
Discourse Analysis.....	Page 23
Visual Content Analysis.....	Page 18
Chapter 6: Interviews, Results and Findings.....	Page 29
Interviews.....	Page 29
Decision Making.....	Page 29
Evaluation.....	Page 30
Evaluation Criteria.....	Page 30
Criteria.....	Page 31
The Notion of Authenticity.....	Page 31
Copyright and Purchase.....	Page 31
Images.....	Page 32
Using Graphic Images.....	Page 32
Image Broadcast Style.....	Page 33
The Risk of Using User Generated Content.....	Page 33
Representation and Controversy.....	Page 34
Citizen Journalism Motivation.....	Page 35
Motivation.....	Page 35
Evaluation.....	Page 36
Case Studies.....	Page 37

Table of Contents

Case Study 1: Immigration Judge Applicant for Sex	Page 38
Case Study 2: Vancouver Airport Taserings	Page 39
Abstract.....	Page 4
introduction.....	Page 6
Chapter 1: Terminology.....	Page 8
Chapter 2: Theoretical Perspectives Surrounding the Concept of Public Journalism.....	Page 10
Chapter 3: History of Public Journalism.....	Page 12
Critique of Public Journalism.....	Page 13
Public Journalism as a Form of Democratic Production.....	Page 15
Chapter 4: Technology Trends in Journalism.....	Page 17
Videojournalism	Page 17
Technological innovation in Journalism.....	Page 18
Mobile Reporting.....	Page 18
Quality of Journalism.....	Page 19
Multi-skilled Staff.....	Page 20
Differing Professional and Amateur Videos.....	Page 20
Chapter 5: Methodology, Interviews and Case Studies.....	Page 22
Interviews.....	Page 22
Research Question.....	Page 22
Discourse Analysis.....	Page 23
Visual Content Analysis.....	Page 18
Chapter 6: interviews, Results and Findings.....	Page 29
Interviews.....	Page 29
Decision Making.....	Page 29
Acquisition.....	Page 30
Selection Criteria.....	Page 30
Credits.....	Page 31
Verification of Authenticity.....	Page 31
Copyright and Purchase.....	Page 31
Editing.....	Page 32
Using Graphic Images.....	Page 32
Image Broadcast Style.....	Page 33
Benefits of Using User Generated Content.....	Page 33
Sensationalism and Controversy.....	Page 34
Citizen Journalism Motivation.....	Page 35
Issues.....	Page 35
Discussion.....	Page 36
Case Studies.....	Page 37

Case Study 1: Immigration Judge Solicits Refugee Applicant for Sex	Page 38
Case Study 2: Vancouver Airport Tasing.....	Page 39
Case Study 3: Victoria Police	Page 40
Data Analysis and Discussion.....	Page 42

Chapter 7: The Future of Public Journalism in the Exercise of Democracy.....	Page 44
---	----------------

Chapter 8: Conclusion.....	Page 48
-----------------------------------	----------------

Bibliography.....	Page 51
--------------------------	----------------

Appendix 1: Consent Agreement.....	Page 52
---	----------------

Appendix 2: interview Transcript.....	Page 59
--	----------------

Douglass Arrowsmith.....	Page 59
Corey Bellamy.....	Page 73
Peter Bregg.....	Page 75
Michael Kelly.....	Page 84
Sandy McKean.....	Page 87
Tor Sandberg.....	Page 96
Participant X	Page 109

Abstract

Public journalism has progressively risen as a significant reform movement with the advent of improved technological equipment, as well as improved access to the internet and news media. With a growing interest in public life and prompted democratic ideals, citizens have become prevalent voices in political, social and economic issues. The masses are trying to be involved in news gathering and distributing; citizens have become significant players as public journalists.

Citizen journalists have reconstructed the traditional means of journalism practice by being their own eyewitness reporters, producers, and news information distributors; they self-advocate for citizens' voices, analyze news, debate, and construct news stories from citizens' perspectives. The internet has created an open system that encourages free press and enables the mobilization of the rights and practice of public free speech. Deliberative democratic goals are significant in participatory journalism, and these challenges mainstream news journalism in their traditional roles as conveyors of journalism standards, professional practices, and ethics mediation. As new media's momentum picks up, the journalistic space between public and professional journalists will need to be shared, and the practices of journalism will have to shift their models for this new form of democratic platform. Through new media and new journalism practices that encourage citizen involvement, journalism is evolving in setting a different standard of what is newsworthy. It is shifting editorial and political agendas to make use of wider content from the public, which could possibly infer the approval of using new journalism models to encourage citizen participation in news making.

This research examines how the democratic practice of citizen participation in news content submissions affect news standards, by which the quality of news journalism is evaluated. This paper assesses how news organizations obtain content from citizens, how they make decisions to print and broadcast the content, and asks whether journalism has progressed into a model that involves citizens and professionals in an effective news production process. This study focuses on the implication of acquiring contributions of citizen journalism from the distinctive perspectives of news practices, participatory journalism, and the deliberation of democracy of citizens' press.

This paper focuses on how the integration of user-generated content (UGC), in news stories as a vehicle that provides voices for citizens in a democratic movement. The usage of UGC in news institutions has changed traditional journalistic practices in terms of their news value, standard and quality. Essentially, editors of the news media determine which images captured by citizen journalists will be used, and they also decide the messages that they want to send to the public through framing and editing techniques. Previous research on editorial practice has identified various standards about newsworthiness that serve as selection criteria. However, there is a limited amount of research available on how UGC has changed the traditional journalism model. Through qualitative interviews with seven image editors, five news companies, *The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*, *CTV*, *Macleans*, *Rabble* and *The Toronto Star*, this study sheds light on the editor's perceptions about citizen journalist videos and

images in news content online. Three Canadian case examples are examined for their visual content analysis: the immigration ex-judge sex bribe case, the Vancouver police tasing of a Polish man, and Victoria police manhandling two young men at a nightclub. Through analysis of the interviews and case studies, this study finds that editors feel that UGC has not altered their traditional news standards. However, upon closer examination of news report cases, it does appear that UGC, which often consists of low quality videos with information entertainment content, has in fact affected the practices of quality journalism. The news media have adopted UGC content styles, which tend toward being more sensational, graphic, raw; these styles can make "hard news", which conveys investigative in-depth information, appear similar to "soft news", such as sensational infotainment. Notwithstanding that professional news organizations use public content in their news stories, they have not provided a platform of partnership to allow citizens to have a democratic voice through their media.

Keywords:

Citizen Journalism, Public Journalism, Participatory Journalism, Democracy, User Generated Content, Online News Sites, Media Ethics, Broadcasting, Photojournalism, Videojournalism, Mobile Journalism

Initially, there might have been reluctance to use poor quality images provided by members of the public. However, after the London subway bombings, *The British Broadcasting Corporation* released many images shot by citizens, and demonstrated the success of using participatory journalism. Slowly, more organizations lowered their image standards, and organizations started using more images from the public as part of their regular news. In order to incorporate images from citizens, news organizations had to modify their traditional practices in ways that affected their objectivity, values, agenda, standards, criteria, and editorial selection.

In the research presented in this paper, interviews were conducted as a means of extrapolating insights about news images. The interviews were then analyzed through the discourse analysis method. Five news companies revealed the debates that journalists are having about the challenges in presenting user generated content in innovative online newsrooms. Along with the editors, the producers and directors of video, print and television media were interviewed. Interviewees include: Douglas Arrowsmith, a video director from the *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*; Sandy McKean, a director of *CBC News*; an unnamed senior producer at *CBC*; and Corey Bellamy, a senior *CTV* video producer. In terms of print sources, participants include: Peter Bregg who has worked with *NewsWires*, *Maclean's Magazine* and *AP* to name a few; Michael Kelly, a picture editor from *The Toronto Star*; and Tor Sandberg, from *Rabble.ca*, a video editor of their alternative news media. These participants were

Introduction

Traditional journalism practice models have changed due to rapid changes in technology, new media convergence, economic fluctuations, journalist layoffs, and the citizen journalism movement. In our age of information technology, mainstream new media might have, at first, been slow to respond to the grassroots or participatory journalism that takes place on social media sites on the internet. Citizen photojournalists and citizen video journalists are at the right place at the right time, and can document news events with a mobile wifi camera. Without a doubt, these images are very useful to news organizations.

Many factors may have contributed to the gradual increase of citizen-shot images in news reports. Economic readjustments, along with budget belt-tightening, are a factor in the downsizing of resources: from a large number of quality team members to a small number of journalists and technical staffers. The layoff of many reporters has caused journalists to take on dual roles as both reporters and videographers.

Due to an increased ease of use and accessibility, mobile phones now have both internet and video modes that allow images to be captured and instantly posted on an online platform. Hence, the popularity of social networks has allowed news gatherers to search for images on Flickr, Twitter and YouTube. Moreover, demand from readers and viewers may have accounted for the space dedicated to the voices of citizens in news media. On news websites, there are guidelines instructing citizens how to capture a news piece, how to submit it, and what information to provide. Engagement between a news institution and the public is beneficial to both parties, as citizens can then see their content posted in news platforms, while news organizations receive timely, free, eyewitness images for use in their news products.

Initially, there might have been reluctance to use poor quality images provided by members of the public. However, after the London subway bombings, *The British Broadcasting Corporation* released many images shot by citizens, and demonstrated the success of using participatory journalism. Slowly, more organizations lowered their image standards, and organizations started using more images from the public as part of their regular news. In order to incorporate images from citizens, news organizations had to modify their traditional practices in ways that affected their objectivity, values, agenda, standards, criteria, and editorial selection.

In the research presented in this paper, interviews were conducted as a means of extrapolating insights about news images. The interviews were then analyzed through the discourse analysis method. Five news companies revealed the debates that journalists are having about the challenges in presenting user generated content in innovative online newsrooms. Along with the editors, the producers and directors of video, print and television media were interviewed. Interviewees include: Douglas Arrowsmith, a video director from the *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*; Sandy McKean, a director of *CBC News*; an unnamed senior producer at *CBC*; and Corey Bellamy, a senior *CTV* video producer. In terms of print sources, participants include: Peter Bregg who has worked with *NewsWires*, *Macleans Magazine* and *AP* to name a few; Michael Kelly, a picture editor from *The Toronto Star*; and Tor Sandberg, from *Rabble.ca*, a video editor of their alternative news media. These participants were

interviewed with different questions based on their background in relation to the topic of journalism and image processes, and their attitudes towards citizen journalism. The questions applied to their positions as image editors, and they generated answers from their knowledge, experience, expertise, and news organization mandate. Depending on the allocated time interviewees gave the investigator, the number of questions ranged from twenty to sixty three, which made the interviews from twenty minutes to two hours long. Video clips were also examined through visual content analysis to determine any editing used, and to extrapolate the rationale behind the changes of the content prior to broadcasting them. The video clips that were investigated are the following three: an immigration judge soliciting an applicant for sex, the Vancouver Airport tasing of a Polish man, and the Victoria police using force to arrest eight men. Through online resources, the original videos are compared to the clips used in news broadcasts to analyze what the editing in news media signifies for citizen journalists and their freedom of speech.

This study quantifies and analyzes the distribution of user-generated content and the process of selection and dissemination of the visual information. By examining the editors' attitudes towards citizen journalism and exploring their broadcast stories, the research establishes how the process of acquiring user generated content, and the decision-making in how to use the images, reflects upon editors' traditional practices and attitudes towards giving citizens democratic voices. In the three video clips filmed by citizen eyewitnesses, the citizens provided sources of evidence to make official authorities accountable for their behaviour. This research builds upon knowledge of the discipline of journalism and its convergence with new media. The results will demonstrate how citizen journalism content is beneficial to both the public and the professional news organizations, as well as how the citizen journalism content contributes to the academic studies of journalism and its convergence with new media.

The increasing use of citizen-generated visual material by professional news-gathering organizations calls for further exploration of the causes of this incorporation. However, this research paper will limit itself to the analysis of the use of amateur video footage by mainstream news media as it normally appears on internet news sites. I will show how amateur video images are edited for use in professional news reporting as well as how they are embedded into the news narrative. Central to my discussion will be ethical considerations, including issues pertaining to the authenticity of the original footage and the editing of this material for broadcast. The interviews in this research work will map out the process of how image editors obtain, select, verify, edit and broadcast citizen photos or videographer's visuals online. The interviews will also seek to verify how the integration of UGC in news media affects the perception of citizen journalism democracy.

including "folk journalist" (Mortensen & Walker, 2002 in Haas, 2007), "grassroots journalist" (Gillmor, 2004), and "personal journalist" (Allan, 2002). More common expressions include "public journalist", "civic journalist", and "citizen journalist."

Perhaps the most challenging aspect associated with naming this form of journalism is the fact that each term has a somewhat different meaning. None of them are an ideal, all encompassing description. For instance, "citizen journalists" are not primarily journalists at all, and if they are not citizens of the country of which they are reporting about, this puts their nationality and status as journalists into question. Because it is too easy to define public journalism in such general and vague terms, the

Chapter 1

Terminology

Participatory journalism (PJ) is slowly becoming a part of traditional news reporting. Although the terminology describing this phenomenon is in flux—it is also referred to as user-generated-content (UGC), citizen journalism (CJ), civic participation, public journalism (PJ), citizen videography, citizen photojournalism, and mobile videographer (MoJo)—these terms all involve the use of eyewitness, non-trained journalists documenting an event. The nature of their involvement can vary: they may write text, capture still images, or make audio-visual recordings of a scene.

The concept of citizen journalism goes back to when civilization began communicating political ideas. The news, in printed form, occurred much later and is still in constant evolution relative to the alternative, independent means of spreading news information. This citizen journalism movement will be addressed in more detail in the following chapter. For now, the numerous names that refer to this phenomenon are notable mentions. The following chapters will present the history and examples of this journalism movement.

The basic notion of citizen journalism involves the active participation of eyewitnesses recording an event and posting the photograph or video on the internet for mass circulation. Through the internet, citizens can post the images on their social networks, such as Twitter, Flickr, and YouTube. There, professional journalists can discover these images. Alternatively, some citizen journalists submit their still or moving images, along with their comments, directly to news websites. Thus, this form of actively capturing and spreading the news credits these citizens the moniker “public journalists” (PJ)—a favourable, though dated, neutral term. This act is acknowledged as participatory journalism and a form of amateur news gathering. As Clay Shirky writes, one may call this act “participatory journalism, or journalism from the edges” (Shirky in Lasica, 2003, p. 71) but it simply refers to “individuals playing an active role in the process of collecting, reporting, sorting, analyzing and disseminating news information” (Lasica, 2003, p. 71). Interestingly enough, this is a role usually performed by trained, professional, and employed journalists.

Public journalism has been given many names. Shuguang Zhou (Changing Faces, 2009) speaks of internet citizens, or “netizens”, who are active and interested in public events. J. D. Lasica (2003, in Haas, 2007) prefers the term “amateur journalist” to describe news gatherers who are untrained professional journalists. A plethora of terms has been coined including “folk journalist” (Mortensen & Walker, 2002 in Haas, 2007), “grassroots journalist” (Gillmor, 2004), and “personal journalist” (Allan, 2002). More common expressions include “public journalist”, “civic journalist”, and “citizen journalist.”

Perhaps the most challenging aspect associated with naming this form of journalism is the fact that each term has a somewhat different meaning. None of them are an ideal, all encompassing description. For instance, “citizen journalists” are not primarily journalists at all, and if they are not citizens of the country of which they are reporting about, this puts their nationality and status as journalists into question. Because it is too easy to define public journalism in such general and vague terms, the

notion of the phenomenon is undermined. For our purposes, Tanni Haas, author of *in Pursuit of Public Journalism* (2007), states that a useful way of seeing the phenomenon is as a "journalistic movement whose primary goals are to enhance civic commitment to and citizen participation in democratic processes." A more neutral definition of public journalism was provided by Edmund B. Lambeth, of the University of Missouri, who stated that such a form of journalism seeks to:

- (1) listen systematically to the stories and ideas of citizens even while protecting its freedom to choose what to cover,
- (2) examine alternative ways to frame stories on important community issues,
- (3) choose frames that stand the best chance to stimulate citizen deliberation and build public understanding of issues,
- (4) take the initiative to report on major public problems in a way that advances public knowledge of possible solutions and the values served by alternative course of action,
- (5) pay continuing and systematic attention to how well and how credibly it is communicating with the public (Lambeth, 1998).

This formulation allows us to clarify our definition. Moreover, scholar Joyce Nip identifies five models of connection between mainstream journalism and public members: traditional journalism, public journalism, interactive journalism, participatory journalism and citizen journalism.

Numerous phrases reference this concept: some are offensive and others are less accurate, which results in numerous names. An initial term, now deemed offensive, is "amateur journalists" (Carlson, 2007; Greenberg, 2010, p. 11), which criticizes citizens as not having the journalistic skills or the standards to record events. This later evolved into the alternative, less offensive term of "non-professional journalist." Using the word "citizen" is also inaccurate as it indicates that the journalists are citizens of the country they document in, holding passports or citizenship cards. So, then, what do we call cross-region citizen journalists who belong to one native country and happen to document a disaster while vacationing in another country? Evidently, the word "citizen" is not an accurate description.

How individuals are called is dependent on the public journalists' role. Those who photograph are known as "citizen photojournalists." Those who are armed with digital cameras with a video option, or use digital camcorders to videotape, are called amateur videographers or "citizen video journalists" (VJ for short). Furthermore, those with mobile cameras are called "mobile journalists", MoJo for short. These mobile devices are flexible and fast, starting a growing trend in the news-gathering processes. According to lecturer David Cameron, this term "MoJo" is loosely applied to describe a "journalistic practice based on reporters equipped with portable multimedia news gathering equipment" (Cameron, n.d.). Writing by journalists, blogs, photographs, and video clips are materials called user-generated content (UGC). Although vague, this term encompasses all media forms and is a general and neutral name. For the purpose of this research paper, the citizen photojournalists and citizen video journalists material will be addressed as UGC.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Perspectives Surrounding the Concept of Public Journalism

This chapter will discuss theories on participatory journalism. Often times, people post images on independent sites such as personal blogs or social networks. increasingly, these networks are being used by mainstream news organizations as valuable sources of visual information. Some of the most outstanding amateur contributions to mainstream journalism have been videos taken by ordinary public members who are eyewitnesses. Within the new millennium, a couple of events that have been cited widely by broadcast news channels are videos of the September 11, 2001 World Trade attack in New York, and the July 2005 London tube bombings in the UK. These images recorded by eyewitnesses have high news value because the tragedies were captured as they happened whereas, in the past, by the time journalists arrived on scene, the disaster was partly dissolved.

Eyewitness images do provide a vehicle of democracy for citizens. These visuals represent a non-authoritative counterpart to media images that may be biased based on a political inclination ruled by government incentives. in other words, images captured by citizens have an "outlaw vision," as Mervi Pantti and Piet Bakker describe, and may be perceived as a neutral or objective voice. This is assumed for the reason that public members would document without a strategic, political agenda slant (2009) as opposed to professional photojournalists who know exactly what the news media look for. Furthermore, the public member visuals would be less restricted as they are not governed by company policies, ethics, or credibility of a videographer's professionalism – their images are neither artistic nor of technical quality.

On the note of ethics, amateur images can be graphic, violent, and indecent. Citizen photographers are not liable to ethical conduct, so they are not restricted in the types of images that they capture. Some prime examples are: the images that were published of the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq in April 2004, portraying the abuse of inmates by American soldiers; Saddam Hussein's execution on December 30th, 2006 – a soldier videotaped the hanging with his mobile phone and circulated the footage on YouTube. The video was eventually trimmed to exclude the moment of the hanging; the ground level videotaping and photographing of violent scenes during the Burma Protest against the military regime: the shooting and killing of the Japanese journalist, Kenji Nagai, on September 27th, 2007; the shocking image of a Burmese monk floating face down, dead in a pool of water (france24.com, September 30th, 2007; dailymail.co.uk, October 5, 2007). Unlike amateur images, the mainstream news media censors and blacks out parts, or else shows bodies with white sheet over them, from a distance, to give privacy to the subject. However, when images are from citizen journalists, some news organizations choose to broadcast and publish the graphic images. These images are used for their explicitly violent aspects, because they are available and exclusive, and because of the disturbing nature of their imagery (Pantti and Bakker, 2009). it is important to note that images captured by citizens distance professional journalists from the accountability of capturing an unethical image.

Without legalities and related issues to worry about, citizens can take advantage of media technology to gather and distribute visual information. Traditional journalists are not the sole agency to go to for news information any longer. This new approach blurs the boundary between journalist and audience. Today, ordinary citizens are taking an active role in news reporting. Equipped with portable internet access and cell phones with built-in cameras and video recorders, the public can now capture developing news stories and send them immediately to news organizations for distribution. As ordinary citizens witness, experience, and gather news information, they are seeing themselves as active journalists, presenting stories from their own perspective. In short, the traditional model of journalism has been challenged, if not revolutionized.

Essentially, public journalism practices are very similar to those of professional journalism, but with a twist. For some, such an activity is merely a sharing of news information with their community. For others, it is a form of activism that exposes a truth usually hidden by a political agenda. As Jay Rosen, an advocate of public journalism and one of its founding scholars, puts it, civic journalism is about where the press should be going, a set of practices tested in reality, and a movement for reform (Rosen 1995 in Haas, 2007).

The following chapter will address the historical development of the public journalist movement in the age of the internet and in a time of economic downturn resulting in cutbacks. A critique of public journalism as a form of democratic production will follow.

In the 1940s, the Hutchins Commission on Freedom of the Press made its report entitled: "A Free and Responsible Press". It stated that journalism should:

- (1) "provide a truthful, comprehensive and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning",
- (2) "serve as a forum for the exchange of comment and criticism",
- (3) "project a representative picture of the constituent groups in society",
- (4) "be responsible for the presentation and clarification of the goals and values of society" and
- (5) "provide full access to the day's intelligence" which forms the social responsibility theory (Haas 2007).

As we can see, this perspective follows Dewey's line of thought.

The consequences of the notion of citizen journalism can be exemplified by the Rodney King case. King was tasered and beaten in Los Angeles on March 3, 1991 at the hands of the Los Angeles Police Department. This event was recorded by a witness with a video camera, George Holliday, who provided the footage to a television news station. The video clip sent shock waves through the African-American community, and resulted in a civic riot in Los Angeles in 1992. The incident also initiated a public journalism campaign called "A Question of Color" that won a 1994 Pulitzer Prize for public service journalism (Haas, 2007). These cases make it apparent that citizen journalism is not a new phenomenon—it has deep roots.

Chapter 3

History of Public Journalism

The history of public journalism dates back to the 18th century when Thomas Paine, a revolutionary propagandist and voice for the common people, wrote pamphlets such as *Common Sense*, published in 1776. This formed part of a movement in that eventually led to America's independence (Kreis, 2000). In a sense, Paine was one of the first citizen journalists: he not only reported on news events, but he had a clear political perspective as well.

In the 1920s, journalist Walter Lippmann and philosopher John Dewey had a famous debate (Voakes, 2004) over the notion of the dual role of journalism. Lippmann argued that the journalist's primary responsibility was to translate the technical deliberations, as well as the actions of political leaders and experts, into the simple language of lay people in order to inform them (Haas, 2007). Dewey, however, extended this notion, and argued that Lippmann's elitist model lacked involvement by the citizenry (Haas, 2007). For Dewey, modern means of communication, such as newspapers, provided a means for educating the public about political problems, and allowed the public to learn about the connection between political decisions and their consequences (Haas, 2007). Once citizens had an understanding of politics, they could actively participate in democratic governance, creating a greater community (Haas, 2007). In other words, the Deweyan notion of journalism is for journalists to facilitate a dialogue with the public (Carey 1987, 1993, 1995 in Haas, 2007).

In the 1940s, the Hutchins Commission on Freedom of the Press made its report entitled: "A Free and Responsible Press". It stated that journalism should:

- (1) "provide a truthful, comprehensive and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning",
- (2) "serve as a forum for the exchange of comment and criticism",
- (3) "project a representative picture of the constituent groups in society",
- (4) "be responsible for the presentation and clarification of the goals and values of society" and
- (5) "provide full access to the day's intelligence" which forms the social responsibility theory (Haas, 2007).

As we can see, this perspective follows Dewey's line of thought.

The consequences of the notion of citizen journalism can be exemplified by the Rodney King case. King was tazed and beaten in Los Angeles on March 3, 1991 at the hands of the Los Angeles Police Department. This event was recorded by a witness with a video camera, George Holliday, who provided the footage to a television news station. The video clip sent shock waves through the African-American community, and resulted in a civic riot in Los Angeles in 1992. The incident also initiated a public journalism campaign called "A Question of Color" that won a 1994 Pulitzer Prize for public service journalism (Haas, 2007). These cases make it apparent that citizen journalism is not a new phenomenon—it has deep roots.

A Critique of Public Journalism

A variety of questions arise in the investigation of public journalism. Is this a new form of journalism or simply a product of corporate, news organizations trying to cut costs and redevelop audiences? Can we even dare call it "journalism" (Haas, 2007)? Should participatory journalism be regarded as a journalistic notion? In actual fact, public journalist reports are not always professional; therefore, mainstream news organizations feel that public journalism is not meeting high standards. This can explain why major news corporations feel hostile towards an alternative form of journalism.

David Simon, a *Baltimore Sun* writer for the HBO series "The Wire", stated that, "High-end journalism is dying in America" (Albanesius, May 6, 2009, p. 4). This is due to the fact that most of today's news reports are by citizen journalists. Bloggers then simply repeat the same journalism and comment on this repackaged news format that has minimal, quality content (Simon in Albanesius, 2009). Trained journalists, however, not only tell the news, but they "use professional judgment to pick and choose what stories to tell and serve as the public's government watchdog" (Mekeel, 2009). This practice filters out any discrepancies or violations of their work ethics. In other words, professional journalists have the experience and skills, that the public might not, to decipher the most important news (Compton, 2000).

The next criticism of public journalism is the lack of original news gathering and reporting. For instance, there may be first person accounts from witnesses or victims of an event, but investigative questions are missing. More problematically, the weblogs produced by citizens cover a narrow range of topics based on what the mainstream news has reported. The sources are also generally very narrow and elitist news organizations such as *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and *The Washington Post* (Adamic Glance, 2005; Davis, 2005; Delwiche, 2003; Halavais, 2002a; Harper, 2005; Himelboim & Soutwell, 2005; Hopkins Matheson, 2005; Messner & Terilli, 2005; Reese, Rutigliano, Hyun, & Jaekwan, 2005; Reynolds, 2005; Wallsten, 2005; Welsh, 2005 in Haas, 2007) signifying that citizens rely on credible, popular news sites, with few people relying on alternative media. These weblogs would be more informative if they included various perspectives from primary sources. This would help public journalists distinguish themselves from mainstream journalists. Instead, citizen webbloggers simply write blogs based on the initial accounts of the mainstream media, rather than challenging and critiquing their content (Haas, 2007). This may be a drawback in citizen journalism reporting when original, investigative and analytical news is more valuable than rehashing reports from mainstream news stories. The links to mainstream news organization on weblogs are used without evaluative commentary (Reese et al., 2005 in Haas, 2007). This does not demonstrate a democratic, independent thought, but a reliance on traditional journalism; practicing public journalists fail miserably in the movement of democratic ideals by relying on mainstream news. The only way these citizen journalists accomplish their own means is by including reports from ordinary citizens.

Another criticism of public journalism is editing—an essential element in mainstream news stories, but an ignored area in public journalism. Editing is used to

add clarity to the reporting process. Public witnesses are used with discretion in mainstream news because pertinent information is sometimes missed. For example, when fighter planes flew low over Manhattan for a government approved photo shoot of the Statue of Liberty, citizens posted fragmented and confusing pieces of information, which caused panic (Shropshire, 2009). In fact, misinformed and panicking people armed with a means to broadcast their fears are likely to produce only more fear (Shropshire, 2009). Conducting preliminary research of current events before reporting news to the public is an important step in journalism as it prevents miscommunication. This step is lacking in public journalistic work.

The free content of public journalism is a problem for news companies because of the easily spread misinformation, as well as the downgrading of the profitability of news companies. Public journalism creates competition for news companies by taking the internet space away from news companies. Through cable, wireless, and other technologies that capture images, the public has more access to online content than ever before, including the ability to participate in Web 2.0 social networks. Citizens have become active agents in posting their own reports, thoughts, and comments about news events, which have brought these public journalists to the forefront on the web. Since public journalists have become news witnesses and blog writers, more news content is available for free and is easily shared and distributed among audiences. This creates a challenge to mainstream news companies, as their business mandate is to make profit.

When companies are competing for space, content, and audiences, traditional news services need to find alternative ways to captivate audiences and still make money. In the beginning, mandatory subscriptions were successful, but they quickly became unpopular because the content became free online. Subscription-only content is not as successful unless the content is compelling and intriguing (Arbanesius, 2009). Furthermore, it is a challenge to charge readers for website content news that they are accustomed to receiving for free, or that they can access free from other news sites—including sites with content written by citizen journalists. Due to media reports now being available online, there are fewer purchases of newspapers. Alarming, “as newspapers die off, so too will reporting. This is the dirty secret of the crisis in journalism” (McGuire, 2009). Traditional journalism is facing the challenge of producing content that will continue to attract readers of print and online news. It is questionable whether public journalism is one of the main causes of the decline in the sales of newspapers. Gary Kamiya, the founder of *Webzine Salon*, noted that “American newspapers lost \$64.5 billion in market value last year, their worst year in history” (Kamiya in McGuire, 2009).

Cleverly, though, news companies have reorganized their business models by including public journalism rather than struggling against it. Since the work by public journalists is voluntary, news organizations encourage the public to report any events that they witness or hear; the organizations even guide the public on how to format concerns or stories in a manner that is advantageous to the organization. Citizen journalists are encouraged not only to write up a short description of what they witnessed and experienced, but also to capture an image with their digital camera or camera phone. Interestingly enough, the news websites that encourage civic participation do not offer incentives, but make money selling timely news. Tanni Haas

pointed out that this type of scheme, used by managements, is a profit-centered strategy used for commercial interests (Haas, 2007). With more citizens submitting eyewitness accounts and images, public journalism is being critiqued for serving commercial interests.

During a time of economic hardship, news companies can save money through budget tightening. Consequently, professional journalists and correspondents are laid off, as they are costly to employ, unlike their amateur counterparts, the volunteer public journalists. Thus, a frequent criticism of public journalism is that public journalists are taking over the employment of traditional journalists. Since citizens willingly offer content for no monetary compensation, news companies can reap the benefits of free labour. But here the public journalists are attacked for taking over the jobs of professional journalists, not the news companies for exploiting free labour. As news companies slash expenses, they also cut back on areas such as local community reports. News companies pinch their budgets by cutting out local news first, in essence diminishing the appeal of their newspapers (Holeva in Mekeele, 2009). The community then has to provide their own local content, which the mainstream has chosen to abandon. Many problems arise from this, including the amount of time local journalists are capable of contributing, and how these local journalists can improve the lives of others.

In addition, it is questionable if citizens have access to the appropriate information technology, such as a computer or the internet to upload this content. Even if public journalists attempt to produce and maintain their local news sites, how accurate and informative is the content? in terms of timelines, public journalists are faster with their reporting than the mainstream news. For example, an individual who captures and delivers an image with a digital device will beat any journalist with a story. in effect, professional journalists appear to be slow and untimely. Even though citizen witnesses can get information to the news media more quickly than trained reporters, the quality of the data is not the same as that provided by professional news journalists. As previously mentioned, timelines are an essential component of media reporting, but accurate facts and clear narratives are just as important. Therefore, the public journalism model is still a work in progress that has many issues to be addressed before it can surpass the traditional journalism model.

Public Journalism as a Form of Democratic Production

A key question about citizen journalism is whether it offers a new, more democratic form of production. Free speech advocate David Slack comments that critics of public journalism are elitist and believe citizens want "democracy in small doses" (Slack in Peacock 2007, in Tilley and Cokley, 2008). Other advocates argue that public journalism should protect "freedom from government intervention", and promote "active citizen participation in the democratic processes" (Haas, 2007). This citizen involvement is a crucial part of democratic activity, affecting how a country is run. When citizen participation is withdrawn from democratic processes, a decline in the number of voters in political elections occurs. There is less involvement in local community events and less interest in acquiring political information. This also leads to a decline in newspaper readership (Haas, 2007). The role of journalists is both to "help form as well

as inform the public" (Haas, 2007). Journalists should be more involved with the process than merely with the outcomes of citizen deliberation (Haas, 2007). Professional journalists should encourage citizens to have an opinion, but public journalists should also develop good public judgment in order to participate in the democratic process (Compton, 2000)— public judgment being a "mutual understanding to realize common goals and values" (Yankelovich in Compton, 2000). A diversity of opinions and various, rich perspectives are beneficial to tackling issues and developing good public judgment. When public input is acknowledged, as in public journalism, formation of public policy, analysis, and an understanding consensus can be made (Compton, 2000). In turn, critical public discussion is encouraged and democracy's principles can be applied. Thus, public journalism is formed through democratic production, and its achievement can be accounted for through challenging the ideology of traditional journalism.

The question at hand is whether public journalism will survive or become a passing trend. Major studies of this phenomenon need to be carried out to measure its effect and impact. However, many news organizations continue to feel indifferent towards the public journalism movement. They may encourage it as an integral part of information gathering, news reporting, and evaluation practices (Haas, 2007), but the main editing is still completed by newsroom managers.

Technological trends have evolved at a more rapid rate than ever before. In fact, with the convergence of new media technology, multi-platform environments, and public participation, the dynamics of traditional means of journalism have changed into new, experimental forms of journalism. In essence, the changes in technology have directly influenced the quality of video journalism.

The purpose of this literature review is to summarize the current state of knowledge regarding technology trends and their effects on the quality of video journalism, as well as point out the limits of that knowledge, put forth through the perspectives of the video journalists themselves. The following will give an overview of the video technology used by journalists and the general public, and will question how the standards of broadcast journalism have been affected by UGC.

Video Journalism

In reviewing studies of news video journalism (VJ), citizen video journalism (CJ), and mobile journalism (MoJo), it is found that limitations exist. For instance, between 2001 and 2004, and between 2006 and 2008, little research exists on these subjects, despite the fact that new technologies were continually being invented. The issue with video journalism revolves around the integrity of the quality of said journalism; the quality of news story reports have deteriorated and become questionable since the submission of video footage by eyewitnesses and citizen video journalists. As mainstream broadcast news shifts towards using new media technologies to meet the demands of the public, many news organizations have modified their standard values.

Chapter 4

Technology Trends and Journalism

Past studies have explored how online news media have adopted user generated content (Chung, 2008; Domingo et al., 2008; Örnebring, 2008; Thurman, 2008). Others have looked at how professional journalists view amateur content and what their motivations are when they use it (Chung, 2007; Hermida and Thurman, 2008; Paulussen and Ugille, 2008). These studies focused primarily on textual contributions in blogs and forums; not much research has been devoted to examining the use of visual material provided by "public" journalists. Mervi Pantti and Professor Piet Bakker, in their article "Misfortunes, Memories and Sunsets: Non-Professional images in Dutch News Media" (2009), investigate amateur photography and videography's collaboration with news media broadcasting, both online and on television. In their paper, they note that much research has focused on new media, technology convergence, and the innovation of online journalism, and less on how professional journalists view, critique, and assess amateur images (Pantti and Bakker, 2009).

Technological trends have evolved at a more rapid rate than ever before. In fact, with the convergence of new media technology, multi-platform environments, and public participation, the dynamics of traditional means of journalism have changed into new, experimental forms of journalism. In essence, the changes in technology have directly influenced the quality of video journalism.

The purpose of this literature review is to summarize the current state of knowledge regarding technology trends and their effects on the quality of video journalism, as well as point out the limits of that knowledge, put forth through the perspectives of the video journalists themselves. The following will give an overview of the video technology used by journalists and the general public, and will question how the standards of broadcast journalism have been affected by UGC.

Video Journalism

In reviewing studies of news video journalism (VJ), citizen video journalism (CJ), and mobile journalism (MoJo), it is found that limitations exist. For instance, between 2001 and 2004, and between 2006 and 2008, little research exists on these subjects, despite the fact that new technologies were continually being invented. The issue with video journalism revolves around the integrity of the quality of said journalism; the quality of news story reports have deteriorated and become questionable since the submission of video footage by eyewitnesses and citizen video journalists. As mainstream broadcast news shifts towards using new media technologies to meet the demands of the public, many news organizations have modified their standard values.

Technological innovation in Journalism

The introduction of new technologies has served to reduce the quality of journalism rather than increase it. However, Simon Cottle argues that such technical developments were not dictated by policy and practice, but were introduced for strategic and competitive advantage. Professor Gillian D.M. Ursell, the Director of the Centre for Journalism in Leeds, UK, argues that technological developments undermine news production in terms of accuracy, factualness, and completeness (Ursell, 2001, p. 192). Studies also note that there has been a demand for quantity output in news productions in recent years, so journalists have less time and, hence, produce less quality work (Cottle, 1999; Ursell, 2001, 2003; Wallace, 2009).

Technological advances are among the forces that drive changes in news information dissemination. These new media options have revolutionized public relations in regards to gathering source material, processing, editing, and broadcasting. The structure of a newsroom organization is also changing in response to the advent of access to innovative technology, and the dynamic between news organizations and audiences has evolved as well (Pavlik, 2000). New media communication technologies are changing from analogue to digital. In actual fact, this has contributed to the transformation of broadcast news production. Examining the differences in how technological changes have impacted the formulation of online news content and delivery are of particular interest with these case studies.

Online news production is one media example that demonstrates how technology has altered news video production. To demonstrate this point further, online video clips are analyzed for their content, visuals, and discourse. The data would potentially provide evidence that video news platform is the adapted new media for future journalism coverage with participation from citizen journalists.

Video reportage has been affected by many factors. Traditional journalism—using print newspaper, television, and radio broadcast—as the first wave of journalism has been replaced by a second wave of online journalism (Deuze, 2003, p. 204). The internet allows for flexibility in length, timeliness, and content submission. Multimedia online platforms are beneficial for both mainstream news organizations and citizen journalists, especially when they integrate new technologies that allow for better quality eyewitness reports. At *The British Broadcast Corporation (BBC)*, research shows that new media technologies have created stress in professional journalistic reportage because of the omnipresence of internet reporting (Singer, 1997a, 1997b) and because of the immediate nature of the internet (Cottle, 1999). Online journalism offers netizens a platform for the exchange of information and personal perspectives, allowing them to freely express opinions and to share knowledge that is relevant to self-governing citizens (Deuze, 2003, p. 211). The integration of professional and citizen video journalistic content may appear to enrich news production, however many broadcasters have doubts about media convergence serving as a better means of news production. This convergence allows for more content creation with fewer professional journalists involved (Devyatkin, 2001) and, thus, deteriorates original and well-synthesized reportage.

Mobile Reporting

The London subway bombings on July 7th, 2005 were one major event in which mobile phone citizen journalism practices were brought to media attention. Many victims present at the scene used their mobile phones to capture images from within the subway tunnels. Readers and viewers of *The BBC*, once passive and silent, then emerged as vocal, participatory journalists. Readers posted comments to the *Have Your Say* section of the *BBC* pages, found after most articles. These readers immediately contributed to the broadcast, for local and global publication, through digital images and textual information. Friends and families were able to find out more about the bombings and the current state of the situation. Henceforth, *The BBC* continued to encourage civic participation through the submission of content to their sites. Citizen journalism changed the dynamics of editor-audience interaction, and changed the model of the gatekeeper's objectives. *The BBC* served as a model of journalism, and inspired national news companies to adapt similar journalistic models for their news.

Quality of Journalism

Since 1970, western, liberal societies have witnessed a gradual deterioration in journalistic performance and output (Ursell, 2001, p. 175). According to Franklin and Murphy, Bailey and Williams (1997), the intellectual content of news broadcasts has been demeaned to a "dumbed down" level in the British news media (1998, p.17). Alarming, news that is investigative in nature has become tabloid news; Franklin claims that the editorial priorities of hard news have shifted to "scandal-mongering... sensationalis[t] and sentiment[al]... masquerading in perverse guise as human interest stories" (1997, p.4). Ian Connell is also keen to point out that the coverage and content have also shifted from traditional news towards stories focused on leisure, style, consumer affairs, and entertainers (1991, p. 236). David Weaver and Cleveland Wilhoit (1986, 1996) point out that journalism involves interpreting an investigation, disseminating information, and being a watchdog in exposing unethical practices (Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman, 1976), but instead, the task has become one of customizing content to customer demands (Franklin, 1997, p. 5), pandering to the perception that the essence of consumerist societies has become "vehicles of narcissism" (Petley in Pilger, 1998, p. 535). Additionally, news content has been taken from "information helotry ... [to the] right to be entertained" (Smith, 1980, p. 206).

Companies that follow technological trends aspire to improve the means of their media production, however, this may also hurt the quality standard of the content and may result in staff cutbacks. Ursell argues that before digital and electronic technologies were invented, organization and production practices suffered due to reduction of production costs during the 1980s (Bonner and Aston, 1998; Ursell, 2000). New production technologies tend to reduce the need for technical specialists and improve the speed of production.

It appears that high quality news stories are not a result of more modern and advanced media technologies (for instance, lighter, higher-quality video camcorders, digital cameras and mobile phones). With the abundance of still and moving images submitted to *The BBC* through camcorders and mobile phones, such as in the London

subway bombing on July 7th, 2005, the low image quality has become more acceptable. New technologies have rattled the broadcast industry since they have taken the place of timely, detailed, well sourced, and even trustworthy information. The quality of news videos highlights one of the challenges that journalists face: assessing filming and interview conditions to be able to conduct an in-depth enquiry—with cross examination or complex interview techniques (Wallace, 2009, p. 694)—to unearth new information from interviewees. Quality also includes the form and content, or synergy, needed to produce a report that is more than the sum of its parts (Wallace, 2009, p. 695). In reality, if viewers prefer or accept a certain video footage quality, then broadcast news can lower their quality standards as well. *BBC* managers determine their quality standards based on audience judgment of the output; audience participation and views are more valued than in the past decades of journalism practice.

Multi-skilled Staff

The method of convergence in journalism practices is not the solution, as reporters only exchange information rather than being gatherers of information across platforms (Wallace, 2009, p. 685, 687). Professional journalists are expected to be multi-skilled: as website designers, news gatherers, recorders, and disseminators. This causes low labour productivity in exchange of cost-cutting and efficiency measures (Stephenson and Mory, 1990, p. 25; Wallace, 2009, p. 690). Journalists are expected to be technicians when recording audio and video, and to be editors when delivering a report (Bromley, 1997, p. 346). As a result, *BBC* journalists have suffered work overload because of the compromise of technological innovations (Ursell, 2001, p. 177).

The role of a professional journalist and a non journalist has become difficult to differentiate (Stephenson and Mory, 1990, p. 25). At *BBC* Newscentre in Bristol, a distinction is made between a quality worker and a craft crew. Video journalists have the choice to solely be journalists, or to have the dual roles of technician and journalist. Technical staff complained that journalists were lowering standards by accepting amateur videos for broadcast, meanwhile journalists claimed that video journalism completed by technicians was not up to standard (Wallace, 2009, p. 697).

Differing Professional and Amateur Videos

During the London subway bombings on July 7, 2005; *The BBC* received 1000 photographs and 20 pieces of amateur video within six hours of the event. This speaks volumes for the *BBC*'s desire to inform citizens of what is happening and exercise democratic agency for eyewitness accounts. The mobilization of eyewitness testimony served as a more relevant and trustworthy account, as the voices of citizens are deemed to be more honest than content created by professional journalists. These professionals have set regulations or political agendas from mainstream news organizations and are seen as less objective and neutral (Sambrook, 2005, p. 14). In defense of citizen video journalism, we could argue that it is better to receive low-quality video footage of live events instead of high quality-video footage filmed after events have passed.

Many factors account for the change in the quality of journalism. Technological innovation may be a minimal part in the drive towards the change in video journalism quality, but attitudes about it, acceptance of it, and community participation have contributed to the news content standards. Some argue that the quality of video journalism is deteriorating, while others believe that it is evolving and creating a wider voice and scope for coverage. But the question still remains: does the integration of citizen videojournalism as part of mainstream news coverage connote acceptance of citizens' voices for democracy? The following chapters, interviews and content analysis will determine this.

R1: Does the integration of UGC as part of traditional news media reportage connote democracy for citizens' voices?

R2: How does professional news media's UGC usage connote a shift in values, standards, and power in their traditional journalism practices?

To find answers to the above questions, a series of sequential steps were taken. First, the investigator conducted interviews to collect in-depth information; the researcher asked photo and video editors, one-on-one, what their rationale was for disseminating images that were captured by citizens. Through this experience, it became apparent that news media practices largely involved decision-making about the acquisition, selecting, editing, and posting of videos on their online news sites. This reflects their news standards and professional values on their attitudes towards civic participation. Through the close examination of video content, my second step, the researcher analysed editorial changes using visual and content analysis. Three Canadian case studies that involve official authorities are, as previously mentioned: the immigration ex-judge sex bribe (2006, 2010), the Vancouver Airport taser (2007), and the Victoria Police manhandling of two young adult men (2010).

Interviews

For the purpose of this project, editors of news media were interviewed, in one-on-one, separate interviews, to gather their perceptions of citizen journalism. These editors are key persons that oversee image selections prior to them being made available for public consumption. Participants included editors of photography, editors of video, as well as journalism professors. They were recruited through email advertisement. These interviews were conducted over the phone, in person, or through e-mail communication, and included questions about how news organizations used amateur videos on websites. All of the interviews were recorded and transcribed. Once this was completed, the editors' answers could be coded and assessed through the discourse analysis method to find out how they regarded citizen content in relation to journalistic quality and news value.

Seven image editors of news institutions were interviewed to discern how their news organizations process user generated content, and to determine how their journalistic practices affect the online streaming of the reportage. These editors work in print, television broadcasting, and online news media. Their backgrounds range from photo editors, to news broadcast editors, to new social media producers. Between a

Chapter 5

Methodology of interviews and Case Studies

The research methodologies employed in this project are based on the methodologies of past studies, which used similar strategies for data-gathering to support a hypothesis. The methods utilized include interviews and image analysis. The following are two research questions that guided the data analysis:

R1: Does the integration of UGC as part of traditional news media reportage connote democracy for citizens' voices?

R2: How does professional news media's UGC usage connote a shift in values, standards, and power in their traditional journalism practices?

To find answers to the above questions, a series of sequential steps were taken. First, the investigator conducted interviews to collect in-depth information; the researcher asked photo and video editors, one-on-one, what their rationale was for disseminating images that were captured by citizens. Through this experience, it became apparent that news media practices largely involved decision-making about the acquisition, selecting, editing, and posting of videos on their online news sites. This reflects their news standards and professional values on their attitudes towards civic participation. Through the close examination of video content, my second step, the researcher analysed editorial changes using visual and content analysis. Three Canadian case studies that involve official authorities are, as previously mentioned: the immigration ex-judge sex bribe (2006, 2010), the Vancouver Airport tasing (2007), and the Victoria Police manhandling of two young adult men (2010).

Interviews

For the purpose of this project, editors of news media were interviewed, in one-on-one, separate interviews, to gather their perceptions of citizen journalism. These editors are key persons that oversee image selections prior to them being made available for public consumption. Participants included editors of photography, editors of video, as well as journalism professors. They were recruited through email advertisement. These interviews were conducted over the phone, in person, or through e-mail communication, and included questions about how news organizations used amateur videos on websites. All of the interviews were recorded and transcribed. Once this was completed, the editors' answers could be coded and assessed—through the discourse analysis method—to find out how they regarded citizen content in relation to journalistic quality and news value.

Seven image editors of news institutions were interviewed to discern how their news organizations process user generated content, and to determine how their journalistic practices affect the online streaming of the reportage. These editors work in print, television broadcasting, and online news media. Their backgrounds range from photo editors, to news broadcast editors, to new social media producers. Between a

diverse range of editors, various perspectives were identified about the processing of UGC. Interview questions and transcripts are provided in Appendix 2. Moreover, the Ryerson University Research Ethics Board approved of my interview research methods and questions prior to conducting the interviews. The participants were read a consent form, given time to ask questions, and signed an agreement form prior to proceeding with the interview. They were voluntary participants, and were not given monetary compensation; they could withdraw from the research at any time. Participants were given the rights to remain anonymous or to skip any questions that they did not want to answer. The interviews were conducted on November 20, 2008, April 9, 2009 and March to April 2010.

The researcher interviewed three editors from the *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*: Video Editor, Prof. Douglas Arrowsmith; Director of Production, Mr. Sandy McKean; and a Senior Producer of News. In addition, the researcher interviewed *Maclean's* Photo Editor, Prof. Peter Bregg; the Video Editor of *Rabble*, Mr. Tor Sandberg; CTV Video Editor, Mr. Corey Bellamy; and *The Toronto Star* Photo Editor, Mr. Michael Kelly. This group of editors was contacted both directly and indirectly through networks of contacts recommended by the researcher's supervisor, Prof. Don Snyder, who are Ryerson University professors, media network, communications colleagues, and library colleagues.

The investigator's supervisor, Prof. Don Snyder, provided an email list of Ryerson's faculty, and that is how the investigator emailed Prof. Douglas Arrowsmith to ask him for a two-hour interview in person, which was conducted on April 29, 2010. Mr. Sandy McKean was found through a second channel. The researcher attended Ryerson's Kodak Lecture Series, which Prof. Snyder organized, and listened to Mr. Rafael Goldchain, a Chilean photographer, talk about photo editing. Mr. Goldchain referred the researcher to Sheridan College's Associated Dean, Mr. Sandy McKean, whose experience as a director of production would help him answer the interviewer's video journalism questions. The interview lasted fifty-minutes over the phone on April 20, 2010. Prof. Peter Bregg was an interesting contact, he was found through an academic lecturer after attending the Ontario Library Association Super Conference 2010 at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre on February 24, 2010. Mr. Arnold Bailey, from *Ex Libris*, wanted to find a contact's name on the internet at my exhibition booth. We became acquainted, and he referred the researcher to Prof. Peter Bregg, who is a photo editor and has a website online. The researcher emailed Prof. Bregg, and conducted a two-hour in-person interview with him on March 25, 2010. The researcher's contact with Mr. Tor Sandberg was through volunteering at his place of work: *Rabble*. The researcher contacted Ms. Kim Elliott, the Publisher and Volunteer Contact at *Rabble.ca*, who referred the researcher to Mr. Tor Sandberg, the video editor—a perfect person to answer questions about citizen video journalism. The interview was initially conducted through email and then through an hour-long Skype (VoIP) conversation on April 25, 2010. The researcher came to interview Mr. Corey Bellamy, from CTV, through York University's course "introduction to Broadcast Management". Mr. Rob Dilworth, a guest speaker, referred me to Bellamy for citizen journalism content answers. The interview was conducted through two emails on November 20, 2008. Similarly, Mr. Michael Kelly's interview was conducted through two emails on April 19, 2009. He was referred by the researcher's work colleague's friend who attended Library Science with

Ms. Astrid Langue, the present media librarian at *The Toronto Star*. Through this channel, Ms. Langue was able to ask Mr. Kelly if he was willing be interviewed. Contacting news editors had initially been a challenge without insider networks, but once found, the process went well.

The questions were sent to participants through email to allow time to familiarise themselves with the researcher's topic, as well as to think over answers. They were then interviewed either in person, on email, over Skype (VoIP), or through the phone. The interviews ranged from twenty minutes to two hours. The content was recorded either with an MP3 voice recorder, Skype call recorder, Gmail, or a DSLR Canon Rebel T1i video camera.

Interviewees Biography

Prof. Douglas Arrowsmith is a PhD graduate from York University. He is a Producer and Director of special news stories coverage at *CBC Television*. His work has included covering the 9/11 and Haiti Earthquake projects, as well as the *Fifth Estate Specials*. Arrowsmith is the Director of the *Ron Sexsmith* film, is the Director and Owner of FeltFilm, and is currently an Adjunct Professor at Ryerson University in the School of image Arts.

Mr. Corey Bellamy is a Video Producer at *CTV News*. As a journalism student at Humber College, Mr. Bellamy did a video editing internship at CTV and was hired before he graduated. He worked his way up through the ranks as a freelance writer and web journalist writer, and eventually landed a video producer position. He was the senior video producer for *CTV Olympics.ca*.

Prof. Peter Bregg is a photojournalist who has traveled internationally to capture historic moments. He is a Photo Editor at *Hello! Magazine*, a Chief Photographer and Photo Editor at *Maclean's*, and has worked as a Photographer and Editor at the *Canadian Press* and the *Associated Press* in London, New York, and Washington, DC. He was also the official photographer for Prime Minister Brian Mulroney in 1984-5. His photojournalistic assignments have included: trips with presidents Vietnam in 1973, the iran hostage crisis in 1979-80, the Solidarity movement in Poland in 1981 during the martial law, and the 9/11 World Trade Centre attack in New York. As an active *PhotoSensitive* member, Bregg has supported charitable causes and travelled to Mozambique, Rwanda, Zambia, and Ethiopia, and his photographs have been in numerous exhibitions to do with these travels. Prof. Bregg is an instructor in the school of Journalism at Ryerson University.

Mr. Michael Kelly is a Photo Editor at *The Toronto Star* and a Contributing Editor at *City Slab*. He is a published writer of fiction, which can be found in journals and magazines. His collection of short dark fantasy and horror stories *Scratching the Surface* has been published by Crowswing Books. He is currently working on a novel and an anthology.

Mr. Sandy McKean used to work as a Director in the development and management of *CBC Newsworld*. He is presently an Associate Dean in Media and Journalism Studies at the Sheridan institute of Technology and Advanced Learning. The school's Digital Media Centre for Real-Time Production receives a 2.3 million dollar fund that allows for innovation and education in the filmmaking industry.

Mr. Tor Sandberg is the Program Director for *Rabbletv*. He is the Editor of Video Content, Writer, and Videographer for the site. *Rabble.ca* is a non-profit organization that provides an online news perspective from citizen journalists. Most of the content is from citizen journalists and progressive writers that cover in-depth features and commentaries. Mr. Sandberg also works in conjunction with the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, and is a graduate student in Environmental Studies at York University.

In addition to the above interviewees, participant X is the Senior Producer of *CBC News*. Her background includes online, television, and radio media. Her expertise is in the User Generated Content *Your Voice* section of the CBC news.

Case Studies

Data for this research is based on recent cases, from 2006-2010, on the theme of official authorities controlling members of the public through videos posted on news organizations' websites. In this study, a post-positivist, qualitative research methodology is employed. The case studies with parallel variables are examined. The three cases involve authorities violating their work ethics and, therefore, violating members of the public. The videos are examined through a visual content analysis method, to determine if or how gatekeeping decision-making contributed to the editing of images prior to online broadcast of these selected events: (1) immigration ex-judge's sex bribe, (2) Vancouver Airport tasing of a Polish man, (3) Victoria Police Department manhandling of young men. These events are similar because they occurred in the same country and include official authorities that violated the rights of public members.

Case studies allow for a detailed examination of a phenomenon. They are useful in preliminary studies and can provide a hypothesis that can be tested with other cases (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 22). The nature of this study is comparative and qualitative, and, therefore, using case studies is an appropriate choice. According to methodologist Robert Stake, using case studies is the best way to examine an interest in an individual situation—in this case, three events that had different media televised by the news. Importantly, case studies are not a methodology, but a form of study used for recording and understanding an inquiry (Stake, 1994, p. 236) that is in a "bounded system" (Smith, 1978 in Stake, 1994, p. 236). In defining case studies, it is essential to note that an intrinsic case study is undertaken to learn more about a particular case (Stake, p. 237).

A single case may only illustrate a particular trait or problem of significance to that particular context at that moment in time; single cases are merely small-scale studies toward a grand generalization (Campbell, 1975 in Stake, p. 238). In addition, from a case study, the results and findings pertain only to that particular situation and the conclusions cannot be universally generalized to other cases, nor are they representative of other cases (Feagin Orum and Sjöberg, 1991; Simons, 1980 in Stake, p. 238). However, researcher Bent Flyvbjerg argues against this notion by stating that one can generalize from a single case, provided that the research gives rise to hermeneutic problems and elucidates its knowledge (2006, p. 224). When completing a case study, it is crucial that we are not drawn into making generalizations, or creating theories, and then losing track of what is important in the research. According to

constructivist epistemology, case studies are a method of constructing knowledge through social experience, observations, or reports (Stake, p. 240). Through interpretation, meanings and concepts of phenomena can be discovered.

Content analysis is one method that worked well for extrapolating data from new media, since my research aimed to examine how eyewitness news content is used. My investigation includes a commentary on how technology impacts journalistic working practices in the process of production convergence. More broadly, this paper describes the changes that are taking place and the ways journalism reportage is reacting to them.

There have been critiques of using case studies as a method approach, due to the fact that studies can be ambiguous, that meanings can be ill transferred, and that communication of a concept can be challenging (Stake, 1994, p. 241). Case studies also do not have legitimate validity in the social sciences; they cannot solve a problem and draw a conclusion that can be applied to other situations. The theory, reliability, and validity of scientific case studies is misunderstood and questioned (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 221). It is a wise decision to use other methodologies to flesh out a case study and to support its hypothesis. For such reasons, a triangulation methodology will be applied in my paper in order to analyze the parallel cases, and then a well-validated conclusion will be drawn. Through using multiple perceptions to clarify meanings and verify evidence, my case studies will be well supported (Flick, 1992 in Stake, 1994, p. 241). Using a case study in addition to analysis, Gun Sara Enli discovered sophisticated rhetoric about audience participation, and suggested that multi-platform formats could strengthen the position of "public service broadcasting in the age of convergence" (2008, 117). Therefore, using the case study approach in this study draws conclusions on how new media technology better serves the public.

In Sue Wallace's paper, "Watchdog or witness? The emerging forms and practices of video journalism" (2009), she draws from the literature review of case studies. She contests that the standard quality of journalism diminishes with the use of new technology in video journalism. Using the literature review of case studies, Wallace supports her argument on the benefits of new technology in professional journalism. Since her study is based on using a series of case studies to support her arguments, some scholars may argue that such a paper-based on secondary sources—is not as strong as studies that implement original case studies as primary evidence. By comparing a series of successful and unsuccessful case study methods, scholars can draw conclusions about technology determinism and decide whether amateurs are using technology to its best.

Using case studies enables researchers to examine a situation closely and make conclusions that validate a thesis. This research method can be a useful tool if triangulation is simultaneously employed for validity purposes, and a historical approach is implemented to examine technological trends.

Content Analysis

The first method that I used was content analysis. With this method, the content was put into context and, therefore, the strategies news organizations used to communicate became apparent. Political agendas, sensational news stories, or

emotionally moving narratives were utilized to engage audience members. Traditionally, many research studies that examined newspapers used content analysis as a research methodology because of its broadness and its excellent ability to realize micro-information that otherwise went unnoticed.

Scholar Thorsten Quandt used content analysis in order to compare online newspapers in Europe and the United States. The online platform served to break journalism out of the traditional, controlled and restrictive print media, and allowed for a more liberal platform in terms of the design structure, the layered content using news media, as well as the democratization of citizens by integrating their content as part of the news coverage. The static, still, silent audience shifted to being active agents in contributing personal content (Rosen, 2006 in Quandt, 2008). The full-text, online articles were investigated. The kinds of topics reported were analyzed, as were the existence of advanced multi-media features, interaction possibilities, and user-generated content (Quandt, 2008).

Using triangulation—three approaches—as a methodology uncovers hidden meanings in text and visuals. Through my interviews, the dialogue reveals the approaches of the news media using UGC. Through visual content analysis of three case examples, the data discloses how UGC is used and how it reflects the practice of professional journalism. Through video analysis, the images use and how they are published and broadcasted address how the mainstreams news represents UGC. The benefits of using triangulation is in extrapolating as much meaning and insights of how citizen video content is edited, used and represented. This in turn speaks of how news organizations perceive and benefit or make uses of free content in their news stories.

the decision-making process occurs in choosing UGC, which is not solely based on the popularity of an image being massively copied and distributed widely online.

Some news reports, and their content, are pre-decided on any given day, but there are instances when news breaks out and a story is pushed into the hourly or daily agenda. This decision making process can be done individually or as a collective, passed through senior editors, editor-in-chiefs, or chief online video editors. Images are rarely placed online without "a chain of scrutiny before it ends up in front of an audience" (Arrowsmith, 2010).

Douglas Arrowsmith describes how the editorial decision committee gathers at the CBC: in newsroom discussions that occur over a few quick moments or continue for weeks. The committee members' backgrounds are in a wide array of fields: they are journalists, political scientists, sociologists, videographers, writers, and producers. Arrowsmith describes their collective discussion as to what content to include or exclude as lively and passionate, as is their process of coming to a consensus in the end. He says that, "Only through that process, I would say, is content really raised to a level that matters for audiences. It is not an "anything goes" practice. Just because we have this hope, this pipeline onto the web, it is still not an "anything goes" practice for news; and I think that is a good thing" (Arrowsmith, April 29, 2010).

Chapter 6

Interviews, Results and Findings

Interviews

Photo and video editors of news institutions were interviewed. They were asked questions related to their use of UGC, about their selection criteria, and about UGC's effect on traditional journalism practices. In more detail, they were asked to describe their decision-making process, their process of acquiring UGC, as well as how they select, edit, and post it on online news sites. The editors were also asked about their perceptions and attitudes towards UGC, as well as what it says for democracy. Their answers were examined in order to determine whether the usage of UGC in traditional news media serves as a vehicle of democracy for citizens.

Decision-Making

There has been a sudden historical shift in interest in UGC because new technology has made information so easy to record and disseminate; camera and videophones are so prevalent today (Kelly, 2009). If news breaks out, there is a high chance that an eyewitness can and will document it (ibid). Editors commented on how the decision-making process occurs in choosing UGC, which is not solely based on the popularity of an image being massively copied and distributed widely online.

Some news reports, and their content, are pre-decided on any given day, but there are instances when news breaks out and a story is pushed into the hourly or daily agenda. This decision making process can be done individually or as a collective, passed through senior editors, editor-in-chiefs, or chief online video editors. Images are rarely placed online without "a chain of scrutiny before it ends up in front of an audience" (Arrowsmith, 2010).

Douglas Arrowsmith describes how the editorial decision committee gathers at the CBC, in newsroom discussions that occur over a few quick moments or continue for weeks. The committee members' backgrounds are in a wide array of fields: they are journalists, political scientists, sociologists, videographers, writers, and producers. Arrowsmith describes their collective discussion as to what content to include or exclude as lively and passionate, as is their process of coming to a consensus in the end. He says that: "Only through that process, I would say, is content really raised to a level that matters for audiences. It is not an "anything goes" practice. Just because we have this hope, this pipeline onto the web, it is still not an "anything goes" practice for news; and I think that is a good thing" (Arrowsmith, April 29, 2010).

Acquisition

The first process involved in using UGC is acquisition. New organizations have used photos from citizens for a long time, even prior to the use of the internet (Kelly, 2009). We may wonder about the amount of UGC received by news organizations but statistics are not readily available. However, CTV.ca Video Editor, Corey Bellamy, notes that approximately four percent of their news stories are UGC, starting as far back as 2008 (November 20, 2008). *The Toronto Star* Picture Editor, Michael Kelly, states that very little UGC is used in their newspaper, less than one percent, beginning in 2009.

In the past, journalists would scavenge for images. Peter Bregg, who is a Photo Editor and has worked at *Maclean's* and *Canada NewsWire*, comments that in the past three decades, when a major story broke, journalists would look for witnesses who photographed the event and buy their images (Brett, March 25, 2010). Bregg states that in television, newspaper, and magazine journalism, the process for image acquisition has always been the same; journalists have always been able to purchase citizen pictures. Journalists may even go to stores with security cameras and buy video footage. The purchase amount is negotiated at the time of purchase (Kelly, 2009).

Nowadays, citizens can submit content, as participatory journalists, through photo calls, emails, or on news sites on their own. Some citizens are regular contributors of content, and so their contacts are saved in a citizen journalist database, in which case they may be contacted to capture future content for the news organization (McKean, 2010). Tor Sandberg, the Video Editor of *RabbleTV*, says that he has partners who create content for the website. Some non-profit organizations are St. James Town Youth Groups, the Regent Park Toronto Dominion, the Community Centre for Policy Alternatives, and a variety of NGOs (Sandberg, April 25, 2010). In addition, the advent of the internet and social network platforms has generated a large amount of content and accessibility (McKean, 2010). Citizens have learned that posting news clips on YouTube might serve a larger audience than submitting to commercial news companies. As an example, a video of the Victoria Police Department using excessive force to arrest two young men near a nightclub was posted on YouTube, and was later picked up by news organizations that further broadcasted the event (YouTube, 2010). Many journalists go to established organizations to seek images, and it is common to find news content from websites such as YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter (McKean, 2010).

Selection Criteria

The basis for using UGC at CTV is the "cost, quality of image, and the story that the image tells" (Bellamy, 2008). CTV prefers free, high-quality images that meet their news quality standard. Peter Bregg notes that the acquisition of citizen images goes through the same selection process as other images by professional journalists: are they newsworthy, does the news media need them, and how much do they cost (2010). Other criteria listed by Michael Kelly are: "does it tell the story, what is the motive, does it capture the moment, is it the best photo that the news company could get" (2010). The selection criteria are based on how likely an image is to draw an audience's attention. Public interest is the guiding principles of the acquisition of images (McKean, 2010). Journalists also make decisions about news images that shed light on events

that would not otherwise be revealed (McKean, 2010). Other criteria may be the quality of the picture, the value of it, and how ideal the picture is (McKean, 2010). For *Rabble*, a small independent news media service, their criteria for citizen video content is based on their news agenda; content needs to fit into their political standpoint. If video footage is of a public lecture, a protest, or of someone critical of a current political system, *Rabble* will most likely accept it (Sandberg, 2010).

Credits

Upon initially receiving images, we may not be able to tell, at a glance, if they are taken by citizen journalists or *Toronto Star* journalists. But, during publication, photographers are given credit by stating their name, for example "Jill: Citizen Photo". In Michael Kelly's opinion, there should not be a differentiation "between citizen journalists and [*The Star*] staff journalists" (April 9, 2009). This may mean that any source is an equally good source, or that there is no need to discern who the source is. CTV does identify that the image is from a citizen journalist.

Verification of Authenticity

As a general rule, most news organizations that acquire images from the public, verify the source to make sure that the images are legitimate. Like all news material, UGC is thoroughly checked and validated by editorial staff before being published on CTV.ca. CTV editorial staff may ask the citizen submitters questions about the time images are taken, the date they were taken, what the citizens saw, and how they obtained the images. Finding out the motives of image senders, as well as clarifying if the pictures actually represent snapshots of what the event was about, are a means of authenticating imagery (McKean, 2010). Further, news organizations receive independent verification of current events by questioning contacts from that area. They may ask people involved to make sure the image is not a reenactment (McKean, 2010). They may also fact check by calling institutional authorities, such as the police, to verify events. All this information helps to verify image validity (McKean, 2010).

One means of telling whether a photograph is original or not is if it was shot in RAW format, which serves as a sort of negative, as if the image were on film. Editors are able to detect any alteration to the image because the date and time stamp are different, states Peter Bregg. "Forensic scientists could nine out of ten times figure out any distortions" (2010). However, *The Star* Picture Editor has not yet come across any altered images by citizen journalists. Journalists will always authenticate an image to be on the safe side before posting or streaming it on their site.

Copyright and Purchases

Unlike some corporate news sites, public journalism organizations rarely purchase images. *RabbleTV* only uses their funding to pay writers. The images are often obtained for free and streamed on *Rabble's* website, but no rights are purchased; they look to Creative Commons for licensed images (Sandberg, 2010). Sandy McKean points out that news organizations are "not supposed to pay anything for them. But in

reality that doesn't happen" (2010). He further refers to the CBC Styleguide (2006) that states that journalists are not "supposed to buy except under extenuating circumstances" (McKean, 2010). Some news institutions pay for images from social networks because of the competition of wanting to get the "great pictures first, upfront, and wanting to have exclusive rights to them" (McKean, 2010). Each organization pays a different amount. Further, he remarks that a "small town market could pay \$50 for a picture to \$100,000 in a big market, depending on what the picture is" (McKean, 2010). At *The Toronto Star*, they rarely purchase all the rights to an image; they might act as an agent and "sell the images on the citizen's behalf" as Michael Kelly did with his Air France jet crash image (2009). If this is the case, *The Star* would sell the rights to organizations outside the Toronto area (Kelly, 2009).

Editing

According to news editing law, there is room to edit images provided this does not alter their content to a great extent; organizations have a limited range for editing. They may change the contrast, crop, or refocus images to visually improve the quality (McKean, 2010). Peter Bregg, who has worked with print editing, says that changing the image contrast is allowed. If an image is dark it can be lightened a bit, through dodging. However, it is criminal to darken an image. An example is an image of O. J. Simpson that was altered: the original mugshot image was printed in *Newsweek*, but a *Time Magazine* editor gave Simpson a five o'clock shadow to make him appear more devious (University of Minnesota (n.d.)). That type of change is designated as photo manipulation and violates the professional photographer's code of ethics. Bregg points out that photojournalists are in constant flux in wanting to be the first person to get an image out; it is quite tempting to edit a picture, knowing that news media are always seeking out new stories and new images (Bregg, 2010). Cropping is an allowed editing technique, with the exception of photos from the Magnum Photo Agency, which does not allow cropping without prior consent of the photographer (Bregg 2010).

Unlike mainstream news, *Rabble* does no editing of other people's content. Because the videos are embedded into *Rabble's* site and streamed, the only way content could be edited is by the author (Sandberg, 2010).

Using Graphic images

Generally, news broadcasters within Canada or the United States reserve the right to censor or blur out faces for privacy concerns. They may also warn viewers with a caption or with an aural message prior to streaming a graphic image. However, on foreign soil, the graphic images do not need to be censored. As an example from Peter Bregg, in Rwanda photographs of skulls and bones are taken to remind viewers of the genocide. As a Chief Photographer, Bregg notes that many photojournalists refrain from capturing graphic images because they know that the images will probably not be published. However, Bregg explains that he photographed South Vietnam's war after the Americans left: he photographed a Vietcong hideout, while dead bodies were pulled out, in the name of documenting war images to archive a piece of history.

Unlike traditional news organizations' views on using graphic UGC, other corporate news media outlets want to be the first at streaming images. They indiscreetly show graphic, violent, disturbing images to cause a sensation and attract a larger audience. An example of this is the Haiti earthquake. Some news stories filmed bodies washed ashore from a distance and cropped out imagery of body parts (ie. a leg sticking out of the bush). Yet, some news sites showed full views of the faces of corpses in distorted positions.

Tor Sandberg only justifies using graphic video for the purpose of understanding the repercussions of political wrongdoing, such as war. A graphic image of Palestinians serves this purpose, educating viewers about the international context of the cost of action or inaction (Sandberg, 2010). However, if images are from close to home, journalists usually refrain from making them disturbing. The case of the Vancouver RCMP tasing of Robert Dziekanski was graphic but the message was potent, and it needed to be shown for political reasons (Sandberg, 2010).

Image Broadcast Style

How UGC is used is of particular interest, clarifying how it represents a story, or broadcasts a visual message. Douglas Arrowsmith and Peter Bregg both say that spin-doctors are those who fabricate content, but UGC cannot be used to invent something new (2010). A video editing style that CBC applied to one citizen journalist's video was zooming in and slowing to a still frame for a close up look at an offender. This was done in a video of Steve Ellis, an immigration ex-judge who solicited a refugee applicant for sex (CBC, 2006). Citizen videos are rarely edited except to pause or slow down the video to view an action better.

A significant question that Tor Sandberg brings up is whether UGC is used as visual filler or is used for its embedded message content. He points out that mainstream news corporations use citizen images as filler, rather than to illustrate their embedded message. For this reason, professional news organizations "will continue to struggle and decline because people are aware of [this tactic]" (Sandberg, 2010). Mainstream news uses eye-grabbing images rather than those that have messages or value to be investigated.

Benefits of Using User Generated Content

There are advantages to using UGC. Corey Bellamy notes that UGC helps news companies "expand their abilities to tell stories through images and video." They also help to get the images to "readers at important moments" (Kelly, 2010). At times, citizen images from eyewitnesses who were at the right place at the right time are the best to use because they are timely and real: live images. Sometimes citizen photos are the "only available source for that story" so news organizations have to use them (McKean, 2010). Citizens tend to be the first witnesses on the ground. For example, when an Air France plane crashed on August 2, 2005 at the Toronto Pearson international Airport, a citizen image was used as it was the only one available at the time. Despite the graininess and blurriness of the low quality image, it depicted the urgency, the drama, and the fear induced by the burning plane (Airdisaster.com).

Many images by citizen photojournalists have become iconic images of “decisive moments.” Examples of this include: images of the Air France crash in Toronto on August 2, 2005, images of the propane explosion (also in Toronto) on August 10, 2008, images of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, images of the Tsunami in southeast Asia on December 26, 2004, images of the Concorde airplane explosion in Paris on July 25, 2000, and images of the London subway attacks on July 7, 2005 (Kelly, 2009). In other cases, countries with extensive levels of censorship or political turmoil may ban professional journalists from covering stories, or they may threaten and shut down news sites. Citizens are ideal candidates for capturing images in these types of situations because they are generally too careful with their content for official authorities to pin them down and imprison them. Sandy McKean gives the example of Iran’s presidential protest demonstrations in Tehran on June 20, 2009: “Traditional media was kicked out of the country, so the only way we could get pictures of the demonstrations in the streets were through citizen journalists.” The filming of Neda Agha-Solta’s death (June 21, 2009) drew a large audience and touched people globally. Tor Sandberg notes that citizen journalists proactively cover the stories themselves and ask all sorts of questions that the mainstream media does not (Sandberg, April 25, 2010).

Using UGC is beneficial to news in the sense that non-trained journalists bring in a fresh and personal perspective to coverage that standard journalism cannot accentuate. An example of this would be the Haiti project, where Ciné institute students tell the story of the earthquake disaster from the ground level, through their own voices and news visual narratives (Arrowsmith, 2010). This new content allows for new meanings outside of the traditional news institutions. Tor Sandberg points out that citizen journalism is great because corporate journalists are duplicating the same stories and lacking in covering major events (2010). Sandberg says that “the police provocateur at the Montebello Summit and the Tamil protests in Toronto have turned cameras onto police aggression. York University students showcased their inside-the-walls coverage of their sit-in at the University. Internationally, we’ve been able to share coverage of Palestine’s plight - the kind that is almost impossible to access because of restrictions on travel in the region.” These are just some examples of citizen news that the mainstream news may not have been able to cover in any other way. Economically, UGC is free and saves news organizations a lot of money, as they do not have to hire journalists or pay for the content. By crediting the citizen photojournalists, both parties win.

Sensationalism and Controversy

A shift of interest can be seen where social media with UGC is being adapted by news organizations to attract more web traffic. Peter Bregg quotes Marshall McLuhan in saying that, “‘the medium is the message’ in the news now, and social media news has slowly crept into becoming part of the mainstream news” (2010). News about politics and important “hard informative documentary journalism” has shifted in importance to “pseudo info-entertainment”; the shift has been incredible (McKean, 2010). There is less investigative research and analysis of major events, including less social responsibility.

YouTube is an example of a social platform with a lot of sensational content. it consists of fighting and dry political speeches (Bregg, 2010). As an example, staged fights in a schoolyard could be videotaped to gain attention on YouTube. Audiences are becoming desensitized to violent scenes, and violent news images have become a norm.

An instance where a YouTube video became a scandalous news item is the Montebello Summit in August 2007 where activists were filming a protest. A protester came up with a rock, which violated the code of peaceful protest. it quickly turned out that the rock holder was part of the Quebec police force. This video clip promptly spread through various social media outlets and then was picked up by the mainstream media (Sandberg, 2010). in events like these, citizen journalists have been able to draw attention to incidents that otherwise would have gone unnoticed.

Most mainstream media companies do not like to print controversial stories, but out of necessity, publish controversial images on their front page to capture audiences (Bregg, 2010). importantly, news organizations do not like to print everything that is controversial or sensational.

Citizen Journalist Motivation

Citizen photojournalists, or mobile journalists, may record events for various reasons: they may happen to experience or witness a breaking news event (such as the London Bombing MoJos), they may seek monetary compensation (Bregg, 2010), or some may seek celebrity status. For instance, an amateur videographer captured a video of Flight 3407's crash into a house in Buffalo, New York on February 13, 2009. This crash killed 50 people. The eyewitness did the reportage himself, which bolsters the fact that he wanted some acknowledgement for having been one of the first to capture the news story. Some citizens may be political activists who videotape violations by authorities to make them accountable to higher authorities, such as the government or the United Nations. An example is the videos of the Burma Red Suffrage (September 28, 2007) where citizens documented how the army killed peaceful monks as well as a foreign journalist, Japanese reporter Kenji Nagai (shot in the back for video recording the human injustice), during a demonstration.

Issues

Issues with UGC usage usually come back to questions of authenticity and photo manipulation; false images in news stories can get hit hard so photo editors always go through a process to check the authenticity of the image. When a news source prints a manipulated image, its credibility as an authentic news source is threatened. in my opinion, that is why the public trusts images taken by citizens rather than trusting images taken by professionals who have experience with composing images that manipulate a message.

On the other hand, professionals know of techniques to capture images that can tell stories without words. With more members of the public carrying cell phone cameras, citizens may potentially turn into paparazzi, which has an ethical implication. This could then violate privacy rights and greatly expose authorities, politicians, and

celebrities (McKean, 2010), though society will not necessarily become more morally responsible. People may be a little more conscious, and a few may change their behavior as a result.

Discussion

The use of UGC in traditional news media platforms has not radically changed mainstream news media. McKean even thinks that “not so much...[has] changed.” The visuals are put into context, however they must satisfy viewers with authenticity. The video of the Tehran demonstration on June 13, 2009, and the Vancouver airport taser incident on October 14, 2007, led to serious inquiries (McKean 2010) because the pictures spoke more strongly than words could alone. Without visual authenticity, the outcome would have been much different.

Traditional journalism practices are echoed between photo and video editors; the selection, editing, and posting processes are similar. However, the outlook towards citizen journalists varies between editors, in regards to democratizing their voices through a mainstream news platform. Michael Kelly's attitude towards citizen journalism is that the participatory content makes a journalist's job easier, and even more interesting. In spite of that, *The Star* has very little UGC in their newspaper. Kelly believes that there is a market for UGC and it will continue to grow. The job of professional journalists is not dying, merely changing.

As to whether citizen journalism content provides a more objective, neutral stance to a story, Douglas Arrowsmith states that it “can be more biased than the news media.” As an example, Toronto citizens took it upon themselves to film examples of the negative conduct of Toronto's Transit System operators, which mushroomed into a citizen journalism campaign (Arrowsmith, 2010). The first photo of a sleeping fare collector was posted on the social networking website, Twitter, on Thursday, January 21, 2010. It was taken by Jason Wieler, a citizen photojournalist (Roberts, January 22, 2010 *The National Post*). To counter mainstream news media's argument that UGC is more biased than mainstream news organizations, Tor Sandberg, a citizen video journalist editor, says that he dislikes the “pejorative label of biased or advocacy-motivated” (2010). Instead, he claims, citizen journalists provide a different view and opinion from those affiliated with corporate or government institutions. As a matter of fact, public journalism news media takes pride in having a differing point of view than mainstream reporting (Sandberg, 2010).

Michael Kelly from *The Toronto Star* believes that there should be no differentiation between citizen photographer and staff journalists. This statement implies that, to him, the source is unimportant and acknowledgement is unnecessary. In other words, my interpretation of Kelly's stance is that he does not care to credit citizen journalists. Or to put it more bluntly, if citizen journalists' photographs should not be credited, neither should their intention of mobilizing democratic voices.

The authenticity of news images is crucial; without it, news organizations lose credibility. Professional journalists check to make sure images are not tampered with in Photoshop prior to submission, though Peter Bregg comments that news magazines have been known to use Photoshop. For example a magazine may add a puck inside a hockey net for a precise moment capture (Bregg, 2010). Although news magazine dare

to use Photoshop, there have been few cases of manipulated images by citizen journalists, demonstrating that UGC is, in part, more honest than content shot by professionals.

As Sandy McKean puts it, this is just the beginning of UGC; there is more coming and then it may become a real challenge. "On one hand, traditional media is in big trouble. The way that people gather and consume information is fundamentally and radically changing and there's going to be some real pressures to reinvent what we mean by 'journalism'" (McKean, 2010). There will be many challenges and two are significant: first is the challenge of practicing traditional journalism and its basis in "objectivity, balance, [and] fairness" (McKean, 2010); second is the challenge of changing the journalism business model to compete with so much "soft news" and free UGC (public members are harder to engage into mainstream news sites as they like free news content).

With the traditional news media slowly adapting to UGC content, Tor Sandberg observes a decline in qualitative journalism. "investigative reporting has almost died out in North America" because of budget cuts (2010). From a public journalism media perspective, mainstream news does not present objective points of view. They use less critical content to delve into deeper issues (Sandberg, 2010). They're simply doing flat out reporting, which means the integrity of quality journalism is lost. In other words, when a lot of images are used to report, there is no explanation about why those images are used. Sandberg believes that it is the public journalists that will slowly rise to the task of serving more investigative reporting. The best content comes from publicly funded independent media organizations who have a strong political discourse and a high level of voter participation, such as countries with low amounts of corruption (Sandberg, 2010). As a public journalist, Sandberg is a strong advocate for qualitative, investigative, and critical journalism. Sandberg also points out that ethics and brevity are essential; they involve gaining power through speaking the truth.

Case Studies

Case study methodologies provide close-up examinations of images in context. This section will examine citizen video journalism with three cases: the immigration ex-judge sex bribe, the Vancouver airport tasing, and the Victoria RCMP's assault of two men. Based on the interviewees' news companies, five news sites (CBC, CTV, *Maclean's*, *Toronto Star*, and *Rabble.ca*) were visited to extract their video images and compare them to original video footage found on non-news sites (i.e. YouTube). The research questions of interest are:

R1: What editing do editors do to UGC prior to posting content online?

R2: Does the professional news media's dissemination of UGC reflect their stance in democratizing citizens' voices?

After inspection of the video content, much can be said about video editing and the representation of the news organizations' mandates.

Case Study 1: immigration Ex-Judge Attempts to Solicit Refugee Claimant for Sexual Favours

A former Toronto city councillor and immigration and Refugee Board adjudicator, 50-year-old Steve Ellis, used his Refugee Board position to request sexual favours from a female refugee claimant, Ji-Hye Kim, a 25-year-old Korean. She was seeking asylum in Canada to escape an abusive father as well as threats from money-lenders in her home country of South Korea. Ellis had met Kim twice outside of his chambers as well as visited her workplace. At a Starbucks cafe in Toronto on September 26, 2006, Brad Tripp, Kim's boyfriend at the time, videotaped a conversation between Ellis and Kim as evidence of Ellis' inappropriate conduct. Ellis told Kim that he would approve of her refugee application if she had an affair with him. He continued to rifle through her case papers, as if tempting her to agree to any of his demands, his ability to approve or disapprove of her refugee application a method of blackmail. The video is accompanied by the audio passage, "I want us to be friends... I know you've got a boyfriend. I've got a wife. So, I mean, if we do things together on the side that's OK. That's fine".

The CBC covered the story during the evening of April 21, 2010, and broadcast 19 seconds of the clip, half of which was a replay with a close-up. Ellis had been found guilty of breach of trust and of accepting a bribe, though he fully denied the accusations, and his hearing began on June 4, 2010. Considering the fact that *The CBC* highlighted the portion of the conversation most indicative of soliciting an affair, it is evident that demonstrating the video was effective. In a public broadcast, exhibiting a video out of context or perpetuating the misinterpretation of a clip's message is highly unlikely. Although the video was shot in a dark environment, it nonetheless allows for a clear interpretation. The video shows Kim smiling and obliging, while Ellis acts in a nervous manner, stuttering and repeating his speech: asking to befriend Kim and "do things on the side". *The CBC* made many visual alterations to the clip: lightening the contrast, trimming a clip with a close-up of Kim's face, and trimming an additional clip with a close-up of Ellis's face. However, this editing does not affect the audio message, which appears to be recorded separately with an audiotape—there is no excessive street noise that should be present. Additionally, Tripp would not have been able to capture sound from across the street. With the *CBC* editing the video clip without audio and then replacing the audio on top of the edited video, the original message has not been drastically changed.

The original video is 45 minutes long and *The National Post* has uploaded most of the four-minute conversation clip onto YouTube.

As for other news sites, *The Toronto Star* (Steve Ellis, Video Evidence, 2010) and CTV (CTV News, 2010) each have articles and video clips posted on February 23, 2010 at 7:46pm. It has no article in the "VideoZone" section and has many metadata tags, including 263 social network locations that the video was shared with.

Rabble.ca has posted no videos regarding this case. The reasoning, as Tor Sandberg explains, is that their mandate is to cover news that is considered "hard news", which possesses a political slant and educational journalistic news value that is educational. In this sexual soliciting case, the scandal is more akin to sensational "infotainment" news than anything else.

In the *Maclean's* magazine online, there is no image or article covering this story, with the exception of another article, written about the immigration and Refugee Board, which alludes to Steve Ellis in a single sentence: "Then there's the issue of the adjudicators who process these claims—the members of the immigration and Refugee Board (iRB)—who too often are selected as much for their political connections as for their credentials. (Recall Steve Ellis, a former Toronto city councillor and Liberal iRB appointee, who gained infamy for allegedly offering to approve a South Korean woman's claim in exchange for sex; the matter is still before the courts)" (Macleans, July 2, 2009)

Overall, this case may be so small that it failed to pique the concern of other news sites; maybe it is the nature of the entertainment news. However, if that was the case, it is surprising that The CBC—a traditional, conservative station—would cover this story. It is possible that The CBC has political ties to government officials who require accountability for their social injustices.

Case Study 2: Vancouver Airport Tasing of Polish Man

Much media coverage surrounded the case of the tasing of forty-year-old Polish immigrant, Robert Dziekanski, in the Vancouver international Airport on October 13, 2007. Dziekanski and his mother Zofia Cisowski, a resident of Kelowna, B.C., waited 10 hours to meet each other, despite being only 100 metres apart, but they were never given the opportunity to do so. Dziekanski was sweating, agitated, and spoke no English. No one came to his aid. The on-site RCMP officers wrongfully assumed that he spoke Russian and yet never called an interpreter. The officers then resorted to using a stun gun five times. According to the investigation, this was enough to kill Dziekanski.

The CBC's video clips, which provided warnings about the clip's graphic scenes, were cut and zoomed in to focus on Dziekanski's face and body to highlight the few minutes of agony he endured during the stunning. *The CBC's* significant reduction of the scene, from ten minutes to a few seconds, served to highlight the important moments. Having eliminated a significant portion of footage, the moments of inaction and silence were eradicated; verbal descriptions, via voice-over, were used as alternatives. The editing served to fit the time frame that a streaming news story was allowed and, consequently, abolished the visual depiction of the hours Dziekanski suffered through waiting as well as the gradual build up of his agitation. *The CBC* provided three video tapes to illustrate the significant coverage of this story:

1. Taser video shows RCMP shocked immigrant within 25 seconds of arrival. (Runs 3:28)
2. What happened in the hours leading up to Robert Dziekanski's confrontation with the RCMP? (Runs 20:20)
3. RCMP use of taser on Robert Dziekanski. Warning: Video contains graphic scenes. (Runs 9:59)

Case Study 3: Victoria Police Department Assault Two Men

The CBC also possessed a separate link to a full, ten-minute video clip that was filmed by amateur videographer Paul Pritchin. His recollection of the incident might have been unnoticed by authorities if his video documentation did not exist.

The CTV published an article to do with the tasing incident on Oct 26, 2007, along with three video clips. The article provided a breakdown of the incident from 1:21am (at which time Dziekanski was reported to be throwing suitcases) to 1:44am, the time at which the paramedics arrived, in order to treat his unconsciousness. Without video footage of the event, it is difficult to determine the manner in which this corporate news site presented the story. CTV British Columbia reported: "Reporters with the latest CTV Newsnet: Mother of Taser victim speaks to the media" (CTV News October 25, 2007).

The online *Maclean's Magazine* had a short sentence posted on January 14, 2010 that alluded to Robert Dziekanski, but there were no images or video footage available. To quote the magazine, "Several recent Crown decisions have raised public ire. It took more than a year before a decision was made not to lay charges against the RCMP members involved in the tasing death of Polish immigrant Robert Dziekanski at Vancouver's airport".

The *Toronto Star* has a "VideoZone" section in which a relevant video had been found, however the video would not stream. Another article, published on May 7, 2010, summarized several RCMP wrongdoings, particularly the killings of two innocent civilians, including Robert Dziekanski.

The search of *Rabble's* website resulted in the discovery of 59 articles. No images or videos were found. However, several short paragraphs and comments from readers were posted which exemplify the importance of this case.

In summary, the fact that news media are incapable of broadcasting certain videos after a certain amount of time may be attributed to various licensing and streaming rights. For *Rabble* to have no image content is quite surprising, as they could simply embed YouTube video links to their website. The basis of this decision could primarily consist of the conservative view against the streaming of graphic footage on their site. The most interesting aspect of this case is the existence of several inquiries related to the case, such as the safe use of tasers. More importantly, however, *Rabble's* 59 postings show how significant this content is to their investigative reporting of important issues. Tor Sandberg, the Video Editor for *Rabble*, made a comment about the RCMP, alleging that they "lied and they lied blatantly about what happened"; additional allegations were made with regards to the inaccuracy of the stun count, despite the fact that the video clearly exhibited the number of times Dziekanski was stunned. If the video footage had been recorded by the airport's surveillance camera, the RCMP could have suppressed it (Sandberg, 2010). This incident outraged the public to a point that a public inquiry was launched. This really influenced the coverage and, I think the repercussions of these acts complement Sandberg's comments. Nonetheless, the RCMP officers were not held culpable for their actions. The only person left with nothing is Dziekanski's mother, Zofia Cikowski, who recently accepted a settlement but lost her only son.

Case Study 3: Victoria Police Department Assault Two Men

Officers from the Victoria Police Department kicked two young men with force on March 24, 2010 at 12:30 a.m. outside a nightclub in Victoria, British Columbia. A witness, video journalist Mike Morellato, happened to videotape the incident and posted

it on YouTube, soliciting hundreds of thousands of views. 23-year-old Harpinder Kang, was the first man on the ground in the foreground of the 56 second video. it appears as though the officers were trying to arrest Kang when another officer in a yellow jacket approached him and kicked him twice. The second victim to appear in the video was 19-year-old Tyler Archer. Archer later said that he was assaulted twice that night, once by strangers who attacked him and afterwards by the officers. The officer in the yellow jacket kicked Archer in his ribs and kneed him, despite the fact that he had been sitting on the ground already. The six men arrested at the scene were released without charges. A young man kicked in the head had been taken to the hospital and was subsequently released. The Victoria police have since reassigned the nine-year veteran officer who was kicking the young man on the ground behind the big rock, to administrative duties pending a criminal investigation. Victoria Police Chief Jamie Graham has not offered any apologies. The B.C. Office of the Police Complaint Commission, as well as the external criminal probe, are investigating the case. The following are links to relevant video footage:

<http://www.vancouversun.com/kicked+Victoria+sergeant+suing+police+department/2732361/story.html#ixzz0nXawGzrE>

<http://videosift.com/video/Update-on-the-Victoria-Police-Kicking-and-kneeing-suspects?loadcomm=1>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M7NvUOUSKvU>

The CBC streamed a portion of Mike Morellato's video on their website and there were also several separate links listed for additional clips on YouTube. One video they linked to featured an interview with a taxi driver who witnessed the event, during which he spoke about his observations.

<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2010/03/24/bc-youtube-victoria-police-arrest.html>

<http://www.cbc.ca/video/player.html?category=News&clipid=1450389213>

<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2010/03/24/bc-youtube-victoria-police-arrest.html>

The CTV's site possessed Mike Morellato's full video. There was also an additional video interview with Tyler Archer and his lawyer. Archer told the story from his own perspective and succumbed to tears. Both are contemplating the form of legal action to be taken next. This corporate news organization presented the case in a sensationally entertaining method. As a viewer, the whole interview seemed staged and re-enacted, thus I did not feel sympathetic towards Archer's cause, particularly due to the questionability of the interview's authenticity. CTV framed the news report in an "infotainment" style, which does not seem insincere. The following are headlines taken from the various videos that had been posted by *The CTV*:

- CTV British Columbia: Jim Beatty on police arrest video
- CTV National News: Rob Brown on the incident
- CTV British Columbia: Stephen Smart on the video
- CTV News Channel: Jamie Graham, Chief of Police
- CTV News Channel: Graham takes questions
- CTV News Channel: Harpinder Kang, alleged victim
- CTV News Channel: Anita Bathe, C-Fax 1070 Radio
- CTV British Columbia: Maria Weisgarber with details of YouTube arrest investigation(http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mnwi6wO03As&feature=player_embedded)

The Toronto Star was the only website that streamed a sharp video from YouTube. The graphic quality of the light, sharpness, and clarity was the best among the five news sites.

On *Rabble*, a cautionary page stops readers from automatically viewing the image it states:

"Excessive force by Victoria police - Mar 20, 2010 - judge for yourself"

This video or group may contain content that is inappropriate for some users, as flagged by YouTube's user community.

To view this video or group, please verify you are 18 or older by signing in or signing up.

Rabble is aware of the fact that some of its viewers may not be of mature age to view the graphic, violent and disturbing image. Therefore, viewers require YouTube accounts which verify their true age prior to streaming the content.

Data Analysis and Discussion

These three video footages spoken about above. Had they not recorded these events, no visual evidence would exist. In spite of the low visual quality of the videos, the subjects and messages come through loud and clear. Whether or not the videos were able to carry out justice is another question, however.

The researcher's initial prediction suggested that increasingly traditional and conservative news organizations would be more reluctant to incorporate citizen-generated content in their news broadcasts (if they stream graphic content online). However, either the traditional standard of journalism has changed or the internet has changed the accessibility to free content. Viewers are very likely to go on YouTube or other free, conveniently accessible sites. Thus, in order for companies to compete for ratings, they must attract traffic to their site by streaming or posting videos on their own news sites. Because of competitiveness, some commercial news sites are willing to bypass the ethics of censorship and do not edit disturbing images, having them stream explicitly as they originally did.

A news organization such as *The CBC*, which is more traditional and conservative, may have hesitated to broadcast images of violence, which, in my opinion, is distressing. However, as mentioned in the above analysis, *The CBC* opted for the same path chosen by other news sites: they trimmed the footage and highlighted the disconcerting scenes. An argument for the streaming of these upsetting videos is that they provide a vehicle for citizens' democratic voices. Public members' works need to be seen in order to allow justice to be served. Nonetheless, in reality, the videos may simply be used to create participatory interaction, as it is a less costly form of journalistic labour.

Under of the *Huffington Post* blog, argues that one does not know "where the consumer is going to be at any point in time", so news organizations have to be prepared and be innovative to attract readers, presenting their news in the right format and location.

Empirical research on public journalism needs to focus on many knowledge gaps. A wide array of news organizations under study need to assist in developing information-rich data on public journalism, news coverage, and its impact on citizens (Haas, 2007). Instead of using small scale studies, a larger study would allow for a better understanding of how well citizen journalism is working. In the United States, public journalism initiative studies have only focused on election reporting. Further, more social scientific research on the practice of public journalism outside of America needs to be conducted, rather than simply observing and describing accounts of experimental public journalism (Haas, 2007). Ultimately, the main news coverage is decided by professional journalists and citizen journalists work on the sidelines. Haas goes on to comment that public journalism initiatives help to inspire citizens, but the effects and outcomes of such a phenomenon still need to be researched. It would be beneficial to know how journalists' and public journalists' actions affect knowledge of politics, activism, as well as whether civic journalism bridges the gap between social groups, or just widens the subordination.

Many initiatives could be taken to ensure that mainstream news integrates public journalism. Holding regular meetings with groups of readers or having formal panels to find out what story topics are of interest could identify topics of concern to citizens. In addition, journalists could report stories of interest from the citizen perspective. Regular feedback could be gathered from citizens through question and answer columns, or even email groups (Associated Press Managing Editors [APME] 2002, 2003; Brickman, 2005; Brown, Thorson, & Fleming, 2006; Quinlan, Bucco, & Berens, 2004 in Haas, 2007). Some news sites even have weblogs inviting readers to exercise their right to vocalize their opinions; "public opinion... deserves to be as much respected as despised" (Hegel in Keane, 1982). In the United States, CBS, *The Guardian*, *The Houston Chronicle*, and *The New York Times* all have editors provide a rationale for their editorial decisions and "invite questions, comments and feedback from readers; and subsequently respond to readers concerns" (Dube, 2007 in Haas, 2007). Many news organizations, such as *The Seattle Post-Intelligencer* and *The Dallas Morning News*, discuss upcoming editorials with readers (Haas, 2007).

In terms of academia, some schools of journalism seek out ways to achieve journalistic democracy. The University of Missouri's School of Journalism won a \$31 million grant and is establishing a process of "bringing citizens, practicing journalists and journalistic scholars together to discuss and experiment means of strengthening

Chapter 7

The Future of Public Journalism in the Exercise of Democracy

If public journalism's goal is to exercise democracy, then there is an immense amount of work that still needs to be completed (Compton, 2000). Arianna Huffington, the founder of the *Huffington Post* blog, argues that one does not know "where the consumer is going to be at any point in time", so news organizations have to be prepared and be innovative to attract readers, presenting their news in the right format and location.

Empirical research on public journalism needs to focus on many knowledge gaps. A wide array of news organizations under study need to assist in developing information-rich data on public journalism, news coverage, and its impact on citizens (Haas, 2007). Instead of using small scale studies, a larger study would allow for a better understanding of how well citizen journalism is working. In the United States, public journalism initiative studies have only focused on election reporting. Further, more social scientific research on the practice of public journalism outside of America needs to be conducted, rather than simply observing and describing accounts of experimental public journalism (Haas, 2007). Ultimately, the main news coverage is decided by professional journalists and citizen journalists work on the sidelines. Haas goes on to comment that public journalism initiatives help to inspire citizens, but the effects and outcomes of such a phenomenon still need to be researched. It would be beneficial to know how journalists' and public journalists' actions affect knowledge of politics, activism, as well as whether civic journalism bridges the gap between social groups, or just widens the subordination.

Many initiatives could be taken to ensure that mainstream news integrates public journalism. Holding regular meetings with groups of readers or having formal panels to find out what story topics are of interest could identify topics of concern to citizens. In addition, journalists could report stories of interest from the citizen perspective. Regular feedback could be gathered from citizens through question and answer columns, or even email groups (Associated Press Managing Editors [APME] 2002, 2003; Brickman, 2005; Brown, Thorson, & Fleming, 2006; Quinlan, Bucco, & Berens, 2004 in Haas, 2007). Some news sites even have weblogs inviting readers to exercise their right to vocalize their opinions; "public opinion... deserves to be as much respected as despised" (Hegel in Keane, 1982). In the United States, CBS, *The Guardian*, *The Houston Chronicle*, and *The New York Times* all have editors provide a rationale for their editorial decisions and "invite questions, comments and feedback from readers; and subsequently respond to readers concerns" (Dube, 2007 in Haas, 2007). Many news organizations, such as *The Seattle Post-Intelligencer* and *The Dallas Morning News*, discuss upcoming editorials with readers (Haas, 2007).

In terms of academia, some schools of journalism seek out ways to achieve journalistic democracy. The University of Missouri's School of Journalism won a \$31 million grant and is establishing a process of "bringing citizens, practicing journalists and journalistic scholars together to discuss and experiment means of strengthening

journalism's democratic role" (Haas, 2007). This is a very positive step, especially since most public journalism is completed without monetary compensation.

It appears that the best thing for all involved would be a hybrid kind of journalism that includes both public and professional journalism. However, this would lead to a high level of criticism. For instance, when mainstream news adopts user generated content in their broadcasts or publications, the format, story, and perspective is decided by the news editors, and the public journalism is reshaped to fit into that mold. In public journalism forums, aside from taking facts from conventional news, the rest of the content is presented mainly from a citizen's view point, usually composed of observations and opinions rather than facts. When reporting on politics, the economy, or disasters, few public journalists move towards interviewing other witnesses, gathering insights and statistics, or embedding historical records from official authorities to authenticate and verify the truth. Instead, public journalists rely on mere speculation.

The exposure and critique of political, authority, and official figures from the government, law, and police department's flourishes on the internet, especially on weblogs. This is what brings officials to resign, quit, or get fired from their positions. Some news media may choose to be quiet about these types of details, but when citizens find out, their movement is able to get officials with high levels of authority to step down. An example of this is when United States Senator Trent Lott made racially insensitive remarks at former Senator Strom Thurmond's 100th birthday celebration. The event attracted little mainstream news attention and *The Washington Post* included a brief article on the event. Trent Lott's reputation was tarnished when the story leaked to the popular weblog *Talking Points Memo* as well as others. Other scandals that caused damage were revelations about journalist Jayson Blair's dishonest report from *The New York Times*, which caused the Executive Editor, Howell Raines, and Managing Editor, Gerald Boyd, to resign. There was also the firing of four senior CBS News Executives: information had surfaced about the authenticity of George W. Bush's preferential treatment in the Texas Air National Guard. Also important was the fact that Bush fired CNN executive Eason Jordan when Jordan made remarks about U.S. Troops deliberately targeting American journalists during the war in Iraq (Palser, 2005; Pein, 2005; Smolkin, 2004 in Haas, 2007). There are many other examples where citizens have revealed scandals that would have otherwise gone unnoticed by the major news stations.

On the other hand, public journalists not only expose the truth, but can steer mainstream news media coverage to significant citizen-produced democratic weblogs (Haas, 2007). Citizens have a capacity for independent, original news reporting while mainstream news organizations have a hierarchical and centralized business model: their information comes from elite sources. Decentralized weblogs report "by turning traditionally passive news consumers into active news producers" (Gillmor, 2004; Rothenburg, 2003; Rutigliano, 2004 in Haas, 2007). Independent journalist Slam Pax, an anonymous Iraqi architect, used his weblog, *Where is Raed?* to report and archive eyewitness news on life in Baghdad before, during, and after the bombings on August 1 to September 1 2003 (Haas, 2007). Slam Pax the citizen journalist, gathered sources from friends, witnesses, family members, and juxtaposed that information to what was reported in mainstream Western and Arab news media (Bowman & Willis, 2003; Matheson & Allan, 2003; Reynolds, 2004 in Haas, 2007) for a diverse perspective—the

best form of journalism. On weblogs, audiences are able to interactively add links to and comment on posts. This "consumptive production" (Rothenburg, 2003) facilitates "multiperspectival" (Bruns, 2005 in Haas, 2007), "multivocal" (Gorgura, 2004 in Haas, 2007), or "intertextual" (Gallo, 2003 in Haas, 2007) forms of news discourse. A broad perspective allows readers to compare, contrast, and evaluate facts for themselves (Gallo, 2003 in Haas, 2007).

Discovering problem solving strategies is of less significance in the conventional news than in public journalism. Scholars and journalistic critics state that commercial media systems do not support problem-solving activism: those goals conflict with journalistic ideals as they are supposed to take a neutral, objective stance to issues. Many journalists contend that their sole responsibility is to report on problems, and if they engage in problem solving, it would represent an "abdication of that responsibility" (Haas, 2007). If the majority of correspondents feel restricted in simply presenting issues of conflict rather than suggesting solutions, they are merely following a narrow definition of a traditional journalism model. They are supposed to take a neutral stance, but still reveal multiple perspectives of a story (ie. both the citizen's and the authority's).

Scholars may not take issue with the notion of journalists as agents of problem solving. Instead, they should be blamed for exaggerating the idea that journalists have the power to make progressive solutions and effect political change (Dzur, 2002; Goidel, 2000; Mancini, 1997 in Haas, 2007). Many readers still feel that journalists do have some power to expose the truth and be active in suggesting solutions; journalists have the authority to report on certain problems from a particular perspective, can gather information from certain sources, and can address some problems more than others. Despite this, the claim that journalism can be objective and neutral is just an illusion. Therefore, it appears that public journalists can step in with a new model and be proactive in resolving problems, even mobilizing nations into democratic success.

Another perplexing issue with public journalism revolves around the role of academics in journalism. If journalism ceases to be a specialization based on skills then anyone could enter a school of journalism and, as a result, many graduates will find themselves unemployed (Tilley and Cokley, 2008). Then, the question becomes whether the purpose of the study of journalism is to prepare people "to be the critic and conscience of society" or "to prepare people for professional jobs" (Tilley and Cokley, 2008). It is worth mentioning that it is difficult for citizen journalism to surpass the quality of professional journalism and report in a better manner than trained reporters. Moreover, do journalists or citizens get to set the agenda? This is an issue that receives little attention from scholars and journalist advocates. Some state that journalists should allow citizens to shape the news agenda (Rosen, 1996 in Haas, 2007), but if this happens then journalists are seen as followers rather than leaders. If journalists set the agenda, then they are criticized for being too ambitious and for not giving a voice to the public. If public journalists are not given the opportunity to set their agenda, then they may feel that their community values are diminished and that they are considered unimportant (Glasser, 2000 in Haas, 2007). The best solution to this problem is for journalists to create and sustain a public sphere in which relevant information on topics of concern to citizens are communicated through journalists. In addition, the public should continue to be an active partner in the making of the news process (Haas, 2007).

This way, both parties are actively participating. Rare news organizations do informally involve citizens in the agenda setting process by conducting interviews, focus groups, and discussing what topics the citizens want covered in daily news reporting.

Another conflict worth mentioning is that some citizens are silenced due to social inequalities. Journalists should find ways to allow those citizens to actively participate in voicing their concerns. A shared public sphere should be composed of multiple, discursive domains in which subordinate social group members can articulate and deliberate their particular concerns (Haas, 2007). Journalists of the public sphere ought to accommodate this inclusive deliberation, and also create conditions for problem solving (Haas, 2007). It is important to note that Tanni Haas is optimistic that if more people participate in public life, the result will be eventual improvement. What better forum do we have for the public's voices to resonate than the internet?

The last area of concern deals with technology. Professor Sandra Braman, of the Department of Communication, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, argues that, "the use of digital technologies may actually decrease, rather than increase, the possibilities of meaningful participatory democracy ... [because] we have not yet developed either the educational systems, or the modes and venues of appropriate public discourse, for political participation that must start with design of the structures of technological systems" (Braman, 2007). In other words, a decrease in internet use will result in a decrease of citizen activism for democracy, and even civic journalism. If people stay away from the internet, then there will not be a platform for reporting.

Even though many aspects of public journalism were criticized above, many positive aspects exist. Among them are the interest in and knowledge of election topics and local community problems (Chaffee, McDevitt, & Thorson, 1997; Chen, Thorson, Yoon, & Ognianova, 2002; Denton & Thorson, 1997, 1998; Huang, 2006; Meyers & Potter, 2000; Miller, 1994; Thorson, Friedland, & Anderson, 1997; Thorson, Shim, & Yoon, 2002 in Haas, 2007), increased trust in citizens (Denton & Thorson, 1997, 1998; Meyer & Potter, 2000 in Haas, 2007), taking part in problem solving activities (Chaffee et al., 1997; Meyer & Potter, 2000; Thorson et al., 1997 in Haas 2007), and the creations of "positive attitudes toward participating news organizations" (Denton & Thorson, 1997; Friedland & Nichols, 2002; Huang, 2006; Meyer & Potter, 2000; Miller, 1994; Rhodenbaugh, 1998; Thorson et al., 1997; Zang, 1995 in Haas, 2007).

Traditional news groups use a classic means of organizing and reporting back to the public, and do not encourage empowering citizens to take initiatives in political stances. They also do not advocate citizens to exercise their democratic rights to break down barriers and dissect the truth out of news reports. In essence, these acts would create a movement for social justice. Citizen participation would help traditional news media provide a fair and balanced approach to delivering the news. Mainstream news organizations would then mobilize citizens to be more political, would allow for marginalized social groups to be heard from, and would promote the stimulation of public deliberation. News organizations should not simply encourage content from citizens or include them marginally, but should help organize them as partners of political action. It will still take time before public journalism will feel democratic empowerment at a mass scale.

This research has found journalists acquiring image content from citizen journalists as useful. The study also discusses what content looks like prior to being

Chapter 8

Conclusion

Mainstream news organizations do incorporate public journalism, but it is not in the way that most scholars and citizen journalists expected. Scholars and citizens may have envisioned a closer working partnership than actually exists in mediating news information and visuals for the purpose of free information sharing to inform and educate members of the public. Academics and public members may prefer news stories that are unfiltered by news organizations' agenda or government controlled information, to a freer, two both sides of the story, in addition to being told by citizens' voices, appearing more valid and trustworthy. As in the case of the Polish man tasered in the Vancouver airport, whose word can we trust: the citizen's, with his mobile phone video, or the police officers, with no evidence to their name? Tor Sandberg stated that had there been no video the authorities could have gotten away with the situation. However, there is video evidence and the officers still "lied and they lied blatantly about what happened" (Sandberg, interview 2010). This is possible through aggregating user generated content (UGC) that citizens as witnesses, are able to capture news events through their recording equipment and have the unedited, non-slanted story telling of the images.

In addition, perhaps credit and monetary reward could be afforded by mainstream news media to acknowledge contributors' work. Some news sites, however, tend not to credit citizen's photos—they do not write the photographer or videographer's name in the caption or narration. Public journalists are, therefore, made to appear less significant by having their work addressed as "citizen photo", the generic name used in the *Toronto Star* according to Michael Kelly.

Other news sites crop or edit photos or video footages to fit the news schedule minutes, or zoom into the focus of the subject, which can make the image slightly out of context. This, in itself, is a form of using power and authority to override citizen content and to demean the original version of the work.

Traditional news groups use a classic means of organizing and reporting back to the public, and do not encourage empowering citizens to take initiatives in political stances. They also do not advocate citizens to exercise their democratic rights to break down barriers and dissect the truth out of news reports. In essence, these acts would create a movement for social justice. Citizen participation would help traditional news media provide a fair and balanced approach to delivering the news. Mainstream news organizations would then mobilize citizens to be more political, would allow for marginalized social groups to be heard from, and would promote the stimulation of public deliberation. News organizations should not simply encourage content from citizens or include them marginally, but should help organize them as partners of political action. It will still take time before public journalism will feel democratic empowerment at a mass scale.

This research has found journalists acquiring image content from citizen journalists as useful. The study also discusses what content looks like prior to being

published or broadcasted by Canadian news media. Despite varying opinions based on training and affiliation, seven interviews with seven editors uncovered attitudes and perceptions towards citizen images. These interviews have helped to determine how traditional Canadian news organizations credit, integrate, and use UGC. For instance, a *Rabble* videojournalist believes that corporate media do not integrate, nor present, citizen news stories in a favourable light. Mainstream news journalists stand by the agendas of their company and practice traditional means, abide by the company's codes and professional standards. Mainstream news journalists stand by the agenda of their company and abide by its codes and professional standards.

By incorporating images from citizen photojournalists and video journalists, both traditional and public journalism benefit. Professional news organizations ought to decrease their high standards of journalism criteria and make room for the democratic voices of citizens. There is still much work to be done in integrating both types of journalism—quality eyewitness images and investigative news stories—to make this new journalistic partnership successful for years to come.

Image content from citizens is the fresh new method that brings a new perspective to the old practices of journalism. Citizen journalists go after stories that matter to them. Had it not been for citizen journalists ready with their video recorders, many first-person accounts would have been missed: police brutality, for instance, that would have been missed by major media (Cauthorne, 2004).

Still photos are used on television news broadcasts now more than ever, and they function as videos online. Citizen videographers are not allowed to have the content speak for itself, however, when it is presented through the traditional news media; footage may be cropped, interpreted, and presented in a different light that changes the content of the image story, as Tor Sandeberg would say. The media will continue to guard the "quality and veracity of material it distributes" states Peter Bregg. However, citizen journalists are biased, too. They may produce images from their own perspective, but they may not necessarily embrace objectivity in the same way as a trained journalist might. Citizen videographers may simply capture an event, but the content of the situation may not be fully disclosed (or filmed) and may be put it out of context as well. We can only hope that the public can decipher the truth, the real news, from the subverted junkie news that is going viral out of mobile phones.

Citizen videojournalists are not accountable for ethical situations or dilemmas, permission, or framing, and, therefore, they are less responsible for their material. In essence, mass media benefits in using the raw clips as they are not held responsible for being the ones who created the content. Because the raw footage is streamed on news video and some are edited, does that suggest citizens lack power to their works and image speech? In contrast to an untouched image means mass media is giving citizens the space and grounds to show things as they are: to show the meaning of the story behind the images, rather than cropping, editing, and changing it. Could this indicate a freedom of press that the public might trust more? Once in the control of traditional news organizations, footage can be tainted and eroded, and no longer represent raw, untouched media. Meanwhile, modern journalism still struggles with the integrity of news content from citizen journalism that has "serious ethical issues, including veracity and outright deception" (Gillmore, 2006). There may be a continual questioning of user

generated content in the mass media as it may not stand up to the standards of quality journalism as practiced in media organizations in the past.

Citizen generated content allows traditional news organizations the opportunity to tap into ideas that may not be presented by mass media news, for example, ideas about politics, social welfare, the economy, the environment, and public health. This dissemination of information allows citizens to think for themselves and discuss issues that matter to them. Citizen news content is more relevant to local community occurrences that citizens deem more important to them. This, in turn, speaks to the power of the voices of the people that document events as witnesses and attach their stories to the content, rather than having their story reframed by mainstream news organizations. Citizen journalists document events and tell stories as witnesses rather than reframing the story through filtered layers. With that said, some news reporters may present citizens' images as they are, thereby allowing citizens space to have their say through unedited image content. This may demonstrate a working partnership between media journalists and citizens, allowing citizens a platform for democratic speech through new journalism practices and uses of technology.

Citizen journalism, or user generated content, will continue to grow and develop into new forms of public speech and content sharing conventions. Audiences need to continue to be active participants of news rather than mere consumers (Gillmore, 2006). Citizens need to be informed and decipher news rather than being passive readers who believe that what they see is the truth. The voices of the people will be listened to, and conversations will continue to propagate.

Retrieved on 27 November, 2009 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/july/7/newsid_4942000/4942238.stm

Braman, S. (2007). *Change of state: information, policy, and power*. First Monday, (4). Retrieved June 9, 2009, from: firstmonday.org/issues/issue12_4/braman2/chapter9.html

Bonner, P. and L. Aston (1998). *Independent Television in Britain*, 5. London: Macmillan.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *On Television and Journalism*. London: Pluto Press.

Bromley, M. (1997). *The End of Journalism*. M. Bromley and T. O'Malley (eds). *A Journalism Reader*. London: Routledge.

Cameron, D. (2008). *Mobile Journalism: A snapshot of current research and practice*. School of Communication Studies, Charles Sturt University Bathurst, Australia.

Carlson, W. B. (2009). "Technology." *World Book Online infoFinder*. World Book.

Cauthorn, B. (April 2004). Former vice president for Digital Media at the *San Francisco Chronicle*.

Bibliography

- Albanesius, C. (May 6, 2009). is Google news ruining journalism? Are blogs, news, aggregators like Google, and citizen journalists destroying traditional, in-depth investigative reporting? Extreme Tech. Retrieved on June 1, 2009 from <http://www.extremetech.com/article2/0,2845,2346702,00.asp>
- Bailey, S. and G. Williams (1997) 'Memoirs are Made of This: Journalists' Memoirs in the UK, 1945-95', in M. Bromley and T. O'Malley (eds). *A Journalism Reader*. London: Routledge. pp. 365-80.
- BBC. (Year Unknown). "About the BBC." *BBC*. Retrieved on 27 November, 2009 from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/info/>
- BBC. (Year Unknown). "1983: Harrods bomb blast kills six." On This Day. *BBC News*. Retrieved on 27 November, 2009 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthistday/hi/dates/stories/december/17/newsid_2538000/2538147.stm
- BBC. (Year Unknown). "2005: Bomb attacks on London." On This Day. *BBC News*. Retrieved on 27 November, 2009 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthistday/hi/dates/stories/july/7/newsid_4942000/4942238.stm
- Braman, S. (2007). Change of state: information, policy, and power. First Monday, (4). Retrieved June 9, 2009, from: firstmonday.org/issues/issue12_4/braman2/chapter9.html
- Bonner, P. and L. Aston (1998). *Independent Television in Britain*, 5. London: Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *On Television and Journalism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bromley, M. (1997). The End of Journalism. M. Bromley and T. O'Malley (eds). *A Journalism Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Cameron, D. (2008). Mobile journalism: A snapshot of current research and practice. School of Communication Studies, Charles Sturt University Bathurst, Australia.
- Carlson, W. B. (2009). "Technology." *World Book Online infoFinder*. World Book.
- Cauthorn, B. (April 2004). Former vice president for Digital Media at the *San Francisco Chronicle*.

- Chang, T.K. and Lee, J.W. (1992), "Factors affecting gatekeepers' selection of foreign news: a national survey of newspaper editors", *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 69 No. 3, pp. 554-61.
- Cauthorn, B. (April 2004). Former vice president for Digital Media at the *San Francisco Chronicle*.
- Compton, J. (2000). Communicative politics and public journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 1(3), 449-467.
- Connell, i. (1991). Tales of Tellyland: The Popular Press and TV in the UK. P. Dahlgren and C. Sparks (eds). *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Franklin, B. and D. Murphy. (1998). *Making the Local News: Local Journalism in Context*. London: Routledge.
- Gillmore, D. (2006). *We The Media: Grassroots Journalism By the People For the People*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilley Media inc.
- Gray, M. (2006). The L.A. riots: 15 years after Rodney King. *Time Magazine*. Retrieved on June 10, 2009, from http://www.time.com/time/specials/2007/la_riot/article/0,28804,1614117_1614084_1614831,00.html
- Greenberg, S. (2010). *Convergence: The international Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav> London, Los Angeles, New Delhi, Singapore, and Washington DC
Vol 16(1): 7-21 DOI: 10.1177/1354856509347695 <http://con.sagepub.com>
- Griffiths, R. (1998). *Videojournalism*. Oxford: Focal Press.
- Haas, T. (2007). *The Pursuit of Public Journalism. Theory, Practice and Criticism*. New York: Routledge.
- Hallin, D. (1996). Commercialism and Professionalism in the American News Media, in J. Curran and M. Gurevitch (eds). *Mass Media and Society*, 2nd edn. London: Arnold.
- Hansen, A., Cottle, S., Negrine, R., and Newbold, C. (1998). "Chapter 4 Policy and Archival Research". *Mass Communication Research Methods*. New York: New York University Press. 66-90.
- Hemmingway, E. (2005) 'PDP, the News Production Network and the Transformation of News', *Convergence* 11(3): 8-28.

- Hemmingway, E. (2008) *into the Newsroom. Exploring the Digital Production of Regional Television News*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Johnstone, J., Slawski, E., & Bowman, W. (1976). *The News People. A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and Their Work*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Keane, J. (1982). Elements of a radical theory of public life: from Tonnies to Habermas and beyond. *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*. 6, pp. 11-49.
- Kreis, S. (2000). The history guide lecture on modern European intellectual history: Thomas Paine. History Guide. Retrieved on June 5, 2009, from <http://www.historyguide.org/intellect/paine.html>
- Lasica, J. D. Blogs and Journalism Need Each Other 'The Transparency of Blogging has contributed to news organizations becoming a bit more accessible and interactive.
- Lamberth, E. (1998). Public journalism as a democratic practice. in E. B. Lamberth, P.E. Meyer, and E. Thorson (Eds.). *Assessing Public Journalism*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Marshall, M. (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- McChesney, R. (2000). introduction: The Media/Democracy Paradox. in Rich Media, Poor Democracy: Communication Politics in Dubious Times. New York: The New Press. pp. 1-11
- Mekeel, D. (April 28, 2009). The power of the press: Newspaper journalists make a difference in their communities by serving as watchdogs over government and keeping people informed of what's happening around them. Reading Eagle. Retrieved on June 1, 2009 from http://internetservices.readingeagle.com/editorial_video/flash/future_of_newspapers/Part4/website/part3.html
- Misa, T. J. (1994). "Retrieving Sociotechnical Change from Technological Determinism." *Does Technology Drive History? The Dilemma of Technological Determinism*. Smith, M. R. & Marx, L. (Eds.) MIT Press, 25 pages.
- Nip, J. Y. (2006). Exploring the second phase of public journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 7(2), 212-236.
- Outing, S. (2003, September 18). Hurricane victims, a.k.a. amateur journalists. Poynter Online. Retrieved on April 3, 2009, from <http://www.poynter.org/column.asp?id=68&aid=48485>

- Pantti, M. & P. Bakker (2009, forthcoming) Misfortunes, Sunsets and Memories: Non-professional images in Dutch News Media. *international Journal of Cultural Studies* 12(5).
- Pilger, J. (1998). *Hidden Agendas*. London: Vintage.
- Quandt, T. (2008). (No) News in the World Wide Web? A Comparative Content Analysis of Online News in Europe and the United States. *Journalism Studies*, 9 (5).
- Reportr.net (6 July 2007). How the BBC is Experimenting with Online Video. Retrieved on October 2009 from http://reportr.net/2007/07/06/how_the_bbc_is_experimenting_with_online_video
- Rosen, J. (2006) "The People Formerly Known as the Audience", PressThink, 27 June 2006. Retrieved on 14 November 2009 from http://journalism.nyu.edu/pubzone/weblogs/pressthink/2006/06/27/ppl_frmr.html
- Sambrook, R. (Winter 2005). Citizen journalism and the BBC: '... when major events occur, the public can offer us as much new information as we are able to broadcast to them. From now on, news coverage is a partnership.' *Harvard University, Nieman Reports*. 59.4, pp. 13 (4).
- Schudson, M. (1991). "Media Contests Historical Approaches to Communication Studies." *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*. Routledge, pp. 175-189.
- Shoemaker, P. J. (1991). *Gatekeeping*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.
- Shoemaker, P. J. (1996). Media Gatekeeping. *An integrated Approach to Communication Theory and Research*. M. B. Salwen and D. W. Stacks, (Eds.). Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum), 79-91.
- Shropshire, C. (April 28, 2009). Citizen journalists exercise their right to Twitter coverage of live events has pros, cons. *Houston Chronicle*. Retrieved on June 1, 2009 from <http://www.chron.com/dispatch/story.mpl/life/main/6394844.html>
- Smith, A. (1980). *Goodbye Gutenberg: The Newspaper Revolution of the 1980s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stephenson, H. and P. Mory. (1990). *Journalism Training in Europe*. Brussels: European Commission.

South China Morning Post. (May 3, 2009). Online 'citizen journalist' logs into social issues. South China Morning Post. Retrieved on June 1, 2009 from <http://www.hedgehogs.net/pg/newsfeeds/hhwebadmin/item/257665/online-citizen-journalist-logs-into-social-issues>

Thurman, N. (2008). Forums for citizen journalists? Adoption of user generated content initiatives by online news media. *New Media and Society*. 10(1), 139-157.

Tilley, E., & Cokley, J. (2008). Deconstructing the discourse of citizen journalism: Who says what and why it matters. *Pacific Journalism Review*, 14(1), 94-114.

Voakes, P. A. (2004). A brief history of public journalism. *National Civic Review*, 93(3), 25.

Ursell, G. (2000). Turning a Way of Life into a Business: An Account and Critique of the Transformation of British Television from Public Service to Commercial Enterprise. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 11(6): 751-74.

Wallace, S. (2009). Watchdog or Witness? The Emerging Forms and Practices of Videojournalism. *Journalism*, 10(5): 684-701.

Ward, C. (2000). Ethical and Moral Considerations in the Decision-Making Processes of Political Journalism, MA thesis, Trinity and All Saints University College, Leeds.

Westley B.H. and MacLean, M.S., Jr (1957), "A conceptual model for communications research", *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 31-8.

White, D. M. (1950). The 'Gate Keeper': A Case Study in the Selection of News. *Journalism Quarterly*, 27(1), 383-90.

What is the Experiment in this Study:

The questions will address the attitudes and process of uses of amateur images and determine the quality, integrity, value and meaning the images have for viewers. The data gathered will determine editors' perceptions of amateur news photography in traditional news media. The data collected will be mainly used for analysis, to test the hypothesis and draw a conclusion. None of the questions used in this study are experimental in nature. The only experimental aspect of this study is the gathering of information for the purpose of critical analysis.

Appendix 1: Consent Agreement Form

Ryerson University: Consent Agreement

The Use of Amateur Video by Professional News Organizations: A Discourse Analysis of Editorial Selection

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Before you give your consent to be a volunteer, it is important that you read the following information and ask as many questions as necessary to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

Investigators:

My name is Susan Lai, and I am a Master's student in Communication and Culture, a joint programme between Ryerson and York University. My supervisor is Professor Don Snyder and my secondary reader is Professor Gene Allen.

Purpose of the Study:

My Major Research Paper examines how a professional news organization uses amateur images in their news publications or broadcast. The analysis will investigate how mainstream media obtains user generated content, selects, edits and publishes or broadcasts the image to the public. As part of my graduation requirement, I will be submitting a write up that are about forty to sixty pages long, in addition to a video documentary of my research. The study will assess photojournalists, photo editors, video editors' attitudes, towards integrating citizen photos and videos in mainstream news sites as gatekeeper sources. Further, the study will gather inside information on the processes of image data gathering and dissemination by news media and investigate where news media stand in their role as visual gatekeepers. The language of use is in English. Interviewees may range from any number between two to ten.

Description of the Study:

The study will determine the credibility of citizen journalism in time period where digital images and the Internet has shifted the values of participatory user generated content in online news media. Interviewees will be asked a set of questions. The interview will be conducted in an office (Ryerson library room or a news company's office) for confidentiality. The interview should take about 30 minutes to 2 hours.

What is the Experiment in this Study:

The questions will address the attitudes and process of uses of amateur images and determine the quality, integrity, value and meaning the images have for viewers. The data gathered will determine editors' perceptions of amateur news photography in traditional news media. The data collected will be mainly used for analysis, to test the hypothesis and draw a conclusion. None of the questions used in this study are experimental in nature. The only experimental aspect of this study is the gathering of information for the purpose of critical analysis.

Deliverables:

As part of my graduation work, I will write a forty to sixty page paper in addition to produce a video documentary that will be submitted to my two supervisors, my programme administrative office and School of Graduate Studies. There will be a paper and a video production, the paper will be bound, and the video will be saved on a CD in addition to posted online in a video broadcasting site (i.e. Picasa, YouTube, Vimeo) as part of my projects portfolio.

Risks or Discomforts:

Any discomfort may be due to the environment, if it is noisy. Some questions may cause disagreements. At risk is the interviewee's reputation, job security, and breach of news media company's confidential information. Other discomforts may be the discussion of events pertaining graphic imagery and cause emotional reaction or certain memories may be evoked. Should either the interviewee or volunteer feel discomfort and choose to discontinue from participating temporarily or permanently, they are allowed to at any time.

Benefits of the Study:

The benefit of this study is to society, academia and news media organizations, in finding answers to perceptions of citizen journalistic practices and attitudes. The data will contribute to academic research in the knowledge of journalism processes in a digital and convergence age of public participation. For news organizations, the research will benefit in the way they integrate user participatory models, and improve their services for viewers and members of their business. I cannot guarantee, however, that you will receive any benefits from participating in this study.

Confidentiality:

By default information provided by the interviewee is confidential, unless they give consent for information release (use of their name, visual image, and recording).

The data that I collect in this project will be used for my research paper, and I hope to turn my paper into a publishable article. I will be citing and quoting you in my paper and video with permission; I will write out the quotation and contact you if I can use those exact words. While many people prefer to speak confidentially, you may find it advantageous to be named in articles and video document, as this might be useful for publicity or other purposes.

The data will be stored in my USB sticks, external hard drives and/or on a secure personal laptop, and in private documents online (email, Google docs). Members that may access the data are my two supervisors for the purposes of consulting data gathering methods, analysis, and advice.

Interviewees will have their interviews digitally recorded through digital audio recorders and/or video digital recorders, for the purpose of transcription after, quoted in the research paper and for a video documentary. A photo of the interviewee may be taken

for the video documentation. If an interview was conducted by email, the email text will be saved. Telephone interviews will be recorded using a digital audio recorder, or if called through SKYPE, the interview will be recorded using the SKYPE recorder with prior consent and knowledge. By default the interviewee's information is confidential unless they give consent to have their name cited, company name revealed, their interview quoted, their portrait added in my video documentation and interview used as part of the video document. Access to the raw audio and/or video recording will be for my supervisors only, if necessary after the research is over, the data will be erased. If the subject wants to edit their quotation prior to publication, they may. The collected transcription, electronic data will be destroyed a month after publication.

Incentive to Participate:

Interviewees will have the interviewer's gratitude for sharing their knowledge.

Costs for Participation:

There are no costs for the interviewee except their time and travelling to the meeting location.

Voluntary Nature of Participation:

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with Ryerson/York University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to stop your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are allowed. At any particular point in the study, you may refuse to answer any particular questions or stop participation altogether.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the research now, please ask. If you have questions later about the research, you may contact:

Researcher

Susan Lai
1susan.lai@gmail.com
416-826-3477

Supervisor:

Professor Don Snyder
285 Victoria Street, Office 810
Toronto, Ontario
416-979-5000 ext. 6852
dsnyder@ryerson.ca

If you have questions regarding your rights as a human subject and participant in this study, you may contact the Ryerson University Research Ethics Board for information.

Research Ethics Board
c/o Office of the Vice President, Research and Innovation
Ryerson University
350 Victoria Street, Toronto, ON M5B 2K3
416-979-5042

Appendix 2: Interview Transcripts

Seven interview transcripts are attached below. Note: Questions asked by the investigator, Susan Lai, are written as "Q". Answers provided by the interviewee are written as "A".

Douglas Arrowsmith

CBC News Network

Video Online

205 Wellington Street West, Rm 4B 200-K

Toronto, Canada, M5V 3G7

Mobile: 416-305-6122

Direct: 416-205-2869

www.cbc.ca/news

In Person Interview (Interview length: 2 hours, April 29, 2010)

Q1: Tell me about your gate keeping role when you were working with the Haiti project.

A1: Well CBC news online wanted to produce videos that would be different in content than what the news format would probably chase down. So story wise we were interested in reaching into areas that had not been covered yet by the standard news media, and one way we found doing that was through the Ciné Institute in Jacmel. The story there is that in Jacmel there is a film study Institute called the Ciné Institute and soon after the earthquake I contacted some of the faculty there. Having had experience at Ryerson teaching I was aware of the skill sets of students in first and second year production courses and it just seemed to me that there was a whole lot of possibility there for reaching stories that were not being covered by the standard news outlets. Their own stories are very fascinating as well. Some of these students had lost family, they'd lost their homes and they began to rally in the weeks after the earth quake and went back to the studio that housed all their equipment and basically dug it out of the rubble and began filming. When I first made contact with the Institute in Jacmel we talked about what type of stories they might go out and look for that would be of interest to a Canadian audience. Because I knew the nature of the stories were going to be sensitive, it was going to be emotional for them, I remember saying to them search for the song underneath the rubble and I think they did just that. There are several examples where the students are including music in their cuts and this is different to how a news reporter would go out and begin building a story in the field. The students are also coming from a background that is not journalism, they're coming from film studies, so they're approaching what would be news stories from a different skill set all together. They're approaching it from the skill set of visual narratives, they are learning about how audio works into their pieces, they're trying to find singular subjects, I guess in most cases that would take us through the stories, and they are probably taking more time to

actually produce these stories than what a news reporter or a video journalist would do. They were creating these short films under a lot of challenging conditions, they had to move their entire operation once out to the airport, once the aftershocks were coming through and I think in the end what happened was CBC's offer to help them get these stories to the wider world ended up inspiring them a lot. There is probably a good half dozen young film makers in that lot that really went out and delivered. You can see those stories online at [CBC news.ca/80films](http://CBC.news.ca/80films).

Q2: From what you've mentioned, these projects are different than their traditional way of reporting, can you elaborate a bit on citizen reporting than from one by a professional reporter?

A2: I think the main difference is now with video online the idea of curating a content that already exists out there. In other words, organizing information, in this case videos that were being produced outside of CBC in a meaningful way. We have often talked about how our jobs have changed with the internet, and we now are not just creating content but we are receiving content and organizing it into new objects and new projects and new meaning so this is what we did with the films from the Ciné Institute. There is more to your question though I think.

Q3: You were talking about how a report done by a professional, the standard is different than how a citizen would report.

A3: Yes, we were concerned with the authenticity of each video. We wanted to also talk about each film maker. So in building the site and project online we wanted to include the personal story and background of each of those student film makers. We found that, that was part of it in each case; so we asked for pictures of each film maker, each director, we included biographies and information about them as they came through the earth quake.

Q4: So in a way making it personal so it brings it closer to home?

A4: That is right.

Q5: And professional standard of reporting has that distance.

A5: Yes, and with these videos what is different is that online, we can show a collection of videos in a very specific way that television can't. Where as they would work well for a curator online, they were not going to work well for, let us say a program like the National or evening news shows because we were not subjecting the videos to journalistic rigor even though we had of course authenticated each of the films.

Q6: I noticed CBC's cover of stories is always very emotional, so when you were describing how this project was slightly different than what CBC normally creates, in that sense I don't think there is a difference because maybe its going more in depth, that it's more personal but it's still a very emotional type of framing, or do you see a difference there?

A6: I think that is a good point, so in the end how different are these student film videos from video journalist pieces one "journalism videos" that would have been produced out there? I think on the one hand there are very different for obvious reasons, they are

coming from fresh eyes, from a discipline that falls out side of journalism and the goals and objectives therein, but in the end there are a lot of similarities in that they found stories that usually focused on a single person going through a certain event or struggle or a quest, those are always good stories, and they also taped into the emotional struggles of each of those subjects. News does look for the same kind of content for sure. I think the work flow was a lot different, I mean to talk about the technical side, the videos weren't being turned around at the rate of news items and part of the discussion there which is interesting is what is the shelf life of stories like this? Is it different for one line because the school was also using the videos on their site? The deal was that we would be the first window for broadcast and release to the world so ... [looses train of thought]

Q7: So you think the shelf life of these stories may be a little longer?

A7: Yes, well there was a discussion of exclusivity; does it matter if the videos are being shared elsewhere? That was part of the, I don't know if you want to call it "gate keeping" discussion but it's different for television because I remember a time a piece like this would have been commissioned and there would have probably been a fairly rigorous discussion around exclusivity and use of that content and a broadcast window and what that meant and definitions and all that stuff. Online is a bit different. We weren't interested in videos that other broadcasters were using, so in a sense there was a kind of implied exclusivity but the school was free to do whatever they wanted with the content which included putting it up on their own side.

Q8: So along those lines how would copyright or licensing or if another station wanted to borrow the stories, or if the students are putting them all over the place then what about that?

A8: The students or the Ciné Institute, I'm to sure how they figure out their own copyright issues, probably the Ciné Institute owns the rights to the video so they agreed to allow CBC none exclusive use of each of the films.

Q9: You touched on the comparison between broadcast and online and that it was quite different. Can you add to it? You mentioned timeliness and places of broadcast are different but what else?

A9: I think what is different is the way video is viewed online; the attention span of online viewers is different to the kind of attention span for television. Because they can control the content, how they view it, the order which they view it, the experience is different so the actual pace of the video can be different for online than it would be for television broadcasting. Some of the films were actually quite artistic, they were silent films or films they produced with no dialogue or no master interviews and television or at least television news does not really have a track record of broadcasting that kind of material. So it is different, I think the way video online is being used is changing the way we think about news or at least the way we receive news compared to the traditional sense of how that has been done.

Q10: That last comment is what is most interesting. I was wondering if you could offer an explanation or an in depth insight about it, the differences between the traditional ways of broadcasting versus the new media. That is what a lot of researchers want to know but it is hard to pinpoint that. How was journalism practiced traditionally before, and how has it altered or evolved or changed now with the new media, like going online or the managing being solo reporters using their own cameras, without a team filming for them, they are on their own. So how has traditional journalism changed for an audience with a short attention span? How have the new practices evolved?

A10: I do not know, I think that is for a real kind of journalism expert to think through. I think the right answer has to involve a bit of the history of journalism as a context. I have my own thoughts on that. I want to say that the rules are different, but I would have to think through what those rules are. There's a very clear sense that the rules changed, but I think we're still in a period where we are trying to find out what those rules are, I think I can say that in terms of videos online and how that differs from use of video for traditional news on television.

Q11: I am going to go back one big step. Can you define what gate keeping is? In your own words I know it is not your specialty but what do you think it is what is the role or what is the concept behind it? And you are a gate keeper in a way because you are an editor of a bigger project so when you decide what images should be shown or not shown, and how to frame a story and how does this image tell a story or not ...

A11: How does it work though, right? I guess gate keeping, in terms of video online, is about the process by which you determine what can or what can not go through the pipe... but I think; I mean gate keeping to me means the process by which you determine what is in and what is out of content for video online which is what we are talking about. But you know, it is part of the editorial decision making process and that is done, sometimes individually and sometimes it is done collectively; but it is always passed through senior editorial people; usually the editor in chief of a news organization; or the chief video online. Nothing; there is no ... how can I put this... There are no mavericks in the field of video online within news organizations. In other words, producers cannot just go out and grab video and slap it online. It has to go through a chain of scrutiny before it ends up in front of an audience. That is the same no matter what you are doing in a news organization, whether you are doing television, radio or online. It all goes through that kind of process.

Q12: Okay, so just going back a step, you said that it is really common sense the guidelines but can you just spell it out a bit because I think each organization has a slightly different criterion or rule. You can even talk about your project in that sense too.

A12: Well, okay, I can give one example, I mean in terms of the student film project from Haiti for online; there were a couple of videos. One in particular was a silent film that had no narrative, no dialogue. It was about a handy capped man who was basically walking through a series of different scenes and scenarios and it was not clear what that

was about. I think the film maker tried to put some context into the piece right at the very end but the only thing that came up on screen was a bit of text that included the word "Jesus"; and that to us as a news organization seemed to fall outside the kind of - sort of set of principles that we operate under. We just did not know what to make of it. We did not necessarily think it was a bad video or that it was shot poorly or anything like that. It did not present itself in a way that had immediate relevance, I think is the word for the audience we have online.

Q13: And also you were mentioning how deter-process. Can you describe an example or a scenario where that internal decision making process works? If there was a collective group.

A13: It never works [laughs]. It is hard. Editorial decisions by committee are very difficult because everybody is bringing a set of stuff to the table and quite often coming from different disciplines or backgrounds. Some people are journalist, some people are political scientists, some people are sociologists, some people are videographers; and the people behind the camera creating the stories... So the collective discussion about what can be in or what is out of news content is always very lively. It can be very passionate; but at the end of the day, I think collectively we come to the right decision. It is only through that process... that content is ...how should I put it; I want to get it right so you do not have to cut it together... I would say it is only to that process that content is really raised to a level that matters for audiences. It is not an "anything goes" practice. Just because we have this hope, this pipeline onto the web, it is still not an "anything goes" practice for news; and I think that is a good thing.

Q14: Let us say for a short news clip, how long would this decision making process take? Like an hour meeting or will take over a week; probably not over a week.

A14: Depends. The length of time an editorial decision can take can be anywhere from a few quick moments to days or weeks. It depends on what type of material you are handling. It depends what you are doing with it. It depends what you want to say with it. At times, there are legal issues around that kind of footage too.

Q15: So for instance this Haiti Project, is it on going or is it a one time project?

A15: The Haiti Project is a one time only project.

Q16: And how long did your senior producers or senior editors decide and cut and edit it, before it went through? I guess you were filming for a few weeks before it...

A16: Yeah, because the films for the Haiti project were coming in across a staggered deadline, they were coming in at a rate of two or three a week across several weeks. We had a few months to decide how to organize that project, what films we were interested in. What films we were not interested in. And begin building the collection. The actual building only took probably three or four days. But we had made our editorial decisions before that.

Q17: In the end, how long was the video?

A17: The videos in the end we showed, eleven videos. We showed ten original student works of video, which averaged around, probably four to five minutes of video and then we had one explainer video called "A Day In The Life of the Sinewy Institute"

Q18: Are you happy with the end project?

A18: Yeah! I mean I think it is an interesting way to tell a story that affected so many different people because we were able to have a set of fresh eyes on the ground that were not coming from inside the institution; looking for stories that we knew would interest our audience and producing them across fresh methods. Using fresh methods of production. They were not thinking ahead in terms of what would or could or may not be accepted by a news organization. They were just out with their cameras chasing their passions, and looking for stories that mattered to them; and that they thought were important to Haitians. That was one part of the story that is stressing. These were stories about Haitians told by Haitians; and that to us was very significant.

Q19: So in terms of inter-process, you mentioned that there were quite a lot of videos.

A19: [technical interruption]

Q20: So we were talking about the editor process; how you selected. There were eleven videos and you selected about 10. Is there a reason why you chose not to show the other one? Was it technical, or did the story line not fit? Or was it not what you were looking for? Or did you think it was too amateur?

A20: I think we got in the end about fifteen videos, and from that we thought ten was the right amount, for that collection. I mean there were videos that were good that we had to make some tough decisions.

Q21: Is it because of the time span that you were given? Alternatively, could you have done a mash up of cutting some from here, and adding it to the other one?

A21: I think we sort of decided in advance that we would show ten of the videos. There was some discussion about whether we would make it an ongoing thing; more open ended. But we thought since this was a first time kind of pilot that we would go with ten; something manageable, something that was an open and close work flow. Something that would not continue across many months.

Q22: You mentioned that in this project, the images are just images that go with the text and the narrative or do you actually think these images in itself have embedded messages; and speak more grandly than the voice or the text. For example, the Victoria Police kicking the two guys. That is a graphic image to let people see what happened. It is documental evidence. Some of the citizen videos ... The news section does not use those images to care out a message; they are just using the visual just to have some visual. It really does not serve as big of purpose. It is like an illustration to go with a book but the illustration itself does not have a voice. It is the text that has the weight?

A22: In this specific project or in any project? So the question is whether it is about an image. I think the use of image is interesting. I remember making a couple of

documentaries for CBC news beginning with September 11th special, "As the Towers Fell". At that time we started using on television, still photos. So in other words, we were stopping the motion to pause and frame a moment or a message in a frozen freeze frame. We did that again, to some extent, with the Tsunami, but we certainly did it again with Deadline Iraq, which was a longer feature that followed the embedded journalist and also the none embedded; the independent journalists that had a lot of still photos in that documentary and it was stronger for it; And the use of still photos online. Still photos cut into a narrative with the use of an interview or an audio bed underneath. That is almost, in some ways, functioning as video online. Although people do not call it video. It is an interesting and efficient way to tell a story and it also gives an impact. The impact is in many ways stronger than video. The images are so huge than the resolution and clarity. That is also the DSLR allowing journalists to play around with different film lenses and making news stories look more like film projects which is changes the overall impact of pieces for audiences. So that whole discussion is still happening. Sometimes I think super shallow depth of field look is too much for news. It does not always alarm; I do not think. For others, it is just a style issue. Others would disagree. I do not know.

Q23: Those are good and interesting points, but can you explain a bit more what you mean by super shallow depth look?

A23: It is like going to go shoot a news item using a DSLR camera similar to what you are using now, but putting a 35mm lens or something with an even wider angle lens on, and throwing the whole background out of focus even at times so that only part of the face is in focus and you get that blurring effect. You know, it looks great for portrait photography. In some ways, moving that direction makes news look more like portraiture at times than traditional video or television. That is where online video is experimenting currently. With the kind of look of the video. It can all be done now for relatively low budget.

Q24: That is quite interesting that news is bringing that in. I am just wondering what is the factor for shifting news production to making it look more like a film, or is it because of technology advances, or is it because everyone has mobile cell phone that has video and decided all this film like story style is more eye catching to the audience? Less of a ...

A24: I think it is both. I think there are two reasons for that. One is, as you say, the availability of the equipment to the average consumer has really changed. So people, camera buffs are really discriminating about the kind of gear they have. That has always been the case, but people have their at home edit suites. Most people have who are even remotely interested in video or photography has Macs so they are cutting using Final Cut or one of the programs. The whole idea of literacy is shifting. I was looking at someone on the box, or even sitting on a park bench the other day, and it was the middle day Tuesday, and the person was reading a book and I thought, "wow, what a luxury". "Who gets to do that anymore, things are moving?" so fast and the whole idea of the shift of literacy from the text to the image.

A: But this is the idea, though, that the shift in literacy from the text to the image is the

phase that we're in right now and I think that's really remarkable. And I think you see kids are coming out of school – you know I took typing because it was all about text and learning to master text with speed – I think the kids that are coming out of school now are image savvy. They're not taking typing. They're learning how to manipulate images and video and audio. And they're coming out ... what was once a really good typist so I could key in my stuff and write my essays in university. Replace that now with really good camera operators and filmmakers, student filmmakers. That's driving this whole shift. I think in a way news organizations are trying to stay in front of that as they look ahead. I think on one hand it's both exciting and scary that a team of student filmmakers can get out front on certain stories, and Haiti is one example of that. Wait until you see what happens with the next big disaster. It's just going to be more of, like you say, citizen journalists at the front of that. I didn't say that very well. Do you want me to re-say that?

Q25: If you want.

A25: Well, just wait until you see the next disaster. I think you'll find there are citizen journalists or students or consumers who are getting the story first and that is different to what we've seen in the past decades with news organizations being first on the ground.

Q26: We've reached a really good point. I was wondering if you could elaborate on what brought this whole trend of video making. Obviously it's all this technology and accessibility and it's really cheap to get a pocket camera now. But what brought up this hype to shoot everything and ... video blogs and YouTube phenomenon?

A26: I don't know what caused this whole trend. I don't know what to say about that. Maybe it's something about the idea of mobility combined ... it's the shift to the cellular phone in 1983 – I was just reading today was the first Motorola phone that came out – at the same time there was no email when I was at university and that wasn't that long ago when I was doing my undergrad. There was no email and nobody had – really I can't remember anyone who had a cell phone. We had ... there was a phone in the kitchen that had an answering machine and that's how we ran our lives. So there was something about that shift combined with the idea that we can take images of each other and circulate that has invited us to think of different ways of narrating our lives whereas before it was all about getting together.

Q27: In other words, do you think the new generation who are hyped up with video making just want celebrity status and they want to be the actors in their own lives ...?

A27: I think it all plays into ... I think it really begins to ask deeper questions about the nature of ourselves and who we think we are because we can shape that now. We can basically make our own commercials about ourselves and put them up on Facebook or twitter in a few hours, in a few minutes in some cases. And it's all really statements about the self. You know, I saw ... there was a twitter blog about ... it was once of the first moments of real severe criticism of social media and how – I'll have to look for that for you – they were calling it self grandiosity and show-offy. The idea that anyone really

wants to know what you're doing hour to hour is a bit pompous. Pompous isn't the word but ... cut that out.

Q28: Since we're talking along the lines of citizen journalism you can see a lot of people going out there taking video and trying to be reporters themselves but the videos aren't really investigative journalism. So where do you think it's going to go, you know citizen ... video journalists are still going to stay as ...?

A28: Here's the difference. There's still a craft called journalism. There's still a craft ... there's still rules to story making. There are still techniques. There's still experience and sort of storytellers, video journalists, people who work in the media a long time perfect those. It's the same as any craft or profession.

A: It's still a craft and can be perfected like any other. There's still a role for ... they are two different categories. The citizen journalism stuff that we see on TV is largely happenstance. People were there at the right place at the right time rolling. There's one great story with 9/11. There's a guy we had in the documentary we did who just happened to be in Queens leaning out his office window testing his video camera as the second aircraft came into the tower. That is citizen journalism. He happened to be there and he caught it. That kind of storytelling ... Is that even storytelling I guess is that question? Whatever that is different to the craft of producing stories using video, shaping them into narratives for news. I guess the ultimate question is, is everybody a journalist? Can anybody do it? The answer to that is yes and no. It is probably that simple. It's like writing. You have to practice it to be good at it.

Q29: I just want to go back to one ... I don't know if we talked about it ... Lets say CBC takes a citizen video or a citizen photo. Does that image have any weight or any value to it or is it just to accompany the story. There really is no encoded or embedded message in it?

A29: I don't know about that. That's probably one for a social media person.

Q30: Where should we go from here? I'm going to throw this out ... so how does the news selection criteria and editorial values change because of the mixture of the citizen videos now? Back then it was all professionally taken images, still or video, and now there's citizen ones.

A30: I think you got to talk to a news editor on that.

Q31: In your own opinion, do you think now that, for instance, CBC is using citizen videos or photos that it is representing a civil point of view?

A31: A civil?

Q32: Yeah, like citizens' perspective. Because when professional reporters report it we think they're all part of the authority, you know the big brothers. Do you think with the integration of those images it's in a way more siding with citizens now? Telling stories from more of a citizen's point of view?

A32: I don't know what to say on that. Well it is ... what do you mean siding? More with the citizen's point of view?

Q33: Well, if there's a slant or a bias in the storytelling ...?

A33: It doesn't take the bias out of it at all. Citizen journalism in some ways can be more biased than the news media. One example of that and it's continuing, is the campaign to film TTC operators here in the city of Toronto. I think that started out as a sort of citizen journalism campaign. Someone kind of took it upon themselves to chase down some stuff. Maybe they felt they had a bad exchange with an operator. You know, it just seems you can take a camera into any kind of operation and randomly film bad stuff. It just seemed that the context there ... I think that's one good example of where citizen journalism was probably really biased. Now it seems that news organizations are taking a closer look at the TTC. But I saw some stuff on TV the other night where the operator, it didn't seem that bad. It just seemed that the guy was calling out to someone or you know was trying to discipline someone. But to me that didn't seem like it was bad stuff. Maybe I don't know the story well enough to comment. Anyways...

Q34: In that case, when the news uses citizen content do you find that it's misrepresented or the way they frame the image is just not ...

A34: I see where you're going with that. The question is can news borrow citizen images or video to tell the story in a particular way. And the answer is yeah. They can use it to support an editorial position that they've established elsewhere. They can't use it to invent something. It's still subject to the same code and ethics that any content would be subject to. So I don't think ... along those lines it would be wrong if news organizations were taking citizens' photo or video and creating completely different stories out of it. That would be like film making, wouldn't it?

Q35: Do you know of any instances where citizen videos or photos were not authentic, and that they turned out to be manipulated or edited prior to being submitted? Or really was broadcasted and fooled everyone, including journalists?

A35: Those are definitely out there. I don't know one off hand. One concern news organization have with citizen journalist material is whether it's their own. How do you authenticate this stuff? And that's part of the rigor of gatekeeping, deciding ... Sometimes people can send in images that aren't their own. That's a difficult ... That kind of gatekeeping you have to talk to someone else about. I think news organizations have to be really careful with how they handle that kind of material.

Q36: Do you by any chance know how they fact check to make sure that image is authentic?

A36: Talk to someone else about that, who's actually making those calls. How's the exposure on that? Is it automatic?

Q37: Yeah, you know what ... there's a temperature thing flashing and I'm like "what is that?"

A37: It's because you're losing light [camera technical talk].

Q38: Oh, because I've never seen that light flash. If you can answer, if not ... pass.

Has the usage of citizen images, like video or photo, changed the way they told the news story if they didn't have that image? Has it altered or changed the story value or the story framing or the narrative of that news event if they didn't have that citizen image to support it? Or changed the story and make it a different angle because of that image?

A38: You need an example for that. I don't know if ... I'm sure it's happened but I can't really point to anything.

Q39: You might know this one; do you find that because of all this citizen stuff mushrooming that the CBC has adopted a more sensational way of reporting stories? I see Peter Mansbridge's background is all flashy ... I get the new look but I really like the traditional look of him just sitting there.

A39: I guess you have to have some sort of news renewal.

Q40: Do you know of any critiques on citizens images or have you heard of any criticisms?

A40: Like from audience or what?

Q41: Maybe from a journalists point of view like "Oh, you guys shouldn't have used that image. You should have stuck with using professional images" because of bad quality or it's very biased. Let's use the Victoria police case as an example. They only used the citizens' point of view. They didn't film the whole context of how the police ended up doing that. But after doing their research and background they realized the police had been going there every night to the nightclub and busting because of problems ...?

A41: Yeah, that's not one for me.

Q42: There's one that I'm not even sure what I'm talking about ... but someone else was mentioning transparency. I don't know if you can touch upon that aspect of transparent. Maybe how citizens' images have brought a news story more transparent as opposed to more traditional practices it was more lopsided, I guess?

A42: I don't know if that's how I think of transparency. Isn't transparency about ... something went around last week about the New York Times was showing video online of their editorial meetings. And the question was, is that an instance of transparency. I think "transparency" is a crazy word around news organizations. It's the candy. It doesn't really work. I'm kind of engaged myself in thinking through why that is. The idea of transparency ... and whenever you see an instance of a news organization turning the camera on themselves ... News organizations don't always trust material ... I just got to think through this a little bit more. This is a good answer. It's going to take me a little while to shape it out. It's a good one, though. Maybe you can quote me in text once I think through that. I'm just working through it right now but it's kind of along the idea that ... it's just the idea that news organizations approach video that they have created, let's say "found video", with so much skepticism. You know, how can they then turn the camera on themselves and feel that it doesn't need to be subjected to the same rigor or skepticism. It's just that idea of transparency is really loaded whenever you see it

happening. Transparency is a news organization's stunt. But I don't want to get fired. But whenever I hear it I think "something's up". And I think the feeling was the same when we saw the New York Times put cameras in their editorial meetings. Who doesn't come into a meeting like that thinking "OK, I got to watch what I say. This is going out to the world."

Q43: How would you define transparency? What is this concept really?

A43: I don't know. Transparency would be opening up a meeting like that ... transparency would be that if you could somehow be there without them knowing. So that there ... transparency is supposed to be about no filter at some level.

Q44: Could you elaborate a little about the filter system?

A44: Well, transparency only works when you are catching something you are not supposed to be catching. That's transparent. The word is also used when news organizations show the "how" aspect behind the stories. I always think that stuff is carefully thought out.

Q45: It's pretentious. It's posed. It's staged.

A45: Yeah. You could say that.

Q46: My opinion is that if they are turning the camera in on themselves, they are trying to gain the public's trust once again. To show that this is how we do it and this is legitimate. We are credible still. I guess this is why they are doing it. If you see a video by a citizen, would you trust it more versus a video made by a journalist, right? Maybe that's where it's all stemming from – that the citizens are trusting citizen videos way more than someone tied to an organization ...

Q47: Citizens are trusting their own material more than ...?

A47: I don't know how you measure that. Sometimes news organizations use YouTube, you know. That's the other aspect that's very interesting. There are thousands of videos out there but nobody really pays attention until the news broadcasts it and then it becomes something. Otherwise it's just sitting there ...

Interviewer: That's right.

Q48: Is it the large audience number who has viewed that video that made the news want to cover that story as well?

A48: To a degree, news organizations are after audiences. They are also interested in ... it's interesting to hear news organizations talk about viral video.

Q49: Which is?

A49: Viral video is creating, capturing something on video that basically generates a huge amount of viewers in a short amount of time. It's one of these videos that gets emailed or passed around from group to group and at the end of the day you have a million viewers. I'm not sure where news organizations are going with that, but it's still interesting to hear it talked about. Does that mean that news organizations are going to

attempt to produce viral videos? I don't know. I don't think so.

Q50: Earlier we were talking about transparency, and that leads to the surveillance part of this. Do you think the news organizations ... ?

A50: Yeah. I don't know what to say on that. The surveillance aspect ... I'm not sure. You can try the question again.

Q51: Do you find when news organizations use citizen images they're actually exposing the official authorities, whether in a good way or a bad way. I guess the answer to that is yes. Or maybe like, is it a good idea for professional news organizations to use citizen images exposing the official authorities because that creates a crack in the system to break them down saying that the official authorities are not perfect. They themselves are now violating rules and thanks to citizen journalists, now we've caught them and now we're going to penalize them or discipline them for all their misconduct. I guess Canada is a democratic society so they will think, the news media, will think it's a good idea to expose them. Shame on Tiger Woods but let's expose him anyways. Versus maybe China or Iran, where its like don't even show that ... Is this surveillance concept good because it hurts the official system as well if we find fault in them?

A51: It kind of keeps everything in check. The idea that citizen journalists are out there on some level ... does it work as a more civilizing force on society? I don't know. I have actually wondered about that, yet. If you're going to rob a bank, do you think maybe you may not do it? Is there less chance of robbing a bank now because you think now there's probably six people in here with iPhones and someone's going to get a shot. Maybe, yeah. That must play out. I don't know.

Q52: So you think it has improved the morale of society?

A52: Has it improved the moral fabric of society? Because it's also, maybe ... yeah, I'd have to write that out I think. It's hard to put that into words.

Q53: It is interesting because you know how the TTC has applied three cameras on each bus, and one news report has said that Toronto's crime rate has gone down a little ...

A53: I don't know. Yeah, that's ...

Q54: How about ethics? Let's go back to citizen journalism. So citizen journalists do not abide by the rules and guidelines ... they can film as graphic an image or break into someone's house and film them ... and then tying it back to the news organizations, if they wanted to use that video content do you think the news organizations should censor it and abide by their own agenda to not broadcast it or just say we weren't the ones who filmed it, we were just streaming it. It's not our responsibility?

A54: Right. Is there a place for news organizations to have an open stream for citizen journalists to file stuff?

Q55: I guess that would be Reuters, or ... Let's say CBC or a news organization is

covering a story and they have a video that is really graphic and really violates all their journalism standards or policies or rules, should that news organization still show that just because they have the visual in place.

A55: I can't really answer that. It's case by case. I know that's how they look at it. It depends what the story is. You'd have to talk to sort of a publisher, a news publisher, on that sort of stuff.

Q56: I have one that you can answer. Looking at the Haiti project, you obviously know that when there's a disaster closer to home, like in Canada, they will not show graphic images ... nothing close up. If it's murder they will just show the body covered in a white cloth from far away. But in the Haiti event, we do see corpses. I guess it's justification for the news media is that it's far away so we can show the body parts and the dead bodies. What do you think of that? For international we're allowed to show graphic images, whereas in Toronto we're not allowed to. What's the justification for that?

A56: Again. I don't know. I would ask an editor in chief those questions. But we do, don't we? Maybe we don't. It does seem that ... Like the Iraq war is a strong example of that.

Q57: Like when you did the Haiti project, did you find there were some graphic images and you felt you'd just cut that section out because you felt it was too ...

A57: No. We didn't edit their videos. That's probably an important point. The videos ran as they were submitted. Including, in some cases, there were some typos in there, some supers ... but these were student films. We felt that ... one of the questions we asked ourselves was "should they be edited?" And at the end of the day we thought they didn't need to be.

Q58: Because you wanted to capture that authentic voice ...?

A58: Yeah. Because they are their films. it is used to accompany a news story. Image is always identified to be user-generated.

Q59: Did you actually go into the schools and train them into thinking this is what we're looking for ...?

A59: No. they weren't assigned stories. They were already out shooting these kinds of things. It was more encouragement in the end more than anything. It's just that we could give them a wider audience and get those stories out. But we were looking for inspirational stories. Other news organizations ... it seems there was enough of the gore and of the devastation. That story was being told around ...

photographer's photos and that of UGC)?

A6: Yes. Image must be verified as authentic, image must be of high quality, there must be no cost involved.

Q7: And are we referring to photos that are part of news articles, or photos in the news gallery A Week in Pictures only?

A7: The quality standards apply to both.

Q8: What percentage is UGC?

A8: Approximately 4 per cent (for news stories).

Corey Bellamy
Video Producer, CTV.ca, CTV News
Mobile: 416-708-8952
Work: 416-332-7039
cbellamy@ctv.ca

Email Interview (November 20, 2008)

Q1: Are photos from stock images?

A1: No. They only use stock images for elements in graphics.

Q2: Freelance photographers?

A2: CTVOttawa.ca hires freelance photographers, CTV.ca does not. If staff is on assignment they will take photographs to accompany their copy. CTV.ca is in a unique situation where we can use screen-grabs from television footage shot by CTV cameramen on the scene. With technology increasing in the field, so does the quality of the screen-grabs to use online.

Q3: Non-professional submitters?

A3: Yes. UGC (user generated content) makes up a small part of our overall visual storytelling. All content is checked and validated thoroughly by editorial staff before publishing to CTV.ca.

Q4: Have the photos being used as part of news articles before?

A4: Yes. If the image has been verified, it is used to accompany a news story. Image is always identified to be user-generated.

Q5: What is the basis of selection of photos from different sources (no stock, freelance photographers, public)?

A5: Our main filters for selecting photo source is: cost, quality of image, the story the image tells.

Q6: Are there criteria/guidelines for selection (free lance photographer's photos and that of UGC)?

A6: Yes. Image must be verified as authentic, image must be of high quality, there must be no cost involved.

Q7: And are we referring to photos that are part of news articles, or photos in the news gallery A Week in Pictures only?

A7: The quality standards apply to both.

Q8: What percentage is UGC?

A8: Approximately 4 per cent (for news stories).

Q9: Why would news sites use UGC?

A9: Expand their abilities to tell stories through images and video.

Q10: What could be problems with using UGC? (E.g. unreal photo/manipulated)

A10: Photo manipulation and fake photos are both issues. Thus the reason we verify each image and have photo editors check in detail the image.

Q11: How are staffs able to verify it the photo is true, and reliable?

A11: Check with person who sent the image, get independent verification of event happening. Visual verification upon receipt.

Q12: What aspect of UGC has there been a gap in research literature?

A12: Integration of UGC into normal news-gathering operations. In my opinion, the dramatic increase in use of UGC in news is captivating. It's a new and somewhat unexplored field on the forefront of journalism. CTV, CBC, and most major U.S. news organizations are using this type of photographic content.

A1: There are two areas that you consider when you think about citizen journalism. One is that mainstream media wants you to get the news from any source they can, and it's such a competitive industry that anyone who shows up with a raw footage of an event can command the price. Initially, the news editor will take it, growing very anxious, and will say "yes, yes. We'll take it". I know in my years (30 years) whenever we had a major story, we'd take our shots and look around to see if there were any people who may have been taking pictures and then try to buy the pictures from them. Even during earthquakes, you go up to the stores that have video (security cameras) in place 24 hours a day and sometimes that footage gives you something that is newsworthy. So and then, of course, nowadays you have the cell phone. I remember when I was a young person, if you went to a concert everybody holding up lighters nowadays everybody's holding up their cell phones.

Interviewer: That description reminds me of news photo of Obama's inauguration party dance where there is a sea of blue light because of the cell phone videotaping.

Interviewee: Everybody has a cell phone and everybody has a camera. It's unavoidable because everybody has a camera. We have 24-hour news. When I was a little boy that was not the case, now there's 24-hour news and there are 500 channels to be watched so the beast needs to be fed. People are watching and obviously they see, today, a plane crash at the airport and somebody had cell phone video. The next time they see anything remotely newsworthy they are out there with their cameras. And it's not just about making money now it's about celebrity status they attach to being published. Everyone wants to be a newsman. The other side of the coin is how the mainstream

Peter Bregg
Photo Editor, Macleans, NewsWire
220 Seaton Street, Toronto, ON M5A 2T4
416-726-0906
peter@peterbregg.com
www.peterbregg.com

Part 1: In Person Interview (Interview length: 2 hours, March 25, 2010)

Q1: What I am interested in is citizen photojournalism. I am interested in the attitudes, perceptions of photo editors on citizen photojournalism...

A1: There are two areas that you consider when you think about citizen journalism. One is that mainstream media wants you to get the news from any source they can, and it's such a competitive industry that anyone who shows up with a raw footage of an event can command the price. Initially, the news editor will take it, growing very anxious, and will say "yes, yes. We'll take it". I know in my years (30 years) whenever we had a major story, we'd take our shots and look around to see if there were any people who may have been taking pictures and then try to buy the pictures from them. Even during earthquakes, you go up to the stores that have video (security cameras) in place 24 hours a day and sometimes that footage gives you something that is newsworthy. So and then, of course, nowadays you have the cell phone. I remember when I was a young person, if you went to a concert everybody holding up lighters nowadays everybody's holding up their cell phones.

Interviewer: That description reminds me of news photo of Obama's inauguration party dance where there is a sea of blue light because of the cell phone videotaping.

Interviewee: Everybody has a cell phone and everybody has a camera. It's unavoidable because everybody has a camera. We have 24-hour news. When I was a little boy that was not the case, now there's 24-hour news and there are 500 channels to be watched so the beast needs to be fed. People are watching and obviously they see, today, a plane crash at the airport and somebody had cell phone video. The next time they see anything remotely newsworthy they are out there with their cameras. And it's not just about making money now it's about celebrity status they attach to being published. Everyone wants to be a newsman. The other side of the coin is how the mainstream

media handle this material? At what point do they say we've been burned too many times. For instance, how media print media. Photoshop's been out there. People have been able to doctor images for a millennium. When you go into a cave how do you know that those are real scenes from that area and not somebody's imagination? Someone once asked me that you must be doing amazing work out there with pictures, etc.? And the technology has changed in the last 25 years, but not the ethics. There were other software programs out before Photoshop. One famous product out there before Photoshop call is called Scitex. It allowed the digitization of pictures and therefore you could transmit the pictures by satellite. And that's how the USA Today, when they first launched, managed to get pages their around the country so quickly because they were able to digitize whole pages. Now with Scitex, they were able to digitize the picture and then manipulate the image. Now people say "we'll just Photoshop that out", but back in the '80s, we'd say "we'll just Scitex that out". Scitex was probably developed for military purposes first. Anything really useful is almost always designed for the military first.

So we had people wondering how much Photoshop you did to this picture. That's the problem and in the mid '90s some got caught. And that's when people started to realize that we've got a problem. How do we make sure that people are going to trust our pictures if photographers have the ability to move the puck into the net? The puck going into the net is always the key picture. There are great pictures taken — action shots, players, etc., but that key shot is the puck going into the net. And in Photoshop that's a one second task to move that puck to where it belongs in the picture. And unless you're a forensic scientist, you won't be able to tell. Now photographers at mainstream newspapers and magazines and wire services are under threat of instant dismissal. I used to work at the Associated Press (AP) — it's not just a rule it's the law — and any manipulation of the picture that changes the editorial content is instant dismissal. We are allowed to dodge and change contrast dark to light to bring it back to its original. And this is something we were doing in the days of what we called "chemical optical darkroom" but not allowed to change editorial content. It's instant dismissal. One recent case, at the LA Times, there was a photographer in Iraq where he took a series of pictures and put them together and thought they looked great but didn't notice that one person was visible in both halves. And then went to the newspaper and they published it and then it was syndicated. And then somebody else found something wrong and they way I heard was that the photographer was called and fired on the spot and told to make his way home. That's how serious the mainstream media is about manipulation. Now you get to the point where there are people who are not afraid of instant dismissal, so you get the spin-doctors. There's this movie called the Green Zone with Matt Damon, and no trick images in the movie. The trick was that there was no weapon of mass destruction. It was fabricated by spin-doctors. In the Iran situation, the only pictures are cell phone pictures that can tell most of the story to this side of the world.

Because of politics, who's going to say it's fake? Spin-doctors are the people who would be able to be the first to get the image out first before anyone else. That makes it very tempting to edit the picture or story knowing that the media is urgently seeking new stories and to be the first to get it out to the public.

Q2: Is it also possible for an image to be published that is too graphic in the mainstream media including the Internet?

A2: Cropping is allowed. Magnum photo agency they ... there would be notes attached to the image saying no cropping allowed without prior consent. Newspaper photo editor art departments are usually the ones with the rulebook. It's just common sense.

Miami Haitian bodies washed ashore from the ocean and you can clearly see the bodies. I don't know if they were shown in Toronto but in the ones I saw you could clearly see. Those pictures were published around the world with wide-angle views. Now if bodies were to wash ashore in Toronto, the Toronto Star would not show those images because people there would be outraged. But if it happened anywhere else, of course, the Toronto Star would publish it. The further away the graphic pictures come from outside the local region; of course the images will be shown worldwide. If you go to Rwanda, the monument of the genocide that happened there includes bones and skulls, so that 20-50 years from now no one will forget what happened. By keeping the physical proof up there, no genocide will happen again. It's the human senses that dictate what is too graphic. It's a typecast rule. It's whatever the senses permit. If you're in the heat of it and you're not an experienced photojournalist, you would cheat on everything and take photos of everything. If I was an experienced photojournalist I would know there would be no point in shooting dead bodies because I would know it wouldn't get published. I remember when I was in Vietnam. I was there when the Americans left. I was shooting the South Vietnamese army after they had shelled a Vietcong hideout it was a direct hit. They started pulling out dead bodies. I was photographing everything! I knew it wasn't going to be published but I had to take those pictures. I knew it was an important piece of history, so I put it in my archives. Personal sensibility keeps us in check to not cross the line. Some people try to move that line a bit without conscience. Sometimes an image is enhanced ... in other words to make it visible so that it looks like the real thing. Not what it wasn't but what it was. Like I'm sitting here looking at you. There can be a bright light behind you. My eyes can adjust the lighting but the camera cannot and then you go in there to adjust the picture. There was an incident when OJ — on a magazine cover by Newsweek — they enhanced his contrast to make him more sinister looking. They enhanced the darker shadows. That was an editorial manipulation of the picture and that's against the rules.

Q3: Do you know any other software where newspapers or magazines can contest if an image's originality has been tampered with?

A3: I don't know of particular software. I don't think there is. There are little things. I teach here not really software, but a browser that allows you to view the image as a contact sheet then click on it to see it in full. But it also has method data that shows me how the exposure was, how the camera was set up, and it also tells me date and what time the picture was taken. And unfortunately I found some pictures from students that are suspect because there's one picture dated last week and another dated 2008. Now unless you set the camera dates ... but there are some students who don't do that. Not only that but some students use two to three cameras. When images are submitted some are dated 2008 and others are dated different. I'm suspect of those pictures. There are ways of hiding the date in other words. I know how to do it but I'm not going to tell you (laughs). My camera here shoots raw. The raw file will always be like a negative. An original you can save to a JPEG file but the raw, for all intense and purposes, the raw file will always remain original and not manipulated. Now you can take a picture with a camera, manipulate it, make a very large print and photograph it in raw. Present that now to a forensic scientist and they can take a look at that and can see that it's not an original. But as a photo editor someone can send a file and say here are some raw photos now and it would say it was taken yesterday. I might not be suspicious, but there are ways of cheating. But a forensic scientist could — nine times out of ten — find out. It's not an area that you begin to investigate because the mainstream media has been vigilant in the last 10-15 years, rooting out anyone who manipulates images against the rules. Now we are going to get a flood of photos from citizens'. There are some journalists who worry that they themselves will not be needed anymore and that the media will only rely on those citizens for images. Media will rely on them when the big stories hit because photojournalists can't get there on time. But the newspapers are not driven by attracting the public via YouTube and other social media Website associated stories. People who want to read the facts read newspapers and magazines because they want truth, honesty and accuracy. Mainstream media would only use those from citizens when it's so pressing that it has to be published. Like when that plane crashed — Air France — there was cell phone images used that came to light. Well that's pretty accurate but the quality was poor. Someone asked why bother, but it's as good as it will get for now. Technology is improving so fast that citizen journalists five years from now will give pictures of the same quality as us media photojournalists.

Q4: Don't you find citizens trust citizens more? Do they just assume the picture is not tampered opposed to one from a photojournalist?

A4: Well, there's greed. Then there're celebrity status seekers and spin-doctors. Those that want to manipulate the news will use any means they can. If somebody's back is up against a wall they will use those tools to camouflage what is being done. Citizen journalists are a lot more anxious and have fewer critics than a photographer working for mainstream media companies. They have more to lose if they get caught. They are burned for life and their career is over. There are no rules or boundaries for citizen journalists we have to check those photos carefully. When we accepted Photoshop with open arms but when it was abused, media clamped down on it with rules, regulations and law. It's not that we didn't have these rules at that time. It's just that it was so easy. Like fashion magazines Vogue, etc., those front-page pictures are manipulated to the extreme. If they don't like her nose there will be several edited pictures and then put together like a puzzle. We accept those images. Some magazines claim it's an advertisement and that it's OK to manipulate the cover. I don't know why they accept that when the product you're selling is honesty and truth. Why would you put a lie on a cover to sell it?

We are not just talking about citizen journalists. There are people who post on YouTube or other social networks because they can put anything they want in their images and put it up right away. It's instant gratification. For instance, yesterday down in Victoria, someone took a picture of Victoria police beating up somebody and posted it right away on YouTube. They didn't even inform the media. The public isn't worried that YouTube isn't real (it's a social network). When you get Prime Minister and the US President using YouTube and Facebook to get directly to the public ... I think the only reason Obama did it was that he wanted to reach more people and a lot of people don't read the newspapers and don't watch television news, so he needed to use that to get to the members of society who are not interested in the news.

In regards to Canada, we have a government that is happy to reach the audience that isn't viewing and reading the mainstream newspaper and television but allows going over the heads of mainstream media, user friendly to the Prime Minister. It's the functional media that like Harper. They will find it handy because it goes directly to the people skipping over the mainstream media. We've been very fortunate with Internet social networking because people haven't abused it yet. Like Photoshop, it took a few years or less, it happened quickly. Citizen journalists, if they manipulate images on YouTube or other social networks, have not been caught yet, but the instant it happens, you can be sure it'll change. Often enough, he's still going to be unafraid, not like media journalists, who constantly have it in their minds. They have a lot more to lose so he's not going to do it. Our experience tells us that we are here to tell the truth. If you don't want to tell the truth, find another career/job. Us photojournalists don't look to be famous

by cheating. We look to be famous by telling the truth. I take pictures I can be proud of. I can't be proud of pictures that are manipulated. Your point is good that other citizens can challenge citizen journalists. If they were in the vicinity of where those photos were taken and they took pictures. Also, citizen journalists can't manipulate those images. But those stories that come in when they were the only one there, the only witness, is that's where we will get burned. It might not happen for a few years. It might not happen at all, but it is bound to happen.

Q5: Do you ever notice that there's a current theme — photos used by citizen photojournalists? To me it's always about disasters.

A5: That's right. But also if you go on YouTube there's a lot of fighting and politicians whose speech is as dry as desert sand. Humorous antics. Who makes a big deal about it? Mainstream media and mainstream media like to print controversy. Does a photographer or reporter write or take a photo to be controversial? Does he do it to be controversial? No. He does it to get affront page by-line. That's how we get ahead. That's the pecking order to get ahead in mainstream media. Where are storytellers itching to tell our story? Not everything that's controversy or sensational gets printed. You can find hundreds of interesting stories in the newspaper. Some can only be five lines. Some just read the business section or the sports section. It's up to the reader.

Q6: I was wondering if you could talk more about your experiences. I guess most are for magazines ...

A6: Twenty years wire services and twenty years with magazines. It's 50/50 experience. I understand the process. The quality of material is incredible today compared to 20 years ago. I left the wire service at that moment when the industry was going digital. The technical changes allowed photographers to be faster, to go more places. Now, even reporters can take pictures. Toronto Star has done away with the titles "photographer" and "reporter". Now they are all called journalists. Now when you apply for a reporter job at a small town in Canada they will ask you if you know how to use a camera and shoot a video.

Q7: Did you notice that there is a difference in what's posted on Websites over what's selected to be printed in newspapers?

A7: I don't make it a habit to go to YouTube, so either way I couldn't tell you if I feel one way or the other about those pictures. Like that image with that police officer beating up someone, went to mainstream media. The only challenge to that was, did the person assault the police officer first or were they being belligerent or resisting arrest? Someone would have to tell you that it happened too, so I know how it can be taken out of context. I could have happened to be in jail for 2 years but I was acquitted for it. A lot

on YouTube, like those kids fighting in a school yard and it being videotaped, a lot of it is for the purpose of putting on YouTube.

How disgusted are we that they are just doing this to get on YouTube? We become used to it that we consider it news so that the medium is the message and it's the news now. It's social media and because social media is in the news. People think that newsprint is on the way out and that radio is on the way out. Newspapers are now going online. Newspapers are hiring reporters who can do video. Why to go online? Evolution of media will keep evolving for hundreds of years. People will always have an interest in the news whether from paper or cell phone watch as examples. Mainstream media is not on its way out. It is going to evolve.

Q8: I was wondering, can you elaborate the process on how a citizen journalist goes to the media?

A8: I think with television and newspapers and magazines, the process is the same as it always been. We have always been able to purchase pictures from citizens. The same process applies. Is it news worthy? Do we need it? How much is it going to cost? But a lot that is driving citizens journalists is entertainment news — paparazzi. On television spaces need to be filled and entertainment news does that.

Paparazzi pay people to call them when a celebrity is sighted. Then those people realized they can also make money taking photos and videos of celebrities. Especially now, there are agencies specific to buying these videos and photos and who go and sell to the mainstream media. It is a lucrative job for paparazzi; they can make hundreds, thousands to millions of dollars. The tragedy to this is that they are called "journalists" when that's an insult.

Interviewer: Thank you for the interview.

Part 2: Email Interview

Q9: Surveillance and watchdog acts of citizen journalists. In the past, traditional news media controlled through framing a story, fabricating a story, propagating a message from the authorities and captured visuals of unethical or misconducts that through news teaches morals to the public (i.e. Tiger was caught with another mistress; therefore, no one should be doing that).

A9: I wonder if the above statement makes the issue too simple. Traditional media does not fabricate or propagate a message willingly as part of the official mechanism.

Obviously a spin doctor can, through manipulation, spin a story and influence the media.

The media does make the comfortable, uncomfortable and try to bring comfort to those who are not. Morality is in the eyes of the beholder and already exists in society. The media has not invented it. Catching Tiger Woods with mistresses does not strengthen the morals of others as a result.

Q10: This 1984 notion of Big Brother watching citizens has shifted when citizens are documenting authorities violating and mistreating citizens (Rodney King, Victoria officers...)

A10: Technology has reached a point where the average citizen is capable of capturing images to indict any wrong doing by officials or citizens. Having these tools has become fashionable so that everyone who is carrying a camera, videocam or cell phone can capture a moment's notice an incident that proves newsworthy.

Q11: (... Seattle girl brutally attacked at a Seattle Metro bus tunnel while security guards stand by watching).

A11: This video is from "Big Brother" - the public CCTV cameras at the transit station.

Q12: What is the indication of this shift in power of documentation that citizens have the power to deflect authorities? To be the big brothers watching the government?

A12: To suggest there is a shift in power might be overly dramatic. We will have more citizens putting material on YouTube but of the millions of uploads, very few are of incidents that make news. They don't become news until the mainstream media reports about them.

Q13: Or are citizens simply doing the work for the government in keeping everyone at bay since everyone is watching everyone else now?

A13: The sands are constantly sifting. The method collection of news worthy stories is evolving as it always has. From the town crier to newsprint, radio and then television. All of these are now converging via the internet so obviously new sources and tools will become part of the landscape.

Q14: On gatekeeping, in your editorial with Hello! MacLean's, and Wire Services, have you found that traditional news media has always been the gatekeepers of visual information and they control what images with their messages they may convey to the public. With the mass adoption of citizen photo/video content, how has the gatekeeping stance changed (if at all?), what does the significant shift mean in the integration of journalism?

A14: By using the words "gatekeepers" and "control" suggests a sinister influence by the media over the public. The media has always published what the public wants to know or the media would be out of business. The internet has become a source of information for many, mostly those under forty.

Therefore, the mainstream media, at great expense with little revenue, has taken a position online to meet that demand. We can view television, read newspapers and magazines and now books electronically. By using fewer trees to distribute the news electronically one might say the shift is environmentally friendly.

The mainstream media will continue to guard the quality and veracity of material it distributes. The democracy of the internet allows "freedom of the press" to anyone with a laptop and internet access.

Press interview (April 9, 2009)

The public will eventually be able to sort out the real news from the junk. The danger is that many citizen journalists will not have the professionalism and integrity of professional journalists working for mainstream media. The public may have difficulty in identifying accurate news.

A1: You wouldn't, at a glance, be able to tell what was a submitted photo by a citizen journalist or a Star journalist. The photo credit would not say Toronto Star, just JILL CITIZEN PHOTO, for example. We do not, and should not in my opinion, differentiate between citizen journalists and our staff journalists.

Q2: Why is there a historical shift in interest in user-generated-content (Web 2.0), in particular for public captured images in mainstream news / The Toronto Star?

A2: Mostly because of the fact that camera and video phones are so prevalent. If something happens, there's a good chance someone can document it.

Q3: What are some factors for the cause of this phenomenon?

A3: Technology, plain and simple. Information can be recorded and disseminated rapidly.

Q4: When did all acceptance of user-created content start?

A4: Don't know. I'm not sure what you mean by acceptance. We've used photos from citizens for a long time, well before there even was a concept of the internet.

Q5: How much % of content is used in The Toronto Star from the public?

A5: Very, very little. At least in terms of photos. Less than 1%.

Q6: What are the criteria for selecting public photos / videos?

A6: Same criteria for any photo. Does it tell the story? Is it emotive? Does it capture the moment? Again, we do not differentiate between citizen journalism and staff journalism. We simply want the best photo.

Q7: How has the submission of citizen submission of images affected journalism in The Star?

A7: I'm not sure. We still try and do the same job. Citizen journalism is a different kettle of fish because it isn't assigned from the newsroom. It is mostly news that breaks fast and is covered by citizens on the scene.

Michael Kelly
Picture Editor, *The Toronto Star*
1 Yonge Street, Toronto, ON M5E 1E6
416-869-4340
1-800-698-8798
mkelly@thestar.ca

Email Interview (April 9, 2009)

Q1: How would I be able to identify from online and print newspapers, which images are from non-professional people who submitted the content?

A1: You wouldn't, at a glance, be able to tell what was a submitted photo by a citizen journalist or a Star journalist. The photo credit would not say Toronto Star, just JILL CITIZEN PHOTO, for example. We do not, and should not in my opinion, differentiate between citizen journalists and our staff journalists.

Q2: Why is there a historical shift in interest in user-generated-content (Web 2.0), in particular for public captured images in mainstream news / The Toronto Star?

A2: Mostly because of the fact that camera and video phones are so prevalent. If something happens, there's a good chance someone can document it.

Q3: What are some factors for the cause of this phenomenon?

A3: Technology, plain and simple. Information can be recorded and disseminated rapidly.

Q4: When did all acceptance of user-created content start?

A4: Don't know. I'm not sure what you mean by acceptance. We've used photos from citizens for a long time, well before there even was a concept of the internet.

Q5: How much % of content is used in The Toronto Star from the public?

A5: Very, very little. At least in terms of photos. Less than 1%.

Q6: What are the criteria for selecting public photos / videos?

A6: Same criteria for any photo. Does it tell the story? Is it emotive? Does it capture the moment? Again, we do not differentiate between citizen journalism and staff journalism. We simply want the best photo.

Q7: How has the submission of citizen submission of images affected journalism in *The Star*?

A7: I'm not sure. We still try and do the same job. Citizen journalism is a different kettle of fish because it isn't assigned from the newsroom. It is mostly news that breaks fast and is covered by citizens on the scene.

Q8: Has there been an increase in viewership / citizenship after more acceptance of public images usage?

A8: No clue. I don't know how you could measure that.

Q9: What are the advantages of using such citizen created images?

A9: The advantages are that we can get images to our readers of important moments.

Q10: What are the disadvantages?

A10: None that I can see.

Q11: Are the amateur photographers / videographers given some monetary compensation for their work?

A11: Yes. Each is negotiated at the time of purchase.

Q12: Are the images then copyrighted by The Star?

A12: No. They belong to the freelancer unless we have negotiated ALL rights, which we rarely do. Sometimes we will act as an agent and sell the images on the citizen's behalf. That's what we did with the Air France jet crash.

Q13: Does The Star share / sale those images to other mainstream news organizations?

A13: As mentioned above, if we act as agent, our syndication department will sell rights to organizations outside the Toronto area.

Q14: Are the images edited before publication?

A14: If you mean cropping and general toning, then yes. If you mean digitally altered, then 'no.'

Q15: Do you have an archive / list as to which ones are from citizens?

A15: No. It would be a very small list. We do not have a lot of images from citizens unless it was a big news event like Air France or the propane explosion.

Q16: How can I as a viewer tell if the images are from citizens (aside from the fact that it doesn't say AP / Getty)

A16: Well, they get a credit just like everyone, but it does not have any press affiliation. It would say "Jane Citizen Photo."

Q17: Would photo editors consider some public captured images "iconic"?

A17: Of course. Look at Air France, or Sept. 11.

Q18: Would photo editors consider some public images as "defining moments"?

A18: Indeed. Look at Sept. 11, the Tsunami, the Concorde explosion, the London Subway attacks.

Q19: How does technology play into user - generated news images?

A19: Well, e-mail and the internet make it easier to receive AND search for citizen photos.

Q20: How does The Star verify/ identify the images as authentic?

A20: We ask. If something seems wrong or strange, not right, we ask. I've never come across anyone malicious.

Q21: What are photo editor's attitudes towards citizen photojournalism?

A21: We love them. They make our job easier and interesting.

Q22: What are the attitudes of professional news photojournalists towards citizen made images?

A22: It wouldn't be fair of me to speak to that as I'm not a photojournalist. You'd have to ask one.

Q23: Is there a market?

A23: Yes. Look at publicnow.com

Q24: What will happen to citizen photojournalism in the future?

A24: It will grow, I think. People are interested in documenting these times.

Q25: Is professional journalism dying?

A25: No. It's changing.

Q26: Would citizen photojournalism ever altogether replace professional photojournalism?

A26: No. There is always a need to have trained journalists ready to go out and cover an assignment. We will never get away from that.

Sandy McKean
Associate Dean at Sheridan College
Former Director of CBC Newsworld
905-845-9430 ex 2176
sandy.mckean@sheridanc.on.ca

Skype (Voice Over Internet Phone) Interview (Interview length: 50 minutes, April 20, 2010)

Q1: So why don't I start with the process of selection. So you've worked for 35 years in one organization, maybe you can draw from there. I want you to describe how the news media gathered the images from citizen journalists – and I guess we're talking about photos only – and how they went about selecting, editing it and publishing it? What are the sources of criteria or processes?

A1: Well, I've worked in print, radio, television and new media over the course of 35 years as a reporter, producer, executive producer and senior news manager. I mean it's interesting just to point off the top. The way editors gather content, whether it's photos or video, hasn't fundamentally changed. Period. We now define citizen journalism as a new emerging phenomenon when, in fact, there's always been so-called "citizen journalism" in media. We refer to them as sources. We refer to them as witnesses. We refer to them as contacts. So in the course of doing journalism - whether it was five years ago, 10 years ago, 15 years ago - it was all about connecting with people. People who had information, whether they were witnesses or participants or people who knew something and whether they had a picture or didn't have a picture. That's the fundamental way journalists gather content to produce their stories whether it has photos with it or video or whether it's a print story. Today the phenomenon has obviously grown because of the accessibility of new technologies. We're 2.0 and we're heading into 3.0, which is any device any time, anywhere. So there's much more access to content than there was five, 10, 15 years ago. But fundamentally the journalists' job was to gather content and information from citizens as it stood. They just weren't called citizen journalists.

Q2: We're just going to talk about some of the details here. Where do they get the sources from? Is it just somebody they find on the street or is it a citizen who has submitted a photo and they keep them on the database for future contact. How do they gather their images?

A2: It's a combination of all of that. Number one, it's not uncommon to get a phone call or an email from someone who has content, has a picture or some video. Number two, by simply going to the Web you can find this content as well. And so, I mean, the accessibility to all kinds of content is there. You can go find it or it can find you. In many cases it finds you. Of course, the big issue is how you verify what it is and whether it's legitimate and all that. But then you can start building your database because you've got

a lot of people sending you stuff. Anybody can walk down the street and see a car accident at the intersection and take a picture and send it to you. There are many, many people out there gathering content and trying to get it to news organizations. There are a few single-minded people who are everywhere, the same person constantly who happens to be in a place or a circumstance where something's happened and through the technology are able to get it to newspaper editors, broadcasters, to Internet platforms, that sort of thing. It's an open market. It's a two-way free-flowing market.

Q3: Now when you mentioned that people go to the Web to find content, are there particular Sites they use more often – like Stock images, AP or Flickr?

A3: It's easy if you happen to know any organization and send it directly to them without having to go through any of the public Websites ... YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, any of those sorts of things. There's different ways to get it to people. And a lot of people are looking to make money and go to the big networks because there's the competitiveness of the industry and wanting to have those great pictures first, upfront, and wanting to have the exclusive rights to them and that sort of thing.

Q4: Do you know how much an organization would pay for an image?

A4: Depending on the organization. Looking at the journalistic principles of most news organizations they're not supposed to pay anything for them. But in reality that doesn't happen. It depends. For example, I've got the CBC Styleguide in front of me – it's probably four years old – but just to give you an example; you're not supposed to buy except under extenuating circumstances. So there are circumstances in which organizations pay. Depending on if it's a small town market it could be \$50 for a picture or it could be \$100,000 in a big market depending on what that picture is.

Q5: So are there any criteria for when they decide to use a citizen image or not?

A5: Yeah. Obviously it depends on what the story is. For an example, let's just flash back to the police taser incident at the Vancouver airport. That's pretty significant. That's pretty important. So you would base that on whether it's in the public interest to know what happened. So you use the basic principles of journalism to make those decisions. I mean, if it's a cute puppy picture why would you use it? But if it's something that has significant public interest and its shedding light on an event that you couldn't have gotten otherwise, then yes, that's some of the criteria you would use. Is it in the public interest? Is it the only source for that material? Who shot that content? Have you been able to verify that it's legitimate in one form or other? Have you checked out the pictures? Have you spoken to the people involved to make sure it wasn't a re-enactment of whatever happened? You look for independent verification that the event actually happened and that those pictures actually reflect what may have happened. You'll notice I used the word "may".

Q6: Would the news company use software to do manipulation detection or authentication? Is there such a thing?

A6: Again, I've been out for 40 years but I'd be surprised if they used such a thing. But I can't speak for organizations.

Q7: What about decision making over an image? How do they decide to use this photo over another one, for instance?

A7: We're talking generally speaking, right? I like to think that it depended on the authenticity of the picture. You may have three or four sources sending you images from a specific event that you were not able to verify. Reporters can't be everywhere. You make a decision on the actual quality of the picture, the news value of the picture and ideally, having some knowledge of who took that picture and their motives behind sending you that picture. Pictures that are actually used should represent a snapshot of what that event was all about. So you want a picture that's of good quality that represents that event.

Q8: Is there a difference between an image that is used in print or in TV broadcast or on a Website? Or would they actually use that same picture in three different mediums?

A8: It could potentially be used in three different mediums. I've seen it in print. I've seen it on TV. I've seen it on the Web. It's the same picture.

Q9: So you don't think there's a difference when they put images on a Website they have to put a cheaper version up, one that is less quality in case somebody steals it versus one that's used in the newspaper because it's black and white?

A9: If that image is sent to you by a citizen journalist, the quality will be the quality. I mean, are you suggesting that some media organizations would doctor the image or manipulate it in some way? **Yes.** Well, I would hope not.

Q10: So if media does do some editing, what basis is editing allowed and what basis is valid and considered manipulation?

A10: I guess each organization would have its own definition of what that would be. But from my perspective - from an outsider's perspective, from an academic perspective - I mean to alter or to change something that could alter the meaning of that picture or that image would be a negative manipulation. If it's simply to bring that picture a little better into focus or crop it to get a better essence is one thing, but to try to manipulate that image that would alter the context and what it represented would not be a good thing.

Q11: So any news media ever encounter an image that was manipulated and how do they figure that out?

A11: Well, I think we've all seen stories about the manipulation of pictures. Even on the covers of major magazines where they've gotten rid of blemishes or hair or various things or they've super imposed heads on different bodies. I can't talk of one specifically, but there have certainly been example after example of how people have altered pictures.

Q12: Even if it is citizen content, citizen photographs?

A12: Well, actually it could have been from the source. It could have been the citizen that actually manipulated the picture and sent it off to a legitimate news organization. I mean, that's the bigger risk. I think there's less of a risk for manipulation by a legitimate broadcast or a media organization simply because there are standards, journalistic

standards of behavior and ethics. The real risk is that the information being sent through the media has already been manipulated or altered in some way. This then puts a lot of pressure on the media organization to try to authenticate the image. That's the real challenge. It's the citizen content that's being sent to organizations that is the biggest challenge.

Q13: Are there other factors why a news media would want to use citizen photos and other drawbacks for why they wouldn't want to use it? So let's talk about why news media would want to use citizen images?

A13: It's real simple. It's the only available source for that story. Stories happen all over the world where journalists aren't located or aren't on the scene. And have authenticated pictures and images that they can get access to be able to tell the stories that need to be told because it's in the public interest to tell. It's a great advantage to have that content. The downside is who took the picture? Who took that image? Are they legitimate? Is it representative of what happened and how do you verify if it's real? Is there a motive? Who sent that picture? Is it a legitimate person or someone who has an ax to grind or someone that has manipulated or taken pictures in a context that doesn't tell the whole story? So there are pros and cons. Bottom line is that everyone has a cell phone. Everyone can take a picture. Who are they? And how do you verify if it's real or legitimate?

Q14: I just want to touch on something you talked about; do mainstream media just because it's an image or do they select it because there's a message in the image they want to evoke?

A14: Usually because that image is representative or helps to tell the story. I mean, the demonstrations in Iran, for example ... Traditional media was kicked out of the country so the only way we could get pictures of the demonstrations in the streets were through citizen journalists. And if you use a citizen journalist, as long as you identify who they are. In other words, you have to tell the viewer where that picture came from and who it came from. If you haven't been able to verify, you have to tell your viewer or listener the source. So there needs to be transparency.

Q15: Have you noticed that using citizen photos or videos has actually changed the traditional means of story telling?

A15: Not so much. I wouldn't say it's changed. It's allowed what could be a copy story turn into a visual, audio story in many respects. I think there are good things that come out of citizen journalism, simply because we have a group of people who are witnesses to events that we can't be at, as journalists. We're not there and we have people there recording. And for us to have that content allows us to do more wholesome stories. It allows us to put it into context. If you take Iran as an example where we had recent demonstrations. To have a copy story and a slide up saying, street demonstrations in Iran today. Don't know much. This or that. But to actually have pictures from a citizen journalist that satisfy us that they're legitimate adds to the story. Let's go back to Vancouver and the taser incident at the airport. Those pictures were very powerful and they actually led to some serious inquiries that otherwise wouldn't have happened if there hadn't have been a camera there. So it's really important. There is a role for

citizen journalists in mainstream media. It's a good mix. It's a good marriage. If you go right back to the fundamentals of journalism and the independence of those we cover and independence of power and formats for public criticism, etc. etc. I'm quoting out of the book "Elements of Journalism", by the way. I don't want to be accused of plagiarism. Those are significant things. And again, using Vancouver as an example, if those pictures had not been available ... I question what the outcome of that would have been.

Q16: You touch on the issue of transparency. How else can news organization make things transparent or to have citizens watch out for it?

A16: Well, ideally a news editor will – or a reporter – who's getting access to these pictures or this content being provided from citizen journalists. And I'm not talking about citizen journalists with their own websites. I'm talking about that content coming in to mainstream journalism. As long as they were able to confirm that this event did actually happen and that could mean calling the police to find out if there was an accident at such and such a street corner and talking to whomever. Doing a bit of fact checking and verifying the event took place. And finding out a bit more about the person who's providing you with the pictures. And if you're putting these pictures on the air the onus is on the news organization to say that these pictures were provided by whomever it was that provided the pictures. Again, not to claim that they took the pictures but to say that the pictures were taken by a witness on the scene through his iPhone or whatever. And you hear that a lot on the air. So it's just a matter of telling your listeners or viewers where you got the content and putting it into context. So not saying this is ours, this is real but here's what we had and here's how we got it, here's who did it. Try to verify as much information that is related to those pictures as possible. And if there's any question, err on the side of caution. Don't run it if you don't know.

Q17: I'm just going to jump to another issue about surveillance and watchdogs. Because there's so many citizen photographers, citizen videographers all over the place now has it affected crucially the practices of traditional journalism?

A17: Yes. It's made it better and made it easier. Back to my earlier point. Newsrooms are getting smaller and smaller for a variety of reasons. You can't be everywhere and essentially there's this generation of mobile journalists out there who are able to provide content not only to the Web but to legitimate news organizations that otherwise would not have that content. So how has it affected practices? It's made it tougher simply because you're getting content that you may not know is authentic. When I started out, and I'm only using this as an example. When I first started in journalism my Internet was the telephone book or the Yellow Pages. And the telephone to talk to as many people as I could and to cover events and talk to people. Couldn't just sit at my desk and go to the Web and find all the content I needed for the story. It was hard work gathering but with the 24-hour news cycle today it's changed everything. In many respects, I don't know how I ever did my job when I was first starting out based on the fact that it was the Yellow Pages and a phone and talking to people to today's generation of journalists who are overwhelmed with information on the Internet: pictures, content, sources. There's more verification, more sifting through. There's more and more information available that needs much more verification than it did in my day. So on one hand it's made it

easier, on the other hand it's almost information overload. It's information anxiety. There's just so much there. How do you bring it all together and tell stories that understand in what you believe to be objective and factual.

Q18: In terms of values, have all these intrusions caused the value of journalism to shift?

A18: I've watched a fundamental shift over the past couple of years. To the point where some days I don't even want to watch a traditional newscast because it's not news it's entertainment. We're obviously seeing much more invasion of privacy, particularly with well-known figures whether it's politicians or movie stars or whatever there seems to be a camera in their face. And they can't go anywhere without being approached. So there are privacy issues. There are all kinds of issues that weren't common 10 years ago. Essentially there's a camera on every corner and there's somebody in your face everywhere. It's made it pretty difficult for a public figure or an entertainer to have any privacy.

Q19: So do you think with so many more mobile journalists around it has improved the social morale of people to behave better?

A19: Good question. I mean I can only speculate on that. I think people are people. Some people may be a little more conscious. You can't even buy a lottery ticket without a camera on you. If you wanted to find out if I spent \$10 a week on lottery tickets, you could probably figure that out pretty quickly because there are cameras everywhere, right? I think people conduct themselves ... I think in some situations people have changed their behavior as a result. Has it made us more moral? I doubt that very much because I don't see a more moral society out there. We live in a pretty diverse society that has many different socio-economic issues. So I don't think that a bunch of people running around with cameras has changed that in any way.

Q20: What about in talking about ethical practices. Since citizen journalists do not abide by any institutions rules, do you think the mainstream media can distance themselves by using the content of a citizen and saying "well, we didn't take it." We're just using and broadcasting it'?

A20: That's a cop-out, though. That's a cop out. I mean, a legitimate news organization is required to operate under the standards and practices of ethical journalism. And it's a cop-out to say "oh, we got that from somebody else". But that's the moral dilemma. That the real ethical dilemma that journalists working in traditional newsrooms, whether it's broadcast or online, it's a cop-out. But that's the whole challenge. What's real and what isn't real. What's authentic? And I think that's why we're seeing a shift away from hard informative documentary journalism into pseudo info entertainment. It's much easier and there aren't the social responsibilities that go with the analysis of a major event. Those sorts of things. But it's a cop-out for mainstream journalism to say we got it from someone else and we don't even know if it's real or not. That just undermines the whole notion of journalism.

Q21: I really want to talk about the surveillance aspect of it. So initially all these government authorities put up cameras to watch us – the TTC, malls – but now

citizens have cameras and we're watching them back. Do you think one day there will be a backlash where a citizen's video or photo ends up in the wrong hands to be used against them? So this who is watching who gets more complex.

A21: It would make a great sitcom, wouldn't it? The watchers being watched by other watchers who are watching watchers. It's kind of a circus like, ludicrous. There are institutional cameras, whether they are police, security cameras, at airports, in restaurants, in stores, in subways. You go into the newsrooms of most large news organizations and there are cameras on the newsrooms. You turn on the television where every news set was a newsroom, with writers and producers in the background at their desks. You were literally on camera eight hours a day if you were working in the news room. You're on camera pretty much anywhere and everywhere now. I don't think I have a camera in my office right now, thank goodness. It's at the point of there's cameras everywhere. You can't do anything. Everyone's watching everyone else. I don't know what that means or if that matters. We're certainly in a society now where you can't walk down the street without being captured on camera somewhere. Many crimes are solved because there are cameras in a parking lot. How many times this week have you seen pictures of robberies in convenience stores? Just the other night it showed a robbery and the store owner coming from the other side of the street and tackling the robber. They're everywhere. I just don't know what to say. We are a society under the microscope. Not just from an institution perspective but from a citizen perspective.

Q22: So I'm going to switch this around and talk about gatekeeping. With so much adaptation of citizens' images in the news now, do you see it as a loss of power or allowing citizens to exercise their democracy?

A22: Certainly, from a Web/Internet perspective there's much more information available to us, whether it's real or perceived. What the motives are hard to verify. There are certainly citizen journalists out there who are witnesses to events providing news agencies with access to much more content, but also creating issues around what is a gatekeeper and what is the role of a gatekeeper?

Q23: Because mainstream media is using these images, do you find it's breaking down the barriers of news media as the gatekeepers only?

A23: Yes. On one level, yes. I think news agendas have changed from 8 in the morning and by noon it may be a whole entirely new editorial agenda based on information that, say five years ago, was not available. So I think you're seeing the lineups and the lead stories on traditional newscasts shifting as a result of access to much more content and information from many more sources. But that's not necessarily a bad thing. How do you define gatekeeper? Do traditional media hold the key to what you and I need to hear? I think we're looking at a whole new generation of people and how they consume content. I think people don't necessarily depend on one news source anymore. I think people may read a newspaper, may watch the news or may go on the Internet. I think people are going to many different places for their information and almost doing their own programming in terms of what they want to know about. Because of the Web if you're really interested in something you can get diverse opinions by going to different Websites. The days of the half an hour newscast -and that's all you're going to find out

about the news – are gone. The world has changed so the fans have shifted. People are now essentially their own programmers.

Q24: How do you see mainstream news organizations playing a role as keepers of images? You were talking about images being everywhere, all over the Internet and social networks. But it's when the mainstream news broadcasts it or prints it that it becomes popular or gains celebrity status. Do you find mainstream news organizations still trying to frame the image and playing gatekeeper in how they use the image and release that information? Because images do have imbedded images ...

A24: I think what we're really talking about are elements of a story. So now you have images coming at you that you never had access to before. But I think that's only a part of the story. If you follow the basic principles of journalism and storytelling where you need different points of view. You don't just talk to the prime minister, you go to the opposition for a reaction. I still think these are just elements of a story and I don't think it's really about gatekeeping. It's taking those elements that you can authenticate and holding them up into a story that has meaning to citizens. A story that has different points of view that has a historical background. The image is not the story. It's part of the story. Go back to Vancouver. You know, the pictures of the tasing. Those told a story but it didn't tell the whole story. The circumstance of why it happened. Who was he and where did he come from? His language skills. All those sorts of things. If you just look at the pictures they obviously represent something horrific, but they needed to be put into context. And that's where journalism comes in. That's the marriage of Journalism where you take those images, those pictures and you put them into perspective. You layer and you explain the story of what that's about and why that's important. I don't see things in isolation. I see elements that you bring together following the fundamental practices of journalism to tell stories that have meaning and are important for citizens to know about.

Q25: Where do you think all these citizen photographs and images will head in the future?

A25: We've only seeing the beginning. We're going to start seeing much more and more and that's going to be the real challenge. On one hand, traditional media is in big trouble. The way that people gather and consume information is fundamentally and radically changing and there's going to be some real pressures to reinvent what we mean in "journalism". We're going to any device. Anytime. Anywhere. The notion that you turn your newscast on at night at 10pm or go to your front door in the morning and there's your Globe and Mail ... boy, the world has changed. It's now that you can get that information anytime and anywhere on any platform. The challenges are significant. There are two levels of challenges. The challenge of practicing journalism as journalism has evolved and then the notion around objectivity, balance, fairness, and all those. And then there's the whole business model. The business model has changed and no one has quite figured out how to deliver the news in that people are willing to pay for it. So there are some real challenges ahead and it's an explosion. It's just information overload in many respects. People are redefining what news is. We've all become our own ... it's like video on demand. The generations of students in my class right now look

and act fundamentally different than I did when I was their age. In many respects I'm an ethereal thinker, where I have a memory. Students today are parallel thinkers, where memory isn't all that important. If you ask the name of the prime minister all they have to do is go to their device and punch it up and they'll tell me who the prime minister of Canada is. They don't have to put it in their brain and save it forever. We're gathering information in so many different places over longer periods of time that we're looking at a fundamental shift in how people consume, use and gather content.

Email interview (Interview length: 1 hour April 25, 2010)

Q1: I am focusing on the selection process of images (photo/video) by citizen journalists, when broadcasted (on TV/websites) of professional news company. How do editors decide to use an image or not, or one image over another before the public sees it?

A1: rabbletv primarily uses the coverage from citizen journalists. It's true, as you write, that citizen journalists are often covering the same stories as corporate journalists – and there are reasons for this which I'll expand upon below. I would say the citizen coverage affects mainstream coverage in the following two ways:

There is a lack of critical coverage of major events from the mainstream media. This deficiency has inspired citizen journalists to go out and cover the events themselves and ask the kinds of questions mainstream media doesn't. A classic example is the mainstream's coverage of protests. Instead of reporting about the reasons for the protest and investigating the merits, often what is portrayed is whatever kind of disruption that occurs.

Sometimes citizen journalists are pejoratively labeled as biased or advocacy-motivated. I find this a bit humorous because one the reasons journalism is one of the most hated professions (and this is the public's perception of mainstream journalists), lies in the opinion that journalists are biased. At rabble.ca, we make no apologies for emphasizing the kind of reporting that offers a different view and opinion on the mainstream (and often right-wing) reporting on current affairs. Given rabble.ca's (and other progressive alternative new centres') rapidly increasing popularity, I do think we are having a strong impact on the discourse on certain issues that never would have seen the light of day in mainstream coverage.

Q2: Aspects on surveillance. Prior, Big Brother had cameras to watch citizens. Now, citizens have mobile cameras to document misconducts of officials (little brother is watching, too). I would like to know about how citizen video/photojournalism has affected the journalism practices when there are many reporters and eyewitnesses doing their own news documentation.

A2: Citizen Journalists have certainly turned the camera on 'big brother' as well. One of the most poignant examples that we featured on rabbletv (and was later picked up by the mainstream media), was the police provocateur at the Montebello Summit. The Tamil protests in Toronto have turned their cameras on police aggression (featured on

Tor Sandberg

Program Director at Rabbletv, rabble.ca

Email: tv@rabble.ca

Skype: torsandberg

416-921-4248

Skype (Voice Over Internet Phone) Interview

Email Interview (Interview length: 1 hour April 25, 2010)

Q1: I am focusing on the selection process of images (photo/video) by citizen journalists, when broadcasted (on TV/websites) of professional news company. How do editors decide to use an image or not, or one image over another before the public sees it?

A1: rabbletv primarily uses the coverage from citizen journalists. It's true, as you write, that citizen journalists are often covering the same stories as corporate journalists -- and there are reasons for this which I'll expand upon below. I would say the citizen coverage affects mainstream coverage in the following two ways:

There is a lack of critical coverage of major events from the mainstream media. This deficiency has inspired citizen journalists to go out and cover the events themselves and ask the kinds of questions mainstream media doesn't. A classic example is the mainstream's coverage of protests. Instead of reporting about the reasons for the protest and investigating the merits, often what is portrayed is whatever kind of disruption that occurs.

Sometimes citizen journalists are pejoratively labeled as biased or advocacy-motivated. I find this a bit humorous because one the reasons journalism is one of the most hated professions (and this is the public's perception of mainstream journalists), lies in the opinion that journalists are biased. At rabble.ca, we make no apologies for emphasizing the kind of reporting that offers a different view and opinion on the mainstream (and often right-wing) reporting on current affairs. Given rabble.ca's (and other progressive alternative new centres') rapidly increasing popularity, I do think we are having a strong impact on the discourse on certain issues that never would have seen the light of day in mainstream coverage.

Q2: Aspects on surveillance. Prior, Big Brother had cameras to watch citizens. Now, citizens have mobile cameras to document misconducts of officials (little brother is watching, too). I would like to know about how citizen video/photojournalism has affected the journalism practices when there are many reporters and eyewitnesses doing their own news documentation.

A2: Citizen Journalists have certainly turned the camera on 'big brother' as well. One of the most poignant examples that we featured on rabbletv (and was later picked up by the mainstream media), was the police provocateur at the Montebello Summit. The Tamil protests in Toronto have turned their cameras on police aggression (featured on

rabbletv) and York University students showcased their inside-the-walls coverage of their sit-in at the university. Internationally, we've been able to share coverage of Palestine's plight - the kind that is almost impossible to access because of restrictions on travel in the region.

Skype (Voice Over Internet Phone) Interview

Q3: I know you edit videos, so we'll focus on videos only. In your observation and experience, what factors have contributed to...?

Q4: The two big questions I have are about surveillance and gatekeeping. You answered a bit of it, but I was wondering if maybe we could go more in-depth with it. I think I'll start with the questions that I emailed you about. So in your observation and in your experience, what factors have attributed to how mainstream news media started adopting and accepting a lot of citizen work? I know you just do video, so we could just talk about video.

A4: I think essentially, with the mainstream especially, it just comes down to their ability to cover things. They don't have cameras everywhere and cameras are ubiquitous everywhere. Citizens are capturing things on video that journalists aren't able to. Now that things are so plugged electronically, it's so easy to send images and video. People are uploading these things already and it's a very easy way for mainstream media companies to get new content without actually paying for it - often not paying for it.

Q5: So we talked on technology; do you think that most of the motivation is because of the easy technology access? And do you think in terms of economic value, for news organizations to take citizen journalism that it's cheaper because it's "free labor"?

A5: Yeah, I think in some instances. As I said before, citizens are capturing things that journalists aren't. Just for the simple fact that there are more citizens out there with cameras than journalists. But I also think that it is an inexpensive form of getting more media content. I also think on another level that - especially with the mainstream - we've been doing it at Rabble for some time, it's a way to involve your audience. The Globe and Mail often has picture competitions. There's a snowstorm, send your pictures to us. So not only does it provide more content, it allows readers to also participate in the news making process. And I think it's a way of creating community for particular media Websites. Web 2.0, so to speak.

Q6: In terms of getting the content, can you describe the whole process of how it is acquired? Some citizens submit their videos, as you mentioned in those contests. But how else do you think the mainstream news or the organization gets all that content?

A6: Well, in terms of picture and video we sometimes consult with picture sharing Websites like FLICKR. FLICKR has a special search function that allows you to search

images through creative commons. Have you heard about that? Essentially, if we want to use an image quickly and we don't have the time to send or ask for permission to use an image then what we can do is do a search on FLICKR, for instance, and filter all the images that are creative commons licensed content. So as long as we attribute to whom the picture came from – because they've already given permission by indicating that their pictures are already licensed through creative commons – so that is one way. Another thing we do is actively ask our readers to participate ...

Q7: You were talking about asking readers to participate. I was going to ask you next, more about license, because you mentioned creative common license. I guess Rabble makes sure that they're not copy written and free to reuse. But what about other ones. What if the other pictures are copy written, would Rabble actually buy it off them?

A7: Rabble seldom, seldom buys and image. They only use its money to pay writers. And this is because Rabble has a very limited budget because it is a small independent media organization that doesn't really have ads from corporations. And so, because of that we're a little bit more unique in the way we approach content creation. So we really do focus on getting people to submit things for free. And looking for creative commons to licensed images.

Q8: Can you give an example of an image that a citizen captured and then the mainstream media kind of blew it out of proportion and became widely circulated? It could be from Rabble or another source ...

Let's say they posted it on Youtube and then a professional journalist decided to use it and because they used that video it became popularized in a way. Can you think of an example?

A8: When you first asked the question I thought you meant was there an image that had been taken and then the context had changed in a bad way. But I think what normally happens is that a good piece of news gets picked up and it's scandalous and gets picked up in a good way. For example, and I gave this to you in an email, the Montebello Summit where an activist was filming a protest and this protester came up with a rock. And this was a peaceful part of the protest and what this protester was doing was violating sort of the code of the protestors. So it turned out that the protestor wasn't actually a protestor but he was a police man. He was part of the Quebec police force. We watched this quickly unravel and it was circulated on social media and it was quickly picked up on the mainstream media. And it turned out to be a huge scandal for the Quebec police force. If you don't remember you can easily Google it under "Montreal Police Provocateur".

Q9: In terms of popularity, do you think let's say citizens videotape something and it was popular among their peers first or it became more popular because the mainstream media put it under the spotlight? Or it could be both ...?

A9: That's difficult to say. I think it became instantly popular in the progressive community. People are so tapped in with social media these days – with Twitter and Facebook – that this video was quickly distributed. But then again, people live in their

own circles. So I think it had to reach a certain amount of popularity before the mainstream media picked it up and saw it as a credible source.

Q10: You mentioned that Rabble uses images from Flickr. They've got photos and videos now I suppose.

So why Flickr aside from the easy search and the creative commons of YouTube or Twitter or any of the other social mediums?

A10: Twitter was just an example. I actually pull many, many videos from YouTube. When I pull a video from YouTube, I'm embedding it. I haven't stolen it. I haven't taken the content. If they disabled their embedding capabilities it would no longer show up on the Site. I don't ask permission when I take a video from YouTube. I try and attribute it as best as I can. But by then indicating that they've put it on a public Website like YouTube with the embedding function allowed, I just assume that they've consented to having this video embedded. And so from my standpoint it's ethically ok if I cite the source.

Q11: What are the criteria for Rabble to select citizen videos? Is there a list of criteria you have to go by before you say 'Ok we cannot use this one but we can use that one, because ...'?

A11: In terms of content, it's usually something that ... we have a certain political view of things and if it fits in terms of content and what our viewers would want – whether it be a protest or a public lecture or an interview with someone who's critical of a current political system – then it would definitely be a piece of content we'd be interested in. In terms of quality, that's sort of hit or miss. Often, images and video speaks more. It's harder to misrepresent video than it is to misrepresent something by writing about it. And of course we have a bit of license in describing what's going on in the video and our description of it. But in terms of quality, people are quite forgiving in citizen journalist production. If the image is a little bit blurry or the sound is bad, we don't often get complaints even though that is often the case. On the Internet, videos are short. People just want to see little clips.

Q12: Let's talk about editing. Do you edit a lot of the videos before posting it? You talk about embedding, but what about the videos sent directly to Rabble. Do you change the light or crop the image? What kind of editing do you do to it?

A12: We do nothing. If we're taking it from someone else, we do nothing. We just embed because in order for us to edit we'd have to take their video and download it to do things to it. But we also do create our own video and often record things. We've had interns that have done original stories. In terms of other peoples' content we never modify it.

Q13: Would you consider Rabble to be more on the professional journalism side or more on the citizen journalism side?

A13: I think it's part of both worlds. Certainly on the Rabble TV side it would straddle more on the citizen journalism world simply because producing video is extremely expensive. You know, cameras, light. It takes a lot more time to do the editing. But on the editorial side of things, the writing. These are paid journalists that submit their

content. And we have a paid editor who goes through it.

Q14: And when you pick your videos is there a certain structure or format or criteria you abide by before producing it?

A14: Nothing specific. I have to be truthful. You can't misrepresent the facts.

Q15: What do you see as the greatest advantages of using citizen videos as part of a news story?

A15: In terms of Rabble TV it gives us free content. A lot of people have valuable things to say and their voices aren't heard in mainstream media. And as a media organization that tries to represent the alternative or speak for the alternative viewpoint, this is a serious place for citizen journalism with Rabble.

Q16: Let's say you take a liberal political standpoint, but what if you get a subscriber or someone who submits content that is totally on the other opposite spectrum and you find you don't agree with it or you find it insulting, would you still broadcast it just to even it out as an objective kind of perspective or would you maybe just scrap it because it doesn't ...

A16: Let's say there's a bad talk by Sarah Palin, for instance. I might post it and put my own commentary saying "look how ridiculous this is". But if there's anything racist or offensive I wouldn't just post it as is. There's definitely a policy that we subscribe by. So if there's an opposing viewpoint or photograph it would be explained and opposed in the text that would accompany that video or image.

Q17: Is there actually a list on the Website; content that would never be distributed by Rabble because of such and such a reason. It's all written there as in terms and conditions or no?

A17: I've looked at the terms and conditions recently, but it's not something that I'm too familiar with. I just know what we would never post anything that is sexist or racist or homophobic. We would also never post anything that is knowingly inaccurate.

Q18: In your usage of citizen videos have you ever encountered issues where you found one that was manipulated or didn't seem authentic and was it still used? And the other question is, do you have or use any software to detect if the video was tampered with prior to being submitted to you for broadcast?

A18: So far we haven't come across a situation like that. I think the closest instance where we've been a little unsure is in a fuzzy video where somebody claimed that the police had attacked a protestor. So that wasn't clearly seen and we just changed the title.

Q19: You still used the video?

A19: Yes. We still used the video but we didn't say "Police attack protestors", I think we said "Protest was disruptive" or something like that. It wasn't specific. We changed it into something general because we didn't have proof that actually happened.

Q20: Are there other issues that news media or Rabble has about using citizen videos?

A20: No. Not really. Nothing that comes to mind. I think I know where a lot of these questions are coming from. Because there's a danger in citizen journalism. A lot of people view citizen journalism as taboo almost. It's not as accurate. Or these are the claims, that it's biased or ... But I think it's insulting to say those things. What makes a journalist that much more accurate than a citizen holding a camera. Everyone is framing something when they are holding a camera or writing something. I think the mainstream corporate media are worried about their elite perspective on the news and that's where a lot of those negative opinions come from. But I think the only negative thing about citizen journalism is when it's unedited or unfiltered. It's hard to find the good stuff. I think that's the great thing about Rabble. It is edited and it is looked at by people who are paid and invested in the truth and who want to put together a message and make it quality.

Q21: How has citizen video journalism changed the traditional means of story telling?

A21: Well, I think traditional news media has noticed the different perspectives that are brought up in social media. I talked about the Montebello case, but there are also cases being reported in the Middle East or the George Galloway, the MP from Scotland, controversy. These are issues that we pushed and that citizen journalists have pushed in various forms. It's an influence, a discourse in the country. I think the corporate media have a specific viewpoint and it has been largely conservative and right wing, in my opinion. And citizen journalism facilitated by the Internet has provided another viewpoint. And I think it speaks volumes that these alternative viewpoints are gaining in popularity so quickly and I think the mainstream media is picking up on that. Now they're allowing comments on their articles and I think they're covering different things as well now. Not completely, because they are still slaves to the same master. They still work for the same publishers and have a corporate standpoint that they need to support.

Q22: I'm going to go back once more to the process of selection. Is there anything you want to add about how Rabble gets things and how they edit it and what is the process of the decision making before putting it out?

A22: I don't think I explained enough about our contributors. Often we have people who send something in and we look at it and we like it we'll often keep in touch with them and keep them on our list. Like we know they might have a specialty in the environment or something. And that's how we stay in touch with them. Also, if the quality of what they send us is good we'll keep them on our list and consult with them when we need something from them in that subject matter.

Q23: Let's talk about the new people you haven't established a relationship with, do you often find that Rabble's "inbox" is clogged by too much content? Some are soft news, some are hard news and some are totally irrelevant. How do you spend so much time looking through every video?

A23: It is a lot of time. Personally, I look for things more than people sending things to

me. And often I can just see by the title of something or just watching the first few seconds if it's something I'm going to like or not.

Q24: If you get too many videos, how do you tackle it?

A24: It's not an issue yet.

Q25: It sounds like from what you're saying that you have a story first and then you go and look for that image. It's not like the others where people are sending you nonstop videos and you just get overwhelmed and you decided whether to cover a story on it or not.

A25: There is another thing I should say. I do have content partners as well. So I partner with other organizations that do video as well. I partner with citizen groups like St. James Town Youth Groups. And so I know that these are groups that are researched that produce video and I've asked them to have a content partnership and I look to see if they've come out with any new videos or sometimes they just send them to me and then I post them. So here's some of the content partners ... I can list them for you: Regent Park TD, they work with youths in underprivileged communities in Toronto. Then there's the Community Center for Policy Alternatives. They are a policy think tank and they sometimes produce advocacy videos or educational videos that talk about various forms of economic and social policies in Canada. Then there's some NGO's. There's Working TV, which is a media collective in Vancouver that covers a lot of union activity and socially progressive events. Basically I have content partners, authoritative sources for video that I've formed relationships with that provide me with content.

Q26: The next part is all about gatekeeping. Do you think that the main news media organizations play a huge roll as gatekeepers for image; you know when they release images for information? Do you find they retain images or do publish it for the sake of letting the whole world know? Do you think they withhold a lot of information?

A26: In one perspective I do think they are gatekeepers inevitably in that they do control the message in the images they decide to publish. I'm sure they get a lot of images. I always go back to the example of a protest. They could show images of protestors smashing windows or they could show images of the destruction of a Canadian mining farm, of which the protestors are protesting. Those two images are from the same story, but both give a very different message. One is saying oh look at these bad protestors and their destruction. Or, the other one says look at the horrible acts that are being committed by this mining company and this is why the protestors are protesting. All these images exist in the world and people are taking them but only certain ones are making it to the front page or being published.

Q27: Since citizen video journalism has kicked in do you find that the gatekeeping role has kind of changed for the mainstream news.

A27: Absolutely. More and more, especially younger generations. And a lot of older generations are jumping on board too. A lot of people are getting their news from YouTube. A lot of people are getting it from citizen journalism sites or alternative journalism sites that utilize a lot of citizen journalism. It's no coincidence that

newspapers or tradition forms of media are struggling right now. People are getting their information in other ways. Personally, I think that's very exciting.

Q28: Do you think all these mainstream news organizations have lost power as gatekeepers because they've suddenly adopted citizens' videos into their news stories?

A28: They only adopt citizen images or videos for the sake of the particular image. They don't do it for the message. And for that reason the mainstream media will continue to struggle and decline because people are aware of it. In the same token, the online media world is also become corporatized. Because commercials are popping up everywhere now. I don't know where I was going with that ...

Q29: If the competition is so high now, do you think professional journalists would one day become less useful? Because they are replaceable in a sense because of citizen journalists.

A29: I think that the professional field of journalism will continue to become more and more difficult. Investigative reporting has almost died out in North America. It's almost preposterous to say, but mainstream news is cutting the budget drastically for any investigative journalism. And what we do have is a lot of images that are just reports of what's happening as opposed to why it's happening. I don't think citizen journalism will help that at all. Although I do rely on citizen journalism and work for a media organization that does as well, I think it's important to have a publicly funded broadcaster that employs investigative journalists because it is not profitable, nor for Rabble either, to have investigative reporting. I think the countries that have the least amount of corruption, the ones that have the best political discourse and the highest level of voter participation are the ones that have publicly funded, and this is independently publicly funded, media organizations.

Q30: I guess my cousin-in-law is in Taiwan and she's afraid of writing anything that the main political party would disagree with, so they have to be so discreet in how they word things. You can't be objective, you can only write good things about the opposing political party.

A30: That's why I made that point: not government controlled, but government funded.

Q31: Do you think citizen videos have altered the selection criteria or editorial values?

A31: I do. I mean, not significantly. The mainstream still goes for the same stories but when something goes viral – on the Toronto Star or in the Globe and Mail - they'll just embed it sort of how we do at Rabble. It's like look at this funny thing or this catastrophic thing. But it's usually not a story or a message. It's always a funny thing or an anecdote or a shocking message. So it isn't citizen journalism as much as it is citizen image protection ... if that makes any sense.

Q32: Can you elaborate?

A32: They're not asking citizens to go out and produce a message or an investigation into what they're filming or taking a photograph of. They're just looking for those images

that show something spectacular or something eye grabbing, whether it would be an image of a protest or a beautiful image of a snow fall. It's just image production. It's not actually journalistic work.

Q33: Do you think because of all these citizen videos people want to watch something sensational and because of this the news thinks this is what the audience wants so let's start making the news more sensational? Do you think the citizen videos influence that effect?

A33: I think in many cases it is. Working in the online field that a headline is extremely important. And often the more salacious and sexy and sexed-up the headline is the more people will click on it. We know that from our own stats. But I think the more intelligent media companies know that the more you do that, the more you trick people into reading something that isn't that great and is fluffy and empty, the less people will keep coming back. I'm just looking at the video on Globe and Mail.com. They have this viral section and this video of a robber being sick. I've seen this video. I've seen it on YouTube months ago and now they're putting it up. Some flights resume. Discovery touchdown. None of these are telling me a message. None of these are investigative. They are just flat out reporting. None of them are critical, so to speak. That's usually the word we use. At Rabble we sort of have the ethos that we should speak truth to power. But how often is the media doing that? The mainstream media.

Q34: Do you think the news organizations do objectively present a civil point of view since they are using all this content.

A34: I don't they're ever presenting an objective point of view. By not using critical content and delving into the deeper issues ... they're framing. To reiterate, their use of citizen journalism is not to improve journalism. It's to get content that shows an image that people want to see, that is exciting. That is good for the bottom line and it's free.

Q35: Do you think the gatekeeping roll of mainstream media organizations will be permanently removed or do you think they'll always have an authoritative stance on how journalism practices run?

A35: I do think, realistically speaking, that they'll continue to hold the majority of the audience they have. They have the money for the glitzy websites, especially now with video ... they all have video sections to their Websites. A lot of them do still create great stories and journalism, but slowly they are getting a run for their money. Social media and the alternative Websites are taking a large chunk out of the market simply because they are taking on issues in such a way that don't speak to the rest of the population or society at large.

Q36: Since they've adopted some of that citizen journalism into their stories, do you think this is becoming a partnership or should I say a form of democracy for peoples' voices? Or they're just sort of pushed to the side because there's so much citizen content that they resist not to use it anymore and that's where it went?

A36: I do not think that citizen journalism in the way it is used in the mainstream media is in any form a democratization of the media. It is still heavily filtered. It's usually not

very critical of the status quo, which I think journalism should be. It's just a way to get content at a very low cost. So I'm skeptical on that front. But I do think that citizen journalism in other forms on alternative media Websites and on blogs and even on Facebook, people writing their own blogs. I think that can be very powerful. Because often bloggers are giving a perspective on things and they're doing research and are looking into the broader, contextual background of the issues of today. But mainstream media, besides the comments section and the letters to the editor, there's no place for citizen journalism in mainstream media.

Q37: Is it ok if I ask you about the surveillance part? I'm really interested in how the little brother is watching the big brother aspect of it all. Do you think mobile video journalist usage has affected or influenced the practices of traditional journalism?

A37: Yeah, I do. I think that the Montebello case was really important and striking. Here we have an example of something that's probably been happening for a long time of police infiltrating protests but the media never realized it. So the whole issue of violent protestor was turned on its head. Even the mainstream media wondered how long has this been happening? How much of the reporting of these evil protestors was false, was actually created by the police? And you know the case of Robert, I forget his last name, the Polish man who was killed by police at Vancouver airport. They lied and they lied blatantly about what happened. And if it weren't for that video they would have gotten off. In terms of citizen video, if those had been surveillance videos they could have been suppressed. There was such public outrage that a public inquiry was launched. It really influenced the coverage and I think the repercussions of those acts.

Q38: Do you find now with everyone filming with their private phones that it's becoming intrusive instead of helpful.

A38: That's a really good question and a hard one to answer. I think the state is really pushing to have more surveillance and I think the only way we can really counter that is by having our own surveillance. I just think in this world it's inevitable that we'd start losing our privacy. We can work really hard to keep it, but realistically speaking our lives is becoming much less private.

Q39: So what about morality. Citizen Journalists are documenting the behavior of official authorities and government people. Do you feel it's decreasing or increasing the morality for good conduct? It is improving the social morale of society? Because people don't want to be caught – for example, like Tiger Woods - doing something wrong. So in that way when their story is published, people think it's not good to cheat on your wife. Everybody's watching everybody else and people realize they're being watched and therefore they'll behave better to reduce crime and whatnot. So do you think this mobile citizen journalism act is improving society in a good way or not?

A39: I think in some ways yes. Whenever you have somebody catching someone else on video doing something wrong, especially when it's someone in a position of authority it's a good thing. I do think there's some issues of privacy, like in the case of the TTC driver who could have been ... I feel mixed about that. At the same time this was very

indicative of the public's deep dissatisfaction of the TTC and what's resulted is a huge overhaul of the TTC and the public relations campaign and them looking into changing the culture at the TTC. But I think it's quite easy to take an image out of context and ruin somebody's reputation with it. I think media organizations have some responsibilities as gatekeepers to monitor that. But again, that spread on Facebook and on YouTube before it came up in the Toronto Star. So it's pretty unstoppable. In terms of sexual deviation, I think the opposite of what you said. Especially in terms of the younger generation and all their sexting and all those inappropriate photos on Facebook. I'm hoping that people will become less prudish and peoples' careers won't be ruined by some sexual scandal that has happened previously. I think peoples' lives were so private that when it became public in some deviant form, it ruined them. But this is letting us know that everyone is imperfect as well. But that's just my personal opinion.

Q40: I'm just going to argue back. It makes me think that people use the excuse "but I'm just human" ... Does that give them that leeway to misbehave in a way if they're going to use that excuse? It could be argued I guess ... Let's say someone steals an apple and says "oh, I'm just human. I'm not perfect" Does that excuse them from the theft? Tiger's excuse was that he works so hard and everybody else gets so much attention, why can't he have whatever he wants?

A40: Well, this is more entertainment and sports as opposed to journalism. I do think it's important for Republicans who are homophobic to be exposed when they engage in homosexual acts or sexually deviant ways because they're hypocrites because they are judging other people for their sexual actions. But they are even worse in their own lives. Then I think it's ok to expose them because of their hypocrisy and their powerful positions. I think it debases journalists and the whole media landscape, especially reputable sources when they start reporting on the sexual lives of people when really it has nothing to do with their politics. Unless they are criticizing other peoples' sexuality. Canada has always been a little more reserved, and that's not to say that Canadian politicians are any less deviant, it's just that the Canadian media are more responsible and not concerned with people's lives as long as they are doing their jobs in a political sense. It's a journalist's job to speak truth in power and be critical of the political implications of government and powerful people. But the actions of those people in their private lives have not impact on the public at large so why report it? Reports instead, don't waste your time on that stuff in ink or on cyberspace because that's a cheap form of entertainment or journalism. The difficult journalism is the investigative journalism and the one that is brave and truthful.

Q41: So the next question is about ethical practices. I don't understand my own question there. Citizen journalists can videotape anything because they don't have to abide by any institutions rules so they could have very little morals. So they can videotape anything and the mainstream media can take that video and broadcast it and claim that they are not responsible because they are not the ones who filmed it. Is that good or bad because citizens don't follow ethical rules and the news media can say they are just showing it and claim they are not responsible?

A41: Are you asking for Rabble's perspective?

Q42: I guess, yes.

A42: Rabble will never, we are not interested in publishing things that are gossipy and that are speaking truth to power. So I don't think we ever published a thing about Adam Giambrone and his affairs. We really didn't care. We didn't want to waste our time with it and I don't think our readers did either. The only reason a media company would publish that has nothing to do with ethics or the responsibilities of journalists. It's pure and simple entertainment and it helps to sell more papers or get more clicks. Because people are naturally drawn to these private lives. Is it ethical? I don't know. I think it really does depend on the editor and the publication. But I really do think that you do need a policy in place of some kind. And it really speaks of your media organization, what you decide to publish.

Q43: So just drawing to that. You know how some newspapers are covering a story from a foreign country and they take an image that's pretty graphic – let's take an example from the Haiti earthquake. You can see maybe photos of the bodies, whereas if this occurred locally maybe all you'd see is the image of a white blanket from far, far away. So in terms of ethics, how come an image from a distance part can be so graphic and they allow it to be published as opposed to close to home it has to be very concealed and distant?

A43: I think I've grappled with this question before. I think I posted a very graphic video from Palestine. To speak of a different issue, from a journalistic perspective I think it's valuable from an international context to understand the repercussions of war. There's an ethical imperative to try and let people know that this is the cost of our inaction's or our actions. This is what happens in other parts of the world while we live happily in our own. And sometimes we contribute to those actions through the actions of our government, or the inaction's of our government. So in that context, I can see why having graphic images of war can play an important part in getting people to understand the costs of war. Often I think graphic images in Canada would only be the cause of an accident. What's the point of showing an image of an accident? Maybe it would demonstrate how dangerous it is to drive without a seatbelt. But mostly it has no political implications and I would shy away from showing any graphic images from home. Except in the case of Robert at the Vancouver airport. That was very graphic and disturbing video, but it had a political implication and it made people go "oh my god. The police are killing people". And this is the result of tasers in the hands of irresponsible police officers and RCMP officers. So it had a very important and graphic message. As disturbing as it was, people needed to see this for political reasons.

Q44: How do social network sites play into citizen journalism's act in surveillance?

A44: I think they play a huge role. You can have a video on YouTube and it can be broadcast to hundreds of thousands of people without it even being put on a media site. But then again, if we put something on a media site it can also be put on social media sites. So I think they have a huge impact in broadcasting news or any organization that doesn't try very hard to expand their social network. Because everyone is trying to spread information and to communicate.

Q45: Do you actually think that the big brothers in the city are watching us closely or are we actually watching them more closely because we have cell phone cameras and when they think nobody is watching we are actually filming them. So who is actually spying on whom? And could this possibly backfire on the citizens because a video could be confiscated or used the wrong way could act against the citizens instead of tattling on the authorities?

A45: There are pros and cons. The protest in Vancouver during the Olympics and the ones who were a little more aggressive and broke windows were quite upset that independent media sites were filming them and they didn't want their pictures taken or they didn't want to be videotaped. But at the same time, had the police attacked them there would have been media coverage. It's a catch-22. With more surveillance, civil disobedience becomes more difficult it allows the states to become more authoritative and crack down on civil disobedience. At the same time surveillance is acting as a check and balance for authorities. They know that at any protest there are hundreds of cameras pointed at them. I think politicians do everything behind closed doors these days and they are able to circumvent the surveillance. But with proper investigation like George Galloway and the immigration minister there's still ways to try and hold the government into account. Those in power into account.

Q3: Oh ok. I thought of a gatekeeper as someone who filters information and decides what the audience or public should know and not know. For instance, the news media they might, maybe not a liberal one, but let's say in Iran or China ... they might choose to censor a lot of information so that the citizens don't know what's going with SARS, for instance, so that bad news doesn't spread and so nobody finds out. So a gatekeeper to me is someone who decides what information goes out to the public in order to protect themselves or authorities or just not exposing people to bad news as well.

A3: OK.

Q4: But, like I said, everybody has a different definition to this.

A4: No. I mean, what you described is what you'd traditionally think of as a gatekeeper. I don't know how sure I am in either sense if that works as a definition.

Q5: Then we can move on to the next one. In terms of traditional practices of journalism, how has CBC's gatekeeping rolls, values and procedures been like in the past in comparison to today with the new media convergence and all the changes that have happened with the advent of the new technologies of the internet?

A5: How have they changed?

Q6: Yeah, the gatekeeping rolls and values because of the Internet and mobile journalism and the entire citizen journalism phenomenon. I guess they're contributing a lot of videos and documenting what is happening that are soft news or hard news ...

A6: I don't think their principles or values have changed in any way. The process is still the same. There's just more information out there and there's the constant need to verify

Participant X
Senior Producer, CBCNews.ca

Cell Phone Interview (Interview length: 30 minutes, April 30, 2010)

Q1: So I'm only going to ask you a few questions because we only have 20 minutes. First question is about gatekeeping and the process of citizen video and image selection. The first question is can you describe what gatekeeping is?

A1: Do you have a definition of gatekeeping? You must have something in mind.

Q2: I do. I guess I want to know how you'd define a gatekeeper and what their role is.

A2: I think that it could be a lot of things. It seems like a lot of your questions are based on that and I would really prefer you defining that so I know how I'm answering the questions.

Q3: Oh ok. I thought of a gatekeeper as someone who filters information and decides what the audience or public should know and not know. For instance, the news media they might, maybe not a liberal one, but let's say in Iran or China ... they might choose to sensor a lot of information so that the citizens don't know what's going with SARS, for instance, so that bad news doesn't spread and so nobody finds out. So a gatekeeper to me is someone who decides what information goes out to the public in order to protect themselves or authorities or just not exposing people to bad news as well.

A3: OK.

Q4: But, like I said, everybody has a different definition to this.

A4: No. I mean, what you described is what you'd traditionally think of as a gatekeeper. I don't know how sure I am in either sense if that works as a definition.

Q5: Then we can move on to the next one. In terms of traditional practices of journalism, how has CBC's gatekeeping rolls, values and procedures been like in the past in comparison to today with the new media convergence and all the changes that have happened with the advent of the new technologies of the Internet?

A5: How have they changed?

Q6: Yeah, the gatekeeping rolls and values because of the internet and mobile journalism and the entire citizen journalism phenomenon. I guess they're contributing a lot of videos and documenting what is happening that are soft news or hard news ...

A6: I don't think their principles or values have changed in any way. The process is still the same. There's just more information out there and there's the constant need to verify

and check. But as far as the basis of the values of choosing what goes out, I would say it's not any different than it was traditionally. Although I'm a new media journalist, so I never worked here 25 years ago so I couldn't really speak to that.

Q7: Can you describe what some of CBC's values are?

A7: Well, its good journalism is the most important. There's an entire CBC standards and policy book and it's followed by the journalists and it outlines the values and everything. So that would be the place to really get what their values are and official values.

Q8: I guess that's on the Website, right?

A8: I think it is. It's in revision right now and it was going to be put up on the Website when it was up. But I believe you can get it on the Website, yep. There's also a little blue book that has that information that's given to staff and that is kind of the guiding policies ... what are the guiding policies of the organization.

Q9: Do you find there's a lot of difference in the uses of citizen images between broadcast in contrast to the Website?

A9: No. I think if it comes, and it's a still image that comes from an audience member ... is that what you're referring to?

Q10: Yeah, let's say a citizen submitted a video ... would the broadcast use that video without editing where on the Website they might change the light or shorten it or present it in a different way.

A10: Generally, if an audience member submits a video it's put online in our, what's called, "Your Voice" section. And although it's in all the terms of use that we can edit this video it's not. It's put online in its entirety. And if broadcast uses it for the length, it's sometimes shortened. So it might just be used, you know if it's a video of a tornado they would just use the actual tornado piece of it whereas online you might get a longer video.

Q11: What are some issues regarding the concepts of gatekeeping that CBC has in relation to all this citizen media?

A11: I don't think it's much different than any other journalism in that you need to verify the source. You have to confirm where you're getting the information in the same way that you would in any news organization. You don't just take a photo that they send in and they say it's a picture of X, you need to make sure it's that picture. And you need to do your checking and you need to contact the person if you're going to go and say that this is whatever it is. You need to make the same kind of judgment call as you would with any sort of journalism. And that's the key. People here have been working as journalists long enough that that kind of rigor is pretty straightforward and standard.

Q12: Next question is, how does the CBC play a roll as gatekeepers in visual information?

A12: Well, there's only so much ... obviously the news agenda of the day is probably the biggest gatekeeping. I don't know if necessarily that's the right word. It's not

necessarily gatekeeping as it is setting the news agenda. So whatever the news agenda is that day based on what the senior journalists at the CBC decide based on the wires and what other media outlets are doing. Based on that. Once the agenda is set, the visual information that comes in, if it is of course on that agenda, it's going to get more visibility basically than if it is not. So, I don't know if you want to call that gatekeeping. Gatekeeping is kind of a strong word. I think it's more just setting the agenda and what comes in. If it's the news of the day it's posted or put on the air. It's basically just around what's being covered and whether or not it fits. You mean visual information that viewers submit, or ...?

A19: No. Not generally.

Q13: Yes.

A13: Yeah, I mean if there was a tornado last night and a viewer submits video of the tornado outside their house it's probably going to be put up on the Website. But if there was something that is interesting ... or it might be put on the homepage because that's the news, but if it's something that's interesting but not necessarily the news then it might be put on page three or three layers deep. I think that's just how content works more necessarily than gatekeeping. It's just the way the news agenda is set everyday. It's not unique to CBC; it's just how news works.

also go to the broadcast folks and they'll have to make that decision on their end and if they want to use it as well.

Q14: So how do online gatekeepers make decisions for using image content online?

A14: Whether or not it's relevant to the day's news. How good the quality is. Whether or not it has been verified by being what it says it is. Those would be some key factors.

in general. I'm speaking somewhat for the CBC. I'm just speaking of how news works and

Q15: Can you describe in detail, if possible, how these processes work when citizen images are used as part of the news story? Like, do you get them from Flickr, do you go looking for it or do you just wait for it to come in. How is it acquired?

A15: Generally it's sent to us. We have a bunch of different access points set up on the Website that people can upload their photos, their videos or comments. So it's generally sent to us. We also often put out a call, like are you stuck on the ship or are you like ... whatever the news is we'll put out a call on that story looking for people to send their stories. And then we'll sometimes get photos from that. If they send us a photo we would try to contact them and ensure that it's theirs and that kind of thing and if we have rights to use it and that they didn't get it off some other Site or that kind of information. And once it goes through the regular journalistic checks, if it was appropriate we might put it in a news story and say who it was submitted by.

a conservative attitude towards all these citizen images?

on more than anything. I don't think it's a

Q16: So you do use the citizen's name?
A16: It depends. Often we do. Usually we check with that person and then they get a credit for that photo.

that they are working to get better at getting more of those images up in a timely way

Q17: So in terms of obtaining a video, do you do anything to it before broadcasting it or putting it online? Either a video or an image from a citizen journalist ...

A17: Not for online, no.

Q18: So it is quite original. Nothing is altered?

A18: No. Not for online. It might be re-sized. Sometimes a submitted photo will be really, really large, which would make our page really heavy so we might have to re-size it or save it as a medium quality image instead of it being a super high quality image. It's going to make the page load really slowly. That kind of thing. And if it's on broadcast it could be re-sized as well. It may also, if it's a video, be edited for length.

Q19: What about other things like cropping or changing the light or whatever?

A19: No. Not generally.

Q20: How many editors sit down together in media room to decide to use this image? Or is it just one person who makes the decision. We're just going to use this citizen image and it just goes through right away?

A20: It might be two or three, depending on whoever is working on that story. An image might have come in and one person might be working on the story online and be asked "do you want this image? Let's get it up. It's been verified." The decision's made kind of at two different stages, if you're online. It might also go to the broadcast folks and they'll have to make that decision on their end and if they want to use it as well.

Q21: What are CBC's attitudes toward citizen videos and citizen photojournalism? What are some of the critiques or expectations?

A21: It can be a real asset. I'm not just speaking for the CBC here. I'm just speaking in general. I'm speaking somewhat for the CBC. I'm just speaking of how news works and I think it's a real asset to many news stories if you have reports from the ground from people who are there and in the situation. People who are on the scene and they can often send their eye witness reports. And it can be a real asset to the news and just to the general engagements of a Website to have that kind of contribution.

Q22: Does CBC actually pay citizens for their work?

A22: No.

Q23: So they just get a name credit pretty much?

A23: Yes.

Q24: I noticed that CBC doesn't broadcast a lot of citizen images in comparison to other local news and so on. Why is there such a conservative attitude towards all these citizen images?

A24: It's probably the flow of information more than anything. I don't think it's a conservative attitude as much as it is just the way information flows around the organization. I know that they are working to get better at getting more of those images up in a timely way.

Q25: If that is the case, why does the CBC decide to use the citizen images? I mean, you mentioned it as being a real asset but maybe the standards of the CBC could be high standard images, why not just use the professional ones? I mean on the Website ...

A25: You mean, why not just use Reuters or whatever? ... civil point of view? From the citizen perspective rather than the authoritative perspective?

Q26: Yeah, why not just use professional taken images rather than amateur ones?

A26: Well, I think it's a toss up and we use both. It really depends on the image that's sent in and that decision has to be made every time by the person who's doing the story. And there's not a citizen image for every story anyways. For most stories, there is not a citizen image. It's kind of unique when you get one. So the person who's putting together that story generally decides what that image is going to be and what they have access to and how quickly – if they want to get it up quickly – so what's available to them and how quickly can they do that? And at that point they would make that decision if there is one available. Is it confirmed? That's the other thing. What do we have access to and what's confirmed and can we get it up quickly?

Q27: I'm just curious, how many citizen photos and citizen videos come in to CBC's page, let's say, in a day on average?

A27: You know, I'd be the wrong person to ask because I haven't monitored that for a while.

Q28: When the CBC uses the citizen images are they simply using it as part of the story because it's a good visual to use or is it the fact that CBC is broadcasting the encoded message that's in the image? Some of these images tell a message themselves without any accompaniment of text and other times news organizations might just use the image because it's just a picture to use. They don't care about the message embedded within it. So how does the CBC differentiate that or make use of the citizen photos or videos as part of the storytelling? Is it just for the visual aspect of it or is it because of the image's message?

A28: I think both. You take it on case by case because a lot of times we had some fantastic videos about the election. We got some different photos from various political events and sometimes it would be both. It depends on what it was that people submitted.

Q29: How has the usage of all these citizen images and videos changed the way CBC tells news stories?

A29: I think that in some cases it's allowed us to broaden the story and engage Canadians more. If there's more Canadians involved and their there and they've got their cameras and they're taking photos and sending their photos ... so it's giving access to Canadians who are involved in it to submit their experience first hand. And for us to tell the story in a way that represents a little bit more of that real people on the ground experience. Or at least that's what I'd like to hope. I mean, there probably could be more of it and I'm not sure it's always done in the best of our ability based upon the

concerns and the quality and all these kinds of issues. But ideally that's the goal. To be able to reflect Canadians back at themselves. And to reflect Canadians in the news stories that we're telling. And it will give them access to tell their story and to share their story.

Q30: Do citizen images represent the CBC from a civil point of view? From the citizen perspective rather than the authoritative perspective?

A30: I'd like to think so. We have an entire section called "Your Photo" and basically people upload photos. You can look at it and anyone from any part of the country – or any other country for that matter – can upload their photo there. They're just photos. It's something that is uploaded and moderated by a moderation group and they can be whatever the person uploading them wants them to be. There's no gatekeeping at all except for moderation and the moderation is things like no naked photos allowed. You know those very basic guidelines that you'd expect. But other than that there's no gatekeeping there. People can just upload what they want. And I think in that case it does allow for further representation of what people want to put online and what they want to show on the site.

Q31: How have news selection criteria or editorial values changed because of the mix with citizen images?

A31: That's a good question. I don't know to be honest. I guess if you got a really great picture from a citizen that story might be pushed higher because you can tell it better in the news agenda of the day it might be told. If you can tell it with a really great picture it might encourage the telling of it. But other than that I think it helps to inform better, or it should. If someone's house is being evacuated because a flood is coming ... if they can send us a video or pictures – information from the ground – it will help us to tell the story better. It will allow us to tell the story from their point of view versus just from us telling it. So that should help the judgment and it's another very important news source that will help the engagement of Canadians.

Q32: Can you talk about transparency? Has the use of all these citizen images and videos made news stories more transparent? You probably understand the definition of transparency more than I do, actually.

A32: I think it's made it more reflective of what's going on. That's what I would do. I don't know. When I think of transparent I think transparent to the organization. Transparent to the journalist. And I don't know how it would do that. But it would certainly make it more reflective and more in touch with the people in the story, if they have that access to provide additional information.

Q33: Have you found with the CBC, because of all the citizen images and videos, has become more sensationalized news more than in the past when there was no citizen content and it was more hard news and less of the soft news aspect?

A33: No. Yeah, now we might feature a really pretty spring flower photo on the homepage that was submitted by someone in our "Your Photo" gallery. But if you want to call that softer news ... I don't really think it's sensational but it is a little more images reflected around the country. We may not have had access to that spring flower

blooming in British Columbia without the "Your Photo" submission area.

Q34: What is CBC's message to the public that they want to send or frame because of all this use of citizen images? By using all these citizen images in CBC's news telling what kind of message does the CBC want to send to the viewers?

A34: Oh, I'd have to pass. I guess that's something that the higher ups than me would be able to answer.

Q35: Has there been any ethical gatekeeping issues at CBC because of using citizen images?

A35: I think I'll pass on that too.

Q36: Is there anything you'd like to add to gatekeeping or any other issues we discussed?

A36: The only thing I'd like to make clear is that I'm not speaking on behalf of the CBC as a corporation. I'm a producer here. I'm a senior producer here who works ... and I think a lot of what I talked about is coming across as news and it's really ... I just want to make it clear I'm not speaking on behalf of CBC or presented that way.

Q37: I won't present it that way...

A37: Yeah, if you were to do that you'd almost have to speak to the head of news or something like that. But I do think my experiences are pretty reflective of or the questions I answered are reflective of the experience I've had working here.

Interviewer: Thank you for your time.