

We the Media
Convergence Journalism: A threat to print journalism?

Lydia A. Miljan
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Windsor
401 Sunset Ave,
Windsor, ON N9B 3P4
CANADA

lmiljan@uwindsor.ca

Paper prepared for The End of Journalism?
Technology, Education and Ethics Conference,
University of Bedfordshire 17-18 October 2008.

Abstract

With the rise of digital technology, concerns have been raised regarding the role of journalists and the quality of information presented. Some of the trepidation centers on the decline of the traditional journalist in favour of the blogger or amateur journalist. Other fears center on the concentration of ownership in that while there may be more avenues for dissemination of information there will be less information provided. The demands are greater for newspapers as there has been a consistent decline in advertising revenue in favour of online news. Converged corporations – those with either newspaper and internet holdings, and/or television – tend to see the solution to these challenges in similar ways: reduce staff, pay less, and have the remaining staffers do more.

This paper examines the challenges journalists have always faced when confronted with new technology that threatens their craft. It looks specifically at how Canadian newspapers have moved to online editions and how this has pressured print journalists to become convergence journalists. Part of the analysis provides a case study of the *Toronto Star*, Canada's largest circulation daily and the first company to put specific language in its collective agreements that defines journalists as “anyone who generates content”. In addition, this paper also provides results from a content analysis of the *Toronto Star* that compares the online version of the newspaper with the print edition. We find that while corporate owners may desire convergence, journalists nonetheless have been able to maintain their traditional roles

Among the challenges that face journalists with new technology, two related issues stand out to fundamentally alter the profession. One is the cross-ownership of media platforms of newspapers, internet, television, or even radio, in the same market. The second is the realization by these same companies that they can provide less content in the different platforms by re-purposing existing content. In doing so, they can ask fewer journalists to do more. For example, television reporters could both blog for a live event and subsequently provide a stand up for a television broadcast. They might also be able to provide a live radio interview for a sister station. Thus the media organization, with an investment in some technology, can have one journalist do three jobs. In the professional vernacular this is what some call being a 2-way or 3-way reporter. This is not the paranoid machination of a communications studies scholar, nor is it the dream of a media baron—both of which have offered that vision—but increasingly, it seems, how daily news is reported.

A recent example is the Detroit Fox television station's coverage of the Kwame Kilpatrick plea bargain on 4 September 2008. Kwame Kilpatrick was Detroit's mayor who had to resign his position when he plead guilty to obstruction of justice and to perjury. Not only did Fox television reporter Amy Lange and her producer, Kerry Birmingham blog from the courtroom on the television station's website, but Lange later reported on the nightly newscast on the day's proceedings. She was also interviewed on a Canadian AM radio station across the border in Windsor Ontario, on the same issue.

There is more than one way to analyze this phenomenon. Management, or even the journalist, could argue that the blogging was simply the unstructured notes of the

reporter made public for those unable to go to the courtroom. This continual blogging added to what otherwise would have been a scant 90 second stand up report. By frequently updating the story for the online viewers, Lange was able to reach more people and in doing so fulfill the public good. In addition, she was also able to ensure that the Fox television station, through its online platform, got more publicity. This happened because other journalists, in this case, radio reporters, viewed the online post and asked Amy Lange for on air interviews. This is a win-win scenario for the corporation.

On the other hand, critics may argue that no matter how commendable a job Lange did on her blogs and reports, she nonetheless offered only one reporter's voice on these multiple platforms. By design, that limits the free market of ideas and frames by which the public has the tools to judge the event. As Ben Scott (2005) argues, "Shared content means few voices covering important events stretched across the network of coordinated news providers. These providers, no longer in direct competition with one another, might be worth paying for because of its removal from public access" (Scott 104). Scott was referring specifically to newspaper and television cross-ownership, but as the internet becomes more mainstream, this criticism can be applied to newspaper and internet partnerships.

Historical Role of Journalists

To recoup losses, media corporations have started to redefine what is a journalist. This was the plan of Canada's largest circulation daily newspaper when it went into contract negotiations with its union. According to media reports at the time, newspapers across North America had been trying to recover lost revenues as readers shifted from newspapers to online and other digital forms of information. Some of the cost-cutting

plans involved buyouts and layoffs. The *Toronto Star* publisher, Jagoda Pike, argued that the company lost \$32-million in advertising revenue compared with the last collective agreement. To recover from such losses *The Star* planned a “transformation of the workplace” (Shecter 2008). The union argued that this transformation was at the expense of journalists.

Among the union’s arguments was that the proposed changes would reclassify journalists into four new jobs, but essentially the journalist would have a “new job title of anyone who ‘generates content’” (SONG 2008, 1). The union claimed that this would create the same job title for everyone from “editorial writers to photographers to reporters to columnists to all bureau chiefs.” More importantly, rather than make distinctions between photographers and reporters who write the text, the expectation would be that all content providers would be a 2-way, 3-way or 4-way journalist. The union argued that the new job descriptions would:

say people should be able to do everything in both the print and digital world. So the new Journalist should be able to interview people and write stories; shoot video; shoot stills; record audio tape; produce Flash and other graphics ... on it goes. Same for the editing jobs: Those people are expected to be as fluent in the digital and other high-tech skill worlds as in print (SONG 2008, 2).

The *Toronto Star*’s definition of journalist is not without precedent. With every innovation journalists have had to redefine what they do and whom they do it for. While there is no one standard definition of journalism, most authorities recognize that it is the gathering of information either through words or pictures and that the information must be disseminated. Some go so far as to insist that journalism occurs only when there is a payment for that information. This may be to protect the journalist as much as it is to protect corporate interests. Nonetheless, traditionally journalism reported the day-to-day news and current events. It has also been closely associated with the events in business

and politics, but also entertainment and sport. Just as journalism has been linked to democracy and business, it has also had to change with the times. The first manifestation of journalism—newsletters—was supplanted by broadsides and later pamphlets, weekly sheets and finally the daily press. This progression took 200 years to evolve, but it then changed again as radio and then television challenged what journalism was, and how it was to be practiced. While the earlier technological challenges of journalism threatened the business interests of the specific corporations who owned the press, today’s digital innovations challenge who is and what is a journalist.

This new model fundamentally alters what it is to be a journalist and the future for the profession. In an entry I wrote for the *Encyclopedia for the Social Sciences*, I defined journalism as:

the gathering, writing, editing, photographing, or broadcasting of information through newspapers, magazines, radio, television, or the Internet by any news organization as a business (Miljan, 2008a).

Through my research, I found that journalism has always been associated with commercial enterprise. While some have noted that “the internet and related digital technologies are advancing so fast that it is difficult for anyone to predict future developments,” (Gunter 2003, 11) there are some basics that will not change.

The threats to journalism in the digital age are not necessarily that the technology has changed from analog to digital, or that it has solved the bandwidth problem. Journalism has survived other innovations to greater or lesser degrees. It has evolved with the technologies that have been developed. The early papers and pamphlets distributed in the 16th century were highly opinionated, full of gossip and have little in common with today’s daily newspaper. Nonetheless, as the press got larger, the quality of the papers

did improve as did the sense of professional standards. Even the most despised and denigrated period of newspapers—where yellow journalism was king— resulted in the hallmarks of today’s elite press: “big headlines, the use of pictures to present information, and the colored comic Sunday supplement” (Miljan 2008a).

The first real challenge to the press was that of radio. The complaints of journalists today against the blogger are reminiscent of the complaints of print journalists against radio. Initially, newspaper owners charged that radio reporters simply read from the newspaper with little editing, and no credit for the source. Moreover, by being able to provide hourly updates they “compete[d] with the primary function of newspapers and take away from newspaper circulation” (Chester 1949, 254). Today, this complaint is echoed by critics of the newest breed of journalist: the blogger, “Amateur bloggers typically have no editorial oversight,” charges J.D. Lasica (2003), “no training in the craft, and no respect for the news media’s rules and standards” (70). Or as Tom Regan (2003) explains, “In the eyes of many journalists, blogs are poorly written, self-absorbed, hyper-opinionated, and done by amateurs” (68).

Despite the criticism waged against early radio, the medium did evolve to create its own content and became influential in public affairs. Some have suggested that online journalism could also have that kind of status. We need to remember that journalism has evolved depending on the medium for dissemination. In the same way radio challenged print journalism, television emerged to confront both, and that left an indelible mark on journalism: especially that of political journalism. Politicians, for example, quickly realized that to appeal to the mass audience they had to adjust their message to the particular qualities of television: good visuals and brief sound bites. It has been widely

repeated that the average length of quoted material has “shrunk from 42 second in 1968” (Baum and Kernell 1999, 99) to 7 seconds in 2004 (Lichter and Lichter 2004, 5). Not everyone agrees that television journalism has been a positive force. Many have argued that television has irrevocably degraded public discourse (Patterson 1994; Fallows 1997; Meyrowitz 1985; McKibben 1993; Putnam 1995).

Despite the problems and limitation of television and radio, neither of these innovations comes anywhere close to the threat posed by the internet to journalism. The reason is that the challenges the internet places on journalism goes beyond sloppy reporting, the lack of fact checking, or even the rise in sensationalism. What the internet ultimately threatens is journalism’s core value of commercialism. All the old media had expensive start-up costs that prohibited entry by small players: one needs a large press to print a daily paper; a radio station needs a certain level of infrastructure in order to reach a large audience; and, television requires a substantial investment in order to go on air. This also impacted who practiced journalism. As the institutions got bigger, the occupation moved towards a higher degree of professionalism. None of these market limitations affects someone starting a blog or an online media service. The technology is already provided, the vast infrastructure exists and, amateurs with a simple keystroke can reach a mass audience. The entry costs to producing online content is quite low for the average blogger or citizen journalist. Some even argue this as a positive outcome for democracy. Herbert Gans (2004), for example, sees citizen journalists as complementing traditional journalists in what he calls “multiperspective news.” He argues that audiences could form a “second tier” of media organization by

complementing the mainstream media and each reporting on news to specific, fairly homogenous audiences...They would devote themselves primarily to

reanalyzing and reinterpreting news gathered by the central media—and the wire services—for their audiences, adding their own commentary and backing these up with as much original reporting, particularly to support bottom-up representative and service news, as would be financially feasible (318).

Lasica agrees saying that participatory journalism “refers to individuals placing an active role in the process of collecting, reporting, sorting, analyzing and disseminating news and information” (71). While he acknowledges that “amateur bloggers typically have no editorial oversight, no training in the craft, and no respect for the news media’s rules and standards” they nonetheless enhance journalism (70). The reason, he and others argue, is because it allows new, and fresh voices into “the national discourse on various topics and help build communities of interest through their collection of links (71). In contrast, Rebecca Blood argues that the “heart of all journalism” is original reporting, which indicates to her that most weblogs do not qualify as journalism (2003, 62). Paul Andrews definition is of journalism is the “imparting of verifiable facts to a general audience” and by that standard most blogs cannot be classified journalism (2003, 63). However, others such as Tom Regan argue that weblogs push journalists to change the way they cover stories. He points out cases where the bloggers amplified stories that journalists failed to emphasize. He also notes that in order for bloggers to fulfill their potential, they need to adopt more of journalism’s best practices (Regan 2003).

In contrast, Andrew Keen (2007), argues that today’s internet with its bloggers, and other peer-to-peer services, denigrates public discourse with its amateurism, shallowness, and narcissism that even the worst of television could not match. But more importantly, by having the audience receive the content—for free—we have completely undermined our culture and the future of the industry. As Keen states,

But perhaps the biggest casualties of the Web 2.0 revolution are real businesses with real products, real employees, and real shareholders... What you may not

realize is that what is free is actually costing us a fortune. The new winners – Google, YouTube, MySpace, Craigslist, and the hundreds of start-ups all hungry for a piece of the Web 2.0 pie – are unlikely to fill the shoes of the industries they are helping to undermine in terms of products produced, jobs created, revenue generated, or benefits conferred (Keen 2007, 27).

While it is relatively easy for anyone to be an online journalist, their individual reach and impact may be quite limited. Nonetheless, the entry to the internet for the big media corporations is not as cheap as it is for the small-time blogger, but increasingly necessary and expected.

There are several reasons why most major media have an internet presence. The first is to recoup some of the lost advertising. Second, they use it as a means to retain existing customers with breaking news and information. Third, it is a way to attract the younger demographic, a group of consumers who as a rule have not adopted the same habits of daily newspaper readership. But increasingly, savvy publishers and managers see it as a cost-effective method to conduct market research. Not only do the media giants track every story read and emailed, but some justify their reporting decisions based on those figures. When the Kwame Kilpatrick story first broke in January 2008, *Windsor Star* editor, Marty Beneteau wrote an op-ed justifying their front page headlines (*Windsor Ontario, is across the river from Detroit, Michigan*). As he stated, “At morning news meetings, editors asked themselves, Is this our story? Do readers care? If our mandate is to deliver outstanding local coverage, is Detroit local enough?” To answer his own question he pointed to the *Windsor Star* website: “One of the beauties of owning a website is instant feedback. We learn reader appetites by monitoring page views on windsorstar.com, and by the volume of responses to poll questions and Sound Offs” (Beneteau 2008, A.6). Most newspapers in Canada with an internet presence not only track the traffic to their site and stories, but put that information on the website, and

sometimes in the print edition. It is common to see a page on these website indicating both the most popular, most discussed, as well as the most emailed stories. One does not have to speculate widely to see that many journalistic decisions could be made on the basis of those tallies.

Media corporations are acutely aware of the potential and actual losses in advertising revenue to the internet. However, their strategies for gaining revenue via the internet has met with criticism. First, is the issue of online material being identical to the print edition. This is disparagingly referred to as “shovel-ware,” (Gunter 2003) others label it “cloning” (Dailey, Demo and Spillman 2003). As Kalb and Sullivan argue, “there may be more ways to get ‘news,’ but the news seems to be all the same” (Kalb and Sullivan, 4). Others note that early forays into online journalism provide merely a “supplement and a complement to the dominant print and broadcast news media” (Regan 2000, as cited in Scott, 93). Part of the ambivalence was that publishers and journalists had difficulty understanding the nature of the new medium, “There is still considerable debate over whether the internet will prove to be a new medium at all or, rather, more simply serve as a better tool for distribution” (Kramer 2000, as cited in Scott, 93). Thus, initial studies found that “the vast majority of news available on the web comes from the news wires (see King 2000; Maynard 200, 49; <http://www.reuters.com>; <http://www.apdigitalnews.com> as cited in Scott 95).

Corporate solutions to the declining readers and revenue does not necessarily include investing in more journalists or a better product – but the reverse to cuts staff and ask them to do more. The extra work involves feeding the online edition of the newspaper website – either to file stories continuously throughout the day, posting blogs or by

posting interactive links with videos or sound off pages. Some have noted that newspaper publishers have not fully realized the potential of the online newspaper. One criticism of blogs or, even newspaper updates is that the product is devalued as the online version may have little editing, if any. Because of time pressures and the acceptance that it is a work in program it may lack the more rigorous fact-checking of the print edition. The requirement of journalists to become all things: editor, writer, photographer and videographer also debases the special skills and training of each of journalism's specialties.

Research seeking to find convergence effects has been wanting. Study after study has found that there is a definite lack of content convergence for companies that own different media in the same market. Many have concluded that the reason is not because of reluctance on the part of owners to implement content sharing, but rather because of journalists oppose the changes. Singer (2006) for example, points out that each newsroom has its own culture which he defines as a "set of shared attitudes, values, goals and practices (846). Thus a newspaper journalist may value professional attributes such as "expertise, ethics, public service, and autonomy, plus work routines" that will differ from those of television or radio reporters (Singer, 2006: 846). In practical terms this means that journalists as a working group simply resist management policies that encourage convergence such as the sharing of sources. Part of this comes from the natural competition between news organizations, even if they are owned by the same media (Gormley, 1976; Lawson-Borders, 2006). So while American media corporations seek full convergence, their reporters do not make it part of their daily work habit (Filak 2004, 217). As William Silock and Susan Keith found in their survey of journalists, "[h]aving a

TV journalist write for one of the newspapers usually was, with a few exceptions, considered a waste of resources” (2006, 617). Pamela Shoemaker and Stephen Reese have argued that, “professional roles and ethics have a direct effect on mass media content, whereas the effect of personal attitudes, values and beliefs on mass media content is indirect....” (1996, 55).

Much of this research examines newspaper and television convergence partners. What the studies found was that there was a perception among different types of journalists that they had conflicting goals. For example, there was a perception that videographers’ only desire was “make you look good” in contrast to newspaper photography which has a cultural norm to “capture life as it is” (Filak 2006, 619). When faced with this opposition, a Phoenix convergence partner abandoned its plans to have photographers shoot video (Silock and Keith 2006, 619). In a study that I am currently working on we found that there was little, if any, content sharing among television and newspaper partners in Canada. In fact, there was little evidence to support the hypothesis of convergence of content production between the converged media. From the story lead, to language, to sources used, to the editorial spin of the article, there were few similarities between the experimental pairs (Miljan 2008b). The lack of content sharing among the major converged media in Canada lead me to conclude that perhaps we have been looking at the issue backwards. Rather than the old media sharing information, it could be that all the focus will be on the sharing of information from the old media to the new media, i.e., the internet. Many have found that there is no one way to look at convergence and it changes and moves according to different influences. Wilson Lowrey (2006), for example, found “that the more time that news organizations spend partnering, the less

favorable are managers' attitudes" (254). It would make sense then that the only way that news organizations can successfully implement content sharing is to place newspaper or television content directly on the internet. This is simply an artifact of journalists remaining in their own specialties (Huang et al. 2004, 77).

The worry then is not that print journalists stay in print, but that they will increasingly have to provide original content for the internet. In addition they will have to compete with citizen journalists. If a journalist is defined as anyone who generates content then anyone who creates a blog or posts a video on YouTube *defacto* becomes a journalist. It is a very short step indeed to argue that if anyone can do it then no one needs to be paid to do so. This is precisely the model of the Korean-based website Ohmynews.com whose motto is "every citizen is a reporter" (Ho 2007). Ohmynews boasts that it has 50,000 citizen reporters working from 100 countries. In addition to the Korean-language site, it also has an English and Japanese site. There is some payment given to the citizen journalists, but only if their story appears on the main page. The author of an article receives 20,000 Korean won, translating to about \$19.00 Canadian or £10.00. Considering that the average word count for a OhmyNews article is 2000 words that works out to less than a penny a word, or roughly, \$1.00 a paragraph. While this model no doubt is a boon for the owners, it represents a severe devaluation of the labour of journalists.

The average newspaper journalist in Canada earns approximately \$40,000 or £21,000 (PayScale Report 2008). Using the Ohmynews model, they would have to write *42 articles a week* to make the equivalent salary! That, is assuming that all of their stories appear on the website's main page. Clearly, this model makes money for the owners, but

it does little for the journalist or for the quality of reporting. By the very nature of its model and the cooperation of the 50,000 citizen reporters, Ohmynews can boast that it has a multiple number of voices, but not necessarily provide a career for any individual.

Ohmynews ostensibly tries to adhere to traditional notions of journalism with its claims of balance, fact checking, and so forth. Those are the hallmarks of what blogger/journalists have defined the profession. Ohmynews even “trains” its citizen journalists on how to craft stories to look and feel more like traditional journalism. What it does not do is pay these journalists a living wage, or ask the audience to pay for the content. Nonetheless the owners of Ohmynews do get paid with advertising revenue and according to their promotional material on their website appear to be quite successful insofar as they have celebrated their seventh year of citizen journalism.

Yet, citizen journalism has its advocates. Lasica promotes the “everyone as journalist” model illustrating how easy it is:

Citizens are discovering how easy it can be to play reporter and publisher. To practice random acts of journalism, you don't need a big-league publication with a slick Web site behind you. All you need is a computer, an Internet connection, and an ability to perform some of the tricks of the trade: Report what you observe, analyze events in a meaningful way but, most of all, just be fair and tell the truth as you and your sources see it (73).

There is no doubt that the owners of major news organizations would be delighted to use trained citizen journalists to provide content: it would help cut costs and allow them to compete with these start-ups. However, this model does not appeal to everyone. Rather than reduce staff and pay less, Glenn Reynolds challenges owners to invest more in journalists:

What this means, however, is that the most powerful application for 21st century media is likely to be hard-news gathering, something that news media organizations are still better at than their atomized competitors on the Internet. If Big Media outfits want to compete with the blogosphere, they'd be well advised to

beef up their foreign bureaus and start reporting more actual news. And that, I think, would please both bloggers and traditional journalists (Reynolds 2003, 82).

Despite the pressures placed on the newspaper industry, it is not going away, and nor does it seem as if newspapers will fire all their reporters and take on citizen journalists. Nonetheless, newspapers not only have to compete with television, cable, radio, and other newspapers, but they now have to provide online content and go head to head with citizen journalists and bloggers. As Barry Gunter notes, “the recent rate of growth and penetration of electronic newspapers signifies that they are a phenomenon that is here to stay” (2003, 30). He places newspapers into three categories: 1) free access 2) free access with registration and 3) access for a charge. The fact that a large proportion of newspapers provides free, unrestricted access illustrates to him, “the high degree of uncertainty among conventional newspaper publishers about the robustness of the market for subscription electronic newspapers and their lack of experience in this new commercial market” (30). Early research noted that online newspapers and broadcasters had recognized the need to produce original content and not just reproduce offline content online (Gunter, 39).

Given the added cost, why have so many newspapers gone digital? Those who look to the future of the newspapers argue that in time, the only newspaper we will receive will be the electronic one. Thus, today’s newspapers need to provide a presence as soon as possible to ensure that they foster an electronic placeholder with both consumers and advertisers. Added to this is the pressure that online newspapers face with competitors offering different types of interaction on their websites: chat rooms, forums, polls with instantaneous updates, and the like (Dibean and Garrison 2005, 266)

As we have had nearly a decade of online newspaper journalism, we need to ask ourselves how has newspaper journalism changed by going online? Have online newspapers moved away from mere cloning of material and provided more value added? Of the newspapers that provide free, unlimited access, what kind of experience do readers get from the online service that differs from the printed edition? These questions can be answered in part by examining the online edition and comparing it with the print version. In addition, we ask, how much material is presented by staff reporters and, how often is it updated? In this study we focus on the *Toronto Star*. First, because it is Canada's largest circulation daily newspaper. But also, the *Toronto Star* was the first newspaper in Canada to put strong language in its collective agreement regarding the definition of journalists. In addition, the *Toronto Star* provides free, unlimited access to all content. Other newspapers in Canada, notably the Canwest newspaper chain also provide a lot of free online content, in addition offer value-added features for subscribers, such as the printed version of the paper in a format that can be read online. In contrast, the *Globe and Mail*, a national newspaper, provides not only the daily news on the website, but offers a searchable database that goes back to 1 January 2002. However, the real difference is that not all the content is provided to readers for free. Some articles are locked and require a pay for service.

Methodology

This research provides a case study of one week of the *Toronto Star* newspaper. The week selected was the first week of the 2008 federal election campaign (September 8 – 13). This week was selected because it can isolate political news and the first week of an election campaign would have increased attention to politics. Demands on reporters

to perform two or more functions may also be heightened. The study employs a paired-comparison model. That means that the day's print edition is compared with the online edition. The unit of analysis is the story. The process involved scanning the online edition of the newspaper each day at approximately 6:00pm. This was to ensure that most of the updates would be covered. The online stories were printed and then compared with the published print edition. Online stories were compared to both the same day and the next publication date. The analysis examines the reporters, length of stories and originality of text. It also identifies the story topic and themes to determine to what extent *Toronto Star* reporters are practicing convergence journalism. In particular we assess whether or not the online version is cloned as well as test claims that the online version is not as carefully edited as the print edition.

Results

One-hundred-and-fifty-eight (158) stories were logged for the first week's coverage of the 2008 federal election campaign in the *Toronto Star*. The number of stories varied by day with the most (35) appearing on Wednesday and the least (23) on Monday. Paired stories were identified and we found that 65 per cent of the stories appeared in both the online and print versions. Thirty-five percent of the stories were not paired. This means that 32 percent of the sample appeared only in the online edition, while a mere 2.6 percent appeared only in the print version.

There were daily differences regarding how much content appeared in both formats. For the first day of the campaign, Monday, 91 per cent of the election news stories were in both formats. Yet, on Tuesday, only 66 per cent appeared in both formats. The additional stories on Tuesday that were not printed in the paper reflected the online

edition providing updates on ongoing stories. The big story that had frequent updates was the controversy over the exclusion of the Green party leader, Elizabeth May, from the all-party debates. Initially, three of the other party leaders said they would not debate at all, if May were included. They reasoned that since the party did not have an elected member of parliament and that the Green Party had early indicated a willingness to work with the Liberal party, that this would not constitute a fair fight. In the end, however, the other party leaders, especially, Jack Layton, the leader of the NDP capitulated and the Green Party leader was included in the debate. This story broke on the Wednesday evening, and the headline for the Thursday edition was, “Greens to be in debates.” This in part reflects the finding that the 51 percent of the stories presented on Wednesday appeared only online. Figure 1 illustrates that the proportion of paired stories fluctuated on a daily basis. The reason for the fluctuation was not seen in the print edition, but rather in the additional stories presented online. Print stories ranged from 13 to 21 stories on the election. The highest number was on the Monday, with the lowest on Thursday. There were only four stories that appeared in the print edition and not in the online edition. Thus, we find that the online edition does in some respect represent cloning but also provides more content than the print version. All editorials and columns appeared in both the online and print editions. For the news stories, 48 had no print version. There were only three news stories where the print version of the story had more content. In these instances, the online version appeared the previous day and the print version provided more detail. In this respect the online version of the *Toronto Star* does reflect the complaint of critics that it represents cloning in that it does not provide more detail than the print version.

Date	Both		Online only		Print Only		Total	
	n	Row %	n	Row %	n	Row %	n	Row %
Monday	21	20.6	2	4.0	0	0	23	14.7
Tuesday	20	19.6	10	20.0	0	0	30	19.2
Wednesday	17	16.7	18	36.0	0	0	35	22.4
Thursday	13	12.7	1	2.0	3	75.0	17	10.9
Friday	16	15.7	9	18.0	1	25.0	26	16.7
Saturday	15	14.7	10	20.0	0	0	25	16.0
Total	102	100	50	100	4	100	156	100

In addition to providing a quantitative content analysis, each article was read and assessed on its journalistic merit. There was no discernable qualitative difference between print and online only stories. In other words, the online stories were of the same quality in terms of news values and stylistic standards as were the print versions.

To better gauge the nature of the online only stories we examine the source of the articles. We should recall that one of the concerns of the *Toronto Star* union was that the changes in the definition of journalist would result in having the same journalist do more. Thus, the question is, who wrote the additional online stories? There were 50 stories in total that were published in the online edition, but did not appear in the print version, either on the day, or in the next day's edition. Thirty-percent of the news stories were wire stories from the Canadian Press. Of those, the majority appeared in the online edition only. In fact, only 23.8 percent of the CP stories appeared in the print version. Most journalists had the bulk of their stories appear in both versions, but often, they did supplement the print version with breaking news in the online edition that did not subsequently appear in print. Examining only the news stories, we found that Bruce-Campion-Smith and Richard Brennan had the highest number of online stories with 8 a piece (16 per cent). Less Whittington had 6 online stories (12 per cent). Tonda

MacCharles and Andrew Chung had three each. All the remaining journalists penned one story for the online version that did not appear in the print version. Part of this reflects the campaign that the different reporters were covering. In Canada, the press often ride on the bus or plane with the different party leaders. Typically, the reporters are given a week with a different party throughout the campaign, in part to ensure fairness, but also to provide some variety for the reporters covering the campaign. Thus, reporters covering the Green party during the first week of the campaign might have more stories to file because of the unfolding events than a reporter covering the Liberal campaign.

As is the norm for an election campaign, the governing party tends to receive the highest proportion of attention, in part because they are the focus of attacks from other parties, and also because they have a record to defend. In Canada, the attention to the other parties tend to reflect their standing in the dissolved house of commons. Over the course of the campaign, their coverage tends to reflect their standings in popular opinion polls. Thus, during the first week of the campaign, the governing Conservative party received the most attention at 43 per cent. The Green party received the second spot with 12.5 per cent of the attention. This attention had more to do with covering the controversy over the party leader not being invited to the all party debate than it was of coverage of the party's policies or platforms. In fact, 43 percent of the Green party coverage focused on the debate controversy, this was followed by the Liberal party (which was the official opposition at dissolution of parliament) with 14 percent of the coverage. The NDP came in fourth with 10 percent of the attention, which is somewhat better than their standing in the House of Commons, yet this is a higher proportion of attention than they might otherwise get considering their fourth party status in the House

of Commons. The Bloc Quebecois received only 3 per cent of the coverage, but they have more parliamentary seats in the House of Commons. This is the exception to the rule. In Canadian politics the Bloc Quebecois is a regional party that only runs candidates in the province of Quebec. Therefore, it is not surprising that they would receive so little campaign coverage in an Ontario newspaper.

The study also examined the topics of the news reports to see if there were any qualitative differences between the print and online editions. Once again, there was no discernable difference between the two versions, with the exception of breaking news. The online edition provided updates, as noted above, often from the wire service, helping to fulfill the requirement of placeholder for the newspaper.

Discussion and Conclusions

This paper examined the differences between the online and print edition of the *Toronto Star*. In general, it found that while the online edition did republish nearly all of the print edition, it nonetheless, provided value-added to readers with respect to breaking news. The newspaper used the online edition to present wire copy as well as video from the Canadian Press newswire service. In addition, reporters from the *Toronto Star* covering the election posted original stories online, as events unfolded. As for the charge that the new collective agreement would require journalists to become 2-way or 3-way reporters, that was not born out by the evidence. Examining the picture credits, for example, found that no reporter took a picture for a story that they wrote for either platform. Moreover, video links, the few that were available, were all taken from the wire service rather than the *Toronto Star* staffers.

What does this mean for the *Toronto Star* and journalism in general? First, just because a news organization puts certain language in its contract does not mean that it can change journalism culture overnight. Professional journalists who have been working for the past few decades have entrenched routines and skills. While management may claim that everyone has to be a 2-way or 3-way reporter, journalists themselves may simply refuse to do added functions indicating that they do not have specialized training for video work or photography. Similarly, a photographer could also indicate that their specialty is not in video or in writing. In order to enforce the language of the collective agreement, the company needs to either invest more in the training of existing journalists, or replace those journalists with people who have that training.

The training of journalists requires the support and innovation on journalism schools. In Canada there are 39 journalism schools. Most of them provide a general first year curriculum having them touch on writing, story-telling, digital technology or broadcasting. However, in subsequent years, students specialize in one field or another. Only one school, Loyalist College, advertises a specialty in e-journalism. Only when colleges and universities provide generalized training in convergence journalism will newspapers and other media organizations be able to enforce their desires of multi-tasking journalists. This may be the how journalism is done in the future, but it appears that we are not there yet.

Bibliography

- Andrews, Paul. "Is Blogging Journalism?" *Nieman Reports* 57, no. 3 (2003): 63-64.
- Baum, Matthew, and Samuel Kernell. "Has Cable Ended the Golden Age of Presidential Television?" *American Political Science Review* 93, no. 1 (Mar 1999): 99-114.
- Beneteau, Marty. "Why Kwame matters." *The Windsor Star*, (31 January 2008), A6.
- Blood, Rebecca. "Weblogs and Journalism: Do They Connect?" *Nieman Reports* 57, no. 3 (Fall 2003): 61-63.
- Chester, Giraud. "The Press-Radio War: 1933-1935." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, (1949) 252-264.
- Dailey, Larry, Lori Demo, and Mary Spillman. "The Convergence Continuum: A Model for Studying Collaboration Between Media Newsrooms." *Paper submitted to the Newspaper Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication*, Missouri (2003).
- Dibeau, Wendy and Bruce Garrison. "Online Newspaper Market Size and the Use of World Wide Web Technologies." *Online News and the Public* by Michael Brian Salwen, Bruce Garrison, Paul Driscoll. Routledge, (2005) 257-278.
- Fallows, James. *Breaking the News: How the Media Undermine American Democracy*. New York: Vintage Books, (1997).
- Filak, Vincent. "Cultural Convergence: Intergroup Bias Among Journalists and its Impact on Convergence." *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 12:4, (2004) 216-232.
- Gans, Herbert, J. *Deciding What's News: A study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time, 25th Anniversary edition*. Evanston Illinois: Northwestern University Press, (2004).
- Gormley, William, T. *The Effects of Newspaper-Television Cross-Ownership on News Homogeneity*. Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in Social Science. (1976).
- Gunter, Barry. *News and the Net*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, (2003).
- Ho, Oh Yeon. *10 Preconditions for the Value of User-Generated Content*. February 26, (2007).
http://english.ohmynews.com/articleview/article_view.asp?article_class=8&no=347628&rel_no=1 (accessed September 21, 2008).
- Huang Edgar, Lisa Rademakers, Moshood Fayemiw and Lillian Dunlap. "Converged Journalism and Quality: A Case Study of The Tampa Tribune News Stories," *Convergence: The International Journal Of Research Into New Media Technologies*. 10:4, (2004) 73-91.
- Kalb, Marvin and Amy Sullivan. "Editorial: Media Mergers: 'Bigger is Better' Isn't Necessarily Better." *Press/Politics* 5:20 (2000) 1-5.

- Keen, Andrew. *The cult of the amateur: How today's internet is killing our culture*. New York: Doubleday, (2007).
- King, Katie. The Wired Revolution. *Nieman Reports* 54, no 4:50, (2000).
- Kramer, Staci D. "What's Changed? Everthing and Nothing." *Online Journalism Review*, 28 (March 2002). Retrieved from <http://www.ojr.org/ojr/dramer/p1017382372.php>
- Lasica, J.D. "Blogs and Journalism Need Each Other." *Nieman Reports*, (Fall 2003) 70-74.
- Lawson-Borders, Grace. *Media Organizations and Convergence: Case Studies of Media Convergence Pioneers*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (2006).
- Lichter, Robert, and Linda Lichter. "Campaign 2004 Final: How TV News Covered the General Election Campaign." *Centre for Media and Public Affairs*. (November 2004). www.cmpa.com/files/media_monitor/04novdec.pdf (accessed September 21, 2008).
- Lowrey, Wilson. "Cognitive Shortcuts, the Constraints of Commitment, and Managers' Attitudes About Newspaper-TV Partnership." *Journal of Media Economics*, 19, no. 4 (2006) 241-258.
- Maynard, Nancy. "Digitization and the News." *Neiman Reports* 54, no. 4: 11-13, (2000).
- McKibben, Bill. *The Age of Missing Information*. New York: Plume, (1993).
- Meyrowitz, Joshua. *No Sense of Place: The Impact of the Electronic Meida on Social Behaviour*. New York: Oxford University Press, (1985).
- Miljan, Lydia. "Journalism." *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 2nd ed. Vol 4. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA. Gale Virtual Reference Library. Gale. Public Trial Site. http://go.galegroup.com/ps/start.do?p=GVRL&u=pub_gvrl 211-216. (2008a).
- _____. "Media Content Sharing Among Convergent Media in Canada." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Assocaition, Vancouver, B.C., June 4-6 (2008b).
- Patterson, Tom. *Out of Order*. New York: Vintage Books, (1994).
- PayScale Report. *PayScale*. (2008). <http://www.payscale.com/research/CA/Job=Journalist/Salary> (accessed September 5, 2008).
- Putnam, Robert. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6, no. 1 (December 1995): 65-78.
- Regan, Tom. "Weblogs Threaten and Inform Traditional Journalism." *Nieman Reports* 57, no. 3 (Fall 2003): 68-69.
- Reynolds, Glenn, H. "Weblogs and Journalism: Back to the Future?" *Neiman Reports* 54, no. 4 (2000) 81-82.

- Scott, Ben. "A Contemporary History of Digital Journalism." *Television and New Media* 6, no. 1 (February 2005): 89-126.
- Shecter, Barbara. "Toronto Star labour talks on brink of strike vote." *Financial Post*. January 16, 2008. <http://www.financialpost.com/story-printer.html?id=239827> (accessed March 31, 2008).
- Shoemaker, Pamela, J. and Stephen D. Reese. *Mediating the Message: Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content*. New York: Longman (1996).
- Silcock, B. William, and Susan Keith. "Translating the Tower of Babel? Issues of definition, language, and culture in converged newsrooms." *Journalism Studies* 7:4 (2006) 610-627.
- Singer, J. "More than ink-stained wretches: The resocialization of print journalists in converged newsrooms." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81, (2004) 838-856.
- SONG. "One big Metroland." *2008 Star Contract Talks Bulletin #13*. (January 11, 2008).