11-15-2005

Content Differences Between Print and Online Newspapers

Jessica E. Smith

University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd

Part of the American Studies Commons

Scholar Commons Citation
Smith, Jessica E., "Content Differences Between Print and Online Newspapers" (2005). Graduate Theses and Dissertations. https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/868

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.
Content Differences Between Print and Online Newspapers

by

Jessica E. Smith

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
School of Mass Communications
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Kenneth C. Killebrew Jr., Ph.D.
Timothy E. Bajkiewicz, Ph.D.
Randy E. Miller, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
November 15, 2005

Keywords: gatekeeping, convergence, shovelware, local news, content analysis

© Copyright 2005, Jessica E. Smith
Acknowledgments

Thanks to Deena Kemp and Erika Llenza for several hours of coding help; thanks to Norma Smith and Nancy Smith for reading headlines to me; thanks to Dr. Cheryl Bacon and Susan Lewis for brainstorming and encouraging; thanks to Charles and Deanne Smith for not asking too often when I’d be done; and thanks to the USF faculty members who have shaped the way I understand mass communication. Special thanks to my thesis committee members, Dr. Randy Miller and Dr. Tim Bajkiewicz, and chair, Dr. Ken Killebrew, for their availability, patience, and guidance through this process.
Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Gatekeeping

  Broadening definitions

  Framing

  Television gatekeeping

  Online gatekeeping

  Trends in online newspapers

  Shovelware

  Interactivity and multimedia use

Local news online

Chapter 3: Method

Chapter 4: Results

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Limitations

Future research

References

Appendices
Appendix A: Print and online sample articles 66
Appendix B: Coding sheet 84
Appendix C: Coding instructions 85
List of Tables

Table 1  Distribution of stories by newspaper  
Table 2  Comparison of contextual elements between print and online stories  
Table 3  Elements in common between print and online stories  
Table 4  Number of stories with types of print elements present  
Table 5  Number of stories with types of online elements present  
Table 6  Print reporter affiliation and mean print elements  
Table 7  Online reporter affiliation and mean frequency of photos and infoboxes  
Table 8  Online reporter affiliation and mean types of elements represented  
Table 9  Story geographic emphasis and mean frequency of print elements  
Table 10 Story geographic emphasis and mean types of elements represented
Content Differences Between Print and Online Newspapers

Jessica E. Smith

ABSTRACT

The Internet provides the opportunity to develop a new way to present journalism, but many scholars say newspaper Web sites do nothing but mirror their print parents. This study used content analysis to compare the content of stories in five newspapers with their Web counterparts, and it examines whether reporter affiliation or a story’s geographic emphasis has a relationship with the story’s amount of contextual elements. These elements could include photos, graphics, or multimedia or interactive components online. This approach applied gatekeeping theory to publications that have editions in two media.

This study examined the five largest newspapers in the South over 14 days, collecting a sample of 635 stories on the front pages and metro section front pages of the papers. Nearly all stories in the sample appeared on the newspapers’ Web sites, and story content was the same 96% of the time. The study found that 85% of print stories were published with at least one contextual element, but only 58% of online stories had at least one such element. About a third of the sample had at least one contextual element in common between print and online versions of a story, while about 20% of the sample had entirely unique sets of contextual elements in print and online. Newspapers are no more likely to publish additional contextual elements with local stories than any other type of
content. This effort focused on storytelling components; it examined whether print and Web editions of newspapers tell stories differently—whether they are complementary or competitive.
Chapter 1: Introduction

The Internet provides the technical capability for a user to read an article, examine its sources, and interact through a natural conduit that other media do not provide. A newspaper’s Web site can provide e-mail addresses or discussion forums that make journalists accessible while fostering community discussion. A site can offer audio clips from interviews, text of government records, and interactive maps that all can change the way a reader understands a story.

News online provides the opportunity to develop a whole new way to present journalism, and Jan Schaffer (2001) of the Pew Center for Civic Journalism suggested that this be done with a “much more interactive toolbox.” Interactivity is one of the things that gives the Internet value as a medium. Newspapers can provide in-depth stories, and television gives pictures and sounds. When providers offer these elements online, users often confront technological limitations. These technical obstacles may be overcome in a few years, but Web journalism still should be able to offer something more, something unique now. If interactivity is the Internet’s outstanding characteristic (Morris, 2001), it seems that online journalism should be taking advantage of it with stories that engage the reader and with tools such as e-mail links to journalists and officials, documents available to view, databases, and hyperlinks.

Some media have been slow to use interactive elements, though (Dibean & Garrison, 2001; Greer & Mensing, 2004; Singer, 2002; Tankard & Ban, 1998). The current environment has media trying to determine whether online news is
complementary or competitive for their operations (Dutta-Bergman, 2004) while journalists are trying to understand how to work in multiple media platforms (Huang, Davison, Shreve, Davis, Bettendorf, & Nair, 2003; Killebrew, 2004). Others say the “high-tech footnotes” (Weinberg, 1996) provided by documents and audio clips with stories online provide credibility but reduce online journalists to repackagers of news. In a time when scholars and practitioners have such questions, it seems crucial to examine the ways newspapers and their Web sites distribute news. Interactivity is a buzz word used about news Web sites, and the ability for a user to give feedback or choose which elements of a story to examine certainly distinguishes a story on a site from its print counterpart. Perhaps an equally popular word for added features of a newspaper Web site is “multimedia,” a form of presentation that uses audio, video, graphics, or other methods to give users different pieces of a story. Interactivity and multimedia capability are integrated features of the Internet, and it is important to understand how online news sites use these techniques.

Newspapers have a tradition of seeking, gathering, processing, and producing news in a one-way daily delivery, but the Internet can give users the ability to make the reporting process more transparent if site visitors can see, hear, or read the sources reporters relied on. In order to get to a point where sites make full use of the online functions that make the Web unique, Lowrey (1999) said both journalists and users must develop new schemas for processing news online instead of viewing it as a modified version of print journalism. This is an opportunity for newspapers to move past shovelware—content pushed directly from the print product to a Web page—and convert stories into forms that make them worthwhile for the online user. Online journalists have
no template for accomplishing that goal, however. Greer and Mensing (2004) make an excellent point: “Newspapers are still working to find interactive elements that function well in an online news environment” (p. 109). Finding an online model that is valuable to users and cost-effective for newspapers will not happen overnight, but it is important in producing print and online media that continue to be viable.

Although many newspapers have separate staffs for their online product, often the Web site is essentially the same as the print edition (Tewksbury & Althaus, 2000) or has fewer stories than what appears in print (Peng, Tham, & Xiaoming, 1999; Regan, 1995; Singer, 2001). With a news hole limited only by the size of a newspaper’s servers, the Web offers a logical home for more information than appears in the newspaper. A newspaper Web site that does not differentiate itself from the print newspaper in daily content has no unique quality to draw users, and without this, a site has no leverage to make a profit with advertisers or through paid content (Chyi, 2005; Chyi & Sylvie, 1998).

Several scholars (Fortunati, 2005; Pavlik, 1997) suggested that news Web sites develop in three stages. A first-stage site mirrors its print parent, and sites in the second stage add some interactive, multimedia, or customizable features. Pavlik (1997) said the third stage, a rarity at that time, would present new forms of storytelling and a different understanding of what constitutes a community. A few years later, Fortunati (2005) said the “‘mature’ site” (2005, p. 30)—one that has mastered multimedia presentation and is trying to develop or improve its economic return—was a present reality, at least for European media. A site that has learned to use multimedia techniques, however, may apply them only sporadically. This could indicate that news sites still do not exploit the characteristics that make them a new, different medium. The evolution of online
newspapers may not be complete, so it is important for scholars to evaluate how news sites function now to see the direction they might move as online newspapers come into their own.

Although companies are undoubtedly at the stage of wanting a sustainable return on investments in all products, online or otherwise, many newspaper sites at first glance appear to be little more than reflections of the day’s edition with perhaps some standing extra features. Research suggests that there is an audience for both print and Web as they currently exist (Dutta-Bergman, 2004), but Weiss (2004) said online newspapers must reinvent themselves as the novelty of their innovation wears off or risk failure. Online newspapers are competitors if their content is free shovelware from the print edition, but news online can be complementary if sites offer different information or features. This study examines daily news content in print and online editions to determine whether the editions are competitive or complementary.

At some level, the law of diminishing returns suggests that a newspaper will put money and effort into its Web presence until the point that more resources would not improve the financial bottom line, even if the product still could be improved. Shoemaker and Reese (1996) address the desire of news organizations to efficiently use resources; the scholars’ media content research fits into a fourth phase of agenda-setting research (McCombs & Shaw, 1993). Shoemaker and Reese (1996) created a hierarchical model of influences on media content that includes routines and organizational forces. The “structural logic” (p. 37) of a newspaper’s staffing structure and reporting norms shape the stories that readers see. If a newspaper’s workflow calls for reporters and their editors to produce stories, editors and designers to produce display type and add photos and
graphics, and Web editors simply to format that work for the Web, users will see a mirror of what appears in print. This structure creates an assembly line mentality, and Shoemaker and Reese suggest that the person at the end of the line, the editor—or in this case, the Web editor—may have little investment in the final product. If Web editors can ask reporters for source materials, such as documents and taped interviews, they face the challenge of creating a presentation that was not “grown up in an online medium,” (DeJean, 1995). This kind of storytelling in effect deconstructs a story and presents the whole as well as its parts. It can require several hours to produce one story like this online, and the outcome is a story that might be different than one produced by a Web editor involved with the reporter in the beginning. The final Web content may depend on the employee structure the organization has in place for its newspaper and Web site.

The content that makes it onto a newspaper site might be only part of what the print edition offers that day, which is a process recommended by the online editor of The Christian Science Monitor (Regan, 1995). Singer (2001) also found that print editions ran more than twice as many stories as their corresponding online editions. Both the stories selected from the print edition to be posted online and the elements such as photos and graphics selected to go with those stories undergo some kind of gatekeeping process to determine whether they will move from the print medium to the Web. Gatekeeping, one of the oldest mass communication theories, has interesting implications for online media.

Singer also found a strong local orientation of online newspapers, which makes sense considering that staff writers would produce most of the content about a newspaper's metropolitan area. A newspaper might find it relatively simple to post wire stories from the nation or region, but its local content is the product that other news
sources do not offer. In theory, a newspaper only has to invest its employees’ time into posting extra resources online with the local stories that ran in the print edition. This creates a situation where, as Shoemaker (1991) said, “cost becomes value” (p. 23).

This study compares the content of stories in selected newspapers with their Web counterparts and examines whether locally written stories are more likely than non-local stories to have additional content. Additional or different content could include photos, graphics, or multimedia or interactive components. The results of this study should offer a picture of how industry-leading newspapers use their Web sites and whether users can find unique information there. The results have implications for models of newspaper Web sites and discussions about paid content online, so it is important to examine whether print and Web editions of newspapers tell stories differently—whether they are complementary or competitive. This effort focuses on storytelling components and should provide a clearer picture of any relationship between newspapers’ practice of print and online gatekeeping.

This study continues in Chapter 2 with a review of relevant literature about the areas of gatekeeping, online newspapers, and local news. Chapter 3 describes the method and reliability of this content analysis, Chapter 4 provides results from the study, and Chapter 5 includes conclusions, limitations, and suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This study draws from work in several areas. Traditional gatekeeping literature examines why particular news items make it to the public. Studies about online news explore unique features of Web delivery and how it matches up with older media. The intersection of these areas provides excellent context for this study.

Gatekeeping

Gatekeeping has a long history as a mass communication theory, and the definitions of who or what can be a gatekeeper and the scope of the gatekeeping process have shifted through the years. The concept of information gatekeeping began with Lewin (1947), who described forces that acted on the selection of groceries and produce as they moved through channels to the family dinner table. He said decisions about food fall to “persons in ‘key positions’” (p. 143) who must weigh opposing forces, such as the cost and desirability of particular types of foods, and select what to bring home. A gate was any area in the channel where the forces changed enough to make that a decisive point for making it through the channel, and Lewin said gatekeepers or impartial rules govern the gates.

The first study that applied Lewin’s gatekeeping concept to mass communication was White’s (1950), and his approach established a focus on the individual as gatekeeper in mass communication literature. In White’s study, a mid-career wire editor at the Peoria Star (Reese & Ballinger, 2001) saved all stories that he rejected from three wire services in one week and recorded why he did not select the stories to run. White found
that “Mr. Gates” was able to run about one-tenth of the 12,000 column inches of copy he saw and tended to choose stories written conservatively that came across early in the evening. The study noted a gatekeeping effect both from individual preferences and constraint by the organization’s production process. If Mr. Gates was representative of other wire editors, White concluded “that the community shall hear as a fact only those events which the newsman, as the representative of his culture, believes to be true” (p. 390).

Snider (1967) repeated White’s study with the same wire editor 17 years later to see whether time tempered Mr. Gates’ approach to news selection. Mr. Gates remained in the same job at the same newspaper, but his situation changed somewhat in the intervening time. The city’s evening newspaper took control of the morning paper Mr. Gates worked for, and the paper had a smaller news hole because it had increased advertising. The paper used only one wire service in 1966 compared to the three used in 1949. Mr. Gates’ newspaper had to compete with radio and television news, which Snider said had not been as competitive 17 years previously. Snider studied Mr. Gates for five days instead of the week White (1950) did and found that Mr. Gates chose about a third of nearly 2,000 column inches of wire type he saw in 1966. Snider said the wire editor chose more international war news than any other category of story in 1966, perhaps reflecting the ongoing Vietnam War, compared to a preference for human interest stories in 1949. Mr. Gates still chose the stories he liked and thought his readers wanted, Snider said, adding that the wire service offered and Mr. Gates chose a “better balanced news diet” (p. 424) in 1966 than they did in 1949.
Several other early studies of gatekeeping focused on wire editors and wire stories (Gieber, 1956; Jones, Troldahl, & Hvistendahl, 1961). Instead of creating a case study of one editor, Jones, Troldahl, and Hvistendahl (1961) analyzed the state wire content provided to and run in 23 Minnesota newspapers. They found that the newspapers used about one-third of the state content provided by the Minneapolis bureau of the Associated Press and that stories provided just before the newspapers’ deadlines were unlikely to see print, a finding similar to White’s (1950) gatekeeper’s approach to filling his newspaper. Contrary to the Mr. Gates studies, Gieber’s (1956) study of 16 telegraph editors found that their personal opinions about events and people in the news had no effect on their selection of newspaper stories. The results of interviews, mock story selection, and analysis of spiked copy in Gieber’s study showed a passive group of gatekeepers, each of whom was “caught in a strait jacket of mechanical details” (p. 432). He said the driving force for these editors was simply filling the news hole.

Gieber’s (1956) study aligns with the approach to gatekeeping that Westley and MacLean (1957) took in their communication model. In addition to parties A and B passing information through channels, they created C as an intermediary and designated that as a gatekeeping position. Those gatekeepers “survive … to the extent that they satisfy [audience] needs” (p. 34). This model uses entire organizations as gatekeepers rather than individual journalists, who are merely “interchangeable cogs in the media machine” (Shoemaker, 1991) in this understanding of gatekeeping. Gieber’s approach also de-emphasizes the importance of the individual gatekeeper by describing gatekeeping as a mechanistic process governed more by the norms and routines of news production than the purposive decision of individuals.
The Mr. Gates study became a model for many gatekeeping studies by putting the individual gatekeeper at center stage and looking at how the process worked around him. Some scholars (Bass, 1969; Brown, 1979), however, criticized White’s (1950) emphasis on the individual because of what it left out of Lewin’s (1947) initial description of gatekeeping. Bass (1969) examined the staff structure of United Nations Radio, where stories came to a central news desk and then were sent to various language departments for translation and broadcast. He said studying a wire editor as a gatekeeper was analogous to studying one of the language editors at UN Radio, and he argued that the news desk made coverage decisions, while wire editors and language editors processed stories. Bass divided the news flow process into two parts: news gathering, which would include reporters and their editors, and news processing, which would include other editors, copyreaders, and translators. Bass said significant news decisions happened at the news gathering level, a contention that differed from White’s, who saw any decision-maker as a gatekeeper. This disagreement over terms formed the greater part of Bass’s discussion of gatekeeping, but he also argued that White pared away a bit of Lewin’s gatekeeping concept to make it applicable to mass communication instead of small-group communication. Lewin (1947) initially said that gatekeeping “holds … for the traveling of a news item through certain communication channels in a group” (p. 145), and Bass (1969) pointed out that White’s omission of the phrase “in a group” changed a group dynamics concept. Although Bass suggested that Lewin’s gatekeeping concept might more accurately be applied to a family’s consumption of news rather than an organization’s production of it, Bass did nothing to change White’s original application of the term in his own analysis of gatekeeping.
Brown (1979), however, said White’s (1950) analysis of stories rejected by Mr. Gates missed Lewin’s statement that gatekeeping applies to some, not all, information. Brown said this ignored the forces Lewin described in his original conception, so Brown examined the stories included about one topic in national news magazines over the course of 30 years. He looked for correlations between Census data and the frequency of coverage of family planning, and Brown found that gatekeeping decisions mirrored societal perceptions. This finding would seem to indicate that gatekeepers are in tune with public opinion.

However, Sasser and Russell (1972) concluded that “there is no such thing as news of the day important to the public” or at the least, editors did not have the training to recognize what the public judged to be important stories. Their study of several newspapers and television stations found that media organizations consistently covered major news events but in general shared few topics. Stempel (1985) also found that when stories were divided into broad subject categories—such as politics and government, crime, and general human interest—newspapers and television stations selected approximately equal mixes of the types, although they varied widely in which stories actually were selected. An analysis of White’s (1950) study suggested that the number of stories the wire services released in each category of news influenced Mr. Gates to select roughly the same mix (McCombs & Shaw, 1976). Dimmick (1974) also suggested that gatekeepers were uncertain about what stories to choose.

These findings support Gieber’s (1964) contention that news is subjective to the gatekeeper, and Adhikari, Everbach, and Fahmy (2002) also observed “little to suggest that editors are detached and objective professionals” (Significance and discussion
Whether subjectivity is a positive or negative thing, it is a theme of many studies of individual gatekeepers dating back to White’s (1950) Mr. Gates, who rejected several stories as “B.S.” and wrote on another, “Don’t care for suicides.”

Gatekeeping studies later expanded to look at the roles of groups, organizations, and routines in gatekeeping decisions rather than the influence of the individual gatekeeper only (Berkowitz, 1990; Berkowitz, 1991; Dimmick, 1974; Donohue, Olien, & Tichenor, 1989; Shoemaker, 1991; Shoemaker, Eichholz, Kim, & Wrigley, 2001). None suggested that the individuals were unimportant in the process, but rather that the “structural context” within which individuals operate affects gatekeeping decisions (Donohue, Olien, & Tichenor, 1989, p. 807). That can happen when an organization reinforces a gatekeeper’s own values (Dimmick, 1974), issues such as deadlines and space constraints impose (Donohue, Olien, & Tichenor, 1989; Shoemaker, 1991), or media from different platforms must decide what to do with the same story (Abbott & Brassfield, 1989; Epstein, 2000).

Routine and organizational influences frequently are discussed separately; both are part of the hierarchy of influences on media content created by Shoemaker and Reese (1996) that works its way outward from the individual level through media routines, organization, extramedia, and ideological levels. Shoemaker (1991) differentiates between routines and organizational factors by “including communication practices that are common across many communication organizations” in the category of routines and factors that vary in the organizational level (p. 53). A good story that comes across the wire 10 minutes before a newspaper’s deadline is unlikely to get the same play it would have earlier in the day; the immediate pressure to publish can constrain the level of detail
and context in a breaking story being posted to the Internet. Those time and space constraints occur at many organizations, and Shoemaker and Reese (1996) said “routines help explain how … content is shaped in response to those limits” (p. 118).

Organizational norms and policies also dictate the amount of time, space, and other resources available for certain projects, but those vary among workplaces.

Journalists produce news within organizations and bureaucracies, and this sociology of news has been of interest to a number of scholars (Hirsch, 1977; Reese & Ballinger, 2001; Tuchman, 1978) who built on the work of Breed (1955). Breed talked about policy as a “more or less consistent orientation shown by a paper” (p. 327) that never was directly communicated to new employees but was widely known. Journalists become socialized to their workplace and become subject to organizational level influences on content. When Hirsch (1977) re-evaluated White’s (1950) gatekeeping data, he argued that professional and organizational norms had far more effect on Mr. Gates’ decisions than any personal bias the wire editor brought. Like McCombs and Shaw (1976), Hirsch pointed out the similarity in the overall mix of stories chosen to the mix of wire stories initially sent to Mr. Gates.

Broadening definitions. Although research of routines as gatekeepers appeared more slowly than the work about individuals, it fit with Lewin’s contention from the beginning that rules can act as impartial gatekeepers. Shoemaker et al. (2001) provide a useful definition of gatekeepers that includes both people and processes: “Gatekeepers are either the individuals or the sets of routine procedures that determine whether items pass through the gates” (p. 235). The researchers performed a content analysis of the coverage of 50 Congressional bills and then surveyed the newspaper reporters and editors
included in the sample of stories. Their study concludes that routines of news work shape content more significantly than individual influence. Shoemaker (1991) suggested that this could be all the more true at a large organization where many more people and processes might be acting as gatekeepers than an organization like a community newspaper. Gatekeeping at a larger organization would depend more on its rules than the “idiosyncratic logic” of the individual (p. 56). This organizational level is important because it puts the people and practices in place that “determine what gets past the gate and how it is presented” (Shoemaker, 1991, p. 53).

The idea that gatekeeping plays a role in news presentation, not just selection, is key in this study. Whereas White’s (1950) study and others focused on story selection, Donohue, Tichenor, and Olien (1972) broadened information gatekeeping to include “selection, shaping, display, timing, withholding, or repetition of entire messages or message components” (p. 43). Shoemaker (1991) argued that items that made it through the gate often had a strong positive force, which meant they were likely to be packaged attractively, get good placement, and be repeated. Stories with negative forces that still progressed through the gate were more likely to have “unfavorable shaping, display, timing,” or repetition (p. 25). The problem with focusing on selection alone, Reese and Ballinger (2001) said, was that the in-or-out decision ignored the effect of framing messages. Time and space constrain the structure, or framing, of a story, and these routine factors can act as gatekeeping forces.

Framing. The pieces of information included in a story, their position in the story, pictures, infographics, or anything that contributes to content can have framing effects. A “frame organizes everyday reality,” Tuchman (1978, p. 193) said, and it makes sense of
events that would otherwise have no context for many people. Reese (2001) defined it by including the “interests, communicators, sources, and culture” that combine to create an understanding of the world, which a person develops from all available “verbal and visual symbolic resources” (p. 11). This suggests that every piece of information included in a story compounds to create a different picture of an issue or event than if the newspaper had included different pieces of information. Even if all of the same pieces are included in two different presentations, the way they are structured affects the way a reader processes the news (Reese, 2001).

Pavlik (2001) suggested that the Web, with its hypermedia and multimedia capabilities, presents many framing possibilities that differ from traditional media. Hypermedia, or the ability to link among online objects, provides “additional background, detail and, most importantly, context” (p. 316), and layering multimedia elements, such as audio and video files, can give extra content to many elements of a given story. Pavlik did not discount the role of the journalist as gatekeeper of information related to a story, but he said the role of the journalist online “emphasizes inclusiveness of perspectives much more than in traditional journalism” (p. 319). “Perspectives” for stories might include source documents, transcripts and recordings of sources’ views, links to past stories on the issues, links directly to source information online, or other such items that might have been merely a reference for the journalist’s synthesis for traditional media.

*Television gatekeeping.* Scholars applied gatekeeping theory to print media for years, then to radio (Bass, 1969), and finally to television news. Seeing how scholars adapted the theory among media provides interesting context in a time when researchers
examine whether gatekeeping works on the Internet. The question of local focus was the most important factor for both newspaper and television gatekeepers in a study by Abbott and Brassfield (1989), but television gatekeepers were more likely to worry about timeliness than newspaper editors and usually weighed visual storytelling criteria more heavily. Berkowitz (1990) echoed this finding and said television gatekeeping was very much a group process rather than an individual one. Harmon (1989) found that traditional news values applied to local television news, but even though stations were capable of enterprise reporting, their role more often was “that of a repackager of news” (p. 861). The focus shifted to production and technological capability. The study did not address the quality of the content, but Livingston and Bennett (2003) said they could make “no guarantees that technologies will not be used simply as glitz factors” (p. 364).

**Online gatekeeping.** Researchers have questioned the viability of gatekeeping theory in the new media era because of the vast amount of information available from so many sources, and most studies have concluded that journalists’ role in information gatekeeping is not dying but evolving (Blake, 2004; Cassidy, 2002; Singer, 2001; Singer, 2005). This concern about shifting roles seems to point more strongly at potential changes in agenda setting and agenda building, however. Williams and Delli Carpini (2004) heralded the “collapse of gatekeeping” (p. 1208), going against the tide who speak of a gatekeeping evolution. The researchers argued that mainstream media—which they viewed as a monolithic group rather than many individual gates—no longer have control of story selection because they must follow as a pack stories that come to public knowledge through alternative media, an issue that Wigley (2004) also discussed. Bill Clinton became a case study for the researchers; Williams and Delli Carpini said that a
tabloid first reported the allegations by Gennifer Flowers, that a trade magazine first wrote about Paula Jones, and that the Drudge Report broke the story about Monica Lewinsky. These three situations persuaded Williams and Delli Carpini that “mainstream journalism [had] lost its position as the central gatekeeper of the nation’s political agenda” in a six-year period (p. 1225). From a broader view of gatekeeping, however, it seems that as long as journalists are selecting some content and rejecting other items, they have a gatekeeping role even in a media environment with more choices for the audience.

The audience is of greater concern to Webmasters than to print gatekeepers, though, Beard and Olsen (1999) found. They studied Webmasters of college and university sites and found that the Webmasters’ previous work experience affected their focus or main goal—such as editing, design, or communication—in managing the site. These online gatekeepers also faced constraints consistent with those mentioned in earlier gatekeeping research, such as inadequate resources, heavy workloads, degree of autonomy, and sharing gatekeeping responsibilities. Beard and Olsen said these constraints, particularly large amounts of work, created a gatekeeping role limited to “selecting and processing existing messages” (p. 207) rather than creating news ones. Overall, the researchers’ qualitative study of eight Webmasters concluded that these people had many of the same responsibilities, values, and constraints as traditional gatekeepers.

Several researchers have compared print and online editions to examine gatekeeping effects (Blake, 2004; Singer, 2001). Singer’s sample of six Colorado newspapers showed that “despite the unlimited news hold available online, editors of
Web products were whittling down the print package for online distribution” (p. 71); the study found more than twice as many stories in the print editions than the papers posted online. Stories online typically were identical or had minor changes to the print versions, and although 48% of the print stories ran with some art, only about 18% of stories had art online. The study revealed no daily news content made just for the site, but it showed that a greater proportion of online stories were about the paper’s metropolitan area than the amount in print editions. Of the news, sports, and business stories coded, about 45% of online stories were metro items, and about 31% of print stories in the sample were metro items. Singer concluded that the Web, with its global potential, was becoming a local niche for online newspapers. A number of constraints that could be considered routine or organizational factors in the Shoemaker and Reese (1996) scheme were listed. Most of the papers in the sample had few online staff members, and locally written stories represented content that the organization already had paid for by employing its reporters and editors. The newspapers would have had to pay more money to find or create additional content. Singer observed that journalists had a “seeming willingness to abandon their traditional gatekeeping responsibilities,” (p. 78), which she said might be because they faced organizational constraints, reordered priorities, or recognized the high level of personalization the Web offers its users.

The contention that the “Internet blows open the whole notion of a ‘gate’” remains in Singer’s (2005, p. 3) work, but she argued that journalists give credibility to information online and therefore retain a gatekeeping role online. The study targeted editors of online political content at some of the country’s largest newspapers during the 2004 presidential campaign, and 47 responded. Most content originated in the print
medium, but Singer found journalists increasingly likely to enhance the original content. Three ways that journalists stepped back from traditional gatekeeping roles included the ability for users to personalize content, the presence of chats, message boards, or discussion forums, and the addition of blogs—online journals. The first two methods gave a great deal of freedom to users, and the last allowed journalists or local opinion leaders to analyze politics. These results indicate that journalists may see their gatekeeping role as a responsibility to offer tools for analysis and interact with readers. Singer said this interaction could save professional journalists from online irrelevancy. The interaction and vetting of information provides an even more valuable gatekeeping role in “today’s rowdy, unbounded information environment” (p. 24).

Blake (2004) said gatekeeping was a valid construct for evaluating different media with common content ownership. Rather than saying journalists abandoned gatekeeping roles online, Blake suggested that at least one gate existed to select news to appear online because his study of two papers found one that focused its content on global and national issues and one that, like Singer (2001) found, focused its content on local and state issues. In both cases, however, stories appearing online were more likely to have been written by a staff member than some other source. Blake searched online for all stories appearing in the front and local sections of the newspapers and found about 78% on the Web—a higher percentage but an even smaller sample than Singer’s—but almost all of the stories that had photographs in the print edition lacked them online.

For the most part, researchers agree that online gatekeeping is important but evolving. Many have concluded that quantity is not quality, as Arant and Anderson (2000) said: “If a news organization simply publishes everything it can get its hands on in
its bottomless online news hole, is it covering an issue in a way that best serves its audience?” (¶5). Organizational constrains might make that much content impossible to manage, but research has shown a variety of trends in online newspapers.

Trends in online newspapers

Several studies have suggested that online newspapers are complementary to print editions, not competitive. People who go online to seek out information about politics, sports, business, science, international affairs, local news, and entertainment news are likely to continue to read about those niche interests in traditional media (Dutta-Bergman, 2004). Dutta-Bergman used survey data from more than 3,000 individuals and concluded that new media news is complementary to traditional media and that “content … is the critical ingredient in media choice” (p. 58). Chyi and Lasorsa (2002) and Zaharopoulos (2003) also found that readers used both print and online editions of the same newspaper, making them complementary.

However, the State of the News Media 2005 survey by the Project for Excellence in Journalism indicated that online news is beginning to cannibalize traditional media forms and that online news is likely to draw even more users away from newspapers in the future because Web users are far younger than newspaper readers. The same study shows that the percentage of regular users of online news was up to 29% in 2004 from 23% in 2000. This growth would be enhanced more dramatically if newspapers would add more original content to the Web product, said Peng et al. (1999), adding that the result would be cost-effective operations. In many cases, though, newspapers have posted nothing more than what appears in their print editions to their Web sites (Gubman &

**Shovelware.** The derisive term “shovelware” describes print content shoveled up to dump online wholesale, without alteration. Studies have found that many newspapers post about one-quarter to just over half of the content they produce for their print editions (Arant & Anderson, 2000; Neuberger et al., 1998; Saksena & Hollifield, 2002). Neuberger et al. said a strong orientation toward print content could be both a good and bad thing: if readers base their expectations of the online product on the print edition they are used to, then shovelware and similar organization can benefit a site. However, too much faithfulness to the print original means that unique Web opportunities go untapped.

Content may receive a variety of treatments online, but Weiss (2004) found that 65% of stories added to newspapers’ home pages had no contextual features added. Her content analysis of 20 newspaper Web sites looked at stories to see whether contextual features such as photos, related stories, section additions, hyperlinks, polls, forums, blogs, slideshows, video, audio, or maps had been uploaded to the site as well.

Many stories are placed online with few modifications from the print version (Martin, 1998). A case study of two newspapers showed that online staff members sometimes wrote new headlines to fit their space requirements and often had to modify photographs from the print versions in order to fit the online templates, similar to Singer’s (2001) findings. Martin said online staff members identified their primary job function as selecting and reformatting existing content, not creating new content or enhancing it.
Online staff members of other sites have said their sites have original content, but it is not in daily news sections (Neuberger et al., 1998; Tankard & Ban, 1998). About three-quarters of 135 online newspapers reported posting content not in the print edition, but the content usually included evergreen features and community services, such as dining guides, tourism information, regional information, and some special project stories. In general, research shows that many newspaper Web sites are posting stories without significant editing or additions to their Web sites, and many have questioned whether that hurts the newspaper in the long run by creating a competitor and whether it ignores some of the Internet’s technical possibilities. Not all online editors thought any kind of changes had to occur: “Good print copy makes for good online copy,” one said in a survey by Arant and Anderson (2000). This kind of edition-blind evaluation to justify shovelware overlooks some of the documented differences about the way users process information on a monitor versus on paper (Poynter Institute, 2004).

*Interactivity and multimedia use.* Interactivity has been called the Internet’s outstanding characteristic (Morris, 2001), but researchers have found mixed results about its use on newspaper Web sites. Lowrey (2003) performed a census of Mississippi newspapers online and created a “degree of site interactivity” variable by totaling occurrences of interactive features on the 48 sites. Lowrey found a mean 3.67 occurrences of e-mail links from stories, list of staff e-mails, e-mail links to Webmasters, other contact information, reader comments posted from stories, chat rooms, bulletin boards, ability to e-mail stories to others, polls, search functions, and hyperlinks to supplemental information. The data suggested that larger newspapers’ sites are more
likely to be interactive, a finding echoed about many features unique to the Web (Greer & Mensing, 2004; Tankard & Ban, 1998; Weiss, 2004; Zaharopoulos, 2003).

Some scholars also consider multimedia applications to have interactive properties, and its use also has been examined on newspaper sites. A multimedia presentation may use audio, video, graphics, or other methods to give users a more complete picture of a story. From a different perspective, Sundar (2000) called “multimedia” a misleading term because it doesn’t refer to multiple media but multiple senses involved in processing a message or multiple channels used to transmit it. The multiple channels might include animation, audio, video (Gubman & Greer, 1997), or pictures (Sundar, 2000). Multimedia gives readers the sense that they can control how they experience a story, and it might also cause them to rate a site as more professional (Sundar, 2000). The sensory experience provided by the Internet is similar to the television, which provides visual and auditory stimulation (Welch, 2004). The findings of Sundar’s experiment, though, suggest that multimedia applications actually hinder memory for story content.

Gubman and Greer (1997) defined multimedia as animation, audio, and video, and their content analysis found only 12 sites using any of those in news sections of 83 online newspapers, and Massey (2000) found it even more rare. He dropped analysis of multimedia in analysis of Asian news sites because he found no occurrence of any applications. Kamerer and Bressers (1998) found few uses of audio and video and suggested that the technological limitations of Web access still made these features impractical because of long loading times and inconsistent buffering.
Advances in time and technology may have shifted the picture about multimedia use. Dibean and Garrison (2001) found 30 percent of site pages for six newspapers offering video in 1999 and 27 percent offering audio. The sample distribution—two small circulation, two mid-sized, and two large circulation newspapers—probably skewed these findings, though, since Schultz (1999) found that larger newspapers were more likely to offer multimedia applications. Greer and Mensing (2004) performed a longitudinal analysis of more than 80 online newspapers, beginning with the data collected in the Gubman and Greer (1997) study. Only a handful were using audio and video content in 1997, but nearly half were doing so by 2003. A great deal of this increase was in the amount of multimedia—audio, video, or animation—used in news stories; in the early years of the study, most multimedia use was in advertisements.

Schultz (1999) described multimedia and interactivity as separate spheres, but the presence of one on a news site often means the site is likely to use the other to tell stories. Schultz found 16% of newspaper sites using multimedia applications, as well as a correlation between that group and the use of interactive functions, which he operationalized as the presence of discussion forums. Of sites that used multimedia applications, 69% had forums, and only 26% who lacked multimedia on their sites hosted forums. Schultz also created an index of interactive options by counting general e-mail addresses, e-mail links from particular stories, e-mail links to politicians and officials, discussion forums, chat rooms, polls, and online letters to the editor. Online newspapers with multimedia had a mean score of 5.88 on the index, whereas others had an average of 3.74. The difference was statistically significant.
Another study counted streaming video, streaming audio, photos, animated graphics, static graphics, slideshows, and photo galleries as multimedia components, and Welch (2004) found news Web sites using all of them except animated graphics. Photos were by far the most frequently used multimedia component. Welch also found sites using interactive elements including polls and surveys, discussion forums, quizzes, search tools, e-mail capability, related Web links, feedback forms, and several other tools. The ability to e-mail articles to others and the provision of related Web links were the most frequently used interactive tools.

Local news online

Newspapers divide their pages into sections to comply with press constraints, and these divisions often fall by types of content; the front section contains national and international news, another section contains local news, and still others might include sports, business, and features. All sections are likely to include a mix of staff-written and wire stories. The paper’s Web site might contain these types of stories in a structure and organization that mimics the newspaper, but several studies indicate that local news is handled differently on the Web than it is in print editions.

Local news is one of the most common types of information on newspaper sites, Greer and Mensing (2004) found; 95% of 81 online newspapers sampled included it in 2003, up slightly from about 90% when the longitudinal study was first begun in 1997. Zaharopoulos (2003) found most of the stories posted on newspaper sites’ home pages to be local news stories, and several editors reported that they publish all or most of their paper’s locally written stories online (Arant & Anderson, 2000). Martin’s (1998) case study found that the Raleigh News & Observer could post only stories written by its
reporters about local or state news. This preference for local stories also emerged in other studies, such as one by Chyi and Sylvie (2001). Their survey revealed that more users of online newspapers are local rather than long-distance and that the local audience was precisely the one newspapers aimed for.

Blake (2004) examined gatekeeping between print and online editions of newspapers and concluded that “the ‘gate’ from the print to the online format is primarily a geographic filter that allows much local and state content to appear while serving as a barrier to less-local news being redistributed online” (Discussion section, ¶6). More state and metropolitan stories were available online than initially expected at the larger newspaper, and this paper also showed a strong preference for staff-written content over stories from other sources. Blake found the smaller paper had more global and national stories than expected, and although it selected more non-staff articles for its Web site than locally written articles, the site relied on non-staff content less heavily than the print edition. The study showed that newspaper sites consistently chose content based on geography—whether locally or non-locally oriented.

Singer (2001) found a significant difference between the percentage of metro stories in online editions and print editions. In the sample of six Colorado papers representing a variety of circulation sizes, about 45% of all stories online were metro stories, and just 31% percent of all print items were metro stories. The differences were particularly sharp between the two mid-sized papers represented; the Colorado Springs Gazette had about 34% metro stories in print and about 55% online, and the Pueblo Chieftain had about 28% metro stories in print and nearly 68% online. Singer pointed out that nearly 79% of stories that appeared in print only were from outside each paper’s
circulation area. The affiliation of reporters for the stories in both print and online editions shows a split even more dramatic than the local percentages: staff writers wrote or contributed to 59% of stories on the Web sites, and they wrote just under 36% of the stories in the print sample.

The inclusion of photography and other artwork was another part of the Colorado study because Singer (2001) said “a photograph or infographic tells a story in its own right and is worth inclusion in any discussion of the relative emphasis given to particular types of newspaper content” (p. 76). Broadening the discussion about content to the components that make up a message allows consideration of gatekeeping from more than the selection point of view. Singer found a significant difference between the art used in print and online. The term “art” had broad application in Singer’s study; this category included not only photographs, but infographics and logos, as well. Out of more than 3,400 stories in the print sample, 48% had some form of art, whether it was a simple identifying graphic or multi-photo package. The online sample had nearly 1,400 stories, and just 18% of those had an art element either in the story, on the home page menu, or as standalone art.

If location is indeed a gate for stories between print and online editions, it seems worthwhile to examine whether it applies for more than story selection. Donohue, Tichenor, and Olien (1972) included shaping, display, withholding, or repetition of message components in their definition of information gatekeeping, and these elements can be compared between local and non-local stories in print and online editions. The contextual elements that support and run alongside the text of a story in print and online formats are the focus of this study. Several studies (Blake, 2004; Singer, 2001) have
compared print and online newspapers, but they focused on story selection. This study focuses not on selection, but on content presentation.

\textit{RQ1: Does story content differ between print and Web versions of daily stories?}

\textit{RQ2: Do contextual elements differ between print and Web versions of daily stories?}

\textit{RQ3: Is there a difference in the amount of contextual elements published with stories by staff reporters and stories from other sources?}

\textit{RQ4: Is there a difference in the amount of contextual elements published with stories focused on local issues compared with stories about state, national, or international issues?}
Chapter 3: Method

This study compared print and Web versions of stories through a content analysis of stories appearing on the front pages and metro section front pages of five newspapers. The first two research questions—Do content and contextual elements differ between print and Web versions of daily stories?—required the comparison of stories that appeared in both editions. The researcher chose to analyze stories on section front pages to combat previous findings that newspapers post to the Web only some of their stories published in print (Peng et al., 1999; Regan, 1995; Singer, 2001). Using both the front page, which carries international and national news as well as important local stories, and the metro section front page, which focuses on local news by definition, allowed examination of the final two research questions: Is there a difference in the amount of contextual elements published with staff-written stories and stories about the metropolitan area compared with stories by other sources and about other geographic areas? Studying both the print and online editions not only allowed comparison of content standards between the two types of media but also whether each medium alone treated local stories differently than national and international ones.

The papers selected for this study have the highest circulation numbers—all greater than 425,000 on Sundays—of papers in the southern United States. These papers are the *Houston Chronicle*, the *Dallas Morning News*, the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, the *St. Petersburg Times*, and the *Miami Herald*. All have circulation numbers placing them in the top 25 largest newspapers in the nation, according the Audit Bureau of
Circulations (2005a), except for the *Dallas Morning News*, which is under censure by the agency (Audit Bureau of Circulations, 2005c).

The bureau censured the Dallas paper in July 2004 for misreporting its circulation figures (Audit Bureau of Circulations, 2005c), and as a consequence, the *Morning News* was excluded from such lists while it underwent audits every six months for two years (Audit Bureau of Circulations, 2004, 2005b). However, the bureau’s most recent audit placed the Sunday circulation of the *Dallas Morning News* at 655,809, a figure second in the list of southern publications only to the circulation of the *Houston Chronicle* (Audit Bureau of Circulations, 2005a, 2005c).

The *Houston Chronicle* is a Hearst-owned newspaper in Texas with Sunday circulation of 720,711, according to the Audit Bureau of Circulations (2005a). It has a partnership agreement with KHOU that allows the *Chronicle* to use the television station’s video on its Web site (American Press Institute, 2005), and its Web address is www.chron.com. Like the *Chronicle*, each newspaper site was unique to the publication and not shared with any partners in a portal format.


The *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* in Georgia has a Sunday circulation of 610,338 and is owned by Cox Newspapers. The newspaper does not have any convergence partnerships, and its Web address is www.ajc.com.
The *St. Petersburg Times* in Florida has a Sunday circulation of 432,231 and is owned by the Times Publishing Co. The paper has a cross-promotional relationship with television station WTSP (American Press Institute, 2005), and its Web address is www.sptimes.com.

Knight-Ridder owns the *Miami Herald* in Florida; the paper has a Sunday circulation of 429,697. The *Herald*’s partnership with a television station, radio station, and cable television station provide the newspaper with additional video and audio components for its Web site (American Press Institute, 2005). The paper’s Web address is www.miami.com.

Several studies (Schultz, 1999; Greer & Mensing, 2004) have found that larger newspapers have more sophisticated Web sites that include more photos and multimedia elements than papers with smaller circulations. Looking only at large newspapers in this study limits potential differences between sites of papers that have varying resources based on their circulation sizes. The papers are all major metropolitan dailies from one quadrant of the country.

Constructed week sampling was used for the content analysis because this method has produced more reliable results than random sampling and consecutive days (Jones & Carter, 1959; Riffe, Aust, & Lacy, 1993; Stempel, 1952). This type of sampling creates a composite week over a period of time so that each day of the week is represented, but the selection of that day is random. This method prevents oversampling of days with unusually large newspapers, such as Sundays, which can happen with random sampling. Constructed weeks are superior to consecutive weeks because the results are easier to generalize over time (Riffe et al., 1993; Wimmer & Dominick, 2003). For this study, the
researcher created two composite weeks from the days between September 18, 2005, and October 15, 2005, a period devoid of major holidays or other planned and nationally significant events. The researcher took the four Sundays that occurred in the month and randomly selected two of them. The process was repeated for the other six days of the week, for a total of 14 days that included each day of the week twice. Both Stempel (1952) and Riffe et al. (1993) said precision increases only slightly with sample size in newspaper content analysis, and the faint margin of improvement is often not enough to outweigh the extra resources required to double or triple a sample.

Content analysis online has special challenges because of the fleeting nature of content on the Web and because the structure of Web pages can defy analysis strategies used with traditional media (McMillan, 2000). McMillan concluded that content analysis is perfectly valid to apply “to the moving target of the Web” (p. 93). Weiss (2004) suggested that researchers continue to explore the use and standards of online content analysis. Singer (2001) warned that the Web “can be a bear” for researchers using content analysis, a “method whose reliability and thus credibility rest primarily on the fact that the content is stable and the classification is reproducible” (p. 70). This cautionary note is particularly true for online newspapers; their news content is updated at least daily, if not more often. Even if researchers take screen snapshots of Web pages, they often have a few hours—or, at best, a few days—to examine the content in the context of the site before it disappears forever. These factors make careful coding of online content a priority because it often cannot be replicated.

Individual stories were the unit of analysis in this study. The content analysis was carried out based on the stories on the print editions’ front pages and metro section front
pages of the five newspapers in the sample. The bias toward print content was necessary in this study from a gatekeeping point of view. Blake (2004) made a similar decision because online-only content never passed through a print gate before its publication to the Web. This study looked for differences between print and online versions of stories, which meant that stories had to be in both editions; the researcher used the print editions to form a directory of stories to find online “because the print paper almost always serves as the content provider for the online edition” (Chyi & Lasorsa, 2002). Newspapers have judged stories on the front page and front of the metro section to be the most relevant, newsworthy items for their readers that day. Stories inside the two sections and in other sections of the print edition were excluded in both the print and online analyses.

For each newspaper each day, the researcher examined stories on the front and metro front pages and the corresponding stories in real time online (see Appendix A). The final step was to compare the two versions. Print stories were coded for newspaper; reporter’s affiliation, which could include staff, wire or news service, contributor, unknown, or some combination of those that might be noted in a story’s byline or footer; geographic emphasis—international, national, state, or metro; and elements accompanying the story. The elements could include photos, sidebars, infoboxes, infographics, artwork, refers to additional content in print or online, pull quotes, and pull outs of portions of the story (see Appendix B).

The researcher began online data collection each day at 11 a.m. beginning with the Houston Chronicle and moving to the smallest paper, usually completed by 2 p.m. Collecting the stories online at the same time each day avoided potential problems with any updating deadlines each site met each day. The researcher visually scanned home
pages for each newspaper and the top pages of major news sections to look for the day’s stories online. If the visual search turned up nothing, the researcher used the online search function to look for the headline. If both search methods failed, the story was classified as print only. Once the story was found online, the researcher coded whether it was the same version of the story that had run in print, whether it had the same headline, and what elements accompanied the story. Like the print edition, this could include photos and infoboxes, but it also might include features unique to the Web: video, audio, source documents, polls, quizzes, animated graphics, static graphics, slideshows, photo galleries, related story links, related Web links, and live chats (Welch, 2004; Weiss, 2004). Discussion forums and blogs were counted only if they focused on the story in question and did not serve as an interactive tool for the whole section or site (see Appendix C).

After looking at the print and online versions of the stories separately, the researcher put them side-by-side to compare leads and contextual elements. The researcher noted whether the first paragraph of each story was the same or different in its two versions and compared whether any contextual elements were repeated in both editions. Elements that could overlap editions included photos, sidebars, infographics, infoboxes, artwork, refers, pull quotes, and pull outs.

The researcher coded all 14 days of content for analysis. However, two additional coders examined two days worth of data, or about 14% of the total sample, in order to determine the reliability of the data. The additional coders analyzed the print editions of the newspapers and screen shots of the online versions of stories collected by the researcher because the stories’ pages were no longer current when the additional coders evaluated the material.
The statistical program SPSS, version 13.0, was used for data analysis. Most of the data in this study was collected at the nominal level, so a great deal of the analysis consisted of frequency calculations and chi-square measures of significance. However, some questions about data collected at the ratio level were best answered by parametric statistics, including $t$-tests and ANOVA.

To establish a measure of reliability for the content analysis, two additional coders evaluated a portion of the data. The researcher coded all 14 days of newspapers, and the additional coders both evaluated the first two days of the sample. The additional coders used regular print editions of each newspaper coded, but they had to use screen shots of each story online rather than seeing it on a live Web site. They were able to see what each story looked like on the day it was posted, but they could not follow links or make any Web features active.

The first two days of the sample included 88 stories, of which all coders entered data on 83 stories, or 13% of the entire sample of 635 stories. Intercoder reliability was measured on the print element variable because of the large amount of data included in it. Holsti’s formula produced a reliability coefficient of .85 with Coder 1 and .90 with Coder 2. Holsti’s formula is two times the number of cases on which coders agree divided by total number of coding decisions. Although the formula has been criticized for failing to account for the role of chance in coder agreement (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003), Neuendorf (2002) said a Holsti’s reliability coefficient of .90 or greater is almost always acceptable, and that a coefficient of .80 or greater is acceptable in most situations.
Chapter 4: Results

The 14-day sample yielded 635 stories on the front and metro section front pages of the five newspapers, and versions of 612 of the stories, or 96.4% of the total sample, also appeared on the newspapers’ Web sites. The number of print stories was distributed evenly across the newspapers, as shown in Table 1, and nearly equal numbers of stories appeared on the front pages of both sections: 49.1% (n=312) on the front page and 50.9% (n=323) on the metro section front page.

Table 1. Distribution of stories by newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston Chronicle</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Morning News</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Journal-Constitution</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg Times</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Herald</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>635</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RQ1*. The first research question asked whether story content differed between print and online versions of stories. The operational measure for this question was a comparison of a story’s lead between its print and online versions. Of the 612 stories that appeared both in print and online, 96.1% had the same lead word-for-word in both media, a significant finding, according to a chi-square goodness-of-fit test, $\chi^2(1, N=612)=519.77, p < .001$. Chi-square goodness-of-fit test compares observed frequencies to expected frequencies, determining whether distribution among categories is significant, or likely to have occurred by chance (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003).
The remaining stories had differences in the first paragraph that could have included rewriting, updating, or using a different version of a story. A small percentage of stories differed in content between media. Although the text of stories was substantially the same in all but a few cases, a larger percentage ran under different headlines in print and online. Stories online had different headlines than their print versions 24% (n=147) of the time. A chi-square goodness-of-fit test also indicated this finding to be significant, $X^2(1, N=612) = 165.24, p < .001$.

**RQ2.** The second research question asked whether contextual elements differed between the two media. Of the 612 stories that appeared both in print and online, 335 stories had contextual elements in both media. In 203 of those cases, or 32% of the entire sample, the stories shared at least one element between media, whether it was a picture, infobox, infographic, or other contextual element. The remaining 132 stories (20.8%) had unique elements in each medium, whether it was a different photo or other traditional element or the use of online-only elements that newspapers could not reproduce in print. A chi-square goodness-of-fit test indicated that the results were significant, $X^2(2, N=612) = 51.54, p < .001$.

**Table 2. Comparison of contextual elements between print and online stories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element comparison</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one version lacking contextual elements</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one contextual element in common</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All contextual elements different</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story not online</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $X^2(2, N=612) = 51.54, p < .001$
Of the 32% of stories that had elements in common between versions, five of eight types of elements were repeated between versions. Table 3 breaks down the number of contextual elements that stories had in common between print and online editions. Because some stories had more than one element in common, percentages do not add up to 100% across elements.

Table 3. Elements in common between print and online stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Number per story</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>2068.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story not online</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infobox</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>703.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story not online</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infographic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>553.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story not online</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>580.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story not online</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidebar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>600.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story not online</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .001$
Three of eight print elements never were in common with online elements: artwork, pull quotes, and pull outs. These elements also were not among the most frequently used in print editions; photos and infoboxes were the most common contextual elements with print stories. More than 85% (n=545) of stories in the sample had at least one contextual element in print, which is a significant finding, according to a chi-square goodness-of-fit test, $X^2(1, N=635) = 326.02, p > .001$.

Table 4 shows the eight categories of contextual elements for print and shows how often one or more examples of each kind of element appeared in print stories.

Table 4. Number of stories with types of print elements present (n=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infobox</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infographic</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidebar</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull quote</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull out</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Some stories had multiple types of elements, so table does not total 100%.
* $p > .001$  

Fewer stories online had contextual elements; 58% (n=355) of the 612 stories online had one or more contextual elements. Table 4 shows the 17 categories of contextual elements for online stories and shows how often one or more examples of a particular kind of element appeared with a story.
Table 5. Number of stories with types of online elements present (n=612)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Web links</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infobox</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related story links</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo gallery</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static graphic</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive graphic</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poll</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion forum</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live chat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slideshow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Some stories had multiple kinds of elements, so table does not total 100%.
* p > .001

The number of contextual elements with each story in print was related to the story’s section. An independent groups t-test, which compares the means of two unrelated groups (Weaver, 1989), revealed that a greater number of contextual elements appeared with front-page stories (M=2.82, SD=2.23) than with metro section stories (M=1.60, SD=1.39), t (df)=633, p < .001. The same trend held true for elements that ran in both print and online versions of a story. A greater number of common contextual elements ran in print and online with stories that ran on the print front page (M=0.48, SD=0.73) than with stories that ran on the print metro section (M=0.36, SD=0.68), t (df)=610, p = .034. Front-page placement made it more likely for a story to have a greater number of contextual elements.
More print stories have contextual elements than the same stories online. Slightly more than half (58%) of the stories had elements in both media, and about a third of the stories repeated the same elements in both print and online versions. Although the response to RQ2 does not provide overwhelming support, the results showed that a fair portion of stories offered unique features in both media.

RQ3. The third research question asked whether the amount of contextual elements published with stories by staff writers differed from stories by other sources. Overall, data analysis did not reveal any significant relationships between reporter affiliation and the amount of contextual elements published with the reporter’s story. Stories written by staff members alone far outnumbered stories from any other source, as Tables 6 and 7 show. When stories where staff writers collaborated with other sources are also considered, more than 90% of stories on the front and metro section front pages carried the reporting of a staff writer, but the distinctions were necessary because in a number of cases, a staff contribution to a story seemed to amount to a few sentences or paragraphs inserted to localize a story from another source.

One-way analysis of variance compares three or more means at a time involving one independent variable (Weaver, 1989), and the researcher used this test to evaluate the mean frequency of contextual elements by seven categories of reporter affiliation in print stories, which are shown in Table 5. ANOVA showed no significant relationship between print reporter affiliation and frequency of print elements, $F(6, 628) = 1.54, p = 0.162$. 
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Table 6. Print reporter affiliation and mean print elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporter affiliation</th>
<th>Print story frequency</th>
<th>Print story percentage*</th>
<th>Mean elements per story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; wire</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; contributor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $X^2(6, N=635) = 2677.98, p < .001$

ANOVA also showed no significant relationship between online reporter affiliation and frequency of online photos, $F(6, 605) = 1.04, p = 0.396$, or frequency of online infoboxes, $F(6, 605) = 0.69, p = 0.657$, shown in Table 6.

Table 7. Online reporter affiliation and mean frequency of photos and infoboxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporter affiliation</th>
<th>Online story frequency</th>
<th>Online story percentage*</th>
<th>Mean photos per story</th>
<th>Mean infoboxes per story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; wire</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; contributor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $X^2(6, N=612) = 2588.10, p < .001$

The data also allowed analysis of the types of contextual elements with each story; no print story had more than six of eight types of elements, and no online story had more than nine of 17 types of elements. The mean number of types of elements per story...
(see Table 8) also had no significant relationship with print reporter affiliation, $F(6, 628) = 0.970, p = 0.444$, or online reporter affiliation, $F(6, 605) = 0.576, p = 0.750$.

Table 8. Online reporter affiliation and mean types of elements represented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporter affiliation</th>
<th>Print story frequency</th>
<th>Mean types of print elements</th>
<th>Online story frequency</th>
<th>Mean types of online elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; wire</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; contributor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$RQ4$. The fourth research question asked whether the amount of contextual elements published with stories about metro-area news differed from stories about other geographic areas. Stories about each newspaper’s metro area had the lowest mean number of contextual elements in print, as Table 9 shows, and ANOVA revealed a significant difference in the means, $F(3, 631) = 2.86, p = .036$. 
Table 9. Story geographic emphasis and mean frequency of print elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic focal area</th>
<th>Print story frequency</th>
<th>Percentage* of print stories</th>
<th>Mean elements per story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $X^2(3, N=635) = 320.71, p < .001$

Although newspapers published more stories about the metro area than all other geographic emphases combined, those stories had fewer contextual elements with them than any of the other categories. Stories about other geographic areas also tended to incorporate a slightly more diverse mix of contextual elements, as displayed in Table 9. ANOVA showed that metro stories in print have a mean of 1.38 types of contextual elements out of eight, below a total mean of 1.48, $F(3, 631) = 5.812, p = .001$. As with the mean in print features, the mean of types of online features that ran with metro stories fell in third place among the four geographic areas. The ANOVA was significant, $F(3, 608) = 3.666, p = .012$.

Table 10. Story geographic emphasis and mean types of elements represented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic focal area</th>
<th>Print story frequency</th>
<th>Mean types of print elements</th>
<th>Online story frequency</th>
<th>Mean types of online elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data indicated that stories with a geographic emphasis on the metro area have fewer contextual elements than stories with other geographic emphases in print. Although the mean number of photos with online stories about the metro area is slightly higher (0.29) than the mean number of photos online for all geographic emphases (0.28), the difference is not significant, ANOVA revealed, $F(3, 608) = 1.555, p = .199$. The mean number of infoboxes with online stories about the metro area (0.20) was lower than the mean for any other geographic emphasis and therefore below the overall mean (0.23). However, ANOVA showed that differences in the mean number of infoboxes in each geographical category was not significant, $F(3, 608) = 1.191, p = .312$. International stories have a higher mean number of contextual elements in print and online than stories with other geographic emphases, but the differences were not significant.
Chapter 5: Conclusion

This study set out to examine the ways newspapers and their Web sites distribute and display news, and the results showed different standards for print content and contextual elements. First of all, nearly all of the stories that appeared on the two section front pages examined also appeared online. Previous studies (Blake, 2004; Singer, 2001) that have examined all news stories in a newspaper and on its Web site reported half to three-quarters of stories in print also appearing on the newspaper’s Web site. This study has no basis for reporting such a percentage for all stories in an issue, but it did reveal that more than 96% of stories on the front page and metro section front page also appear on the Web.

This comparison with past findings would seem to indicate that placement on one of these section front pages in print could create a positive force for a story, making it easier for it to move past online gatekeepers and gatekeeping routines. Competition for front-page story slots is among the fiercest fights for space at any given newspaper, and when a story makes it through the gate, it means it is more likely to receive attractive packaging, good placement, or repetition (Shoemaker, 1991). The finding about the consistent inclusion of stories from the two news sections opens the door for future study about story placement and its selection across media.

Moving beyond story selection, the data suggested that story text may not face additional gatekeeping processes between publication and posting of editions; only 4% of stories in the sample had different leads between media. In traditional inverted-pyramid
style news writing, the lead is the place in the story that contains the most important information, which is often the most forward-looking. Therefore, it is a likely place to look for the most updated information in a story. Only a handful of stories offered different content across media as measured by the lead. Once newspapers publish stories, that is the way the stories stay in most cases, regardless of the limitless opportunities for updated information online.

However, this finding also may not mean that newspaper Web sites offer only old news. Some stories that were posted online the same way they ran in print had updated versions elsewhere on the site. For instance, several newspapers in the sample posted online the print version of a story about a tour boat capsizing in New York, almost as if the Web site were running the print version for the sake of record. However, if users went to site sections that provided continuously updated wire news, they would find different versions of the story that might give fresh death tolls or details about the disaster.

The inclusion of contextual elements also provides the opportunity to examine the presentation aspect of gatekeeping. About a third of the entire sample had at least one contextual element in common across print and online media, and Shoemaker (1991) pointed to repetition as one sign that a story has a strong positive force to make it through a gate. The 32% figure is, by itself, neither good nor bad. On one hand, the figure could encourage those who have concluded that online newspapers do little but post the text of any given story and skip elements that might have to be resized or reformatted for digital display in order to get the elements, such as photos or infographics, ready to post online. On the other hand, some might be discouraged by the thought that so many stories are repeating elements from one medium to the next, possibly indicating that the newspapers
do not value the differences between platforms. Until journalists and users view Web sites as more than carriers for modified print content, they have little room to grow, some have argued (Lowrey, 1999).

Finding no relationship between reporter affiliation and contextual elements shakes the notion that staff-written stories are guaranteed better play or display simply because they are a unique commodity to the newspaper. It would be easy to assume that a staff reporter’s access could translate into more photos or other elements to give context to a story in any medium, but the average number of print contextual elements and online photos and infoboxes that ran with staff-written stories showed no significant variance from the mean.

A related thought about the use of contextual elements might assume that stories about the metro area would have more elements than stories about issues and events from greater distances away. In fact, stories about international news had the highest mean of contextual elements published with them both in print and online. Stories about the metro areas actually had fewer contextual elements in print on average than international, national, or state stories, and this difference was significant. Although the number of contextual elements with these stories was lower, more than half of the entire sample was made of stories focusing on the geographic metro area—54.6% in print and 52.8% online. This finding is disappointing. Many sources offer international and national news; a person in Florida can read different perspectives and reports of the same global news produced in Washington, New York, London, and Riyadh. The metropolitan newspaper may be one of only a few sources that offers local news, though. Enhanced international and national coverage make newspapers competitors with hundreds of other sources—
which may have more resources or more direct connections—rather than allowing them to serve a local niche.

In ignoring their local content, newspapers are missing the point online, and they are missing a powerful opportunity for competition. The growth of the online medium depends on competition because only by providing a desirable commodity that will attract an audience will online newspapers be able to attract advertisers. Advertising revenue provides the resources to pay staff to create enhanced news content online. Newspapers are caught in an online Catch-22: until they put some money into Web operations, things cannot change, and until newspapers change some of their content and delivery, hopes of making a profit on the medium seem dim. All the while, local content languishes.

*Limitations*

The period of study began about three weeks after Hurricane Katrina’s landfall in New Orleans, and hurricane clean-up and recovery stories still were receiving prominent play in newspapers across the country. However, Houston and Dallas were particularly large centers for evacuees, and their special coverage of the disaster could have affected the results of this study. For instance, both of these newspapers created a standing box of online features and links that was posted with each story about Hurricane Katrina on the Web sites. These standing boxes provided contextual content for the stories, but it was not unique; readers saw the same content with story after story, day after day.

The *Houston Chronicle* and *Dallas Morning News* did the same thing for Hurricane Rita, which directly affected three of the cities involved in this study during its first week. The storm struck a glancing blow to the Florida Keys, which are inside
Miami’s coverage area, and it came ashore near Houston on September 23, sweeping up
to cities near Dallas. Houston evacuated before the hurricane, which affected newspaper
production; during one day of the study, the Chronicle did not produce a traditional metro
section, choosing instead to focus all of its local content on hurricane preparation and put
that in the front section. The special coverage leading up to and following Hurricane Rita
seemed to affect the number of front-page stories produced and the amount of online
elements available.

The purposive sample of newspapers for this study assembled a more
homogenous group of papers in terms of size and location than would be expected in a
random sample of American newspapers and their Web sites. The results of this study
cannot be generalized to the entire population but create a snapshot of these newspapers.

Another limitation includes story duplication on the Web site of the Atlanta
Journal-Constitution. The newspaper provides a prominent link to its “print edition,”
where most of the stories that ran in the paper that day are posted by section. The stories
include some contextual elements like photos and infoboxes. However, visitors to other
sections of the site might find links to the same stories—that have different contextual
features than the first online story. Rather than having one version of a story linked to
from several places, the site architecture calls for at least two versions of many stories,
which could have created a coding nightmare. However, this study consistently sampled
only one set of stories, the ones under the “print edition” link. This assured consistent
sampling, but it could have been at the expense of unique Web features for that site.

That limitation points to another difficulty of online research: particular pages can
be difficult to find within a site. The design of this study called for extensive searching
for a story online before determining that it appeared in print only. There is the possibility that search efforts just did not turn up stories that did exist on the site. But if a researcher with determined intent could not find a story, the utility of the story to a casual browser must be questioned. In many cases, online newspaper sites are really quite a mess.

Several coding decisions complicated analysis of the data. With the exception of online photos and infoboxes, which were coded by frequency, other online elements simply were coded for presence or absence. Because of the great variety of types of online elements and the many ways they could be displayed or linked from stories, the researcher noted whether a type of element was present but not how many times it occurred with a story. This data could not be analyzed at the same level as information about contextual elements in print or in common between editions because these variables were measured at the ratio level. Most of the online elements were measured at the nominal level. Raising the coding level for the online elements variables would allow more specific analysis and direct comparison with print elements and common elements.

Measuring the elements that were the same between versions of a story was a fairly simple comparison that yielded exact information about the kinds of elements that are repeated between print and online editions. However, just because a story was counted as having elements in common did not mean the story didn’t have other contextual elements that were unique between media.

Future research

This study points to a number of questions for future research. Whether front-page story placement in print acts as a gate for online story selection would be a worthwhile question. Although it intuitively makes sense that the stories chosen as the
most important in print also would be important online, the high percentage of print and online overlap in this study also simply could indicate a greater percentage of stories online overall.

It also would be interesting to examine whether the affiliations of contextual elements’ producers—photographers, graphic artists, videographers—have any effect on the frequency and use of these elements in print and online media.

Examining the content differences between print and online newspapers answers the question of what is going on but not why or how. Further study of newspapers’ online gatekeepers and gatekeeping processes is warranted. Scholars also should examine newspapers’ commitment of resources to producing contextual elements for either medium.

The ability of newspaper Web sites to offer readers something new with their daily news than they would receive in the paper has advanced in the dozen or so years that newspapers have been online. This study indicates that newspapers still have more potential for growth than substance to many claims about content differences between print and online newspapers. Readers are able to find a mirror of stories they see in print, and they are more likely to find contextual elements that provide visual storytelling in print than online. The most common online-only contextual elements are links to related sites externally or stories internally, and even those appear in less than one-fifth of stories online. Even though use of contextual elements with online stories is sparse compared to print editions, it should be noted, however, that more than half of the stories online had at least one contextual element posted with them. Even though newspaper Web sites have been slow to embrace and use interactive and unique online features, the presence of
contextual elements online that do not appear in print is evidence that the print edition of a newspaper is not always a gate to online posting. Newspapers may be making progress, but they still have a long way to go before claiming widespread content differences between print and online editions.
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Appendices
Appendix A: Print and Online Sample Articles

Print Houston Chronicle, September 19, 2005, Page A1

A safety net that held strong, breaking the fall of 15,000

By LEIGH HOPPER
HOUSTON CHRONICLE

Four days after levee breaches drowned hospitals and cut off medical care for thousands in New Orleans, a tidal wave of people in the midst of potentially fatal health crises began pouring into Houston.

Doctors and emergency medical technicians at Reliant Park jumped aboard arriving buses full of Katrina refugees, identifying the sickest. Diabetics without insulin, severely dehydrated children, renal patients without dialysis were rushed to a clinic created inside a livestock exhibition hall.

In the aftermath of Katrina, amid angry debate about the confused federal response to the disaster, the "Katrina Clinic" at Reliant Park, spearheaded by the Harris County Hospital District, stands out as an undisputed success story. For many of the patients it served, a day more without medical attention might have killed them.

"Let me say up front, this, as far as I know, has never been achieved at this level, in any..."
Clinic: Politicians’ ‘jaws dropped’ in awe of the feat

Continued from Page 1
playbook, or blueprints for disaster planning anywhere in the world, ever,” said Baylor College of Medicine’s Dr. Kenneth Marcus, the chief of staff at Ben Taub, Houston’s largest charity hospital and home of a renowned trauma unit.

Officials said that when Sen. Hillary Clinton, D-N.Y., Health and Human Services Secretary Mike Leavitt and Surgeon General Richard Carmona visited the 100,000-square-foot clinic, their “jaws dropped.” Clinton asked for a blueprint of how it was done. The hospital district — the county’s health care safety net for the poor — is doing an oral history project so details of the feat won’t be lost.

All told, the clinic, which disbursed Thursday, saw more than 15,000 patients during 15 days — 2,000 on the first full day alone — gave out 10,000 tetanus shots and filled thousands of prescriptions. An outbreak of contagious diarrheal illness was detected and contained. About 900 people were transported to hospital emergency rooms. Estimated total cost: $4.1 million, to be covered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

“Every disaster is different. We may plan for structures involving explosions, trauma, wounds. ... We recognized this was not that kind of disaster,” Marcus said. “We didn’t need a (mobile) surgical hospital, we needed a big pharmacy. We needed a lab. We did not need an operating table, we needed an exam table ... And that’s what we put in place on Wednesday afternoon.”

Organizers say the Katrina Clinic came together with almost halcyon grace. Calls for supplies were answered with speed. At 505 for more volunteers resulted in so many doctors and nurses that a special credentialing and staffing station had to be created.

Plans for the clinic began taking shape at 6 a.m. Aug. 31, three days after the storm, as a convoy of 450 buses prepared to leave Houston for Louisiana and bring back evacuees, said George Maui, the hospital district’s chief operating officer.

At 9 a.m. Maui met with Harris County Judge Robert Lickliter and Mayor Bill White, who asked Maui and other leaders to prepare “a significant medical mission.”

With 15 or 16 hours to get ready, Maui left the meeting and drove to Reliant Park, where he deemed the vast Reliant Arena a good spot for the clinic, not withstanding the horseback inspection in the concourse floor. Beds and curtains for assigning off exhibition spaces were in storage, ready for use. The pieces, like giant Tinker Toys, were fashioned into rooms for patient registration, medical triage, exams and a pharmacy.

Tables came next, and dozen of copiers, copiers, telephones and chairs followed. Ten simms for handwashing were installed in a row. Later, CVS pharmacy would bring in two mobile homes for the distribution of medicine. Siemens loaned X-ray machines. Abbott Laboratories donated a mobile lab on an 18-wheeler that was headed to Oklahoma.

By midnight, the core of the clinic was ready.

As evacuees arrived, the clinic grew from 20 exam rooms to 40, and then to 70. The staff of the hospital district and Baylor College of Medicine worked 16 hours straight. By Sept. 2, the first Friday, doctors were feeling stretched thin. A call for more help went out. About 2,000 doctors and nurses volunteered.

At the behest of the mayor, a second clinic, staffed by physicians from the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, opened at the George R. Brown Convention Center, and began seeing 600 to 700 patients a day, reaching a total of 7,000 last week.

Doctors saw patients with asthma, broken bones, chest pain, out-of-control diabetes and high blood pressure. One young man had a gunshot wound to his forearm. The most difficult encounters were with patients in withdrawal from narcotic addiction.

Fears of TB or a deadly diarrheal outbreak surfaced. On-site chest X-rays for adults with coughs quickly dispelled the tuberculosis worry, but on Day Four of the clinic, doctors said 90 children had some type of contagious gastrointestinal illness. Chances of typhoid or cholera epidemics seemed remote but not impossible.

The infection soon spread to several hundred people, forcing the quarantine of the clinic’s own workers. Baylor identified the culprit: a treatable norovirus similar to one that causes widespread illness on cruise ships.

As the crisis phase passed, people too poor for easy access to medical care for less pressing problems in New Orleans sought it out in the Katrina Clinic. People who barely escaped New Orleans with their lives could now get attention for injuries sustained.

“We had people who lost their glasses, and we had the ability to examine their eyes and (put) glasses on their heads in 20 minutes,” Marcus said. “To get this population of people back into function, to get them a job and get moving, we gave a lot of immunizations, we filled a lot of prescriptions.”

Last week, as the clinic and megashelters wound down, health officials began publishing the locations of free and low-cost clinics throughout the county, to ensure continuity of care for evacuees and to head off overcrowding in Houston’s frequently razed-out emergency rooms. The Red Cross will operate a first aid center for evacuees, who remain at Reliant Park.

Mari said evacuees with health insurance who decide to stay in Houston will be easily absorbed by the medical center. The uninsured, who could number in the thousands, are another story.

“The question is, if they are the medically needy, who are we going to refer them to, where will they go for their health care?” Mari said. “It’s still problematic. We don’t know.”

Ingh.happens@chron.com
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HOUSTON'S 'KATRINA CLINIC'

A safety net that held strong, breaking the fall of 15,000

By LEIGH HOPPER
Copyright 2005 Houston Chronicle

The 15-day effort at a glance:
• Size: 100,000 square feet
• Exam rooms: 70
• Patients seen: 15,000
• Tetanus shots given: 10,000
• Doctor and nurse volunteers: 2,700
• Cost: $1.1 million

Source: Harris County Hospital District officials

Four days after levee breaches drowned hospitals and cut off medical care for thousands in New Orleans, a tidal wave of people in the midst of potentially fatal health crises began pouring into Houston.

Doctors and emergency medical technicians at Reliant Park jumped aboard arriving buses full of Katrina refugees, identifying the sickest. Diabetics without insulin, severely dehydrated children, renal patients without dialysis were rushed to a clinic created inside a livestock exhibition hall.

In the aftermath of Katrina, amid angry debate about the
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In the aftermath of Katrina, while many agencies served the
(continued) federal response to the disaster, the “Katrina Clinic” at Reliant Park, spearheaded by the Harris
County Hospital District, stood out as an undisputed success story. For many of the patients it served, a day
more without medical attention might have killed them.

“Let me say up front, this, as far as I know, has never
been achieved at this level, in any playbook, or
blueprint for disaster planning anywhere in the world,
ever,” said Baylor College of Medicine’s Dr. Kenneth
Maturo, the chief of staff at Ben Taub, Houston’s largest
charity hospital and home of a renowned trauma unit.

Officials said that when Sen. Hillary Clinton, D-N.Y.,
Health and Human Services Secretary Mike Leavitt and
Surgeon General Richard Carmona visited the 100,000-
square-foot clinic, their “jaws dropped.” Clinton asked
for a blueprint of how it was done. The hospital district —
the county’s health care safety net for the poor — is
doing an oral history project so details of the feat won’t
be lost.

Told, the clinic, which disbanded Thursday, saw
more than 15,000 patients during 15 days — 2,900 on
the first full day alone — gave out 10,000 courses shots
and filled thousands of prescriptions. An outbreak of
congenital diarrheal illness was detected and contained.
About 900 people were transported to hospital
evacuation rooms. Estimated total cost: $4.1 million, to
be covered by the Federal Emergency Management
Agency.

“Every disaster is different. We usually plan for a
disaster involving explosions, trauma, wounds ... We
recognized this was not that kind of disaster.” Maturo
said. “We didn’t need a (mobile) surgical hospital; we
needed a clinic.”
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said. "We didn't need a (mobile) surgical hospital. We needed a big pharmacy. We needed a laboratory. We did not need an operating table, we needed an exam table ... And that's what we put in place on Wednesday afternoon."

Organizers say the Katrina Clinic came together with almost bellicose grace. Calls for supplies were answered with speed. An SOS for more volunteers resulted in so many doctors and nurses that a special credentialing and staffing union had to be created.

Plans for the clinic began: taking shape at 6 a.m. Aug. 31, three days after the storm, as a convoy of 450 buses prepared to leave Housson for Louisiana and bring back evacuees, said George Masi, the hospital district's chief operating officer.

At 9 a.m. Masi met with Harris County Judge Robert Eckels and Mayor Bill White, who asked Masi and other leaders to prepare "a significant medical mission."

With 15 or 16 hours to get ready, Masi left the meeting and drove to Reliant Park, where he deemed the vast Reliant Arena a good spot for the clinic, not withstanding the horse shoe imprints in the concrete floor. Rods and curtains for sectioning off exhibition spaces were in storage, ready for use. The pieces, like giant Tinker Toys, were fashioned into rooms for patient registration, medical triage, exams and a pharmacy.

Tables came next, and dozens of computers. Copiers, telephones and chairs followed. Ten sinks for handwashing were installed in a row. Later, CVS pharmacy would bring in two mobile homes for the distribution of medicine. Siemens loaned X-ray machines. Abbott Laboratories diverted a mobile lab on an 18-wheeler that was headed to Oklahoma. Businesses donated medical supplies.

By midnight, the core of the clinic was ready.
To State Fair sculptor, the King is more than a hunka hunka churnin’ love

Sculptor Sharon BuMann had to have hound dogs in her Elvis scene at the State Fair of Texas. She’ll have rabbits too. But the guitar will be the tricky part. Hard surfaces, she said, are the hardest to carve in butter.

Butter artist will have Elvis down pat

Dallas: Professor studies singer’s every move for authenticity

By KATIE MENZER
Staff Writer

It’s a monument fit for the king — the king of high cholesterol.

Elvis Presley will be memorialized this year at the State Fair of Texas in an 800-pound slab of butter.

As a lover of many things fried, the king of rock ‘n’ roll would have undoubtedly been impressed with his life-size, lardish likeness now being sculpted by New York artist Sharon BuMann.

Ms. BuMann arrived in Dallas last week and has spent most of her time here in a 42-degree refrigerator case in the Creative Arts building at Fair Park.

Despite her artery-clogging medium, she’s decided to portray a younger, fitter Elvis inspired by his ’68 comeback concert.

Ms. BuMann’s vision is an elaborate scene with Elvis dressed in a leather jumpsuit and flanked by a glittering sign and country porch.

He won’t be wearing blue suede shoes, but he’ll be surrounded by a couple of butter hound dogs and other animals.

“You know, in the song ‘Hound Dog,’ he sings, ‘You ain’t never caught a rabbit, and you ain’t no friend of mine,’” said Ms. BuMann, who plans to finish the sculpture this week. “So, it’s got to have a few rabbits.”

See ARTIST Page 8B
Appendix A (Continued)

Artist buttering up Elvis for State Fair
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This is the second time in her decadelong butter-sculpting career that Ms. BuMann has been commissioned to craft the famous Memphis crooner. Her first Elvis — complete with a gold lamé jumpsuit — was shown at the Tulsa State Fair two years ago.

Texas fair officials asked for the repeat performance to coincide with this year’s rock ‘n’ roll exhibit in the Texas Hall of State building. The fair, which opens Sept. 30, will also feature Elvis-inspired food, such as fried peanut butter and banana sandwiches and fried ice cream.

Ms. BuMann — who sculpts while wearing a snowsuit, insulated boots and ski cap — has been churning through old photos and videos of Elvis during the past weeks to study his features and delve into his psyche.

It’s important to know the subject, she said, whether it’s a cow or the king.

“You want to show the whole demeanor. You’re constructing the person from the inside out,” she said. “You need to know the soul first and bring that out to the surface.”

She’s played Elvis documentaries as she toils away in her refrigerator case and has made detailed drawings of his nose in her sketchbook. She’s even wondered if his family would appreciate Elvis being sculpted out of butter.

(He doesn’t think so.)

Elvis fine features, high cheekbones and thick eyelashes are sticky, but it’s his glossy guitar that will be the trickiest part of the figure to sculpt, Ms. BuMann said.

To me, hard materials are the hardest to portray in butter,” she said. “Hard surfaces must be perfectly smooth with no undulations.”

Elvis marks the eighth butter sculpture Ms. BuMann has carved for the Texas state fair in the last decade. Her past sculptures have included a longhorn, goat, giant pumpkin, Cadillac and two horses.

But officials were lucky to book Ms. BuMann this year. Before arriving in Dallas, she finished a butter sculpture for the Kansas State Fair. She’s scheduled to head to Tulsa and Phoenix once Elvis is complete. She also sculpted for the Illinois fair this year.

Ms. BuMann is a college professor and has a degree in sculpture from New York’s Syracuse University. She traditionally sculpts in bronze.

But when carving in butter, it’s obvious she’s not just playing with her food.

Her Kansas butter sculpture features a boy impossibly balanced atop two bucking boars. As the pigs run through a mud puddle — butter mixed with cocoa powder — they begin to separate and the boy starts to topple into the muck.

Last year’s State Fair sculpture included a group of children huddled together in Halloween costumes beside a giant pumpkin.

One of the children — dressed as a ghost — had no feet and seemed to hover magically above the ground.

She’s done a few butter cows in her career, but she said she prefers to sculpt scenes that tell a story.

“I want it to have a plot and a subplot or two,” she said. “I want you to be drawn in to the story.”

So, please, don’t call her the “butter cow lady” — a moniker used by Norma “Duffy” Lyon, the farm wife who has been sculpting butter cows for the Iowa State Fair for 45 years — unless you want to insult both Ms. BuMann and Elvis.

E-mail: kmerser@dallanews.com
Butter artist will have Elvis down pat
To State Fair sculptor, the King is more than a hunka hunka churning' love

By KATIE MEEKER / The Dallas Morning News

It's a monument fit for the king – the king of high cholesterol.

Elvis Presley will be memorialized this year at the State Fair of Texas in an 830-pound slab of butter.

As a lover of many things fried, the king of rock n' roll would have undoubtedly been impressed with his life-size, lardish likeness now being sculpted by New York artist Sharon BuMann.

Ms. BuMann arrived in Dallas last week and has spent most of her time here in a 42-degree refrigerator case in the Creative Arts building at Fair Park.

Despite her artery-clogging medium, she's decided to portray a younger, fitter Elvis inspired by his '68 comeback concert.

Ms. BuMann's vision is an elaborate scene with Elvis dressed in a leather jumpsuit and flanked by a glittering sign and country porch.

He won't be wearing blue suede shoes, but he'll be surrounded by a couple of butter hound dogs and other animals.
Security hangs on the grapevine

By MONI BASU
mbasu@ajc.com

Baghdad, Iraq – Capt. Michael Cannon leapt out of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and walked over to inspect the bomb damage by the side of the road.

The blast from a makeshift bomb, detonated in broad daylight the day before as 48th Brigade Combat Team soldiers were patrolling in southwest Baghdad, left a crater large enough to swallow a small car.

“I think it’s something homemade. I don’t see any shrapnel,” Cannon said.

No one was hurt in the incident, but Cannon was determined to find out who had planted the potentially deadly bomb.

After almost four months on the ground in Iraq, the 48th’s infantry soldiers have become intimately acquainted with the areas in which they operate. The soldiers who patrol the highways and villages west of the Baghdad airport know the more dangerous routes from the safer ones.

But geography is often not enough, given the random nature of the insurgency in Iraq.

Because there is little defense against some enemy tactics, the
Troops: Soldiers seek ties with Iraqis
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key, say soldiers, is to flush out insurgents before they can plant deadly bombs in roads, blow themselves up at checkpoints or launch rocket attacks and mortar rounds into U.S. camps.

Of the 18 brigade soldiers who have been killed in Iraq, 14 died in bombings that have become leading killers of American soldiers here.

After inspecting the damage, Cannon walked to a small shop at an intersection just a few feet away. He was certain the shopkeeper Naejeeb, who lives nearby, would know something about the bomb.

Keeping secrets

At the shop, Cannon found a middle-aged man dressed in a traditional white dishdasha leaning on metal crutches. He knew nothing, he said, looking away from Cannon.

"Do you know where Naejeeb is?" asked Cannon, commander of Alpha Company of the 2nd Infantry Regiment's 1st Battalion.

Silence fell over the simple shop, which had three outdoor bins filled with half-rotten potatoes, tomatoes and onions. A young boy pointed to the woman keeping the shop. "Naejeeb is my father. He is not here," he said. "That's my mother."

The woman's name was Badriyah. She said she heard the loud noise from the explosion, but didn't know anything else.

"I swear to God, I didn't know anything," she told Cannon through an interpreter. "I am sure they put the bomb in at night."

Cannon was convinced that Badriyah and Naejeeb were keeping secrets.

"There's no way someone could put something in the ground 20 meters from Naejeeb's store and [they] not know about it," Cannon said.

Scared to talk

The key to getting information, he added, is working with the Iraqi people. "But most people are scared that insurgents will kill them if they are seen talking to Americans."

On a recent raid in Sada Yusufiyah, near the banks of the Euphrates River, 2nd Lt. Michael Persley faced the same frustrations as Cannon did at the roadside shop.

After a swift 10-minute ride from Camp Striker, a Black Hawk helicopter swooped down into a field behind a one-story house that had come under suspicion. Persley led soldiers of Bravo Company, 2nd Battalion, 3rd Infantry Regiment, on house-to-house searches.

In the middle of the night.

No one confessed to knowing the man Persley was seeking. After several rounds of questioning, Persley decided to detain a man who knew a secondary suspect.

The cat-and-mouse game between American soldiers and insurgents in Iraq might seem old hat to Persley, who has been a police officer in Albany for 13 years. But nothing, not even his crime-fighting experience, can prepare a soldier for the violence in Iraq, he said.

"You, we know our area better. But people stay away from us," Persley said. "We don't really get to know them very well. We're like the Gollith here. The insurgents consider themselves David."

Suspicion, mistrust

Persley said it would help to have more interaction with residents, just like police officers who hang out in their neighborhoods at home. But in this nation gripped with fear, no one trusts anyone anymore.

"Back home, people may threaten you for taking the police, but here, if you talk today to an American soldier, tomorrow, you might end up dead," Persley said.

Cannon said, ultimately, building trust is essential for U.S. security efforts.

"Seeing people over and over again is crucial," he said.

Cannon tried to meet with villagers when he is out on patrol.

In Al Radwaniyeh, he sat down for tea with Abbas Hamza, a village elder.

Hamza gave Cannon his account of the situation in Iraq, that his nation needs a single governing entity, whether it be Sunni, Shiite or Kurd.

"It doesn't matter who will be president of Iraq," Hamza said, taking a long drag of his Miami cigarette.

"The most important thing is for my people to feel safe. We can't even go into Baghdad when we want because we don't feel safe."

Cannon had met twice before with Hamza. In this third, more revealing conversation, Hamza told Cannon about recent attacks in his village.

"I'm starting to develop a friendship with him," Cannon said. "The past two times, he didn't mention the anti-Iraqi forces. This time he began to open up."

Cannon thought he was developing the same relationship with Naejeeb, the store owner.

"I told him I held him responsible for that area," Cannon said. "The first few times, he had remained silent. But now he's started to divulge information."

Cannon vowed to return to the shop to find Naejeeb.

In the meantime, he left Naejeeb's wife with a stern warning.

"I find it hard to believe you were here and you didn't notice anything," Cannon told her. "If my men die and I think that Naejeeb knows about it, I will bulldoze this store. One more bomb in this area, and your store is gone."

IRAQ DEVELOPMENTS

Insurgents assassinated a Kurdish member of parliament, Faris Nasir Hussein, along with his brother and their driver in an ambush near Dujail, north of Baghdad. A second Kurdish lawmaker, Haidar Shannoun, was wounded in the attack.

Iraq's National Assembly gave final approval to the nation's new constitution and the United Nations began printing 5 million copies of it for voters to study before an Oct. 15 referendum.

Police found 20 bodies shot to death and dumped in the Tigris River near Baiji. Four others were found handcuffed and shot.

The U.S. military said a 56th Brigade Combat Team soldier was killed in a roadside bombing while on patrol near Al-Asad Air Base in a violent, insurgent-infested region near the Syrian border. The death raised to at least 1,899 the number of U.S. troops killed since the beginning of the Iraq war in March 2003.

Associated Press
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GEORGIA’S GUARD: THE 48TH IN IRAQ: Security hangs on the grapevine

Monica Bauo - Staff
Monday, September 19, 2005

Baghdad, Iraq — Capt. Michael Cannon leapt out of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and walked over to inspect the bomb damage by the side of the road.

The blast from a makeshift bomb, detonated in broad daylight the day before by 48th Brigade Combat Team soldiers were patrolling in southwest Baghdad, left a crater large enough to swallow a small car.

"I think it's something homemade. I can't see any strpple," Cannon said.

No one was hurt in the incident, but Cannon was determined to find out who had planted the potentially deadly bomb.

After almost four months on the ground in Iraq, the 48th's infantry soldiers have become intimately acquainted with the areas in which they operate. The soldiers who patrol the highways and villages west of the Baghdad airport know the more dangerous routes from the safer ones.

But geography is often not enough, given the random nature of the insurgency in Iraq.

Because there is little defense against some enemy tactics, the key, say soldiers, is to flush out insurgents before they can plant deadly bombs in roads, blow themselves up at checkpoints or launch rocket attacks and mortar rounds into U.S. camps.

Of the 15 brigade soldiers who have been killed in Iraq, 14 died in bombings that have become leading killers of American soldiers here.

After inspecting the damage, Cannon walked to a small shop at an intersection just a few feet away. He was certain the shopkeeper Naebeb, who lives nearby, would know something about the bomb.

At the shop, Cannon found a middle-aged man dressed in a traditional white dishashka leaning on metal crutches. He knew nothing, he said, looking away from Cannon.

"Do you know where Naebeb is?" asked Cannon, commander of Alpha Company of the 121st Infantry Regiment's 1st Battalion.

Silence fell over the simple shop, which had three outdoor bins filled with half-rotten potatoes, tomatoes and onions. A young boy pointed to the woman wearing the shoe. "Naebeb is my father. He is not here," he said.
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Hamza gave Cannon his account of the situation in Iraq: that his nation needs a single governing entity, whether it be Bum, Shite or Kurd.

"It doesn't matter who will be president of Iraq," Hamza said, taking a long drag of his Miami cigarette. "The most important thing is for my people to feel safe. We can't even go into Baghdad when we want because we don't feel safe."

Cannon had met twice before with Hamza. In this third, more revealing conversation, Hamza told Cannon about recent attacks in his village.

"I'm starting to develop a friendship with him," Cannon said. "The past two times, he didn't mention the anti-Iraqi forces. This time he began to open up."

Cannon thought he was developing the same relationship with Najeeb, the store owner.

"I told him I held him responsible for that area," Cannon said. "The first few times, he had remained silent. But now he's started to divulge information."

Cannon vowed to return to the shop to find Najeeb.

In the meantime, he left Najeeb's wife with a stern warning.

"I find it hard to believe you were here and you didn't notice anything," Cannon told her. "If my men die and I think that Najeeb knows about it, I will bulldoze this store. One more bomb in this area, and your store is gone."

IRAQ DEVELOPMENTS

> Insurgents assassinated a Kurdish member of parliament, Faris Waisir Husein, along with his brother and their driver in an ambush near Kirkuk, north of Baghdad. A second Kurdish lawmaker, Baidar Shanoun, was wounded in the attack.
> Iraq's National Assembly gave final approval to the nation's new constitution and the United Nations began printing 5 million copies of it for voters to study before an Oct. 15 referendum.
> Police found 20 bodies shot to death and dumped in the Tigris River near Baghdad. Four others were found handcuffed and shot.
> The U.S. military said a 56th Brigade Combat Team soldier was killed in a roadside bombing while on patrol near Al-Aad Air Base in a violent, insurgent-infested region near the Syrian border. The death raised to at least 1,999 the number of U.S. troops killed since the beginning of the Iraq war in March 2003.
--- Associated Press
Most seniors made it to safety

In Hurricane Katrina's wake, safety plans for a vulnerable population are re-examined.

By SHERRI DAY and LISA GREENE

Times Staff Writers

BATON ROUGE — With Hurricane Katrina threatening, John Bourne's family took him to the only place they thought was safe: his nursing home.

As floodwaters began rising in the Jefferson Healthcare Center's courtyard, its owners mobilized a caravan of buses and vans, evacuating residents to nursing homes around the state.

It was part of a carefully crafted plan state law requires of all nursing homes in Louisiana. Not all such plans went so smoothly.

A St. Bernard Parish nursing home failed to evacuate its residents, and 34 were left to drown in rising floodwaters. Investigators are looking into the deaths of 14 patients at the LaFon Nursing Home.

Please see VULNERABLE 5A
Appendix A (Continued)
Appendix A (Continued)

Online St. Petersburg Times, September 19, 2005

Hurricane Katrina

Most seniors made it to safety

In Hurricane Katrina’s wake, safety plans for a vulnerable population are re-examined.

By SHERRIDAY and LISA GREENE

Published September 19, 2005

BATON ROUGE - With Hurricane Katrina threatening, John Boome’s family took him to the only place they thought was safe: his nursing home.

As floodwaters began rising in the Jefferson Healthcare Center’s courtyard, its owners mobilized a caravan of buses and vans, evacuating residents to nursing homes around the state.

(Time photo: Chris Jerges)

JOSEPH LAWRENCE, 79, rests at the Baton Rouge River center, where a Red Cross shelter was set up.
Region on alert as Rita gains strength

Another tropical threat approached South Florida, with Rita expected to deliver wind and rain beginning tonight.

BY MARTIN MERZER, CHARLES RABIN
AND CARA BUCKLEY
mmerzer@herald.com

Tourists streamed out of the Florida Keys overnight and hurricane alerts again blanketed South Florida this morning as Tropical Storm Rita — the 17th named storm of this extraordinary season — menaced the region.

Forecasters said Rita could grow into a hurricane by tonight. The projected path carried its core just south of the region, very close to the Keys — and as a Category 2, the keys are much closer to Miami-Dade and Broward counties.

Rita's outlying wind and rain should arrive tonight and intensify Tuesday, with the Keys getting the worst of the weather but all of South Florida also on the perilous right side of the center.

A voluntary evacuation of coastal Miami-Dade could be recommended today, according to Carlos Castillo, the county's emergency manager.

"Because of its close proximity to South Florida, and with expected impact approximately 24 hour away, it is imperative that everyone pay close attention to this storm and carefully monitor advisories and emergency messages," Castillo said Sunday night.

HURRICANE SEASON 2005

- The commander in chief of cleanup says New Orleans isn't ready for people to return.
- FEMA Nation officials turn to Katrina to fine-tune Florida's disaster plans.
- Herbert Saffir, who helped devise the hurricane intensity scale, is still working hard.

Herald.com

For the latest news and to track Tropical Storm Rita, click on Today's Extras.
Region on alert as Rita approaches

CAT MAN: A man who identified himself only as "The Cat Man" towed three cat carriers while evacuating Key West.

All visitors were ordered Sunday to leave the Lower Keys, including Key West.

It could be far worse in the Keys, with much stronger wind, up to 15 inches of rain and an eight-foot storm surge. "It's a no brainer for the Keys," said Max Mayfield, the hurricane center's director. "They'll have to go through the drill. For Miami-Dade and Broward, we are going to see an impact, but it will depend on exactly where the storm passes."

STORM UPDATE

Tropical Storm Rita formed over the Bahamas and was expected to bring rain and wind to South Florida during the next few days. Tropical Storm Philippe, meanwhile, strengthened but remained far from land.

CARS and motorcycles — including some 10,000 bikers returning from the annual Poker Run charity bike ride — flowed out of the Keys late Sunday, though it was difficult to distinguish between the evacuation and usual weekend traffic.

While some people said they were fleeing the storm, boats still sailed on blue water. Jet Skis still criss-crossed paths. Fishermen still fished. And many grocery stores were almost empty.

"No one's paying attention to the storm — not yet anyway," Alex Marti of Kendall said as he bought groceries in Key Largo — provisions not for the storm but for watching the Miami Dolphins-New York Jets football game on television.

Just before sunset in Islamorada, Tom and Corinne Davies of Aurora, Ohio, nursed drinks at the Lorelei seafront bar, blissfully unaware of the tropical storm. "You're kidding," said Corinne Davies, 61, "The thing of it is, we don't turn on the TV." Then again, Davies mused aloud, the inn they were staying at did seem curiously empty.

Forecasters predicted that Rita would become a hurricane tonight, when its core begins passing through the Florida Straits, between the Keys and Cuba. The forecast track then carried the storm into the Gulf of Mexico, with a possible landfall along the Gulf Coast of Mexico or southern Texas.

Katrina's primary impact zone of New Orleans and the Mississippi coast did not appear to be in immediate danger.
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Online Miami Herald, September 19, 2005

South Florida on alert as Rita gains strength

By Martin Ederer, Charles Babin and Cara Bucy
mmeder@herald.com

Tourists streamed out of the Florida Keys overnight and evacuation alerts again blanketed South Florida this morning as Tropical Storm Rita – the 17th named storm of this extraordinary season – menaced the region.

Forecasters said Rita could grow into a hurricane by tonight. The projected path now has its core just south of the region, very close to the Keys – and as a Category 2 hurricane with 110 mph winds. Meteorologists warned that a slight deviation could bring the core through the Keys and much closer to Miami-Dade and Broward counties.

Rita's outlying wind and rain should arrive tonight and intensify Tuesday, with the Keys getting the worst of the weather but all of South Florida also on the perilous right side of the center.

A voluntary evacuation of coastal Miami-Dade could be recommended today, according to Carlos Castillo, the county's emergency manager.

"Because of its close proximity to South Florida, and with expected impact approximately 24 hours away, it's imperative that everyone pay close attention to this storm and carefully monitor advisories and emergency messages," Castillo said Sunday night.

Some South Florida residents are still cleaning up the mess left by Hurricane Katrina less than four weeks ago.

"Mother Nature still has us in its sights," said Jim Lushine, the National Weather Service's severe weather expert for South Florida. "I hope it's a warning rather than hitting us in the gut."

At 11 p.m. Sunday, a hurricane watch covered all of Broward and Miami-Dade, meaning that winds of at least 74 mph are possible within 36 hours. A hurricane warning was issued for the Keys, meaning that those conditions are expected within 24 hours. Residents of the Bahamas and central and western Cuba also...
## Appendix B: Coding Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEWS:</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>DMN</th>
<th>AJC</th>
<th>SPT</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRINT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECT.</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFIL.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>Staff &amp; Wire</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG.</td>
<td>Int’l</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Int’l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEM.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>photos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sidebars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>infographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>infoboxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>artwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFIL.: Staff</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff &amp; Wire</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEM.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>photos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>infoboxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>docs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. graphic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disc. forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s. graphic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>slideshow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>photo gallery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rel. Web links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rel. story links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>live chat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFFIL.: Staff</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff &amp; Wire</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAME:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Appendix C: Coding Instructions

NEWS  Select newspaper and date. **HC**=Houston Chronicle, **DMN**=Dallas Morning News, **AJC**=Atlanta Journal-Constitution, **SPT**=St. Petersburg Times, **MH**=Miami Herald

PRINT

SECT  Select front or metro (which may be called City & State, Metro, Tampa & State, or Metro & State)

HED  Write headline that appears with story. In some cases, a story may have more than one headline, so here are some guidelines.
- If a big headline acts as an umbrella over two or more stories, use the smaller headlines that appear directly over each story.
- If only one story falls under the big headline, use the big one in that case, even if there is a smaller headline directly over the story.
- If a small headline (like a label, such as “Disaster Relief,” or a feature headline that particularly addresses the action in the photo) is stacked on top of a picture that is stacked on top of a story that has another headline directly over it, use the headline directly over the story, not the small overline.

AFFIL  Select the affiliation of the reporter. **Staff, Wire**=Associated Press, Reuters, Bloomberg News, or any chain correspondent (identified with Cox, Knight-Ridder, etc.), **Staff & Wire**=combination of any of the above (staff writer might be listed alone in byline, but story has a footer that says wire material was used), **Contributor**=might be identified as a correspondent or “special to the Chronicle,” etc., **Unknown**

GEOG  Location the story focuses on: **International, National, State, Metro.** Determine this by skimming first few sentences of story. A story may have more than one geographic focus.

ELEM  Identify the presence of any elements besides story text with “yes” or “no” and place the number of each kind of element next to it. **Photos**=photographs or artists’ renderings that have a box around the outside. **Sidebars**=related stories that appear on the same page as the story or its jump. Story topics should show a strong relationship, not just two stories about the military or a hurricane. **Infographics**=information delivered graphically. Includes maps. **Infoboxes**=facts, figures, or details that support a story and appear in a box or module with the story. **Artwork**=includes sketches or any kind of illustration floating without a border. **Other**=anything else. If you choose this option, please describe the element to the right. Examples include: **refer** (a note directing readers to other stories in the paper or on the Web), **pull quote** (a
quote from the story that is inset into the text in big type), or pull out (a sentence or two from the story that is inset into the text in big type).

AFFIL Select the affiliation of the photographer or artist. Staff, Wire=Associated Press, Reuters, Bloomberg News, or any chain correspondent (identified with Cox, Knight-Ridder, etc.), Staff & Wire=combination of any of the above (staff writer might be listed alone in byline, but story has a footer that says wire material was used), Contributor=might be identified as a correspondent or “special to the Chronicle,” etc., Unknown
• If an element, particularly an infobox, does not name the person responsible for creating it, mark it as “staff” if the element appears in a staff-written story or “wire” if it appears in a wire-written story. If the element appears in a “staff & wire” story, then mark the element as “unknown” affiliation.

ONLINE

P. ONLY Does the story appear in the print edition only? If a screenshot of the story does not appear in that newspaper’s folder for that date, the answer is “yes.”

HED Note whether the primary headline on the online story is the “same” or “different” than the print edition. Only write in the headline again if it is different.

AFFIL Select the affiliation of the reporter. Staff, Wire=Associated Press, Reuters, Bloomberg News, or any chain correspondent (identified with Cox, Knight-Ridder, etc.), Staff & Wire=combination of any of the above (staff writer might be listed alone in byline, but story has a footer that says wire material was used), Contributor=might be identified as a correspondent or “special to the Chronicle,” etc., Unknown

GEOG Location the story focuses on: International, National, State, Metro. Determine this by skimming first few sentences of story. A story may have more than one geographic focus.

ELEM Identify the presence of any elements besides story text with “yes” or “no” and place the number of each kind of element next to it if it is a photo or infobox. Otherwise, simply put an “X” next to any element present, or use an “S” next to any element that appears in a standing box. A standing box would be one that appears with several related stories (such as a box labeled “DeLay indicted” or “Hurricane Rita”). Elements should appear with intent; i.e., it doesn’t count if every page of a site links to a general discussion forum in its site architecture. Photos=photographs or artists’ renderings that have a box around the outside.
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Infoboxes = facts, figures, or details that support a story and appear in a box with the story.
Video = links to video clips.
Audio = links to audio clips.
Docs = links to documents that were sources for the article.
Poll = allows readers to vote on a question presented.
Quiz = a series of questions for readers to complete.
Infographic = interactive graphic. Can the reader click or manipulate the presentation of the data? Can include maps.
Blog = either a reporter’s Weblog or a blog that readers can participate in.
Disc. Forum = discussion forum or bulletin board.
Static Graphic = static graphic. The graphic does not update or respond to user input. Can include maps.
Slideshow = series of photos that automatically runs when clicked.
Photo gallery = series of photos that must be manually run when clicked.
Rel. Web links = links to related Web sites.
Rel. story links = links to other related stories or coverage on that newspaper site.
Live chat = link for readers to participate in a real-time online conversation with one another, experts and sources, or journalists. May also be a link to a transcript of a chat that is already past.
Other = anything else; please describe it to the right. Might include refer (a note but no link directing readers to other stories in the paper or on the Web) or submit photos (a feature allowing readers to send in their own photos).

AFFIL Select the affiliation of the journalist. Staff, Wire = Associated Press, Reuters, Bloomberg News, or any chain correspondent (identified with Cox, Knight-Ridder, etc.), Staff & Wire = combination of any of the above (staff writer might be listed alone in byline, but story has a footer that says wire material was used), Contributor = might be identified as a correspondent or “special to the Chronicle,” etc., Unknown
• If an element, particularly an infobox, does not name the person responsible for creating it, mark it as “staff” if the element appears in a staff-written story or “wire” if it appears in a wire-written story. If the element appears in a “staff & wire” story, then mark the element as “unknown” affiliation.

SAME Circle “yes” or “no” to note whether any of the elements that appeared in the Web version of the story was the same as any element that appeared in print. If “yes,” please write to the right which element was in both media, such as “photo” or “infobox.”

LEAD Circle “same” if the first paragraph of the Web story says exactly the same thing as the print story. Circle “different” if the leads vary at all.