

NewsReel

2017-1-HU01-KA203-036038

NEW SKILLS FOR THE NEXT GENERATION OF JOURNALISTS

TEACHING GUIDE

COLLABORATIVE JOURNALISM



About the Newsreel Project

Journalists have an essential role in the new media landscape as a pillar of credible and contextualized information. Being in competition with several alternative forms of news, non-professional or even deliberately manipulated news, professional journalism should be empowered by new competencies and skills.

Opportunities enabled by digital technologies, such as processing, analyzing and visualizing large amounts of data, as well as multi-sectoral and digital cross-border co-operations, open new fields of journalistic activities, and new ways to speak about public issues. However, this environment also entails technical and economic risks, and demands expertise in IT security, as well as the development of business models and strategies from journalists and media companies.

Journalists face several ethical challenges that should be handled to meet their social responsibilities. Fake news and hate speech have become major issues in the public sphere, as have whistleblowing and activism.

By improving skills of a new generation of European journalists, NEWSREEL will contribute to the strengthening of the common European democratic public sphere. It will do so by improving collaborative and cross-border journalism that is able to elaborate and make tangible the huge amount of available data, and which is based on a predictable business strategy and a firm ethical foundation.

The main goal of the project is to develop e-learning materials connected to four fields: data journalism, new business models, collaborative journalism and ethical challenges. All educational materials produced by the project are openly and freely accessible through open licenses via the project's website (<https://newsreel.pt.e.hu/>).

The project partners are the University of Pécs, in Hungary; the Erich Brost Institute, from the Dortmund Technical University, in Germany; the University Institute of Lisbon (ISCTE-IUL), in Portugal; and the University of Bucharest, in Romania.

Teaching Guide

The main goal of the teaching guides, there is one for each one of the four fields, is to give some hints and help teachers to implement the courses. Here they can see in a glimpse what contents will be found at the eLearning, the main goals of the course, for whom it was thought, bibliographical references, and other contents.

Collaborative journalism

The professional field

Collaborations between journalists and news organisations are gaining importance, especially for those concerned with investigative journalism. Collaboration allows journalists and media organisations to join resources and expertise to investigate issues of public relevance for example in the fields of politics, and crime; both at a pan-national and a cross-border level. Those collaborations do not only embrace the cooperation of journalists from different media organisations and journalistic cultures, but also the inclusion of non-journalistic actors such as IT developers, academic scholars and interested citizens. Vital for this new form of journalism is not only that journalists share their questions and findings, but that they mutually cross-check and ultimately merge their findings before individually fact-checking and publishing these findings adjusted to their national, local or otherwise specialised target groups. Journalists with collaborative and intercultural skills who keep their targeted audience in mind are more and more in demand.

This course builds on existing courses in journalistic practice and journalistic research. It does not aim to convey basic knowledge but wants to expand students' skills regarding collaborative aspects and journalistic teamwork.

Target audience

This course is directed to advanced students of academic programs such as Journalism or Media and Communication Science. Students should have knowledge of the basics of journalistic writing and research. The learning material was developed for a semester-long course, but single sessions might be used independently for related courses. As such, the learning material is also suitable for journalists who wish to educate themselves as well as for newsroom managers who want to support their team to start journalistic collaborations.

General objective of the course

The overall objective of this course is to enable students to take part in a collaborative journalistic effort.

To reach this goal, they will first gain knowledge about the different forms of collaborative journalism projects in their home country and abroad through the presentation of case studies and their own research. In a second step, students will learn about different roles in a team, how to set up and maintain successful teams, and how to communicate and to cooperate cross-culturally and interdisciplinary. Students will gain knowledge about different communication tools and digital security, and new ways of financing journalism.

The course enables students to develop a research plan, to identify suitable partners and to carry out a collaborative project with journalism students from other universities, from their own country or from abroad.

The hands-on project ideally starts after students have developed a basic understanding of collaborative journalism (mid-semester) and aims at the production of different journalistic outputs that are arranged for specific audiences.

Specific objectives of the course

Working in teams with different partners from other disciplines and/or cultures is one of the prerequisites of collaborative journalism. Therefore, by the end of the course students will

- understand the organization and management of different collaborative journalism projects, starting from case studies,
- have knowledge of different roles in teams and be able to work in teams,
- be able to transfer acquired knowledge into own project ideas,
- be able to develop a research plan, implement it into a journalistic research project and produce journalistic content,
- have the ability to communicate and cooperate cross-culturally and interdisciplinary,
- be able to identify error sources in the run-up of a project and to develop solution strategies,
- have carried out a collaborative project with partners from other universities / from abroad,
- be able to adapt the findings of an international project for their national or local target groups.

Furthermore, they will

- be able to judge digital communication tools in terms of data security,
- have knowledge about alternative forms of financing journalism
- have knowledge about crowd-sourcing and other forms of audience involvement.

Professional competences to be enhanced

The following professional competences will be enhanced through this course

- journalistic research skills, such as working with data bases, interviews and fact-checking,
- teamwork / collaborative skills, such as integrating different opinions, mediating conflicts, listening
- management / organisational skills, such as developing working schedules, distribution of tasks, reliable communication,
- intercultural skills, such as asking questions, questioning one's own stereotypes, taking a different perspective
- critical thinking,
- and empathy.

Course

Contents

The course consists of nine consecutive sessions:

- 1) What is collaborative journalism? An Introduction. (Definition, development, actors)
- 2) Different forms of collaborative journalism (theoretical background)
- 3) Teamwork in collaborative journalism (skills, roles, different forms of networks)
- 4) Case studies (e.g. Panama Papers, Cross Check, Correctiv's CrowdNewsroom)
- 5) Planning a cross-border collaborative journalistic project (networking, idea finding, team building, research plan)
- 6) Implementing a collaborative project – communication tools for collaborative journalism (case study, risk assessment, information security, tools)
- 7) Implementing a collaborative project – intercultural communication (theoretical background, intercultural communication, constructive criticism)
- 8) Financing collaborative journalism (funding by donors, by legacy media, crowdfunding)
- 9) Involvement of the audience (citizen and participatory journalism, crowdsourcing, audience analytics, training)

Teaching methods

This course is suitable for a blended learning approach. Ideally, the e-learning materials are used for a flipped classroom set-up, i.e. students work through the sessions and hand in their answers to the deepening questions before class.

In class, students are encouraged to participate actively in discussion rounds, group works and role plays (e.g. first meeting of an intercultural team, pitch of a project idea, peer consultation for trouble shooting).

An important component of the course is the involvement of practitioners who are experienced with collaborative and cross-border journalism, and are willing to share their experiences and give feedback on students' projects.

The hands-on project needs meticulous preparation with all partnering institutions. Support for struggling teams should be available throughout the term.

Selected recommendations for interactive in-class teaching

Introduction: reveal prior knowledge through a "silent discussion"

- Students answer in writing on different posters (guiding questions: Give examples for collaborative journalism. Have you ever worked collaboratively with colleagues? Which skills do journalists need to work successfully with other journalists? Which problems can arise when journalists from different media or from different countries collaborate?).
- Students should not talk with each other but should silently comment written answers of their peers.
- After ten to fifteen minutes students return to their desks and discuss interesting points on the posters; teacher might point out some obvious misconceptions.

Alternative method: World Café

Case studies: Peer mentorship for presentations

- Students prepare in groups and present case studies in class, answer follow-up questions from their peers
- After each presentation appointed students (rolling system) gives feedback on presentation style, contents etc.
- ! The rules of constructive feedback and of good presentation need to be clarified beforehand (work sheet, verbal instruction) !
- Teacher comments on the presentations only if important points were missing in the presentation / feedback

Intercultural sensitivity: Roleplay

- Student prepare in groups information about journalistic cultures in different countries before class.
- Representatives of different countries come together for a first newsroom team meeting and discuss different aspects of journalism in their countries. Several rounds (e.g. ethics of reporting, newsroom hierarchies, salaries and cost of living), discussants swap.
- Students observe and comment after each round.

Discussion with practitioners: Moderation

- One or two students volunteer to moderate the discussion round.
- All student help the moderators with preparations (background on guests, questions), work distribution according to the number of guests.
- ! The rules of moderation need to be clarified beforehand (work sheet, verbal instruction)!

Project work: Pitch your project (start of the project phase)

- Research groups pitch their research idea / report on the status quo of their project (max. five minutes)
- Peers and teacher comment (e.g. clarity of research question, distribution of tasks, research plan, timeline, communication set-up, chances of realisation, expected challenges)

Project work: peer consultation on challenges (mid-project)

- Students collect common challenges from their collaborative work and vote which they would like to discuss.
- Teacher introduces rules of peer consultation (1. entry phase for organisation – 10 minutes, 2. presentation and clarification of the case – 10 minutes, 3. clarification of question and aim of the consultation – 10 minutes, 4. analysis of the case – 10 minutes, 5. suggestions for solutions and perspectives – 15 minutes, 6. conclusion and preparation for next round – 10 minutes).
- Students volunteer for the roles of “seeking advice” and “moderation”, the rest of the students takes over the role of “advisory group”.
- Several rounds according to the students’ votes and available time.

Evaluation

Each session includes interactive tests which enable students to survey their learning progress. Sessions end with questions aiming at processes of deeper learning and through which students are asked to develop their own solutions. Answers should be handed in before class for the purposes of feedback, grading, and as a starting-point of discussion in class. Model solutions provided with this handbook (see attached files) can be used as a guideline for teachers and for self-study.

All students

- participate in class activities such as discussion rounds and group work,
- give a presentation of current examples of collaborative journalism,
- participate in the collaborative project, present their progress, challenges and solution strategies in class and finally produce journalistic output,
- write a reflection report.

All tasks should be accompanied by work sheets that explain the aim of the task and guide students through the process.

Short Bibliography

Alfter, Brigitte. 2019. *Cross-Border Collaborative Journalism. A Step-By-Step Guide*. London and New York: Routledge.

Grzeszyk, Tabea, ed. 2018. *Cross-border journalism as a Mindset*. Online: <https://blog.hostwriter.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/crossborderjournalism-mindset-final.pdf>

Hofstede, Geert, Jan Hofstede and Michael Minkov. 2011. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Revised and expanded* (3rd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 3-47.

Jenkins, Joy and Lucas Graves. 2019. *Case Studies in Collaborative Local Journalism*. Oxford: Reuters Institute, online: <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/our-research/case-studies-collaborative-local-journalism>

Journal of Applied Journalism and Media Studies. 2019. *Special edition on cross-border journalism*. Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 141-249, online: <https://www.intellectbooks.com/journal-of-applied-journalism-media-studies>

Lehtniemi, Ninni. 2016. *Nerdistan–Designia–Journoland: Best practices in multiskilled digital journalism teamwork*. Oxford: Reuters Institute, online: <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/our-research/nerdistan-designia-journoland-best-practices-multi-skilled-digital-journalism-teamwork>

Pew Research Center. 2014. *Journalism Partnerships. A New Era of Interest*. Online: http://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/2014/12/PJ_JournalismPartnerships_120414.pdf

Sambrook, Richard, ed. 2018. *Global Teamwork: The Rise of Collaboration in Investigative Journalism*. Oxford: Reuters Institute, online: https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2018-3/sambrook_e-ISBN_1802.pdf

Stonebely, Sarah. 2017. *Comparing models of collaborative journalism*, online: <https://collaborativejournalism.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Models-for-Collaborative-Journalism-research-paper.pdf>

Surveillance Self-Defense. 2019. *Your security plan*, online: <https://ssd.eff.org/en/module/your-security-plan>

Usher, Nikki. 2017. *The Appropriation/Amplification Model of Citizen Journalism: An account of structural limitations and the political economy of participatory content creation*. In: *Journalism Practice*, 11:2-3, 247-265, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2016.1223552>

Weaver, David H., and Lars Willnat, ed. 2012. *The Global Journalist in the 21st Century*. New York: Routledge.

Notes to the teachers

Depending on the size of a class, giving feedback on the students' answers to the deepening questions of each session might be unrealistic. Alternatively, students could be asked to hand in their answers only to selected sessions, evaluate their progress by comparison with the model solutions, or to evaluate the answers of their peers. The model solutions can be used by teachers for preparation of in-class discussions as well as for self-study students.

The implementation of the hands-on collaborative project requires preparation and close coordination with the involved partners. Suitable partners might be journalism and similar programmes from other (non-)academic institutions in a country, related programmes in foreign countries, and other faculties from the same institutions such as statistics, natural or social sciences. The aim and time-frame of the collaboration should be agreed on by all teaching partners and communicated to all participating students.

Ideally, the project phase kicks off with a meeting of all participants (students and teachers). As this might not be financially feasible, a video conference could replace a personal meeting. A clear communication structure should be set up beforehand. Repeated inquiries on work progress as well as interventions in teams struggling with their set-up or unresponsive partners might become necessary. However, the aim of the collaborative project phase is that the student groups organise their work independently. During the project phase, in-class discussions help to exchange tips and tricks and to jointly develop useful strategies to cope with the uncertainties of collaborative work.

Observations

Depending on the session and the language skills of the students, students claimed to have needed about 1 to 2 hours to work through each session. An additional 1 to 2 hours were needed for answering the deepening questions. No information is available on how much time the reading of obligatory and facultative literature consumed.

In general, the navigation through the e-learning materials is self-explanatory. However, although today's students often are called 'digital natives', we noticed that depending on skills, experience and infrastructure all students need explanation and time to adapt to new digital tools. This is especially true to the use of more complex communication channels like Slack and tools to enhance digital security. Questions on technicalities should be answered in a timely manner, a short display of distinctive tools in class / through a video should be considered.

Open questions or interesting ideas from individual answers to the e-learnings' deepening questions can be collected and presented by the teacher – with consideration to data protection laws – to enable in-depth discussions in class or allow students to compare their own learning progress to that of other students.

The team

Tina Bettels-Schwabbauer is a research associate at the Erich Brost Institute where she works as managing editor of the German website of the European Journalism Observatory, and at the Institute of Journalism at TU Dortmund University where she is in charge of the public relations of the institute and of its study programmes. For the NEWSREEL project she was responsible for the research phase and developed e-learning materials on the field of collaborative journalism together with her colleague Nadia Leihs.

Nadia Leihs is a research associate at the Erich Brost Institute. In the NEWSREEL project, she was involved in the publication of the research report and the development of the e-learning materials for the course on collaborative journalism. From 2014 to 2017 she was managing the project „Ombudsmen in Tunisia“, which introduced the concept of media Ombudsmen to Tunisian media outlets and trained future Ombudswomen and -men. She works as a freelance journalist and is a PhD candidate at the University of Erfurt and the Freie Universität Berlin.

Marcus Kreutler is a research associate at the Erich Brost Institute for International Journalism at TU Dortmund University. He participated in several international research projects and is the co-ordinator of an international study into coverage of migration and refugee matters. He has worked as a journalist and as a journalism lecturer as well as a trainer in the field of migration and the media. For the NEWSREEL-project, he has contributed to the editing of the teaching guide and the online glossary.

Annexes

Model solutions for the course “Collaborative Journalism”

Session 1: What is collaborative journalism

Question 1

Name three obstacles that might constrain a journalist who wishes to take part in an international journalistic collaboration and sketch a solution for each.

An answer might include the following aspects:

Organisational Obstacles	Possible Solutions
Intercultural sensitivity	Openness, ask questions, clear communication about aims and strategies, patience, understanding and appreciation
Lack of common language	take and share notes, agree on working language(s), employ translators if necessary
Different time zones	Need of understanding, consideration, clear communication
Different work philosophies	Change perspectives, ask questions, understanding and appreciation, patience
Fear that partners might violate agreements	Start small, build trust
Need to construct collaborative environments	Agreement with employer on infrastructure, use of a shared work space, set up of technical solutions, secure financial means, employ staff
Different access to journalistic sources	Openness about access and challenges, adaptation of research plan (research question, schedule), find additional/alternative partners, find additional/alternative sources, flexibility with deadlines
Partners invest time and effort on different levels	Openness, truthfulness, adaptation of research plan, end partnership
Lack of resources	Application for grants / crowdfunding, involvement of bigger partners that can support you financially, start with a small project, ask for help from fellow / experienced journalists
Media pluralism	

Fear of decrease	Collaboration with non-competitors, broadening the range of investigations instead of using it for day-to-day news gathering, support of small newsrooms and freelancers, online publication and promotion
Appropriate partners	
Other media are not interested in collaboration	Extend your network, look for alternatives outside your region/country, start your project and see if partners are more interested when they can see the first results
Other journalists are not interested	Extend your network, look for partners outside journalism, look for journalists outside your region/country, engage with journalism students and their teachers, start your project and see if partners are more interested when they can see the first results
Data security	
Surveillance	Awareness, encryption, personal meetings, risk assessment
Infrastructure	Investments, strategy, expert consultation

Model solution

One type of obstacle a journalist would have to face if s/he wants to work with other journalists of other countries could be organisational ones, such as different languages, work philosophies or possibilities to access information. The circumstances can be very different from person to person, country to country and newspaper to newspaper.

A possible solution could be a very detailed agreement or contract in which these organisational topics are written down, so everybody who is working on the collaborative project has to follow the same rules, regardless of the country he/she is coming from. In this agreement paper, the limitations and possibilities in different countries should be considered very well, before the project starts. This can provide a better feeling of security for the journalist.

Another obstacle can be finding an appropriate partner for the collaborative work. Especially small newspapers or publishers, or single journalists might face this problem. A possible solution is a very focused search for co-workers, for example for newspapers with a similar wo/manpower or, on the contrary, find large organisations which are willing to collaborate with smaller ones and even help them out when it comes to experience or financial resources.

Also, data security can be an obstacle in collaboration. Therefore, digital communication, e.g. via mail or messengers, must be secured and encrypted. Other ways of communication, for example Skype, should be avoided when it comes to sensitive information. Knowledge is a very valid point regarding this topic. Hence, every journalist who wants to work in a collaborative way must be aware of this topic and also inform his/her partners about it.

Question 2

In your view, has digitalization already had an impact on journalism? If yes, do you consider it positive, negative or inconsistent? Please give a short explanation (about 300 words).

An answer might include the following aspects:

- positive: new communication channels, faster transmission of information, potential of global audience, customizing of media content, more sources for information, innovative research tools (data journalism, visualisation), new jobs / different profiles in journalism, new business models, simplification of cross-border collaboration / collaboration between different media outlets, involvement of the audience, collaboration with non-journalistic actors like scientists
- negative: loss of revenue streams, non-acceptance of digital payment models, increased competition, unification of media markets, reductions in staff resulting in time pressure for remaining staff, increase of platforms with populist and entertainment content, loss of gate-keeper function, e.g. direct communication of political, economic and other actors through their digital platforms, algorithms determine news agenda instead of journalism, threat to democratic processes by emergence of information bubbles due to personal and algorithm-driven customization of media content
- inconsistent: consideration of positive and negative aspects

Model solution

It is certain for me that digitalization has an impact on journalism. I would neither say it is great for journalism nor terrible. Digitalization changes journalism and it is too early to say if it will change it for the better or for worse. Digitalization has many advantages: Journalists can collaborate easier, investigate topics in a more detailed fashion and it is way easier today to find out what is going on in the USA – all you need to do is open the twitter app on your phone. For me, digitalization is also globalization. Getting information has never been so easy. Collaborations as big as we experience them now are only possible because of digitalization. At the same time, journalists lose their role as Gatekeepers and become Gatewatchers instead. It is hard to sell news when everyone can get nearly every information on the internet for free. Not only journalists gain from new investigative chances that digitalization brings - surveillance is way easier nowadays, thanks to the internet, and therefore a threat for independent and investigative reporting. Still, without digitalization the Panama Papers would never have been published. The anonymity of the internet and its way of sending large data gave John Doe the opportunity so send his data to the Sueddeutsche Zeitung via a Darknet website. Edward Snowden used digitalization to uncover spying that could only exist because of digitalization. There is no black and white answer to this question. Digitalization is a challenge for journalism, but also a chance.

Question 3

What features of collaborative journalism can be found in the example of the Panama Papers investigation? Name three and explain your choice.

An answer might include the following aspects:

- involvement of numerous media outlets, global cross-border research, intercultural team work, global relevance of research, investigative journalism, shared technological infrastructure (data bank, server, communication channels), shared research results, mutual support, collaboration of journalists and data experts, joint publication date

Model solution

Features of collaboration found in “The Panama Papers” include:

- First and most obviously, there were many different media organizations involved. The Süddeutsche Zeitung and the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ) initially and for the period of publishing hundreds of media outlets. The most basic feature of collaboration is that journalists from different media outlets work together.
- A journalist from the SZ got access to the leaked data through a whistleblower in 2015. But instead of working on the data by himself and for his news outlet exclusively, he collaborated with experts from the ICIJ. As the research and evaluation went on for more than a year, this helped immensely. The results would probably not have been published as soon if the SZ journalist had done it alone, so sharing duties (especially with people who are experts in certain fields, e.g. data analyzation) is another important feature of collaboration.
- Finally, when the results of the investigation were published in April 2016 more than a hundred newspapers, TV stations and online media outlets in about 80 countries took part. They all released the news at the same time which once more emphasizes how important collaboration is. The news reached people in so many countries at the same time which would not have been possible had only one outlet published it. Another feature: all the outlets adapted the findings to fit their formats, readers, medium.

Session 2: Forms of collaborative journalism

Question 1

Please describe shortly one example from your national or local media market for each of the forms of collaborative journalism as differentiated by Sarah Stonbely.

Model solution

Temporary and separate

In this form of journalistic collaboration, according to Stonbely, partners work together in one-time projects but create content separately. The content is then shared. An example would be the project “Globale Gesellschaft”, in which SPIEGEL ONLINE took part. SPIEGEL-reporters from all over the world reported from Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe about societal challenges and development. The project was sponsored by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for three years. The time is therefore limited. Other media like “The Guardian” and “El Pais” had similar projects with their reporters sponsored by the foundation. SPIEGEL ONLINE mentioned the other news organizations and they are all part of the similar project, however, the content was produced completely separate.

More: https://www.spiegel.de/thema/globale_gesellschaft/

Temporary and co-creating

In a temporary and co-creating form of journalism, journalists chose to cooperate for a limited period of time and create content together. “Europe’s Far Right Research Network” was a cooperation between the Newspapers taz, Falter, Gazeta Wyborcza, HVG, Internazionale and Libération. Up until the 2019 European Parliament election the journalists involved worked together and investigated how the far right prepared for the election.

More: <https://europa.blog/dossiers/europes-far-right-research-network/>

Temporary and integrated

The collaboration “Ambulant operieren - so zufrieden sind Patienten in Sachsen” (Outpatient surgery – How satisfied are patients in Saxony?) was a project by the three regional daily newspapers Freie Presse, Sächsische Zeitung and Leipziger Volkszeitung. They asked 100.000 patients in Saxony who underwent surgery as out-patients how satisfied they were with the procedure and the results. The survey was conducted and analysed with the help of scientists from TU Dresden University. From October to December 2015 the results were published individually by each of the three newspapers involved.

More: <https://www.lvz.de/Thema/Specials/Ambulant-operieren>

Ongoing and separate

The Ohio Valley Resource is a regional journalism collaborative reporting on economic and social change in Kentucky, Ohio and West Virginia. It combines seven public media outlets across the three states and is a long term project where the partners create content separately and share it.

More: <https://ohiovalleyresource.org/>

Ongoing and co-creating

Project “Europa”: In 2011, the Guardian teamed up with five other papers from the largest EU countries to investigate the European predicament. Since then, the Europa team – the Guardian, Le Monde, La Vanguardia, La Stampa, Gazeta Wyborcza and Süddeutsche Zeitung – have worked together to dig deeper into some of the major issues of the day.

More: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/series/europa>

Ongoing and integrated

A research cooperation of the daily newspaper Süddeutsche Zeitung and the public broadcasters WDR and NDR was established to tackle complex and time-consuming investigative research. The occasional cooperations are coordinated by a joint investigation department.

More: https://www.ndr.de/der_ndr/daten_und_fakten/Recherchekooperation-NDR-WDR-und-Sueddeutsche-Zeitung,kooperationen100.html

Question 2

Choose one of the forms from Stonbelys scheme and develop a draft for a journalistic investigation and the network necessary to implement it. Reflect on what benefits and tensions might arise when putting the collaboration into practice.

An answer might include the following aspects:

- Benefits

bigger reach, deeper understanding, additional information

If ongoing: partners already known to each other, trust each other, structures exist as well as means to develop them

If temporary: opportunity to test if partners think along the same lines, no long-term commitment, possibility to evaluate after the project and optimize the process or look for other partners

If separate: every partner works according to his or her interests, resources, and timing. Partners do not need to wait for others' results

- Tensions

If ongoing: changes in goals, staff, or investors may compromise a continued effort

If temporary: trust needs to be built, structures need to be developed, and the schedule could be too tight

If co-creating / integrated: Co-ordination needs more time and staff as compared to working separately. If one partner delivers content late, all other partners will have to wait.

Generally, the research process may take more time.

Model Solution

One possible investigation would be a research on how sustainable local governments act and whether they stick to the rules or not. Therefore, journalists in different cities within Germany – or from different countries within Europe if it is to be an international cooperation – could do research on how their local government acts on sustainability issues. After a certain period of time, the results could be shared and put into one concluding article or a series of articles, which then are either published on a special website for the project or in the media outlets the journalists work for under a similar headline.

Possible tensions could arise when the journalists have to decide when to publish the material. They have to be able to trust one another, so that nobody releases the material early. Furthermore, tensions can arise when some members do not stick to deadlines or when some do less research than others. Therefore, there have to be clear standards that everybody can rely on. Benefits would be that each journalist has better connections to their hometowns' or their countries' politicians and has easier access to information about their sustainability than to the one of foreign countries or cities. The other journalists can profit from that expertise and vice-versa.

Session 3: Teamwork in collaborative journalism

Question 1

Do you consider yourself a good team player? Why or why not? (approx. 300 words)

An answer might include the following aspects:

- Communication skills
- Mediation / conflict management
- Listening (active listening, asking questions, nonverbal cues, summarizing)
- Reliability (deadlines, clear tasks, immediate responses)
- Respectfulness (eye contact, use of names)
- Trust (be trustworthy, trust others)
- Sharing and helping
- Specialization / specific skills
- Networking skills
- Awareness for nonverbal communication
- Anticipation of potential obstacles
- Knowledge of intercultural differences, willingness to adapt own expectation and communication

Model solution

The question of whether I am a good team player is one I honestly feel conflicted about. I definitely consider myself a communicative person, which is why I have no problem to interact with new people and to form groups. As I am also a very opinionated person, I like to engage in discussions and pitch my ideas to others. Furthermore, I often find myself in the role of the mediator within a group because I feel obligated to involve all parties. That often means that I also try to encourage the quieter group members to share their ideas. When I was 6 years old I started playing handball. Especially there I learnt how to be part of a team. I had to communicate with the other team members, I needed to be reliable so that the others could trust me, I developed my strengths and brought it to the team. I learnt that it is not just a good feeling to be part of a team and behave like a team player, I learnt that you can achieve much more in a team.

On the other hand, school and unfortunately also university has taught me, to be very cautious regarding being a team player. I have always been very ambitious, and I can handle a lot of work, which is why my fellow students have often tried to take advantage of me. While I did most of the work, they leaned back and waited until they could profit from a good grade in the end. This continuous experience of unreliability has made me a bit weary of group work.

Nevertheless, I like to work in groups when I can choose the people I work with. In some journalism seminars, I had to collaborate with fellow students and the results were great, as was the working process. What I also like about collaborative work is that you get many insights you probably would have not had on your own. Discussions often make projects a lot better and thorough. In conclusion, I would say that I have certain qualities, which enable me to be a good and reliable partner in a group, but mixed experiences in the past have taught me that being a team player can also result in other people taking advantage of you.

Question 2

Sketch a short scenario for

- a loose network in journalism
- a limited collaboration in journalism
- a close collaboration in journalism (each about 200 words)

An answer might include the following aspects:

- loose - eyes, ears and colleagues in other countries (networks like Hostwriter, mailing lists, Facebook groups, Twitter followers, regular meetings at conferences, sharing interesting information with colleagues)
- limited - subtasks are clearly distinct and defined and can be solved together, mutual exchange, often limited to specific areas (such as Freedom of Information Acts (FOIA), local aspects of global processes and events like factors and consequences of migration or business practices of global enterprises, comparison of legal systems or statistical data), often temporary, no involvement of direct competitors in one team
- close - an investigation team in several countries, working on the same data, intensive collaboration, sharing and commenting results of single investigations, merging single investigations' results, trust necessary, often journalists have known each other for some time and have already collaborated on a smaller scale (examples are Panama Papers, EIC, OCCPR)

Model solution

- a loose network in journalism

A loose network in journalism could be for example a German journalist who is an expert on the pharmaceutical industry building personal connections to journalists across the world who cover the same topic. These people could have met at a conference organised by the World Health Organisation or a press event of a lobbying group. There they probably exchanged their email-addresses and started following each other on Twitter, LinkedIn and Xing. The German journalist then occasionally emails the other journalists that are part of the loose network when she comes across a press release from a big pharma group or when she reads an interesting study on how the costs for producing a new drug is only one hundredths of what the company sells it for. In return, she receives interesting mails from the other journalist that can be an inspiration for her own research or an addition to an article she is currently working on. Since she does not know the other journalists that well, she double-checks all the information she gets before she publishes it. One day, she hears about a scandal in which a big German pharma group that operates internationally might be involved and considers which colleagues from her loose network could be reliable and suitable partners for a proper collaboration.

- a limited collaboration in journalism

When the German journalist first hears that a big German pharma group allegedly did not mention a severe potential side effect in the patient information leaflet of one of their drugs that was primarily used in the eastern European states, she wants to know whether the health departments in these countries know about this. She remembers that some of the journalists in her network had requested similar information in Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic before and asks them to help her. In return, she offers them the information she got from her source. In addition, she offers to request information from the regional health ministry that partly funded the development of the drug. This sparks the interest of the other journalists and they agree to help the German Journalist. Once all journalists involved receive the requested information, they share it and then individually decide when and how to use it. Afterwards this limited collaboration dissolves, since the journalists all start working on projects that only focus on their own home country. Nevertheless, they stay in contact and are still part of the same loose network they have been before.

- a close collaboration in journalism

By now, the German journalist has had some experience with smaller limited collaborations and is ready for a bigger and more intense collaboration. Rumour has it that several European pharma groups still sell drugs to the US government for lethal injections despite strict export regulations on a European level. Allegedly, some high-ranking European politicians are involved in this deal as well. Obviously, the German journalist could not do all the research on her own, which is why she contacts some of the journalists with whom she had worked before and who also know each other. The team members are all quite experienced in working collaboratively and have gained each other's trust over the years. Together they start digging, always having each other's back and making sure that everybody is safe. During the process, they communicate clearly and openly. Finally, they are able to gather enough information and data to prove that several companies are indeed still shipping drugs for lethal injections to the US, all supported by important politicians. They agree on a simultaneous publication and individually use the information and materials for their national target groups. After the publications, they talk to each other on a regular basis and plan on working together again soon.

Question 3

In your opinion, how much should a journalist know about coding? (about 300 words)

An answer might include the following aspects:

- necessity of (basic) technical understanding, listening skills, verbal skills, openness to adaptations of journalistic goals and strategies to technological opportunities, understanding for the necessity of clear and reliable schedules that are jointly developed and include periodic meetings and sharing of interim results of the journalistic research and the technical development, willingness to communicate about journalistic and technical challenges and obstacles early and clearly, willingness to fair work distribution and development of adequate structures such as communication channels, mutual respect for different skills, ask questions, patience, tolerance

Model solution

In my opinion, journalists should have a basic knowledge of coding, but I think they do not necessarily have to have distinct technological knowledge, since they can work together with skilled coders and IT-specialists, that are experts in their fields. Anyway, I think that journalists should at least try to learn the basics about coding and get a sense of that field in order to understand coders, make the communication with them easier and maybe even to solve very basic coding tasks alone. Nowadays, at least a basic knowledge of coding is almost as important as language skills and it is one of the key tasks – not only for data journalists – to get to know more of that topic and be able to understand the main points and processes of it. For the more detailed coding work, complicated tasks and in-depth-analysis, the journalists could work together with professional coders who have a deeper knowledge of coding and are able to get the most out of the given data or research. While working together on a project in a team, both sides can still learn a lot from each other and improve their knowledge. If there is no understanding, there will not be any good results from both sides. It is important for the journalist to try to think from a coder's point of view, to know what one can expect from a coder and be open to different approaches and ways of thinking. Only if there is a general understanding and appreciation for each other, the collaboration can become a success. In my opinion, it is very important, that in the digitalized world we live in, journalists make an effort in gaining knowledge and experience on topics like statistics, technology and coding. It can only enrich their work, make their workflow easier, give them a broader view on research and enable them to communicate easily while working together with coders and IT-specialists.

Session 4: Planning a cross-border collaborative project

Question 1

Sketch a short cross-border „current event“ story idea (approx. 500 words)

An answer might include the following aspects:

- current issue that gains high media attention and is relevant for audiences in different countries, assumption of different perspectives in the different countries
- organization, chain or comparative stories (for a detailed explanation of these terms see Alfter 2019, 41), examples might be: terrorist attacks, environment scandals and catastrophes, police investigations against criminal cross-border networks, global protest movements, regional / global migratory movements, technological development, international VIP travel/tours
- sketch components: story idea, hypotheses, distribution of work in a team, countries relevant to the investigation, schedule

Model solution

An article is published about two teenagers who were shot in Sweden. One of the teenagers died. The authorities started to tackle the underlying problem of gang crimes with a new approach than they had reacted to similar events before the recent killing. Based on that a journalist plans a long-term cross-border collaboration on gang crimes and how the authorities in the partners' countries tackle the problem. She develops some guiding questions: What kind of deeds are typical gang crimes in the different countries? How many of the crimes count as gang crimes (proportionally)? What do the gangs typically look like (social structures like families, clans or neighbourhoods, age, etc.)? Do the gangs operate internationally? What are counteractions to gang crimes? → interactive map of gang crimes in Europe

The hypothesis: The characteristics of gang crimes differ from country to country and so do countermeasures.

Cross-border relevance: In which countries might this gang criminality be relevant? Germany, Sweden, Lithuania, Poland, Spain, Italy, Great Britain, etc. -> There is no country with no gang crime (except maybe from Vatican City State)

Type of collaboration: rather close than loose

- Skills needed: graphic / data visualization, data analysts, journalists experienced in crime reporting (maybe with contacts to Interpol) who can give input about how much time is required for the research and may obtain necessary documents easier, common language (English?), head editor / project manager needed

The combined research cumulates in an interactive map; but afterwards partners are free to publish individual stories, which are relevant to their audience and countries

Timeline for initial research, to establish dataset/interactive map: 3-5 months (depending on how much data is acquired) 1 month to develop/improve dataset/interactive map

Work in teams (ideally 2-3 persons per country)

-> One group focuses on: What kind of crime are gang crimes in the respective countries typically? How many of the crimes count as gang crimes (proportionally)? What do the gangs typically look like (social structures (families, clans), age, etc.)? Do the gangs operate international?

-> Another group focuses on the authorities: What are counteractions to gang crimes? How long does it take to solve cases of gang crime? What resources have authorities at hand (especially financial resources)?

- Secured video/telephone conference each week to pinpoint problems as early as possible, e.g. topics that are more time consuming than previously thought

-> secured communication via email

-> secured cloud in which documents are collected and shared

Funding: apply for grant by journalismfund.eu, other foundations/charities (e.g. Bill & Melinda Gates foundation)

Question 2

What are the similarities and differences in setting up a collaborative journalism project with colleagues in your own country and a cross-border collaborative journalism project with colleagues from abroad? (approx. 500 words)

An answer might include the following aspects:

Similarities

- similar phases according to the seven-step work circle (Alfter 2019): build network, develop idea, set up team, develop research plan, do the investigation, publish, share your experience with peers
- work perceptions might be different and must be integrated in the collaboration's set up (research ethics, journalistic standards, different workflows e.g. caused by different publication channels, size of news room)
- topics could be either current, organization, chain or comparative stories
- each journalist / newsroom needs to do a reality check (own resources, relevance for audience, willingness of the media outlet to publish results)
- challenge to find the right colleagues (expertise, work ethics, resources, interest, security)
- to create enough media attention, partners should be diverse and include prominent / influential media outlets / journalists

Differences

- in national collaborations there are hardly any intercultural differences, members often speak the same language and live in the same time zone, they might be direct competitors in the market, will have probably similar financial resources, personal meetings certainly are less costly – while in cross-border collaborations visa regulations and meagre financial resources might prevent personal meetings, security aspects might be less relevant in national collaborations (highly dependent on the research topic)

Model solution

When setting up a journalistic collaboration, be it cross-border or within one's own country, several aspects have to be considered. Several questions need to be clarified in advance, so all partners know in which direction the project is heading. This includes identifying the research question and the scope of the collaboration. Furthermore, the general timeline and the timeline for each of the collaborating institutions have to be set and expectations need to be clarified. In addition, it has to be agreed upon which partners are going to take part in the collaboration. This does not only include the media outlets or organisations, but also the individual journalists in those outlets. The partners have to agree on a structure: Which partner is going to fulfil the role of the lead editor, who is going to be the project manager? Another important question is the funding of the project. Furthermore, the partners have to agree which metrics are going to be tracked. These questions all apply equally to national and to cross-border projects.

A question that might be more difficult to solve in a cross-border collaboration than in a national one, might be which values and ethics the partners share. Living and working in different countries, journalists might have different standards or even different ethical beliefs. Organisational questions like "How are the partners going to communicate? What is the workflow? How does everybody stay up to date?" might be more difficult to answer in cross-border project as misunderstandings due to different language levels can occur. Understanding how and why people work in a certain way is always easier when team members have the same journalistic cultural background. Furthermore, one has to deal with time differences and the fact that in some countries the financial means for investigative journalism simply are not there.

Another important point to consider is that tasks have to be distributed according to the possibilities each partner has in their country. This also means taking into account legal and security issues that might make the investigation more difficult or dangerous for a journalist in a specific country. It could be harder to convince a journalist to collaborate because they could work in an environment in which doing investigative research is a big danger. Another partner therefore could fulfil difficult tasks – whereas the partner in the "difficult country" might contribute other information.

Finding the right colleagues for a collaboration is always a difficult task but trying to find the right people abroad can be an even bigger struggle. Mutual trust and a common sense of ethics and journalistic standards is needed. A journalist's network is most likely more advanced in their own country so there is a bigger pool of people to choose from the start, furthermore it might be easier to trust colleagues one has already met during a press conference than colleagues you might not have the possibility to meet that frequently.

In one country, it might be easier to find a topic that all partners are interested in. Agreeing on a topic that is relevant, striking and interesting for the general public might be a bigger issue in a cross-border project.

Session 5: Communication tools for collaborative journalism

Question 1

Choose a file-sharing service you know and one you have not used before and collect in a list the information the providers give you on how they secure your account and data. Do a quick online search (ten minutes each) and see what others say about the security measures of both. Add that information to your list.

An answer might include the following aspects:

- cost, funding model, advertisements policy, sale of data to third parties, size of shared documents / folders / account, type of storable data, complexity of account / file structures, duration of storage, individual / shared rights of access to data / files / account, joint work, reliability of access, user accessibility / simplicity of access, information on user security (passwords etc.), two-factor authentication, (end-to-end) encryption (technology), user identity control, user numbers, deletion of data, location of server, security of servers, back up policy, back door for governments / security agencies / third parties, hacker attacks, privacy breaches, own security team / cooperation with security experts, open source code, collection of metadata

Model solution

File-sharing service *How does it secure my account and data?*

*I use: **Dropbox*** *What it says:*

- Several security levels, reliable infrastructure (constantly checked for security flaws)
- Guideline and safety-mechanisms to protect data
- Safety tools to protect data, two-factor authentication
- Saved data is being encrypted
- Safe transport between servers (names certain socket layer)
- Public data only accessible through Link

What others say:

- Prime hacker target because of its reputation
- Dropbox is unequipped to deal with breaches of private information
- Dropbox “beefed up” its encryption, does a great job there
- Provides each user protection for every file
- Authentication to ensure web safety during use
- Dropbox has both internal security teams and third party analysts conduct regular tests of its servers

*I have not used
before:* **Jungle Disk**

What it says:

- “Encrypts user data with AES-256 encryption; a government and industry standard that’s one of the most well-studied and most secure encryption algorithms available”
- Unique key for each file
- Special security of cloud providers
- Enhanced background check process
- protected by multiple issuing controls increasing security, extended validation

What others say:

- Strong security
- BUT no two-factor authentication
- End-to-end encryption
- One of the strongest encryption algorithms
- How secure data will be in the data centre depends on which cloud provider is chosen

Question 2

Choose a messenger you know and one you have not used before and collect in a list the information the providers give you on how they secure your account and data. Do a quick online search (ten minutes each) and see what others say about the security measures of both. Add that information to your list.

An answer might include the following aspects:

- costs, funding model, advertisements policy, sale of data to third parties, usability for different types of devices, user numbers, reliability of access, migration to other devices, user accessibility / simplicity of access, information on user security (passwords etc.), two-factor authentication, (end-to-end) encryption (technology), secret chats and other privacy settings, emoticons, size and type of shared data (photo, video), user identify control, control over access to information on device (contacts, memory, camera), deletion of data, location of server, security of servers, back up policy, back door for governments / security agencies / third parties, hacker attacks, privacy breaches, own security team / cooperation with security experts, open source code, user numbers, collection of metadata

Model solution

Messenger *How does it secure my account and data?*

I use: Whatsapp

What it says:

- End-to-end encryption for messages and calls
- Settings for data privacy adaptable, basic controlling mechanisms
- Block other users
- Report for information and settings on account available
- Two-factor authentication possible

What others say:

- Safe, provides end-to-end encryption => ensures that only you and the person you're talking with can read what is sent
- "WhatsApp uses part of a security protocol developed by Open Whisper Systems, a company that has its own fully secure messaging app Signal"
- Enormous user base makes it an obvious target for cybercriminals => problem is Whatsapp Web
- Whatsapp shares its data with Facebook, nobody knows to what extent

*I have not used
before: Signal*

What it says:

- End-to-end encryption
- State-of-the-art security
- Additional technical information stored on servers, but limited to the minimum

What others say:

- Widely regarded as the most secure and private way to communicate
- Signal is almost transparent in use
- Includes the option to encrypt all stored messages
- "Secure Signal messages are encrypted using the Signal Protocol, which is arguably the most secure text messaging protocol ever developed"
- Other additional security features available
- Metadata information that Signal itself retains is "the date and time a user registered with Signal and the last date of a user's connectivity to the Signal service"

Question 3

After having done that research, do you consider to change the provider of your file-sharing account or your messenger? Explain your decision to a friend or your mother (approx. 300 words).

An answer might include the following aspects:

A decision (not) to change the provider and an explanation for that decision along with some criteria from the previous questions such as (end-to-end) encryption, low/high user numbers, location of servers, cooperation with security experts, sharing of data with third parties / security agencies.

Model solution

It's a sunny afternoon in spring. Me and my best friend Laura talk about data security.

Me: Did you know that WhatsApp isn't as bad regarding data security? I mean, all conversation is end-to-end encrypted, so nobody but us can read what we write. And calls are also encrypted. So it's pretty fine for private use.

Laura: Just for private use?

Me: Yeah, if I had to work in an investigative project, I would change my messenger and chose Signal. That's the messenger Edward Snowden uses.

Laura: Okay, wow. So why is Signal so secure?

Me: First, Signal doesn't collect metadata: data like to whom or when I send messages. These metadata could be used against me in countries, where the freedom of the press is limited. So governments could ask for this metadata and spy on me or my colleagues. And this could be very dangerous. Moreover "screen security" is optional. That means, that no member of the conversation and no apps can take screenshots. If the conversation is about sensitive topics, it might be better if there is no option to store it. I mean, screenshots containing parts of the conversation might get publicized if the mobile phone gets hacked. This might be dangerous for me, my colleagues and my sources. And it's also about trust. I trust my friends that they don't take screenshots and send them to people who want to attack me with it. But I don't know if other journalists would maybe do that, for example if the government puts them under pressure. In addition to that, Signal offers that you can make messages disappear after a set time and you can write self-destructing messages.

Laura: And why wouldn't you use Signal for private use?

Me: Just because the end-to-end encryption is nearly the same, so it's both based on the Signal protocol. Moreover, most of my friends use WhatsApp and we need to use the same messenger to communicate. Private communication would be more difficult, if I'd change my messenger.

Laura: And what do you think about Google Drive?

Me: I don't like that Google Drive collects plenty of data. Although all files are encrypted, Google scans them. And it's unclear, who is able to use this huge amount of data. Yet I don't know what option would be better. I read about Jungle Disk, but I wouldn't want to pay for a file-sharing service. And Jungle Disk also cooperates with Google Drive and mentions that Google Drive is safe. Also, you can't use two-factor authentication in Jungle Disk. That's why I would use Google's "Advanced Security Program" for journalists instead.

Session 6: Implementing a collaborative project – intercultural communication

Question 1

Which difficulties can occur in international teams regarding the uncertainty avoidance? Have you already encountered difficulties yourself concerning this matter? (approx. 300 words)

An answer might include the following aspects:

exert control by establishing explicit rules / codes of behaviour or belief; relaxed attitude towards risks such as granting loans, acceptance of uncertainty and doubt, (low score of uncertainty avoidance = more relaxed approach) disagreement about the need of arrangements concerning rules, work distribution, schedules, regular meetings, journalistic formats, communication channels

- refusal to adhere to explicit rules
- insistence on extensive set of rule

easy vs. strict handling of agreements

- violations (delay in submitting tasks, absence during meetings, non-realisation of tasks, delegation to other colleagues, publication before/after set date)
- lack of understanding for necessary adaptation of agreements due to scheduling difficulties, unforeseen events, difficulties during research like non-respondent sources

willingness to take risks

- high: use of non-secure communication channels, inclusion of new partners without consent of team, early publication of (interim) results, use of untrustworthy sources
- low: exclusive use of official sources, refusal to integrate innovative research methods, refusal to integrate new partners, delay of publication because of extensive verification, laborious communication

Model solution

Attitudes to risk and uncertainty can differ widely from one culture to another and can also strongly influence the way people perceive each other. Cultures showing high uncertainty avoidance have a low tolerance for ambiguity and vagueness in most situations. They tend to be risk-averse and favour rules and a well-structured environment. Furthermore, they tend to establish laws, rules, regulation and control mechanisms. As a result, decisions in these cultures are made by consensus, projects are carefully planned, job roles often require a very high level of expertise and many rules are in place.

On the other hand, cultures with a low uncertainty avoidance work in a completely different way: They are open to new ideas and influences, favour flat organisational structures and people are more flexible and willing to take a risk. Therefore, people approach projects from different angles and may have a more flexible attitude towards deadlines. Additionally, there is a preference for flexible rules and informal activities.

Putting people from cultures with low and high uncertainty avoidance in one team can lead to many conflicts. While it is crucial for some team members to work out a precise plan, other team members have a more laid-back approach. The team members with a high uncertainty avoidance would be constantly stressed out and worried about not finishing the project on time whereas the team

members with a low uncertainty avoidance would feel pressured and overly restricted by plans and deadlines. In addition to that, the team members who do not like uncertainty would want to put one person in charge and establish some kind of hierarchy while the others would favour no hierarchy. The risk-averse team members would also be less likely to make late changes to the plan or try out completely new approaches and work methods, which then again would frustrate the team members who are more open-minded.

I personally have never worked in an international team, but I have worked with people who do not take deadlines and rules as seriously as I do. I do not consider myself a completely risk-averse person since I am always open to new ideas and favour flat organisational structures. Nevertheless, I think you can try out new things and be creative while following a plan and stick to deadlines. This has led to some minor conflicts in the past, especially when I felt like I was the only one taking the success of a project seriously.

Question 2

Sketch a feedback scenario (in a newsroom) and give constructive criticism. (about 300 words)

An answer might include the following aspects:

- Feedback Sandwich: Point out strengths, voice criticism, suggest ways of improvement / sketch potential positive outcomes
- Criticism focusses on the matter, never the person
- Criticism should be specific, point out concrete problems, give examples
- No assumptions on the reasons for problems should be voiced
- Goals should be achievable, partners should not be overburdened, no generalisations; results may be written down or summarized by the partner

Model solution

The scenario: A member of the newsroom produced a short product for the radio program. Therefore, he had to cut vox-pops from people in the street and put them together. It is a funny piece and the content is really good. The problem is that the cut is pretty bad because the ends of some sentences are missing and the cut is hard. This is not the first time this problem occurs.

The feedback (referring to the sandwich method): "I like the piece in general because it is very funny and I think the audience is entertained well. It is evident that you took a lot of time to think about good questions. Unfortunately, the cut is not good: Sometimes I cannot even understand the end of the sentence the interviewed person said. For example, the piece contains an answer of a young man and the last verb of his sentence was missing. In general, I can really hear the cuts because the words are cut quite hard. This is really too bad because it would make your radio pieces even better if the cut was softer. For the next piece, I would recommend to cut the sentences with a little pause at the end of the sentence. It could be also helpful to leave some "ums" and breaks due to the breathing of the interviewed person in the radio piece because this makes it easier to cut and it sounds a lot softer. Finally I want to stress again that the content of the piece is great and I really appreciate that such funny things are part of the program."

Session 7: Financing collaborative journalism

Question 1

Compare three campaigns for journalistic projects on three different crowdfunding platforms including one that was not successful.

- a) How do the campaigners address their potential funders and how do they attract attention? Name some similarities and differences.
- b) If you were to set up your own campaign: What aspects would you integrate? What aspects would you drop completely?
- c) Would you invest in one of the campaigns if you had the money? In which and why?

An answer might include the following aspects, focussing on similarities and differences:

- Project description and time frame are clear,
- Use of different communication channels
- Invitation to information events
- Video about the product available
- Appealing graphics
- People behind the campaign are being introduced
- Steps already taken are being described
- Monthly payment possible vs. one-time campaign
- Membership model
- Give-aways
- Gathering ideas from supporters and involving them in the research
- Special interest

Model solution

1 a)

In 2012 the German technology journalist Thomas Reintjes tried to find donors willing to invest 10.000 euros in his project Feodo – a crowdfunded magazine – via Indiegogo. His campaign failed – he only gained 2.083 euros. To explain his project, he embedded a YouTube video at Indiegogo explaining his idea. However, he could not present a real concept and just said that he needs the money to develop a concept. Feodo should have been a magazine in which journalists could have told stories digitally, no matter in which form. He barely described the content of the magazine. Moreover, he published an English and a German explanatory text, saying that the articles should also be financed via crowdfunding. A detailed FAQ complemented the campaign. Reintjes assured that everyone involved – reporters, funders and the editorial team – should be satisfied in the end and explained the risks of a funding: Reintjes wrote that – if the campaign failed – the gained money would be donated to organisations fighting for quality in journalism. It remained unclear which organisations he wanted to support. This unclear situation might have seemed too risky for funders.

The founders of the Luxembourgish online magazine reporter.lu chose a far more transparent campaign via Kickstarter saying that donators will get their money back if the campaign fails. This did not occur – the campaign was successful. Funders donated 181.800 euros, even more than the founders' goal of 150.000 euros.

In contrast to the Feodo campaign, the founders of reporter.lu decided not to embed a video – they only wrote an explanatory text in German. The explanatory text was very transparent, saying reporter.lu should be the first investigative magazine in Luxembourg that wants to work completely independent and thus needs to be funded by the crowd. Moreover, the rewards you get when you donate a certain amount of money were explained in detail. The founders of reporter.lu addressed their funders by making the concept very transparent und telling the advantages of a funding. Similarly transparent was the campaign of the Ukrainian journalist Taras Zozulinskyy via Press Start. Just like Thomas Reintjes, Zozulinskyy decided to explain his idea in a YouTube video where he also introduced himself and his former work. Moreover, he added a very extensive text about his reporting proposal "Cracking Eastern Europe's lead paint syndicate" and listed the awards he gained for his former work. In the end, his campaign was successful, he raised 3.420 dollars out of 2.200 dollars that were his goal. Like the founders of reporter.lu, Zozulinskyy addressed his funders by making his concept very transparent. However, he did not write about the potential risks of a funding as Reintjes and the founders of reporter.lu did.

All in all, it is to be observed that the two successful campaigns were very transparent for the funders, even though Taras Zoulinskyy did not say anything about potential risks like the others did. Only one of the three campaigns – reporter.lu – offered rewards for funding the project and thus emphasized the advantages for the funders. Feodo – the failing campaign by Thomas Reintjes – was very opaque, which was the hugest difference between this and the other campaigns. All the campaigns were explained via a detailed text and Taras Zoulinskyy und Thomas Reintjes also chose a video to explain their ideas. This attracted attention. The project reporter.lu attracted attention by offering different rewards for the funders.

1b)

If I were to set up my own campaign, I would definitely integrate a list of the risks for funders in order to appear trustworthy: If the campaign failed, every funder would get his or her money back. Moreover, I would explain the idea of my project in detail, an element that I found most striking in the campaigns of reporter.lu and Taras Zoulinskyy. It is very important to present a well-structured concept – so I would drop all the current uncertainties of my project. If I wanted to work investigatively like Taras Zoulinskyy, I would just summarize the idea of the project and completely drop my name, because it might be too dangerous to explain everything in detail. If I wanted to do a "normal" or safe research, I would do it like Taras Zoulinskyy and introduce me, my research proposal, and my former work in detail.

Like Thomas Reintjes, I would write an explanatory text in English and in German to make sure that everyone is able to fund the project.

1c)

I would invest in reporter.lu if I lived in Luxemburg, because it was the most transparent campaign and I like the idea of crowdfunded media to avoid bias and dependence. Moreover, the concept was very clear and structured and thus seemed very professional. I also like the idea of gaining a reward for funding a project; it provides a nice further incentive. Moreover, investing in reporter.lu means investing in various important stories and not in only one specific project. It is nice that you can achieve a lot with one investment.

Question 2

Sketch a project idea in a few sentences and draw up a (rough) budget plan for it.

An answer might include the following aspects:

- Idea
- Time frame
- Expenses for: personnel, insurance, travel to meetings and associated costs of meetings (venue, catering), travel for research, visa, translations, hardware (computers, printers, cameras, audio equipment), database access, office rent and other costs (communication, paper)

Model solution

A budget plan should include all expenses that are to be expected for the journalistic project. For this budget plan, I will refer to a European investigation. My project idea is to investigate right-wing parties and movements across Europe: How did they develop? Did they gain influence in the past years? Why do these people believe in right-wing ideologies? How do the ideologies and movements differ across Europe? Are they somehow connected? In order to find out about that, I would include perspectives from all over Europe. The more countries' perspectives are included, the better the bigger picture would be. At least, I would include one country from each region in Europe: one from Eastern Europe (like for example Hungary), one from Southern Europe (for example Italy), one from Northern Europe (like for example Sweden) and one from Western Europe (like Germany). The project would be published online with a focus on written articles. Multimedia elements could also be included.

The budget plan (this budget plan is calculated for members of the four countries mentioned above):
Salary for the team: Salaries have to be paid for four journalists. What a journalist earns on average differs from country to country. I could not really find complete trustworthy statistics showing what journalists in Europe earn in comparison. The numbers I found differed extremely. In Germany, journalists earn 4277 euros on average according to a study from 2017 (source: <https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/651363/umfrage/durchschnittseinkommen-in-journalistischen-berufen/>). I only found data from all the countries on "salary expert", but I do not think it is a representative statistic. They said that in Germany journalists earn 6221 euros on average. In Sweden journalists earn 4288 euros according to them (source: <https://www.salaryexpert.com/salary/job/journalist/sweden>), in Hungary 2214 euros (source:

<https://www.salaryexpert.com/salary/job/journalist/hungary>) and in Italy 5.129 euros (source: <https://www.salaryexpert.com/salary/job/journalist/italy>). However, this shows that the salaries in the countries differ. I would calculate the salary from the country where journalists earn the most for all of the countries, so that all four journalists earn the same. As the only reliable source I could find (and I do not consider “salary expert” to be one), I used the German average salary as found on Statista here. This would be 4277 euros for four persons, which is 17.108 euros per month. I would calculate three months for the investigation, so that would be 51.324 euros. Additionally, there would maybe have to be people helping in setting up the website or shooting videos. As this does not have to be during the whole time, I calculated three monthly salaries here, so there can be one additional person where needed every month. This accounts for 12.831 euros.

-> The costs for the salary of the team account for 64.155 euros.

Costs for team meetings: Team meetings on a regular basis could be carried out via video conferences. As we have learned, it is better to meet everyone in person at least once. So I would initiate a meeting at the beginning of the collaboration in the country where the coordinator of the investigation lives.

-> For travel expenses I would roughly calculate 400 euros per person, which accounts for 1200 euros in total as one person lives in the country or city where the meeting takes place.

Travel costs in connection with the research: I think as everybody only investigates within their own country travel costs should not be extremely high. It would mainly be about meeting protagonists and experts and talking to the right-wing parties. However, as the investigation takes three months, some money is certainly needed.

-> Therefore, I would calculate 2000 euros, which accounts for 500 euros per journalist.

Costs for visa: As all of these countries are part of the European Union, there are no visa costs.

Costs for translations: It would be the easiest if everybody spoke English and it would possibly also be the case as it is very common in Europe. I therefore would not calculate any costs for translations.

Costs for access to paid-for databases: I would roughly calculate 200 euros for that because the investigation mainly concentrates on the right-wing movements and the people. Therefore, there should not be too many paid-for databases that are needed.

Costs for equipment: As all of the partners collaborating most likely already use laptops for work and maybe also have other equipment, I would not consider these costs to be very high. Considering the focus on written articles in this project, there also do not need to be super-professional cameras or microphones. If additional equipment is needed for multimedia projects, I would roughly calculate 1000 euros for that. As the journalists work from four different countries, it would not make sense to rent an office in every location. Therefore, I think that working from home would be the best option. I therefore would not calculate any costs for renting an office.

-> I would calculate 1000 euros for costs for equipment. In total, this accounts for 68.555 euros.

Session 8: Involvement of the audience

Question 1

In your opinion, why did citizen journalism not fulfil the high hopes of equality and democratisation so far?

An answer might include the following aspects:

- Journalists' Perception

Official sources are considered more trustworthy by journalists than private persons. Journalists often expect content provided by citizens to be one-sided, of lower quality or simply false.

Journalists distinguish strongly between themselves and citizen journalists, pointing to professional standards only adhered to by themselves. User comments are expected to come from overly critical or outright annoying persons, criticism is perceived as not constructive.

- Lack of media literacy

Criticism is in fact sometimes fuelled by a lack of knowledge about journalistic workflows or differing political opinions. It may also be voiced based on single journalistic pieces that do not represent coverage as a whole.

- Lack of resources in the media

Generally, only user-generated content is being used in the coverage, but there is no collaboration especially on current issues. This may have to do with a lack of time due to staff reductions. Journalists' perception of internet users is changing from co-producers to distributors, from autonomous storytellers to mere content providers or sources.

Lack of communication channels for a constructive exchange of opinions. Specific platforms for citizen journalism launched by some mass media were not successful and have been replaced by social media; content was either not used or integrated in mass media coverage without contacting the original producers.

Collaboration requires ethical standards (ask for permission, empathy, time, possible consequences).

Inclusion of non-journalists in production of news requires resources (time, platforms, staff, and structures),

Increasing competition and shorter news cycles due to digitalisation and (non-journalistic) publication through social media

Verification requires trained personnel

Logic of news favours coverage of catastrophes

- Ethics

Safety of citizen journalists cannot be safeguarded by mass media; trainings are costly; individual bias is always possible, trust has to be built and maintained; feedback on content is necessary (what was good, what was not?).

- information overflow

Independent platforms for citizen journalists often only receive limited use in an internet overflowing with information.

Political platforms and news sites gain influence in times of rising distrust in conventional journalism.

- Bias and quality of contributions

Citizen journalists can only cover events or topics for a limited amount of time as they lack resources and training. They often have their own agenda (political opinions, financial interests, prejudices).

Content is usually only produced by a small part of the population that has the necessary resources (time, hardware, language skills, knowledge), so it is often not representative.

Model solution

I think that citizen journalism did not fulfil the high hopes of equality and democratisation so far because the citizen journalists participating in projects do not necessarily represent the society. The citizen journalists might lack representativeness and balance, as they do not always represent all social groups. Some groups might consume journalistic media on a regular basis and therefore can be reached much easier when media outlets call for citizen journalists to participate in projects. But there are also less media literate and disadvantaged people that are not represented. Therefore, the content produced by those citizen journalists does of course only represent the perspective of the citizen journalists themselves. They might not intent to provide only their point of view. But even if they try to be objective, there will always be their perspective and social background that influences the way they see the world and the subject they report about. Furthermore, there is the digital divide, which describes the difference in the ability of people to access digital media.

In order to solve this problem and to achieve equality and democratisation, journalists and media outlets have to try to address different social groups. They could do so by using different channels and selecting citizen journalists and, in doing so, pay attention to the social groups they come from. They then can try to construct a network of citizen journalists as diverse as possible.

Furthermore, some people might use the possibility to participate in journalistic projects as a way to promote their political agenda, which can also be a reason why citizen journalism did not fulfil the high hopes. The openness of citizen journalism can also be a risk. Therefore, media outlets have a great responsibility to crosscheck information forwarded to them by citizen journalists and to check whether there is any bias or agenda behind it.

Question 2

Name two ethical obstacles to the collaboration with the audience and suggest strategies on how to deal with them.

An answer might include the following aspects:

- Need to inform about goals of coverage and journalistic standards – specifically trained staff in media houses, time, material, trainings, discussions
- Consent of users is necessary – specifically trained staff in media houses, time

- Simple topics are preferred over complex ones – critical evaluation of participatory mechanisms and the topic in question: is it suitable for collaboration, can editorial independence be preserved, quality instead of quantity (no click-bait, no sole focus on access numbers / user analytics)?
- False or unclear coverage may occur accidentally or on purpose – need for verification, specifically trained staff in media houses, time; explaining goal of coverage in simple terms and several times, being prepared for vandalism
- One-sided coverage and spreading of prejudices – feedback, editing of contributions where necessary; combining contributions with different perspectives, clearly identified as personal opinion; non-publication with feedback to authors
- Representative participation is not possible (social constraints, digital divide etc.) – use of additional sources; contacting as many groups as possible; point out possibility for bias in coverage; critical evaluation: participatory instruments and topic of coverage suitable for cooperation with the audience?
- Risks for producers
 - digital security – prosecution of whistle-blowers, attacks from the audience, inadvertent publication of private data
 - physical security – accidents, risks involved in crisis and war, physical health (contributors should be informed about possible consequences in case of global dissemination of their contents)
 - Careful treatment of eyewitnesses and informants (e.g. no requests to go closer; safe, encrypted, anonymous communication channels)
 - Media can offer trainings (online or in person) to help
- Concerns of media house may contradict concerns of producers – point out goals of coverage, finding consensus, show respect and listen – media may need to adapt their goals or refrain from collaboration
- Exclusively extrinsic motivation (money, direction from employer) – develop strategies to create intrinsic motivation

Model solution

First scenario: Journalist Stephan works for a regional daily newspaper. His deadline for articles is 8pm; the pages are printed at 9pm. At 6pm, the police informs the public that there has been a terrorist attack in a town 500 kilometres from Stephan's editorial office. Now Stephan has only two hours to write an article about it. Therefore, he searches for posts of citizens on Social Media. He searches for photos of the scene and posts from witnesses and finally finds the account of @MrHaley, who has posted two pictures and his thoughts. Stephan wants to use these posts for his article. Unfortunately, @MrHaley is offline and Stephan is not able to ask him whether he allows the distribution of his content or not. There are only 20 minutes left until his deadline expires. So what will he do? It is an ethical obstacle.

Strategies: If a journalist is not able to ask whether he is allowed to distribute content of a citizen, he should not publish it anyhow in most of the cases. However, there is an option that allows journalists to publish the content: If the social media platform on which the content was posted has in its terms and conditions that it is permitted to distribute the content of the post, there is no danger here. However, to be sure, the editorial team should develop a guideline on how to deal with posts so that no ethical problem arises. For example, you could notify the author afterwards and pay him a

reasonable fee if he requests one. In general, you should always ask for permission to distribute content by citizens. At least if the audience was not directly asked to provide information to the medium.

Second scenario: A famous German political magazine – that is well known all around the world – asks its readers living in a war zone to provide it with content from the war zone, e.g. with pictures, videos and witness reports. The ethical obstacle in this case is that the witnesses could be traumatized and triggered by the request for content. They could also put themselves in a dangerous situation just to report, and be easily identified.

Strategies: It is important that the editors offer their informants from dangerous areas a secure mailbox, where citizens can transmit their photos and texts anonymously and the data is encrypted. Citizens must be aware that their data is kept anonymous and that they are secure. The security of citizens must always be the top priority in a collaboration with the audience. It has to be said explicitly that none of the citizen journalists should get themselves into dangerous situations for reporting and it should only be reported if it is secure to report. In general, the letter to the audience should be written as neutral and friendly as possible: triggering traumas must be avoided. It is also significant that a team of experts looks at the provided material carefully in order to decide whether the content is too unsettling for the readership. In addition, the journalists who work with witnesses of this type should receive further training in dealing with traumatized people. These could be strategies to avoid this ethical obstacle.