

## Navigating International, Real and Fake News

---

**KAITLIN**

Hello everyone and welcome to navigating international real and fake news. I'm Kaitlin

**HENNESSY:**

Hennessy, the program coordinator at WSU Global Connections. Tonight presenting is Lorena O'English, social sciences librarian at Washington State University. Her specialties include political science, sociology, theater, and sports. Thank you for coming today. I'm going to turn it over to Lorena.

**LORENA**

Excellent. We're going to go ahead and get started. And I'm just going to tell you now that this presentation is a reprise of one that I gave earlier this year through the WSU Common Reading Program here on the Pullman Campus. And I called it current events and conversation keeping up with international news. We'll kind of see why I call it that a little bit more.

**O'ENGLISH:**

And then originally I was just going to talk about keeping up with international news. But then towards the end of last year, all of a sudden there was a lot more talk about this fake news thing. So I decided, I'd put a little bit of that in the talk, as well and we'd see how they go.

You can see my email is on the screen [oenglish@wsu.edu](mailto:oenglish@wsu.edu). And I'm also available on Twitter [@wsulorena](https://twitter.com/wsulorena). And if you have questions outside of this webinar, feel free to contact me and I'll try to respond. So we'll go ahead and get started. There we are.

So because this originally started as a Common Reading presentation, I just want to talk a little bit about why I was talking about international news in the context of the Common Reading book *I am Malala*. And the reason is that I actually did some looking in one of our other library's historical databases.

We have historical database for the *London Times* going back to about 1750 or something. And I just did a little bit of research about Pakistan and Afghanistan in India-- that whole area-- and found out that it was really fascinating. In the 1830s, you have Russia and the United Kingdom at war in that area, and it was called the Great Game.

And Russia won. And then the United Kingdom tries again in 1880. And not so great. And then after World War II, you have the partition of India where India separates India and Pakistan. And then later on Bangladesh leaves Pakistan. And then about 150 years after the Great Game you have the Soviets invading Afghanistan and just that whole area has basically, for 200 years, had all of this chaos.

And it's really interesting to think about that in the background of Malala's story, looking at the reason why history has something to say and history and news has something to say about why things are. So that got me thinking about this particular topic.

So I'm going to talk about a couple of framing devices. The first one I'm going to talk about is the information diet, which is the information guide or our media diet. And this is a really interesting book. You can read it if you want. You can check it out from the WSU libraries or through Summit.

But the guy who writes it basically says, we don't really have information overload. We're always told that we have information overload. But that's not true. What we really have is something that he calls information obesity, which is that it's not that we have too much information. It's that we are really focusing on the wrong kinds of information. We're eating too many Doritos and Cheez-Its and not enough apples and kale.

And the Doritos is *People Magazine*. There's room for people. And there's room for Doritos. But if you made that your whole diet all the time, then you're not really going to be having a good information diet. So that's kind of our first framing device. I see, yeah.

Our second framing device is the notion of the filter bubble. And we'll talk a little bit more about that in a little bit. But basically the filter bubble is the idea that, in a way, we're all kind of like-- it's like being in a hollow tube. If you're in a hollow tube and you shout something, the sound reverberates back to you. And so it makes your sound louder.

And that's kind of what the filter bubble is all about. If you only talk to people who agree with you, then what happens is the repetition of claims, the same thing being told over and over and over again, essentially rebounds back at you and reinforces your beliefs. So you are essentially in a bubble, and your information has been filtered so much that your ear bubble gets smaller and smaller and smaller and you're not really open to information from other sources.

It's kind of related to the notion of the echo chamber. In fact, I just reversed those. So all that I just said was actually the echo chamber because the filter bubble is actually something completely different. And the filter bubble is essentially the idea of personalization. It used to be, if you use a search engine, if you used AltaVista or Yahoo, everybody had the same search engine experience.

But in the last number of years, search engines have had personalization. And so what happens is the more you click on certain types of links, the more likely they are to send similar links to you. And you say, well, I can avoid that. I cannot log into my Google account when I do Google searches. So Google doesn't know what I'm doing.

But that's not true. Even if you're not logged into your Google account, there are a number of tells that the browser can pick up on. The search engine can pick up on what browser you're using, where are you located if you're on a PC. It pretty much always has location on. And so it's able to actually track, perhaps not you precisely, but that computer or someone in your general area.

And the result of this personalization is that it sort of enhances the notion of the echo chamber because you end up seeing the same sorts of things. They're being pushed to you because you're living in a bubble and everything's been filtered by the fact that I like clicking these sorts of links so that is what Google is going to push to me based upon its personalization algorithms.

And it's not just Google that has algorithms. Facebook does this. All sorts of websites do this. The more they build up a profile of you or your computer or your geographical area, the more they kind of constrain what they actually are going to share with. So that becomes an issue.

We're going to talk about one more framing device. And that's the notion of confirmation bias. And I really love this cartoon because this cartoon explains confirmation bias absolutely. I've heard the rhetoric from both sides. It's time to do my own research on the real truth. And literally the first link that agrees with you you're going to believe.

And so you're looking for something that's going to reinforce what you already believe. And that's just a natural human tendency. And at the same time, you're avoiding or not noticing things that might disagree with you. And that's called confirmation bias. So you can say I did a search, everything agreed with me, let's go ahead and do this and not understand that you're missing a lot of things. And that's just a natural bias that all of us have but something that we really have to be aware of because it is so natural that confirmation bias happens constantly and we don't even notice it.

So we're going to go back to the filter bubble a little bit. And I'm not going to do this for this talk. I don't have a lot of time, and I'm kind of moving back between links. So I'm kind of doing

some things abbreviated. But everything that I show you is going to be made available to you. You can actually find the links in this presentation. And you'll see, at the end, that I've created a library guide that has all the links, as well.

So don't feel like you need to write down any links or worry about that because they're all going to be there for you. But we're going to see that it's a little awkward sometimes moving between the PowerPoint and the internet. So I just wanted to minimize that a little bit.

So I really recommend watching this TED Talk. I think I got the year wrong. I think I said 2013. It's actually 2011. But Eli Pariser basically came up with this idea. Then he wrote the book based upon it. And it's a really interesting read. And here's the thing. Even if you don't watch the TED Talk or read the book, you can find enough information about the filter bubble online to really get a good idea of it.

And the more you read about it, the more you're going to realize that it's actually really true. And we're going to see an example of that. So what it'll do-- let's cross our fingers and see if this works. I'm going to hit a couple taps, and we are going to go to the internet. And we are going to look at our first tap, which is-- this is a project from the *Wall Street Journal*.

And this is blue feed, red feed. And what they did was they created two separate Facebook feeds with the kind of resources that someone on the blue or more liberal side might choose versus someone on the conservative, more redder site. And you can see, if we go ahead and look at this-- let's go ahead and choose. Here, I'm in the Affordable Care Act right now.

And you can see, based upon what shows up in somebody's Facebook feed, these are the sorts of links that we see. And we can see a very big difference between our blue feed and our red feed. And this is an example of the filter bubble at work.

If all you subscribe to are web sites and feeds of a particular persuasion, then that's what you're going to see. And you can see that the realities diverge. And it's hard to believe that you're actually dealing with people who are living in the same existence because their views are so disparate. So that's the filter bubble. And there's a need, cross out of it, and think about some of the other sorts of things that are out there.

So we're going to move back to the power point. And this was successful. Excellent. And let's go on and talk about the next thing. So thinking about this notion of filter bubbles, I've been talking about filter bubbles in the context of personalization and algorithms.

But there are other filter bubbles that we deal with that are based upon things that don't have anything to do with what particular site we click on in an internet browser. One thing is ideology. And you get a sense of that looking at the website for a red feed and blue feed.

One thing is your status or your situation. You're college students. Well, I remember when I was a college student in the 1980s. I read my campus newspaper religiously, but it had very little international news or national news. And there was a lot of stuff going on that I was really interested in, but I also wanted to know what was going on in my own state.

But a lot of times, I just didn't know. And I was always wondering. And occasionally I'd buy *The New York Times*. But it was a little bit intimidating to me at that time. It was also expensive. So I was really happy when *USA Today* came out because it actually provided me with a way to keep up with news a little bit more in a more affordable way.

So being a college student, being busy, not necessarily maybe always having time for news, maybe focused on other sorts of things-- that can kind of be a little bit of a bubble for what you're doing. Geography can matter, as well. I'm in Pullman. And I don't know where you all are. But sometimes you're in a big city, like Seattle or New York or an international city.

Sometimes you're in Pullman, Washington. Our library might be a little bit smaller. There might be a few less sorts of resources and opportunities that there might be in bigger areas. So sometimes that might limit the ideas that I'm exposed to. Financial situation. If I don't have a lot of money and I can't afford cable, I can't watch the news-- I'm going to miss out.

And I see someone agreeing to me. If you're in an area where you don't get exposed to the greater world, then you miss out on a lot of things. I missed out on a lot of things in the early 80s, a lot of things in the early 90s. And even now I still don't understand what was going on in Bosnia in the 1990s. That just went right out of my head.

So our financial situation matters. And so the effect of all of this, the effect and the effect of this, is to reinforce the notion of the filter bubble and the echo chamber because your inputs are constrained and so you make up your mind based upon less information.

So what happens when you have competing filter bubbles? Because that can happen. You might believe in different things that just cognitively don't work. So you have cognitive dissonance. You just can't deal with all of it. And you just go back and turn on Netflix and watch *Ace Ventura Pet Detective* for sixth or seventh time and say to, today is a day for

information obesity. And let's just go on with it. So that's just real life. That's the way it always works.

So it's talk a little bit about sources. And the first thing that I want to talk about is, you're busy. You're busy. You don't have a lot of time. You're students. You may be parents. You maybe deal with elderly parents. You might have a job. You might have all those things at the same time. So you've got a lot going on.

So I'm going to show you some resources of minimal to increasing complexity. And if you just want to start with one or two of them, that's great. If you want to look at some of the more expansive sources I have, that's great, too. Most of these are going to be from a US point of view, but not all of them.

And that's a really good way to think about breaking out of the filter bubble or the echo chamber, by looking at how news is being perceived in other countries through different sorts of eyes. And we'll see that we also have some international sources, as well, because, after all, this is a talk about keeping up with international events.

And I want to be really clear. This is not anything remotely, remotely at all a full list or even a best list. It's not. These are things that I've been exposed to. These are things that I've learned about-- some pretty recently. And these are things that I thought I wanted to share because they seemed to have some value.

So a few things I want to think about. One of the things you're going to see is that you're going to notice that I really definitely have a bias towards traditional sources. And there's a couple of reasons for that. One of these is that I'm an old-- I was born in 1963. And so I really still think kind of analog rather than digital sometimes.

But the other reason is that I'm a librarian. And there's some things about traditional news sources that I really value. So I just want to talk about some of these things. And these things aren't limited to traditional news sources. These are also things that we can think about as we look at more modern news sources, as we look at news from blogs or news from different sorts of websites, or news that we hear on a podcast, et cetera. These are just some things to think about.

What is the notion of a code of ethics? And here I'm going to do my little thing here. But go over and switch to the Society of Professional Journalist Code of Ethics. And this is something

that's important to me. This is the notion that, if you are a reporter, that you subscribe to a certain code of ethics-- and not always.

People actually err. People make mistakes. People cheat. People lie in journalism, as well as any other profession. But still there really is this idea of a code of ethics that colors what news is and what news is about and the kind of things that people do.

The second thing is the notion of expertise. And if you're a journalist, if you are a reporter who's been covering a beat for awhile, you really know. You know your community. You know your issues. You know what's going on. You have you developed expertise over time as you learn how to do your job.

Sure, if you start off as a cover reporter, you don't know very much. But over time you learn things. And whether you're an investigative reporter or a crime reporter, given a couple of years, most reporters in the community are really going to know all the dirt, where all the bodies are buried, and what all the issues are, and who to talk to. And these are really important skills-- knowing your community and knowing the areas upon which you actually write your stories.

Curation. Curation is big for me. So I don't want to be hit with a huge amount of stuff. I would be happy to see the top picks. So I like a well curated list. Not everybody does. Some people like to get a lot of stuff thrown at them and have the fun of choosing what they want to see. So I'm going to show you some resources that are curated, as well as some resources that just throw a lot of stuff at you and let you choose.

But I value curation. And curation just means that these stories are selected in place for a particular purpose, that they have something to say, that they establish a story, a narrative, along the way, and they're going to choose this story and not that story.

Now sometimes that can be problematic because sometimes things can be overcurated, leaving out important things. Sometimes also curation can move more into biased content. So you have to watch out for that. But for the notion of it, I think it's a good place to start.

There's also the notion of archiving. I want to know that I can go back. And if I'm reading a story and I think to myself, hmm, I think I read about something about that five years ago, I want to know that I can go back to that. If we're talking about internet resources, there's a really cool resource that I don't include on this called the Wayback Machine for the Internet

Archive.

And if you've never looked at it, write that down-- Internet Archive Wayback Machine-- because it's amazing. What it enables you to do is to go to any website, let's say, WSU's website and see what it looked like at various points over the last 15 or 20 years. Well, it's really interesting to look and see what the WSU webpage looked like in 1997 compared to what it looks like in 2017.

So not everything is covered by the Internet Archive. And it doesn't cover every day. But it does let you go back and archive the web, see what the web looked like in the past. And that can be really important as you're trying to figure out whether something is true.

Sometimes what happens is they say, oh, it's like this, it's like this, and it's like this. And you're like, no, it's not. And I can prove that. Yes somebody else remembered that I talked about that. You can tell that I love the Wayback Machine because I really want to talk about that.

But in addition to the Wayback Machine for online sources, let's also talk about archiving physical copies of newspapers in databases and on the web and in microfilm so that you can go back to it and get information. And I think that's a really important thing so that things are not ephemeral.

Sometimes on the web, a site exists and then three weeks later it's gone. And with traditional sources, all that information there is a paper trail or an online paper trail that you can follow to get information.

Fact checking. That's a really big one. Newspapers have fact checking departments-- newspapers, news magazines-- they have fact checking departments and they have lawyers. And they know how to use both of those. So it's more likely that the information being provided is legitimate than perhaps some other sorts of nontraditional sources that may not have fact checkers or lawyers making you use the fact checker.

Multiple viewpoints are really important. Reporters are trained to actually try to get multiple perspectives so that you can see that every story has different sides. Now that can be problematic sometimes. Sometimes there really is just one particular or two ways to look at things.

And then you say, oh, I have to go find somebody else. And so you find somebody on the fringe. And that just messes up the whole context of what you're trying to say. There's actually

a name for that. It's called false equivalence. And it's like sometimes you say, well, we have to provide equal time to this theory and that theory when one of the theories is clearly a crackpot theory.

So you can go a little bit too far with multiple viewpoints, and you can go a little bit too far with all of this. But in general multiple viewpoints is really important because you have to recognize, we want we don't want to have our new source be an echo chamber. We want to recognize that there are competing viewpoints out there with differing perspectives.

Retractions. Sometimes things are printed wrong. So retractions being printed or put online, being archived-- so you can go back and find them later-- being prominently viewable so that they can be identified. It's really nice if a news outlet has a public editor or an ombudsman whose job is to basically hold the news resource's feet to the fire and make sure that they're properly serving their readers.

Also want separation of advertising and editorial. Sometimes bloggers will review products and not tell you that they were given that product for free. So I want to be sure that there is a distinction between what I read on the editorial page and what I read in the news page. I also got follow up. One of the things about traditional news sources is you do have people with beats, and you do have time to actually continue a story across weeks, months, years, et cetera, in series. So you can kind of build up a way for you to continue to learn more about the story as it progresses over time.

I also want investigative reporting. Investigative reporting identifies some of the hugest disasters and calamities and miscarriages of justice of over time. But the thing is, investigating reporting is also very expensive. And it requires resources, including things like foreign bureaus. I value newspapers of record like the *New York Times* or *The Washington Post* or *The London Times* or *The Economist* that have foreign bureaus in places like London or Venezuela or Nairobi or Pakistan so that I can get the viewpoint from people who are actually embedded in a community and not the viewpoint of someone who's sitting in the United States, trying to get a sense of what people are talking about in those various places.

But the thing is that not all of these elements are always going to be present. And also there are failures. Every single thing-- we have failures of ethics. We have failures of curation. We have failures of multiple viewpoints. We have failures of investigative reporting. All those things are going to happen.

But being aware of those and looking out for those sorts of resources is something to think about. So now we're going to start talking about some sources. But one thing I wanted to mention is you're going to see that I'm actually a big fan of sources that provide summaries, just the basics of the news.

And so I had thought about this a little bit. Do they provide value to other people? And one of the things I thought about is a journalistic tradition called the five W's and an H, which is how, when a journalist writes an article, all the important information is at the top. That's the most important information. And then as you go further down the article, you're actually giving still crucial information and then more detail and more detail and more detail.

And so that structure is really helpful. And snippets, it's usually the same thing. Snippets, or summaries, are usually going to be what's continued in the lead, the most important information. And journalists are trained to look at who, what, where, why, when, and how-- all of those. Those are the important things are supposed to be in the first couple of paragraphs and the snippets to give you the most important information.

So even if you just read the first paragraph or a snippet or a summary, you're still going to have an idea of something that's going on. You still have values to learn something. Something else, by the way, that journalists are trained to think about in the context of who, what, where, why, and how, of course, is the old Watergate dictum-- follow the money. And that's always the important one.

So let's talk about some sources. And I started off as summaries because that's the very first thing I'm going to do. This is one of my favorite things. This is a relatively new service called The Skimm. It's available by email. There is an iOS app that you pay for. That's how they monetize. And it's freely available on the web. And you can subscribe to it. You can also follow them on Facebook.

They are a daily email blast. And their tagline is making it easier for you to be smarter-- and mostly domestic content, some international content. They provide summaries, links out other sources. The links will generally provide you sources that are freely available. Heavily curated by two journalists. And they have a very definite tone. And they're very snarky, very fun-- an enjoyable thing to read in the morning.

There's a six week archive back on the web-- thinking about archiving. And they also have The

Skimm guides, that are explainers. And you know this is just a really low threshold way to start. Just sign up for The Skimm, and you'll be able to actually have a good idea of what's going on with some of the different perspectives that are around it. So that's a good place to start.

Now I also want to talk about *The New York Times*. And I know everyone's familiar about *The New York Times*. But it is a newspaper of record. There are other newspapers of record. There's *The Washington Post*. There's the *LA Times*, *The Chicago Tribune*. But *The New York Times* is certainly one of the oldest.

And one of the things that I'm not sure people realize is that they have a very amazing educational rate, which is just like-- digital access \$1 a week. And so I think it might even be less than that. But it's a really good deal. \$1 a week-- that's certainly less than you spend on coffee. And you'll get web access and smartphone and tablet apps.

And I really recommend it. I do it myself. And I love it. I love having access to it on my phone and on my tablet, as well as on the web. But you can also get access to it through the WSU libraries. And I've given you a link there. And that will also be on the library guide.

Now I want you to look at the screen. And you'll notice, if we look over there, that there is this little thing over here in the corner that says world. And most of the time, we really don't pay much attention to that fact. Most of the time, frankly, we don't pay attention to any of these things on the very top. We just start going down, which is the way people look at web sites.

But let's go ahead and see what happens when you actually click on that World link because something that happens is interesting. So let's go back to the late 19th century in Paris. And there was a journalist there who started a paper called *The Paris Herald*. And it was very popular, especially with ex-pats because they did a really good job of kind of covering United States news and international news.

And over time, it became *The Herald Tribune* and then *The International Herald Tribune*. People like Ernest Hemingway read it and wrote for it. And it was really important newspaper in the early part of the 20th century. And *The New York Times* bought it some years ago. And they've incorporated it into *The New York Times'* site.

So what you don't realize is *The New York Times* is really two different papers. It's *The New York Times* and *The New York Times World*, and they're actually kind of distinct because they actually have some different people involved with them. And the thing is that some of this

content is incorporated into the regular *New York Times* and the physical paper.

But a lot of it isn't. So there's a lot of content beyond what you're going to see in the physical newspaper. So I'm going to go ahead and do our little thing here. And we're going to go look at it very quickly. Let's go find *The New York Times*. Here we are.

So here I am in *The New York Times* world. And you can see there's some basic sorts of things, the kind of things what's going on. And then I can choose. I can look at things-- let's go ahead and look at what's happening in the Middle East. And I can click on this.

And like I said, this is going to provide me *New York Times* quality articles but from different sorts of perspectives looking at different sorts of areas. And most of these articles are not going to be available on the regular paper. So I'm getting different sorts of stuff.

So let's go back to our power point. The other thing that I wanted to mention is that you can also follow *The New York Times World* or individual journalists' accounts on Twitter or Facebook. And the nice thing about *The New York Times* and social media is that, like many sources, they give you a certain number of free articles a month if you don't subscribe.

It can be anywhere from one to 10. In *The New York Times* case, it's 10. But with the social media articles, generally, if you have used up all of your 10 sources that month. If you click on a link from Twitter Facebook, you'll generally be able to read the article, which is really kind of nice.

I particularly like their newsletters. Let's see if I actually included that link here. I'm going to go back over here. And we're going to go find *The New York Times'* newsletters. These are great. These are email things that you can sign up for. And the *Interpreter* covers world news. You can see some of them are regional. Here's Canada, another world one.

And these are really great because they give you these little snippets. They give you a sense of what you need to know understand what's going on in the world-- not a huge amount of detail, just the basics. If you want more detail, you can click on a link and read the full story. But at least in the snippet, you're getting the basics.

So we're going to go back over here. So I'm going to progress a little bit. Reuters News Service. Reuters is actually a news service that provides content to the newspapers. But they have a freely available site for members of the general public, as well. And let's go ahead and take a look at it.

And let's see. Here we are. And you can see, if I go over here-- and you can see business, markets, et cetera-- I can go over and choose-- I'm looking at the United States' edition, but they have editions for all these other countries, as well. And they're going to be in the actual language of the country. So that helps me see news from different perspectives.

And Reuters is high quality. It's very legitimate. They have reporters all over the world. And they provide news, as well as podcasts that you can watch online or download, RSS feeds. And they have a really nice little app that you can download. I have it on my own phone. And it's really cool to get used to that. And they also have an ethics statement with their trust principles.

The next one-- I just want to make one more comment about email blasts. Some people say oh I get too much email. I can't stand to have another email. And I'm, like, that's really true. We do get too much email. But, again, it goes back to that notion of information obesity.

If I actually cut back a little bit on my winter [INAUDIBLE] and other sorts of email lists that I'm on and actually did a few more news lists, I would actually be more informed. I don't have to read them every day. But I subscribe to a number of these. I really like Foreign Policy Interrupted, which is women in the foreign policy community . And it's basically a source that amplifies their voices.

*The Economist* puts out some really good newsletters. Here's a really nice one that keeps me up [? on things. ?] Foreign policy-- I actually like foreign policies lists so much that I actually subscribed to it. I got really good education rate. And the thing is that think tanks and research institutes and policy organizations and opinion journals on every side of the political spectrum generally have these sorts of newsletter blasts.

So go to a site that looks interesting to you and look to see what kind of publications-- and they probably going to have an email newsletter blast that's going to give you access to things for free. A couple more things-- Public Radio International. This is just amazing. Let's go a take a look at this one over here. And let's go find it.

Sorry, I'm kind of squinting. I don't have my glasses, and I'm navigating two screens. But I love PRI. It's just great. And you can see, one of the things that it has is-- I can go over here, these links over here in the corner. I can click on Global Post. And this is going to give me the latest stories. And I can click on these and get the full story. But I get a wide variety of stories that I

wouldn't otherwise have seen.

And if I would rather get them in audio format, I can get different stories as podcasts. And I can watch them online or download them. And you can see, I can also look at the sections. And there's a wide variety of topics and sections. So this is actually a really good way to keep up with international news.

Next thing we're going to look at is Global Voices. And Global Voices is a different sort of tool. Go back here. And this is another source that's going to give us things from different perspectives. And you can see-- Africa, America-- and I can go up here and see it in different-- if I speak another language, I can actually read news in these languages, as well.

So right now we're looking at the English edition. And, again, I'm getting international news that I probably wouldn't see in my own newspaper or through my own filter bubble. This really breaks my filter bubble, breaks my echo chamber, and exposes me to a lot of different things.

And I can just skim the latest stories. And I can subscribe to their email blast or follow them on Facebook or get a daily email. Or I can look at these more intently if I wanted you.

Look at our next resource-- Unfiltered News. This one is just the coolest thing because what this does is they actually have this-- it's this technology partnership with Google News. And what they do-- let's get rid of this-- is they look at Google News, and they look at what stories are not being talked about in a particular area. So let's go ahead and skip the tutorial here.

I'm going to choose the United States. And you can see, these are topics that are less reported in the United States. And I could choose different countries if I want. Or I could use this little filter bubble sort of thing. And these are some of the stories that I can see it if I'm interested in looking at what's going on with FC Barcelona, you'll see that this actually has to do with soccer.

Because this is actually pulling things from Google News. So there's a random aspect of this that is just really cool. And the way they figure out what is not being talked about is they have Google News' data to draw upon, and they're actually able to look and see what's being talked about, what links are being clicked in Spain or Egypt versus the links that are being clicked in the United States.

So this is a really great way to see how people are looking at news in different ways. We really

used to the echo chamber of the United States news. And we forget about the fact that everybody has news.

So how do we incorporate this into our lives and our practice? So I really believe in low key, low threshold ways of doing this. I don't want it to be too elaborate. So I like my email newsletters. I like my read it later apps. I used a really cool tool called Instapaper. And this is an example of it.

If I find an article, I can use a bookmark link to save it. Once I've saved the article, I can read it online. And I read it in this beautiful format. No ads. The links all work. I see pictures. And it just is easier to read. I can increase the font if I want. I can make it more narrow. I could do all sorts of things. I could even use just this little click over here and have it read out loud to me while I'm on the elliptical trainer or I can send it to my Kindle and read it that way. So these are all weigh--

And since I started using Instapaper, I read so many more news articles because I read them when I want to not when I see them. But I save them and read them later, and I read them without the ads and in a much more easy to read format. So this is really handy. Or you can also use digital radio and podcast because one of the things is that all of us end up spending a lot of time standing in line.

So while we're standing in line, why not quickly catch up on our read it later apps or quickly listen to a podcast. And for a lot of these things, you don't even have to have an internet connection or a lot of juice in your phone. My Instapaper updates every time I'm on a Wi-Fi network. And so even if I don't have Wi-Fi, I can open it up and see the most recent thing that I saved and actually just go ahead and start reading it.

So I have significantly expanded the variety of articles that I've read and actually reading them, which are two very different things, by using this, by looking for a way to actually incorporate this in a way that's easy. I really believe in easy. I don't believe in complexity.

So the way most of us get news is through aggregators. We get it through-- it's not going to sites like PR directly or Global Voices, but we get it through links on Flipboard or Google Play or Facebook or Twitter. And that kind of brings us into the notion of fake news because those aggregator sources are more likely to actually show us fake news sites-- either links that people share or the kind of things that in Facebook show up on the news feed to the side.

So let's talk about that a little bit. When we talk about fake news, we're not talking about *The Onion*. Three years ago, if you asked me about fake news, I would have said, oh, you mean *The Onion*. But I'm not talking about these sorts of charming humor sites that actually say a lot about modern times in the context of humor. I'm talking about something that is a little bit more not as sweet as *The Onion*.

So I like this typology of fake news that's about done by Claire Wardle writing in the Columbia Journalism Review. And she talks about authentic material used in the wrong context. And that, for example, might be a picture or some video of a protest march in one country that is being claimed to actually be happening in another country. Or we might have imposter news sites. I almost fell for that. I found something really interesting. And it looked like it was from ABC.

And I'm like, oh. But it wasn't from ABC. It was from abc.com.co. And they had taken some of the branding elements from ABC. And so you wouldn't know that it was fake news if you didn't really carefully look at the URL. So it's really easy to get [INAUDIBLE] false by that.

Fake news sites-- the kind of things that we think about when we think about fake news. The pope is behind Donald Trump or some of the other things that we saw last year. Manipulated content-- that might be photographs. A couple of years ago, I did a Common Reading talk about manipulated photo-- it is very easily fooled by these sites. That's very true.

It's very easy to be fooled by manipulated photographs. But there are ways to get around that. I did a talk on, how can you tell whether those crazy pictures in your Facebook feed are real. And there's actually tools that help you trace the provenance of images. And those are just some really cool tools that you can use.

Then we also have parody content, which would be like fake Steve Jobs or fake Donald Trump. So we're not going to talk about this very much because you guys all know that fake news is not really fake news. Fake news is really misinformation, disinformation, distortion, and lies.

And it's done intentionally for a profit. Those Macedonian kids, they made over \$60,000 because people clicked on the links they made. And they made all this money in ad revenue. So it's very attractive. And they make this fake news to be attractive. It's carefully written to appeal to the sorts of things that make us actually click on links. It's made to be delicious. It's made for you to want to read it and want to share. It's very intentional.

And it's not just in the United States. Fake news is happening in Germany. It's happening in India, where they're using not Facebook but the more commonly used WhatsApp as a way. So basically fake news will adapt itself to fit the technology that's made available.

And the thing is it's confusing. And one of my favorite tools is actually the Pew Center for Internet Technology and Society. And they do really good surveys. They do high quality surveys. Take a look at them. Just do a Google search for Pew Internet, and you'll find their site. In their data, they have wonderful, good social science data. And their data sets are available for you to download. So that's kind of the opposite of fake news.

This is one of their surveys. And you can see that the majority says fake news has left Americans confused about basic facts. But at the same time, they're also confident in their ability to recognize fake news. That's a little bit untrue. There's a really interesting psychological theory called the Dunning-Kruger effect. And the Dunning-Kruger effect says that people actually think they're better at things than they really are. Because it's our own personal echo chamber about who we are in a way, our own little filter bubbles.

But the fact is really that most of us have been fooled by fake news and most of us have shared fake news. Sometimes we don't have all the skills. This one is from a really interesting study done from Stanford just last November. They say our digital natives may be able to flip between Facebook and Twitter while simultaneously uploading a selfie to Instagram. But when it comes to evaluating information that flows through social media channels, they are easily duped.

And this was a really easy study talking about all this. So what do we do? So here we have another survey from Pew. And they asked people, who should take the responsibility for stopping the spread of fake news. And people said, it should be a government. It should be social networking and search engine sites. And yet it should also be us.

So let's talk about this a little bit. The government-- we have in the Czech Republic and in Germany and in Finland-- we have governments that are actually setting up fake news units. And that might be a little bit problematic. I'm a little bit disturbed by that because it really can be this notion of state sponsored spin. You attack fake news by in a way framing it in a way that might also be fake.

And I love this little graphic from *The Washington Post* about how Russia used news in the

Czech Republic. And you can see how it makes its way all the way through the extremists, all the way down to the moderate politicians and general citizenry. Social networking sites-- so Facebook. Actually you probably saw-- I think it was last week when you logged into Facebook-- there are tips to spot fake news.

And they are working with fact checking groups to automatically flag fake news, the kind of stuff that you see in the sidebar menu. They're also changing their advertising practices to make it less remunerative for people to actually do fake news, doing intensive education efforts, and making it easier for you to report if you see this.

Is this the best way? Not necessarily. So there is a professor at WSU Vancouver called Mike Caulfield. And we're going to learn a bit more about it in just a second, too. Let's see if I can find this.

Yes. He actually argues that it's actually harmful to news literacy. And his point is that a lot of this stuff is too difficult to do. And we should actually really more focus on network activities. And we'll talk about that a little bit later. I'll give you some resources to explain where he's coming from in different ways.

We also have Google doing the same thing. And Google actually has this little fact check thing. You can see, this is a search I did-- Obama, Kenya, birth certificate. And you can see, I do that search and the first thing that comes up with something from Snopes. And it's even going to tell me Fact Check by snopes.com is false.

And they're also trying to, again, change the rules for ad revenue. And in the long term, people are thinking about technical solutions. One really cool thing is the Trust Project. And the Trust Project-- many journals have recognized that people have, because of things like echo chamber and filter bubble and cognitive bias, some people have lost their faith in the news.

So the Trust Project is this big project being done to create real sorts of modes and indicators to actually work to regain the trust of the American people. We also have a number of browser applications. I don't have time to show these. But this is pronounced awesome. This one is from the University of Indiana. This is the one, if I were going to use these, I would actually use this one-- Hoaxy-- more than some of these others.

Because the problem that some of these others, I'm not really so sure about. There are a lot of these fake news detectors. And I really worry about sorts of these-- I think that they are

good starting points. But I certainly wouldn't use them all the way. But there are good starting points.

This is such a new thing. Even though fake news has been around forever, this iteration of it, the way it can spread like wildfire, is new. And it's going to take while for these sorts of tools to actually really make a difference. There's also really cool fact checking sites. We're all familiar with Snopes. But there's a really cool thing called the International Fact Checking Network because it turns out--

Let's ahead and find that. Where is my international fact checking network? Here we are. -- that fact checking is happening all over the world. And so this is actually this really cool project that is gathering the fact checking arms in various countries and making it sort of an international effort, which I think it's a really cool thing.

And you can see this map actually shows you all the different places that have fact checking. And here's some of the services available in Australia, the charmingly named Crikey, Get Fact and also a reminder that fact news is not just about fake news. It's not just about politics. There's a lot of fake news about medicine topics. And you can see here, we have the Medical Observers Metafact as a way to talk about that sort of different disciplinary aspect to fake news.

And then finally there's us. So one of the things is that, when it comes to us, one of the things we have to kind of think about is looking outside of our Facebook feed, not just the things that show up on a feed. But if we have a friend who has a different political persuasion, maybe go look at his or her site and see what he or she is sharing, not just the stuff that's showing up on your feed. Because remember personalization, filter bubble-- all that sort of stuff is happening.

You want to memorize the *Breaking News Consumers Handbook*. One of the things it says is don't trust stories that cite another news outlet as the source of the information. Or don't trust a story where, if you go look it up, you see it repeated over and over and over again. Because sometimes what happens is something like a game of telephone, where stories-- that's a good question. I will answer that. --where stories basically get distorted all on the way and become more and more crazy and wild.

Or you actually have networks of fake news people who are actually repeating what each other is saying so that, if you say, oh, I want to triangulate and see if there are other sources that agree with this, you'll see exactly the same thing. So when I say triangulate, I mean focus

more on these traditional sources because you say, well, if somebody is showing up on Twitter or Facebook and it's not on *The Washington Post* or *The New York Times*.

You might say, first of all, they've got to scoop. And is it really that important to see it immediately? I would kind of wait and see what more traditional media outlets are saying. Second of all, it could be very sketchy. And third of all, it might just have happened and they just really lucked into an amazing scoop. So I'd be really careful and really think about this *Breaking News Consumer Handbook*.

But you really need to think about expanding your filter bubble. Some people say, I have enough friends of different political persuasions. I'm going to see it all on my Twitter feed or my Facebook feed. Again, they don't because of personalization. This really cool study that just came out was basically people who say the news will find me through social media. That's not true. They don't see all the news. They see very definitely filter bubble news.

One of the things you really want to think about is reading the full story. This actually is a link from *Slate Magazine*. And they look at data from an organization called Chartbeat. So every time you click on a link, every time you save something to Instapaper, all that is being logged. And Chartbeat sees that. And Chartbeat can actually see where people actually turned away from a site.

And it turns out that, if you're looking at an article on the web, a lot of people don't make it past 50% of the article. Now remember we have our who, what, where, when, and how. All the most important information is up at the top theoretically. But a lot of times, some of the most really useful details are at the bottom.

So sometimes people just start reading an article or maybe they just see the headline. How many of us can say that we have never shared an article just from the headline? I have. But the thing is, a lot of times it's really better to read the full story because you will see a lot more nuance if you read it all the way through.

So you want to break out of that, of just reading the first paragraph or just going to the 50%, and actually read the whole thing. Now I'm a big fan of annotation. And one of the things that you can do is, that Instapaper site that I showed you, you may have noticed-- oops, I hope I didn't-- I don't know what I just clicked.

Let's go back over here where we were looking at it very quickly. And you'll notice that I

actually had a little bit of highlighting here. I'm going to really regret this. Hopefully, you remember that there was something that was actually highlighted on that screen. Because when I'm reading Instapaper on my phone, on my tablet, or online I can highlight stuff and I can add in notes. I can annotate it just like you would annotate a scholarly article.

So as I'm reading it, if I see things that I disagree with, I don't just say, oh, I disagree with that and go on and then completely forget about it. I write myself a note and maybe I come back and investigate it a little bit more. So I'm reading articles critically, and I'm taking notes about them. And I can do this on Instapaper, and I can do this on other sites, like Medium.

You may be familiar with Rap Genius, which is way of actually kind of crowdsourcing out lyrics. There's also a version of it called News Genius, which lets you actually annotate the web. You can actually annotate blogs or the State of the Union address or etc. So that you or other people who use News Genius tool can actually see those annotations and have conversations.

And there is a scholarly equivalent of that called Hypothesis that is used to annotate scholarly articles. But also it can be used to annotate anything on the web. And the more you annotate, the more you talk about things, the more you discuss-- Hypothesis, by the way, actually requires you to use your university email account and your identity.

So it really is probably the most rigorous of all of these things. The more you do all of this stuff, the more you investigate and read, you keep up with the news, you develop your own knowledge, your own expertise and networks. And you become part of networks.

And Mike Caulfield, the guy who I was talking about a little bit earlier, the guy at WSU Vancouver, has actually written a new book that you can really download called *Web Literacy for Student Fact Checkers*. And I have not added it to the web page yet, but I will tomorrow. And then also really partially committing to being informed means actually supporting newspapers and news sites with your money because news is not free.

This is your saying yourself, Lorena, this is a little bit light. And I admit that it is because I only had 50 minutes, but only half of it was fake news. But what I really want you to think about is this notion of really evaluating information and developing a little bit of expertise and knowledge. And if you become an expert, say, on things having to do with space exploration and your friend becomes an expert on political campaign finance or something, you create these sorts of networks. And then in your Facebook conversations, in your blogs, in your larger conversations, you have this network of people who you trust to actually be able to say,

I actually did some research on that, and it's legit. Or it's not legit

Mike Caulfield over at WSU Vancouver is doing something called the Digital Polarization Initiative, which is actually something that students can work on. And this is a way for students to actually investigate information on the web using tools like Hypothesis. And you can see they even have a little chrome extension that you can use to basically look at issues of digital polarization.

And digital polarization is things like our red feed and our blue feed. So that's a really exciting thing. So I'm going close now. And I want to close thinking about a couple of things. We're you go back to the things that I framed my talk around. And you might have noticed that-- I mention them occasionally, occasionally with the wrong definitions. I talked about filter bubbles and echo chambers and confirmation bias.

But not a lot because I think that was implicit in what I was saying. So I want you to think about. This, I want you to broaden your information diet. I want you to break out of your filter bubble. I want you to blow up your echo chamber. I want you to bury your confirmation bias so deep you can never find it again.

And I want you to bring on your critical thinking and your digital and information literacy skills. The kind of skills that you use when you're doing scholarly research, you can apply those same sorts of analytical and critical skills to looking at news. And this link right over here, this first one, the one that says keeping up the news-- this is the link that includes all the resources that I provided from this talk.

And like I said, I'll be updating it tomorrow. The second one is actually better. And it's from Erica Nicel, who is WSU Pullman's Communications Librarian. And she has a really nice library [? guide ?] on fake news. We will take a quick look at both these. And then we'll go ahead and do some questions.

So I'm just going to quickly show you. This is my guide, keeping up with international news. And this is Erica's guide, evaluate news, fake news, and beyond. And she's going to go more into evaluation techniques.

Olivia noted that the news was so different in Kenya. She had a hard time figuring out what's going on. Yeah, that's really true. Sometimes that's hard because you don't know the context. Sometimes that's good because you have to exercise different aspects of your brain, and it

really makes you realize that the same thing can be viewed in multiple dimensions. Let's see.

Tony commented that it's really easy to be fooled by these sites. And it really is because they are made to fool you. They are made to appeal to you in a way that makes you want to click on that in a way that's almost a cue. If the title looks too good to be true, then maybe you say to yourself, I really do have to put on my critical evaluative cap on as I look at this and do some of the checkmark things that are traditional-- who published this, what's the URL, when was it published? Let's look at the language. Where's the about statement?

And then also some of the more critical thinking evaluative networks thinking. Let's see what people are talking about this on. Is there anything about it on Wikipedia? Is there anything about it on a fact check site to kind of do those sorts of strategies?

Tony asks if I believe whether fake news will ever be more monitored and removed from social media entirely. No. Fake news has been around forever. I read the most wonderful account of fake news in Germany in the 19th century, where some journalist sitting in his apartment in Berlin just made up all these stories about events that were happening in Great Britain.

He read articles, and he pulled in enough details to make them seem legit. But he made up his own interviews. He made up all sorts of stuff. Fake news has always existed and always will. In fact, it's going to get more sophisticated the way it is now, which means that our skills have to advance to keep up with it.

So I'm kind of cynical about that. But the more we're aware of it, the less likely we are to be fooled by it. Kaitlin asks, do I think fake news is getting worse in the United States? So why do you think it has more attention right now? I think it has more attention. I think it's probably a little bit of both but [INAUDIBLE] more attention.

And a lot of that is really because of there are more opportunities for news to be shared through things like Twitter or Facebook. If you think about 10 years ago when we didn't have those social media outlets, it was fake news was maybe something on a blog or maybe something on some sort of online bulletin board. But it didn't have the reach that things have now with our resources like Facebook and Twitter and the ease of sharing information and the ease of cloning information and copying it and manipulating it like manipulating photographs. So it's here to stay. But so are we.