

What does journalism mean to you?

We asked a few members of the New Trier News Editorial Staff why journalism is important to them.



Nora Crumley
NT News Co-Editor-in-Chief

“It provokes empathy in people across the world. Journalism is one of the only mediums that really lets you experience something like you were there.”

“It means informing the public, holding people accountable, and not just starting controversy, but starting a conversation.”



Connor Josellis
NT News Co-Editor-in-Chief



Bella Geroulis
Opinion Editor

“It keeps people honest. It’s the fourth branch of government.”

“It means getting past the gobbledegook of the day-to-day and getting the facts out to the public.”



Max Minogue
Opinion Editor



Joe Borushek
Features Editor

“A voice for the people. It also means delivering facts and evidence of things that are going on in the world that people can take in and have their own opinion about.”

“It provides a medium for me where I can make my voice heard among the entire student body in a way that’s informing, but also allows me to do what I love, which is write.”



Georgia Caras
News Editor



Hannah Young
News Editor

“It’s the center of action. To me, it’s a way to use the power of words and voice to make an impact. We have the ability to speak for those who can’t.”

CO-EDITOR’S CORNER

Misinformation is in the hands of media outlets

by *Helen Fagan*

We’ve all heard the term fake news. I’m sure you’ve heard it countless times in this *Examiner* issue alone. It’s the main problem facing our media right now.

The widely-publicized solution to the problem has been to “get your news from multiple sources” and “read up on the author’s qualifications” and other similar strategies. These tools really do work.

The problem is, we’re instructed to use these tools when writing research papers, persuasive writing pieces, and other large English assignments where finding reputable sources can make or break your grade.

The chances of me reading the same article on two different news sites and pondering the differences between the two on my own time is slim.

I don’t know about you, but my daily news intake comes mostly from CNN push notifications on my phone, or a BuzzFeed article when I’m bored of reading the pointless (but dangerously attractive) “Can you get through this post without

spending \$50?” and “18 of the most deeply upsetting cake pictures you’ll ever see” articles that comprise my usual perusing of the “news”.

Thus, the current strategies directed at the American people to combat the “fake news epidemic” are useful in theory, but will do little to prevent its spread.

Lets face it, many people don’t have the time, energy, or motivation to spend more time than it takes to read a single article to get their news.

This may speak to a greater issue in this country, that the general public does not look for “facts” necessarily but reads only from news sites they “like” (and these are most likely sites that somewhat agree with them politically).

So then, what is the solution? I believe it lies with the media itself.

A culture of strict objectivity must put in place. Now, any journalist would tell you that his/her ultimate goal is to give the public all of the facts regarding an issue in an objective way, and many journalists do this.

But, news corporations are not as concerned with objectivity as individual journalists may be.

Sure, objectivity makes one’s company reliable, but once this reliability has been established, the goal of the corporation shifts to luring readers from other, equally reliable sites to their own.

This means that articles must include the objective facts, but also inklings of opinion (at the very least, a little voice), in order for the reader to say “I like this site” as opposed to other sites.

Then, the media is no longer about objectivity. Currently, corporations attempt to find a balance of objectivity and emotion, to attract readers to their site and keep them there.

That’s the real problem of “fake news.” If all news sites were completely objective, or at least closer to it than they are now, there would be no such thing as fake news.

Therefore the fighting of this epidemic cannot be done by the average American. It can, in theory, but until news corporations are held responsible, and there is a complete expectation to publish news and only news, “fake news” will remain.

Consumers to blame for spread of unreliable news

by *Beth Wall*

From rabid cries of “fake news!” to partisanship dominating front pages and sensationalism ruling the newsfeed, it is clear that there are more than a few problems with the current state of media in the U.S.

In a Gallup poll from 2016, only 32% of Americans reported that they trust the media “a great deal” or “a fair amount”.

How do we go about affecting change in the field that forms our entire understanding of the world?

One might suggest that professional journalists should be held more accountable, and should have to go through more rigorous training before unleashing their pens unto the public.

Another solution might be to hold news corporations accountable through boycotting and increased affiliated legislation to prevent misinformation.

I’m not saying any of these courses of action are necessarily detrimental. In fact, I see precisely why they might make a notable difference in the reliability of the press.

The obvious answer seems to be that we should fix the problem at its source. But with the ever-evolving definition of journalism, this task becomes increasingly elusive.

If we want to maintain our grip on our First Amendment rights, how can we introduce legislation that demands that our press report in a

mandated way?

As we’ve seen in this *Examiner* issue, what qualifies as “journalism” changes pretty regularly, so who is it, exactly, that we’re attempting to regulate?

I ask now that you consider (honestly) where you find your news sources, and through what means you primarily hear about breaking stories.

If you’re like myself, and many of my peers, I imagine platforms like Snapchat, Facebook, and Twitter are generally your biggest source for updates. There’s no shame in this. But it does suggest some pretty conclusive implications about who really is in control of the circulation of news.

You see what your friends or idols get excited about, and in turn, your pals and admirers see every headline or link that you find especially stirring.

Rather than solely blaming reporters and media agencies, I believe it is more important to rely on the consumer to think critically, and to be highly vigilant of the pieces they share with other consumers.

It is an undeniable fact that information has a market just like any other industry.

The most flashy stories get the most views no matter how accurate they are. Think about which articles catch your eye as you surf the web.

Ethical issues aside, working journalists have to make a living,

just like any other professional. If their market demands sensationalism, is it really a surprise that they might write articles that cater to this demand?

What if instead of only accusing journalists of pandering, we actively tried to stay wary of contentious stories?

In a fast-paced world such as the one we live in, I imagine there are many people who might sheepishly shrug and point at their enormous backlog of responsibilities to attend to when asked to check their sources and to make sure they’re reading reputable material.

I have serious doubts that every reader of this *Examiner* issue is now going to excruciatingly fact-check every piece of media they are subjected to from now on.

But if you recognize that there are major problems with the state of media sharing and journalism in general, then I insist that the change is literally at your fingertips. If you feel like you can’t trust most of the media sources that you see, then don’t waste any time perpetuating sensationalized stories that are targeted at shock-seekers.

If you are passionate about a subject enough to share its story with others, make sure you’re sharing the correct story.

To whom it may seriously concern, I urge you: take your time, and take responsibility.