Hi, everyone. A little bit of an afternoon delay. My name is Ms. Megan Reichelt. I'm Mrs. Valerie Linsinbigler. Mr. Christopher Lowder. We are here to talk to you about fake news, which has always been important but seems to be just increasingly important as the deadline for elections loom. So we're looking at fake news within that place. So I want to get to know you all a little bit and what brought you to the workshop. So if you could go around and just say your name and who you are and start with you? I'm Kate, I'm a graduate student, and I am studying Literacy and Reading Education. Wow. Then I have interest in Critical Literacy, so we read a lot of severe input. [inaudible 00:01:01] I missed the last part of what you've said because of a lot of noises. Okay, so I have interest in Critical Literacy. So I think it's really important to figure out which is true or which is not. We read a lot but some of them are not true. Exactly. Okay. Great. Well, that's really exciting. I hope that we're able to give you some new step toward that. How about you? I'm Coleen, I work here at the Library and Access Services and this just sounded like a really interesting workshop. Great. I'm glad. Thank you. Yeah. I'm Stacey Remick-Simkins. I'm in the English Department, but on a personal level, I read all the time and it's just good to have as much knowledge as possible. I think I'm getting much better, I'm recognizing it almost instantly, but then there are times when I don't. So it's just getting as much perspective and learning as I can. Exactly. Well, that's great. Good. I hope we're able to give you some more tools. So I'm David, I also work in the libraries. I'm on Teaching and Learning Team with the team up there. I'm really interested in misinformation and in this presentation, I hope I'm going to learn some more things here today, too. Also, seeing how the hybrid workshop thing works out so I'm here for a lot of different reasons. Yeah. So do we have anybody online? Yes. So we have Hannah Mclaughlin online and she works downstairs in the Sp@RC Lab, and then she loves that we give this workshop on libraries and wanted just to try one. How are you? Hi, Hannah. Cool. Great. So we're going to start this out by playing a game called Fake or Real. I'm going show you a little snippet of a news article and you have to tell me whether or not you think it is fake or real. Goals. We have goals. After today, you will be able to examine personal and unconscious bias, which is probably a huge part of where we get our fake news tendencies; determine accuracy and or bias within news media; and then identify sources that can help you learn more information about a new source, to get that clean diet. Now, we're going to play fake or real. I'm going back and forth between two computers, one for my notes, one for this, so bear with me. Fake or real? "Gunman Demands Chicken Sandwich from Texas Popeye's, Leaves Empty and the Hungry." Do you think it is fake or real? Real. Real? Why? Well, it looks like it's Washington and Channel 4 News. You know what? I take that back. It's probably fake. Why? Because it was Chick-A-Fils were that actual story happened. Chick-A-Fils? Yeah, they came out with that chicken sandwich. It was supposed to be this phenomenal thing. Was it Chick-Fil-A? Chick-Fil-A. Chick-Fil-A. Yeah, that's right. Is there another one that I don't know about? So there is that recent story about the person who killed the guy in line for a chicken sandwich. Because the chicken sandwich was too phenomenal and they had way too many people they didn't have enough of the new chicken sandwich. That did happen. Any other thought for this? Is it fake or real? I say real. Say real? So we have a real that turned into fake. We have a real. I think it's real. You think its real? Okay. Why? I learned a news digitally in school. Yeah. Yeah. So one thing that is really difficult with things like this is, oftentimes if we hear it somewhere, we don't remember where we heard it, but then we see it again, and we are like, "Yeah, I heard that

somewhere." So it reinforces itself. However, in the case of this, it is actually real, but the title is really couldn't be real, right? Juries, you found this, right? I found this one You found this. Do you want to talk about it? Yes. So this one is a real story, but the part about the "leaves empty and hungry" is a little exaggerated. He did have a gun on him, but it wasn't like he was holding people hostage in a Popeye's. It was like, "A man with a gun goes to Popeye's and does not get a chicken sandwich," and they turned it into this kind of story. Yeah. So the NBC logo is definitely a clue for some of you, right? But you have to be careful with things like this for counterfeits, because it's very easy for me do a screenshot like we did. We did a screenshot of this, take that and stick it on top of whatever I'm posting. Also read here, this is a good indicator, it's an Associated Press photo, which means that the photo comes from the Associated Press. But again, you have to make sure to follow all these trails to make sure that this is a legitimate Associated Press photo. Anyone else want to talk about that one? No. Next. Boom. "Trump's grandfather was a pimp and tax evader; his father a member of the KKK?" Is it fake or real? So I'll just say that to me this seems fake, things that are indicated that to me, I don't know what the AHTribune is. It might be a paper, but I would be aware of the way that I learn of Channel 4 that we're just talking about. That's one clue and the title, it seems to me it's either exaggerating actual reality the way that the previous one was or it's just like completely made up stuff, and it's a little hard to believe. Yeah. Interesting. Other thoughts? Fake or real? I think what we can not say stuff like [inaudible 00:07:46] because he was just a social leader cool, how we can just believe it's true? It's true, but how often is this what we see of the news? We're scrolling through Facebook, our friend has posted something like this and we see this and we pass by but we absorb it into our brain and we are like, "Oh, my gosh this thing happened" they keep scrolling, we don't actually dive in further so you're absolutely right that in order to figure this out, we would need to do a little further investigating but that's why I want to play this game because this is how we often see it. So it is fake but it is the most viewed of all the fake news, all the fake news when? Last year. Last year. 2019. 2019 the most viewed all fake news in 2019 with 29,202,552 estimated views and 1,638,165 interactions. So there's views and interactions are shared. Do you want to talk about this little one? It's just this one was the most viewed fake news article of 2019 and it was not any kind of political side that was doing it, it was so many people that it was everyone was sharing this and it showed up just like this I took this exactly from the Facebook posts that had it. I took off all the comments underneath it but it was just like this on Facebook. It is an example of potentially, though you do say that people of all started to shared it. If you were inclined to think that Trump was a bad person, you would be more inclined to just be " Ha-ha, here's proof look at this". So Trump's grandfather did have prostitution potentially in one his hotels but a lot of hotels are hosts to prostitution and he was not involved directly. So it is taking something and is stretching it so far to make it fake news. This one, there we go, two Wikipedia, FBI agent suspected in Hillary e-mail leaks found dead in an apparent murder suicide, fake or real? I'm going to guess fake. Why? Well, for one thing the Denver Guardian, I've never heard of before. Lot of these were actually list that year of all the publications which were Russian bots and they would often mimic the names of legitimate newspaper, so it would be some close to the real newspaper that you had to really look hard. This is one of those that I don't remember if it's on the list but it seems like

somebody mixed up Denver Guardian and The Guardian newspaper and some Denver newspaper together to create this inflammatory article. That's absolutely what happens, there are several ways that fake news organizations, people who are doing fake news or fake news bots do this where they are combining something, a name of a town and then something that sounds newspapery, even in Alaska like the AHTribune or things like that, it makes it sound legitimate or they take an actual news source like ABC.com and add a little extra to the end and say "dot co " so they co-opt the name and how to close to it but not exactly. So that they're able to spread fake news in a way that people think that it is legitimate, that is going through legitimate source. Any questions about that before we move forward? Cool. So the information overload, how many hours a day do you think you spend consuming media? Media of all kinds. Probably a couple of hours at least. A couple of hours? We don't all at the same but cumulatively probably three. Yeah, I'd say probably four or more. Four or more? Yeah. Okay. I think more than two hours. More than two? Three or four. Okay, Duke? I was going to say four or five like my colleague. Do you have any thoughts for 10? Okay. So it's actually 11, 11 hours per day consuming media which includes TV, video games, radio, tablet, smartphone, and computer. Okay, I lied. Think about how much time you spend at your computer out and work alone and then when you're walking, you're on your phone and then when you're in your car, you're listening to things. Eleven hours so that means you are a wash in media, it's just coming at you all the time. So even if you're usually good at vetting news that you read so often you are, "Oh I heard it on this. I read it on the Internet somewhere, I heard that somewhere, it rings a bell," But you don't remember exactly where and so that can cause the spread misinformation or maybe you think that something is true when it actually isn't because it rings a bell somewhere. If you find yourself in a particular pocket of the Internet due to algorithms, I was a little worried about this when I was looking up some of the fake news articles that we had, one of them was from InfoWars and I was worried that I'm going to start seeing ads and media and cookies and things based on my search history. I think I mentioned, I liked one of Elizabeth Warren's tweets and then I started seeing ads everywhere for Elizabeth Warren, so this is how our Internet environment works now and if you start seeing something over and over and over and over, your perspective may start to change unconsciously because I've seen it multiple times and this is what my reality looks like, it's through the window of the screen. Do you have any examples of that happening to you at all? Where you started to see something more and more and more? It happened and it happens so much that it's hard to even recount. Yeah, was your mind ever potentially changed or you started to be like, "Oh maybe this is true?". Not really. Yeah, I get suspicious. Good. Valerie had an example all right. Yeah, this is something that happens to me all the time because I'm very involved in the political debate around climate change like that is floods all of my social media all the time. So there's all these Doomsday article headings I'm always being consumed with and so they're depressing, they're hard to read to the point where I've gotten to where I just read the headings now and then I get upset and then I keep moving because I'm too exhausted mentally when actually read the article and find out what is the science behind this? Is any of this actually true? So I don't do my homework, I don't do the backup and so I just get sad and start to believe all the doomsday sources just because I'm someone that assumed it all the time and they are so many. Especially because they have clickbait titles, the entire thing is just trying to evoke emotional reaction in you, so you will

click on it. I've actually noticed, I've started listening to news on the radio and avoiding news on social media and since doing that, I actually feel less stressed out because you get a fuller picture when you listen to the entire article, you'd hear one side but then you hear the other side as opposed to this horrible thing is happening, scream into the boy about this. It actually shows you that there are counter movements going on in multiple directions or multiple sides to the story. But yeah, so it is really important to be able to think critically about how you are getting this giant waterfall of media because it can be dangerous, just make sure I have anything else. So the algorithms, dive into that a little more, help promote the most clicked on items to the top of search results. So when you are searching Google, it's not the best item that comes up but it's the most popular, and it also tries to customize things based on what they think that you will like and click on, so it will completely avoid telling you articles that might disagree with you. So this is one of the reasons why we are potentially in this divided nation where it seems like we're living in two different worlds and in both sides are I don't understand you how do you think this way? It's because we are seeing completely different media streams. So where do you get your news, David? I listen to NPR in the morning, and I do read a lot of news articles on Facebook. I try not to click on them because I'm trying not to become part of the algorithm, however it doesn't always work. So I consume some news on Facebook and I try to listen to NPR in the mornings before I look Facebook so that I can start the day grounded with maybe things that my friends are not sharing with doomsday articles. I see a lot of the same articles Valerie was talking about. Okay. Only Reddit, that's where the problem is. Yeah, Reddit is where a lot of that happens. I love my dad, and I cannot follow my dad on Facebook, but he is a hardcore liberal and so he will post articles from Alternet and things like that where it's a lot and it's super stressful. So I am very glad when I go to NPR and I'm like, "Okay, this is actually what's happening as opposed to this." It's still not great but there's gray. Oftentimes there will be an article that's like "This thing was put to the floor of the House," and making it seem like it was passed into law, where actually someone just proposed it, and the nuance is lost in those clickbaity headlines. Where else do you get your news? I'm mostly on NPR because it's nice. I look at so much of the articles and you know. There was a time one friend of mine who's very Fox News put the story out there about how, this was when Obama, it was during the last election and how he had sold all of our most sensitive military planes to Saudi Arabia. He had handed them all of our defense technology, all that stuff. My stepson is in the Marines, and it was his mom who was doing this. So his mom called my husband and said, "Did you know?" So my husband being very, very skeptical of everything called my stepson and said, "Jonathan, I know this can't possibly be true." Of course, he said I don't know where she's getting her information. She said, "Do you think that the military might mutiny over something like this?" So it's very, very hard and so the extremism that shows up on Facebook is sometimes, and they're getting really refined. Yeah. So it's like these phishing campaigns that you get on your computer. It's starting to get so sophisticated that they can put an extreme story in such a way that it sounds a lot milder than it is, and it can have you really thinking that this is kind of what's happening? Yeah, absolutely. You said something interesting that I'm going to talk about in just a second. I'll come back to that, but one more thing about this is, also something to consider is, I started listening to the BBC News and realized there's so much going on not in the United States right now.

So a lot of US media is so US-focused, we even kind of self-censor that way, where even if we're looking at legitimate news sources in the United States, then there is an entire world out there that is not being reported on by a lot of news outlets or at least not making it front-page headlines, things that we would see. So things to think about. Hannah shared that she likes to go to NPR too, it's a pretty good source, sometimes podcasts and sometimes things from Facebook, but that she tries to censor the click baits or just be conscious of them. I love that so many of us in the room are conscious of it and trying to get our news from regular sources. That this is what its looks like for most of the United States where we are increasingly getting our news from social media. Then of course, with that comes the number of people who are afraid of fake news. They're concerned about the influence of fake news on voters on elections in the United States as of June 2018. It's here and it's everyone. Everyone is terrified right now, not just one side or the other, and they're worried about the other side doing it to them, like everyone is scared. So we need to be able to know how to make our decisions based on the truth and not what we fear or what we hope. So what is fake news? What is it? Well, I know a lot of it is, it can can be one of two things I think. It can be something that looks, it can be extrapolated from an event that happened, but it's not actually the event itself and they turn it into something else. So it's so psychologically linked to that very thing that you were talking about, "I've heard before". Or it's just all it's just a totally all out fake and it has no basis at all in any previous events, but it draws on enough that's real that it sounds like it's something real. Any other thoughts on what fake news might be? It is made with intention. Made with intention, as opposed to perhaps some misinformation, which is just a mistake? Yeah. To spread the news in favor of all their position and political party or some interest. To be able to influence people. Maybe, yeah. Do you have any thoughts? No, I think she said it. Cool. So strictly speaking, fake news is completely made up and designed to deceive readers to maximize traffic and profit. So more clicks on the website and then that means more eyes on the advertisers for that website. But the definition is often expanded to include websites that circulate distorted, decontextualized or dubious information through, for example, clickbaiting headlines that don't reflect the facts of the story, or undeclared bias. So there's a lot of gray area when it comes to fake news, where a news article in itself could be true but it's misrepresented in some way or it is slanted to advantage a certain group. Let me just make sure I have everything on here. So these are different types of fake news. Biased news, satire like The Onion. How many people have accidentally shared an Onion article? Do you know The Onion, the satiric newspaper? Though I'm starting to see these wonderful comparisons online where it was like here's The Onion article that came out a bunch of years ago and here's the actual thing that's happening right now. Yeah, that's fun. Clickbait, conspiracy, it's something that is misleading or it could be just straight up fake. So how can you tell if what you are reading is fake news? How do you vet things? So one of the ways that I try to avoid fake news is by going to sources that I trust, things like NPR, BBC, Al Jazeera, sources that I know or at least not going to be selling me things that are completely not based on reality, even if there's a political sleight into what they write or what the person is saying. At least I know that it's not just going to be about 12 senators or space aliens, right? Right. So you just start out by making sure that what you consume is from legitimate sources. What about if you stumble across something on your friend's Twitter? How do

you know how to check it's fake or real? Hannah mentioned that she likes to check the sources and the links in the articles, kind of backing up the research and look at the author. Yeah, absolutely. Checking the author, making sure that they have the authority to write this article or if they even exist. Any other thoughts? I really try to keep a wide range of sources from across the spectrum that I trust. Yeah. My experience has been when they start all agreeing with each other on something, that's when something is going on. The Venn Diagram of. Right. So sometimes some friends of mine who love conspiracy theories from all sending this conspiracy theories, Facebook. Yeah. It's so ridiculous that, so I go and I look at all domain like the Washington Post and New York Times. I searched everywhere for [inaudible 00:29:29]. Something about this particular thing that they keep telling me it's going on, and I go first to the sources that it could come from. Like one of the worst defenders of these bizarre conspiracy theories is the several of the Christian Broadcasting Networks, and so for a while there was this big conspiracy theory about how Hillary Clinton was involved in an [inaudible 00:30:05] ring in the basement of that pizza place, right? Yes. So instead of just immediately, what I did was I not only couldn't find it anywhere, even on Fox News. I went back to my friend and I said, you know what, "This is nowhere to be found." So you triangulate your sources. I triangulate my sources, and I say, "If I can't find it here". Yeah. If indeed she had [inaudible 00:30:35]. Do you think that this would not end up? Yeah. But some people you can tell them everything and then will still hold on [inaudible 00:30:48]. Which is a great segue into how you can spot fake news, and the very first step is examining personal bias. One of the things that you said previously when you are talking about, which one was it? That the military start selling those things, you said, "I knew that couldn't possibly be true," which is an interesting statements because one of the tests that I've started to do because is to check and see, okay, if I read this headline and I switched the name to somebody I didn't agree with, will I still believe it? It's I think something that both sides of the aisle should examine as we are all seeking truth. So the first thing we think about is what emotions do this article evoke in me, and examine those. Does it make me angry? Does it make me scared? Does it make me happy this happened? Are you hoping that the content turns out to be true or worn out, and what does that mean? Then consider counter-opinions or counter-arguments, like okay, if this is true, if somebody I disagree with fundamentally did a good thing, what does that mean? Or if somebody that I really like did a bad thing, what does that mean? Could you consider that the people are pushing back against this thing I believe in for legitimate reasons? What are those reasons? Because I firmly believe that the only way that this country can move forward is through everybody listening to the legitimate needs of each other and coming to a way that all concerns can be vetted and valid and come up with a plan that considers all of them as opposed to, well, anything you say is wrong and racist or anything you say is wrong and it's stopping our freedoms, we have to come together. So and the first way that we do that is being, okay where am I coming from emotionally? Where are emotions possibly clouding my search for truth? I think we came across, I think it was MIT though, it's got to be. They did in which [inaudible 00:33:31] this is the thing that we should be doing. They did a study in which they presented someone with an evidence counter to their views and instead of changing their views, they held even stronger to the view. So even though they were given evidence that what they were thinking was wrong, the majority of the participants held fast and set in more

and believed their view stronger given counter-evidence. Yeah. So why might we have a personal bias? Why may these things exist within us? Life experiences. Life experiences. What kind of life experiences? Like you're raised in certain environments, you form opinions based on bad encounters. You had a time component, just so many different events and things that have happened to you. You form all your biases. Sometimes you may not even know that they're there. Any other thoughts on why we might? Yeah, the thing is that like human beings just to survive are wired to see patterns, and so our brains are okay, well this thing happened to me, and so thus in all cases this must be true or this is the color of this person that did this thing. So it accidentally or like inadvertently colors how you see interactions in the future and you may not know it, so it is important to examine those things. Let's see. So confirmation bias leads people to put more stock in information that confirms their beliefs and discounts information that opposes them. So we got to be careful about that. Just want to make sure I have everything on this page. Can say important. Yeah. So make sure that you know your own feelings, first examine, This is what I'm feeling. I acknowledge it and then are able to separate it from evaluating the truth of the articles contents. Address this first and then we can move on to the rest of the thing. So only then can we be truly objective in our analysis. So next, consider the source. This is something we've talked about before? Is it well-known? How does this site describe itself in the About section? Do other articles published in that site seem reliable? Read laterally about the news. So many fake news sites use the fake kind of address to make it seem legitimate. You also have to examine what everybody is saying is reliable sources and what are not because two weeks ago, the Tennessee House put forth a revolution in the State House that CNN and Washington Post be classified as fake news. Which is not great, but as you can see, lawmakers are now trying to decree what is fake news and what is not fake news. So you have to be careful of that. Is there anything else you'd like to say about that? Intention is important. Cool. So read beyond the headline. Does the content match the headline? What kind of content is it? Is it news, opinion, satire? So many people are like, "This is from the Washington Post," but it's an editorial, so it's an opinion?, and think about what its purpose is. Is it trying to convince you of something? Is it trying to sell you something or simply to inform you? Then check the authors. Does the author have a byline. Who is the author? Who do they work for it? Are they qualified to speak on a topic? So always dig a little deeper there. Then of course we said investigate supporting sources. Does the story site a variety of sources? Are these sources official and experts? Does the information appear in reports from other news outlets and are you able to verify the images? I see [inaudible 00:37:56]. So we're finding images, a lot of the fake news out there is video now. For example, Donald Trump tweeted this video of Nancy Pelosi tearing up the State of the Union after he introduced each of the Head of American heroes that he talked about in his State of the Union address. So it made it look like her tearing up the State of the Union was in reaction to the contributions that each of these individuals made, and that was through editing. He just changed the order of events. When if you read literally if you were able to see that video in other places, you could see when it actually happened at the end of the State of the Union. There's also deepfake videos which are terrifying. I didn't have the time to show. Maybe at the end. Maybe the end. Okay. There is an amazing deepfake video out there that is joyful and not scary, but also a little scary, where it is casting Robert Downey Jr. and Tom Holland in Back to the Future. So it takes a

scene from Back to the Future and puts Tom Holland and Robert Downey Jr's faces on Doc and Marty and has them go through the scene and you believe it. You're like yes, obviously this is how it was originally cast, and it's scary and fun, but also scary. So that's one of the difficulties. Is it that like, well, you can't say anymore, well, it's a video, I can see it because videos can be deepfaked. You'd have to be extra careful with visual evidence. Anything else out for me. [inaudible 00:39:42] through. Check the date, is the date current? Are the sources used current? How many people have seen the shark swimming down the highway picture? None. So, after every major floods, there is this picture of, "Oh my god, it flooded so much for the shark is swimming down the highway!" But it actually appeared after flooding in Puerto Rico and it was a Photoshopped image then. So it just keeps appearing after every major flood. So make sure that what you're looking at even from the thing that it says it is. Cool. Now, this is the big thing, checking for it. So we examined their own personal lives. Now we're checking bias in the article itself, if the writers or the publishers were biased, if the language or imagery loaded or sensational, either unfair blame placed on one person, group or cause. What seems to be the purpose of the article, does it try to convince you of something? So these are different ways that it could exist. So by headline, how they talk about something. "Bill Cosby Sex Assault Trial: Judge Allows Only One Other Accuser to Testify, Not 13." So it's trying to make you feel a certain kind of way about it. Whereas this one says, "Judge Allows Testimony of Another Accuser in Cosby Case, " that is a little more neutral. We have bias by omission, by selection and omission. So if someone is giving a speech and people boo in the middle of the speech, do you include that do you not? And the people who do include it may be trying to show exactly what happened, they may also be trying to influence like thinking about what people include. Bias through displacement. So what's on the front cover versus what's on page 27? So, Tiger Woods, this is on the front cover, but then Republican National Convention begins on page 26. So they are prioritizing Tiger Woods over the Republican National Convention. So you may not even know that it's in there if you see this in the grocery store. Then bias by photos, captions, and camera angles. Do you want to talk about this more efficiently? Oh, I can talk to about this. You talk about this. So here was a big five role do thing that happened in the past year. This image was spread widely, but shortly, well not shortly after a little bit after more journalists did more digging and they pulled like, I think two-hour video came out of actually everything that happened. It puts in a lot different position of what all was happening than just this one image. It's like you see this image it makes you feel emotions. But then if you do have the time to watch, a two-hour video, you're going to feel differently. It's a more complex situation with like a third group. So there was the March for Life. There was also the indigenous peoples March. Then there was a third group of people who was initially harassing the boys on the right for the March for Life that sparked off the entire encounter. So there is a lot more gray area than just what one image shows. This was initially tweeted as "this Maga loser gleefully bothering a Native American protester at the indigenous peoples March". So it contextualize it in a very specific way. If that's all you see, then that's all that you will potentially receive about it. Yeah, cool. Bias through use of names and titles. So when Jeff Sessions was appointed attorney general, career racist Jeff Sessions is Donald Trump's pick for attorney general. Trump picks Sessions for attorney general. Then over here he called Senator Jefferson Beauregard Sessions III. So there are three very different

pictures being explored and painted to that. Then bias by choices of words. This article was in Time Magazine and it says, "Fishing for Donations. House Speaker Denny Hastert led 35 donors last Monday on a predawn fly-fishing excursion in Valley forge, Pennsylvania. Each donor got a personal guide from the local Trout Unlimited. Minimum donation: $5,000; number of fish caught: One." He was trying to be funny, he's trying to make a joke about the value of the fish and the value of his campaign. But it was also in a legitimate news article, and it's trying to influence how you see this person has a lot of talk. Step eight, so that was all bias. Then consult the expert. So think about what Fact Checkers say, what Bias Checkers say. We're going to give you a handout at the end with all of these on it. Then what can you find from your library or librarians? Because that's why we're here. Cool. Do we have enough time for the activity? We have 12 minutes. [inaudible 00:45:30] All right. So we're going to do a speed activity. Let's get two groups in the room. Do you guys mind pairing up? Sure. Sure. Okay, go there. Are you guys [inaudible 00:45:48]. I would like you to quickly read an article, probably not one of the longer ones. Yeah. Then see if you can figure out if it's fake news, if it isn't. If it isn't, what kind of nuance does it have to maybe make it biased or not, or is it legitimate? We'll go for five minutes. You don't necessarily have to fill up the entire paper. Just write down your thoughts. The indoors thing is huge. So wanted to know about the fidget spinners. Yeah, that's it. Take maybe five minutes, read over the article, discuss with each other, answer some of the questions, and then we'll come back together. So let's all come back together, see what you discovered. So one of you has this curve right here, yeah? You have the centimeters and the fidget spinners? That was me. That was you? Sorry. So what are your thoughts? So one of my options out here is what is your immediate emotional reaction and there's articles about senators playing with fidget spinners and stress balls during the impeachment trial. Yeah. Ultimately, [inaudible 00:47:12] reactions like, why? Who cares? We rewrote who cares, not care. Are we able to react, and was like, "Why would we care if they had fidget spinners during the impeachment trial?" That's so funny because my immediate reaction when I first heard that was anger. Really? Yeah, because they also now have got people reading and things like that, and I'm like, this isn't important. You want to hear the arguments. But I acknowledge that that was where I came from initially. But I think you had a really good point when you said your emotional reaction was, they're telling us about this to make us feel like the impeachment trial was a joke. It comes from Fox News and one of the other questions I hear is like, does Fox News have connections to places that might indicate a certain bias? Yes. So I don't know if I'm characterizing your [inaudible 00:48:05]. No. Perfectly. But numbers have a artsy takeaway was like they're trying to tell us what you think, what made me fit. It's better to think if there be any adults in the room. They're so good, this is so dumb that they actually distract themselves. Our takeaway from the tone of the article, which included a lot of screenshots from Twitter. That's all. Yes. Any other thoughts on that? So, is it fake news? It's hard to say, but I tend to think that it's probably isn't. The reason that I think that there were other sources that we're making reference to the not as the primary surprise piece of this story. But as a side note to show how the partisanship of the proceedings, it use it as evidence to show how the partisanship was expressing itself. I would say if decontextualized truth is fake news, then yes, because this happened. Yeah. Right. So it's not like they just made it up. It's not falsified through space aliens. It's not the same thing. But one of my questions

is, do they always have goodness fitness and starts falls available and they just happened to bring them out during or is this a new thing for this? There's nothing about whether it's happening and if you try read the article, it's just about budgets. There's no weird about that. So, like hey, this is like decontextualizing and what's going on is, who's leading up these. So potentially it is factual, but the slight that they put on it maybe, has an agenda. Right. Exactly. The other one was which one? Oberlin. Oberlin. Okay. So, Oberlin College students protest culturally appropriative dining hall food. What did you think? It's fake news. Or what are your general thoughts on the article? Mine I would say, I don't necessarily think I would classify it as fake news. Maybe more of just one side of a bias. But again, this would be something that you would want to fact check because they quote, I think it leak. They quote at least one person in here. Will be interesting to see if there were any published articles after that. Again, it's like, "No I didn't say that." So that's something that won't get into. But I think it has mirrored. Interesting as far as existing. Yeah. But one over the Christians see in democracy face just to act to sanctifying. He was still sick. Yeah, I think he has a problem in then that he shows us only one side of the story. I don't believe that there is millions of antagonist but instead we can now apply professionals. interesting, do you want to talk about this one? I love it Yeah, so this one was a big article that led to a lot of pink kisses, and then probably a year or two afterwards, people actually followed up and looked at the journalism behind them, and it wasn't necessarily fake. But that journalism was a very badly and very poorly done. Right The one person cited was the one person that complains. So as an entire college, there was one person that complained about like the taste of the sushi, and then it caused all this outrage online about cultural appropriation and students massively protesting. When it was this one senior. Go ahead. But it wasn't said. The students said this. Yeah, but it was exploded entirely on both sides of the issue. Cool. So, I just want to give you a few tools to make sure that your news diet is healthy, clean, and non-bias. Things that you can do. Be wear of online filter bubbles. Makes sure that you read wide variety of places. Think critically, use Mason library's resources and subscriptions, and you want to talk about. Yes. So if there's one thing you could do to combat fake news or to combat the bubble that you find something online, is when you're browsing using the [inaudible 00:52:32] you use, go incognito mode, so that it doesn't know it's you, it doesn't know what articles, you could glide, Facebook, it doesn't know what you usually Google. So, it does not feeding the bad things that you want to look at. It's feeding up everything because it doesn't know you know. Yes. I don't know if you have ever seen this before but it's really helpful and it changes. This is a medium bias chart. This is version 5.1. But it takes a different media outlets and then ranks them, most extreme left, most extreme right, and then these are like the most reliable for news and then as we get down is less reliable. So over here we can have most extreme right, and this is still slightly reliable where this is less. So when you see an article come up on Facebook, you can check the media bias chart maybe to see where it lands and try to keep your media diets somewhere around here. Cool? I know that we probably have do over two minutes, but we didn't. Any questions? Was this helpful? Very. Yeah. Cool. Great. Did you learn something that you can take away and immediately apply? Yeah. Yeah? Okay. Goods. That is all I ask. It is all I care about. [inaudible 00:54:02] thank you.