

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

Subramaniam Vincent¹, Phoebe Wang², Zhan Shi², Sahas Koka³, Yi Fang²

¹ Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA

² Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA

³ Dublin High School, Dublin, CA

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Subramaniam (Subbu) Vincent, Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University, 500 El Camino Real, Santa Clara, CA 95053, United States. Email: svincent@scu.edu.

About the authors: Subramaniam Vincent is Director of Journalism and Media Ethics at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University. Phoebe Wang was a MS student at Santa Clara University when conducting this work. Zhan Shi is currently a Ph.D. student at the Department of Computer Science and Engineering at Santa Clara University. Sahas Koka is a senior at Dublin High School, Dublin, CA. Yi Fang is Associate Professor of Computer Science and Engineering at Santa Clara University.

Abstract

Since the launch of ChatGPT in late 2022, the capacities of Large Language Models and their evaluation have been in constant discussion and evaluation both in academic research and in the industry. Scenarios and benchmarks have been developed in several areas such as law, medicine and math (Bommasani et al., 2023) and there is continuous evaluation of model variants. One area that has not received sufficient scenario development attention is journalism, and in particular journalistic sourcing and ethics. Journalism is a crucial truth-determination function in democracy (Vincent, 2023), and sourcing is a crucial pillar to all original journalistic output. Evaluating the capacities of LLMs to annotate stories for the different signals of sourcing and how reporters justify them is a crucial scenario that warrants a benchmark approach. It offers potential to build automated systems to contrast more transparent and ethically rigorous forms of journalism with everyday fare. In this paper we lay out a scenario to evaluate LLM performance on identifying and annotating sourcing in news stories on a five-category schema inspired from journalism studies (Gans, 2004). We offer the use case, our dataset and metrics and as the first step towards systematic benchmarking. Our accuracy findings indicate LLM-based approaches have more catching to do in identifying all the sourced statements in a story, and equally, in matching the type of sources. An even harder task is spotting source justifications.

Keywords: Journalistic Sourcing, Large Language Models, Benchmarks, Content Analysis, Journalism Ethics

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

Introduction

Since the launch of ChatGPT in late 2022, the capacities of general purpose Large Language Models and their evaluation have been in constant discussion, both in academic research and in the industry. Scenarios and benchmarks have been developed in several areas such as law, medicine and math (Bommasani et al., 2023), for instance with the Holistic Evaluation of Language Models (HELM) initiative, to perform continuous evaluation of model variants. There is both excitement and worry about the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the news media and the ongoing interest in newsroom-situated experimentation with LLMs and chatbots. Despite this, one area that has not received sufficient scenario development attention for benchmarking is real-world journalism, and in particular journalistic sourcing and ethics. A scenario represents a use case and consists of a dataset of instances (e.g., HELM).

The authority of journalism is founded on a robust connection between news and truth (Steensen et al, 2022). Journalism is a crucial truth-determination function in democracy (Vincent, 2023). Sourcing is a crucial pillar to original journalistic output. Without people, organizations, footage, documents and data serving as sources, journalists would not be able to do their work. And the manner in which journalists attribute statements, claims, findings, conclusions, and broadly the content in their stories to sources and justify their inclusion is often unstructured and embedded in the communication itself, be it writing, audio or video. But assessing, even if roughly, whether and to what degree a series of stories is sourced from the democratic stakeholdership on issues requires new datasets based on source retrieval and annotations around an ethics vocabulary. Source retrieval, text extraction and analysis are in use

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

for development of methodologies to study and visualize bias in source selection (Zhukova et al., 2023). With source and source-related definitions, categorization, and enumeration, the work of building quantitative measures and qualitative assessments of sourcing, for e.g. in news coverage of chronic issues such as homelessness (Moorehead, 2023), using standards from ethics is possible. Manual efforts are both expensive and difficult to instrument in real time when news cycles are ongoing. In the real world, this impoverishes the discourse on assessing the ethical quality of news stories - especially in technological distribution systems such as news aggregators and social media - to the realm of factual accuracy, as opposed to expanding to account for stakeholder inclusion, perspective-centering, including the lived experiences of communities.

Evaluating the capacities of LLMs to use a supplied vocabulary about journalistic sourcing to identify and annotate stories, and offering an approach to benchmarking is the core work behind this paper. The intersection of language and journalism is the topic of research (Jaakkola, 2018). We define the most salient elements of sourcing - statements attributed to sources, types of sources, names of sources, titles, justifications and characterizations of sources. LLMs have substantive language capacities and it ought to be possible to evaluate how well they identify sourcing language and various elements as a narrow task. This is a crucial scenario that warrants a benchmark approach because if LLMs (general purpose for now, but this applied to purpose-based LLMs for journalism that may be available soon) could get the job done, we may be able to address the paucity of easily accessible but more complex journalistic source evaluations, and expand the accessibility and customizability of audit solutions for different genres and formats of newsroom output.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

Second, this offers a pathway to examine the risk and rewards of LLMs to save resources for real world scenarios where journalistic source audits are expensive and time consuming. We are able to see which LLMs perform better for different types of source annotations and compare them. If there is significant underperformance, it means that the claims of LLMs passing a bar exam, scoring high on school math exams, etc., are not useful to journalism evaluation.

In this paper we lay out a scenario from the real world to evaluate LLM performance on identifying and annotating sources, sourced statements, and source characterizations and justifications in news stories on a five-category schema that are inspired from journalism studies (Gans, 2004). We offer the use case, our dataset, the LLM prompts, our ground truth data, and a set comparison metrics for each model as the first step towards systematic benchmarking. We recognize this is an initial framework and data pipeline for evaluating LLMs for accuracy.

Our accuracy findings indicate LLM-based approaches have more catching up to do in identifying all the sourced statements in a story, and equally in the task of spotting source justifications. Source justifications in particular, if accurately annotatable, could provide a signal and incentive to help distinguish between the more bottom-up ethical grades of journalism from the top-down elitist forms.

Related Work

There has been substantive interest in the use of language models for analysis applications in journalism environments. One study (Bhargava, 2024) tested the capacity of ChatGPT to audit sources at a local university-based news outlet. Another study (Spangher et al., 2024) has studied large language models (LLMs) for a role in longer-form article generation itself as part of an effort to explain how journalists plan their sourcing, amongst other workflow tasks, before writing. A third study (Li et al., 2024) probed GPT-4 for knowledge of journalistic

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

tasks and compared it to an existing database of occupation descriptions. This analysis was situated in the context of developing agentic systems for journalism. To the best of our knowledge we know of no current work aimed at proposing a new use case and scenario, on the lines of HELM's approach to test and compare general purpose LLMs for annotating journalistic sourcing as a capacity.

In (Vincent et al., 2023), the lead author of this paper and co-authors documented an effort to use source-diversity proportions data from direct quotes annotations for over 800 news sites to conduct boundary analysis for journalistic behavior online. The computational system was Stanford CoreNLP-based, and augmented with a machine learning model (Shang et al., 2022) for quote extraction and attribution. However, direct quotes are only one form of attribution to sources. The limitations of the earlier NLP-based technology to annotate more complex types of journalistic source attributions and justifications hamper prospects of building datasets for wider ethics analysis and comprehensive ethics audits. This is one of the reasons for us to propose the need to benchmark LLMs. This inspired an initial effort through an MS thesis work (Wang, 2024) where we staged and tested an initial set of LLMs prompts, followed by this work.

Hypothesis

As we noted earlier, LLMs have substantive language capacities and a variety of claims are made about them through benchmarks in other scenarios such as law, medicine, math, reasoning, and so forth. Discerning the language used by journalists to show their sourcing work in stories is a tough area for annotations by LLMs, and we would like to examine the following hypothesis.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

H1a: LLMs will be able to accurately spot different types of statements attributed to sources, not only direct quotes. Previous generations of NLP technologies such as Stanford Core NLP (Muzny et al., 2021) have had quote attribution modules to detect direct quotes in story texts. But journalistic news often has indirect speech and attributions in statements to anonymous sources, documents and unnamed groups of people. We expect that LLMs ought to be able to go beyond direct quotes, and detect these as well, and would like to evaluate the overall accuracy for a general definition of sourced statement for the different models.

H1b: LLMs will be to identify the different types of sources journalists use in news stories, given a set of plain text definitions for named persons, named organizations, unnamed groups of people, documents and anonymous sources. We test how the models apply the definitions to catch all the different types of sources in a story with their sourced statements, by comparing with ground truth data. We note that types of sources and sourced statements are related and we are interested in testing both H1a and H1b together.

H2a: LLMs will be able to identify source titles and justifications since these attributes are components of language used by journalists and go to the heart of their general-purpose capacities on language. Journalists usually signal to readers why a source is being attributed in the story using their title or expertise or sometimes their presence in a critical moment or meeting or event, or their lived experience or historical connection to the issue the story is about. By offering definitions for the terms source titles and source justifications, we evaluate whether the LLMs are able identify these attributes and if so, how accurately.

H2b: Specifically, LLMs will be able to spot anonymous sources and extract the journalist's justification to attribute statements to the source. Anonymous source justifications

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

are normatively significant because they involve disclosure about the sensitivity in the status or role of the human source who engaged with the journalist for the story. Journalists' use of anonymous sources was once scorned and later gained more acceptance despite ethical concerns (Duffy, 2014). But a lack of consistent scrutiny on the use of anonymous sources creates a blind spot not only in our understanding of news sources, but of journalism more broadly (Carlson, 2020). A validated capacity in LLMs to spot both anonymous sourcing and the presence of absence of justifications could have positive implications for downstream ethics audit applications.

H3: We expect the leading “open source” models (Llama, from Meta) to also perform as well as (or nearly) closed source models (Open AI, Anthropic and Google), especially the 405 Billion parameter model. The comparative performance of open-source LLMs for text classification in political science contexts has received attention for performance benchmarks (Alizadeh et al., 2024) because of the fine-tuning possibilities in these models.

Models evaluated

We selected the following models for testing:

1. Anthropic's Claude 3.5 Sonnet
2. OpenAI's ChatGPT-4o
3. Google's Gemini Pro 1.5
4. Meta's Llama 3.1 405B Instruct, and
5. Nvidia's Llama 3.1 Nemotron 70B Instruct.

We used Llama 3.1 to include two “open source” variants and the other three as “closed source” models. At the point when we started out on this research we did not have any hypothesis about which model would perform the best. Our interest is in assessing the capacities

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

of language models to process different patterns in journalistic language to spot sourcing, attributions and justifications.

Methodology

Story selection and sample size

For our corpus, we selected 34 articles from a variety of different news sources - local to national, with 557 sourced statements that we identified through our ground truthing process. See Table 1 for the list. The only common aspect of these news outlets is that they are engaged in journalistic work. They undertake both original reporting - by sourcing and digging out facts, truths and viewpoints on ongoing realities - and some of the sites also publish interpretative commentary based on facts and factual claims. They range from local to national to issue based and BIPOC-led. (Black, Indigenous and People of Color)

Site name	Type of site	Number of stories in sample (total=34)
Regional/Local News		
Cal Matters	CA news	2
Documented NY	Immigration News	1
LAist	Southern California Public Media	2
MLK50	Tennessee regional	3
Oakland Side	Bay Area Local News	3
Sacramento Observer	CA regional news, Black-owned	2
SF Gazetteer	SF Local News	2
SF Standard	SF Local News	2
VT Digger	Vermont Local News	2
WHYY	Philly Public Media	1
Mercury News	Bay Area Local News	1
Central Virginian	Virginia regional	1

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

Non-local/Mission/National/Wire		
19th News	Mission oriented, gender and politics	1
Capital B	Black-owned	2
Native News Online	Indigenous American	1
Associated Press	National/Syndicated News	4
New York Times	National/International	1
Reuters	National/International	1
Salon.com	National/International	1
Reason.com	News and Opinion	1
Total number of articles		34

Table 1: List of publishers and articles in our news corpus.

Input Statistics from the Article Samples (Workload to LLMs)

Figure 1 below shows the distribution of types of sources in 557 sourcing statements across the 34 news articles. We developed the full ground truth sourcing data for all the stories, and this distribution is drawn from the aggregate. See the next section for the definitions of the types of sources.




Figure 1. Distribution of types of sources in the workload used to test the LLMs.

Our schema for journalistic source annotations

We define the following five elements of journalistic sourcing as critical attributes to look for in news stories. 1) Sourced Statement 2) Type of Source 3) Name of Source 4) Title of Source (when present), and 5) Source Justification (when present).

Source titles and source justifications are key distinguishing aspects signaling the ethics of the sourcing process. Journalism has always had a bias towards experts, elites and people in positions of structural power. Those sources are usually introduced with their title and additional qualifications in stories, interviews, podcast conversations and so forth. Democratic pressure on sourcing results in people and communities being included and centered in stories. Those sources may or may not have titles (expertise or power), but are expected to be justified all the same.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

In a story about a new law passed in the Vermont state legislature banning hair discrimination, the reporter cited lawmakers by title and constituency, but also that some of them were co-sponsors of the bill. There were sources quoted as people who experienced discrimination or as parents of children who did. These are examples of source justifications.

Through the system prompt, we provided the following definitions to the LLMs. These definitions were revised repeatedly through an iterative process from the initial ones to the ones used to generate the data for the calculations.

Source: A source in journalism is a person, organization, document, or another news article from whom a journalist takes viewpoints, experiences, claims, expertise, positions, insights, knowledge, data or documents. Reporters may directly quote their sources or use indirect speech to paraphrase a source's views or claims. Sometimes the source is the person who sent sensitive material such as emails or documents or other internal organizational correspondence to the reporter. The source is a person who may have been present at meetings where sensitive deliberations or discussions took place, and that person then shared material from the meetings with the journalist. For e.g., when a reporter attributes a claim or statement to a person or a group of people with words such as "according to people familiar with..", or "according to people who were present at the meeting..", it means that person or those people are the source. When the reporter attributes claims or a statement using words like "according to a copy of emails reviewed by this newspaper" or "according to a copy of the document.." it means the source could be a document. If the person who sent the emails or documents to the reporter is granted anonymity by the report, then that person is an anonymous source. (See also, our definition of Anonymous Source.)

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

A source is an organization when the reporter cites the organization by contacting its spokesperson or other representative or officials. The reporter may cite such spokespersons or officials from a direct interaction or from a press release or social media or corporate blog.

A source can also be another news organization itself. When the journalist has attributed something in the text to another news organization that reported it earlier, then that organization is the source. Sometimes, the reporter will name that organization directly in the text. At other times, the text may simply carry a web link directly to that news article, similar to a document link.

Types of Sources: a) Named Person b) Named Organization c) Document d) Anonymous Source and e) Unnamed Group of People.

Named Person: A source who is a named human being in the story. Note that documents like emails, audio, video, meeting minutes, or other material internal to an organization sent by a human source may contain named people expressing views, taking actions, decisions, etc. Those named people are not sources, even if the reporter included those names and reported their viewpoints or actions in the news article. The person sharing the emails or documents with the journalist is the source, or the documents themselves, if they are authenticated, are a source. (See also, our definition of Document as a type of source.) Also note: When a named person is quoted (directly or indirectly) citing or referring to the contents of a document, the named person is the source, not the document.

Named Organization: An organization named as a source. This includes cases where reporters attribute a statement or statements to unnamed "officials" or "spokesperson" of a named organization.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

Document: An original or authentic document issued by an authoritative organization or person for that field, jurisdiction or expertise. It is usually accessible by the public online or may be retrieved in return for a public records request. The document may itself be a full webpage or PDF or other portable format. It may be attributed through a URL inline in the article. However, when documents sent to a reporter are part of internal material in an organization, such as emails, correspondence, presentations and data, the person sending the documents is the source. Also, the reporter may have included statements from a person who is citing or referring to the contents of some document or study or research. That does not make the document the source. The person is the source. The document is the source only if the author of the story has accessed the document itself and used its contents directly for the story.

Anonymous Source: An anonymous source is a person, known by name and identity to the reporter and often the reporter's editor, but the name is being withheld from inclusion in the article as a named source before its publication. You may see the reporter disclose this in the story, that they spoke to the person "on condition of anonymity", or that they were offered anonymity to discuss sensitive matters. This source may have been present at meetings where sensitive deliberations or discussions took place then shared material from the meetings with the journalist. Or this source may be a key player or witness in internal decisions or proceedings at an organization. For e.g., when a reporter attributes a claim or statement to a person or a group of people with words such as "according to people familiar with..", or "according to people who were present at the meeting..", it means that person or those people are the source. This source may have sent sensitive documents, emails, audio, video, meeting notes, or other internal

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

correspondence from inside an organization to the reporter, and the person's identity needs to be protected. So they are not named.

In journalism ethics, the reporter may offer anonymity to the source if the reporter believes or concludes that the source's life or career/job or family members lives, etc., might be in jeopardy or that they might face retaliation or retribution. An unnamed spokesperson or official of a named organization is not an anonymous source.

Unnamed Group of People: Sometimes a reporter may attribute a statement or statements to a group of people who are saying or expressing or advocating for something as a group. We call this type of source, Unnamed Group of People. An Unnamed Group of People source is a group the journalist has witnessed on the ground or online or at a meeting or had access to the group of people otherwise. For example: players, teachers, children, protestors, attendees, advocates, activists, participants, onlookers, commenters, etc. The reporter does not name them individually and refers to them as a group, and may quote or paraphrase what the group of people is saying using words like "the protestors said this", or "the teachers chanted..".

Note 1: Do not confuse them with the Anonymous Source type. Here an individual actually asked for anonymity from the journalist. An Unnamed Group of People-type source are not people who asked for anonymity from the reporter. Note 2: A document sent by a source to a journalist may contain references to groups of people saying something. That is not an example of an Unnamed Group of People source. The document is the source. Note 3: When reporters attribute a statement or statements to unnamed "officials" or "spokesperson" or "lawyers" of a named organization, the type of source is Named Organization, not Unnamed Group of People.

Next, in the same system prompt we offer additional definitions for the data we are

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

instructing the LLM to extract.

Sourced Statement: Every statement in a story that the reporter would NOT have been able to put in without drawing or receiving the content or part of the content from one or more sources, is a sourced statement. These are actual text lines in the article that reporters have written with attribution to their source. Sourced statements may contain quotes or indirect speech. They may include viewpoints, experiences, criticism, questioning, advising, support or other expressions from a source. Sourced Statements also include all other attributions the reporter has made in the story, referring to the source's conduct, position, or attitude. For example, lines that state that a person criticized, supported, questioned, or decided something, may be present in addition to quotes from that person.

Name of Source: Name of Source applies to the following types of sources: Named Person, Named Organization and Document. For Named Person and Named Organization types, it is the person or organization's full name. This is identifiable as a proper noun in the article. When a source is referred to using a generic designation such as "spokesperson" or "representative" or "officials" from a named organization, the name of the source is the name of the organization. When the source is a public document, the name of the source is the document's publishing organization or person, if available. For Anonymous Sources, the Name of Source does not apply, i.e. it has a 'null' value. For Unnamed Group of People source, the name of source is the term being used to refer to the group. For e.g., it might be "teachers", "participants", "parents", "attendees", "rallygoers", "protestors", etc.

Title of Source: The words defining or designating the formal position of power,

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

authority, or leadership held by the Named Person source. For e.g. Director, Mayor, Vice President, President, Secretary, Treasurer, Board Member, Professor, Provost, Principal, Congresswoman, Senator, Chief of Police, General Counsel, Spokesperson, etc. If the person is a legislator, the title includes the constituency. Experts are often Named Person sources and their expertise is signaled by their title, designating their position or role usually held at some organization, and specialization. Sometimes people in leadership roles will simply be referred to as "leader". That is also a title. Note 1: Characterizations or designations like team member, player, senior, sophomore, junior, freshman, activist, protestor, attendee, participant, eyewitness, etc. are NOT titles. Occupations in the trades like carpenter, plumber, janitor, installer, coal miner, etc., are not titles. They represent people in a type of trade or life journey or activity. Note 2: For anonymous sources, the title may or may not be in the story and only the association or justification for inclusion in the story is mentioned. Also, journalists may include the voices of everyday people and people who are NOT in formal positions of authority or power. Such Named Person sources may not have a title. Finally, for Named Organizations and Document sources, title of source does not apply.

Source Justification: This refers to any additional source characterization or explanation that justifies to the reader why the source is in the story or that section of the story, how they are connected to the story and/or to other sources in the story. Any of the five defined types of sources may have such justifications and explanations present. It is not the same as the title of source, which is the previous definition above. It may be a few words, a part of a sentence, multiple sentences, or a full paragraph. The reporter will usually offer a justification in the story when they introduce the source. Source justification may be a part of the sourced statement itself.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

Sometimes the source justification comes later or earlier in the article where the source or some situation involving the source is referred to. While source justification is NOT the same as title of the source, it may include the title of the source. For named persons, the source justification text may narrate the lived experience of the source. When sources are people who are stakeholders to the issue being reported on, who witnessed something happen, or have a lived experience related to the issue of the story, or a co-litigant in a lawsuit, etc., narrating this demonstrates their significance in the story for readers. For e.g., someone who went through a period of homelessness may be quoted for their lived experience and opinion about solutions. Someone else may have spent four years waiting to get a job or to get their voting rights back because of a prior felony conviction. Remember that Source Justification is not the same as title of the source, but may include both the title of the source and the explanations for the source's role in the story or relationship to other sources. Named Persons or Anonymous Sources without a title may still have source justification present in the text.

Ground Truth development

We took the following approach for developing ground truthing data for all for the 34 stories. We offered six volunteer graduate students a brief orientation and explanations of the same journalistic sourcing vocabulary (as given in the prompts for LLMs). They then annotated two stories as their first attempt, which we reviewed together in meetings. This process leads to corrections, removal of misunderstandings and final version of the sourcing annotations for the five-element schema. After this, the students annotated the production articles in our data

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

sample. The lead author then reviewed all of the annotations individually and did a full review and made corrections, producing one CSV ground truth data file per story.

Finally, each ground truth CSV has a list of sourcing statements (rows), with type of source, name of source, title, and source justification. Table 2 shows the layout for the ground truth annotations, one per news article.

S.No	Sourced Statement	Type of Source	Anonymous? Y/N	Name of Source	Title	Source Justification
------	-------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	-------	----------------------

Table 2: Layout for the ground truth annotations, per news article.

The lead author tested this approach in a internship course at Santa Clara University in Spring'24 (COMM 198) with a group of undergraduate students from humanities and engineering. This led to an experience of new learnings in sourcing literacy amongst the students and the validation that ground truth data production for sourcing could be developed as part of journalism literacy efforts.

Logic and learnings of the final version of the user prompt

Our experimentations with prompts led to about 40 revisions in all for both system and user prompts. We structured the prompts as follows.

System prompt: This is primarily for definitions. We used this to insert all the foundational journalism-domain definitions as well as the data definitions for the five-attribute annotation. We asked the LLMs to take on the role of an analyst.

User prompt: This is where the LLMs is asked to do the real work of parsing the story and producing the data in a series of steps.

By reviewing what the LLMs were able to catch and what they missed or annotated

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

inaccurately, we are able to revise the prompts over and over again. We stopped at version 40.

Our reflection on learnings from the revisions are:

1. The more detailed the definitions are, with examples, the more likely the LLM will be able to apply them comprehensively to the article. This is why our definitions are quite detailed, with examples.

2. In our initial versions, we asked LLMs to apply all the type of source definitions to the article at the same time (one instruction), identify the corresponding sourced statements, and the rest of the data (name of source, title, justifications, etc.) This results in non-comprehensive annotations where many sourced statements are left out, and often unpredictably.

3. We redesigned the prompts to instruct the models to parse the article for one type of source after another, in serial order. This modularizes the instructions, allows us to test per type of source, and produces more comprehensive results. After each type of source pass, we ask the models to generate the JSON data element for that type of source. And so on, till we finish all types of sources.

4. We also discovered that when the sources that “easier” to identify for humans, for e.g. named persons or named organizations, come later in the sequence, the comprehensiveness of the sourced statements identified improves. For e.g. we found that anonymous sourcing is harder to pick up, even for humans without training, because of the inherently unstructured and non-obligatory nature of standardized disclosure about sources in journalistic writing. Refer to our definitions in the system prompt. For anonymous sourcing, the we have given cues in the definition and examples that require the LLMs to look for attributions to people who are not being named, (without or without the language that they requested anonymity for acceptable

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

reasons), and where those people were somehow crucial to letting the reporter access viewpoints, claims, developments, decisions, etc., that they might have been witness to, or have documentation about. We also included in the definition that anonymous refers only to the public status of the source, who is unnamed in story to protect the identity of the source, but that the journalists and often editors know the person. Reporters often signal that using language such as “three people who were present at the meeting..”, etc. Compare this to a different type of source, also involved in attributed statements, where reporters refer to groups of people at an event doing or saying something together. These are unnamed groups of people, a different type of source, where the people did not seek anonymity from the journalist as part of the sourcing engagement. In our final prompts for this paper, we go with the following sequence.

- a. Anonymous sources (most difficult)
- b. Unnamed Groups of People.
- c. Documents.
- d. Named Persons.
- e. Named Organizations.

We ask the LLMs to identify sourcing statements for each of the types of sources in order and inline, extract the data on names, titles and source justifications.

5. In addition, for anonymous sources, our initial prompts did not include examples about how reporters signal them. For e.g. when internal documents or footage from an organization is sent by an anonymous source to a journalist, they may contain a named person making a newsworthy claim. In response to our initial definitions, all five LLMs would pull the claim, but mistake the type of source as the named person in the source-sent material, as opposed to the

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

person (anonymous source) who sent it. For this reason, it helped for the Document type of source search to happen after the anonymous sources and unnamed groups of people are identified along with their sourcing statements.

Instructions to LLMs via the user prompt

Through an iterative process (prompt engineering), we developed a set of instructions asking the LLMs to “apply” the definitions to each story. The final instructions used for this paper are here.

“INSTRUCTIONS

Read the attached news article carefully %s. Apply the instructions below only on the attached news article. Follow ALL the steps below to extract the following data from the article. Sourced Statements, Name of Source, Type of Source, Title of Source, and Source Justification.

1. Using the definitions provided above, identify all the Anonymous Sources in the article. Remember that for Anonymous Sources, Name of Source has a 'null' value. No need to write or print anything yet.
2. For each Anonymous Source in your list above, find all the associated Sourcing Statements. For sourced statements, extract the exact full sentences from the article whether they are quoted or indirect speech as the data. Do not paraphrase or summarize. Retain them as they are. Copy and paste the exact wording used in the article for each statement. And pay special attention to multiple statements from the same source.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

Remember that for Anonymous Sources, Name of Source has a 'null' value. No need to write or print anything yet.

3. Applying the definition of Title of Source provided above, for each Anonymous Source in your list, extract the Title, if present in the text. Remember that Anonymous Sources may or may not be included with a title, since the title itself may be sensitive information. But if a title is present, extract it. No need to print anything yet.

4. Now apply the definition of Source Justification given, and find the source justification for each anonymous source in each sourcing statement. Extract only the text that matches this definition directly from the story. Remember that source justification refers to words or sentences doing additional characterization or justification for inclusion of that source in the story. Do not synthesize or generate or summarize in your own words. Extract the actual text. If more than one source justification is present in the text, concatenate them as one single string separated by '!'.

5. Organize and add your data to a JSON object as follows:

```
{  
  "Anonymous Sources": [  
    "Sourced Statement": "string",  
    "Name of Source": "string",  
    "Type of Source": "string",  
    "Title of Source": "string",  
    "Source Justification": "string"  
  ]  
}
```

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

}

6. Next, apply the definition of the Type of Source "Unnamed Group of People" and find all such sources in the article. Remember that the type of source "Unnamed Group of People" is different from "Anonymous Source", so apply the definition carefully. No need to print or write anything yet.

7. For each source of the type "Unnamed Group of People" in your list above, find all the associated Sourcing Statements. Look only for statements where groups of people are quoted directly or indirectly. Remember that none of the Sourced Statements in your Anonymous Sources list must appear on this list.

8. And remember that for Unnamed Group of People, the Name of Source is the term the reporter has used to refer to the group. For e.g., it might be "teachers", "participants", "parents", "attendees", "rallygoers", "protestors", "advocates", "activists", "students", etc. If not present, set Name of Source to the 'null' value. No need to print or write anything yet.

9. For each "Unnamed Group of People" source in each sourcing statement, find the Source Justification, by applying the definition given. Extract only the text that matches this definition directly from the story. If the same Unnamed Group of People source is attributed into multiple sourcing statements, you may copy the Source Justification from the first sourced statement to the others for that source. Remember that source justification refers to words or sentences doing additional characterization or justification for inclusion of that source in the story. Do not synthesize or generate or summarize in

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

your own words. Extract the actual text. If more than one source justification is present in the text, concatenate them as one single string separated by ';

10. Organize all your data and add to above JSON object as follows:

```
"Unnamed Group of People": [  
  "Sourced Statement": "string",  
  "Name of Source": "string",  
  "Type of Source": "string",  
  "Source Justification": "string"  
]
```

11. Next, apply the definition of the Type of Source "Document" and find all such sources in the article. Remember that Document sources are different from Anonymous Sources and Unnamed Groups of People, which you already identified.

12. For each Document source in your list, set the Name of Source to the 'null' value. But if the document is a public document, set the Name of the Source to the document's publishing organization or publisher, if available. No need to write or print anything yet.

13. For each Document source in your list above, find all the associated Sourced Statements. Remember that you already saved the sourced statements Anonymous Sources and Unnamed Group of People sources. The sourced statements for the Document sources, if any, will be different. Extract the exact full sentences from the article whether they are quoted or indirect speech as the data. Do not paraphrase or summarize. Retain them as they are. Copy and paste the exact wording used in the article

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

for each statement. And pay special attention to multiple statements from the same source. No need to write or print anything yet.

14. Now apply the definition of Source Justification given, and find the Source Justification for each Document source in each sourcing statement. Extract only the text that matches this definition directly from the story. If the same Document is attributed into multiple sourcing statements, you may copy the Source Justification from the first sourced statement to the others for that document. Remember that source justification refers to words or sentences doing additional characterization or justification for inclusion of that source in the story. Do not synthesize or generate or summarize in your own words. Extract the actual text. If more than one source justification is present in the text, concatenate them as one single string separated by ';'.
DRPUB.COM/STUDENT

15. Organize and add your Document sources data to above JSON object as follows:

```
"Document Sources": [  
    "Sourced Statement": "string",  
    "Name of Source": "string",  
    "Type of Source": "string",  
    "Source Justification": "string"  
]
```

16. Next, apply the definition of the Type of Source "Named Person" and find all such sources in the article. Remember that all named persons in the text of the news article are not Named Person sources. And this type of source is different from Named Organizations. No need to write or print anything yet.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

17. For each Named Person source in your list above, find all the associated Sourced Statements. No need to write or print anything yet.

18. Applying the definition of Title of Source provided above, for each Named Person source in your list, extract the Title, if provided. Remember that Named Persons in positions of power, formal authority, leadership or expertise will usually be quoted with a title. But when the voices of everyday people and people without structural power are included in the story, they will also be Named Person sources and may not have a title. No need to write or print anything yet.

19. Now apply the definition of Source Justification given, and find the Source Justification for each Named Person source in each sourced statement. Extract only the text that matches this definition directly from the story. Remember that source justification refers to words or sentences doing additional characterization or justification for inclusion of that source in the story. Do not synthesize or generate or summarize in your own words. Extract the actual text. If more than one source justification is present in the text, concatenate them as one single string separated by '!'.
DRAFT SOURCE MATERIAL

20. Organize and add your Named Person sources data to above JSON object as follows:

```
"Named Person Sources": [  
  "Sourced Statement": "string",  
  "Name of Source": "string",  
  "Type of Source": "string",  
  "Title of Source": "string",  
  "Source Justification": "string"
```

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

]

21. Next, apply the definition of the Type of Source "Named Organization" and find all such sources in the article. Note: All named organizations in the text of a news article are not sources. And this type of source is different from Named Persons. No need to write or print anything yet.

22. For each Named Organization source in your list above, find all the associated Sourced Statements. No need to write or print anything yet.

23. Now apply the definition of Source Justification given, and find the Source Justification for each Named Organization source in each sourced statement. Extract only the text that matches this definition directly from the story. Remember that source justification refers to words or sentences doing additional characterization or justification for inclusion of that source in the story. Do not synthesize or generate or summarize in your own words. Extract the actual text. If more than one source justification is present in the text, concatenate them as one single string separated by '!'.
DRAFT COPY - CONFIDENTIAL

24. Organize and add your Named Organization sources data above JSON object as follows:

```
"Named Organization Sources": [  
  "Sourced Statement": "string",  
  "Name of Source": "string",  
  "Type of Source": "string",  
  "Source Justification": "string"
```

]

25. Finally, print the entire JSON object.

Do not print or provide any other analysis. I only want a valid json format that can be parsed. Give me no other text but the json.

END OF INSTRUCTIONS.”

Creating the LLM annotated data annotations

Our article pre-processing code uses the Trafilatura library to extract and process article content from the sample of articles. It gets the webpage content using `trafilatura.fetch_url`, extracts metadata such as the headline, subtitle, publication date, and publisher through `trafilatura.extract_metadata`, and retrieves the main text of the article with `trafilatura.extract`. The extracted information is formatted and saved to one output text file per news article.

We developed a python script to streamline generating outputs from various LLLMs using the OpenRouter API and format them into JSON and CSV files for metric evaluations. It begins by loading the system and user prompts, combining them with content from the article text files. These inputs are sent to LLMs via API requests, with mechanisms for retries to ensure valid responses.

Extracted JSON-formatted outputs are cleaned and validated, then saved alongside converted CSV files. The code processes multiple articles iteratively, saving results in experiment-specific directories, enabling structured and reproducible evaluations for comparative analysis.

Handling LLMs unpredictability: Five generated JSONs per article

Most publicly available LLMs have a setting called temperature with a range from 0 to 2. 0 tells the model to be most deterministic (or predictable). That said, we noticed during testing

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

that even with a temperature setting of zero, there were minor variations in the JSON data generated by the LLMs when the same article was sent back for annotations to the same model. The differences were in sourced statements being missed or included, and at other times source justifications texts would be correctly spotted or left out. To account for this, we decided to generate five sourcing annotations (JSON and CSV outputs) for each of the 34 news articles. We scored each CSV separately and averaged the scores per model per article and then built the overall score per model for all 34 articles.

Total generated data from five LLMs for 34 articles

We generated 850 annotation-carrying data CSVs in all. This is based on a the following calculation:

34 stories x 5 models x 5 iteration (annotated data versions) per model = 850 JSONs (or converted to CSVs).

Comparison functions to score the LLMs for each annotated data element

We use three different matching functions to compare LLMs generated data (sourced statements, type of source, name of source, title and source justifications) to ground truth data, as described below. Table 3 shows the ground truth data to LLMs data comparison method for accuracy scoring.

Fuzzy match: The fuzzy match (Mouselimis L, 2021) function leverages a text similarity algorithm based on the Levenshtein distance, which measures how many single-character edits (such as insertions, deletions, or substitutions) are needed to transform one string into another. This approach returns a similarity score ranging from 0 (completely different) to 100 (identical), indicating how closely two text strings match.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

The process begins by cleaning the text from both the ground truth and model-generated output to remove any formatting inconsistencies. Afterward, the similarity score is calculated, reflecting how similar the two cleaned texts are. This method is particularly useful for tasks like name matching, where textual variations such as misspellings, spacing differences, or capitalization changes may occur.

This function is applied for name matching. (Name of source metrics).

The threshold for fuzzy match is set at 80 to balance accuracy and tolerance for minor textual variations, ensuring that relevant matches are captured while minimizing false positives.

Semantic match: The semantic match (Reimers et al., 2019) function uses advanced natural language processing techniques to evaluate the meaning of text rather than its exact wording. It relies on a pre-trained language model that transforms text into numerical representations called embeddings. These embeddings capture the semantic essence of the text.

To compare texts, embeddings are generated for both the ground truth and the model-generated output. The similarity between these embeddings is then measured using a mathematical metric called cosine similarity. This score indicates how closely the two texts align in meaning, with higher scores reflecting greater semantic similarity.

For improved accuracy, longer texts are split into sentences. Each sentence from the ground truth is compared with every sentence from the model output, and the highest similarity score is used. This method is applied in task sentence matching, title matching, and justification matching, where capturing the underlying meaning is crucial.

To enhance the clarity and precision of the semantic match process, specific thresholds are set for evaluating similarity scores. A threshold of 0.8 is used for sentence matching to ensure a high level of semantic alignment, which is crucial for tasks where precise meaning is essential.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

This high threshold helps in maintaining a stringent standard of similarity, ensuring that the matched sentences share a strong contextual and semantic resemblance. Additionally, for title matching and justification matching, a threshold of 0.55 is utilized. This value strikes a balance between being overly strict and too lenient, allowing for a reasonable degree of semantic correspondence while accommodating minor variations in language expression.

Exact match: Our exact match function performs a straightforward comparison by checking whether two text strings are identical. Since the source types come from a predefined set, strict equality is required for this comparison.

Ground Truth data to LLMs data comparison method for accuracy scoring			
Journalistic sourcing annotation element	Type of data	Matching function	Similarity threshold
Sourced Statement	Unstructured text	Semantic match	0.8
Type of Source	Structured text	Exact match	n/a
Name of Source	Structured, but minor variations are possible	Fuzzy match	0.8
Title of Source	Unstructured, may contain partial title or title with organizational affiliation	Semantic match	0.55
Source Justification	Unstructured, may be part of sourced statement, or text from other paragraphs	Semantic match	0.55

Table 3: Ground Truth data to LLMs data comparison method for accuracy scoring

Accuracy formulae for the five sourcing attributes in the schema

$$\text{Source_Statement_Match_Rate} = \frac{\text{Sentence_matched_num}}{\text{GT_sentence_num}}$$

$$\text{Source_Type_Match_Rate} = \frac{\text{Type_matched_num}}{\text{Sentence_matched_num}}$$

$$\text{Name_Match_Rate} = \frac{\text{Name_matched_num}}{\text{Sentence_matched_num}}$$

$$\text{Name_matched_num} = \frac{\text{Title_matched_num}}{\text{Sentence_matched_num}}$$

$$\text{Justification_Match_Rate} = \frac{\text{Justification_matched_num}}{\text{Sentence_matched_num}}$$

Determination of average accuracy scores

To develop the performance metrics for each LLMs, we do the following:

1. For a given story, we calculate the accuracy score per sourcing attribute (sourced statement to source justification) using the functions above for a model.
2. Then we average the scores out for all five CSV samples per story. That produces the model's score for that story. (For two articles in the 34-sample set, we found that the models do not produce 5 valid outputs for the iterations on the same story, and hence we have fewer than five CSVs.)
3. We average the model scores over the five samples to produce one more model (per attribute) for the story. We then average the model across the 34 articles to produce a score for each sourcing attribute. We use that to compare the models at the per attribute level and as a whole.

Results

We reviewed the accuracy scores per model for each of the five attributes of sourcing first. Following that we reviewed the overall model scores for accuracy across all attributes taken together.

Sourced statement accuracy

This is a comprehensiveness measure shown in Figure 2. It measures the extent to which the sourced statements identified by the five LLMs matched those in the ground truth CSVs. A 100% score for this metric would mean that the model pulled all of the sourced statements, across all of the stories as found in the ground truth. We find that Gemini 1.5 Pro did better than the other four models by 15-20% points.




Figure 2: Sourced statement extraction accuracy comparison between the models.

Type of source accuracy

This is a key metric on LLMs identifying the type of source (named person, named organization, document, anonymous, or unnamed groups of people) accurately, as shown in Figure 3. Here we find that Claude 3.5 Sonnet, Gemini 1.5 Pro and Llama 3.1-405B all are in the 80% accuracy range, and GPT-4o and Llama 3.1-70B are in the 70-75% accuracy range.




Figure 3: Type of source detection accuracy comparison.

However, the worth of accuracy on the type of source attribute is higher when the sourced statement accuracy is higher, as shown in Figure 4. Given Gemini 1.5 Pro significantly better score on sourced statement accuracy compared to Claude 3.5 Sonnet, if we combine the metrics, Gemini 1.5 Pro would be the better performer for a product of the two, as a benchmark.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing




Figure 4: Comparing product of source statement and type accuracy.

Name of source accuracy

Name of source accuracy measures how effectively are the LLMs able to correctly pick up the name of the source by comparing with our ground truth data. As shown in Figure 5, we find that Claude 3.5 Sonnet, Gemini 1.5 Pro and Llama 3.1-405B are in the 80% range, whereas the other models GPT-4o and Llama 3.1-70B are around 70% accuracy.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing




Figure 5: Name of source accuracy comparison.

These accuracy numbers go down marginally for all models if a condition is introduced.

If the named source accuracy is calculated only for those cases where the type of source is also correct, Claude 3.5 Sonnet performs a little better than Gemini 1.5 Pro and Llama 3.1-405B. See Figure 6.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing




Figure 6: Name of source accuracy comparison for the condition that type of source is correct.

Title of Source accuracy

Title of source accuracy matches the titles of sources in the LLM generated data with the ground truth. As shown in Figure 7, the Llama 3.1 models both perform marginally better than the other three closed sourced models, but all of them are in the 80% accuracy range.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing




Figure 7: Source title accuracy comparison.

Source Justification accuracy

Source justification accuracy is scored by comparing source justification texts between the LLMs generated data and the ground truths. As shown in Figure 8, we find all the models here struggle. Gemini 1.5 Pro and Claude 3.5 Sonnet reach 35% accuracy, while GPT-4o and Llama 3.1-405B are in the 25-30% accuracy range. Llama 3.1-70B is very low.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing




Figure 8: Source justification accuracy comparison.

One of the complexities here is how journalists use the title of a person. Sometimes the title of the source is an inherent justification to include them and this is evident in the sentence(s) used to introduce the source. We found that in some cases the LLMs were also adding the title to the justification column. Our intuition is that if the title and justification text data was combined and compared for similarity between the LLM data and ground truth, the accuracy score per mode for the merged justification attribute may change. Indeed it does, as shown in Figure 9. Claude 3.5 Sonnet received a 50% accuracy score, with Gemini 1.5 Pro coming in after. However these are still low scores, indicating that LLMs are struggling with detecting unstructured signals in language using definitions.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing




Figure 9. Revised source justification accuracy comparison, when title and justification are merged and compared with ground truth data.

Overall model accuracy for journalistic sourcing

We define overall model accuracy as the rate of LLMs getting all attributes (sourced statements, type of source, name of source, title of source and source justification) accurate for each story, as recorded in the ground truth files. As shown in Figure 10, we find that none of the models reach even 50%. Gemini Pro 1.5 scores significantly better here than GPT-4o and Claude

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

3.5 Sonnet, whose scores are better than Llama 3.1-405B. Llama 3.1-70B has the poorest score.




Figure 10: Comparison of overall accuracy models across all attributes.

Discussion

Our key finding is that detecting sourced statements and types of sources is itself an area when LLMs have to make more progress than they are currently. The second key finding is that LLMs are currently unable to extract source justifications with high (say, 80%) accuracy, indicating room for much improvement ahead. Next we review our findings with respect to each hypothesis we made at the outset.

H1a: LLMs will be able to accurately spot different types of statements attributed to sources, not only direct quotes.

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

Finding: While we do find that LLMs are able to go beyond direct quotes and detect a variety of different types of sourcing language and statements, only Gemini 1.5 Pro reaches even a modest 75% accuracy. The other models are in the 55-65% accuracy range.

H1b: (In conjunction with H1a) LLMs will be to identify the five different *types of sources* journalists in the given a set of plain text definitions.

Finding: Overall, our finding is that LLMs are able to apply our definitions for the five types of sources. Claude 3.5 Sonnet, Gemini 1.5 Pro and Llama 3.1-405B all scored in the 80% range, with ChatGPT-4o and Llama 3.1-70B coming in a little behind. One difficulty we see is with document sources that cite named people or named organizations within their content. We detailed these distinctions in our types of sources definitions given to the LLMs, but we did see evidence of conflation between document sources and named person sources for cases where the former is the correct annotation. This is already factored into the accuracy scores for the models.

H2a: LLMs will be able to identify source titles and justifications since this is a key test of the models capacities on language.

Finding: We find that the five LLMs are able to detect source titles at high levels of accuracy (80%). In itself, this is not surprising because some NLP systems have already been able to do title detection (Full List of Annotators, n.d.). For source justifications, we find that, qualitatively, LLMs are able to apply our definition to extract the relevant text for the sources. But there is a substantial distance to go in reaching high levels of accuracy. In some cases we found that LLMs were synthesizing or summarizing justifications in their own words, instead of doing what the instructions asked them to: extract the exact words or sentences used

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

by the journalist in the text. We had to add additional “do not” instructions in the user prompt for this.

H2b: LLMs will be able to spot anonymous sources as a type, related sourced statements, and extract the source justification as well.

Finding: Qualitatively, we find that LLMs are able to spot anonymous sourcing using the signals journalists put into the text about the source’s role or presence or access to materials. The finding about this capacity has positive implications for journalism literacy. Anonymous sources are accepted by the public as a type of sourcing in journalism under particular contexts (Gottfried et al., 2024). News readers on the other hand feel that journalists are recklessly drawing claims and viewpoints from people whose identity is unknown. Digital news apps analyzing political stories could marshal this capacity carefully to signal the presence of anonymous sources and their justifications during news cycles on heated or sensitive political developments.

H3: We expect open source models (Llama, from Meta), especially the 405 Billion parameter model, to also perform as well as (or nearly) to closed source models (Open AI, Anthropic and Google).

Finding: Our central finding is that the open source models Llama 3.1 -- 405B offers similar results to the ChatGPT-4o and Claude 3.5 Sonnet. Llama 3.1-70B struggles in the more complex task of source justification annotations. Other studies that have compared open source LLMs to closed source suggest that fine-tuning may help (Alizadeh et al., 2024). But the distinctive overall (all-attributes) performance difference between Gemini Pro 1.5 and the other four models indicates that for the scenario of journalistic sourcing annotations, the type of model (open source vs closed) is not a significant driver of accuracy.

Limitations and future work

1. In our current framework, we intentionally limited the range in types of sources to five. In reality, documents as a type of source are amenable to a deeper taxonomy. For instance, it is now common practice in digital journalism to use inline text to link directly to primary documents online (URLs of documents issued by official authorities). The document may not necessarily be suggestively referred to as a verdict (courts), report, study, research paper, etc. But at the same time, journalists also use inline text to add secondary sourcing URLs to other press articles, often to the same news outlet's earlier coverage. There is also the case of citations to other web pages that fit the definition of a document source. Our current work only includes document sources referred to in plain text. We plan to disambiguate and expand document sourcing to a deeper taxonomy that includes sourcing signals through URLs, for a future effort.

2. Our proportions of different types of sourcing - in the 34 article sample set - was not equally distributed across all five types. Named people and named organizations are a very high proportion in our source types. Future experiments would need higher proportions of anonymous and document sourcing in the samples to develop sub-benchmarks for those types of sourcing.

3. Unnamed individuals (without the reporter qualifying in the text as having sought and received anonymity) as a general type of source: A non-standardized practice in journalistic sourcing is to refer to an individual as a source, not name them, but also not disclose a specific justification (or qualification) for anonymity. This type of attribution is different from the references to "unnamed groups of people" as a source when journalists witness an event or development and report a group of people saying something. Defining a separate type of source called unnamed individual for this case will have the advantage of testing whether a) LLMs can distinguish between all three types of sources and b) whether this can then be used to track and

callout instances in news cycles where stories are carrying claims and statements from unnamed individuals without specific conditions of anonymity being transparently disclosed in the story.

4. LLMs temperature setting: It is possible that by increasing the temperature setting marginally from 0 to 0.1 or 0.2, the LLMs may produce variations in results for one or more of the sourcing attributes. In future work, we plan to examine whether LLMs will show improvement (or regress) for accuracy metrics in sourced statements and source justification annotations, with revisions to the temperature setting. Also, while most model literature recommends zero for temperature settings that map to deterministic behavior, GPT-4o has recommended the low-end to be 0.2 and not 0. We set the temperature to zero for all LLMs we evaluated.

Conclusion

We noted earlier that one area that has not received sufficient scenario development attention for LLM benchmarking is real-world journalism, and in particular journalistic sourcing and ethics. Evaluating the capacities of LLMs to annotate the sourcing in stories is the core work behind this paper. We believe that this is a scenario that warrants a benchmark approach because if some LLMs could get the job done, we may be able to address the paucity of easily accessible but more complex journalistic source evaluations and audits during news cycles in real time.

We claim that our work adds a new scenario to benchmark LLMs for journalism which we draw from the real world of everyday journalistic sourcing work. This will help evaluate the various models the technology industry is offering along this new dimension. We offer the use case, our dataset of articles, our ground truth data, the LLM prompts, LLM generated data, and a set comparison metrics for each model as the first step towards systematic benchmarking.

Ethics Statement

Our study is about language models and their benchmarking. Our use of text from the selected news articles and the sourcing statements is strictly for their language patterns and data for our experiment. We have not used the content for any other publication or evaluation purposes. We are also not making any study or claims or observations about the ethics of sourcing in these individual news articles or of their authoring journalists themselves and hence we did not engage in actively disclosing our analysis to each news outlet whose stories we included for this experiment.

References

1. Bommasani, R., Liang, P., & Lee, T. (2023). Holistic evaluation of language models. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1525(1), 140–146.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.15007>
2. Steensen, S., Belair-Gagnon, V., Graves, L., Kalsnes, B., & Westlund, O. (2022). Journalism and source criticism. Revised Approaches to Assessing Truth-Claims. *Journalism Studies*, 23(16), 2119–2137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670x.2022.2140446>
3. Vincent, S. (2023). Reorienting journalism to favor democratic agency. In *Reinventing Journalism to Strengthen Democracy: Insights from Innovators*. (pp. 21–50). Kettering Foundation.
4. *Holistic Evaluation of Language Models (HELM)*. (n.d).
<https://crfm.stanford.edu/helm/classic/latest/#/scenarios>
5. Moorhead, L. (2024). Who Gets a Voice in Homelessness? A Content Analysis of Quotations Used by Journalists. *Journalism Practice*, 1–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2023.2300281>

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

6. Jaakkola, M. (2018). Journalistic writing and style. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.884>
7. Gans, H. J. (2004). *Deciding what's news*. Northwestern University Press.
8. Bhargava, R. & H. E. & H. M. (2024). Testing generative AI for source audits in Student-Produced Local news. *ideas.repec.org*.
<https://ideas.repec.org/p/osf/socarx/7hc2d.html>
9. Spangher, A., Youn, J., DeButts, M., Peng, N., Ferrara, E., & May, J. (2024, November 7). *Explaining mixtures of sources in news articles*. arXiv.org.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.05192>
10. Li, C., Diakopoulos, N., Northwestern University, & Northwestern University. (2024). Probing GPT-4 for knowledge of Journalistic Tasks. *Proceedings of Computation + Journalism Symposium (C+J Symposium)*, 5.
https://cplusj2024.github.io/papers/CJ_2024_paper_17.pdf
11. Muzny, G., Fang, M., Chang, A., & Jurafsky, D. (2021). A Two-stage Sieve Approach for Quote Attribution. *ACL Anthology*. <https://aclanthology.org/E17-1044/>
12. Vincent, S., Wu, X., Huang, M., & Fang, Yi. (2023). Could Quoting Data Patterns Help in Identifying Journalistic Behavior Online? In *Official Research Journal of the International Symposium on Online Journalism* (Vol. 13, Issue 1, p. 9) [Journal-article].
13. Shang, X., Peng, Z., Yuan, Q., Khan, S., Xie, L., Fang, Y., & Vincent, S. (2022). DIANES. *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531660>

14. Wang, J., (2024). "A Step Towards Automated Ethical Analysis in Journalism: Measuring LLMs' Performance in Extracting Sourcing Information" (2024). *Computer Science and Engineering Master's Theses*. 43. https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/cseng_mstr/43
15. *Full list of annotators*. (n.d.). CoreNLP. <https://stanfordnlp.github.io/CoreNLP/annotators.html>
16. Gottfried, J., Walker, M., (2024, April 14). Most Americans see a place for anonymous sources in news stories, but not all the time. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2020/10/09/most-americans-see-a-place-for-anonymous-sources-in-news-stories-but-not-all-the-time/>
17. Mouselimis L (2021). *fuzzywuzzyR: Fuzzy String Matching*. R package version 1.0.5, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=fuzzywuzzyR>.
18. Reimers, N., & Gurevych, I. (2019). Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
19. Duffy, M. J. (2014). Anonymous Sources: A historical review of the norms surrounding their use. *American Journalism*, 31(2), 236–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08821127.2014.905363>
20. Carlson, M. (2010). Whither anonymity? Journalism and unnamed sources in a changing media environment. In *Journalists, Sources, and Credibility* (1st Edition, pp. 49–60). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203835708-9>
21. Alizadeh, M., Kubli, M., Samei, Z., Dehghani, S., Zahedivafa, M., Bermeo, J. D., Korobeynikova, M., & Gilardi, F. (2024). Open-source LLMs for text annotation: a

Measuring Large Language Models Capacity to Annotate Journalistic Sourcing

practical guide for model setting and fine-tuning. *Journal of Computational Social Science*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42001-024-00345-9>

22. A. Zhukova, T. Ruas, F. Hamborg, K. Donnay and B. Gipp, "What's in the News? Towards Identification of Bias by Commission, Omission, and Source Selection (COSS)," *2023 ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL)*, Santa Fe, NM, USA, 2023, pp. 258-259, doi: 10.1109/JCDL57899.2023.00050.

DRAFT CONFIDENTIAL