Do Citizens and Communities Have the News and Information they Need and Want in a Digital Age?

This article sets out evidence of social and technological trends that challenge traditional notions of civic engagement, particularly New Zealand’s changing demography and media markets. It is intended to provide insight for future policies on civics and media matters.

The role of civics and media in a democratic society

News and information assist citizens and communities to participate in democratic processes, develop a sense of connectedness and attachment to New Zealand, solve problems, coordinate activities and establish systems of public accountability. In the digital age, news quality and access, and citizen engagement in democratic processes, are being transformed. Traditional forms of citizen engagement are supplemented by ‘modern’ methods of participation facilitated by technological media developments. The news media landscape is rapidly evolving. Citizens have an abundance of news from around the world at their fingertips, at the same time as, in terms of quality, news favours immediacy over investigation and analysis. In so far as news and information are the fuel for the engine of a well-functioning society, New Zealand faces a fresh set of challenges and opportunities if we want to retain our position in the top tier of socially and economically successful societies.

As Figure 1 shows, the infrastructure of a well-informed society includes capability, content and connection. Nations need inclusive economic and political institutions for continued prosperity (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2012). Countries that are inclusive economically and democratically thrive and outperform those that are not. Citizens, communities and businesses depend on well-functioning public and private institutions in order to make decisions. The fair and effective functioning, and legitimacy, of government relies upon citizens having a core level of trust in the governing institution.

New Zealand consistently ranks highly on international measures of good governance. In 2014 New Zealand ranked second on the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index, and ninth on the World Press Freedom Index. In 2013 the World Bank rated New Zealand in the 98th percentile for ‘voice and accountability’ in its Worldwide Governance Indicators. In the OECD Better Life Index, New Zealand is ranked in the top third of OECD countries for civic engagement (OECD, 2015a): eighth of 36 countries for consultation on rule making, and 11th for voter turnout (higher than the average for the OECD, which was 68%). This state
As Suzanne Snively, Transparency International New Zealand chair, argues, ‘a clean reputation makes us attractive to do business with and secures qualified migrants and confident tourists’ (Transparency International New Zealand, 2016).

As for all countries, a changing demography, new technology and rapidly evolving media markets present fresh challenges and opportunities for citizen participation. As Alexis de Tocqueville pointed out, each new generation is a new people who must acquire the knowledge, learn the skills and develop the dispositions or traits of private and public character that undergird a constitutional democracy (de Tocqueville, 1835). Those dispositions must be fostered and nurtured by word and study and by the power of example. Democracy is not a machine that would go of itself, but must be consciously reproduced.

There are social and technological forces at work

A credible argument says it is ‘rational’ not to participate in civic life (Krugman, 1997). If civic engagement entails costs to the individual (e.g. acquiring information, attending town meetings), when the benefit to the individual is weakly associated with any one individual’s participation, then the individual may decide that it is in their interest not to participate. The result is a suboptimal outcome for democratic society as a whole. There are social and technological changes occurring in New Zealand that may influence participation further.

New Zealand fell from second to fourth place in the Corruption Perceptions Index in 2015. Transparency International predicts that further downgrades in New Zealand’s scores are likely ‘if areas such as access to information and governance of the environment fail to keep pace with the trends in northern European countries’ (Transparency International New Zealand, 2016). Voter turnout at New Zealand general elections is in decline, with less than 80% turnout of all enrolled voters in four of the last five elections, as shown in Figure 2. Among those enrolled voters who did not vote, the most commonly cited reason for not voting in 2008 and 2011 was disengagement: ‘I didn’t get round to it or I forgot about it/am not interested’.

The distribution of young New Zealanders’ civics knowledge and intentions is the widest of 36 countries in the 2008 International Civic and Citizenship Education Study, with some of the highest and lowest scores for civics knowledge (Schulz et al., 2009). Ethnicity, gender and parents’ occupational status have an apparent impact on students’ civics knowledge and intentions (Hipkins and Satherley, 2012). Results from the study showed that mean civics knowledge scores for students identifying as Māori or Pasifika; girls generally achieved higher results than boys; and Māori and Pasifika
boys’ civics knowledge was particularly low (ibid.).

Young people engage differently

Traditional forms of citizen engagement are now supplemented, or replaced, by ‘modern’ methods of participation. Largely facilitated by technological media developments, these methods bring new ways for communities to engage and participate. For example, Wellington City Council used Loomio to gather ideas and feedback from the public for new alcohol policies. Loomio, and similar technologies such as NationBuilder, can help build consensus rather than conflict.

Research conducted by Ipsos shows that traditional forms of engagement are still utilised, including taking an active role in the community; joining a political party; presenting views to an elected representative; attending a demonstration; standing for office; taking an active part in a lobby or campaign; boycotting products for political or other value-based reasons; signing a petition. But these are supplemented by contemporary forms of engagement, including using social media; contributing to blogs; getting involved in an E-campaign; joining an online advocacy group; and engaging in crowdsourced funding for a cause (Pew Research Center, 2014).

Research conducted by the Museum of Australian Democracy shows agreement across the generations on the current state of democracy (Evans, Stoker and Halupka, 2015). Young Australians are interested in democracy, but participate very differently from older generations. Generation Y (born between the early 1980s and early 2000s) uses a wider range of sources to gather information about politics and elections than older generations, including friends, family and social networking sites. Despite a wider breadth of ways to engage, however, Generation Y sees elections as the most effective tool for participation. This is followed closely by a combination of traditional forms and more contemporary forms of engagement.

While further research is required to examine the current state and trends
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of civic engagement in New Zealand, it appears that these emerging trends have a global reach.

Our demography is changing fast
New Zealand has been diversifying faster than almost any other OECD country, as shown in Figure 3. The percentage of people living in New Zealand who were born overseas was 25.2% in 2013, compared with 19% in 2001. This diversity enriches New Zealand. But the speed and breadth of change over the last 20 years may present some challenges for civic engagement.

With 40% of the population made up of migrants, Auckland is a ‘superdiverse’ city (McNichol, 2013), with Toronto the only more diverse city in comparable countries. Projections for Auckland suggest that by some time in the mid-2020s no ethnic group will exceed 50% of the population, as implied by Figure 4.

Results from Statistics New Zealand’s 2014 General Social Survey show that people with Māori ethnicity are far more likely to say they feel very strongly that they belong to New Zealand (71%), compared with Europeans (56%), Pasifika people (45%) and Asian people (24%). New Zealanders on the whole find it either easy or very easy to express their identity; however, there is a wide distribution between ethnicities.

Media markets are in flux
Newspapers have traditionally been a central source of the news and information that is needed and wanted by citizens and communities. The Advertising Standards Authority reports advertising industry turnover for newspapers in New Zealand dropping from $790 million in 2004 to $494 million in 2013 (Advertising Standards Authority, 2014). Over the same period, the newspaper share of total advertising dropped from 38% to 22%. By contrast with newspapers, there is a history of public funding to support ‘broadcast’ news media. New Zealand per capita public broadcasting expenditure puts us in a group with Australia and Canada, below many European nations and above the US, as shown by Figure 5.

NZ On Air research shows that New Zealanders are making use of new media and new technology (NZ On Air, 2014). The research also suggests that traditional media, such as linear television, live radio and newspapers (including online), still dominate and will do so for some time; but roughly half of Facebook and Twitter users get news on those sites, according to the Pew Research Center (2014).

In the United Kingdom, the Ofcom annual review of public service broadcasting 2014 observed that the proportion of the adult population who claim to use the internet for local news was up 28% between 2007 and 2014. In the same period the number of internet users who agreed the internet is very influential in shaping public opinion about political and other important issues rose from 52% to 75%. People aged 16–24 were more likely than those aged 55 and over to use the internet to access news (60% compared with 21%), and were less likely to use the television (56% compared with 90%) (Ofcom, 2014). This trend is also evident in Canada, where 57% of 28–34 year-olds use the internet as their primary source of news, as shown in Figure 6.

In New Zealand, online news reading continues to grow, as print news readership is declining. According to Nielsen, since 2008 the number of New Zealanders accessing news online has grown from 25% to 54% (Nielsen, 2015). Radio New Zealand reports that as at 16 June 2015,
The internet allows for new forms of self-expression, and empowers citizens to choose where to get their content, how to share it and how to report it themselves. This is, overall, positive; however, citizens may have difficulty finding information and establishing source reliability. The benefit of wide distribution of news through a diverse range of channels has come at the expense of information gathering and investigative reporting, which can ultimately shift the balance of power; as Bill Girdner observed, ‘when journalists don’t have presence, others control the information process’ (as cited in Federal Communications Commission, 2011).

Additional choice is good for consumers, but also puts financial pressure on the production of ‘hard news’, and in some cases the accuracy and quality of news. It also results in fragmentation, which in turn has led to new forms of aggregated content that may or may not be well curated from a public interest perspective. UMR research conducted in 2014 shows that 68% of the New Zealand public agree that ‘political’ news on television focuses too much on politicians’ personalities and not enough on real issues (UMR and Coalition for Better Broadcasting).

### Civics on the public agenda

The purpose of this article has been to establish the nature and magnitude of the current trends in civics and media, so that consideration can be given to whether they should be on the agenda of society, media and government. Current trends present both dangers and opportunities. There are dangers that the quality of democracy will be diminished. But there are also wonderful opportunities presented by technological innovation and changing patterns of civic engagement. It remains to be seen whether a new equilibrium of supply and demand for the news and information needed for informed civic participation will be found. At this stage the issue is firmly on the agenda, as the Civics and Media Project goes on to examine.
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1 As Timo Meynhardt explains, ‘public value is value for the public ... Any impact on shared experience about the quality of the relationship between the individual and society can be described as public value creation’ (Meynhardt, 2009).
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