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Trust in news – or lack thereof – is the focus of this year’s Digital News Report: Australia. Some insiders assure me that the low level of trust that Australians have in news sources, news organisations and journalists is an accepted feature of the news environment; in our special section on Trust, Caroline Fisher goes so far as to suggest that lack of trust in news is a healthy by-product of a growing level of ‘media literacy’ in consumers (p. 69). If this is indeed the case, it seems to fly in the face of the importance of building trust in brands, which many organisations outside of the news sector spend considerable resources in trying to achieve. Indeed, some institutions may need to try harder in this regard: an Ipsos poll conducted earlier this year for the Institute of Governance and Policy Analysis and the Museum of Australian Democracy found that Australians – especially those age 50+ years – perceived low standards of honesty in elected politicians and a disconnect between citizens and political decision-making processes (www.governanceinstitute.edu.au).

Does lack of trust play a part in our unwillingness to pay for news? Perhaps so, yet Australians are fortunate to have access to an “abundance” of news, as Nic Newman from the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism describes it (p. 14). Not only do Australians usually not pay for news content, they are increasingly turning to (usually free) ad-blocking software. News Corp Australia is among those major players moving to force consumers to deactivate ad-blockers in order to access content. This is without doubt a risky strategy and it remains to be seen whether this will further encourage users to use their social feeds to receive news. Over half of the respondents to this year’s Australian survey indicated that social media were their main source of news, just behind terrestrial TV.

By way of comparison, a 2016 survey by Pew Research Center found that 62% of adults in the USA use social media as their main news source. Therefore as social networks become the news source of choice, the need for distributed content strategies to ensure that specific news content and brands remain visible within individual news feeds will no doubt occupy some organisations over the short-term – see our Distributed Content section (p. 50).

Gwangjae Kim provides some insights into the enduring poster-child of digital infrastructure, South Korea – which joins the wider Digital News Project for the first time this year (see p. 22). South Korea’s drive towards a 5G network rollout opens the door to high-quality mobile streaming video. This capacity may well favour those news organisations who are geared up to produce and/or distribute video content e.g. broadcasters, YouTube and Facebook. Twitter Australia’s recent move to larger premises in Sydney alongside its development of video sharing functionality may or may not flag it as a growing player in the news video space. But our data indicate that – for the time being – Australian consumers prefer to read news online rather than watch online news video (p. 40).

As ever, my heartfelt gratitude goes to the very capable research team at the News & Media Research Centre which has pulled out all the stops to make our second Digital News Report bigger and better than 2015. Our collaborators at the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism at the University of Oxford have worked closely with us again on this year’s survey. Thanks also to our external commentators: being able to include perspectives from Australia, Ireland, South Korea and the UK has really helped us to draw out the broader global trends changing how we interact with – and are shaped by – news.
ABOUT

Welcome to the Digital News Report: Australia 2016, the second annual survey of its kind of news consumption in Australia. This report is a collaboration between the News & Media Research Centre at the University of Canberra and the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism at the University of Oxford. The Australian survey is part of a wider project involving 26 countries.

The survey was conducted by the market research and data company YouGov plc between 29 January and 26 February 2016. An online interview was administered to members of the YouGov plc panel of individuals who have agreed to take part in surveys. An email was sent to panelists selected at random from the base sample according to the sample definition, inviting them to take part in the survey and providing a link to the survey.

YouGov plc normally achieves a response rate of between 35% and 50% to surveys, however, this does vary dependent upon the subject matter, complexity and length of the questionnaire. A quota based on Australian Bureau of Statistics census data was set using gender, age and region. Any respondent who said that they had not consumed any news in the past month was filtered from the results to ensure that irrelevant responses did not impact data quality.

Core questions were asked in all 26 countries in order to provide an international comparison. The questionnaire and the overall project methodology were consistent across all countries and the following questionnaire themes were refreshed in 2016:

- Behaviour: why social media and aggregators are used for news; why people share news content;
- Brand: main brand for traditional and online news; noticing news brands on social media and aggregators; aggregators split out from other online news brands
- Consumption: scaled interest in types of news; first contact with news in the morning; trust in algorithms
- Devices: device and platform for watching video news; use of smartwatches
- Payment: payment for digital news; ad-blocking software – past and current use, on what device

All data in this report were provided by YouGov plc and cleaned by the News & Media Research Centre unless otherwise stated. The data were weighted further to reflect the Australian adult population based on census data with regard to age, gender and region. Due to differences in the size and composition of the survey recruitment panel in 2016 compared to 2015, direct comparison of data between 2016 and 2015 has not been conducted in this report.

The Digital News Report: Australia 2016 is an online survey and we might expect the results to underrepresent the consumption habits of those who are not online news users, typically older and/or less affluent people. A fuller description of the global survey methodology can be found on the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism site www.digitalnewsreport.org.

METHODOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Brazil (urban)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Korea, South</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Turkey (urban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total starting sample size: 2,201 including non-news users

Total number of non-news users removed: 180

% of non-news users removed: 8.18%

Final sample size: 2,021 adults who access news once a month or more
RESEARCH TEAM

R. Warwick Blood is an authority in risk communication and the reporting of health issues such as suicide, mental illness, obesity and influenza. He has conducted research in these areas for several government departments. He is co-founder of the Australian Health News Research Collaboration.

Megan Deas is editor of the Communication & Media section of Australian Policy Online. Her doctoral research examines the construction of national identity in popular press photography in Australia during the post-war era.

Michelle Dunne Breen worked as a journalist for newspapers and magazines for more than 20 years in Australia, Britain and Ireland. Her research interests include mainstream media representation of marginalised voices in policy processes. Her teaching includes journalism practice, the media’s role in democracy, and digital media literacy.

Caroline Fisher was a journalist with the ABC and a ministerial media adviser prior to becoming an academic researcher. Her current projects focus on transparency and conflict of interest in journalism, trust in media, and the changing nature of political media advising.

Glen Fuller has worked in the magazine industry in a number of different positions. He co-leads the project ‘Mapping Contemporary Career Paths in the Journalism and Media Industries’. He teaches online news, data journalism and communication technologies and change.
RESEARCH TEAM

**Jee Young Lee** is a doctoral researcher at the News & Media Research Centre. Her work focuses on policy issues and digital environments. Her PhD thesis explores a user-centric inclusion framework for a digitalised society and the role of digital divide policy in addressing exclusion.

**Franco Papandrea** is a well-established policy expert and author of the 2013 report *State of the Newspaper Industry in Australia*. He advised the two foremost Australian public inquiries into newspapers: the House of Representatives Select Committee on the Print Media 1991, and the Independent Inquiry into Media and Media Regulation 2011.

**Sora Park** has written widely on the economics of television, newspaper markets and other information industries. Her focus is on digital media, media markets and media policy. She has extensive experience in policy research and has led multiple consultancies for major internet and media companies such as KBS, NHN Corp and MBC.

**Matthew Ricketson** was Media and Communications editor for *The Age* newspaper from 2006 to 2009 and assisted the Hon R Finkelstein QC with the 2012 ‘Report of the Independent Inquiry into the Media and Media Regulation’. He has worked on staff at *The Australian*, *Time Australia* magazine and *The Sunday Herald* amongst other publications.

**Jerry Watkins** is Director of the News & Media Research Centre. Alongside his research focus on online, mobile and social systems, he has over 20 years' high-profile international experience in communication strategy and has led major projects for some of the world’s biggest telecoms companies including AT&T Wireless and Deutsche Telekom.
KEY FINDINGS
DIGITAL NEWS CONSUMPTION IN AUSTRALIA
SORA PARK

• Terrestrial TV (53.9%) and social media (52.2%) were reported as the most popular sources of news in the week prior to the survey.
• But when asked for one main source of news, 37.6% replied TV; 27.4% replied online news; 18.5% replied social network services / blogs.
• Radio news programs (39.6%), printed newspapers (35.4%) and websites of newspapers (32.5%) were also widely used as sources of news.
• Traditional media news consumption – TV, print and radio – is regarded as the main source (52.3%) and this is reflected to some extent in online news consumption, where the top source of news among online media was through websites or apps of newspapers (21.7%).
MAIN SOURCES OF NEWS: TV AND SOCIAL

We separated all responses by those who cited traditional media platforms – TV, radio, newspaper and magazine – as their main source of news vs. those who cited online media platforms as their main source – websites/apps of newspapers, magazines, TV, radio and other news outlets – or social network services / blogs (Figure 1.1).

Terrestrial TV (53.9%) and social media (52.2%) were reported as the most popular source of news in the week prior to the survey. But taken together, TV news bulletins and 24-hour news TV are still regarded as the main source of news.

As might be expected, age plays a large part. Younger consumers use more online news platforms: 64.9% of the 18-24 age bracket cited online news platforms as their main way of accessing news. In contrast 72.4% of the 55+ age bracket mainly consumed news via traditional platforms (Figure 1.2).
TYPES OF NEWS

Respondents were asked to rate how interested they were in different types of news using a five-point Likert-type scale. ‘News about my region, city or town’ was rated with the highest interest at 3.8, followed by international news (3.72) and news about crime, justice and security (3.58). ‘Entertainment and celebrity news’ and ‘sports news’ were rated lowly; it is possible that some respondents may have under-reported their interest in these popular news types (Table 1.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News about my region, city or town</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International news</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News about crime, justice and security</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health or education news</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and technology news</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News about the environment</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political news</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle news (e.g. food, fashion, travel)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and economic news</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports news</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and culture news</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment and celebrity news</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1.1: INTEREST IN NEWS TYPES

SOCIAL NETWORKS

The survey asked which – if any – social network services (SNS) were used for any purpose in the last week. Facebook (68.8%) and YouTube (52.3%) dominated over Instagram (19.1%), Twitter (17.2%) and LinkedIn (16.4%). Respondents were then asked which SNS they used for finding, reading, watching, sharing or discussing news. Facebook is even more prominent at 44.7%, with YouTube a distant second place at 14.8%. The use of WhatsApp for news access (4.1%) is noteworthy in the SNS environment (Table 1.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SNS FOR NEWS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1.2: TOP FIVE SNS SITES AND SNS SITES USED FOR NEWS
DEVICES

There is a fairly even split between online news consumers using mobile devices (47.3%) and computers (e.g. desktops & laptops, 48.3%) as their main way of accessing news. Age preferences are again quite clear: when asked what the main way of accessing online news was, 64.9% of 18-24 year olds replied mobile devices including phones, tablets and other mobile devices. The 65+ bracket much preferred desktops and laptops for accessing online news (75.6%) – Figure 1.3.

![Graph showing access platform for online news by age (%)](image)

**FIGURE 1.3: ACCESS PLATFORM FOR ONLINE NEWS, BY AGE (%)**

Somewhat unexpectedly, a relatively small number of news consumers reported accessing news via apps on their smartphones or tablet device: 12.1% of smartphone users and 6.8% of tablet users used apps to get access to news (Table 1.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used an ’app’ on my smartphone to access the news</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used an ’app’ on my tablet to access the news</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1.3: USE OF NEWS APPS ON SMARTPHONES AND TABLETS IN THE LAST WEEK**

ACCESS

When using a computer to access news, 31.7% went directly to a news website or app, which was the most popular way of accessing news via computers. On the other hand 36.6% of mobile phone users came across news via social media. Searching or getting alerts were less popular ways of accessing news (Figure 1.4).

**36.6% OF MOBILE PHONE USERS CAME ACROSS NEWS VIA SOCIAL MEDIA**
Reading news online (58%) was preferred to watching online news video (27.4%). When respondents watched online news video, they preferred computers (51.7%) over smartphones (27.7%). The main reason given for not watching online news video was mainly due to inconvenience rather than costs.

**INTERNET AND MOBILE IN AUSTRALIA**

In 2015, 86% of Australian homes had broadband access. Mobile internet is becoming more prevalent with 56% of adults using their smartphones to access the internet. While the penetration of smartphones has plateaued, people are spending more time on their mobile devices. An average adult spends 35 hours per month on smartphones and engages in 199 sessions per month which is four times that of people using computers. The way people use digital devices has significant impact on how they consume news and information. The majority of respondents accessed news on their mobile devices.
PARTICIPATION

The most popular participatory behaviour among news consumers was ‘talking with friends and colleagues about a news story face to face’ (38.9%) and sharing a news story via social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Reddit) at 21.5%. About 17% of online news consumers commented on a news story via SNS (e.g. Facebook or Twitter) and 14.6% talked online with friends and colleagues about a news story e.g. by email, social media, instant messenger. Australians are active participants in and sharers of news coverage and prefer to talk face-to-face with friends about news coverage. However 36% of respondents replied that they did not engage in sharing or participatory activities online when consuming news (Table 1.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>% OF CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share a news story via Social Network (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Reddit)</strong></td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share a news story via email</strong></td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate, like or favourite a news story</strong></td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment on a news story in a Social Network (e.g. Facebook or Twitter)</strong></td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment on a news story on a news website</strong></td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Write a blog on a news or political issue</strong></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post or send a news-related picture or video to a Social Network site</strong></td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post or send a picture or video to a news website/news organisation</strong></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote in an online poll via a news site or social network</strong></td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Take part in a campaign or group based around a news subject</strong></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talk online with friends and colleagues about a news story (e.g. by email, social media, instant messenger)</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talk with friends and colleagues about a news story (face to face)</strong></td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>None of these</strong></td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participatory behaviour of news consumers differed by their preferred type of news outlet. Those who preferred mainstream sources for news (broadcast, print inc. websites/apps of newspapers) engaged less in sharing behaviour in general than non-mainstream news consumers (digital-born and social media news sources). Face to face sharing was similar between the two groups (40.2% vs. 37.9%) but non-mainstream news consumers shared news stories on social media (33%) more than mainstream (18.7%). Non-mainstream consumers also commented on news stories on social media (23.4%) more than mainstream (15.3%). Mainstream consumers shared stories via email (12.6%) more than non-mainstream news consumers (7.9%) – Figure 1.5.
Paying for News

Thirty-eight percent of respondents said they had paid for a print newspaper in the week preceding the survey. Only 10% had paid for digital news in the past year. Among print newspaper readers, 12% were regular buyers with home delivery one or more days per week. Those who did pay for online news paid $10 or less per month on average. The majority (74%) of those not currently paying for digital news were not prepared to make any payment for digital news in the future. Of the quarter of those who said they would be likely to make a payment in future, a little more than half (57%) were willing to make an ongoing payment.

Mainstream vs. Non-mainstream

Further analysis on the main source of news reveals that 76.6% (N=1,442) cited ‘mainstream news’ as their main source. Mainstream news outlets include traditional sources – broadcast and print – and also the online websites/apps of these traditional news companies. All age brackets preferred mainstream news sources over non-mainstream but with clear age preferences: almost half of 18-24 year olds (44.6%) preferred non-mainstream news whereas the majority of the 65+ age bracket (90.9%) preferred mainstream (Figure 1.6). More male consumers preferred mainstream news (82.3%) than female consumers did (71%) – Figure 1.7.
About 86% of participants in this year’s survey reported as heavy internet users e.g. accessing the internet five times or more per day. The 25-34 age bracket was the heaviest user and those 54 years of age or less were heavier internet users than those aged 55+ years. Only 4.4% of respondents reported using the internet less than once a day. Those on higher income and with more formal education accessed the internet more than those participants with lower income levels and less formal education.

A similar question was asked to estimate news consumption, including traditional and online news platforms. The majority (78.7%) consumed news at least once a day (Figure 1.8). Participants less than 25 years of age, on a household income under $49,000 a year and with a high school education or less, were the least likely to access news.

---

1 Australian Communications and Media Authority (2016). Regional Australians online. www.acma.gov.au/theACMA/engage-blogs/engage-blogs/Research-snapshots/Regional-Australians-online
COMMENTARY:
BUSINESS PROBLEMS MOUNT FOR PUBLISHERS (NEW AND OLD)

Nic Newman
Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism
University of Oxford

News and journalism have never been easier to access or more difficult to monetise. This year’s report highlights the growth of distributed (offsite) news consumption, a sharpening move to mobile and the rise of ad-blocking worldwide – all of which are adding to the financial pressures of publishers. Few are immune to these pressures but it is newspaper groups that have been worst hit, as falling print revenues combine with the brutal economics of digital in a perfect storm.

News Corp Australia and Fairfax newspapers combined have announced more than 200 editorial staff cuts over the past 12 months, but these difficulties have been mirrored elsewhere. In the UK, the The Independent has abandoned print entirely, shedding around 75 jobs in the process, while The Guardian had a particularly difficult year, losing around £50m. There have been cutbacks, changes of ownership and significant media consolidation in France, Italy and Poland, amongst other countries. Digital-born companies have also increasingly been affected by the same trends, with BuzzFeed reportedly missing revenue targets1 and Mashable and Vice amongst others laying off staff.

The key underlying issue is that we have moved from an era of information scarcity to one of abundance. One consequence of this high-choice environment has been reduced loyalty to any individual news brand, with the price of most content reduced to zero. Our international survey data has consistently shown that only a small minority in most countries is prepared to pay anything for online news. Only brands with unique, high-quality content such as The New York Times and The Financial Times have been able to drive significant revenue from online subscription, and it is striking that no English-speaking country has a headline payment rate of more than 10%. By contrast, some smaller countries protected by geography or language have been able to achieve rates of 20% or more, particularly where there is a tradition of newspaper subscription via home delivery to build on (Figure 1.9).

Q7a. Have you paid for ONLINE news content, or accessed a paid-for ONLINE news service in the last year? (This could be digital subscription, combined digital/print subscription or one-off payment for an article, app or e-edition.)
Base: Total sample in each country

1 BuzzFeed slashes forecasts after missing 2015 targets.
www.ft.com/cms/s/0/26ebf992-00c4-11e6-99cb-83242733f755.html#a234ddajka4N
Nic Newman is a journalist and digital strategist who played a key role in shaping the BBC’s internet services over more than a decade. He was a founding member of the BBC News website, leading international coverage as World Editor (1997-2001). He is currently a Research Associate at the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism and a senior Research Fellow at City University, London.

In the absence of online subscriptions, most publishers have been hoping to fill the gap with online advertising, with publishers such as the MailOnline and The Guardian expanding to the US and Australia in a search for scale. But the almost infinite amount of inventory available has kept prices low, while Facebook and Google – with their better data and targeting capabilities – have been able to attract the majority of new advertising.

If this were not enough, news organisations have been hit by a new threat. Data from our survey shows that ad-blocking is now running at between 10% (Japan) and 38% (Poland), but much higher amongst under-35s. In Australia, around a quarter (23%) use a blocker, with heavy news users and younger users most likely to do so. Most of those who have ever downloaded a blocker are using them regularly, suggesting that once people download, they rarely go back (Figure 1.10).

Of those that currently use an ad-blocker, the vast majority do so on their laptop or desktop computer. Across our entire sample, only around one in eight (12%) block adverts using their smartphone. However, these numbers may increase with ad-blocking apps and browsers now available for Apple and Android phones – especially in Asia. Around a third of our sample say they plan to install an ad-blocker on their smartphones in the next year (this question was asked in Germany, UK and USA only).

With existing models of online advertising increasingly broken, publishers have renewed their focus on alternative forms such as branded and sponsored content. A number of publishers have set up internal agencies that create content for brands, often using the same formats, fonts and templates as other editorial content. Although this is bringing in some new revenues, even some of the most innovative publishers such as BuzzFeed are reportedly having trouble scaling this model sufficiently.

An increasing problem for news organisations – new and old – is the powerful role played by Silicon Valley tech giants in the distribution of content. Our survey data show that growing numbers of people now access and consume content via social platforms, giving their algorithms considerable control over what stories get seen. Over half of our Australian sample (52%) say they use social media as a source of news with almost a fifth (18%) saying it is their main source. Facebook has been trying to keep users for longer within its walled garden through its Instant Article initiative; Snapchat launched its Discover channels in the United States last year; while Apple News launched an aggregated service in the USA, UK and Australia last year. If more content is consumed in the future through these platforms rather than directly from news websites, it could be even harder for publishers to stand out from the crowd, to maintain the link with the reader, and ultimately drive revenue.

Although not all publishers are suffering to the same extent, these trends in combination are likely to force more cuts and further consolidation in the news industry over the next few years, in turn raising questions about plurality and diversity of media. Although our research shows that people still use and value news brands, the questions over how to pay for quality journalism become ever more pressing.

FIGURE 1.10: PROPORTION THAT ARE CURRENTLY USING AD-BLOCKING SOFTWARE (ALL COUNTRIES)

QAD3. And do you currently use software on any of your personal devices (e.g. laptop, smartphone etc.) that allows you to block adverts on the internet (e.g. Adblock Plus)?
An additional 14 countries joined the international Digital News Project for the first time in 2016. These new entrants provide an even broader frame with which we can compare how Australians perceive their news environment against their fellow news consumers around the world.

- Facebook continues to rule the social media landscape in all the countries surveyed this year, both for general social networking as well as specific news access.
- Australian news consumers have a relatively high awareness of digital-born news brands.
- Australian (27%), British (29%) and Finnish (30%) respondents used tablets for news access more than any other country.
- For those active news participants who do share content, 36% of Australians mostly or almost always approve of the stories they share versus 29% of UK respondents.
Australian, French and Polish news consumers are distinctive in that both digital-born and print brands (including online and social versions of print brands) were their most-accessed news sources in the week prior to the survey, over and above broadcast media (Figure 2.1). The evident brand awareness of digital-born brands in Australia is noteworthy, particularly in comparison to UK (31%). Print brands continue to have traction with Australian consumers despite a continued unwillingness to pay for newspaper content either online or in print (see p.32).

SOCIAL NETWORKS FOR NEWS

Facebook continues to rule the social media landscape in all the countries surveyed this year, both for general social networking as well as specific news access (Figure 2.2). As we highlighted last year, WhatsApp continues its evolution from messaging service to social network, and may begin to challenge Twitter as a preferred news content provider. It is worth remembering that local brands can do well: Japanese consumers access news via Facebook (16%) as well as Line (13%), although they prefer YouTube most of all (26%). In Korea, 22% use Kakao Talk for news access against 24% for Facebook.
PARTICIPATION

Does the high usage of social networks to access news mean that consumers have embraced the ability to write their own blogs, send content to a news website or simply share stories with their friends list? Three categories were used to assess this level of interaction (Figure 2.3):

**PROACTIVE PARTICIPATORS**
- e.g. write a news blog, take part in an online campaign, comment on a news story

**REACTIVE PARTICIPATORS**
- e.g. share news content via email or social network, rate/like stories or vote in a poll

**PASSIVE CONSUMERS**
- e.g. discuss news stories either online or f2f; or may not participate at all

FIGURE 2.3: PARTICIPATION IN THE NEWS ENVIRONMENT (%): PROACTIVE, REACTIVE, PASSIVE
*Base: Total sample in each country.*

In 2016, survey respondents in Brazil and Turkey came from urban areas only and this may explain the high level of proactive participation in these countries (61% and 60% respectively). Australia is part of the majority of countries in which passive consumers (53%) outnumber active news participants.

SHARING NEWS

What motivates those who do share news content with their social networks? Do they approve of the coverage and aim to share ‘positive’ news with friends or family? Or do they disapprove of the content, or the way it has been presented? In most countries the response was a somewhat predictable ‘half and half’. Notably 13% of British respondents either mostly or almost always disapprove of the stories they share versus 9% for Australia and USA. In contrast 36% of Australians mostly or almost always approve of the stories they share versus 29% of UK respondents (Figure 2.4).
FIGURE 2.4: SHARING NEWS STORIES Q13i. You said that you share news content during an average week. Do you tend to do this because you approve or disapprove of the coverage? Base: All who shared a news story in the last week: Finland = 453, USA = 807, Australia = 573, Korea = 380, UK = 487 Note: Those who answered “Don’t know” are not shown.

HARD vs SOFT NEWS

Respondents in all countries were asked about which types of news they were interested in. These responses were categorised as:

- ‘hard’ news: international, political, business and economics, health or education
- ‘soft’ news: entertainment, celebrity, lifestyle

Japan was the only country in which the majority of respondents said they either preferred soft news, or were equally interested in soft and hard news. Australian respondents indicated a preference for hard news at 62%; contrast this to Greece – which seems to be an outlier in a number of measurements in this year’s survey – where 81% of respondents indicated they preferred hard news. Participants who indicated a preference for soft news were generally younger, female and used social media as their main source of news (Figure 2.5).

FIGURE 2.6: DEVICES FOR ACCESSING NEWS
Q8b. Which, if any, of the following devices have you used to access news in the last week?

Desktops and laptops remained the most common device for accessing news. Australian (27%), UK (29%) and Finnish (30%) respondents used tablets to access news, more than respondents in the other countries in the week before the survey. South Korea seems to remain the poster-child for digital communication infrastructure, as Korean respondents were the only ones to report using smartphones for news access more than desktops or laptops (Figure 2.6).

FIGURE 2.7: AD-BLOCKING
QAD3. And do you currently use software on any of your personal devices (e.g. laptop, smartphone etc.) that allows you to block adverts on the internet (e.g. Adblock Plus)? Base: Total sample in each country.
Most respondents agreed that advertising on news sites is intrusive: hence ad-blocking software is proving popular, especially in Poland (38%) and Greece (36%). Korea (12%) and Japan (10%) are noticeably lower users of ad-blockers. The survey results do not return a single clear reason for the adoption of ad-blockers but, in all countries surveyed, ad-blocking decreases with each increase in age bracket.

Respondents’ attitudes about whether they were prepared to see advertising “in exchange” for free access to news content were quite varied. Australian respondents leaned towards agreement: 40% agreed, 32% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 28% disagreed. Amongst those who disagreed most with the proposition were respondents in Finland (43%) and France (45%) – see Figure 2.8.

Although younger consumers were generally more likely to use ad-blockers, the under-35 years age group in most countries – including Australia – were most likely to respond that they were prepared to see advertising in exchange for free news (Table 2.1).

We discuss ad-blocking further in section six.

**FIGURE 2.8:** “I AM PREPARED TO SEE ADVERTISEMENTS IN EXCHANGE FOR FREE NEWS”

QAD1. Thinking about advertising on news websites or news apps, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements. If you use an ad-blocker, please answer this question assuming that you have it switched off.

It is apparent that global feeds continue to shape a smaller, faster and more interactive world in which developed economies influence each other through news content and services. There is no doubt that new media services are leading this process: in particular smart devices and rich social networks are driving far-reaching change in almost all areas of the news market. In general, big and strange things can make consumers and producers inherently uncomfortable. But the inconvenience of change hasn’t halted the speed or direction of news transformation.

According to the Digital News Report: Australia 2016, news consumers from many of the 26 countries surveyed have shown a consistent inclination to access news via smart device as well as a preference for a digital-born brand. For those active news participants who do share content, 36% of Australians mostly or almost always approve of the stories they share more highly, compared to UK (29%), Korea (32%) and USA (35%) – Figure 2.3. Perhaps this active sharing of news content with friends and family reflects in some way the multicultural Australian society, considered by some outside nations as a strong competitive advantage for Australia around the world.

If news consumption and participation are increasingly dependent on new media and devices, then comparison with the South Korean market – well-known for its high levels of fixed and wireless infrastructure and media innovation – may provide valuable insight. The data from the International Comparison section (above) of this year’s Digital News Report: Australia indicate South Korean respondents have eschewed traditional print news media brands in favour of broadcast and digital-born brands (Figure 2.3).

Although Google is commonly cited as the global search leader, the US corporation has struggled to gain a firm foothold in South Korea in the face of well-established domestic portals including Naver and Daum. Both these local players have provided news and consumer information since the late 1990s via either production or aggregation models. This kind of information-provision service has certainly decreased the power of traditional media such as newspaper and terrestrial TV. Like their international competitors, the Korean portals are seeking to expand their business into the mobile space – unsurprisingly, since South Korea respondents were the only ones across all countries who used smartphones to access news more than computers or tablets (Figure 2.6).

So where to next for digital news in South Korea? We would anticipate substantial disruption from two major infrastructure projects: the roll-out of a public Internet of Things (IoT) network – led by Samsung and SK Telecom – as well as the introduction of 5G wireless systems, a field in which Korea is an acknowledged leader. The IoT describes an environment in which digital devices can communicate with each other in order to provide a much richer information environment.

Seen as a precursor to smart cities, subscribers to the Korean IoT network are forecast to reach one million by the end of 2016. 5G wireless systems should offer both faster access and lower latency – so in principle, live-streaming sports events could be viewed via smartphone. Judging from past precedents, these technological advances will offer numerous possibilities to both news consumers and producers that will be realised in a short period of time.

On reflection, we have experienced rapid, dramatic changes in news since the introduction of smart devices and the speed of this change may be faster than many would prefer. Nevertheless, disruption continues apace so it is imperative that we do not shy away from the opportunities presented to us. Based on what is already happening in South Korea, it seems to me that the battle for the near-future of digital news has already begun.

Dr Gwangjae Kim is Assistant Professor in the Department of Advertising & Media, Hanyang Cyber University in Korea. His research focuses on media and telecommunication policy, media industries and media literacy. He is the 2016 Visiting Fellow at the News & Media Research Centre, University of Canberra.
22 January 2016. Nick Kyrgios of Australia challenges the umpire over ambient music in the crowd during his third round match against Tomas Berdych of the Czech Republic at the Australian Open tennis tournament in Melbourne, Australia.
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INTEREST IN NEWS

- Overall, about 64% of respondents said they were very or extremely interested in news.
- Males, those aged 55 or more, with household incomes of $100,000 a year or more, and more formal education levels, expressed the most interest in news.
- Participants were most interested in ‘news about my region, city or town’, ‘international news’ and ‘news about crime, justice and security’.
- Males are slightly more interested in ‘international news’ than females, and females are slightly more interested in ‘news about my region, city or town’.
- Older age groups are more interested in ‘international news’ and ‘news about my region, city or town’ than younger age groups.
- Demographics are not predictors of interest in ‘news about crime, justice and security’, perhaps reflecting the universal concern with these issues.
NEWS SOURCES

Participants were presented with a list of news sources and asked to nominate which ones they had used in the last week. Multiple responses were recorded.

67.1% of respondents said they were very or extremely interested in news.

**FIGURE 3.1: NEWS SOURCES USED IN WEEK BEFORE SURVEY (MULTIPLE % RESPONSES)**

Figure 3.1 shows all news sources that participants used in the week before the survey. Thus, of all responses recorded, about 67% reported using TV news or 24-hour television news channels. Those participants aged 55 or more were the most likely to say they accessed TV news or 24-hour television news channels.

About 56% reported using social media such as Facebook, Twitter or blogs for news, with the 18-24 age group the heaviest users (77.4%) compared to older age groups. 60.8% of participants reported that they had used websites – online news sites, which include websites or apps of newspapers, news magazines, TV and radio companies, and of other news outlets such as MSN, Yahoo, Huffington Post, and Buzzfeed.

In line with social media usage, the 18-24 age group were far more likely to use websites for news than older participants. Participants with less formal education and lower household income were the least likely to use online news sources.

About 39% of participants said they had read a newspaper in the last week with males, the 55 years or more age group, and those with a $100,000 household income the heaviest newspapers users.

41% of participants reported they has used radio news in the last week with those aged 45 or more the heaviest users, and those with a household income of $49,000 or less the lowest users.

These data set the scene for a changing media environment when examining the choice participants made when they were asked to nominate their main source of news.

DEMographics are not predictors of interest in “news about crime, justice and security”
FIGURE 3.2: MAIN SOURCE OF NEWS
Q4. You say you’ve used these sources of news in the last week, which would you say is your MAIN source of news?

Figure 3.2 illustrates that while TV news, including 24-hour news channels, are a dominant main source of news for about 38% of participants, online news and social media as main news sources are very competitive. 18.5% of participants report that social media are their main news source while 27.4% report online news as their main source – a combined digital usage of nearly 46%. This divide between the traditional and the digital is neatly illustrated when looking across age groups.

FIGURE 3.3: MAIN SOURCE OF NEWS BY AGE
About 41% of the 18-24 age group nominated social media as their main source of news compared to only about 7% of the 45-64 age group and about 6% of those aged 65+ years. In sharp contrast, TV news and 24-hour news channels are the main source of news for older age groups. However, still less than 50% of the 65+ age group nominated TV news and 24-hour news channels as their main source of news.

Social media were nominated by 20.9% of those with a high school education or less as their main source of news compared to 17.3% for those with some university education and 14.0% of those with a postgraduate qualification. The higher educated tended to nominate newspapers and online sites as their main news source compared to the less formally educated who nominated TV news. Females were more likely to nominate TV and radio news, and social media, as their main source. Males were more likely to nominate newspapers and online sites as their main news source.

Using TV ratings, data on time spent with TV, and the worldwide Digital News Report surveys, Nielsen and Sambrook (2016) question the long-term sustainability of traditional TV broadcast news in countries such as the UK and USA. They argue that, as Figure 3.3 implies, TV news is increasingly out of touch with the population, especially the young: “There are no reasons to believe that a generation that has grown up with and enjoys digital, on-demand, social, and mobile video viewing across a range of connected devices will come to prefer live, linear, scheduled programming tied to a single device just because they grow older” (p.11).

While not predicting the immediate demise of broadcast TV news, they argue the data convincingly demonstrate that TV news providers face an ageing and eroding audience in a complex digital media environment with many new competitors.

Preston (2016) highlights the Nielsen and Sambrook (p. 9) analysis that some TV broadcast news bulletins are declining as fast as newspaper circulations.

Nielsen and Sambrook conclude that the biggest challenge facing TV news is “how to reinvent its social and political mission” and to “move beyond television news as we know it” (p. 24). The rate of decline of TV news is a continuing question for future research, but in the current Australian environment it is worth noting that about a quarter of the 18-24 age group, and about a quarter of the 25-34 age group, still nominate TV news as their main source of news.

### Table 3.1: News Brands Used via Traditional Platforms in the Week Before the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel 7</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 9</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel TEN</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A regional or local newspaper</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald Sun</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Morning Herald</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC News</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIN Television</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime7</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky News</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple J</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier Mail</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Age</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple M</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox News</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio National</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cross</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Advertiser</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Financial Review</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIIS Mix FM</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other newspapers or broadcast news channels</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5a. Which, if any, of the following have you used to access news in the last week? Please select all that apply. Via TV, radio or print only.
BRANDS

Participants were presented with a list of traditional news brands, and a list of online news brands, and asked to report which they had used in the week before the survey. Multiple responses were recorded.

Among traditional platforms – TV news, radio and newspapers – Channels 7, 9, and TEN, ABC and SBS were the most-used by participants. The high-rating Channels 7 and 9 were the most frequently used. Reflecting the enduring news value of localness, regional newspapers were used by about 19% of participants, as shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.2 shows the analysis for news brands used when accessing online platforms. News.com.au, ABC News Online, ninemsn, Yahoo7 and The Sydney Morning Herald online, were the most frequently used by participants in the week before the survey. But regional newspaper websites were used by 15% of participants. Participants were asked to nominate their main source of news when accessing both traditional and online platforms.

Among traditional platforms the ABC, Channels 7, 9 and 10 were nominated as the main brand used by participants in the week before the survey. For online access, ninemsn, ABC News Online and News.com.au were the most frequently named as the main news brand used. Predictably only a handful of participants report regional or local newspapers or websites as their main source of news.

Among the newer digital pure players, BuzzFeed was nominated by 2.6% of participants and the Guardian Online was nominated by 2.2% of participants as their main news brand. The Huffington Post was nominated by only 1.2% of participants as their main news brand.

TABLE 3.2: NEWS BRANDS USED VIA ONLINE PLATFORMS IN THE WEEK BEFORE THE SURVEY Q5b. Which, if any, of the following have you used to access news in the last week? Please select all that apply. Via online platforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRANDS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News.com.au</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC News Online</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninemsn</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo7</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Morning Herald (smh.com.au)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other regional or local newspaper website</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC News online</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald Sun (heraldsun.com.au)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph (dailytelegraph.com.au)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel TEN news online</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Age (theage.com.au)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffington Post</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BuzzFeed</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian (theaustralian.com.au)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skynews.com.au</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN.com</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier Mail (couriermail.com.au)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian online</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Advertiser (adelaidenow.com.au)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Financial Review (afr.com)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Online</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sites from outside country</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Times online</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conversation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crikey</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice News</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junkee</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


# Table 3.3: Main News Brand Used Via Online and Traditional Platforms in Week Before Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online Platforms</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TV, Radio, or Print</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ninemsn</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td><strong>ABC</strong></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC News Online</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td><strong>Channel 7</strong></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.com.au</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td><strong>Channel 9</strong></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo!7</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td><strong>Channel TEN</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Morning Herald (smh.com.au)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td><strong>SBS</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald Sun (heraldsun.com.au)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td><strong>Herald Sun</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other regional or local newspaper website</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td><strong>Triple J</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Age (theage.com.au)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>A regional or local newspaper</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC News online</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td><strong>BBC News</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph (dailytelegraph.com.au)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td><strong>Sydney Morning Herald</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BuzzFeed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td><strong>Prime7</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel TEN news online</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td><strong>Daily Telegraph</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian online</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td><strong>WIN Television</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skynews.com.au</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td><strong>Sky News</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Advertiser (adelaidenow.com.au)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td><strong>The Age</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier Mail (couriermail.com.au)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td><strong>Triple M</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN.com</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td><strong>The Australian</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian (theaustralian.com.au)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td><strong>The Advertiser</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Online</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td><strong>Courier Mail</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffington Post</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td><strong>CNN</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other online sites from outside country</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td><strong>KIIS Mix FM</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Financial Review (afr.com)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td><strong>Southern Cross</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice News</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td><strong>Radio National</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conversation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td><strong>Fox News</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crikey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td><strong>Australian Financial Review</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Times online</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Other newspapers or broadcast news channels from outside country</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junkee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td><strong>Don’t know</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table shows the main news brand used via online and traditional platforms in the week before the survey. The percentages indicate the proportion of respondents who used each platform or traditional medium. The table includes both domestic and international news sources.
James, David and Hannah were gathered around my kitchen table last week. They are in their 20s and 30s and I had invited them to pop in on their way home from work because I’d been asked to write this commentary and I didn’t quite trust the math. I was counting on them to reassure me that all was well in my world. It didn’t quite work out that way – but don’t despair this is not going to be particularly gloomy.

Hannah is 22. She’s studying to be a dietician, could not envisage any circumstances in which she would read a newspaper, and says she is happy to pick up on what’s been going on by flicking through her Facebook feed. She would never consider paying for news given how much is freely available online. Hannah fits neatly into that first column in Figure 3.3 Main Source of News by age (p.26): the 40.7% of 18-24 year olds who said social media were their main source of news in the week prior to the Digital News Report survey.

But hang on, she then tells me she loves The Project on Channel 10. It’s “witty and entertaining and I learn a lot”. “But you said you didn’t watch any news on TV”, said I. “The Project isn’t news”. Hold that thought...

How about David? He is 25, which the math tells me is in the zone where he’s most likely to access news through websites. And he does: 3-4 times a day he clicks through to The Age and checks out what’s been happening. News.com.au is the other site on his favourites bar. He’s not much interested in the BuzzFeeds and Huffington Posts: the grammar is appalling and the comments are silly – “they lack credibility”.

Then there’s James. He’s 35 and became a dad for the first time two months ago. And his age puts him in column three of the same graph on (p.26) – the 35-44 years age bracket. Apparently he’s most likely to say that TV is his main source of news. Well... yes and no. He’s a bit of an ABC fan so likes to watch Q&A and thinks that 7.30 is good because he can trust it. And he has The Age as his home page; he even pays a monthly subscription. But it’s not one or the other: he multi-tasks. James and David both said they couldn’t just sit and passively watch TV, they use the ad breaks to catch up on their social media or to surf other news sites. And yup, just as the math told me, he was the most likely of the three to open a real newspaper. 3-4 times a month perhaps, or if he is sitting have a coffee at the weekend; it’s part of the ritual.

So the pure math was spot on. Well done YouGov. Why then am I not piling last week’s newsprint into a heap, adding the telly, jumping on top and lighting the touch paper? Because it’s the applied bit I’m not getting; the doomsday scenario when not only has everything gone digital but none of the traditional media are left to curate the news.

I get the bit about the hegemony of live, linear, scheduled programming ending as soon as James, David and Hannah finish their growing up, because they will have so many more toys to play with. But it is not clear they want them. David signed up for Twitter but has cancelled his account: “too many emails”. James doesn’t like auto-streamed digital video “it’s too intrusive. I’d rather make my own choice to click and watch”. 
Already Column Two David, just two years older than Column One Hannah is showing signs of editorial ageing. He is not as wedded to social media as Hannah and has become more discriminating about what he reads and what he trusts: just as has always happened as generations age. The age demographic remains relevant and the legacy brands are the beneficiaries of David’s discretion. Offered choices not open to my generation, he is selecting content using similar criteria to which I did 30 years ago.

The data in the report reflect this. Together, ninemsn, ABC and News Limited’s news.com.au were the main online news sources for almost 40% of all those who had visited a news website in the previous week. The ABC was five times more likely to be the main news source than BuzzFeed, which was the highest rated of all the new players. Collectively those newcomers were the main source of online news for just 5% of respondents.

All good for the traditional media? Linear death averted? Not quite… back to The Project and also Have you been paying attention?, another Channel Ten program which James and Hannah recommended.

Okay, they are not strictly news programs, but they do deliver news and are available on a free-to-air channel. And the digital generation say it’s their kind of programming.

Those programs are the exception, said my guests: “All the major networks are dead ducks. Traditional TV will be dead as a doornail in our lifetime.” But it was not because they didn’t like sitting in front of a television. They loved doing that. They didn’t even mind ‘appointment TV’ although they were more likely to watch on catch-up. It was because what the networks put out and called news was mostly “boring, monotone and old”.

“The ABC,” said David, “has had the same light blue/white/grey colour palette on its news for years. Everything I use online gets updated weekly. And then I turn on the TV and it’s the same old, same old.

“If the networks can deliver it better, then I’d still watch, I don’t care if that’s online or on the sofa.”
Paying for News

Franco Papandrea

• 10% made a payment for digital news in the preceding year.
• 60% of those reporting a payment for digital news paid $10 or less per month ($120 or less per year) — median payment $100/year ($8.33/month).
• 74% of those not currently paying for digital news are not prepared to make any payment for digital news in future.
• Of the 25% likely to make a payment in future, a little more than half (57%) were predisposed to making an ongoing payment.
• 38% had bought a printed newspaper in the preceding week.
• 12% were regular buyers of newspapers with home delivery one or more days per week.
ALMOST TWO-THIRDS OF RESPONDENTS ARE NOT PREPARED TO PAY FOR NEWS

INTEREST DOES NOT EQUAL PAYMENT

Most Australian respondents (95%) professed being interested in news. More than three-quarters accessed news at least once a day (77%) and relied on an unpaid main source for their news (75.4%) - Figure 4.1.

PAYMENT FOR ONLINE NEWS

Payment for access to online news is an uncommon experience. Only 10% of respondents reported paying for online news (this is little changed from the rate reported in our 2015 survey).

Australia’s experience is comparable to that in other English-speaking countries and about average for the range of countries participating in the wider 2016 Digital News Report project (Figure 4.2).

![Figure 4.1: Main sources used to access news](chart)

- Paid: 7.9%
- Mix paid/free: 13.4%
- Unpaid: 75.4%
- Other: 3.3%

**Figure 4.1: Main sources used to access news**

![Figure 4.2: Payment for online news, by country](chart)

- NOR: 27%
- POL: 20%
- SWE: 20%
- KOR: 17%
- ITA: 16%
- DK: 15%
- FIN: 15%
- JPN: 12%
- NL: 12%
- BEL: 12%
- FRA: 11%
- SWI: 10%
- AUS: 10%
- SPA: 9%
- USA: 9%
- IRE: 9%
- POR: 9%
- CAN: 9%
- GER: 8%
- HUN: 8%
- CZ: 7%
- AUT: 7%
- GRE: 7%
- UK: 7%

**Figure 4.2: Payment for online news, by country**

Q7a. Have you paid for ONLINE news content, or accessed a paid-for ONLINE news service in the last year? (This could be digital subscription, combined digital/print subscription or one-off payment for an article, app or e-edition.) Base: Total sample in each country.
A subscription for a digital news service (41.7%) was the most common form of payment employed by the 10% of Australians who had paid for online news. The second most common was ongoing payment as part of a print subscription (21.6%). However 22.2% reported paying a “single one-off payment for article or day pass for access”: a significant difference recorded for 2016 cf. 14% in 2015. Note that the responses on payments for digital news are not mutually exclusive and therefore not additive (Figure 4.3).

**Figure 4.3: Distribution of Digital News Payments**

Q7ai. You said you have accessed paid-for ONLINE news content in the last year. Which, if any, of the following ways have you used to pay for ONLINE news content in the last year? Please select all that apply.

Among those who had paid for online news, males outnumbered females by a factor of three to two. Those with a postgraduate degree were more likely than others to pay for online news. Those relying on newspapers as their main source of news were on average twice as likely as others to have paid for online news (22% cf. overall average of 11%).

Males were more likely than females and older people (45+ years) were more likely than others to make ongoing payments. Reported payments for online news were considerably smaller than typical payment for access to printed newspapers. The overall median payment was $100 per year or $8.33 per month.
However, a closer examination of reported payments shows a substantial variation in median payments among respondents reflecting the type of payments that had been made. Of those who had paid for digital news, 37.5% made single payments only (to get temporary access to news content, to access a news app or make a donation to a digital news service), 41.0% had made ongoing payments only, while 21.5% had made both forms of payments in the previous year.

The median of the payments made rose from $45 per year ($3.75/month) for those who reported single payments only, to $72 ($6/month) for those who made both single and ongoing payments; and $129 ($10.75/month) for those who had made ongoing payments only.

These amounts are all smaller than the lowest price digital subscription for a major daily metropolitan newspaper (for example, the cheapest currently available digital subscription to The Sydney Morning Herald is $3.50 per week).

For all age groups except the 35-44 years cohort, a significantly larger proportion reported ongoing payments for a digital news service vis a vis single payments, which was particularly evident among mature respondents (45+ years). For the 35-44 years cohort, the proportions were approximately the same. There were no significant differences with respect to gender, education and income.

Almost three quarters (74%) of the overwhelming proportion of Australians not currently paying for access to digital news are not prepared to make any payment for digital content in future. The proportion of current non-payers predisposed to make different types of future payment for access to digital news services follows (note that responses are not mutually exclusive and consequently not additive):

Overall one in four of current non-payers indicated a predisposition to make at least one of the types of payments listed. A little fewer than six out of 10 of them (57.5%) indicated a predisposition to making an ongoing payment.

**FIGURE 4.4: MEDIAN ANNUAL PAYMENT FOR DIGITAL NEWS BY TYPE OF PAYMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Payment</th>
<th>Median Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single payment only</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both single and ongoing payment</td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing payment only</td>
<td>$129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 4.5: FUTURE DISPOSITION TO PAY FOR DIGITAL NEWS SERVICE BY THOSE NOT CURRENTLY PAYING.** Q7c. You say you don’t currently pay for online news, but in the future might you be prepared to pay for content you like in any of the following ways (tick all that apply).
The aggregation of responses of those currently paying for digital news and of those predisposed to paying in the future provides an overview of the overall willingness to pay for digital news by respondents (see Figure 4.6 for details). The results show that almost two-thirds (66%) of Australian respondents are not prepared to pay for digital news and that 20% are either paying or prepared to pay for a subscription to a digital news service.

There is also a small but significant proportion of respondents (8%) willing to pay for casual access to digital news not readily catered for by current paywalls of major newspapers. Disposition to support free digital news and related services by way of a donation is low (4%).

**FIGURE 4.6: PAYING OR WILLING TO PAY FOR DIGITAL NEWS (%)**
BUYING A NEWSPAPER

38% of respondents bought a printed newspaper in the week preceding the survey. However, less than a third of them (12%) had the newspaper delivered at home at least once a week (Figure 4.7. Don’t know responses have been excluded from this analysis).

**FIGURE 4.7: BOUGHT A PRINTED NEWSPAPER LAST WEEK**
Q7. Have you bought (paid for) a printed newspaper in the last week? (This could be an ongoing print subscription or one off payment for a physical copy). Please select all that apply.

Those aged between 25-34 years were the least likely to have bought a printed newspaper in the previous week and those aged 65+ years were the most likely (Figure 4.9). Males (42.9%) were more likely than females (35.3%) to buy a newspaper (Figure 4.8). Levels of income or education were not correlated significantly with the buying of a newspaper.

Those using online and social media as their main source of news were the least likely to have bought a newspaper (26%) followed by those who used TV or radio as their main source (45%).

**FIGURE 4.8: BOUGHT A PRINTED NEWSPAPER, BY GENDER**

**FIGURE 4.9: BOUGHT A PRINTED NEWSPAPER, BY AGE**

50.1%
36.4%
32.3%
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COMMENTARY: A POTENTIALLY DISASTROUS SCENARIO

Steve Allen
Media analyst

Many traditional newspaper masthead publishers have been transitioning from print to a traditional/digital media mix for over 20 years. As publishers gave away their copy online, eyeballs were going to be side-tracked and copy sales were going to fall. And so it has come to pass.

In response to audience defection to online, traditional media companies swarmed to stake claims and capture territory on the internet channel, especially in Australia. Data from this year’s Digital News Report show that the top 10 most-accessed online news sites in Australia were all traditional media brands (although two were UK brands). ‘Dwell times’ – the amount of time that consumers spend on average each visit – tend to be longer for traditional news mastheads, which points to a certain level of brand knowledge and awareness.

The transition to online is important simply due to the economics of publishing. With most online news sites free of subscription cost, revenue from advertising has been the economic driver. For those traditional publishers who are successful in pursuing it, digital revenue is the fastest-growing revenue stream, with the advertising component comprising around 60% of revenue. Digital advertising revenue by itself can typically generate over 25% of total publishing revenue.

But this revenue stream is undermined by the proliferation of smartphones for mobile news access, and the uptake of ad-blocking, particularly on mobile.

News access via mobile device is the overwhelming province of consumers under 34 years of age and as mobile ad-blocking grows, the potential revenue challenge facing publishers is substantial. In short, mobile ad-blocking makes for very treacherous dynamics now and in the future.

To some extent, all consumers are resistant to paying in the digital space and often do not make the linear connection between paying for news content and the quality, accuracy and breadth of that content. The data from the Digital News Report show that 38% of respondents had paid for a print newspaper in the week preceding the survey but only 10% reported paying for online news. Furthermore, 74% of those not currently paying for news were unwilling to pay in the future.

This outlook is a little daunting to say the least. If revenue is further challenged by ad-blocking, then operating costs for creating news content will have to be reduced – which commonly involves shedding staff. This in turn arguably compromises content and, if content is compromised in its depth, breadth and/or accuracy, then the masthead is ultimately damaged over time.

This could create a potentially disastrous scenario in the not-too-distant future for both publishers and news consumers, ad-blocking or no.

Steve Allen has been forecasting, analysing and measuring the media marketing industries for three decades. He is a widely quoted source of market dimension, trend and commentary for the media industries. He has lectured widely, including UNSW, Macquarie University and UTS and judged on many media panels including Cannes Media Lions, Magazine Publishers, Publishers Australia, and CEASA Media Trends over many years.
24 MAY 2016. Nova Peris, the Northern Territory senator and first Indigenous woman elected to Australian Federal parliament, announced she would not recontest her seat. It has been suggested that Peris is seeking a senior role with the Australian Football League.
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5 ONLINE NEWS VIDEO

MEGAN DEAS

• Reading news stories was the most popular way respondents looked at news (58.4%), while watching online news video was the third most popular option (27.4%).

• Consumption of online news videos via social networks and news websites/apps is almost equal (34.4% and 33.4% respectively).

• Almost as many respondents in non-urban areas as those in urban areas reported that they had watched an online news video in the week prior to the survey.

• When online news videos are consumed, 51.7% of respondents prefer to watch on a desktop or laptop while 27.7% prefer to watch on a smartphone.

• More affluent and more highly educated respondents were more likely to watch news video.

• The main reason for not watching online news video is a perception of convenience, not a concern about cost of access.
58.4% of respondents to the 2016 survey reported that “Reading news stories or articles” was their most common way of consuming online news in the week prior to the survey. Watching online news was comparatively popular (27.4%). Taken together, online visual media – e.g. online video, picture galleries and infographics – are significant secondary sources of online news content; however, written content remains most popular (Figure 5.1).

More males than females reported having engaged with online news overall with 60.3% of males and 56.5% of females having read news stories or articles. Likewise more males reported watching online news video than females (30.1% and 24.9% respectively). While a similar percentage of men and women had looked at a gallery of news pictures such as a series of photographs related to a print news story (17.6% and 17% respectively), twice as many men had looked at a news graphic than women (12.3% as opposed to 6.2%).

FIGURE 5.1: LOOKING AT NEWS ONLINE (%)
Q11. Thinking of the way you looked at news online (via any device) in the last week, which of the following ways of consuming news did you use? Please select ALL that apply.

58.4% of respondents to the 2016 survey reported that “Reading news stories or articles” was their most common way of consuming online news in the week prior to the survey. Watching online news was comparatively popular (27.4%). Taken together, online visual media – e.g. online video, picture galleries and infographics – are significant secondary sources of online news content; however, written content remains most popular (Figure 5.1).

More males than females reported having engaged with online news overall with 60.3% of males and 56.5% of females having read news stories or articles. Likewise more males reported watching online news video than females (30.1% and 24.9% respectively). While a similar percentage of men and women had looked at a gallery of news pictures such as a series of photographs related to a print news story (17.6% and 17% respectively), twice as many men had looked at a news graphic than women (12.3% as opposed to 6.2%).

FIGURE 5.2: WATCHED AN ONLINE NEWS VIDEO (BY AGE, INCOME AND EDUCATION)
Whilst results from the Reuters Institute’s 2016 international survey indicate that ‘TV news is increasingly for old people’, the Australian survey results reveal that older respondents were both the highest consumers of TV news as well as the highest consumers of online video. When asked the question “You say you’ve used these sources of news in the last week, which would you say is your MAIN source of news?”, 48.1% of 55- to 64-year-olds and 45.5% of those aged 65+ reported TV as their main source of news, followed by online news at 22.9% and 22% respectively (with print newspapers the main source of news for only 12.6% of those aged 55-64 and 16.1% of those aged 65+).

Online news videos were slightly more popular with older consumers with 29.6% of those aged 65+ having watched online video as opposed to 25.9% of 18- to 24-year-olds and 25.6% of 25- to 34-year-olds. These figures contrast with the consumption of all online video by age, reported by the Australian Multi-Screen Report for Q4 2015.

This report states that older Australians were the lowest consumers overall of all online video (i.e. beyond news video) via PC or laptop with adults aged 65+ years reporting they watched an average of 3 hours and 55 seconds of online video per month and 50-64 year olds reporting they watched an average of 5 hours and 51 minutes per month in Q4 2015, compared to the average 19 hours and 59 seconds per month watched by 18-24 year olds. See also an analysis of online news video consumption by age at Figure 5.7 (below). Respondents in the higher income and education brackets were more likely to have watched online video, with 33.5% of high income earners and 31% of those with a postgraduate education having watched online video in the past week.

**Reasons for Not Watching Online News Videos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find reading articles quicker and more convenient</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather watch on a bigger screen</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They take too long to load up/start playing</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many have pre-roll adverts which tend to put me off</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about the cost of access (e.g. via mobile)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos don’t tend to add anything that is not in the text story</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have access to sound (e.g. at work)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.3: Reasons for Not Watching Online News Video**

Opt11ai. You said that you don’t usually watch news videos online. Why not? Please select all that apply.

Out of those who reported that they do not regularly watch news videos online, the primary motivation is a perception of convenience rather than concern over cost. Of those who responded that they do not usually watch news videos online, 35.9% stated that they found reading articles quicker and more convenient while only 17.8% were concerned about the cost of access – e.g. mobile data charges.

An analysis of Qt11ai by age at Figure 5.4 indicates that nearly half of respondents aged 65+ found reading articles quicker and more convenient (49.6%). This was significantly higher than the responses received from other age groups, with the second-highest response to this question (from those aged 45-54 years) at 36.3%. Only 15.3% of 55-64 year olds and 14.5% of those aged 65+ reported that they were concerned about the cost of access.
Other reasons given for not watching online news videos were the length of time taken to load the videos (26.4%), being put off by pre-roll advertising (26%) and a preference to watch news videos on a larger screen (26.5%). More men responded that they were more put off by pre-roll advertising than women (29.6% compared to 22.8%) whereas more women (28.5%) than men (24.4%) said they would prefer to watch news video on a bigger screen. Older respondents also reported a preference to watch online news videos on a larger screen, with 36.3% of those aged 55-64 years and 32.7% of those in the 65+ age bracket indicating this was a factor in their decision not to usually watch online news videos. While only 16.9% of those surveyed responded that ‘videos don’t tend to add anything that is not in the text story’, this sentiment was about twice as prevalent among those with a postgraduate education (31.9%) than those with some university or no university education (16.2% and 14.8% respectively). Interestingly more people aged 18-24 years than in any other age bracket felt that online news videos did not add any new information (23.1% of respondents aged 18-24 years).
Overall responses to the question of why online news videos were not watched indicate that fewer than 20% were concerned about the cost of access e.g. mobile data charges. However, a closer examination of the survey data reveals that cost of access did concern particular groups. Although the 25-34 age bracket was most likely to watch online news video on a smartphone (49.8%), this same age bracket was the most concerned about the cost of accessing news videos (21.6%). Perhaps as a consequence of cost of access, the 25-34 year age group was also the most likely to be put off by the length of time taken for the videos to load (30.7%).

Similar levels of respondents from both urban (28.2%) and non-urban (24.8%) regions reported watching an online news video in the week prior to the survey.

This similarity in urban and non-urban consumption is supported by a recent research snapshot released by the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) which addresses the degrees of online engagement by Australians living in different regions. The ACMA snapshot found that at June 2015 “80 per cent of Australians living in non-urban areas reported a broadband connection at home, compared with only 61 per cent four years ago”, the largest increase for any region in Australia and only 6% less than the national average.

Slightly fewer residents of non-urban areas reported watching online news video on a smartphone than those in urban areas (25.1% compared to 28.3%). 55.6% of non-urban residents reported watching online news video on a computer, compared to 50.7% of those in urban areas. These findings are again reflected by ACMA’s research snapshot, which reports that only 37% of Australians living in non-urban areas used their mobile phones to go online in the last year, well below the national average of 55%.

Almost as many respondents in non-urban areas as those in urban areas reported that they had watched an online news video in the week prior to the survey.

Responses to the optional question 11D at Figure 5.5 confirm a preference amongst respondents to read news in text format, with 33.5% of those who answered the question indicating that they mostly read news in text. 37.1% indicated that while they mostly read news in text, they occasionally watch an online news video that looks interesting, and 11.5% stated that they watched news videos and read news stories in equal amounts. Despite this, just 3.7% of respondents reported that they ‘mostly watch news video’.

Figure 5.5: Online News Habits
OptQ11d. In thinking about your online news habits, which of the following statements applies best to you? Please select one.
Overall survey results for the question ‘Which of the following statements best matches your consumption of online news video? Please select one’ show a very similar level of preference between those who primarily watch online news videos on social networks such as Facebook, YouTube and Twitter and those who opt to watch them via a news website or app (see Table 5.1). However, upon closer inspection, more disparity is identified when analysing responses according to gender, age and education.

Almost 40% of female respondents watch news video mostly via social networks while less than a third of males watched videos this way. More than 40% of males were more likely to access a news website or app directly to watch a news video, as opposed to 26.6% of females. Those with a postgraduate education were more likely to watch online videos via a news website or app (45.1%) while those who had not been to university preferred to watch news videos via social networks (37.4%, Figure 5.6).

Younger respondents were also more likely to watch news videos via social networks, with 56.1% of 18- to 24-year-olds and 44.5% of 25- to 34-year-olds reporting that they primarily consumed news videos this way. The preference for watching news video via social network declined as age increased, while the preference for watching news video via a news website or app was highest in the 65+ age bracket (with 40.1% of respondents) compared to just 14.6% of 18-24 year olds reporting they had watched a video via a news website or app (Figure 5.7).

![Figure 5.6: Consumption of Online News Video, by Gender](image)

**TABLE 5.1: CONSUMPTION OF ONLINE NEWS VIDEO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly watch via social networks</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly watch on a news website or app</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t watch any online news video</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.6: Consumption of Online News Video, by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Mostly watch via social networks</th>
<th>Mostly watch on a news website or app</th>
<th>Don’t watch any online news video</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.7: Consumption of Online News Video (Platform), by Age**

**OVERALL, SIMILAR NUMBERS OF RESPONDENTS WATCHED ONLINE NEWS VIDEO ON SOCIAL MEDIA AS VIA WEBSITES/APPS**
FIGURE 5.8: CONSUMPTION OF ONLINE NEWS VIDEO (DEVICE), BY AGE (%)
Q11f if Q11e. Which of the following statements best matches your consumption of online news video?

Overall, computers (desktops and laptops) were the preferred device for watching news videos for just over half of respondents (51.8%) while only 13.7% preferred watching on a tablet. Males were more likely than females to watch online news videos on a computer (59.7% vs. 44%) while more females than males preferred watching on a smartphone (32.8% vs. 22.3%).

Smartphone use was highest in the 25-34 age bracket with half of this age group preferring to watch videos on their mobile device. Of the three options, tablet use was the lowest across all categories of gender, age, income and education. Notably 18% of 55-64 year olds mostly watched news videos on their tablet, but only 8.6% of 18-25 year olds preferred a tablet to a smartphone or a computer.

Watching online news video was the third most popular method of consuming news; but with less than 30% of respondents indicating that they had watched a news video in the week before the survey, online news videos have yet to become a replacement for reading news articles for many Australians.

Key points for examination in next year’s Digital News Report: Australia will include whether computers are still the primary device on which to watch online news videos or whether the increasing popularity of smartphones will alter viewing habits; and whether consumption of news videos via social networks remains the most popular platform to watch videos.

THE SUPER SHARERS
BY MICHELLE DUNNE BREEN

A growing number of survey respondents internationally are indicating that social media are their main source of news. In Australia this amounted to nearly a fifth (17.5%) of 2016 survey respondents (p.7 Figure 1.1 Key Findings section). Levels of “proactive participation” in news – via blogging, commenting, liking etc. – vary across all 26 countries surveyed in 2016, with high levels of participation in urban Brazil and low levels in Japan (p.18 Fig.2.3). But looking closer we find a small core of people who are doing most of the sharing: the Super Sharers.

Highlighted by Unruly’s 2014 Geography of Sharing report these Super Sharers can be described as heavy news users, consuming via multiple devices and with a preference for ‘hard’ news. Significantly in 2016 the highest proportion of Australian respondents (36.6%) said the main way they came across news in the past week via online, mobile and social platforms was by accessing social media via smartphones. This illustrates the potential reach and impact of Super Sharers (Table 5.2).

SUPER SHARERS AND ONLINE VIDEO

Where Super Sharers could arguably make the most impact on news circulation – and by default, news consumption – is on dissemination of video content. Video sharing is integral to the business strategies of Facebook, Twitter and online news sites even though this year’s data indicate that users are just not engaging with online news video in the numbers for which some producers are aiming (Figure 5.1, p.41).

The Facebook algorithm is favouring those sharing video, and the network is trying to out-pace YouTube as the go-to platform for video. Likewise Twitter is aiming to remove the character ‘penalty’ incurred for posting pics and videos, suggesting it too is wishing to accommodate increased video sharing.

Therefore our finding that less than 30% of Australian respondents indicated that they had watched a news video in the week prior to the survey raises some important questions for any strategy aimed at boosting online news video consumption. Whether Super Sharers will be an important player in such a strategy remains to be seen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PC</th>
<th></th>
<th>SMARTPHONE</th>
<th></th>
<th>TABLET</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly accessed one or more news websites apps</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a search engine and typed in a keyword for the name of a particular website</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a search engine and typed in a keyword about a particular news story</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a website or mobile app that pulls together different news links</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used social media and came across news that way</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got news via an email newsletter or email alert</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a news alert through an app on my mobile phone/tablet or via SMS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5.2: MAIN WAY OF COMING ACROSS NEWS STORIES
Q10a. Which is the MAIN way in which you come across news stories?
If there is one thing digital media are good at, it is generating data. Never have media organisations had such a rich supply of detailed information about how the audience is using – or not using – what we produce. While access to this data may seem like a boon, it can be a double-edged sword. The numbers are only part of the picture: the real value lies in drawing insights from those numbers and using those insights to inform decisions. That is where the magic lies and that is why reports like this are so valuable. They provide the context that helps turn numbers into insights.

So what online news video behaviours does this year’s report highlight? While reading text is the most popular method of consuming news for respondents, more than a quarter (27.4%) reported watching video in the previous week. Respondents were equally likely to play that video on social networks (34.4%) and news websites or apps (33.4%). Perhaps surprisingly – given the smartphone is now the digital device of choice – respondents were far more likely to watch news video on a desktop (51.7%) rather than a phone (27.7%). Even more surprisingly, the age group that reported playing news video in greatest numbers was 65+ (29.6%), out-performing 18-24s (25.9%) and 25-34s (25.6%). The challenge for media decision makers is to take these findings and use them to try to answer three key questions:

- What is this telling us?
- Does this represent a changing trend in user behaviour?
- How do we change our approach as a result?

Unfortunately, digital media – especially video – are complex, so the answers can be difficult to discern. Gone are the days of predictable media consumption: the sit-back behaviour associated with TV, the ‘in the background companion’ of radio and the daily, mostly morning, habit of newspapers. With each new device comes a new set of behaviours and that means newsrooms need to change their output to fit those behaviours.

For example, we know our mobile audience comes to the ABC more often each month than our desktop audience. But mobile sessions are shorter. The predominant mobile behaviours are therefore snacking and scanning, which means content made for desktop does not work so well on mobile.

This demands the testing of different methods, discarding what does not work and building on what does – an environment of constant change. As if this is not complex enough, the rise of social networks as news sources has created an ever-expanding array of different user behaviours for which our news stories need to be tailored.

At ABC News Digital we long ago realised that even the most beautifully crafted TV news package does not perform particularly well online. So we changed our approach to ensure the video we attach is complementary to the text, rather than replicating it. The difficulty now is that what works when embedded in the stories on our website does not work on Facebook. And what works on Facebook is not tuned for the needs of the YouTube audience. And none of those necessarily work that well on Instagram. Then there is Snapchat, where short, uneditable grabs get stitched together to form ‘stories’. We face a world in which a single story may need four or five video executions if it is to be tailored to the dominant user behaviours of each of these platforms.

This understanding is pivotal to success on social. ABC News has been a leader on social platforms. We have the number one news presence in Australia on Facebook (>2m fans), Twitter (>1m followers), YouTube (almost 80k subscribers) and Instagram (>113k followers). We have achieved this by treating each service as a legitimate platform in its own right. So on Facebook, our videos are short and punchy with text overlays so they can be watched with no sound and front-loaded so the most compelling pictures are in the first three seconds. On YouTube the offering is closer to a traditional ‘sit-back’ experience but focused on talking points, powerful raw footage, quirky and entertaining clips and explainers that break down the issues behind the news. On Instagram, the video effort is all about aesthetics – our Instagram audience wants beautiful images so that is what we give them.

In a media environment where there are very few certainties, there is one you can bank on – change will continue to be a constant and the landscape will get even more complex. So data that lead to insights about audience behaviour will only become more valuable.
NEWS MOMENTS OF 2016
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The big shift in recent years is the rise of app-based access to news associated primarily with mobile devices.

There is a pretty even split between online news consumers using smartphones and tablets (47.3%) compared to laptops and desktops (48.8%) as their main source of news (Table 6.1).
Online news consumers shift from a wayfinding navigation of the web (what used to be called ‘pull’ media) to dipping in and out of a constant news flow structured as a personalised feed (what used to be called ‘push’ media). One response by news-based media companies is to make their content accessible as a part of this flow through a strategy of ‘distributed content’, a term popularised by BuzzFeed to describe a strategy for monetising how their followers on various social media channels engage with their content.

Commentators often use the metaphor of the ‘new homepage’ to describe the relationship between audiences and social media services. Realistically, media content producers have not controlled the relation of attention with a homepage since the domination of the online experience by search engines from the mid-2000s. What commentators are trying to represent is the new set of habits that audiences are developing around social media.

Distributed content is not a news-based strategy as much as it is a mechanism for thinking about how to capture some of the attention from media consumers by trying to seamlessly insert your content (and brand) into their feed. In effect the ‘content’ of distributed content is delivered to users like any other piece of algorithmically tuned content. Does the distributed content strategy offer traditional media content producers a robust mechanism for monetising their audience through social media? The evidence at this stage is mixed.

### DISCOVERY

Just over half of respondents to this year’s Digital News Report: Australia survey indicated that they use social media as a source of news (52.2%, see p.7 Figure 1.1) but only 36% nominated social media as one of the ways they came across news (p.10, Figure 1.4). The difference between the two figures – 16.2% of total news consumers or 31% of social media users who use social media as a source of news – are discovering news somewhere else other than social media. This ‘discovery gap’ presents a missed economic opportunity for a distributed content strategy premised on monetising discovery through social media platforms.

A distributed content strategy relies on social media users who have already changed their habits in order to use social media platforms for discovering news. Survey respondents indicated a range of relevant reasons including 51.5% who agree that social media platforms are ‘fast for breaking news’ and the 34.4% who use social media for news because it ‘alerts them when there is something worth knowing’. It will be interesting to see if this figure changes over the next few years.

The evident discovery gap might indicate why BuzzFeed’s recently leaked economic figures are not as strong as projected. The market can only get tougher, considering Facebook has opened up its Instant Articles service to all publishers. If news consumption is broadly understood to be a habitual practice, then projecting growth at the ‘speed of clicks’ in the tech world needs to be readjusted for taking into account the rate at which news consumers change their habits in the real world.

In Australia this is nowhere more apparent than with the state of Fairfax Media. The practices of journalists were once thought to be a primary barrier to innovation but it could be argued that Fairfax Media management is somewhat stuck between the expectations of shareholders and the sticky habits of its audience. Although Fairfax Media’s audience is evidently changing its habits, it is not happening quickly enough – if share price is an indicator. Experiments by public broadcaster the ABC to encourage new audience habits are therefore important from a journalistic perspective for the entire industry.
IF NEWS CONSUMPTION IS BROADLY UNDERSTOOD TO BE A HABITUAL PRACTICE, THEN PROJECTING GROWTH AT THE ‘SPEED OF CLICKS’ IN THE TECH WORLD NEEDS TO BE READJUSTED FOR TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE RATE AT WHICH NEWS CONSUMERS CHANGE THEIR HABITS IN THE REAL WORLD

SHARING

One of the hidden outcomes of the rise of distributed content is the diminished importance of audience members sharing and therefore discussing news-based media content. Facebook uses an algorithm that counts a number of user and friend actions to determine the relative value of a piece of content.

Unlike the era of online news dominated by homepages and email, audience members do not actually need to send each other content, they can just share it to their own walls (or post to their own followers) and it then appears in their friends’ feeds – based on the relative value of the content as determined by Facebook’s (or Twitter’s) algorithm. The rise of distributed content is therefore also the rise of indirect sharing.

Influential US blogger Ezra Klein has suggested that the majority of social media users will be the recipients of indirect sharing, which means that these social media users rely on a very small number of power users who visit news outlet webpages to discover news. The major difference between light consumers of news (1-2 stories per week) and heavy consumers of news (more than 3 stories per day) is that 45.4% of heavy news consumers directly accessed one or more news sites while only 20.9% of light news users accessed news sites. These are the ‘influencer’ news consumers that are at the ‘beginning’ of social chains.

NEW ANALYTICS NEEDED

There is a dearth of effective ways to measure the value of an audience. Simplistic representations of user activity have diminished in importance as publishers surrender control over the ability to measure traffic. BuzzFeed Publisher Dao Nguyen has indicated that unique visitors “as they are currently reported are decreasingly relevant to BuzzFeed.”

Instead, BuzzFeed is turning to other ways of measuring engagement, including what it calls ‘subscribers’ and ‘engagements’. Both are audience-centric measures of content value. ‘Engagement’ occurs when an audience member performs an action (for example, ‘likes’ or ‘shares’) that sends a countable signal to an analytics platform. Subscribers are:

- people who have taken an action to show an interest in the BuzzFeed brand, such as people who use our mobile apps, sign up for our newsletters, visit our homepage, or follow our social feeds.

The 2016 survey data show an increase in the number of respondents who indicated they do not follow key groups that represent a significant slice of the explicitly political media participants in the public sphere e.g. a news organisation, journalist, political party, politician or campaigning group. In the 2015 survey, 38.6% of respondents indicated they did not subscribe to any of these groups; in the 2016 survey this figure was 59.9% (calculated as 1,208 responding ‘None of these’ as % of total survey respondents, n=2,021 - see Table 6.2).

### Table 6.2: Followers of Key Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>% of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News organisation</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political party</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning group</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12gg. When using social media like Facebook, Google Plus, YouTube or Twitter, have you subscribed to or followed any of the following? Please select all that apply.
AD-BLOCKING

Distributed content is attractive to media content producers because the monetisation of the relation of attention is partially outsourced to the distribution platform. The core tension is now around the extent to which audiences employ ad-blocking software.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop or Desktop computer/s</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablet computer(s) e.g. iPad, Samsung Galaxy, Hudl etc.</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone(s) e.g. iPhone, Samsung, Nokia Lumia etc.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/ can’t recall</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6.3: RESPONDENTS WHO USE AD-BLOCKING SOFTWARE**

QAD4. On which, if any, of the following personal devices do you currently use software that allows you to block adverts on the internet? Please select all that apply.


Since the publication of last year’s Digital News Report, Facebook has eaten the world – at least according to Emily Bell, one of the closest watchers of modern media. What the former digital editor for The Guardian means is that, through a combination of the magnetic pull of Facebook’s news feeds for millions around the globe and the swift rise of ad-blocking software, the major mainstream media companies’ plans to offset declining revenue from print products by drawing mass traffic to their digital websites is under threat, if not underwater.
Bell’s insights were delivered in March 2016 and it is well-nigh impossible to predict what else will have changed before the next Digital News Report is published – but amid these rapid, swirling currents, I want to rescue two swimmers and put them on the river bank for closer inspection. One is a multiple gold-medal winner gasping for air in unfamiliar conditions, while the other used to drop out in the heats but is now threatening to reach the finals and perhaps even place. I am referring first to the mainstream news media companies and, second, to the nation’s journalism schools. The former has been shedding editorial jobs at a punishing rate in recent years while the latter is becoming a provider of innovative and high-quality journalism projects.

Let’s examine these developments one by one; they are inter-related and have ramifications for the future of the news media.

Internet-enabled communication technologies have laid waste to the business models that long provided plump profits for newspaper companies. Illustrating the maxim that sometimes your greatest strength can be your greatest weakness, newspaper companies in Australia and overseas failed to protect the revenue they earned from classified advertising. The elegantly compiled bundle of news, entertainment, service information and advertisements that was the 20th-century newspaper was unstitched by the internet, which created stand-alone websites to meet customers’ individualised needs for jobs, cars, real estate or other products and services.

As Australia’s two biggest print media companies – News Corporation Australia and Fairfax Media – continue struggling to find a new business model, they have responded to collapsing revenues by slashing costs throughout their business, especially by making many of their journalists redundant. Between 2012 and 2015 more than 1800 newspaper journalists in Australia lost their jobs as well as a smaller but unknown number of broadcast and cross-platform journalists, according to the New Beats research team which is led by La Trobe University’s Lawrie Zion and of which I am a member (www.newbeatsblog.com). There is no sign of a slowdown in the number of job losses in mainstream media companies, with Fairfax announcing a further 120-plus redundancies in early 2016.

The redundancy rounds of recent years have also coincided with the rise of the 24-hour news cycle and with social media. Journalists now file stories the moment news breaks, whether by tweeting or by live-blogging, and they are now required to file audio, video and online reports as well as stories for the next day’s newspaper. The departure from newsrooms of many experienced journalists, combined with a ratcheting-up of the number of stories those remaining need to file, prompts questions about the ability of mainstream media companies to continue to provide the kind of quality journalism for which they are known.
That is a crucial issue; the media industry is far from alone in experiencing digital disruption, but newspapers have long been the engine room of what Eric Beecher – proprietor of Private Media Partners – calls ‘public interest’ journalism; that is, journalism that keeps a watching brief on society’s main institutions. The media outlets’ ability to perform this role may be diminishing as the big city newsrooms are hollowed out but it remains important for journalism and by extension for democratic societies.

As the dwindling of editorial resources in newsrooms has begun to bite, journalism schools have stepped up to take on at least some of the responsibility for providing Beecher’s ‘public interest’ journalism. Such a step was unexpected because the role of journalism schools historically was confined to preparing students to work in the big city newsrooms or the many regional and rural newspapers and broadcast outlets. They did this in service to an industry that was profitable, powerful and habitually sceptical about the value and relevance of university courses to teach a vocation many media executives believed was best learnt on the job, in the so-called ‘university of life’. If journalism schools were acknowledged, it was as providers of semi-ready graduates who would be knocked into shape through the traditional cadetship system.

Journalism schools have recruited some of those made redundant in newsrooms to work alongside established journalism academics; the schools have also seen gaps in news coverage opened up by continuing downsizing, and have been incorporating projects into their curricula which have the twin aims and benefits of giving students real-world journalistic experience and of providing audiences with stories they would not otherwise have seen or read. The former helps students to understand journalism beyond the classroom, while the latter goes to the original purpose of journalism – telling readers something they don’t already know.

Several of these projects have already been published by mainstream news outlets which are recognising – even if only tacitly – the professional quality of the student work. In 2013, Caroline Graham and her students at Bond University worked with Crikey.com.au on a project entitled Order in the House. This ambitious initiative analysed 10,000 speeches and 3,000 questions to assess parliamentarians’ levels of political involvement. One of the biggest data-driven political investigations in Australia at the time, the stories are available here: www.crikey.com.au/tag/order-in-the-house/.

In the same year, Bill Birnbauer and his students at Monash University created the Dangerous Ground reporting project which aimed at tracking the effectiveness – or otherwise – of environmental regulation in Victoria. Students’ stories were published in the Herald Sun, The Sunday Age, Crikey.com.au, ABC television’s Stateline program and in suburban newspapers. The project’s website is here: artsonline.monash.edu.au/dangerousground/.
At the University of Canberra, I have worked with students over the past three years to produce investigative projects in collaboration with *The Australian* and more recently, *The Guardian Australia*. On one project, students summarised and analysed 600 submissions to a senate committee inquiry into the then federal Labor government’s planned amendments to the Racial Discrimination Act; while in 2015 students tested the then-Prime Minister Tony Abbott’s assertion that the cross-bench controlled senate was “feral” by assessing the record of bills passed and blocked in the senate and comparing that to previous senates. Stories from the first project were published in *The Weekend Australian* on 25 May 2013, and the story and accompanying student-made video for the latter are here: www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2015/aug/10/crossbenchers-insist-tony-abbotts-feral-senate-is-simply-doing-its-job.

The latest and most ambitious project is *UniPollWatch*, a cross-campus student-driven journalism project that is a first for Australia and – to the best of my knowledge – the world. Initiated by Swinburne University’s journalism program director, Andrew Dodd, *UniPollWatch* is a collaboration between 28 journalism programs around Australia to cover the 2016 Federal election. Overseen by journalism academics, students will report on all 150 House of Representatives seat as well as the state of the Senate. They will provide a profile of each electorate, interviews with as many candidates as makes themselves available and a range of background briefing pieces about major policy areas that will feature in the election, such as health, education, defence, national security and communications.

As befits a project driven by student reporting, much of the content will be relatively straightforward journalistically – but there is value in providing such information for every seat because the diminished resources of big metropolitan news organisations has affected their ability to cover rural and remote areas in particular. Taking advantage of the hundreds of students working on the project, every candidate for the election will be asked their views about campaign donations and whether they are willing to disclose the source of any donations now rather than wait until after the election, which is the standard process. This will provide valuable information, given recent controversies about lack of timely transparency in political donations. Even if many candidates decline to answer the question – which is more likely than not – that in itself would be a news story that would provide concrete information and a platform for further political discussion.

Questions about, say, fact-checking and legal clearance of students’ stories are important but beyond the scope of this short essay. The project is being hosted by the Journalism Education and Research Association of Australia (JERAA) and is collaborating with *The Guardian Australia* which will publish (and pay students for) any stories it deems nationally newsworthy. The *UniPollWatch* project is being built as this essay was written, so its success or otherwise is not known yet. What is important to note here is the potential of the *UniPollWatch* model for collaborative staff-student projects that have the capacity to be bigger than the sum of their parts. If *UniPollWatch* does succeed, the model could be extended to other projects that may be more investigative in nature or which may identify areas of society that are being under-reported. There is even scope for the *UniPollWatch* model to be extended overseas, either as a direct export or for transnational collaborative projects.

No-one would argue that this limited number of student-driven projects replaces mainstream media outlets, but they do illustrate the continuing value of having resources to commit to a project; and they do add to the diversity of news and views available to audiences.

**Projects:**


*Dangerous Ground*. artsonline.monash.edu.au/dangerousandground/

University of Canberra journalism project. www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2015/aug/10/crossbenchers-insist-tony-abbotts-feral-senate-is-simply-doing-its-job

*UniPollWatch*. www.unipollwatch.org.au

1 www.cjr.org/analysis/facebook…and…and_media.php
TRUST
COMMENTARY:
MAINTAINING TRUST – A SHARED ENTERPRISE

Attitudinal surveys in Australia about trust are notoriously confounding. Lawyers, for example, usually rate very poorly. However, when asked, Australians admire and respect their own lawyers – it is all those other lawyers they despise. And they want their own children to study law at university, and place judges at or near the top of the rankings, despite them being former lawyers.

If lawyers come in two basic flavours according to popular perception, then ‘news organisations’ must throw up an increasingly fragmented series of images. Traditionally, the public thinks of ‘broadsheet’ newspapers as representing the quality end of the print market, with a higher degree of accuracy and integrity in reporting. Despite the lower expectations, the ‘tabloids’ have enjoyed higher circulation. Then there are the ‘mainstream media’ – with broad coverage of news, current affairs, sports and entertainment – as opposed to specialised publications focused on business, say, or dedicated to a specific interest group, such as surfers, fashionistas or movie buffs.

The Australian media are currently in a period of dynamic change driven by new information and communications technologies, globalisation, increasing competition for readers and advertisers, and other factors – all of which raise ‘trust’ issues for those involved in news production.

The two major news organisations, News Corp and Fairfax Media, have already developed major presences online (news.com.au and fairfax.com.au) and while these could be seen as supplementing their print operations, the indications are that the high costs of print production and distribution will soon lead to abandonment of daily print output in favour of online distribution, with print operations limited to weekends. This is especially true of Fairfax, which already runs online-only operations in Queensland (brisbanetimes.com.au) and Western Australia (watoday.com.au) and whose management has been wondering out loud about when (not if) to cease daily print publication, and how to engage further with social media platforms (e.g. Facebook and Google).

The digital revolution has also brought with it many new voices into the marketplace of ideas. Historically, the Australian media market has been among the least diverse in the developed world, with a few majors controlling a high proportion of print circulation and broadcast licenses. The relative ease of establishing an online news operation has brought in many new entrants, both local sites such as New Matilda, The New Daily, Crikey and Mumbrella – and overseas transplants e.g. The Daily Mail Online, Huffington Post Australia and Guardian Australia.

At the same time, most Australian news organisations have been cutting staff – sometimes dramatically – and the phenomenon of mass redundancies and ‘hollowed-out’ newsrooms has itself become news. They are also experimenting with new business models as advertising revenues decline (having migrated to social media) usually involving some mix of paywalls, sponsored content and ‘click-bait’ strategies – all of which pose serious threats to maintaining readers’ trust if handled without a clear focus on ethics and independence.

The Australian Press Council comprises roughly 900 mastheads, including almost all newspapers and magazines (95% of circulation). The Council is constantly seeking to engage with other publishers, so it now boasts a growing collection of the major online-only news sites, as well as the first members from the thriving multicultural or ‘ethnic’ press sector. The Council is also continually testing its Standards of Practice to ensure they are sufficiently robust and aligned with emerging technological, commercial and cultural environments. This includes changing social attitudes, such as towards the reporting of family violence, sexual orientation, race and religion. In recent times, complaints have been rising by 10-15% pa, but the number of individual complainants has been increasing by over 300% pa – indicating community confidence in the Council as well as the power of social media in harnessing outrage.

If there is one thing upon which editors, journalists, the general community and the Press Council can completely agree, it is that the critical factor for success in this highly contestable environment will be the ability to maintain public trust in a masthead’s ethics, independence and integrity. This effort should be seen as a shared enterprise involving dedicated editors and journalists, a vigilant public and an effective Press Council.

Professor David Weisbrot AM FAAL DLitt is the Chair of the Australian Press Council. He is Emeritus Professor of Law and Honorary Professor of Medicine at the University of Sydney. He has written or edited ten books and well over 200 official reports, journal articles and conference papers. Professor Weisbrot was awarded a Centenary Medal by the Australian Government in 2003 and in 2006 was made a Member of the Order of Australia (AM).
To capture some of the main dimensions of the complex concept of trust in news, the *Digital News Report: Australia* 2016 survey comprised these measures of trust: general news trust, trust in news organisations, and trust in journalists. This year’s survey finds that trust in news organisations and in journalists is far less than general news trust.
GENERAL TRUST IN NEWS

For general news trust, participants were asked if they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: ‘I think you can trust most news most of the time’. Participants could strongly disagree, tend to disagree, neither agree nor disagree, tend to agree or strongly agree with the statement.

This 5-point scale has been coded as trust (strongly agree, tend to agree), neither trust nor distrust (neither agree nor disagree), and do not trust (tend to disagree, strongly disagree).

About 43% of participants agreed with the statement ‘I think you can trust most news most of the time’. Finland recorded the highest level of general news trust with 65% and Greece the lowest at 20% among all the 26 countries surveyed by the Digital News Report in 2016.

Australia is equivalent in general news trust with Norway and Austria – at the mid-point among the 26 countries in the 2016 surveys. In a comparison of English-speaking countries, Australia and the USA are the lowest in general news trust compared to Canada, UK and Ireland, as Figure 8.1 shows.

In Australia 25.5% of participants do not trust news and about 31% neither trust nor distrust news most of the time. There are no differences in trust across differing age groups, gender, and household income.

However, those with some university education and postgraduate education are less likely to trust news most of the time than those with a high-school education or less.

TRUST IN NEWS ORGANISATIONS AND JOURNALISTS

Trust in news organisations and trust in journalists were measured by asking participants to endorse, using the same 5-point scale as above, the following statements: ‘I think you can trust most news organisations most of the time’ and ‘I think you can trust most journalists most of the time’.

FIGURE 8.2: GENERAL NEWS TRUST, TRUST IN NEWS ORGANISATIONS AND TRUST IN JOURNALISTS
Trust in news organisations and in journalists is far less than general news trust, as Figure 8.2 above shows. Trust in news organisations is about 39% with 27.5% not trusting news organisations. Trust in journalists is only about 32% with about 30% not trusting.

The 18- to 24-year-old age group has slightly less trust in news organisations than older age groups as do those participants with a postgraduate education.

Participants with postgraduate education are slightly more likely to be less trusting of journalists, than those with lower levels of formal education. Taken together, these data suggest that demographics are not strong predictors of general trust in news, trust in news organisations or trust in journalists.

PERSONALISATION OF NEWS AND ALGORITHMS

To further explore the concept of trust, participants were asked about their attitudes to the selection process and personalisation of news, as follows:

‘Every news website, mobile app or social network makes decisions about what content to show to you. These decisions can be made by editors and journalists or by computer algorithms analysing information about what other content you have used, or on the basis of what you and your friends share and interact with on social media. With this in mind, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

Having stories automatically selected for me on the basis of what I have consumed in the past is a good way to get news.

Having stories selected for me by editors and journalists is a good way to get news

Having stories automatically selected for me on the basis of what my friends have consumed is a good way to get news’.

Nearby 22% of participants agree with the statement that editorial decisions are a good way to get news compared to about 33% who agreed that having stories automatically selected for them (via a computer algorithm) on the basis of what they have consumed in the past is a good way to get news, as shown in Figure 8.3.
Younger participants are more likely to support algorithms. Such a finding is consistent with younger participant’s widespread use of social media, as discussed in section three on News Access and Consumption, p. 24.

About 48% of 18-24-year-olds agreed that having stories automatically selected for them on the basis of what they have consumed in the past was a good way to get news compared to only about 21% of 55-64 and 25% of those aged 65+. Similarly, 32% of 18-24-year-olds agreed that having stories automatically selected for them on the basis of what their friends have consumed was a good way to get news compared to about 13% of those aged 55+.

But is the reverse the case? Are older participants more likely to rely upon editorial decisions than younger participants who rely on algorithms? The data show the opposite. About 28% of 18- to 24-year-olds agreed that having stories selected for them by editors and journalists was a good way to get news compared to only about 17% of 55- to 64-year-olds and 19% of those aged 65+.

Participants were asked to consider negative consequences from the personalisation of news using algorithms. Did they worry about missing out on important information, missing out on challenging viewpoints, and that their privacy was placed at greater risk?

There are no differences in levels of concern among differing age groups. But participants with higher household incomes, and those with higher formal levels of education, are more likely to worry that by using algorithms they will miss out on important information and challenging viewpoints.

### ABOUT 48% OF 18-24 YEAR-OLDS AGREED THAT HAVING STORIES AUTOMATICALLY SELECTED FOR THEM ON THE BASIS OF WHAT THEY HAVE CONSUMED IN THE PAST WAS A GOOD WAY TO GET NEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I miss out on important information</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I miss out in challenging viewpoints</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My privacy is placed at greater risk</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 8.4: CONSEQUENCES OF PERSONALISED NEWS (%)**

About 60% of participants agreed that personalised news made them worry about missing out on important information and about 58% worry about missing challenging viewpoints. About 50% of participants worried that their privacy is at greater risk when using algorithms.
TRUST AS A COMPLEX CONCEPT

The complex nature of trust in news and the inherent difficulties in empirically assessing levels of trust were explored by qualitative research commissioned by the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism in 2016 as part of the wider Digital News Report project. Focus group discussions were held in the UK, USA, Germany and Spain and these findings inform our analysis.

The findings show that people have a “repertoire” of news brands, initially using their preferred brand and, for some, this may lead to seeking out other brands for verification and to gain a plurality of viewpoints. Brands are mainly perceived along traditional platform lines: broadcasters; print heritage; news aggregators; social media. Print heritage is often segmented by the brand’s approach, i.e. tabloid versus serious broadsheet. Native digital brands are not as well-known as established brands, particularly among older and less technically savvy users. Consistent with the findings for the Digital News Report: Australia 2016 survey, journalists are not a prominent factor in the reader’s assessment of whether they trust a news story. Indeed, some stories are followed through differing news sources to gain a plurality of viewpoints.

Typically, younger age groups prefer algorithms which they view as independent and allow a variety of topics and a plurality of viewpoints. Older groups typically prefer to rely upon editorial decisions to signal what is important, especially given the quantity of content in the digital environment. In our Australian survey data, we found that younger age groups agree that editorial decisions as well as algorithms are a good way to get news.

The qualitative results demonstrate the difficulty that diverse participants had in agreeing on an accepted definition of trust in news. What also emerged was the importance that participants attached to specific news stories or events when considering what they meant by ‘trust’ – a departure point for this year’s extended essay in section nine.

NEWS MOMENTS OF 2016

21 APRIL 2016. TV 60 Minutes journalist Tara Brown and producer Stephen Rice arrive at Sydney International Airport. The production crew was released on bail from a Beirut prison where it was held for two weeks after being accused of child kidnapping, along with Brisbane mum Sally Faulkner.

IMAGE: EPA/DEAN LEWINS
On traditional media platforms such as TV and newspapers, news content used to be fairly easy to identify: reportage was separated from commentary sections and stand-alone news bulletins, and advertisements were clearly segregated. However, these previously clear distinctions have been eroded by the creeping tide of opinion entering the 24-hour news cycle, and nowhere faster than on social media. Rather than news being quarantined, it is now squeezed in amongst celebrity gossip, status updates and selfies on the continuous social media ‘feed’ where the distinction between ‘news’ and ‘not news’ is increasingly hard to discern. This has led to some concern that news is perceived as being less trustworthy than it once was and, in response, the Digital News Report includes specific questions on trust in news (see section eight for detailed results).
But when consumers are asked if they ‘trust’ the news, what does that actually mean? Are they being asked if they ‘trust’ the news brand that produced the story? The friend who shared it? The algorithm that sent it? Or the journalist or even the ‘robot’ who wrote the story? Depending on which question you ask, you are likely to get a different answer: this year’s Digital News Report: Australia found that 27% of survey respondents do not trust news organisations, and 30% do not trust journalists. But what does that mean?

Extensive research into the trust or credibility of news media over the past 80 years has been underpinned by a belief in the important contribution of reliable news media institutions to the functioning of a democratic system. The research into media credibility can be categorised under three broad and often overlapping headings:

- message credibility i.e. trust in the story;
- source credibility i.e. trust in the provider of the story;
- media credibility – a.k.a. medium or channel credibility – i.e. trust in the medium through which the news story is relayed.

A brief overview of the history of credibility research will help paint this changing picture of ‘trust’. Historically, concern with media credibility came to the fore in the 1930s when newspapers feared losing audience to radio and again in the 1950s to television. Surveys by the Roper Organization for the US Television Office asked audiences to compare which source of media – newspapers, radio or television – they were more likely to ‘believe’ if they contained conflicting reports. Until 1960, surveys found there was higher trust in print media than electronic media, but this changed in the 1960s following the arrival of TV. The continuing dominance of TV as the most trusted news medium continues in this year’s Digital News Report: Australia.

In the 1950s, research into source credibility highlighted perceptions of ‘expertise’ and ‘trustworthiness’ of an individual communicator as the key determining factors. Building on these early findings, further studies revealed a wide range of adjectives were used by consumers to describe perceptions of credibility in traditional news media including: believability, accuracy, fairness, bias, trustworthiness, ease of use, completeness, reliability, and attractiveness of the coverage and presenters. Additional influences on trust perceptions included whether a story respected people’s privacy, whether it was concerned with community well-being, and whether the reporters were well-trained.

Rather than news being quarantined, it is now squeezed in amongst celebrity gossip, status updates and selfies on the continuous social media ‘feed’, where the distinction between ‘news’ and ‘not news’ is increasingly hard to discern.
Further research argued that perceptions of trust in a source of news were in fact about trust in the editorial processes of journalism and the selections that were made for consumers by journalists and editors. The argument being that if a consumer cannot trust the selective decision-making processes of journalism, then he or she cannot logically trust the end-product – the news story. Complicating this further is the entrance of computer- or robot-generated news in the editorial process. Recent research shows consumers can find news written by a robot just as trustworthy – if not more so – than human-generated news.

The intervention of computer programmes in the selection and creation of news has also complicated perceptions of who or what is the source of news on social media. From the perspective of the mobile-phone user checking his or her feed, the source of the story could be the news brand, the journalist who wrote it, the friend who shared it or the algorithm that sent it. A study by the Pew Research Center shows that increasing numbers of people rely on Facebook and Twitter as their main sources of news. Depending on which one of these the consumer perceives to be the source, his or her perception of trust of the news story might well change. This is clearly shown in this year’s Digital News Report: Australia survey: when respondents were asked which was a ‘good way’ to get their news on social media, more people said selections calculated by an algorithm – which are based on their previous viewing habits – than choices made by journalists and editors.

Beyond the ‘source’ of the news item, technological features of the news medium or platform can also influence consumer perceptions of ‘trust’ or credibility. Young people in particular can be strongly influenced in their credibility judgments by the interactivity and functionality of an online site or app such as its layout, ease of interaction, endorsements – likes, reader statistics – and download speed.

The motivation of the news consumer also further complicates perceptions of trust. Put simply, people do not always seek news or information to become reliably informed about something. Because of this, it is not necessarily important to them to access news they ‘trust’. This is borne out in research into online habits of college students in America which found the students’ need to access credible information changed depending on the amount of time they had and whether they were seeking information for an essay or for entertainment. Studies into the uses and gratifications of media consumption clearly show that people access news for a whole range of reasons including entertainment, relaxation or simply having something to talk about with their friends.
Indeed the 2015 Digital News Report: Australia found those who predominantly used online media were not necessarily motivated by a specific intention to become well-informed via the news media. Instead it showed their use of online news media was more of a consequence or by-product of their daily online use, rather than a purposeful goal. In other words, they bump into the news, rather than actively seek it. All of the issues discussed above highlight problems with the conception of ‘trust’ in news media.

Finally we are forced to question whether ‘trust’ in news media is even desirable. In response to the tsunami of online information, consumers are being encouraged to be more media-literate. In other words, blind trust in news content should be replaced by a ‘way of sceptical knowing’xi, whereby consumers ask a range of questions to test the quality of a news source and its information, such as: What kind of content am I encountering? What information is missing? What evidence is presented and how was it tested or vetted? What might be an alternative understanding or explanation? This ongoing testing of news media credibility may be increasingly necessary at a time when the boundaries between ‘news’ and ‘not news’ are blurring and lack of trust in news organisations and journalists is so clearly evident.

2 Hovland, C I, Janis, I L, & Kelley, H H 1953, Communication and persuasion; psychological studies of opinion change. Yale University Press
If there is a common factor underlying sentiment towards politics, public institutions and media in the past decade, it is one of declining trust. It is all a long way from the mid-20th century when the news media were among the most respected institutions. For example, a famous 1972 poll found that 72% of Americans trusted CBS Evening News anchor Walter Cronkite more than any other public figure.

This decline in trust in both media and politics has been accompanied by the fragmentation of both the news media and the party system. Just as anti-establishment politicians are on the rise, so too are alternative news outlets. We now have a proliferation of talk shows, online news, opinion from Tumblr and Reddit and many entertainment-themed news options. The news media – often with reduced resources – now compete with this cacophony of voices and demands for more partisan or entertaining styles of news. The news media are also under increased fire from politicians, activists, and pundits and a citizenry that is more critically engaged. One result of this environment is that we now tend to trust fact-checkers more than traditional media.

Yet the level of trust is not uniform among countries. Even if we look to mainly English-speaking countries only, Australians display lower levels of trust than many others. In last year’s Digital News Report, Australia ranked 8th out of the 12 countries surveyed for trust in news and in 2016 it is ranked 15th out of 26 countries at 43%. In comparison, trust in Ireland measured 50% in 2016. Australian levels of trust are also below the UK and Canada. The USA – perhaps unsurprisingly – is ranked lower still at 33%.

There are myriad reasons why trust in news may be low in many countries, including plurality concerns, political involvement and allegations of bias. At first glance it appears that the big difference in trust levels is almost generational; or at least the differences between digitalists and traditionalists may do much to explain the low levels of trust. In this research, ‘digitalists’ cited an online source as their main source of news while ‘traditionalists’ cited an offline source as their main source. To a certain extent these are arbitrary distinctions, but they do appear to be reasonable predictors of some expected behaviours. Overall, Australian and Irish digitalists tend to trust news less, while older news consumers tend to trust more.

So how does this play out in Australia? Our starting point is that some 39% trust news organisations and 32% journalists. To delve a little deeper into what actually lies behind these headline results, we conducted some multivariate analysis. The results presented below are preliminary but may be a useful direction for future research.

It turns out that trust in the journalist and news organisation are the best predictors of trust overall. But what lies behind this? It emerges that a belief that the organisation is free from political control is a highly significant predictor of overall trust as well as trust in the individual organisation. Interestingly, concerns around commercial control do not matter to a significant extent. This is true in both Australia and in Ireland. In other words, it appears that concerns about political control are what matters to Australian and Irish news consumers. They worry less about commercial control.

We thus turn to the third component of the model, trust in the message or information. Here we model this as the type of material which the person prioritises. The 12 types of news contained in this question include international; political; regional; business and economics; entertainment and culture; lifestyle; health or education; arts and culture; sports; science and technology; crime; environment.
Here we find the first differences between Australia and Ireland. In Ireland, those factors which have a significant (negative) impact on trust are interest in crime news and an interest in business news.

In other words, those who particularly seek out crime or business news display lower levels of trust than other consumers. However, no particular interest in any specific type of news is a significant predictor in Australia.

Putting all this together, we can tentatively say that in both Australia and Ireland in 2016 the main factors which drive trust – or lack thereof – are:

• the journalist;
• the news organisation or brand, which was largely determined by a belief that it was free from political influence.

This is a finding which will be very interesting to explore across other countries and with more and varied methods.

![Figure 9.1: Impact of a 1 Point Change on Levels of Overall Trust (2016)](image-url)
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BACKGROUND - DIGITAL NEWS REPORT AUSTRALIA: 2016

This is the second in a series of annual reports which tracks changes in news consumption in Australia over time – particularly within the digital space – in order to understand how offline and online media are used together. A particular emphasis is on news discovery via social networks and news consumption via mobile devices. The Australian study was conducted with approval from University of Canberra Human Research Ethics Committee SSD/CUREC1A/14-224.

The Australian survey forms part of a global study by the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. Sponsors of this year’s global study include Google, BBC Global News, Ofcom, Broadcasting Authority of Ireland (BAI), Media Industry Research Foundation of Finland, Fritt Ord Foundation in Norway, Korea Press Foundation, Edelman UK, and academic sponsors at Hans Bredow Institute, University of Navarra, University of Canberra and Université Laval in Canada.
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