

25th ISOJ Trends in online journalism research

- Chair: **Vanessa D Higgins Joyce**, associate professor, **School of Journalism and Mass Communication, Texas State University**
 - **Amy Ross Arguedas**, postdoctoral research fellow, **Reuters Institute, University of Oxford, UK**
 - **Richard Fletcher**, director of research, **Reuters Institute, University of Oxford, UK**
 - **Gina Masullo**, associate professor, School of Journalism, and associate director, **Center for Media Engagement, UT Austin**
 - **Sue Robinson**, professor, **School of Journalism and Mass Communication, UW-Madison**
 - **Anya Schiffrin**, director, technology, media and communications, **Columbia University**
-

Amy Ross Arguedas [00:00:01] Well, thank you all so much for being here. I know this is a very early session, and it is very brave of you to get up so early. I'm really pleased to be here, presenting some of the work that we're doing at the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. And I'm going to be talking a bit about changing patterns in online news consumption. And then I'm going to hand it over to Richard, who's going to talk about news interest and news avoidance.

Amy Ross Arguedas [00:00:42] Okay. Let's see. Hopefully this works better. Okay. Thank you. So the findings that we're presenting today are from the latest digital news report. And it's based on an online survey that was conducted in January and February of 2023 by YouGov, across 46 different markets. And it's important to keep in mind that since it is an online sample, it's going to tend to under represent some offline behaviors. And also when it comes to countries with lower internet penetration, it's going to over represent younger and more educated audiences. And also just a big thank you to our sponsors, including our main sponsor, Google News Initiative for making this possible. So one of the key themes out of this year's digital news report is the frank connection between news organizations and audiences. And I'm going to start out with kind of a quick, a couple of quick reminders of the general scene that we've been seeing over the past couple of years before delving into kind of online changes that we're seeing. So this chart here shows us what news sources respondents, use over the past week, both online and offline. And this is us data that we're looking at here. So basically what we see is, a very clear decline in television and print news. No surprise there. We also see that online news has been mostly flat since 2013, so pretty stable. And then social media, news use had kind of a very rapid increase between 2013 and 2017, but then after that really kind of leveled off. As we're also well aware of, there are important generational differences. And in this chart, we ask people to tell us what their main source of news is and we cut it by age. And what we can see quite clearly here is, of course, television, continues to be important among some of the older groups. But when it comes to younger people, digital is really the most important gateway to news. And, especially when we're looking at the under 35, social media in particular is the main way that they're getting news. With roughly half of 18 to 24 saying that social media is their main news source. So beneath these trends that we're kind of already aware of. There are some dynamics that we think kind of compound the effects of some of the things that we're seeing further weakening the

role of traditional media. And I'm going to focus on online news consumption here. So, what this chart is showing us is that when we ask people what their main way of accessing news online is, the percentage of people who say that they're going directly to news websites or to apps has been steadily declining since 2018, so from 32% to 22%, in 2023. And at the same time, we see that social media as the main access point to news has been growing. So even though we tend to see this kind of stable reach of social media overall, so I guess even though the reach hasn't changed, the overall importance of social media as a gateway to news has been changing and becoming more important. We see fewer differences when it comes to other gateways. But it is important to note that search continues to be, you know, really important. This is aggregated data across the 46 markets. And it hides some really important differences that we see across countries and regions. And those are quite clear in this slide here. So what this is showing is that smaller countries in northern Europe so think Finland, Norway, Sweden for example, tend to have much stronger connections. So larger proportions of of the audience are directly going to news websites in those countries. In some of the other markets in Asia, we see kind of a deeply aggregated access to news. So people rely more on search engines and news aggregators. And then when it comes to Latin America, social media is the main gateway to news. And search and aggregators also play a relatively important role.

Amy Ross Arguedas [00:04:56] So as we've seen, social media platforms have become increasingly important for how people are consuming news. But when we look at the specific platforms that people are using, we see some further evidence of eroding relationships between news organizations and audiences. And the first reason for this is simply because Facebook is becoming less influential for news. So this is aggregated data across 12 markets that we've been tracking for a longer period of time. And we can see here that Facebook kind of peaked in terms of weekly reach for news back in 2016 when it was at 42%. And then it's been steadily declining since then. All the way down to 28% in 2023. And we can see that the gap between it and the other platforms is now quite small. When we're looking at the aggregated data. Twitter or X has been relatively stable. And where we see some really important growth is in the video lead networks. So think YouTube, Instagram and TikTok. So not only is social media becoming more important, but platforms where the news media has typically been stronger are the ones that are kind of stagnant or declining. And this shift is especially apparent when we focus on younger audiences. This chart here shows us weekly use of platforms for any purpose. So this isn't only for news among 18 to 24 year olds. And we've kind of simplified it a bit here just to show that, among this segment of the audience, Instagram already overtook Facebook back in 2019. And it's also striking to see how quickly TikTok has been growing, basically catching up with Facebook. At this point in the aggregated data, not quite in the United States, but still pretty close at this point. And if we look across all our markets and focus specifically on news, we see that the fastest growing network is TikTok. And this is especially the case in some African and Asian markets, but also in Latin America. So we can see it kind of making into the top ranking of most popular social media platforms. And in places like Colombia and Peru, we even see, you know, close to like half of respondents saying that they're using TikTok. In Peru, for example, 30% for news, with a 14 percentage point increase. So quite rapid shifts here. And the last chart I'll show you speaks a bit to why this shift matters. And I've alluded to this already before, but is the question is where people paying attention when there are all these different platforms,

they're not all the same. And so when we ask people this, what we see is that mainstream news tends to do much better on Twitter and on Facebook. These kind of legacy platforms, which are the ones that are stagnant or are declining. And when we look at the platforms that are growing most rapidly, we see that personalities. So think influencers and celebrities, and on TikTok, ordinary people, are getting a lot more attention. And so this is part of the challenge for publishers, in the context of, you know, these platforms being the ones that are actually growing right now, for news. So, I will hand it over to Richard now.

Richard Fletcher [00:08:16] Thanks, Amy. I'm going to use the same sort of source of data and talk about some of the other trends that we find there are related to the themes that Amy's picked out. And the first is to do with news interest. Now, we've already seen this chart already. But we've added a couple of extra lines, and one of them is the proportion of people who say they didn't use any of these news sources in a typical week. And you can see in the US that's grown from 3% in 2013, all the way up to 12%, in 2023. And this highlights the fact that there's a growing it's still a minority of people, but a growing proportion of people who are not really consuming any news, from these but typical platforms on a regular basis. In addition to that, we can also see a decline in the proportion of people who say that they're highly interested in the news. And this is not unusual in some countries, such as Argentina, France, Spain, the US, the UK, to see a 20 to 30 percentage point decline in the proportion of people who are highly interested in news, even in just the last 7 or 8 years. So a really profound shift in what we know is the kind of primary driver personal motivation is that the primary driver, the consuming news. And we can see that's declining. It's important to point out that this isn't true everywhere, but even in places with typically high levels of interest and high levels of news consumption, like Germany and Austria, we have seen a decline emerging in the last couple of years, still not to the same extent as the countries at the top of the chart, but nonetheless quite important. There are some exceptions, though. The Netherlands and Finland, we don't see these declines, so. But these are minority in the in the sample of 46 countries that we look at. And this, I think, is related to what we've called selective news avoidance. And this is something we've been trying to track, in the, in the project for some time now. And when we look at the data, we can see that across all the countries that we track, there's been a growth in news avoidance. So this is the proportion of people who say they actively avoid the news, at least sometimes, or often, up from 29% in 2017 to 36%, in 2023. And we can also see that there is a bit of national variation here. So some countries where the levels are slightly higher like India, UK and the US, some countries right. Slightly lower, perhaps unsurprisingly, the Nordic countries, but nonetheless even here we still do still see roughly a fifth of people who say they regularly avoid the news. We've tried to break this down into different types of news avoidance. So the first of these we call periodic, news avoidance. So this is where people essentially are trying to shut out all news, such as, you know, through scrolling past news, if they see it on social media or perhaps changing the channels when the TV comes on. And this is something that we've linked to, people with, on average, lower levels of interest in news and lower levels of interest in politics. And we can contrast this with what we call, specific avoidance, or selective avoidance, where people are a bit more strategic. They're limiting news consumption to certain times of the day, perhaps first thing in the morning, turning off notifications, that kind of thing, and in some cases, also avoiding certain news topics that they know might bring down the mood or increase anxiety.

And this is something we've associated in the data with people who typically have higher levels of interest in news and politics. And we can see these these types of news avoidance, quite different. And in parallel, we do some qualitative research to try and sort of flesh out some of these themes. And you can see an example here from the UK of someone who says that they try to avoid news about the economy. And someone from the US talking about avoiding news to do with US politics. When it comes to topics, certain topics where, you know, it's perhaps surprising that people are trying to avoid news about topics like the war in Ukraine, national politics, crime and security. But there are some which are kind of specific to different demographics. So particularly for older people, they do say that they're trying to shut out news on social justice issues, for example. When we ask people who avoid the news, what types of storytelling or formats they're most interested in. We do see higher numbers for what's sometimes called positive journalism or solutions journalism, and less interest in the big stories of the day. And I think the challenge for news organizations is that if you ask the population as a whole, they're most interested in this big stories of the day. So you can see how news organizations might find it difficult to sort of to bring people back whilst retaining that their loyal users. And you can see here again some of the quotes, this time from Germany about the desire for a certain type of news coverage. That might make them less anxious.

Richard Fletcher [00:13:18] I'm going to move away from some of the findings from the report now, which you may have seen already and talk about, you know, perhaps some research that that sort of, you know, caveats the slightly. So the first is on, a study that we did, in, a couple of years ago looking at, what happened to news use during, coronavirus. And we did this using, tracking data from comScore in the US, UK, France and Germany. And combine that with data from Newsguard, which is a tool that ranks news sources in terms of their trustworthiness. And when we look at the data, what we can see is that a very new starting in 2018, but going through to 2021, a very large spike in news use, which I think we're all aware of now during 2020. But the important point is, if we break this down, by, sources, according to their trustworthiness, according to Newsguard, we can see a very large spike in the Green Line. Which of those which, ranked as generally, trustworthy. And you can almost not see it at all that the increase in some countries in the, in the use of, news from generally untrustworthy sources. So not only did we see a large sort of, in real terms, a large sort of increase for trustworthy brands, but also in, in relative terms as well. So the percentage increase for trustworthy brands was higher than it was for generally untrustworthy news sources. And I think this highlights how important the news is, even amongst news avoiders, when it comes, to sort of times of a crisis and information is really important. Another study which makes this sort of related point, I think is to do with the role of news use in, in combating false beliefs, belief acquisition or misinformation acquisition, over time. We know that some people have argued that the news media, in fact checking or even covering misinformation as a topic, might be inadvertently exposing people to false claims that they then come to believe. So we're interested in whether this was true or not. So we conducted a panel study in the UK, India and Brazil, and try to this is again during the coronavirus pandemic, to see, to see whether this was actually true. And what we found is that people who you used more news use over time and as new false claims emerged, they did learn about those claims. Their awareness of those claims was higher. For those who consumed more news during a given period. But interestingly, the belief in those

same claims didn't go up in line with awareness. So in other words, the news media was informing people about the false claims, but it wasn't increasing their belief in them. And in fact, in the UK, what we found that people who use more news actually their not only did their awareness of false claims go up, but that their belief in those false claims actually went down for those people who used more news. So again, this shows how news use just, you know, on its own, whether it's in fact checking or providing an alternative narrative to the, to the the sort of false claims can help fight misinformation. And again, I think this just highlights, you know, why all of the things that myself and Amy were talking about are so important thank you.

Gina Masullo [00:17:08] All right. Well, good morning, everyone. As Vanessa said, I'm Gina Marcello. I'm the associate director of the Center for Media Engagement. And, can I take this out? Okay. And I'm also an associate professor at the School of Journalism and Media here at UT Austin. And I just want to tell you a little bit about the center before I just go into sort of a rapid fire of some of the research that I think you might be interested in, that we've done. So the center is comprised of, you know, faculty members, students. And what we are really focused on is solving problems. Our official, you know, statement is that "we envision a vibrant information ecosystem that more effectively empowers the public to understand, appreciate, and participate in democratic exchange of ideas." What we're really interested in is solving problems, particularly for news organizations, but also for other institutions, so that it's in the service of democracy. So we always have that link between the media and democracy. So over the course of our history, we date back to 2011. We've partnered with more than 200 newsrooms to do research projects, and more than, close to 900 newsrooms are using either the research or tools that we've developed for this. Oh yeah, I do. Oh, thank you for letting me know. Okay, great. Sorry about that. Okay. Get all this other stuff out of the way. All right. So one of the projects we worked on that I wanted to highlight was our practicing engaged journalism project. We partnered with 20 U.S. based news organizations. And basically we were testing out a form of engaged journalism. And what this is, is a process where the audience can submit questions to the newsroom. And they do this through a platform called Hearken. And then the newsroom answers them so that there's a direct connection between the questions the public has and the news. So really, the news organizations are solving the questions that the public wants, rather than just doing stories about other things. So our big findings were, we looked at subscriptions, subscription renewals, web traffic, page views, those kind of things. They saw an increase in subscriptions, but not renewals. So more people wanted the product, but it didn't necessarily make people who had started come back, which is concerning, of course. And it really didn't affect web traffic. The effect on the audience relationship, though, is important. Participation, the newsrooms that participated in the Engage journalism initiative had much more positive responses from the audience. People felt like they had more of a say in news coverage, and that is a benefit that I think we shouldn't understate, because what we hear through our research and others research is that the public feels very disconnected from the news media. They feel like we're not in this together. There's an us, them. And as a former journalist, I know that's not the intent of news organizations. So the fact that engaged journalists, we can get past that sort of bias the public has is really important. People felt that they were more able to have a say in the coverage. They also felt that the news organization was more responsive to them just by letting them submit questions, which is a pretty small ask, right? The takeaways for

newsrooms were certainly like, engage journalism can strengthen your relationship and it can increase the bottom line. It can identify audience interests that you might not know they're interested in. And so it's something that we definitely would recommend trying. So another project we worked on is we wanted to look at fact checking. And our idea was actually we wanted to come up with what we call the kinder, gentler fact check. And I'll tell you, this was based on me having a meeting with my pulmonologist, who I asked him about something I'd read on Facebook, and he started screaming at me, "don't listen to Facebook, that's a lie." And I was just like, dude, don't you want me to ask you? Guess what? I'm never going to ask you again. Right. And that made me think, you know, how often do we make people who believe something untrue? Feel stupid for believing it? And I'm picturing my mother right here. You know, that doesn't convince anybody. Telling somebody you're an idiot for believing this doesn't. And even if we never say you're an idiot for believing it the way some fact checks are written, it feels that way, perhaps to a sensitive person. So we tested out a traditional fact check, and we tested out what we called the empathetic style. And the empathetic style is sort of like, it acknowledges that many people believe this misperception, but then it also has, like the journalist walks the viewer through the process of discovering the truth, like, hey, I looked here to figure it out. Then I looked here to figure it out and sort of modeling sort of the good behavior that we all should do when we see news right now. This is what it looked like. We did this all through broadcast, which was one of the contributions of it to and the takeaway was both approaches worked equally well. So we were sort of wrong about the empathetic thing. But the positive thing, if this is even if you don't go through all that path, fact checks were still more effective than the control condition. We also did a focus on news deserts, and we surveyed people living in areas that don't have a news organization connected to them. And what we found was really troubling is that they didn't think they were news deserts. They were like, oh, I just get my news from Facebook. And after watching your presentation about Facebook, I mean, that's concerning too, right? Because we know that's not all true, right? Or many of it. So they were getting inadequate information. And they didn't see their community as a news data desert. But what did help them is if they felt a feeling of social cohesion in their community, that sort of almost in their mind replaced it. But they really were getting their information and thinking the things they get from Facebook are news in a way that we found pretty troubling. But we did see that they were not sharing a whole lot of misinformation, so that was good. If I got one minute. Okay, newsrooms should build relationships with their audience. Do they engage journalism that we just talked about in a couple slides ago? Show the community in positive light when you can and, you know. You all the newsrooms probably could benefit some for some training in this, because that's not necessarily something you think is part of your normal job. And that's all I've got for you. Thank you so much.

Sue Robinson [00:24:35] Hi. I'm Sue Robinson from the University of Wisconsin. And, I've been following all of these studies, quite carefully because I'm interested to see if the engagement journalism movement is going to work. In this book that came out in May, I document the movement, and I make the argument that it's the first major paradigm shift we've seen in mainstream Western countries for the press in more than a century. And that we have a critical mass of people who have decided engagement journalism is going to, increase trust and solve all of our problems. So, what we're doing right now, and these are just preliminary numbers. And

I'm working with a team of people, including Josh Star, who is a quantitative political scientist at Syracuse, and Patrick Johnson, who's a qualitative media literacy person at Marquette. And we wanted to figure out, like, how can we test or measure it? Again, I'm wicked qualitative, so don't ask me too many questions. But anyway, we're doing applied research. And we're working with these organizations, you know, all of them, I'm sure. Testing news and Hearken and solutions, journalism network and space ship media. And what we're working on is, trying to figure out, like, we're going to, we're doing these, like, little interventions, kind of like what Center for Media Engagement did with their six month intervention. But we're doing it with a whole bunch of different newsrooms, through these different projects. And I'm just going to give two quick examples of the kind of measurement like for like, I know, I'm not allowed to use that term as a quality person. But anyway, so a lot of these projects have a small in. And what we're trying to do is aggregate them together to say, okay, here's sort of the general trends that we're finding. So, for example, with the Pluralism Project we do to trusting news, we ask these nine journalists to go ahead and interview or not really interview, conduct listening sessions with people, community members, people who are disengaged from their brand and to just listen, we said, you're not allowed to defend yourselves. You're not allowed to respond in any way. You just have to listen. And the average conversation was about 30 to 45 minutes. And about half of them were right leaning and the other half were black or brown community members. It depended on what the newsroom wanted to, how they wanted to expand their audiences. And it was really interesting. They did 77 conversations that two thirds of those participants reported feeling that the conversations themselves had built trust for them with the news brand. This is really interesting because we got all of the transcripts of these conversations, and they were super vitriolic, like people were just yelling at the journalists. In fact, this focus group that we held with the nine journalists ended up being a therapy session, for all of us. It was really difficult, like Patrick Johnson and I, we had to take breaks. And he identifies as, queer. And so there was a lot of homophobia. And so it was they were crazy. And so when we saw these post surveys, we asked all these community members to fill out these surveys, and they said, actually, I'm going to subscribe. Well, a third of them said they were considering subscribing. So that just it's a small end. But, it does indicate that there's something in the power of listening. And then the other thing I was really interested in doing is, figuring out, like, you know, we know that the participants in these intense trainings and they all these trainings are like six weeks or more, and they're very intense. And most of them involve multiple people from the newsroom, including at least one manager. So, we looked at night, well, we looked at 44, 45, but for for the purposes of this slide, we were looking at Democracy S.O.S., which was a 2022, program that Hearken and Solutions Journalism Network and Trusting News did, with a bunch of newsrooms. So there were 19 newsrooms, and there were, I think, like 50 people involved in them. And what we did was we collected all of the political stories from 2018, 2020, 2022, and we will do 2024. So again, these are preliminary numbers. And then I wanted to see, like did the content change because all of these trainings were changed. Your coverage of elections, right? So we looked to all the coverage. We collected all of the election coverage and political stories in October and November of each of those years through a scraper. And then we spent so much time coding them and cleaning them. And these are significant results for these four categories. So what we saw was, about 27, 28% increase between 2018 and 2022, with for example. In what we would call engaged stories. And that was explicitly stated, right? So, like, the story had to have some

kind of, you know, mention in the story or alongside it that said, hey, we actually did this doing this engaged reporting. Right? So, so it was kind of a yes or no question. We also did a bunch of qualitative coding. But we also saw increases in transparency, in solutions journalism, and more importantly, we saw a huge decrease in what you might call game frames or horserace coverage, about 30% between 2018 and 2022, which, I remind you, are only with these newsrooms that had this intense training. And so we're going to collect 2024 and we're adding a whole bunch of newsrooms and we're adding ten newsrooms who did not do any training just to have like a control group. And we'll see what happens. We're kind of just trying out a lot of different things. So this is just one of them. And so we're, you know, we're kind of seeing some stuff. And this will be for like, you know, I guess the next book, and that's it.

Anya Schiffrin [00:30:57] So, this is the first time I'm presenting any of this material, and it's a four year project, and I think I have six minutes, so I'm just going to focus on highlights. What? We tried this. This is a paper about the impact of cross-border investigative journalism organizations. And it sits squarely in the literature of impact of journalism and the impact of cross-border collaboration. I think my first paper on impact was in 2015, with Ethan Zuckerman. And during the pandemic, we gathered a group of cross-disciplinary people. So, economists, political scientist Lindsey Green Barber, and decided to take a look at everything, every it was a real pandemic project because they were all stuck at home. We had a weekly call. We tried to look at everything. Everybody had written about impact of journalism. So we looked at all the political science literature, we looked at all the economics literature. We looked at, you know, we reread all the classics like Journalism of Outrage, you know, Protest, Jay Hamilton. And, what happened was like going to slideshow mode, I don't think I don't think I can get through all the slides in such a short time. And what triggered this was ICIJ came to us and said, could you figure out, you know, we really after Hamilton, we talked about this yesterday. Everybody thought you could do a cost benefit analysis of investigative journalism. So ICIJ came to us and said, we really want to show funders that if you invest \$100,000, you get back \$1 million in return. And, you know, as you know, I know a lot of economists, every economist I called said, you can't do this. It doesn't actually work. But what we tried to do was we made this, like, insanely huge matrix of every kind of impact we could think of. And then we about 15 of them in some way were related to business. So, economic quantifiable. So, for example, one of the things that we were interested in was the opportunity cost. If you're in ICIJ, what do you not covering because you joined an ICIJ project and could that be quantified. You know like Sue we're obviously interested in things like does your traffic go up if you publish an investigative story. So basically we made this crazy huge matrix and we did it along. We included the deliberative individual substantive. And then we also did a time scale. And then we included, you know, Phil Napoli and Lindsay's points about micro meso audience relationship. And so we made this like a vast, vast matrix. And then I sort of took it out to real people like Minky Warden and Susan Shera, and they said, you know, this is too big. You're never going to be able to measure all of this. So what we did was we designed a survey for ICIJ, so you can see some of the sense of this matrix. And by the way, we published the first part of the study. I have copies, so that might be the easiest. But anyway, bottom line is we designed a survey for ICIJ and surveyed 55 of the partners from the Pandora papers, and then with Caroline and Yuki and a team of students, we did the same thing for report for the world. And what we found were all

kinds of fascinating things that we didn't expect to find. So I think one thing we found, which I think is new, is we have more information now on the effect of these collaborations on the journalists themselves. So we looked a whole lot at the newsroom. And what we found was very, very high numbers. Some things you would expect, like being part of these collaborative efforts, teaches you to collaborate. So we found that the journalists all said they were working together much more. They were learning a lot of new skills. And then again, when we were trying to find ways of sort of measuring the economic benefit, we found a lot of them were getting new jobs, for example, they were being hired away by their organizations. So that was that was like one interesting bit of data, which we think is fairly new, having read all of your work over and over again, before preparing the study. And then I think, another part that also felt new was we didn't really understand how much we would be writing about innovation within the newsroom. And it turned out we heard over and over again in the interviews that all of us have been doing over the last few months, reporters in places like, you know, I don't know where Ukraine or Brazil would say, hey, we cater to a low income community. You know, we're in a big city, there's no parks, so when we got an environmental reporter, everybody said, who cares? And then they start to realize why it was important. So it turned out, you remember Guy Berger studies like 20 years ago about the impact of training and what it has on newsrooms. And they found in South Africa that women journalists came back to the newsroom and sort of disseminated information more than men did. So this is a bit in that in the vein of that literature, that it turns out that having these trainings, kind of transformed the whole way the newsroom worked. And, you know, I've been many of us are interested in newsroom innovation and what works the most right to buy it from outside. You incubate, you know, so this was an interesting finding for us. So I'm sure I'm out of my six minutes. The first part, the ICIJ part, has been published. I did like a little summary for GIJN, where we've got the second part with report for the world and ICIJ out for submission. So if anyone wants to talk more or use the matrix, adapt the matrix in any way. Thank you for hearing me out.

Vanessa D Higgins Joyce [00:37:28] Okay. So thank you so much for these wonderful presentations. I am going to present here. Some snippets of, some research that we're conducting with the Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas. And, even though Rosental holds this for 25 years and the Knight Center has been doing research since 2013, I think this is the first time that he gives us, himself some spotlight, because Rosental is generous that way. So I am very honored to be the one presenting a little bit of our research here. It's a big group, includes, Summer Harlow, who's around, Amy Schmitzwise, who I know is here on Zoom, and many other researchers. So it's a group effort. And Silvia Dalben Furtado, hey Silvia you're here, who has worked with me on this one in particular. So we look at journalism in Latin America, in many different ways. And in this case here we're looking at homophily and, within journalism and, within this context of political polarization and, with the hopes of finding ways that journalists can connect better and build trust. So in general, there's this, I'm sure you all are familiar with this increase in polarization that occurs in many different areas in the world and in Latin America. That is also the case, with increased hostility against journalists within this climate. So we were interested in looking at the concept of homophily. So how, people tend to, flock to others who are similar to themselves. And in this case, we're looking at journalists perception of their audience. Do they perceive their audience to be similar to themselves or,

different from themselves or dissimilar? And, so that is the relationship that we're looking at here. And in specific we're looking at value homophily. So people think like me, act like me, have similar political beliefs than I do. Or space based, homophily. They live where I live. They are close, in geographic locations to I am, they frequent the same places that I do. And we believe that that might have some impact in, the stories, and issues that are being told. So this is a survey that we conducted, with 20 Latin American countries and, we adopted from some previous, published research. And, we were specifically interested in looking at the differences between online, news conducted, within online media and traditional, which in this case really means, journalists see their news organization, mainly offline, like television. Although that's, you know, of course, television also has an online version, but that's where the journalists perceive that that's where their work live. And what we found is that there are some significant differences between online and offline, traditional, journalists and their perception of, how similar their audience is. And online journalists have a higher perception of audiences, being similar to them in terms of values. Greater than offline, traditional journalism, media. Sorry. And situation has shifted, in terms of space. So offline traditional media see that their audiences belong to the more similar space area that that they do more than, online. And that makes sense, right. If you think about radio and, and television and newspapers and, where it can be reached. So that part makes sense to us. But the online part is so intriguing to us. We didn't see much difference between the different regions in Latin America. We did see some interesting differences between the types of news organizations that journalists in general worked. So journalists that work for alternative, independent news and advocacy news had a higher, we're more likely to perceive their audience, similar to themselves in terms of value. And it didn't really make a difference whether they were working for commercial news organization or government or, or nonprofit news organization. So that didn't really matter. But the type of news, how they perceived it as independent alternative, that did matter. So what does that mean for us? So we know that there is an increased numbers, independent, digital native news organizations in Latin America. There are doing fabulous work. There are bringing much needed diversity to the journalism landscape in Latin America, where that really matters. It matters everywhere, but in Latin America that has some particular, impact there. And so that is fantastic. But what this study is showing us is that, from a media point of view, these online news organizations are more likely to cater to audiences that are similar to them. Well, that's good. And bringing inclusivity, it doesn't include that perspective to a wider audience. So those that are dissimilar to them, right. So, in that term, so from an audience for from a media perspective, that may be problematic. From an audience perspective, we know that audiences duplicate their level of exposure. They're not just looking at one news organization, but we know also that audiences, just like journalists, tend to flock to those who are similar to them. So in that case, it is problematic. How do you solve that problem? Well, that's a good question for us to try to figure out, some ideas that have been brought in yesterday in panels were, bringing some I guess somebody said and I forgot the name. Sorry. Being humble and perhaps bringing that new perspective. So from the part of the journalists really training to bring more perspectives, and to include the different points of view within some aspects of the news process. Or collaborations, right. So I believe that, for a bigger for the good of society, these collaborations between different perspectives there might be useful and fruitful for the benefit, decreasing polarization that is really hurting all society and it is hurting journalism, as well in Latin America. So that's,

that part of it. So thank you so much for listening to this, work in progress. I do have a book also that is coming out soon. It is available for pre-ordering, so I hope very soon that will be available as well.