Conclusions
Introduction and recap

This dissertation set out to answer how people’s experiences of news use could be captured, and how these experiences could help make sense of everyday news use. In the introduction, it was observed that although news users have taken center stage in journalism and its study, they have not gained a seat at the table. Emic approaches to news use have been overshadowed due to three tendencies within journalism studies. First, much research focuses on news professionals’ assumptions about and conceptions of audiences instead of on audiences themselves. Second, especially in a fast-changing media landscape, research is dominated by approaches that measure and quantify rather than seek to understand (changing) news use from users’ own vantage point. Third, increasingly, data are collected by and in and on the news industry’s terms, which is framed as more “data-driven” and (thus) “scientific” (see Napoli, 2011), risking replacement of efforts to understand news users from their own perspective.

A second point of departure was scholars’ conception of audiences in terms of agency and/or activity. Though valuable for grasping changing news use in a changing media landscape, three concerns were raised over what the notion of more or less active users is prone to overlook. First, a focus on what people do or do not do – what was called the on/off approach – risks essentializing news users based on a singular (e.g. page views as measure of users’ preferences or interests) or limited (e.g. the types of media they use) dimension of their news use. Second, the notion of active users as deliberate and rational is not easily compatible with researching – respectively – automatic or subconscious dimensions of people’s news use and how it is shaped by (everyday) structures. Third, relatedly, the notion of active agents tends to lead to a focus on cognitive dimensions of news use (selection, meaning-making, production) at the cost of other experiential dimensions, such as affective and sensory ones. This dissertation therefore implemented three shifts:

1. From assumptions about news users to understanding news users in and on their own terms;
2. From categorizing and quantifying what news users do to understanding what it feels like to (not) use news;
3. From a focus on cognition to including other (experiential) dimensions of news use.

These shifts, it was argued, could potentially reveal a different, more nuanced picture of everyday news use. To effectuate these changes, the case was made for taking the notion of experience as point of departure. Experience was a fruitful starting point because it affords: 1) moving beyond opinions; 2) grounding people’s reporting of their news use in what they have actually undergone or are undergoing; 3) taking a broad lens that leaves open the possibility for various (not a priori considered) dimensions
to be noticed and (therefore) included; and 4) an opportunity to critically explore the methodological and epistemological consequences of using qualitative interview-based approaches. Below follows a reflection on what this approach has added to our understanding of everyday news use.

**Theoretical contributions**

Rather than aiming to arrive at a unified audience theory, this dissertation sought to do justice to the messiness and contradictions of everyday news use in all its complexity. Capturing the experience of everyday news required a carefully designed methodological set-up. As chapter 2 showed, the methodologies used in this dissertation each centered around a different dimension of experience (*erleben, erlebnis*), mode of knowing (sensation, perception, conception), and temporal organizational (real-time, retrospective). As such, the methodologies each made it possible to capture different aspects of people’s news use, from cognitive and affective to sensory, pragmatic, lifestyle, and communicative (Gentile et al. 2007; Gentikow, in Ytre-Arne, 2011). Following the idea of “crystallization” (Ellingson, 2008), the insights gained into everyday news use were complementary but also necessarily partial (Tracy, 2010). Together, they helped generate a more complex, layered understanding of everyday news use, adding color and depth to existing ‘portraits’ of news use as well as redrawing some of their lines.

**First**, this dissertation has nuanced dominant assumptions about the interests of news users. Taken at face value, metrics such as clicks and time spent appear to confirm long-held suspicions about users’ preferences for news, as clicking patterns suggest that users are mostly interested soft or sensational news (e.g., Boczkowski & Mitchelstein, 2013; Tenenboim & Cohen, 2015; Tewksbury, 2003). By taking people’s experience of using news as point of departure – or more precisely, by capturing their experience while using news – this dissertation has shown that their interests are not fully reflected by metrics. Chapter 4 has shown that although clicks do indicate some type of interest in news, they are a problematic measure of people’s interest because they overemphasize headlines that ‘demand’ a click (i.e. that evoke curiosity more than reflect a pre-existing interest) and miss browsing practices such as “checking” and “monitoring” (Costera Meijer & Groot Kormelink, 2015) that do not require a click but that users do experience as valuable and informative. Similarly, chapter 7 has shown while time spent can be an indicator of interest or engagement, it can also point to a lack thereof or be a sign of users’ skills and practice. Finally, journalists’ assumptions about users’ hunger for junk news and their subsequent concerns about personalization were nuanced in chapter 3, which showed that news users, too, worry about potentially missing important updates if they personalized their news diet. It is important to emphasize that these findings
do not suggest that news users do not enjoy consuming ‘junk news’ nor that they will consume public affairs news in large quantities; rather, they suggest that users’ clicking and time-spending behavior – at an individual or aggregate level – does not reflect the breadth of their interests.

**Second**, this dissertation nuances the narrative of “the rationalization of audience understanding” (Napoli, 2011) which suggests that more data necessarily get one closer to a better or more ‘objective’ understanding of news audiences. While metrics (and tracking data) have certainly added an indispensable – and previously unattainable – perspective to understanding news audiences, this dissertation has shown that such data cannot be interpreted in isolation. For instance, clicks and time spent cannot be made sense of without context, such as the devices and platforms used and the surrounding user practices like browsing and scrolling. Capturing people’s experiences of news use allows for a critical assessment of the strengths and limitations of metrics, and helps avoid essentializing news users based on an isolated dimension of their news use.

**Third**, this dissertation captured experiences and associated practices that do not neatly fit within established categories, generating nuances and new insights that further our understanding of everyday news use. A first example is what we might call “measured avoidance”, which fits somewhere between the categories of news-seeking and news avoidance. It refers to people’s careful measuring of and slaloming around (negative) content to protect their frame of mind. It is worth recounting the informant that ‘felt’ her way through Facebook, her finger ready to scroll away if news hit her emotionally; or the informant that skipped heavy content in her newspaper after the first pages to preserve her weekend mood. This notion of measured avoidance also adds to mood management theory (Zillmann, 1988), showing that the optimization of one’s mood through content choices occurs at the most micro of levels – down to the scanning of words in a news item to establish its tone or valence – and is actively negotiated throughout one’s news practice.

A second example is the distinction between enjoyment and appreciation for making sense of how people value political (TV) news. These notions from media psychology proved not only measurable in experiments (Bartsch & Schneider, 2014; Oliver & Bartsch, 2010), but were also found inductively to be distinct experiences embedded in distinct practices: enjoyment is characterized by pleasure in the sense of fun and amusement and is associated with a lean-back viewing practice in which the news often functions as “background noise” or “companionship” (Lull, 1990), whereas appreciation is associated with concentrated, lean-forward viewing and is characterized by a willingness to invest time in exchange for gaining insight and learning new perspectives. What this distinction could suggest is that people’s inclination to select entertaining news over public affairs news is less a reflection of people’s intrinsic interest in news
than a reflection of how the former provides instant gratification whereas the latter requires an investment of time and energy before it generates pleasure (in the sense of enlightenment). A last example of nuances generated by explicitly starting from users’ experiences are the thirty considerations for clicking or not clicking on news (chapter 4). These were generated bottom-up, adding further detail to known phenomena (e.g. the difference between ‘bemusement’ and ‘bullshit’ as reactions to clickbait headlines) as well as yielding original considerations such as “gleeful annoyance” which is a mix of positive (delight) and negative (rage) affect.

A fourth conclusion is that experience is a helpful starting point for making sense of news use because it requires a more holistic approach that helps generate a deeper understanding of news use unattainable when looking at singular or separate dimensions. While one of the starting points of this dissertation was to go beyond cognitive dimensions of news use, the chapters have shown that we must not throw out the baby with the bathwater: cognitive, affective, sensory or other dimensions have significance in their interconnectedness. An important example in this respect is place-making: how people create a sense of home through their news use. Chapter 6 provided powerful illustrations of what we may overlook when we focus on cognition and affect as separate, pre-determined categories, such as the informant who subscribed to a newspaper to recreate a sense of nostalgia but found herself struggling with the negative content, and the informant who simultaneously snacked news websites and watched a familiar TV show to create a comfortable atmosphere in which she was then comfortable consuming news. Another illustration of how different dimensions are intricately connected in the experience of using news is the practice “scrolling”, characterized by an incessant urge to keep moving down one’s Facebook feed, even if one is interested in the content: it includes cognitive (perceiving the content), affective (feeling an embodied urge to move on) and sensory (moving one’s finger on the mouse or keyboard) dimensions. Rather than “non-representational” theory”, it would therefore perhaps be more appropriate to use the term “more-than-representational” (Lorimer, 2005) to refer to the move beyond cognitive (and symbolic) dimensions of news use.

Fifth and finally, the notion of experience proved most useful for capturing how using news involves embodied knowledge and practical skills that need to be acquired. This is a further reminder of the importance of looking beyond cognition; these skills have become so embodied that they have arguably become ‘post-cognitive’. As chapter 6 has shown, learning how to efficiently handle and navigate a technology or platform requires time and effort. Such skills of news use have been underappreciated in journalism studies. Digital literacy studies have looked at a wide variety of skills users need to function in digital environments (Eshet, 2004; Hargittai, 2005) and media literacy has been defined as the ability to access, analyze and produce information (Aufderheide
& Firestone, 1993; Livingstone, 2004), the first of which leaves room for including learning how to handle and navigate devices and platforms. Yet, news literacy has focused mostly on critical thinking and comprehension of news (production) processes (Ashley, Maksl & Craft, 2013; Fleming, 2014; Mihailidis, 2012). This dissertation suggests that in addition to enabling or empowering people to function as “good” citizens, news literacy – or news fluency, as Rosenstiel & Elizabeth (2018) recently suggested – might also include teaching people how to be proficient users.

Social implications

An important social contribution of this dissertation is that it shows – in alignment with Costera Meijer (2013) – that listening to users does not automatically lead to a lower quality of journalism. Journalists have historically had a low estimation of people’s preferences; note how in chapter 3 journalists argued users should not be allowed to personalize their news diet because that would lead to “fatties” (i.e. junk news) “with a limited or distorted world view”. It is insidious that clicking patterns seemed to confirm these expectations: if people are believed to be mainly interested in junk news this can lead to click-chasing and a “dumbing down of news” (Nguyen, 2013), raising concerns about journalism’s role in society (Tandoc & Thomas, 2015). What is more, it could lead to a situation where journalists and users value each other less and less. If clicking patterns ‘show’ that users prefer junk news, journalists may potentially come to resent them. This becomes increasingly problematic if news professionals are or feel obliged to ‘listen to’ or ‘engage’ with their audiences, as engagement has become a key term in journalism (Nelson, 2018). Vice versa, click-chasing and sensational news could (further) erode users’ trust in news (Nielsen & Graves, 2017). As expressed by one of our informants, such news “is catchy, but it gets you fucking nowhere”. There is a danger, then, that by ‘listening’ to news users as expressed in clicks, journalists end up pleasing no one (not in the least place themselves).

The results of this dissertation suggest a way out of this downward spiral: listening to users can in fact increase the quality of journalism, albeit from a user perspective, in ways not necessarily aligned with conventional journalism. As chapters 4 and 5 have shown, users certainly do consume junk news or sensational news when offered to them, but ultimately this is not what they come to serious news titles for. People do have a desire for ‘public affairs’ news, but not always in the way it is currently presented to them. This will be further set out in the practical recommendations below, but the point here is that this dissertation has illustrated that giving users ‘what they want’ and providing news that plays a beneficial role in society are perfectly compatible. However, for this to happen news organizations must ask themselves which ‘desire’
they want to cater to. Similar to how food choices and dietary behavior are influenced by access to and physical availability of food (Larson & Story, 2009), it should be no surprise that users will consume junk news if offered to them. To stay with the food metaphor: this suggests that while news organizations may continue to bring news that provides instant gratification but little substance – and, similar to junk food, may also generate feelings of guilt or regret after consumption (McPhail, Chapman & Beagan, 2011; O’Dea, 2003) – this should not come at the expense of news that requires a bit more chewing but provides a luscious quality experience and leaves one satisfied. Put differently, the challenge is to create a user experience that is both currently pleasurable and retrospectively appreciated.

**Professional relevance: user-centered journalism**

The findings and conclusions of this dissertation also have professional relevance. What can news organizations take away from this research? To continue with the point raised above, first, the results offer suggestions for how to create user experiences that are both currently pleasurable and retrospectively appreciated. As chapter 4 suggested, in terms of content, people enjoy and appreciate news that is empathetic, explanatory, and constructive. (Note: although these results emerged from a current affairs TV case study, they also resonate with the findings from the other studies). An *empathetic approach* refers to enabling news users to relate to the subjects in the news (i.e. to understand what it feels like to be in their situation), but also to journalists’ attitude toward these subjects. Somewhat surprisingly, informants most appreciated news that approached politicians and other powerful individuals critically but still as real people, providing them the opportunity to explain underlying considerations for their decisions and positions. An *explanatory approach* ultimately refers to helping users understand the significance of a topic: What does it mean and why does it matter? For most users who are not news junkies following the news all day, it can be challenging to keep up with and make sense of the barrage of news that comes their way on a daily basis. As the consideration “disjointed news fact” (chapter 4) illustrates, users have little incentive to click on a headline about the latest development regarding Russia’s annexation of Crimea if they do understand the conflict in the first place. Likewise, they cannot care about the Elections to the European Parliament if they do not know what this parliament does and how it affects their everyday life. Explaining the basics of such topics affords users an entry point to caring about these topics. This does not mean that journalists have to start at zero in every news item, but there is no reason why online news about a complex topic such as Dutch provincial politics cannot link to an explainer of the basics of this system. Finally, a *constructive approach* here refers to news that offers a possible way
forward and/or identifies barriers to a potential solution (cf. Gyldensted, 2015; McIntyre & Gyldensted, 2017). To clarify, this does not mean that users expect journalists to solve complex problems; rather, they want to understand why they keep hearing about that same problem in their municipality over and over, or if those opposition parties that seem to be against everything themselves have any viable alternatives to offer.

However, it would be naïve to think that providing the right content would automatically result in more users or more subscribers. Content and storytelling choices are no panacea (Groot Kormelink & Costera Meijer, 2015). At least as important as offering the right content is understanding the audience’s patterns of news use and daily routines: availability and opportunity must be aligned. For instance, chapter 6 showed that news content can perfectly match a user’s interests and yet not be read due to time issues or saturation. While more research is needed to suggest concrete strategies to get into users’ daily routines, news organizations would do well to experiment with pushing different content at different times. They might experiment with personalized pushing (e.g. newsletters, push notifications about relevant content) and try to establish which moments and which types of content work for different users. To illustrate, the informant that had become “news tired” when she finally got to the supplements of her e-paper she was actually most interested in, would ideally be pushed this content first thing on Saturday morning.

Editorial analytics are essential here. Although this dissertation assessed ‘clicks’ and ‘time spent’ critically, metrics are most valuable for news organizations to understand their users. However, there is no one-size-fit-all approach to metrics: the right (set of) metrics for a news organization must be based on their specific goals (Cherubini & Nielsen, 2016). For news organizations aiming to deliver news that is both currently enjoyable and retrospective appreciated and offer news in a way that fits their users’ practices, various metrics can be used to assess their performance. Clicks can help establish which (kinds of) headlines attract users to quality content, and ‘engaged time’ and ‘scroll depth’ can help gauge if stories intended to be read fully were successful and if not where readers dropped out. Click-through rates on social media can help establish what kind of content is worth interrupting one’s flow of scrolling (chapter 6), and ‘session length’ and ‘return visits’ can help determine which practices visitors engage in (e.g. “reading” versus “checking” (Costera Meijer & Groot Kormelink, 2015). Conversation rates for free trials or subscriptions can help determine what kind of content is (literally) most valuable to users: what is worth signing up or paying for?

Usability is also essential. In addition to having smoothly working and intuitive designs, news organizations could help news users master their devices and interfaces. As chapter 6 revealed, one barrier to adopting news into one’s routine is missing the practical skills to handle and navigate devices and platforms efficiently, and not wanting
to put effort into learning them. A practical solution is to make an accessible how-to-guide for new users or subscribers. Examples include a manual explaining the basic setup of the newspaper so that the subscriber knows where to find relevant and interesting content, or in-app ‘directions’ for first-time users (e.g. “double-click to open the article in print version”; “do [so and so] to save this article for later”). News organizations may also keep in mind that different users engage in different practices, such as “checking”, “reading” and “scanning” (Costera Meijer & Groot Kormelink, 2015). A user-friendly approach that takes these practices into account does not have to be money or time-consuming. A simple example is Dutch newspaper Trouw, which summarizes its cover story in three short, clear sentences, effectively serving both users who “read” and those who “scan”.

Regarding explicit personalization, chapter 3 shows that this should be as effortless as possible for users. Although implicit (algorithmic) personalization was not researched in this dissertation, it must be kept in mind that people consume news for more than informational or entertainment reason: they also consume news – even if it is just to glance at a headline – to have a shared frame of reference with other people. From a user perspective, then, a mix of general content and algorithmically personalized content would likely be ideal.

Limitations

In addition to the limitations of the methodological approaches discussed in Chapter 2, it is worth reflecting on a few specific points regarding this dissertation. First, a valid criticism is that although one of the points of departure of this dissertation was a concern regarding the notion of the agency, the think-aloud protocol seems to conceive of people as exactly that: active, deliberate users aware of their own considerations for clicking or not clicking. While this is a fair critique, the goal was to capture people’s ‘stream of consciousness’, their immediate thoughts and feelings. The informants were not conceived of as agents fully aware of their environment and capable of computing different options before coming to a rational decision, but rather as subjective beings navigating an information environment in real time. The aim was to capture the experience of browsing news from their own perspective, which is why their considerations for (not) clicking were labelled explicitly in their own terms.

A related note is that in chapter 4 a distinction was made between cognitive and affective considerations for clicking, despite the argument in this conclusion that such dimensions only gain significance in their interconnection with each other. A defense is that these categories were not the starting point but the endpoint of research. Using the grounded theory approach, these categories appeared – inductively – to be the
best ‘fit’ for making sense of people’s considerations for clicking: they express the distinction between instantaneous thoughts (cognitive) and gut feelings (affective). In other words, this distinction has heuristic value and should not be interpreted as suggesting a separation between cognition and affect (although this debate is beyond the scope of this dissertation).

In chapter 3, informants built their ideal news sites, which had a striking similarity: they all prominently featured columns with the latest headlines (chronologically ordered) and with the most important news (as highlighted by the news organization). A possible criticism of this method is that since this project was done in collaboration with NOS Nieuws, cards featuring elements from their website were dominant (although they were supplemented with functionalities from other websites). One could therefore question whether informants’ ideal news sites were constrained by the available (NOS) cards, i.e. whether they merely recreated NOS.nl. However, defenses against this are that 1) not all informants were familiar with NOS.nl; 2) the ones that did use NOS.nl criticized it for (at the time) being highly unorganized and unclear; and 3) their ‘clean’ ideal news sites did not resemble NOS.nl. A weightier concern is whether the ideal news sites were a reflection of the lay-out of most news sites (which usually prominently feature the highlights and the latest headlines), including most popular Dutch news site Nu.nl. This is a fair question that cannot be answered based on the data collected within this dissertation (see Webster, 2014, for a discussion about whether user preferences are preexistent or cultivated by media, p. 110-112). What can be emphasized is that the informants’ considerations were key in interpreting their ideal news sites: they were able to explain why they wanted their ideal news site to look like this, namely because they wanted to be brought up-to-date about the latest and most important news as quickly as possible.

The results in chapter 3 must also be revisited in light of new findings regarding people’s preferences for personalization. Research from the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism (Oxford) found that in 19 out of 26 countries surveyed, respondents said that having news automatically selected based on their past consumption was a better option for getting news than having it selected for them by journalists and editors (Nielsen, 2016b; Thurman et al., 2018). How does this square with our findings that people prefer journalistic selection over personalized news? First, although the differences were small, Dutch respondents still preferred journalistic curation (Thurman et al., 2018). Second, our study focused on explicit personalization (i.e. users actively personalize their news) rather than algorithmic selection. Third, it is likely that between 2013 and 2016 people grew more accustomed to personalization due to exposure to such services as YouTube, Spotify and Netflix. Finally, the difference in appreciation of journalistic curation might partially be explained by the different questions asked. In
our study, journalistic curation was presented as the status quo. For instance, in the news site building exercise, news “highlights” were depicted visually on a card (i.e. the card contained an example of highlighted news on an actual news site), rather than explicitly presented as news marked as most important by journalists. In addition, our (non-representative) survey questions regarding journalistic curation did not reference human actors (e.g., “I find it important that the news site clearly indicates which news is the most important”). The Reuters study, on the other hand, did refer to individual journalists (“Having stories selected for me by editors and journalists is a good way to get news”), and presented journalistic curation as one among three equivalent options (“Automatically based on what I’ve read before”, “Judgement of editors or journalists”, and “Automatically based on what my friends have consumed”) (Newman et al., 2016: 12). It could therefore be argued that journalists’ role in selecting news was underemphasized in our study and overemphasized in the Reuters study.

Although this dissertation has shown the value of taking people’s experience of news use as point of departure, this approach – of course – also has limitations. The most notable one is that by focusing on people’s experiences, one of the core functions of journalism is partly overlooked: to inform people. Most notably, the question of whether users understood and remembered news was not addressed. Clearly, this is a limitation: People may appreciate an explanatory approach, but does this actually enhance their understanding? They may experience the practice of checking as valuable and informative, but does it increase their actual knowledge of news? These are important questions that warrant further research. What this dissertation did show was how the situatedness of news use must be taken into account when studying comprehension and retention of news. News is more than a text: it is situated on a technology that has to be handled and navigated, used in a distinct place and time, involving surrounding practices and including different feelings. As concluded in chapter 6, more non-news-centric, in-situ approach is needed to understand how people perceive and process news in real life.

Finally, a word on the grounded theory method employed in this dissertation. In this approach, concepts and categories are described as “emerging” from the data (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). This is a useful way of emphasizing that concepts and categories are the result of the research process rather than the starting point. However, sometimes we can only see things if we have words or concepts for it. In practice, therefore, (new) literature was searched and consulted throughout the research process to help make sense of the data. The notion of prism is helpful here (Pink & Leder Mackley, 2013). Whereas a lens focuses light on a particular dimension, a prism instead turns a ray of light into a spectrum of colors, making visible an array of dimensions inherent but hitherto invisible. Rather than superimposing a priori decided concepts, analytical prisms can be
seen as “theoretical constructs that have been developed to understand things that are already happening”, offering “an abstract route to comprehending complex processes” (Pink, 2012: 19). The challenge then becomes to keep revisiting the data as openly as possible, so that the concepts and categories can still “emerge” from the data.

**Future directions**

In the sections above, some suggestions were already made for future research. As noted, a main challenge is to explore how people can be enabled to use news that their ideal selves want to use. A first step is to systematically explore whether empathetic, explanatory and constructive approaches to news translate into increased use or subscriptions. However, just providing the right content will likely not do the trick; news also needs to fit into people’s everyday routines. A second avenue for research is therefore habit formation: how do people adopt (new forms of) news into their everyday routine, and what are the barriers and possibilities? Methodologically, one way to go about this is to follow people who have recently subscribed to a news title – that they actually want to use – and to capture how, when, and why they do or do not manage to use it. A related question is how taste or preferences for news develop (see Webster, 2014). In particular, it would be interesting to explore how exposure impacts people’s preferences for content and form and by extension how these preferences can be nudged or changed. For instance, two groups could be exposed to different versions of a news site over a longer period of time and then be surveyed about their preferences.

Another challenge is to (further) develop metrics that are more civic-oriented and measure the democratic impact of news. This is especially urgent for public service media, whose primary task in the Netherlands is to inform and educate the public (Mediawet 2008) and whose performance thus should be also judged on the basis of these criteria. Research shows that while journalists do wish to measure their impact in terms of “changes in public policy, public opinion/discourse, individual/community action, and awareness/understanding”, they lack the tools to do so and instead rely on more readily available metrics such as social media traction and web traffic (Powers, 2018: 467). Although metrics of reach and engagement can help media determine whether they fulfil their duty to reach a broad audience, too much of a focus on these numbers incentivizes traffic- and traction-chasing. The latter in particular deserves more attention. If (public) news organizations judge their performance based on social media traction such as comments, this encourages not only subjective status messages (Welbers & Opgenhaffen, 2018), but also intentionally sensational or polarizing ones, since controversial topics attract more (uncivil) comments (Ksiazek, 2018; Ziegele et al., 2018). This is undesirable, especially for public news organizations. Various stakeholders
(scholars, journalists, policymakers) should work together to formulate how civic-oriented impact might be defined and how it can be measured.

Finally, capturing people’s experiences systematically could be a valuable way of creating a historical record of changing news use (cf. Livingstone, 2003; Jensen, 1993). If only numbers like engagement metrics, ratings and circulation figures survive, this will leave behind a limited, superficial account of people’s news use. By recording people’s news use from an emic perspective, we could ‘archive’ how their mundane everyday news experiences change over time. For instance, a representative panel of news users could be followed over the course of several years (or even decades), interviewed yearly to document (changes in) their news use. Such an ambitious project would allow us to document how changes in the media landscape impacted people’s everyday news use.