The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Exploring audience perceptions of, and preferences for, online news videos

Michael Koliska, Neil Thurman, Sally Stares, and Jessica Kunert

Abstract

Journalism professionals and media experts have traditionally used normatively formed criteria to evaluate news quality. Although the digital news media environment has enabled journalists to respond at unprecedented speed to audience consumption patterns, little academic research has systematically addressed how audiences themselves perceive and evaluate news, and even less has focused on audio-visual news. To help fill this research gap, we conducted in-depth group interviews with 22 online news video consumers in the UK to explore their perceptions of online news videos—an increasingly popular news format. Thematic analyses suggest audiences evaluate online news videos using a complex and interwoven set of criteria, which we group under four headings: *antecedents of perceptions*, *emotional impacts*, *news and editorial values* and *production characteristics*. Some of these criteria can be positioned clearly in relation to the literature on news quality in general, while our documentation of the others contributes new, format-specific knowledge. Our findings offer journalists practical insights into how audiences perceive and evaluate a host of characteristics of online news videos, while our conceptual framework provides a foundation for further academic research on audience evaluations of online news videos, and even audio-visual news more generally.

KEYWORDS: criteria for perception of audio-visual news, group interviews, news credibility, news perception, news quality, online news video

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Introduction

High quality of news helps attract and retain news consumers (Wanta & Hu 1994), contributes to journalism's authority and legitimacy and is crucial to the institution's democratic function (Shapiro 2010). However, defining and judging the quality of news has been described as a task that is "as murky as critical judgment of poetry, chamber music or architecture" (Bogart 2004, 44), because "journalists, scholars of journalism, and others with interest in the field lack a common evaluative lexicon" (Shapiro 2010, 145); in our view, Shapiro's characterisation still holds today.

Establishing a common lexicon has been hampered by two seemingly contradictory tendencies. On the one hand, research has proposed a multitude of criteria to evaluate news quality (often multidimensional concepts themselves such as "credibility"), making it difficult to agree on a common framework (Gladney, Shapiro & Castaldo 2007; Kiousis 2001; Prochazka, Weber & Schweiger 2018). On the other hand, there has been little research on quality criteria for specific news formats, such as online video[1]—the focus of this article. Moreover, the majority of scholars have developed quality criteria normatively, or used quality criteria that have been developed normatively (Rieh & Danielson 2007); little research has explored the perceptions and evaluations of audiences themselves.

In the current digital media environment, audience evaluations are becoming increasingly important. This is because measuring audience behaviour online has contributed to a shift in who the arbitrators of news quality are—away from journalists, media experts and academics towards audiences, with their judgements often directly or indirectly influencing journalistic work (Lee & Tandoc 2017).

The impact of the audience is especially noticeable in the provision of visual news. Even though television is still the most popular source of news in the US and across Europe (Matsa

2018; Mitchell 2018), the proportion of online news consumers who watch online news videos on a weekly basis has increased substantially—from 24% in 2016 to 67% in 2020[2] (Newman et al. 2016; Newman et al. 2020). News providers have adapted to this increased appetite for online news videos by changing how news videos are made, with shorter, captioned videos on the rise (Bock 2016), and also, in some cases, by using algorithms to help reduce production times and costs, allowing for a greater volume of output (Dörr 2016). CBS, Reuters and *USA Today* are just some of the news organisations that use automation technology to produce videos (Wibbitz 2020; Wochit 2020).

These changes in news media consumption and production, including the introduction of automated journalism, have made understanding how audiences perceive and evaluate particular news formats more important, motivating our systematic exploration. This study is, we believe, the first attempt to qualitatively explore audience perceptions and evaluations of online news videos and to suggest a set of criteria that can be used in further research on audiences' evaluations of audio-visual news. To do this we conducted group interviews with 22 participants, recruited to ensure a diversity of ages, occupations and genders. Participants watched a range of online news videos and, as they did so, noted their reactions, which were further explored in extended moderator-led discussions. Once transcribed and analysed, the discussions revealed four major categories of themes that we suggest can be used to understand audiences' evaluations of online news videos. Firstly, *antecedents of perceptions*: viewers' preferences for particular news genres, and for specific content they could relate to. Secondly, *emotional impact*: the valence—their liking/disliking—of specific videos, as well as the degree to which they were attracted or repulsed—their levels of arousal. Thirdly, *news and editorial values*: their evaluations and expectations of objectivity, balance and neutrality. Fourthly, *production characteristics*, such as narrative flow, video length and audio-visual features. The themes within

these categories frequently interacted, both within and across categories, to form criteria against which videos were evaluated.

Before discussing our methodology and findings in more detail, we first review the literature on the evaluation of news quality, with a particular focus on audio-visual news.

Literature Review

Two major strands of journalism research focus on perceptions of news and judgements of its quality. The first examines news quality in the broadest sense and the second focuses on perceptions of news credibility.[3]

Defining and Evaluating News Quality

As Urban and Schweiger (2014, 822) write, "defining [news] quality is a tricky task", because journalists, audience members and media experts use different criteria to define and evaluate quality (Neuberger 2014; Tsfati, Meyers & Peri 2006). Most research into news quality has used the values and practices of news media professionals as a benchmark for excellence (Bogart 1989, 2004; Shapiro 2010), with those values based on normative democracy theory (McQuail 2013; Prochazka, Weber & Schweiger 2018). This approach has been criticised (e.g. Beck, Reineck & Schubert 2010), triggering calls to better understand public perceptions of journalistic quality (Meijer 2003). While some research has, indeed, furthered our understanding of the journalism content that audiences need and want (see, e.g., Lacy 1989; Lacy & Rosenstiel 2015; Lee & Chyi 2014; Meijer & Bijleveld 2016; Schrøder 2015), it has mostly centred on print media, and little research has focused on audiences' perceptions and evaluations of audio-visual news.

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021,
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Table 1: Criteria used commonly to evaluate the quality and credibility of news

Common credibility criteria			Common news & information quality criteria
Source credibility	**Media credibility**	**Message credibility**	
Attractiveness[3] (*visual)	Accurate[4,7]	Accurate[5,6]	Accuracy[9,10,11]
Dynamism[2] (*visual)	Believability[8]	Believable[6]	Authority[14]
Expertise[1]	Community well-being[7]	Biased[6]	Balance[13,14]
Trustworthiness[1]	Disregards reader's concern[7]	Boring[6]	Breadth/Depth[11]
	Fact/Opinion separation[7]	Clear[6]	Citizen participation[11,12]
	Factual[7]	Coherent[6]	Civic/Public discourse[11]
	Fair[4,7]	Comprehensive[5,6]	Community building/Leadership[11,12]
	Immoral[7]	Concise[6]	Comprehensibility[9]
	Patriotic[7]	Currency[5,6]	Credibility[11]
	Public interest[7]	Disturbing[6]	Currency[10]
	Reporter training[7]	Enjoyable[6]	Decency[12]
	Respect privacy[7]	Fair[6]	Diversity[9]
	Sensationalistic[7]	Important[6]	Editorial vigor[11,12]
	Trustworthy[4,7]	Interesting[6]	Ethics[9]
	Unbiased[4,7]	Lively[6]	Exclusivity/Originality[11,13]
	Watches out for your interest[7]	Objective[6]	Fact/Opinion separation[11,12]
		Pleasing[6]	Good illustration[11,12]
Sources		Relevant[6]	Good writing[11]
1 Hovland, Janis & Kelley (1959)		Reliable[5,6]	Goodness[10]
2 Berlo, Lemert & Mertz (1969)		Sensationalistic[6]	Immediacy[11]
3 Ohanian (1990)		Timely[6]	Impartiality/Independence[9]
4 Meyer (1988)		Validity[5,6]	Importance[10]
5 Metzger et al. (2003)		Well-Written[6]	Influence[12]
6 Sundar (1999)			Integrity[12]
7 Gaziano & McGrath (1986)			Lack of sensationalism[12]
8 Roper (1985)			Local coverage[12]
9 Urban & Schweiger (2014)			News interpretation[12]
10 Rieh (2002)			Outside commentary[11]
11 Gladney, Shapiro & Castaldo (2007)			Professionalism[12]
12 Gladney (1996)			Relevance[9,11]
13 Shapiro, Alabnese & Doyle (2006)			Transparency[13]
14 Bogart (2004)			Usefulness[10,11]

Unless indicated (as *visual), all criteria in the table were applied primarily to, or were primarily developed from, print/written news.

Table 1 illustrates the plethora of criteria used in normative definitions of news quality (see also Burgoon, Burgoon & Atkin 1982; Lacy & Fico 1990; Merrill 1968; Merrill & Lowenstein 1971; Shapiro 2010). Urban and Schweiger (2014) summarised the most common normative criteria used in news quality research as: diversity (of viewpoints and sources) and impartiality (neutrality and a balance of viewpoints and sources); relevance (timeliness, completeness and analysis) and comprehensibility (conciseness, simplicity, coherence); and ethics (respecting personal, religious and moral attitudes/rights; no discrimination; and the protection of minors) and accuracy (correctness, precision and transparency).

Urban and Schweiger (2014) found that news recipients were better able to distinguish between news items using some normative criteria—such as relevance, impartiality and diversity—than others—such as ethics, objectivity and comprehensibility—and that media brands were used as an important heuristic to evaluate news quality. Tsfati, Meyers and Peri (2006) suggested that audiences evaluate news quality differently than journalists do.

The Perception of Credibility

Many researchers have proposed that credibility is a vital component of news quality and, over the past 70 years, have developed some 200 credibility items (Hanimann et al. 2020) and several measurement scales consisting of as many as 30 items (Gaziano & McGrath 1986; Hanimann et al. 2020; Metzger et al. 2003; Meyer 1988; Roper 1985). Not surprisingly, several scholars have pointed out that there is a lack of agreement on core credibility dimensions (Kiousis 2001), and have suggested that the focus on measuring credibility has come at the price of clearly developing the concept (Metzger et al. 2003). Researchers have also identified possible definitional problems with Hovland, Janis and Kelley's (1959) influential book, which proposed expertness and trustworthiness as two key factors of source credibility. Kohring and Matthes

(2007, 233) wrote that "it remains unclear whether these two components […] are dimensions of credibility or reasons for credibility".

Credibility dimensions differ (despite some overlap) according to whether source credibility, media credibility or message credibility is being measured (see Table 1). Source credibility has been defined as "judgments made by a perceiver (e.g. a message recipient) concerning the believability of a communicator" (O'Keefe 2002, 181). Media credibility research, meanwhile, focuses mainly on the relative credibility of various media channels (for example, print, radio and TV), and message credibility scholars examine message characteristics, such as the content, delivery and structure of messages and the use of language (Metzger et al. 2003). Although credibility is a receiver-based construct, and "exists in the eye of the beholder" (Gass & Seiter 2018, 18), credibility research has focused primarily on developing and testing normative criteria defined by journalism scholars and practitioners.

A few studies have, however, explored qualitatively how audiences perceive and evaluate source and message credibility. Berlo, Lemert and Mertz (1969) interviewed students and their spouses about the acceptability of certain sources, producing 83 adjective pairs and three credibility dimensions: safety (honest-dishonest etc.), qualification (qualified-unqualified etc.) and dynamism (aggressive-meek etc.). Sundar (1999) also asked students to list adjectives they associated with news messages and used them alongside previous, normatively developed criteria in experiments. Using exploratory factor analysis, Sundar proposed four higher-level perception criteria for print and online news, including 'credibility'—as well as 'liking', 'quality' and 'representativeness'—although he acknowledged (1999, 383) that these criteria were not exhaustive. Hilligoss and Rieh (2008) used diary data to understand how students evaluated the credibility of various media. Their three-level framework primarily described psychological evaluation processes, and did not fully explicate the criteria used in the evaluation of specific media types.

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Little research has focused on credibility criteria for audio and video content (Hanimann et al. 2020), though as with evaluations of news quality, scholars recognise that evaluations of credibility can depend on the medium being evaluated (Kohring & Matthes 2007). Although Newhagen and Nass (1989) showed that people focus on different factors when assessing the credibility of television (e.g. the anchor) and print news (e.g. the organisation), much remains to be known about what audiences pay attention to when assessing the quality and credibility of specific news formats such as our focus: online news videos.

The Perception of Audio-Visual News

While television and online news videos can differ in terms of their target audience, narrative style, interactivity and more, they do share fundamental audio-visual production and storytelling features. Despite the maturity of television news video as a medium, the published literature on its perception by audiences is sparse, and the literature on online news video is even sparser. Studies examining the quality of television news often favour normative and comparative approaches, including examination of the news values (such as impact, normality, entertainment, drama, prominence, proximity, timeliness and visual quality) that television editors rely on to select stories within different markets (Buckalew 1969; Golding & Elliott 1979; Schlesinger 1987). Research has also shown that television journalism that is locally focused and/or investigative can increase viewer numbers (Abdenour & Riffe 2019; Belt & Just 2008), suggesting that audiences prefer hard over soft news (see also Nguyen 2012) and a higher degree of professionalisation (see also van der Wurff & Schönbach 2014).

Another strand of research has explored psychological processes, by examining how the characteristics of TV news alter viewers' recall and comprehension. Gunter (1979) showed that the use of short videos within an anchored TV news broadcast was correlated with higher levels of recall than the use of audio or stills. Other studies found that recall and comprehension could be affected by information overlap in the audio and visual channels, the use of narrative

storytelling, the use of graphics and the perception of source credibility (Drew & Grimes 1987; English, Sweetser & Ancu 2011; Furnham, de Siena & Gunter 2002; Gunter 2015; Lang, Newhagen & Reeves 1996; Wise et al. 2009). Audiences appear to struggle to fully attend to audio and visual channels simultaneously (Drew & Cadwell 1985). Audio-visual information has also been found to create a bigger emotional impact than single channel messages, which can assist recall (Crigler, Just & Neuman 1994; Lang et al. 1999). Work examining interactivity and engagement around online news videos—such as commenting and recommendations—indicates that such popularity cues serve as a heuristic for worthwhile viewing (Ksiazek, Peer & Lessard 2016) or positive website perception (Chung & Nah 2009).

In sum, research on the criteria that can be used to judge news quality has mainly focused on print media and on professionally defined normative benchmarks, while little attention has been given to understanding audience perspectives and the potential specificities of different formats. This study explores how audiences perceive and evaluate online news videos. We organise our findings into broad categories of themes that can be thought of as the basis for criteria of evaluation. Our intention is that identifying and illustrating these themes (or criteria) will provide useful practical insights for journalists, as well as foundational material for scholars developing further audience studies research on online news videos, and even audio-visual news more generally.

Method

We conducted nine group interviews in June 2018 with 22 UK residents (five interviews with two participants, and four with three). An agency recruited the participants, who were each paid £60. They were pre-screened for demographic variety and to ensure they consumed online news videos and had no background in journalism.

We decided on group interviews because, compared with one-to-one interviews, they can stimulate participants' explanations and recall, offering more perspectives (Frey & Fontana

1991), and because the interviewer's influence on the interviewee is "diffused by the very fact of [the interview] being in a group rather than in a one-to-one situation" (Frey & Fontana 1991, 180). In contrast to focus groups, which typically revolve around a facilitated debate, our group interviews were guided by a series of questions posed by the interviewers, to achieve more consistency between sessions (Bloor & Wood 2006).

Participants

We interviewed nine females and 13 males, from 27 to 68 years of age, and from a variety of occupations—from landscaper to financial analyst. Table A in the Supplemental Material gives specific demographics, including the gender- and ethnicity-matched pseudonyms used in our reporting. Participants consumed online news videos in various ways, via, for example, news organisation apps, newspaper websites and social media. Most interviewees preferred legacy media for their online news video consumption, such as BBC News online, Guardian.com, MailOnline, *The Sun*, *The Times* and the *London Evening Standard*. Many interviewees had subject preferences, such as politics and sport. They often accessed online news videos on their phones, particularly when not at home. Other devices, more often used at home, included laptops and tablets. When watching videos on public transport, participants would sometimes use headphones and sometimes not, in which case they muted the sound and relied on captions. Videos were often consumed alongside other news forms: online articles, print newspapers, television, radio and podcasts.

Procedure

The group interviews were conducted by three of the authors, in classrooms at a London university, and followed the semi-structured interview script included in the Supplemental Material. Participants were first asked questions about their online news video preferences and watching habits. Then they were shown several online news videos (in sets of two or three), projected onto a large screen with the audio relayed through speakers, to elicit their reactions and

interpretations (Philo 1990). Participants were asked to write down adjectives or phrases that came to mind as they watched the videos, and how strongly these influenced their reactions to, and evaluations of, the videos. The interviewers facilitated discussions around what participants had written down, prompting for thoughts on specific themes where needed. The sessions were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Participants' names were replaced with pseudonyms during that process. The resulting 145,000 words were analysed in NVivo, using thematic analysis,[4] with issue identification, mark-up and theme development evolving over several rounds of coding between two of the authors.

Stimulus Material

Interviewers used a pool of 41 videos with topics ranging from Uber losing their licence in London (local UK news) to the German general election and Catalan independence (international news) (see Table 2). The videos averaged around 70 seconds in length. Twelve were published on the websites of BBC News (5 videos), Guardian.com (5 videos) and the *New York Times* (2 videos). Fourteen were provided by PA Media, a national multimedia news agency, and 15 were produced on Wibbitz's text-to-video automation platform.[5] The videos differed in format, using background music, captions, narration and combinations of stills and moving images to varying degrees (see Table 2, and Table B in the Supplemental Material).

Results

Our analysis of the group interviews revealed that news consumers' perceptions and evaluations of online news video were informed by a complex and interwoven set of criteria. We organised these into four broad categories: *antecedents of perception*, *emotional impact*, *news and editorial values* and *production characteristics* (see Table 3). The sections that follow describe and illustrate these criteria. While we mention when certain themes were discussed frequently, we do not provide any quantitative summary of themes, since our participants in no

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

way constituted a probability sample, or one which we would claim to be "representative" of online video news consumers (Gaskell 2000).

Table 2: Summary of videos played to participants

		Proportion of total videos played*
	With captions	87%
Still/ moving images	All moving images	41%
	Mostly moving images	20%
	About half moving and half still images	11%
	Mostly still images	14%
	All still images	14%
Audio†	Narration from journalist	16%
	Non-journalist speech (e.g. vox pops, interviewees, crowd)	53%
	Natural sound	45%
	Background music	63%
Topic	Arts, entertainment and celebrity (including British royalty)	32%
	International politics or conflict	43%
	Business	12%
	Natural disasters	3%
	Sport	7%
	Science and health	4%
Source	BBC News	17%
	The Guardian	20%
	New York Times	3%
	National news agency (PA Media)	22%
	Video automation platform (Wibbitz)	38%

* The same video was counted more than once if it was played to more than one group.

† Because audio elements can be used in combination, the percentages in this section do not add up to 100.

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Table 3: Summary of criteria used in news consumers' perception of online news videos

Antecedents of perception	**Emotional impact**	**News & editorial values**	**Production characteristics**
● *Subject matter preferences* ● *Relatability* ● *Media type preferences*	● *Valence* (liking-disliking) ● *Arousal* ● *Engagement*	● *Objectivity* ● *Balance* ● *Bias* ● *Neutrality* ● *Sensationalism*	● *Professionalism* ● *Narrative flow* ● *Length* ● *Captions* ● *Visuals* (moving/still images, infographics and transitions) ● *Audio* (natural sound, narrator, interviews, music)

Antecedents of Perceptions

As regular news media consumers, the study participants had developed specific news consumption preferences. These preferences—for particular media platforms and types of content—acted as antecedents in their perception and evaluation of online news videos. Interviewees expressed having clear *media type* preferences. For example, some said they didn't like newspapers anymore, and some clearly expressed a particular liking for videos, finding them more emotionally engaging, with Julian, for example, saying, "You could scream from watching a video, you can laugh, you can cheer."

Interviewees often voiced affinities to news content, which were linked to the interviewees' demographics, location or experience. *Relatability* was passionately discussed by Dina who talked about her response, "as a woman", to a story about Saudi women drivers. Mukesh related strongly to a story about Uber because he travelled a lot. In contrast, Jason thought a video about Spain and Catalonia would be of interest only to people in those places. George was interested in a story about a fire because he had witnessed the fire himself.

Participants' responses to the videos could be impacted by *subject matter preferences*. For instance, Linda thought a video about Hugh Hefner was not her "type of news". Carla said she would find any video about Cristiano Ronaldo engaging because "sometimes your heart automatically lifts to something which you like". Julian pointed out, however, that his preferences only partly explained his responses and that sometimes video makers were at fault: "the subject's not boring, but they've made it boring".

Emotional Impact

Participants' first responses to the videos were frequently emotional in nature. For example, they stated that they liked/disliked, enjoyed/hated or were excited/bored by them. Participants described the video message valence in many ways, including "amusing", "interesting/uninteresting", "captivating", "dramatic", "engaging/unengaging", "dry", "dull", "distressing", "funny", "gripping", "entertaining", "immersive", "humorous", "compelling", "stale", "shocking" and "sad". Responses also varied in the level of emotional arousal. For example, Patricia was "very emotional" and Dina "quite passionate" about a video concerning women drivers in Saudi Arabia, whereas Julian "hated" a video about a cat because it was "so boring".

Participants' expressions of arousal and valence were also sometimes tied to the videos' specific editorial and production characteristics. Interviewees themselves frequently provided a rationale for the way they felt: for instance, while William liked still images that had captured "an expressive face", Gareth thought still images left viewers "aloof" from the story. Jacob was especially engaged by moving images of a fire: "you feel like you're there, it's immersive". Gerard couldn't engage with a video because "there was no talking in it". But speech quality was also important: in one video, for William, "the studio based person was almost like a robot. It was very dull."

News and Editorial Values

Participants' perceptions and evaluations of online news videos were also connected to their general preferences for—or beliefs about—news and editorial values. Much of the participants' discussion evoked normatively defined criteria developed by media professionals. Interviewees frequently said they expected online news videos to be neutral, objective, balanced and comprehensive. When they perceived that videos did not meet these criteria they suggested that the stories were too "sensational", had an "agenda" or lacked "balance". Mukesh criticised a video about Barbie for featuring only the views of a company representative who was likely "to have a biased view". In contrast, Jenifer praised a video about German elections as "unbiased and factual"; more generally, she valued being told "this is what's happened" and being left to make her own mind up, "especially with political things". Jason agreed that the same video gave "no opinion either way", but was less sure this was desirable because "I don't know what they're trying to tell me". Elaine thought balance a more urgent requirement in times of political polarisation. She wanted to be exposed to more than one news source and to try to see "the other side", the better to "make sense" of events such as Brexit and the election of Donald Trump. Interviewees were also often sensitive to online videos being overblown or sensational. Jeriah was wary of "propagandistic" videos that played on viewers' emotions. Gerard, too, felt videos often tried to trigger certain emotions rather than represent reality, with the aim of being "shared around to gain ad revenue or traffic".

A frequent feature of news videos, vox pops—i.e. "man on the street" interviews—triggered a range of responses. Prakash, for instance, thought members of the public could give "very biased" opinions. Dana was wary of discussions featuring people "who just have opinions, they're not experts". A video that featured three anti- and four pro-Uber speakers was praised by

Gerard for having "a good mix" of people and being "balanced", but George had the opposite opinion, thinking "90% of it was one-sided", with most speakers in favour of Uber.

Specific components of the videos, such as the presence or absence of the reporter, also influenced participants' evaluations of how objective or credible a story was. Scott said that it's always useful to have a reporter at the scene, believing their presence contributed to the credibility of the piece by adding "an element of realism" to it. Patricia liked to know that reports were produced by particular journalists whose opinions she valued and whom she felt were "authentic" and "neutral".

As discussed below, perceptions of, and preferences for, certain news and editorial values interacted frequently with perceptions of the videos' production characteristics.

Production Characteristics

Much discussion revolved around the videos' production characteristics (see Table 3). As a consequence, the following section is lengthier, and divided into sub-sections reflecting the components of this broad category.

Production Professionalism

Interviewees frequently remarked on the *professionalism* or *quality of video production*. Jacob and Elaine thought videos that used a slideshow style looked "cheap". William had similar feelings about a video composed of still images and captions, stating that he "could do that" on his laptop. He wondered if it had been made by students.

Videos using moving footage could also come in for criticism. Gareth described a BBC video about Uber as resembling an "afterthought …. I didn't think that it was put together that well." Jeriah and Elaine thought a *Guardian* video about Catalan independence was particularly "professionally produced". When asked what its professionalism consisted of, Jeriah talked about the effective use of music and its representation of "various sides" of the argument, while Elaine mentioned the dexterous use of various forms of media and the concise rendering of

complexity. There was variability in judgements of overall quality: for example, some participants liked a video about an art auction that used largely unedited footage, thinking it effectively captured atmosphere, but Jeriah felt the lack of editing equated to a need for "better production".

Participants pointed out that *narrative flow* was important to them, which was affected by the entire spectrum of story elements, from *structure* through *content* to *narrator*. George, for instance, expressed a preference for videos that feature "a beginning, a middle and an ending". Jacob approved of videos that wrap up "in one piece", like a "short story". However, he also accepted that not all videos needed "to have flow" if, for example, they captured "a dramatic moment in time".

Gerard praised one video for the way in which different elements—"graphics and photos and video clips"—had been used to construct a story. Gareth felt that the visual effects (a between-scene transition effect that used a stars-and-stripes motif) in one video created a sense of narrative immersion: "I felt like I was inside the story." He also suggested that moving images were better than still images in allowing the viewer to feel "the flow of the emotion". The lack of such *flow* could be perceived as a lack of quality. Patricia, for instance, faulted a video about Donald Trump because of the unchronological order in which clips were presented: "The whole thing was mixed up." Peter felt a video composed entirely of captions and still images failed to present an absorbing narrative. Jacob lamented the absence of a narrator, which negatively influenced his perception of the story: "I like to feel like it's a piece that's nicely flowing along and to me that generally needs a reporter or narrator."

Length

Many respondents expressed a preference for shorter videos but accepted longer videos in certain circumstances. Hannah, for example, approved of videos that featured no "unnecessary information" and quickly covered all the facts. Some participants valued such efficiency because

it allowed them to access a wide variety of news quickly: “I try and stick to short ones because I like to read lots of different news,” said Sanjit. Patricia spoke of an increasing preference in society for concision: “we don’t have time and there’s so much” information. Gareth spoke of not having the attention span for longer news.

Some spoke of shorter videos as complements to other types of news consumption—as a way of quickly catching up with developments in stories they were familiar with from elsewhere (Dana), or as starting points for more involved investigation of stories (Gerard). Julian spoke of short videos being a source of serendipitous “extra stories” that he doesn’t seek out but that teach him “something new”.

Subject matter and currency had an influence on acceptance of length. Dana spoke of wanting short videos on subjects it was important to know about but irksome to read about, such as a politician she disliked. She also liked shorter videos for breaking news, “because it just happened, boom”.

Length preferences were also influenced by device and location, for example when videos were viewed away from home: “I like that short snippet length when you’re out and about” (Jacob). Viewing scenarios mentioned included watching during a break at work, perhaps surreptitiously: “not long, just so nobody sees” (Carla). Some participants favoured shorter videos when watching on their phone (e.g. Gerard, Jacob), citing concerns about battery use (Jeriah, George) and data restrictions (Linda). Some stated they would be more likely to watch longer videos at home than when out and about: “I’m quite happy to watch them at home on the laptop” (George). Several of the interviewees would also watch longer videos by skipping through them (Linda, George). Hannah said she would accept longer videos when the subject was something she was “really interested in”.

Participants criticised some of the videos they watched for being too long. For example, Hannah thought a video about a cat was too lengthy given the lightness of the subject. Jacob felt

one video, at a certain point, ceased to add any interesting information. Julian suggested videos could be experienced as too long if their style created a sensory overload that exhausted the viewer.

Some participants experienced videos as being different lengths than they actually were. Elaine experienced a video she liked as being "30-odd seconds" when in fact it was two and half minutes. Julian, however, felt a BBC video he disliked was shorter than a *Guardian* video he did like when in fact it was slightly longer. He thought this might be because it was "lighter in weight" and "covered less".

Captions

Several participants expressed negative sentiments about the use of *captions*, often contrasting this to a preference for speech. Linda, for example, described captions as "just words coming up", and found speech easier to "*relate*" to. Gerard agreed: "we're humans, we're attuned to it [speech]". Some participants felt that videos were not the proper home for large amounts of text, because with large amounts of text they "might as well just be reading an article" (Jacob). A recurring point was captions being too *numerous* or too *fleeting*. Dana said they could vanish before they were read with the result that she had "lost the news". Bridget spoke of captions making her "glaze over" because "it's all too quick". She struggled to *process text and images* simultaneously: "My brain doesn't work like that." Interviewees also expressed an aversion to captions appearing in various places around the screen, with Carla speaking of text being "there and there and there and it's like which way do I look?"

Participants expressed acceptance of text in a secondary capacity, for instance to *complement* speech. Mukesh felt that captions could help to compensate for people speaking too quickly. Some participants allowed that captions were useful for translations of foreign speech. Several saw the merit of captions in viewing scenarios where sound was inappropriate, such as at work or on a bus in the absence of headphones, "because you don't want to disturb people"

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

(Sanjit). Gerard thought that text was "fine for a quick titbit of information", though it shouldn't be the main medium through which information is conveyed.

Some participants objected to *colour* choices within captions, finding red text, for example, unclear, and finding *visual variations* in text problematic generally: "I found it hard to keep reading, because the size and font kept changing" (Julian). Others, however, did not have a problem with such variations in formatting or even failed to notice them. One interviewee, Prakash, felt colour could be used in captions in the service of increased clarity, with red highlighting key information in a way that "really sticks in your head".

Visuals: Moving versus Still Images

Most of the discussion around still images was critical. Linda dismissed still images as "flashing pictures" and said that while she thought still images were OK if used to illustrate a text story, in video she expected "to watch a video … not just words and screenshots". Several interviewees likened the use of still images to "annoying", "boring" or "cheap" presentational slides. George said, "there's no action". For Sanjit, the PowerPoint style was a reminder of work, and made him "want to get away from it", while Peter referred to "death by PowerPoint". One respondent, William, enjoyed the use of still images of Sean Spicer in one of the videos, likening the resulting clip to "a piece of art" and saying he appreciated the opportunity to observe Spicer's facial expressions in the images. Two other respondents commented positively on photographs of Donald Trump in one of the videos, which they "liked" or were "gripped" by.

Interviewees put forward a number of reasons for preferring moving over still images. For Peter, live action conveyed "a message far faster" and held his attention better. For Gareth, moving pictures evoked "more emotions", and were more "inviting and more captivating" compared with still images, which he referred to as being "aloof" and "boring". Some participants appreciated the "liveness" they thought video brings, especially—for Sanjit—with "serious" stories such as conflicts. Moving footage, Prakash thought, "gives you a sense and a

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

picture in your head as to what actually happened." In a similar vein, Elaine thought that "you believe" a story more "if there's moving images" because moving footage is harder to fake.

Some participants did, however, express acceptance of the limited use of still images, commenting that a mix of footage and photographs could work well and hold the viewer's interest. It was also acknowledged that still images sometimes had to be used if moving footage was not available.

Several comments related to *mismatches between images and stories*. For example, Prakash criticised the seemingly "random" nature of some of the illustrative pictures in a video about doping in sport, which caused him to feel a "disconnect" with the video. Some interviewees, like Jenifer, went further, suggesting that a video about a North Korean soldier defecting to South Korea was "like fake news" and "terrible", partly because of the images shown, which could "easily not even [have] been [of] Korea". Participants did not always spot irrelevant images, however (e.g. one video focused on a particular public figure heavily featuring images of someone unrelated to the story), when they were unfamiliar with the subject matter.

The use of *amateur footage* in videos received mixed responses. Carla especially disliked amateur video footage shot in portrait mode, which necessitated the use of black strips down the sides of the video to make it fit a landscape screen. However, Jacob welcomed the inclusion of mobile phone footage, because "we get to see these situations as they're happening".

Visuals: Transitions

Many of the videos used *graphical effects*, mostly as part of the *transition* between scenes. Gerard felt that graphical effects in news videos generally were not an indicator of credibility. He stated that "the more highly edited … a news source is, the less likely it is to be reliable and interesting". He felt "flashy images" were great for a "Marvel movie" but not for a news video. Other participants too felt editing effects could be used to try to mask shortcomings. Jacob said of one video: "they're trying to add loads of graphics to make it all as alive as

possible … but it's still a pointless video". Bridget thought "fancy transitions" were fine, but only for lighter pieces.

Some interviewees, like Jacob, found especially lively effects distracting. Elaine thought the transitions in one video made information harder to "absorb". Mukesh said of the same transitions that they weren't necessary "to get information across to the audience". Hannah felt the use of some transitions featuring stars and flashes and bubbles was excessive. In contrast, Gareth liked some effects: "the transition was very eye catching … I liked the stars and stripes." He thought the visual aspect of that particular video so engaging that he didn't pay attention to the text: "I didn't read one word."

Visuals: Infographics

While editing effects could create suspicion, infographics were seen as useful ways to present facts and statistics. Gerard said, "I find visually it's easier to digest information than hearing numbers." He thought that infographics would be particularly useful in short videos as a way of getting a lot of information across quickly. Jenifer felt that the visual presentation of statistics added a sense of "validity".

Audio: Speech

We have already noted the broad preferences for speech in news videos. Speech was deemed easier to "relate" to, more interesting or easier to process. Bridget said she could concentrate more easily when listening than when reading. Linda had a fundamental expectation that videos should feature moving images and speech, but found an absence of speech more acceptable if moving images were used, "because it says it all in the video". Gerard found there were occasions when he couldn't "be bothered" with sound or when sound might annoy people nearby. Several participants expressed a liking for hearing *interviews* in particular. Jenifer thought they could add to the "emotive tone". In a video about anti-government protests in Iran, Sanjit missed "someone physically in the environment … talking about it".

Various participants expressed a liking for the presence of *reporters* in news videos. Jacob said he preferred a video "where someone's telling the story" and didn't like "just words [text] and pictures", in part because "there's no host as such". He didn't mind if the reporter was present visually or in voice-over; either way, their presence provided "a personal touch". George expressed a liking for reporters with "a nice soft voice" whom he could "relate to". Some interviewees took against particular voices, deeming one, for example, "impartial" but also "boring" and not "engaging" (Hannah), and insufficiently serious for the subject it discussed (Sanjit).

Audio: Natural or Background Sound

Peter felt that the use of *natural sound*—the "buzz and hum"—in a video about an art auction captured the import of the occasion, and that music would have "taken away" from this. Jeriah, however, felt the opposite: the use of natural sounds alone made the same video "dry". Bridget thought that natural sound is especially important "when it's a serious topic. Hearing the way everything's working … brings it more to us."

Audio: Music

The use of music in the news videos was sometimes deemed problematic or inappropriate. Gerard said the emotional colouration produced by music was appropriate for movies, but not in news where it could work against an "unbiased balanced standpoint". The use of music in a story about doping and Russian athletes attracted comments for being very dramatic, which some saw as manipulative. Scott said "overpowering music" could be used to "create a crisis out of anything". Carla felt that in "celebrity videos" or "funny videos about cats and dogs … the music adds a bit extra". But Jason, for example, found the music used in such a video annoying: "it's just dings and dongs for no reason".

Several participants spoke specifically about the appropriateness of music in captioned, unnarrated videos, preferring silence to any music. Patricia said that in the absence of spoken

narration, “just leave us with the captions”. Dina spoke approvingly of the absence of music and use of natural sound in a captioned piece about the sale of a painting. Elaine, however, thought an absence of music made that video dry, thinking the piece “one where music would have been great, because it’s about art”.

Several participants found music distracting and a source of sensory overload that impaired understanding: “so you’ve got text and then you’ve got the pictures, you’ve got the music and for me it’s like there’s a lot to focus on” (Mukesh). Bridget spoke of blanking out music because otherwise there was too much to process. But several interviewees reported not having noticed any music; in this case, Gerard concluded that the music must have been “fairly neutral”.

Although some participants saw music as a hindrance, some thought music helped them to engage with a story. Dana found the music in one video was “at the rhythm you were meant to read” the text, and was therefore “helpful” in her keeping up with the story. Dina said that music could “draw you in”.

Discussion and Conclusion

In contrast to previous work, which predominantly developed news quality criteria using normative and print-based approaches (see Table 1), our research analyses audience perceptions and evaluations of online news videos and proposes criteria that could be used to measure, from the audience perspective, the quality of online news videos in particular, and audio-visual news in general. We have organised the themes that arose in our group interviews into four categories (see Table 3). *Antecedents of perception* includes pre-existing individual preferences that can influence how a video is evaluated. *Emotional impact* covers direct, visceral responses to online news videos, specifically the direction (positive or negative) and level of engagement. *News and editorial values* corresponds largely to the classic, normative criteria that are well developed in

the news quality literature. Lastly, *production characteristics* includes a large set of considerations, including the use of captions, moving and still images, audio and so on.

Our findings have the following implications for academics and practitioners with an interest in online news videos. Firstly, we found evidence of a clear consonance between audiences and journalists in the value they place on classic, normative news and editorial principles. Academics and practitioners in the field of online news videos can thus draw on broader literature and received knowledge in this regard.

Secondly, the emergence of emotional impact as a salient category of reactions supports Sundar's (1999) argument that "liking" is a vital news perception criterion. This may be especially the case with online news videos because of how their multi-channel, audio-visual nature engages viewers, prompting emotional assessments (Latulipe, Carroll and Lottridge 2011).

Thirdly, we have mapped out audience perspectives on a range of video production characteristics which are not present in the research literature. This large category of criteria provides new considerations for journalism practice and research. Our article illustrates a wide variety of perspectives that audiences may take in relation to these characteristics.

Fourthly, identifying and describing the separate category of antecedents to perceptions provides researchers and practitioners with a potential means for explaining and anticipating different reactions to news videos. Such an endeavour is beyond the scope of this study since we did not employ a random or sufficiently large sample of respondents, and while we made efforts to interview people with a range of age, gender and occupation, they cannot be said to constitute a sample that is "representative" (even in these few characteristics) of the broader population from which they were recruited. Indeed, our aim in this paper was not to be able to empirically generalise our results to the population level, but to contribute analytical generalisation by

mapping out the various themes raised in discussion with participants, and suggesting a conceptual organising framework for them.

Nonetheless, the mapping that we are proposing could provide suggested content for further studies that employ quantitative approaches to develop measures of criteria used by audiences to evaluate news quality. We suggest that it would be useful, for example, to test in a well-drawn and large sample the extent of the consensus of opinion around evaluation criteria that seemed to emerge in our small set of participants. Our participants consistently indicated they preferred videos that had a story that flowed without too many distractions. In particular, music, flashy transitions/edits, too many or illegible captions and too many still images were frequently criticised as being distracting or as impeding comprehension. Participants often thought that moving images were more authentic and truer to the medium of online news videos and that the human touch—e.g. a reporter at the scene and/or a human narrator—enhanced their viewing experience. By contrast, videos were perceived as being of lower quality when their visual content didn't match the captions or when it was deemed that insufficient context was provided to make sense of the story. Of course, our participants' preferences varied with subject matter. For instance, while music was often seen as distracting or manipulative in hard news, it was frequently appreciated in entertainment news.

Whilst these findings were striking to us, we cannot say with certainty to what extent they may have been a function of our study design. Firstly, participants were volunteers ready and keen to reflect on their reactions to online news videos. The physical setting for our data collection did not match the natural contexts in which the participants usually consumed online news videos, and their reactions in the classroom may therefore have differed from how they would have reacted if, for example, they had been alone, watching on a smartphone, in a busy or noisy environment, and so on. In their own lives they choose their viewing material according to their interests and preferences, so the range of stimuli used likely departed from their usual

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

viewing habits. And although we tried to show videos with a wide range of topics and production styles, our limited sample of 22 participants evaluating 41 online news videos may mean that we missed capturing different reactions to other types of videos.

Our focus on online news videos provides a set of results that can now be systematically compared with other news formats, to help us further understand their points of overlap and idiosyncrasy. For example, Jenks (2002) suggests that people are more likely to believe what they see than what they read. We may therefore expect that certain criteria might play out differently for video compared to print news.

In this focused study of audience reactions to online news videos, we hope to have clarified how the mainstream literature on *news and editorial values* fits with audiences' expectations and desires in this arena, and how salient *emotional impact* is (following Sundar 1999). We hope also to have provided new insights into the ways in which *production characteristics* affect audiences' reactions, and to have identified some of the habits and preferences (*antecedents of perceptions*) that form a basis for people's reactions. By mapping out the large set of themes raised by our participants, organising them into this four-category scheme, and describing some of the complex ways in which they interact with each other, we hope to have provided a useful way for journalists to think about the best deployment of this news format, and to have provided a basis for scholars to develop audience research on this and other news formats.

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Notes

1. We define online news videos as audio-visual content that is specifically designed and produced for distribution and consumption over the internet. Online news videos differ from broadcast news as they are often self-contained packages that don't require a news programme or anchor for contextualisation. Moreover, many online news videos are captioned, which means they can be consumed and understood with or without sound.

2. This 43% increase in weekly online news video consumption is an average. The increase in consumption in some countries—like the United States (33–61%), Canada (32–62%), the UK (22–39%) and France (22–48%)—was less, while in some other countries, like Turkey (29–95%), it was more.

3. Many researchers studying news quality identify credibility as a vital element (Gladney, Shapiro & Castaldo 2007; Neuberger 2014; Prochazka, Weber and Schweiger 2018; Urban & Schweiger 2014). Some posit that credibility differs from information quality while acknowledging similarities between the two concepts (Rieh & Danielson 2007; Hilligoss & Rieh 2008).

4. Thematic analysis can be described as "a process of making explicit the structures and meanings … in a text" (Gavin 2008, 275). In other words, it is an analysis of text for themes and patterns.

5. Using a text story as a basis, the platform chooses illustrative still and/or moving images, creating an initial edit with either captions or a voice-over. Some further manual editing is usually undertaken prior to publication.

References

Abdenour, J., and D. Riffe. 2019. “Digging for (Ratings) Gold: The Connection between Investigative Journalism and Audiences.” *Journalism Studies* 20 (16): 2386–2403.

Beck, K., D. Reineck, and C. Schubert. 2010. *Journalistische Qualität in der Wirtschaftskrise*. Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft.

Belt, T. L., and M. R. Just. 2008. “The Local News Story: Is Quality a Choice?” *Political Communication* 25 (2): 194–215.

Berlo, D. K., J. B. Lemert, and R. J. Mertz. 1969. “Dimensions for Evaluating the Acceptability of Message Sources.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 33 (4): 563–576.

Bloor, M., and F. Wood. 2006. “Group Interviews.” In *Keywords in Qualitative Methods: A Vocabulary of Research Concepts*, edited by M. Bloor and F. Wood, 99–101. London, Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications.

Bock, M. A. 2016. “Showing versus Telling: Comparing Online Video from Newspaper and Television Websites.” *Journalism* 17 (4): 493–510.

Bogart, L. 1989. *Press and Public: Who Reads What, When, Where, and Why in American Newspapers* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bogart, L. 2004. “Reflections on Content Quality in Newspapers.” *Newspaper Research Journal* 25 (1): 40–53.

Buckalew, J. 1969. “News Elements and Selection by Television News Editors.” *Journal of Broadcasting* 14 (1): 47–54.

Burgoon, J. K., M. Burgoon, and C. Atkin. 1982. *The World of the Working Journalist*. New York: Newspaper Advertising Bureau.

Chung, D. S., and S. Nah. 2009. "The Effects of Interactive News Presentation on Perceived User Satisfaction of Online Community Newspapers." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 14 (4): 855–874.

Crigler, A. N., M. Just, and W. R. Neuman. 1994. "Interpreting Visual versus Audio Messages in Television News." *Journal of Communication* 44 (4): 132–149.

Dörr, K. N. 2016. "Mapping the Field of Algorithmic Journalism." *Digital Journalism* 4 *(*6): 700–722.

Drew, D. G., and R. Cadwell. 1985. "Some Effects of Video Editing on Perceptions of Television News." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 62 (4): 828–849.

Drew, D., and T. Grimes. 1987. "Audio-Visual Redundancy and TV News Recall." *Communication Research* 14 (4): 452–461

English, K., K. D. Sweetser, and M. Ancu. 2011. "YouTube-ification of Political Talk: An Examination of Persuasion Appeals in Viral Video." *American Behavioral Scientist* 55 (6): 733–748.

Frey, J. H., and A. Fontana. 1991. "The Group Interview in Social Research." *The Social Science Journal* 28 (2): 175–187.

Furnham, A., S. De Siena, and B. Gunter. 2002. "Children's and Adults' Recall of Children's News Stories in both Print and Audio-Visual Presentation Modalities." *Applied Cognitive Psychology: The Official Journal of the Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition* 16 (2): 191–210.

Gaskell, G. 2000. “Individual and Group Interviewing.” In *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*, edited by M. W. Bauer and G. Gaskell, 39–56. London: SAGE Publications.

Gass, R. H., and J. S. Seiter. 2018. *Persuasion: Social Influence and Compliance Gaining* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gavin, H. 2008. “Thematic Analysis.” In *Understanding Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology*, 273–281. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Gaziano, C., and K. McGrath. 1986. “Measuring the Concept of Credibility.” *Journalism Quarterly* 63 (3): 451–462.

Gladney, G. 1996. “How Editors and Readers Rank and Rate the Importance of Eighteen Traditional Standards of Newspaper Excellence.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 73 (2): 319–331.

Gladney, G., I. Shapiro, and J. Castaldo. 2007. “Online Editors Rate Web News Quality Criteria.” *Newspaper Research Journal* 28 (1): 55–69.

Golding, P., and P. Elliott. 1979. *Making the News*. London: Longman

Gunter, B. 1979. “Recall of Brief Television News Items: Effects of Presentation Mode, Picture Content and Serial Position.” *Journal of Educational Television* 5 (2): 57–61.

Gunter, B. 2015. *The Cognitive Impact of Television News: Production Attributes and Information Reception*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hanimann, A., A. Heimann, L. Hellmueller, and D. Trilling. 2020. *The Credibility of Credibility Measures: A Review of Credibility Measurement Scales in Media Research from 1951 to 2018*. Unpublished manuscript.

Hilligoss, B., and S. Rieh. 2008. “Developing a Unifying Framework of Credibility Assessment: Construct, Heuristics, and Interaction in Context.” *Information Processing and Management* 44 (4): 1467–1484.

Hovland, C. I., I. L. Janis, and H. Kelley. 1959. *Communication and Persuasion: Psychological Studies of Opinion Change* (3rd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Jenks, C. 2002. “The Centrality of the Eye in Western Culture: An Introduction.” In *Visual Culture*, edited by C. Jenks, 1–25. London: Routledge.

Kiousis, S. 2001. “Public Trust or Mistrust? Perceptions of Media Credibility in the Information Age.” *Mass Communication and Society* 4 (4): 381–403.

Kohring, M., and J. Matthes. 2007. “Trust in News Media: Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Scale.” *Communication Research* 34 (2): 231–252.

Ksiazek, T., L. Peer, and K. Lessard. 2016. “User Engagement with Online News: Conceptualizing Interactivity and Exploring the Relationship between Online News Videos and User Comments.” *New Media & Society* 18 (3): 502–520.

Lacy, S. 1989. “A Model of Demand for News: Impact of Competition on Newspaper Content.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 66 (1): 40–48.

Lacy, S., and F. Fico. 1990. “Newspaper Quality & Ownership: Rating the Groups.” *Newspaper Research Journal* 11 (2): 42–56.

Lacy, S., and T. Rosenstiel. 2015. *Defining and Measuring Quality Journalism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers School of Communication and Information.

Lang, A., P. Bolls, R. F. Potter, and K. Kawahara. 1999. “The Effects of Production Pacing and Arousing Content on the Information Processing of Television Messages.” *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 43 (4): 451–475.

Lang, A., J. Newhagen, and B. Reeves. 1996. “Negative Video as Structure: Emotion, Attention, Capacity, and Memory.” *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 40 (4): 460–477.

Latulipe, C., E. A. Carroll, and D. Lottridge. 2011. “Love, Hate, Arousal and Engagement: Exploring Audience Responses to Performing Arts.” In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1845–1854.

Lee, A. M., and H. I. Chyi. 2014. “When Newsworthy Is Not Noteworthy: Examining the Value of News from the Audience's Perspective.” *Journalism Studies* 15 (6): 807–820.

Lee, E.-J., and E. C. Tandoc. 2017. “When News Meets the Audience: How Audience Feedback Online Affects News Production and Consumption.” *Human Communication Research* 43 (4): 436–449.

Matsa, K. E. 2018. “Most Western Europeans Prefer TV News while Use of Print Outlets Lags.” *Pew Research Center*, 27 September. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/09/27/most-western-europeans-prefer-tv-news-while-use-of-print-outlets-lags/

McQuail, D. 2013. *Journalism and Society*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Meijer, I. C. 2003. “What Is Quality Television News? A Plea for Extending the Professional Repertoire of Newsmakers.” *Journalism Studies* 4 (1): 15–29.

Meijer, I. C., and H. P. Bijleveld. 2016. “Valuable Journalism.” *Journalism Studies* 17 (7): 827–839.

Merrill, J. C. 1968. *The Elite Press: Great Newspapers of the World*. New York: Pitman.

Merrill, J. C., and R. L. Lowenstein. 1971. *Media, Messages, and Men: New Perspectives in Communication*. New York: David McKay & Company.

Metzger, M. J., A. J. Flanagin, K. Eyal, D. R. Lemus, and R. M. McCann. 2003. "Credibility for the 21st Century: Integrating Perspectives on Source, Message, and Media Credibility in the Contemporary Media Environment." *Annals of the International Communication Association* 27 (1): 293–335.

Meyer, P. 1988. "Defining and Measuring Credibility of Newspapers: Developing an Index." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 65 (3): 567–574.

Mitchell, A. 2018. "Americans Still Prefer Watching to Reading the News – and Mostly Still through Television." *Pew Research Center*, 3 December. Retrieved from https://www.journalism.org/2018/12/03/americans-still-prefer-watching-to-reading-the-news-and-mostly-still-through-television/

Neuberger, C. 2014. "The Journalistic Quality of Internet Formats and Services: Results of a User Survey." *Digital Journalism* 2 (3): 419–433.

Newhagen, J., and C. Nass. 1989. "Differential Criteria for Evaluating Credibility of Newspapers and TV News." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 66 (2): 277–284.

Newman, N., R. Fletcher, D. A. L. Levy, and R. K. Nielsen (Eds.). 2016. *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2016*. Oxford.

Newman, N., R. Fletcher, A. Schulz, S. Andı, and R. K. Nielsen (Eds.). 2020. *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2020*. Oxford.

Nguyen, A. 2012. “The Effect of Soft News on Public Attachment to the News.” *Journalism Studies* 13 (5–6): 706–717.

Ohanian, R. 1990. “Construction and Validation of a Scale to Measure Celebrity Endorsers' Perceived Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Attractiveness.” *Journal of Advertising* 19 (3): 39–52.

O’Keefe, D. J. 2002. *Persuasion: Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Philo, G. 1990. *Seeing and Believing: The Influence of Television*. London: Routledge.

Prochazka, F., P. Weber, and W. Schweiger. 2018. “Effects of Civility and Reasoning in User Comments on Perceived Journalistic Quality.” *Journalism Studies* 19 (1): 62–78.

Rieh, S. Y. 2002. “Judgment of Information Quality and Cognitive Authority in the Web.” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 53 (2): 145–161.

Rieh, S. Y., and D. R. Danielson. 2007. “Credibility: A Multidisciplinary Framework.” *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 41 (1): 307–364.

Roper, B. 1985. *Public Attitudes toward Television and Other Media in a Time of Change: The Fourteenth Report in a Series*. New York, N.Y: Television Information Office.

Schlesinger, P. 1987. *Putting Reality Together: BBC News*. London: Methuen.

Schrøder, K. C. 2015. “News Media Old and New: Fluctuating Audiences, News Repertoires and Locations of Consumption.” *Journalism Studies* 16 (1): 60–78.

Shapiro, I., P. Albanese, and L. Doyle. 2006. “What Makes Journalism ‘Excellent’? Criteria Identified by Judges in Two Leading Awards Programs.” *Canadian Journal of Communication* 31 (2006): 425–445.

Shapiro, I. 2010. “Evaluating Journalism: Towards an Assessment Framework for the Practice of Journalism.” *Journalism Practice* 4 (2): 143–162.

Sundar, S. S. 1999. “Exploring Receivers' Criteria for Perception of Print and Online News.” *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 76 (2): 373–386.

Tsfati, Y., O. Meyers, and Y. Peri. 2006. “What Is Good Journalism? Comparing Israeli Public and Journalists’ Perspectives.” *Journalism* 7 (2): 152–173.

Urban, J., and W. Schweiger. 2014. “News Quality from the Recipients’ Perspective: Investigating Recipients’ Ability to Judge the Normative Quality of News.” *Journalism Studies* 15 (6): 821–840.

van der Wurff, R., and K. Schönbach. 2014. “Audience Expectations of Media Accountability in the Netherlands.” *Journalism Studies* 15 (2): 121–137

Wanta, W., and Y.-W. Hu. 1994. “The Effects of Credibility, Reliance, and Exposure on Media Agenda-Setting: A Path Analysis Model.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 71 (1): 90–98.

Wibbitz. 2020. “Wibbitz.” Retrieved on 5 March from https://www.wibbitz.com/

Wise, K., P. Bolls, J. Myers, and M. Sternadori. 2009. “When Words Collide Online: How Writing Style and Video Intensity Affect Cognitive Processing of Online News.” *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 53 (4): 532–546.

Wochit. 2020. “Wochit.” Retrieved on 5 March from https://www.wochit.com

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Supplemental Material

Table A: Demographics of the interviewees

Pseudonym	Age	Gender	Work status	Occupation	Children under 16
George	49	Male	Full time	Landscape gardener	Yes
Gerard	29	Male	Full time	Musician	No
Linda	61	Female	Part time	Receptionist	No
Jacob	37	Male	Part time	Course administrator	No
Bridget	43	Female	Full time	Personal assistant	Yes
Dina	53	Female	Full time	Social carer	No
Peter	68	Male	Self employed	Commercial director in art sales	Yes
Dana	42	Female	Part time	Business development	No
Mukesh	27	Male	Full time	Manager	Yes
Sanjit	28	Male	Full time	IT business intelligence consultant	No
Jeriah	48	Male	Full time	Human resources	Yes
William	56	Male	Full time	Music producer	No
Hannah	30	Female	Full time	Personal assistant	No
Carla	36	Female	Full time	Construction logistics manager	Yes
Elaine	50	Female	Full time	Photographer	No
Prakash	44	Male	Full time	Financial analyst	Yes
Scott	42	Male	Full time	Charity manager	Yes
Jenifer	27	Female	Full time	Personal assistant	No
Jason	59	Male	Full time	Transport consultant	No
Julian	32	Male	Full time	Photographer	No
Gareth	44	Male	Full time	Data analyst	Yes
Patricia	65	Female	Part time	Modern languages teacher	No

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Interviewer Script

Get to read participant information sheet and sign consent form.

Suggested intro:

The session will last two hours and if you need anything during that time, a drink or a bathroom break, please feel free to get up: you don't need to ask first.

This session is about online news videos, which you said you watched, that's right isn't it?

We're interested in what you think about online news videos as news consumers. For example, what you like – or look for in them.

What's really important to us is YOUR opinion. There are no right or wrong answers. So please write down and tell us what comes into your head as you watch and discuss the videos. We're not looking for you to say anything in particular, just what you honestly think or feel.

So, let's start with a short round of introductions. Could you please introduce yourselves briefly, with just your name if you like.

Thank you. As I said, we're interested in short online news videos that you watch on news websites or mobile apps.

This is the sort of video I mean [**play video**]. They are usually 1–3 minutes long, although they might be shorter if they are for social media like Twitter. Some might have captions: words on the screen rather than a voiceover. They might be landscape format if you watch them on a PC, or portrait format if you watch them on your phone.

Of course, some online news videos are longer. 5, 10, 15 even 25 minutes. Although we are mainly interested in short online news videos, we're also interested in your views about longer online news videos. We'll talk about them too later in the interview.

GENERAL QUESTIONS (NO MORE THAN 30 MINUTES):

Q: Ok so please could you each tell me how regularly you watch online news videos and where, for example at home, at work, when travelling.

Q: Has the number of online news videos you watch, and where you watch them, changed over the last few years?

Q: Can you say what kinds of factors have influenced that change? [if change expressed]
or
Can you say what kinds of factors might influence how often you watch news videos? [if no change expressed]

Q: Thinking about the mix of online news videos you watch, how many are short (1–3 minutes) and how many are longer, for example 5, 10, 15 or even 25 or 35 minutes?

Q: Can you tell me why you tend to watch shorter or longer online news videos?

Q: Are there particular kinds of topics you tend to watch online news videos about? [Only show slide of topics once] And any more from this list, or any others that now come to mind?

Q: Why or when do you prefer watching news videos over other forms of news?

Q: What do you like about news videos?

Q: What do you dislike about news videos? (esp. in contrast to other news formats)

Q: Why do you watch news videos?

WRITTEN / ORAL EXERCISE ON SPECIFIC VIDEOS:

Q: Ok now we'll watch a short online news video. As we watch them, could you write down the thoughts that come to your mind about the video. Don't worry about expressing things elegantly – they can be odd words, phrases, anything – and could be things that you notice about the video, your reactions or how you feel when watching it – really anything that goes through your mind. **[hand out sheet**]

PLAY FIRST VIDEO

OK now could you take a look at what you wrote and think of adjectives to describe your reactions to the video. They don't have to be single adjectives – they could be phrases if that makes more sense to you [**hand out 2nd sheet**]

Now you've done that, in the column next to the adjectives or phrases could you indicate how strongly each adjective influences your overall reaction to the video or your overall judgement of the video. Two stars for very important, one star for important, and just leave the box blank if the adjective is not so important.

Ok let's discuss some of the adjectives or phrases you wrote down. [Get them to read through.]

Example prompts:

- Why did you feel that way?
- What do you mean?
- Can you explain a bit more?
- Can you give an example?
- What does that mean to you?
- Was that something that struck you immediately, or was it more subtle?
- Is that something that you tend to notice in news videos generally?
- Did you think that was really unusual?
- What are your thoughts on that?
- Do you have any reactions to that? For example, prefer A or B? What is it about A or B that you like better?

REPEAT EXERCISE WITH OTHER VIDEOS.

ISSUES TO GO INTO MORE DETAIL ON – IF NOT ALREADY DISCUSSED / IF TIME REMAINING:

CAPTIONS:

- Some online news videos have captions (the words on screen) [PLAY VIDEO]. How do you feel about captions on short online news videos?

- Are captions useful? For example, if you are watching short online news videos at work or on public transport?
- What do you think about short-form news videos with captions versus videos with someone talking?
- Do you have any thoughts about different styles of captions? Different fonts? Movement? That sort of thing?

STILL AND MOVING IMAGES:

- Short online news videos can use a mixture of photographs and / or moving images. For example, this one [PLAY VIDEO] is more of a slide-show video that uses mainly still photographs. How do you feel about that?

MUSIC:

- Some short online news videos just use background music. What do you feel about that?

GENERAL / SPECIFIC IMAGES:

- (show video with lots of generic images) Just say "what did you think of this video?"

GOOD RANGE OF IMAGES / TOO MANY SIMILAR IMAGES:

- (show video with lots of similar images) Just say "what did you think of this video?"

LENGTH:

- Most short online news videos are about 1–3 minutes. Is that too short, too long or about right?

EDITING:

- In general do you notice how well edited short-form online news videos are? Things like:
    - How well the music combines with the visuals?
    - How many separate scenes a video has?
    - The pacing of the cuts between scenes?
    - How the audio and text match the visuals, i.e. seeing an image or video that matches what you are reading or hearing?

TRANSITIONS:

- Some videos use simple cuts between scenes, others use wipes or fades (play example).
- How do you feel about these different transitions?

COLOUR:

- Some short online videos use colourful overlays (play example).
- What do you think about these?

GRAPHICS:

- Some short online videos use graphics (play example). What do you think about that?

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021,
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Table B: Full list of videos played to the participants

Story	Publication date	Length (mins: secs)	Supplier	Number of group interview(s) video shown in	Had captions?	Had narration from journalist?	Subjects (e.g. interviewees) audible in video?	Non-vocal location sound audible?	Had background music?	Mixture of still images / moving footage
Saudi women rejoice at end of driving ban	30.09.2017	2:03	BBC News	4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	All moving footage
Playboy's Hugh Hefner dies aged 91	29.09.2017	1:11	BBC News	3	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	All moving footage
Mixed reactions after Uber stripped of London licence	22.09.2017	1:49	The Guardian	6	Yes, some, mostly to indicate name of speaker	No	Yes	Yes	No	All moving footage
More reactions after Uber stripped of London licence	23.09.2017	1:59	BBC News	2	Only two, for quotations	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	All moving footage apart from stills accompanying two quotations
Trump cancels visit to London	13.01.2018	0:59	Automated video platform	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	About half and half

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Wildfires in southern California	07.12.2017	1:02	National news agency	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	All moving footage
Prince Harry talks “fantastic” Christmas with Meghan Markle	27.12.2017	0:40	Automated video platform	6	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	All moving footage
Italy fans distraught after team fails to qualify for World Cup	14.11.2017	1:55	National news agency	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Mostly moving footage (only 17 seconds of still images)
Superstar golfer Tiger Woods pleads guilty to reckless driving	27.10.2017	0:38	National news agency	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	All moving footage
“The Rock” set to receive star on Hollywood Walk of Fame	07.12.2017	0:53	Automated video platform	2	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	All still images

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Taylor Swift wins assault case against DJ	15.08.2017	1:32	BBC News	2	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Mostly moving footage (only 29 seconds of still images)
Could Omar be the world's longest cat?	21.05.2017	0:48	The Guardian	4	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	More moving footage (15 seconds of stills)
Protesters killed in Iran's anti-government rallies	31.12.2017	0:41	Automated video platform	2	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	All still images
A profile of Hillary Clinton	2017	1:18	Automated video platform	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	All still images
Cristiano Ronaldo Ballon d'Or Winner: Career in 60 seconds	07.12.2017	1:02	National news agency	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Mostly still images (only 16 seconds of moving footage)
Fats Domino the amiable rock 'n' roll pioneer has died aged 89	25.10.2017	0:38	National news agency	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	About half and half

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Angela Merkel re-elected for fourth term	27.09.2017	1:33	BBC News	2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	All moving footage
Harry and Meghan release romantic engagement photos	21.12.2017	0:30	National news agency	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Mostly still images (10 seconds of moving footage)
IOC bans Russia from 2018 winter Olympics over doping scandal	05.12.2017	0:47	Automated video platform	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	About half and half
President Trump formally recognizes Jerusalem as Israel's capital	06.12.2017	0:44	Automated video platform	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	About half and half
North Korean soldier escapes to South	13.11.2017	0:42	Automated video platform	2	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Mostly still images (only 5 seconds of moving footage)

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021,
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Trump critical of May	29.11.2017	0:48	Automated video platform	2	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Mostly still images (16 seconds of moving footage)
Spanish PM moves to dissolve Catalan government	21.10.2017	1:10	National news agency	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	All moving footage
Angela Merkel wins German election	24.09.2017	0:51	National news agency	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	All moving footage
Catalonia's fight for independence explained	01.10.2017	2:24	The Guardian	3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mostly moving footage (44 seconds of stills)
Earth-sized planet discovered with mild climate and peaceful parent star	15.11.2017	1:00	National news agency	3	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	All moving footage

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Barbie's boyfriend Ken gets a new look	21.06.2017	0:55	The Guardian	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	About half and half
Kim Trump Dotard	22.09.2017	0:48	Automated video platform	3	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	All still images
Group 6 Kim Trump Dotard	22.09.2017	0:48	National news agency	2	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Mostly still images, with some moving footage of the newscaster
Russian athletes ban	05.12.2017	0:58	National news agency	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	All moving footage
Coffee cuts risk of dying from heart disease	11.07.2017	0:41	The Guardian	1	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	All moving footage
Tom Petty dies, his lyrics spoke for underdogs	02.12.2017	1:42	The New York Times	1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mostly moving footage (23 seconds of stills)

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Trump travel ban	24.07.2017	1:03	Automated video platform	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Mostly still images (14 seconds of moving footage)
USA military exercises Korea	21.08.2017	0:32	National news agency	1	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	All moving footage
Strong earthquake strikes near Mexico City	20.09.2017	1:43	The New York Times	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	All moving footage
Hollywood Me Too	01.01.2018	0:47	Automated video platform	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Mostly still images (13 seconds of moving footage)
Trump mocks Kim	03.01.2018	00:50	Automated video platform	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Almost all still images; one very short segment of moving footage
Leonardo da Vinci painting sold at auction	15.11.2017	01:05	National news agency	2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Almost all moving footage, just one still image

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Journalism Studies, 20 May 2021, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1927154

Sean Spicer resigns	21.07.2017	01:14	Automated video platform	3	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	All still images
Nicola Sturgeon meets Hillary Clinton	07.04.2017	00:52	Automated video platform	2	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	A mixture: roughly the first half moving, the second half still
Paradise Papers – who's been named?	05.11.2017	01:50	National news agency	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	A mixture, alternating between each format