Małgorzata Gajda-Łaszewska is Assistant Professor at the American Studies Center of Warsaw University; her PhD thesis was devoted to the presentation of the Gulf War (1991) in media and literature as a reflection of American mainstream culture. She pursues research on American media, with a particular focus on the media and war, and communication in consumer culture (advertising).
e-mail: mgajda@uw.edu.pl

Małgorzata Gajda-Łaszewska

The digital experiment of daily newspapers: A necessity or a hasty misstep?

It is common knowledge that daily newspapers are not faring too well at the moment. Almost every newspaper in America[1] (as well as in Europe, where a similar process is taking place) has experienced a wave of layoffs, budget cuts, section consolidation, closure of foreign offices or an abandoning of print editions (Vranica & Marshall, 2016). The acute crisis in the daily press and the attendant loss of the influence of printed newspapers now superseded by the Internet have highlighted a much more far-reaching process, involving profound changes in the mechanism of accessing information, as well as its selection, verification and consumption, especially among young users of new media. This, in turn, has had an impact on the level of social awareness of the citizens as well as on their ability to make informed choices. The problems experienced by newspapers have largely been attributed to the failure of the business model which so far formed the basis of their operation. Until 2000, advertising on average accounted for 82% of newspaper revenue (in the American market), with sales making up the remaining 18% (Meyer, 2009, p. 40).[2] It must be noted that this was the highest level of income recorded since the Newspaper Association of America began research of the newspaper sector in 1950 (Perry, 2015). The following years, however, saw

---

[1] The present article focuses on the presentation of problems of newspapers and news in general in recent years on the example of the American market.

[2] To compare, in the mid-twentieth century these figures were, respectively, 71 and 29% (Meyer, 2009, p. 40).

a decline of over 75% in advertising revenue, from 67 billion US dollars to a mere 16,4 billion in 2014 (Perry, 2015). Until recently, newspaper advertising was dominated by three major sectors: retail, nationwide advertising and classified ads (mainly jobs, housing and cars). It is the last of these sectors that has been particularly prone to change and migration to new media. Robert G. Kaiser (2014) observes that Craigslist, the free Internet provider of classified advertising "has destroyed" newspapers. It must be noticed, however, that such a state of affairs was partly the result of the newspapers' expansive, monopolistic policy. As Philip Meyer argues, the newspapers which monopolised local communities were like "tollgates" on a motorway, controlling the flow of information between local retailers and their customers: "For most of the twentieth century, that bottleneck was virtually absolute. Owning the newspaper was like having a power to levy a sales tax" (Meyer, 2009, p. 38). It is no wonder, then, that the development of new technologies prompted advertisers (mainly retailers) to look for other marketing methods. With the advent of alternative solutions, advertising turned out to be unreliable as the main source of newspaper revenue, endangering in fact the very survival of the medium. This was all the more so given that daily newspapers, used to "easy money", were reluctant to face this new reality and introduce changes to adapt to it. "That easy-money culture has led to some bad habits that still haunt the industry. If the money is going to come in no matter what kind of product you turn out, you become production oriented instead of customer oriented" (Meyer, 2009, p. 39). As a result, you may lose your customer. The advent of new media, more attractive from the commercial point of view, more precise and less expensive in reaching desirable target groups, has undoubtedly become an advantageous alternative for advertisers, allowing them to free themselves from the press monopoly. As Bernard Poulet notes, "It is not the advertisers' task to fund the press and information" (Poulet, 2009, p. 34). It seems, however, that for advertisers the Internet is not simply a medium of choice, but of necessity, since it is used by young people, the most valuable of all consumer groups. Meanwhile, the daily press continues to lose readers:

> Advertising is following readers out of the door. The rush is almost unseemly, largely because the internet is a seductive medium that supposedly matches buyers with sellers and proves to advertisers that their money is well spent. Classified ads, in particular, are quickly shifting online. ("Who killed the newspaper?", 2006)

A considerable reduction in profits led to an outbreak of panic in the press industry. This meant budget cuts, limited expenditure and layoffs among journalists. The last twenty

years has seen the loss of about 20,000 jobs (39%) (Barthel, 2016, p. 9); in the most extreme cases, newsrooms have been closed. It must be observed, however, that the profit turned over by newspapers at the time reached 20–40%. Such figures are typical of luxury goods retailers rather than supermarkets, which are a much closer parallel for the newspaper industry (6–7%). "In turnover, newspapers are more like supermarkets than yacht dealers. Their product has a one-day shelf life. Consumers and advertisers alike have to pay for a new version every day if they want to stay current" (Meyer, 2009, p. 39). Understandably, a fall in the profit margin caused widespread alarm. However, it is worthwhile remembering that, as Bill Moyers rightly pointed out, the level of profit reaped by newspaper publishers was even higher than Fortune 500 (Moyers, 2007). The economic crisis of 2008 further exacerbated the financial difficulties of the press. Even those advertisers (mainly local ones: shop owners, car dealers) who chose daily newspapers as their marketing tool had to limit their advertising expenditure. They placed their advertisements less often and on a smaller scale, increasingly looking towards the Internet as a more profitable medium. Google's advertising revenue, for example, rose year by year: "from $70 million in 2001 to an astonishing $50.6 billion in 2013" (Kaiser, 2014).

In this way the Internet won over advertisers, who look for the most profitable investment, following their clients into the virtual world. At the same time, the number of newspaper readers has been steadily falling. The sharpest drop in newspaper circulation since 2010 took place in 2015 (7%) (Barthel, 2016, p. 10). The decline can generally be seen across all age groups, with the highest fall noted in the 35–44 group, while paradoxically the level of circulation among 18–24-year-olds was the least affected (Edmonds, Guskin, Mitchell, & Jurkowitz, 2013). This, however, may be attributed to the fact that only slightly more than 20% of people in this age group report that they read any daily newspapers at all. Critics observe a general decline in interest in the news, locating its causes in such problems as "a crisis of convictions and social engagement, as well as models of collective behaviour, coupled with the triumph of individualism and growing social disparities" (Picard, 2006, as cited in Poulet, 2009, p. 41). Young people migrate to the Internet in order to satisfy their need for information and communication, mainly through social networking sites. It seems that the process of "generational replacement – older, loyal readers dying off and being replaced by young people socialized to other media" (Meyer, 2009, p. 68), which took place in the 1970s, is now repeating itself. The Internet is the natural environment, the new reality of young media consumers; it is a deeply integrated world in which a mobile device

can perform a range of tasks, from online chatting, shopping, checking cinema listings and traffic updates, to banking, providing favourite music and other entertainment. This does not mean that while being online a young person does not receive any news. The process, is characterised by an entirely different dynamics. Before taking a closer look, however, let us consider the steps that newspapers have taken in order to survive and function effectively in the new circumstances, retaining or gaining readership.

How to survive

Remedy plans include various measures. Many American newspapers implemented the most radical version, involving a total surrender and closure of newsrooms. The number of daily newspapers in the USA fell by over a hundred titles, from 1,457 to 1,331 (Barthel, 2016, p. 19). Most newspapers, however, are putting up a fight. They try to enter the world of the Internet and make their mark there on their own terms. Sometimes they abandon the costly print edition and continue to serve their readers exclusively online. Moreover, they test other crisis solutions, for example the division of website content into items freely available and those reserved only to paying subscribers (paywalls). In this way newspapers try to draw the readers' attention to the fact that reliable journalism requires considerable expenditure, and attempt to make up (at least partly) for the losses caused by the crisis in traditional solutions. On 4 August 2015, over four years after the introduction of content division, *The New York Times* reported that it had exceeded the number of one million online paying subscribers. This took place two months after the World Association of Newspapers and News Publishers (WAN-IFRA) announced that on the global press market the revenues from the print and digital circulation had exceeded advertising revenues (which had dominated since the 1960s). As Derek Thompson observes,

> The emerging business models of the *Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* are slowly traveling back in time to recover the subscription-first model that dominated the industry before the 1830s – with one important catch. The 1830s were a heyday of local papers; without the advent of telegraphs or telephones, news didn't travel well. But today it's local news organizations that are suffering the most. (Thompson, 2016)

Such an approach demonstrates the need to maintain good-quality, serious, socially useful journalism based on high standards, which is especially important for

local communities. This is in fact the route closest to the traditional model of the press. The medium and its ways and means may change, but the mission remains the same. It must also be added that, while seen as justified and accepted by people concerned about the marginalisation of some areas of journalism (such as investigative journalism), the introduction of paywalls seemed difficult to accept for readers who over the years had become used to free online content and did not intend to pay for it, even at the cost of not being adequately informed. However, as Larry Kilman argues, there is "a clear indication of the growing acceptance of paying for credible and reliable on-line content, something that was considered heresy just a few years ago" ("The big ideas for 2015", 2014). He also observes that

> With all the free offerings out there, people are still willing to pay for news that is professionally written and edited, that is independent, entertaining and engaging. In short – what newspapers have offered for 400 years, and continue to offer, on emerging and existing platforms, no matter how it is delivered. (Milosevic, Chishlom, Kilman, & Henriksson, 2014, p. 35)

Paid subscription on newspaper portals, especially the well-respected ones, is not the only survival strategy. Newspaper owners are searching for other sources of funding, such as the municipal model, government press or press sponsored by foundations (see: Pickard, Stearns, & Aaron, 2009).

In the sphere of content, there are also numerous initiatives aimed at enhancing the attractiveness of the product, i.e. information. Here, however, most solutions tend towards the adaptation to the new media environment (in both form and content) and making one's presence visible in it. Newspaper portals adopt an assimilation strategy. They make use of new technologies in order to enhance the attractiveness of the message and enrich the reader's experience. For example, *The New York Times* introduced documentary virtual reality feature films and provided its subscribers with cardboard glasses to enable viewing (Lufkin, 2015). However, a question arises whether for the news to enter the Internet is just a change of tools? Can new media, such as the increasingly popular social media, take over the role of newspapers, and if so, how? Is news on Facebook the same kind of news as that published by traditional printed newspapers or their online portals? Does the Internet have a social function at all? Who is responsible for informing and educating citizens in this situation?

The Internet is full of news outlets and services of all kinds. As defined by the American Press Institute, they can be divided into three basic groups. Newspaper websites, which see virtual portals as a chance to reach new, younger readership, offer original journalism. This is why, together with television and radio stations, they constitute the group of content creators and have earned the name reportorial media. The second category comprises curated media, i.e. platforms which collect and organise information from other sources, using algorithms and/or editors. This category includes web browsers, aggregators and blogs. The third category concerns social media such as Facebook, Twitter, etc. ("Millennials' nuanced paths", 2015). The latter two categories are largely derivative in nature. They copy information from other sources, including newspapers, and present it to their users in a new context, gathered in one place. In this way they gain advantage over the less easily accessible printed medium which they parasitically exploit. The practice of aggregation has already resulted in many court cases, prompting an attempt to define the limits of acceptable appropriation (Isbell, 2010). The technological possibilities offered by the Internet have led to the cutting of the news cycle and to constant news bombardment. We obtain a lot more information in a much shorter time than we used to. This produces a feeling of information surfeit and creates a guise of being up to date. But are we really better informed?

Selection of content

As we know, the Internet is primarily a medium of entertainment. Electronic media ushered in, and the Internet has only accelerated and intensified, the tabloidisation of news. The process can best be exemplified by the protest of Mika Brzezinski, a CSNBC journalist, who, on air, refused to present a news story about Paris Hilton's release from prison as the day's headline on 26 June 2007. She won widespread respect of journalist circles and viewers, becoming America's heroine, and her reaction was number one news item presented by other news outlets (Harris, 2007). While the news content is trivialised and entertainment dynamics rules over newscasts with inclusion of topics previously not covered, such as lives of celebrities, a wider question arises concerning the sources of information and the criteria of selection. Who decides about the kind of information we have access to? How do we gain information? How do we know what we should know? It is in this sector that changes are the most visible and the most worrying. In the traditional press, the editorial board selected and arranged news items in the order of their newsworthiness. How is it done today? There are two new ways of selecting the content that reaches us. The first one is

an algorithm, it is the technology used by a particular medium that selects news items which we might find important due to our search history. The second decision-making source is the readers themselves. Let us take a look at communities which have developed around outlets concerning particular topics or social media groups. It is their members, usually people of similar views and interests, who express their opinions and choose certain articles as important by means of voting (Sundar & Nass, 2001). Both forms seem useful and justified. However, there is a hidden catch. In both cases we run the risk of being exposed only to such information as we have previously expressed preference for. We get only what we want to get, what accords with our outlook and does not undermine it or induce us to reconsider our own attitudes and opinions in any way. Magdalena Szpunar writes:

> A number of scholars studying the virtual environment draw attention to the so-called echo chamber effect observed on the Internet. (…) Although we have unlimited opportunities to confront our opinions with those of others, we are more interested in confirming our own standpoint than getting to know different views. (…) This results in a situation conducive to the homogenisation of the social circle in which we function. An inclination towards homophily makes us function as if in a social clique, where our personal convictions become increasingly more similar and increasingly stronger. (Szpunar, 2014, p. 71)

Can mature attitudes be formed when the risk of encountering "alien" content has been reduced to a minimum? On the contrary, our capacity for critical thinking is lulled, leading to the emergence of extreme standpoints (Szpunar, 2014, p. 71).

A large amount of news reaches audiences by means of social networking services. Especially for Millennials, the digital natives, "news and information are woven into an often continuous but mindful way that Millennials connect to the world generally, which mixes news with social connection, problem solving, social action, and entertainment" ("How Millennials get news", 2015). In such cases, however, exposition to news is mainly accidental. As many as 78% of the surveyed claim they "see" news when they are on Facebook for a completely different purpose. Consequently, engagement with, and interest in, the content encountered is likely to be smaller. This can be seen in the amount of time devoted to news and the number of pages read. As far as the range of news topics browsed through on the website is concerned, entertainment dominates at 73%, with "people and events in my community" (65%) and sport (57%) following (Matsa & Mitchell, 2014). "Entertainment has superseded the provision of information; human interest has supplanted the public interest;

(…) the trivial has triumphed over the weighty" (Franklin, 1997, p. 4, as cited in Allan, 2004, p. 203). Tabloidisation, as Stuart Allan notes, leads to "a perceived realignment of serious (factual, worthy, respectable, upmarket) conceptions of news values with those associated with the tabloid (sensational, superficial, prurient, downmarket) press" (Allan, 2004, p. 205).

The whole order of things is also disturbed at the level of layout. The Internet does not provide clear information about the relative importance of a certain story or event through its position or headline size. The "newspaper" order of presented information – from the most important items to the crossword and weather forecast – is disturbed. Is this bad? Perhaps not always, but assuming that the Internet is the main environment of young people, a place where they gain knowledge about the world, we must notice that a fundamental part of their media education will be missing. All incoming information is equally important. Politics, economy, celebrity lives and TV series enjoy equal status. In addition, lack of context and awareness of wider issues often makes it impossible for young people to divide and select content on their own. Not only are they simply unaware of a wide range of issues, since they encounter only news recommended by their friends, but also those news items which they do encounter are mainly "news you can use", i.e. stories that may be used to take part in a conversation or indicate membership in a group. The process of news consumption has thus become socialised.

Apart from the benefit of belonging, another argument often put forward is that of convenience and saving time when we only pay attention to content that has been recommended to us, instead of looking for information on our own. Such a state of affairs often results in a lack of awareness about the source of a particular news item. As many as 44% of respondents could not identify the source of information they received within the previous two hours. In the 18–29 age group even fewer people paid attention to where information came from, with 47% unable to locate the source (Edmonds, 2017). In this context, the pressing problem of fake news circulating in media acquires a new significance. How far are readers of news on social networking sites prone to deception? The majority of adult Americans (62%) admits that fabricated news is a problem and causes a lot of confusion in current affairs, but 39% is absolutely sure and a further 45% fairly sure that they can recognise such fake information (Barthel, Mitchell, & Holcomb, 2016). Still, 23% admitted that they had shared a fake news story, knowing or not knowing that it was not true (Barthel et al., 2016). We are dealing, then, with a recycling of lies and errors, sometimes on a global scale. If a news story looks more or less credible, it is not always verified before being posted online, not just in social media, but also blogs and news outlets. A stamp issued

by the US Postal Service to commemorate Maya Angelou, an Afro-American writer, poet and actress, is a case in point. The stamp featured a quotation from the 1967 poetry collection by Joan Walsh Anglund, a children's book author. However, numerous web portals, articles and magazines had so long attributed the words to Maya Angelou that everyone assumed she was the author. Neither President Obama nor the US Postal Service suspected that this might not be the case. No one bothered to identify the source of the quotation. As a result, the whole undertaking, including particularly the unveiling ceremony, became slightly ridiculous and turned into a symbol of credulity in dealing with new media, which should not be uncritically trusted. The act of continued repetition of a news item does not in itself make it true, as many users of Twitter and other media mercilessly pointed out. Sometimes, however, lack of credibility affects more serious problems than a memorial postage stamp. Stuart Allan discusses many such examples in his book *Online news: Journalism and the Internet* (2006).

More of the same

It seems worthwhile to pay some attention to the question of information surplus. Practice shows that most web pages devoted to news are derivative. Thus aggregation dominates over original journalism. Audiences get a lot of news, but it is mainly copied rather than source content, it is more of the same instead of a range of perspectives, details, points of view. Jonathan Stray of the Nieman Lab Foundation conducted research concerning this problem in 2010. The event he decided to focus on was a hacking attack on Google and other American companies, traced to a prestigious technical college in China. He chose this particular news story since, as he claimed, it was complex, international in scope, and involved a sensitive issue of social importance. Stray wanted to check how the event, which took place in February 2010, was presented to the public: "It's the sort of big story that requires substantial investigative effort, perhaps including inside sources and foreign-language reporting" (Stray, 2010). Having read 121 articles covering the story listed on Google News, Stray found that only 13 of them (11%) included elements of original reporting (an article was qualified as original if it included at least one original quote from a source). These are his findings: only 7 articles (6%) were the work of original journalism; these came from such media as *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Guardian*, *Tech News World*, Bloomberg, Xinhua (China), and the *Global Times* (China). Of the 13 articles identified as containing elements of original reporting, 8 were published by the print media, 4 came from news outlets and 1 from an online source. Only 14 articles (12%) were prepared by Chinese outlets,

had a local dateline or mentioned cooperation with journalists based in China. Nine articles (7%) did not quote any sources. Considering such low indicators of journalist engagement in covering this particular topic, Stray asks: "What were those other 100 reporters doing? When I think of how much human effort [went] into re-writing those hundred other unique stories that contained no original reporting, I cringe. That's a huge amount of journalistic effort that could have gone into reporting other deserving stories" (Stray, 2010). He suggests a change of approach, from chasing after sensational stories in all media to covering important events of a smaller scale or less spectacular character. It seems, however, that contemporary scoop culture will not yield so easily.

Migration to the Web

In view of the above-described processes affecting news on the Internet, the question to be asked is whether the newspaper migration to the Web was the right move? As it turns out, it is extremely difficult to offer a straightforward assessment. While it did not bring the expected financial results, it increased awareness of other weaknesses and threats newspapers are exposed to.

From the economic point of view, it is impossible to talk about success. Quoting the Newspaper Association of America, H. Iris Chyi and Monica Chadha observe that after fifteen years of experimenting with new platforms, only 10% of total advertising revenue comes from this source (Chyi & Chadha, 2012, p. 432). In 2010–2014 this amounted to 3–3.5 billion US dollars respectively. Thus despite major losses suffered by daily newspaper advertising, it still accounts for 82% of total advertising revenue (Barthel, 2015, p. 27). The situation is further complicated by the fact that distribution of news on a number of platforms ushers in new players necessary to provide content to both readers and advertisers. Newspapers rely on aggregators (for example Google or Yahoo) and social media (Facebook). As a result, they not only have to conform to their rules, but also share part of their income (quite substantial, as it turns out) (Chyi & Chadha, 2012, p. 443). In addition, critics point out that Internet advertising has an adverse impact on published content. Drawing on the findings of Professor Roger Fidler, Michael Rosenweld argues: "print offers a limited amount of ad space, which is infinite online, driving down ad prices and sending publishers racing around a hamster wheel. To make money, they need more content to advertise against. Some of this content is – how to put this? – lousy, giving readers another reason not to pay for news" (Rosenweld, 2016).

Indeed, attempts to charge fees for access to online newspapers are largely limited and, as it turns out, not quite effective. Many newspapers are revising their policy of access to paid content, often abolishing the established paywalls. The *New York Times* had more than a million digital subscribers at the end of 2015, but it cannot be regarded as a typical American newspaper. Usually online subscriptions do not exceed 1% of total revenue (data for 2012; Chyi & Tenenboim, 2017, p. 801). Fewer than 10% of readers declare readiness to pay for premium online content (Rosenweld, 2016). In the USA, out of 98 newspapers with a circulation of over 50,000, nearly 78 use some kind of paywall. In 1999–2015 the above-mentioned newspapers dropped their paywalls 69 times (Lichterman, 2016).[3] The main problem is that newspapers do not have ideas for unique content "behind the paywall". It is understandable that readers are reluctant to pay for news which they can find on other portals, "but the fact that 44 million Americans are still willing to pay for the print edition (which carries similar content) indicates that the 'container' is not neutral. Media format has an enormous impact on consumer choices" (Chyi, 2013, p. 69).

As it turns out, consumers of news in digital and printed media are also very different from each other. Digital consumers, as we already know, are rarely faithful to one title. They search for information without paying attention to its source. Even if they are news consumers, they do not necessarily become devoted readers of one title. This does not in the least improve the situation of newspapers. In addition, digital readers are impatient. As shown by the findings reported by Rosenweld, they do not stay long on news websites, skim quickly through the content on offer without acquiring in-depth knowledge, and consequently do not recognise the relative importance of news items. They belong to the society of skimmers, who still lose out to the readers of printed newspapers (Rosenweld, 2016).

Editorial Darwinism

Our discussion so far shows that the migration to the digital world has not brought the expected results in the form of the development of an alternative, reliable business model. In most cases newspapers "gave up" the content to aggregators and social media, gaining in return a younger, but more superficial consumer, who does not appreciate their contribution to quality journalism. What is more, readership surveys carried out in 2007, 2011 and 2015 show clearly that despite

---

[3] In 41 cases paywalls were brought down for a period of time, for example due to public danger in a given region (e.g. a hurricane); a further 28 were reduced or removed for good (Lichterman, 2016).

the "digital first" policy, the printed product reaches a much larger number of readers than the digital edition across all age groups (Chyi & Tenenboim, 2017, p. 798).

There are also positive aspects of the newspaper crisis. As Bob Franklin observes, newspapers are very resilient and so far have survived all similar challenges (often caused by the introduction of new technologies) which have put in question their business model and editorial practices. "From telegraph to television, newspapers' ability to adapt to changing circumstances has always provided them with a survival strategy and secured their future; this editorial Darwinism is central to understanding the history of newspapers" (Franklin, 2008, p. 631). It is certainly true that upsetting the current status quo meant the necessity for a probing self-analysis, an examination of own practices and reconsideration of routine procedures. Undoubtedly this is a victory. The search for new, diversified sources of revenue or the necessity to conduct market research in order to better know and understand the readers, their needs and apprehensions, may only be to the newspapers' benefit, stripping them of complacency to which they were often prone. For there are voices claiming that it was not the Internet that jeopardised the newspapers' existence, but it was rather the decline of the trust of their readers that was the original cause of their problems. Maybe, then, the strategy of becoming similar to new media was not the best or even necessary? This is not what faithful readers want. As it turns out, it is difficult for journalists to focus on their own sector, and to identify and assess its problems reliably and in-depth. It is much easier to write about others. Studies of press coverage of the newspaper crisis reveal that in many cases such reliability and objectivity in the assessment of their own situation was missing (Chyi, Lewis, & Zheng, 2012). Maybe this necessary "homework" will be an appropriate remedy, prompting journalists to reconsider the ways of practising their profession, and consequently the value and social role of the press. This will certainly be to the benefit of all interested parties.

Translated by Maria Fengler and Piotr Styk

Bibliography

Allan, S. (2004). *News culture* (2nd ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Allan, S. (2006). *Online news: Journalism and the Internet*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Barthel, M. (2015, April). Newspapers: Fact sheet. In Pew Research Center, *State of the news media 2015* (pp. 24–31). Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.journalism.org/files/2015/04/FINAL-STATE-OF-THE-NEWS-MEDIA1.pdf

Barthel, M. (2016, June). Newspapers: Fact sheet. In Pew Research Center, *State of the news media 2016* (pp. 9–19). Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2016/06/30143308/state-of-the-news-media-report-2016-final.pdf

Barthel, M., Mitchell, A., & Holcomb, J. (2016, December 15). *Many Americans believe fake news is sowing confusion*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.journalism.org/2016/12/15/many-americans-believe-fake-news-is-sowing-confusion/pj_2016-12-15_fake-news_0-01/

Battle plans for newspapers. (2009, February 10). *New York Times*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/02/10/battle-plans-for-newspapers/?_r=0

The big ideas for 2015. (2014, December 10). *NewsMediaWorks*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://newsmediaworks.com.au/2015-whats-to-come/

Chyi, H. I. (2013). Trial and error: US newspapers' digital struggles toward inferiority. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, Spain. (*Media Markets Monographs* series, 14)

Chyi, H. I., & Chadha, M. (2012). News on new devices. *Journalism Practice*, 6(4), 431–449. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2011.629125

Chyi, H. I., & Tenenboim, O. (2017). Reality check. *Journalism Practice*, *11*(7), 798–819. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2016.1208056

Chyi, H. I., Lewis, S. C., & Zheng, N. (2012). A matter of life and death. *Journalism Studies*, *13*(3), 305–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2011.629090

Crouch, I. (2015, April 10). Maya Angelou and the internet's stamp of approval. *New Yorker*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.newyorker.com/culture/culture-desk/maya-angelou-and-the-internets-stamp-of-approval

Edmonds, R. (2017, February 9). Where did that story come from?: Pew finds new evidence that many readers don't know. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from www.poynter.org/2017/where-did-that-story-come-from-pew-finds-new-evidence-that-many-readers-dont-know/447740

Edmonds, R., Guskin, E., Mitchell, A., & Jurkowitz, M. (2013, May 7). Newspapers: Stabilizing but still threatened. In Pew Research Center's project for excellence in journalism, *The state of the news media 2013*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.stateofthemedia.org/2013/newspapers-stabilizing-but-still-threatened/newspapers-by-the-numbers/

Finley, K. (2015, June 3). In the future, robots will write news that's all about you. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.wired.com/2015/03/future-news-robots-writing-audiences-one/

Franklin, B. (1997). *Newszak and news media*. London: Arnold.

Franklin, B. (2008). The future of newspapers. *Journalism Studies*, *9*(5), 630–641. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700802280307

Greenberg, J. (2015, August 6). The Times has 1 million online subscribers. It needs more. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.wired.com/2015/08/times-1-million-online-subscribers-needs/

Harris, P. (2007, July 1). Why I said 'no' to Paris Hilton Mania. *The Guardian*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.theguardian.com/media/2007/jul/01/broadcasting.tvnews

How Millennials get news: Inside the habits of America's first digital generation. (2015, March 16). American Press Institute. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.americanpressinstitute. org/publications/reports/survey-research/millennials-news/

Isbell, K. (2010, August 30). *The rise of the news aggregator: Legal implications and best practices* (*Berkman Center Research Publication* No. 2010-10). http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1670339

Kaiser, R. G. (2014, October 16). *The bad news about the news*. Brookings Institution. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://csweb.brookings.edu/content/research/essays/2014/bad-news.html

Kamiya, G. (2009, February 17). The death of the news. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.salon.com/2009/02/17/newspapers_2/

Lafrance, A. (2012, April 16). Online journalism shines in 2012 Pulitzer picks. Retrieved from http://www.niemanlab.org/2012/04/online-journalism-shines-in-2012-pulitzer-picks/

Levinson, P. (2013). *New new media* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Lichterman, J. (2016, July 20). Here are 6 reasons why newspapers have dropped their paywalls. Retrieved from http://www.niemanlab.org/2016/07/here-are-6-reasons-why-newspapers -have-dropped-their-paywalls/

Lufkin, B. (2015, 10 December). Virtual reality lets you live the news instead of reading it. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://gizmodo.com/virtual-reality-now-lets-you-live-yjr- news-1747206008

Matsa, K. E., & Mitchell, A. (2014, March 26). 8 key takeaways about Social Media and news. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.journalism.org/2014/03/26/8-key-takeaways-about-social -media-and-news/

McGinley, M. (2009, April 3). Tough times in newsrooms. *Columbia Journalism Review*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.cjr.org/behind_the_news/tough_times_in_newsrooms_1.php

Meyer, P. (2009). *The vanishing newspaper: Saving journalism in the information age* (2nd ed.). Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Millennials' nuanced paths to news and information. (2015, March 16). In *How Millennials get news: Inside the habits of America's first digital generation*. American Press Institute. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from https://www.americanpressinstitute.org/publications/reports/survey -research/millennials-paths-to-news-and-information/

Milosevic, M., Chishlom, J., Kilman, L., & Henriksson, T. (2014). *World press trends 2014*. Paris: World Association of Newspapers and News Publishers (WAN-IFRA). Retrieved November 20, 2017, from http://www.arpp.ru/images/123/51253_WAN-IFRA_WPT_2014.pdf

Mitchell, A. (2014, March 26). Overview. In Pew Research Center, *State of the news media 2014*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.journalism.org/2014/03/26/state-of-the-news -media-2014-overview/

Moyers, B. (2007, November 16). When the FCC put big media over America. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://billmoyers.com/content/when-the-fcc-put-big-media-over-america/

Newspaper Death Watch. R. I. P. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://newspaperdeathwatch.com/

Nichols, J., & McChesney, R. W. (2009, March 18). The death and life of Great American newspapers. *The Nation*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.thenation.com/article/death-and-life-great-american-newspapers/

O'Neal, L. (2015, April 6). Maya Angelou's new stamp uses a quote that may not be entirely hers. *Washington Post*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/lonnae-oneal-a-possible-misquote-that-may-last-forever/2015/04/04/41f937a4-da3c-11e4-b3f2-607bd612aeac_story.html

Perry, M. J. (2015, April 30). Creative destruction: Newspaper ad revenue continued its precipitous free fall in 2014, and it's likely to continue. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from https://www.aei.org/publication/creative-destruction-newspaper-ad-revenue-continued-its-precipitous-free-fall-in-2014-and-its-likely-to-continue/

Picard, R. G. (2006). Journalism, value creation and the future of news organizations. Cambridge, MA: Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.robertpicard.net/PDFFiles/ValueCreationandNewsOrgs.pdf

Pickard, V., Stearns, J., & Aaron, C. (2009). *Saving the news: Toward a national journalism strategy* (*Free Press special report*). Washington DC. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.freepress.net/sites/default/files/fp-legacy/saving_the_news.pdf

Poulet, B. (2009). *La fin des journaux et l'avenir de l'information*. Paris: Gallimard.

Rosenweld, M. (2016). Print is dead, long live print. *Columbia Journalism Review, 2016*(autumn/winter). Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.cjr.org/special_report/print_analog_comeback.php

Sennott, C. (2009). Roll the dice. *Columbia Journalism Review, 2009*(March/April). Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.cjr.org/cover_story/roll_the_dice.php?page=all

Starkman, D. (2014). The great story. *Columbia Journalism Review, 2014*(January/February). Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.cjr.org/feature/the_great_story.php

Stray, J. (2010). The Google/China hacking case: How many news outlets do the original reporting on a big story? Retrieved from http://www.niemanlab.org/2010/02/the-googlechina-hacking-case-how-many-news-outlets-do-the-original-reporting-on-a-big-story/

Sundar, S. S., & Nass, C. (2001). Conceptualizing sources in online news. *Journal of Communication, 51*(1), 52–72. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2001.tb02872.x

Szpunar, M. (2014). Internet – nowa sfera publiczna czy kabina pogłosowa? In M. Adamik-Szysiak (Ed.), *Media i polityka: Relacje i współzależności* (pp. 69–77). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie Skłodowskiej.

Thompson, D. (2016, November 3). The print apocalypse and how to survive it. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/11/the-print-apocalypse-and-how-to-survive-it/506429/

Vranica, S., & Marshall, J. (2016, October 20). Plummeting newspaper ad revenue sparks new wave of changes. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved September 20, 2017, from http://wsj.com/articles/plummeting-newspaper-ad-revenue-sparks-new-wave-of-changes-1476955801

Weeks, L. (2009, February 3). Chronicling the death of American newspapers. *NPR online*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=101237069

Who killed the newspaper? (2006, August 24). *Economist.com*. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.economist.com/node/7830218

World press trends: Newspaper revenues shift to new sources. (2015, June 1). American Press Institute. Retrieved September 2, 2017, from http://www.americanpressinstitute.org/publications/reports/survey-research/millennials-news/

The digital experiment of daily newspapers: A necessity or a hasty misstep?

The deep crisis suffered by the daily papers in recent years has resulted largely from the collapse of their financial model. The breakdown of the financing system threatened the existence of the traditional model of serious reporting understood as a service to society. Marginalisation of print newspapers, a decline in readership and advertising and the rise of serious competition in the form of the Internet made newspaper owners adopt measures to survive. The following work tries to look at this process in order to present and assess different ways of adapting news to the new media as well as the tactics of reaching readers in the new reality. Starting from more traditional online portals of print newspapers which introduce paywalls and premium content reserved only for subscribers, the article will also discuss news aggregators and tabloid news in social media. A decreasing interest in serious information especially among young audiences on the one hand, coupled with assigning the status of news to stories from the world of celebrities and entertainment on the other, redefines the concept of news itself and additionally poses a question about the level of information among society.

Keywords:
news, newspapers, new media, Internet, journalism, crisis

Cyfrowy eksperyment gazet codziennych: konieczność czy pochopny ruch?

Głęboki kryzys jaki przeżywają gazety codzienne w ostatnich latach wynika w dużej mierze z upadku modelu biznesowego, na którym ich funkcjonowanie się opierało. Zachwianie podstaw finansowych sprawiło, że istnienie tradycyjnego „poważnego" dziennikarstwa uważanego za służbę wobec społeczeństwa zostało zagrożone. Marginalizacja gazet drukowanych, odpływ czytelników i reklamodawców, konkurencja ze strony Internetu: wszystkie te zjawiska doprowadziły do podjęcia przez gazety codzienne walki o przetrwanie. Poniższa praca jest próbą spojrzenia na ten proces i oceny różnych taktyk adaptacyjnych podejmowanych przez gazety w celu dostosowania wiadomości do nowych realiów i nowych wymagań odbiorców. Przedyskutuje np. strategie wprowadzania płatnych treści dostępnych jedynie dla subskrybentów przez portale tradycyjnych gazet drukowanych, ale także zajmie się nowymi

formami przedstawiania wiadomości jak agregatory w mediach społecznościowych. Spadek zainteresowania wiadomościami ze strony młodych odbiorców oraz przypisywanie statusu newsów informacjom ze świata rozrywki redefiniuje samo pojęcie wiadomości i dodatkowo podnosi pytanie o poziom doinformowania społecznego.

Słowa kluczowe:

wiadomości, gazety, nowe media, internet, dziennikarstwo, kryzys