

# How Media Ownership Matters: Online Appendix Tables

For Rodney Benson, Mattias Hessérus, Timothy Neff, and Julie Sedel, *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025).

See “Appendix II: Methods” in *How Media Ownership Matters* for additional information about data gathering procedures.

## Table of Contents

### **2.1 Series: Elite vs. Omnibus Audiences**

- 2.1a US: Audience Education and Income by Outlet
- 2.1b Sweden: Audience Education and Income by Outlet
- 2.1c France: Audience Education and Occupation by Outlet

### **2.2 Series: Partisan Preferences of Audiences**

- 2.2a US: Audience Partisan Preferences by Outlet
- 2.2b Sweden: Audience Partisan Preferences by Outlet
- 2.2c France: Audience Partisan Preferences by Outlet

### **2.3 Series: Primary Funding, Revenues, and Audience Size**

- 2.3a US: Primary Funding, Revenues, and Audience Size by Outlet
- 2.3b Sweden: Primary Funding, Revenues, and Audience Size by Outlet
- 2.3c France: Primary Funding, Revenues, and Audience Size by Outlet

### **2.4 Series: Partisan Preferences of Owners**

- 2.4a US: Owner Partisan Preferences by Outlet
- 2.4b Sweden: Owner Partisan Preferences by Outlet
- 2.4c France: Owner Partisan Preferences by Outlet

### **7.1 Series: Ownership Interests**

- 7.1a US: Major Owners, Donors, and Associated Businesses or Organizations by Outlet (2015–2016)
- 7.1b Sweden: Major Owners, Donors, and Associated Businesses or Organizations by Outlet (2018–2019)
- 7.1c France: Major Owners, Donors, and Associated Businesses or Organizations by Outlet (2018–2019)

**Outlet Abbreviation Key** (for Online Appendix Tables, Series 2.1-2.4)

- US: ABC (*ABC News*), CNN (*CNN*), HuffPo (*HuffPost*), LAT (*Los Angeles Times*), USAT (*USA Today*), CBS (*CBS News*), Fox (*Fox News*), NYT (*New York Times*), SlateUS (*Slate*), MetroUS (*Metro*), BuzzF (*BuzzFeed*), MinnST (*Minneapolis Star Tribune*), WPost (*Washington Post*), ViceUS (*Vice*), CSMon (*Christian Science Monitor*), CIR/R (*Center for Investigative Reporting/Reveal*), MinnP (*MinnPost*), ProPub (*ProPublica*), TexTrib (*Texas Tribune*), NPR (*NPR*), PBS (*PBS NewsHour*)
- Sweden: SvD (*Svenska Dagbladet*), MetroSW (*Metro*), DagNyh (*Dagens Nyheter*), DagETC (*Dagens ETC*), GPosten (*Göteborgs-Posten*), KIT (*KIT*), JPosten (*Jönköpings-Posten*), N24 (*Nyheter24*), Dagen (*Dagen*), Barom (*Barometern*), DagAren (*Dagens Arena*), GefleDag (*Gefle Dagblad*), Norran (*Norran*), SR (*SR*), SVT (*SVT*)
- France: TF1 (*TF1*), Metnews (*Metronews*), LHPO (*Le HuffPost*), LeFigaro (*Le Figaro*), LeMonde (*Le Monde*), Rue89 (*Rue89*), Slate.fr (*Slate.fr*), ViceFr (*Vice France*), Libé (*Libération*), LaCroix (*La Croix*), L'Huma (*L'Humanité*), Mediapt (*Mediapart*), OuestFr (*Ouest-France*), FrInfo (*France Info*), FrTV (*France Télévisions*)

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.1a) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.1a** US: Audience Education and Income by Outlet

	1 = Elite 2 = Omnibus <sup>1</sup>	Average of Education & Income Index Scores (Approx. +130 Elite/-130 Omnibus) <sup>2</sup>	Education: 4-Year College Graduate+ (Pew 2012 <sup>3</sup> )	Education: 4-Year College Graduate+ (Pew 2019 data <sup>4</sup> )	Other Education Indicators	Income \$75k+ (Pew 2012 <sup>5</sup> )	Other Income Indicators	Other Relevant Data
ABC	2	93	107	67	—	104	—	—
CNN	2	101	100	111	—	92	—	—
HuffPo	1	155	—	—	176 <sup>6</sup> (2011)	—	133 <sup>7</sup> (2011)	<i>HuffPost's</i> audience is “more affluent” than <i>BuzzFeed's</i> (2020). <sup>8</sup>
LAT (Tribune)	1	168	—	—	155 <sup>9</sup> (total readership 2002–2003)	—	191 <sup>10</sup> (online 2004) 158 <sup>11</sup> (total readership, 2002–2003)	Long history of editors and publishers lamenting lack of class and ethnic-racial diversity <sup>12</sup> of the <i>Los Angeles Times</i> audience
USAT	1	132	155	—	—	108	—	—
CBS	2	98	107	83	—	104	—	—
Fox	2	82	83	75	—	89	—	—
NYT	1	180	193	200	—	146	—	—

(continued)

Online Table 2.1a Continued

		1 = Elite 2 = Omnibus <sup>1</sup>	Average of Education & Income Index Scores (Approx. +130 Elite/-130 Omnibus) <sup>2</sup>	Education: 4-Year College Graduate+ (Pew 2012 <sup>3</sup> )	Education: 4-Year College Graduate+ (Pew 2019 data <sup>4</sup> )	Other Education Indicators	Income \$75k+ (Pew 2012 <sup>5</sup> )	Other Income Indicators	Other Relevant Data
SlateUS	1	233	—	—	274 <sup>13</sup> (2002)	—	191 <sup>14</sup> (2002)	<i>Slate's</i> “audience is similar to that of other WPNI outlets” (2004) (Washingtonpost.com and Newsweek.com). <sup>15</sup> <i>Slate</i> Publisher John Alderman (2009): “ <i>Slate</i> has managed to attract an educated, affluent audience. It’s similar to <i>Forbes</i> and the <i>New York Times</i> but a little bit younger and more tech-savvy.” <sup>16</sup>	
MetroUS	2	105	—	—	105 <sup>17</sup> (2017)	—	94 <sup>18</sup> (2017) 119 <sup>19</sup> (2013)	—	
BuzzF	2 (borderline)	129	—	—	145 <sup>20</sup> (2011)	—	114 <sup>21</sup> (2011)	<i>HuffPost's</i> audience is “more affluent” than <i>BuzzFeed's</i> (2020). <sup>22</sup> <i>BuzzFeed's</i> audience is younger, more likely to be female, and with a lower average income than that of the <i>New Yorker</i> . <sup>23</sup>	

		1 = Elite 2 = Omnibus <sup>1</sup>	Average of Education & Income Index Scores (Approx. +130 Elite/-130 Omnibus) <sup>2</sup>	Education: 4-Year College Graduate+ (Pew 2012 <sup>3</sup> )	Education: 4-Year College Graduate+ (Pew 2019 data <sup>4</sup> )	Other Education Indicators	Income \$75k+ (Pew 2012 <sup>5</sup> )	Other Income Indicators	Other Relevant Data
MinnST	1	152	—	—	152 <sup>24</sup> (2016)	—	—	—	The <i>Minneapolis Star Tribune's</i> media kit (2016 data) does not provide income data, but it provides other evidence of relative affluence. <sup>25</sup>
WPost	1	193	—	—	158 <sup>26</sup> (2016)	—	194 <sup>27</sup> (2016) 228 <sup>28</sup> (2016)	—	—
ViceUS <sup>29</sup>	1	136	—	—	133 (2016)	—	139 (2016)	—	—
CSMon	1	280	—	—	280 <sup>30</sup> (2017)	—	—	—	<i>Christian Science Monitor's</i> self-description of its "online" audience, June, 8, 2016: " <i>Monitor</i> readers tend to be mature, successful, and financially comfortable. The typical <i>Monitor</i> reader is well-educated, well-traveled, and well-read." <sup>31</sup> An estimate from an expert who conducted research at <i>Christian Science Monitor</i> : the target audience is "an educated couple in their 50s." <sup>32</sup>

(continued)

Online Table 2.1a Continued

		1 = Elite 2 = Omnibus <sup>1</sup>	Average of Education & Income Index Scores (Approx. +130 Elite/-130 Omnibus) <sup>2</sup>	Education: 4-Year College Graduate+ (Pew 2012 <sup>3</sup> )	Education: 4-Year College Graduate+ (Pew 2019 data <sup>4</sup> )	Other Education Indicators	Income \$75k+ (Pew 2012 <sup>5</sup> )	Other Income Indicators	Other Relevant Data
CIR/R	1	(est.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	Its flagship podcast appears on 500 NPR stations; thus, likely a similar audience to NPR. <sup>33</sup> <i>CIR/Reveal</i> partnered with elite-audience <i>Texas Tribune</i> to hire a reporter based in Austin. <sup>34</sup>
MinnP	1	221	—	—	48% have a “post-graduate” degree <sup>35</sup> (2014)	—	221 <sup>36</sup> (2014)	—	In an interview with Benson (2012), the editor overtly distanced <i>MinnPost</i> from “mass audience publications.” <sup>37</sup>
ProPub <sup>38</sup>	1	199	—	—	250 (2017)	—	148 (2017)	—	
TexTrib	1	307	—	—	330 <sup>39</sup> (2010)	—	284 <sup>40</sup> (2010)	—	The <i>Texas Tribune</i> aims to reach “influentials, elites, opinion shapers, leaders.” <sup>41</sup>
NPR	1	186	186	189	212 <sup>42</sup> (2014)	—	186	158 <sup>43</sup> (2014)	—
PBS	1	185	—	—	144 <sup>44</sup> (2023)	—	—	226 <sup>45</sup> (2023)	—

1. This overall characterization of each outlet's audience as either socially elite or omnibus is based on a holistic analysis of the available data. As with our other national samples, we use a 130 (depending on national context) approximate average of elite indexes (higher education, professional/managerial occupation [only available for France] and/or highest levels of income [not available for France]) as a rough cut-off between omnibus (below 130) and elite (above 130). An index of 100 indicates an outlet audience with demographic characteristics equivalent to the national mean. Very few major national news outlets, for a variety of reasons as explained in the book, have audiences with below national average levels of education or income; thus, our category of omnibus extends to audiences with education/income/professional levels *at or slightly above* the national mean; the elite category is reserved for outlets with audiences with education/income/professional levels *substantially above* the national mean. At the borderline, we also take into account qualitative indicators, including interviews with editors or experts.
2. This figure is the average of all indexes reported in the table for each outlet: thus, for *ABC News*, it is the average of 107, 67, and 104.
3. Pew Research Center, "In Changing News Landscape, Even Television is Vulnerable: Trends in News Consumption: 1991–2012," Pew Research Center, September 27, 2012, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/09/27/in-changing-news-landscape-even-television-is-vulnerable>. Index scores are calculated by dividing the percent in the outlet audience sample by the percent of the total sample and multiplying the result by 100. For example, in this 2012 Pew survey, 45 percent of *USA Today* readers had a college degree or greater versus 29 percent of all survey respondents: 45/29 = Education Index of 155. In some cases, the Pew survey lumped together categories of outlets that applied to our sampled outlets (not otherwise analyzed by Pew), which we used with caution. Our index scores for *ABC News* and *CBS News* are based on Pew's category of "evening network news" shows.
4. Elizabeth Grieco, "Americans' Main Sources for Political News Vary by Party and Age," Pew Research Center, April 1, 2020, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2020/04/01/americans-main-sources-for-political-news-vary-by-party-and-age/>. This source reports results of a 2019 survey of US adults who named, in response to an open-ended question, their single main source of political news. Pew only revealed audience demographic characteristics for outlets chosen as their main source by 2 percent or more of the sampled adults: *Fox News*, *ABC News*, *CBS News*, *NBC News*, *CNN*, *NPR*, *New York Times*, and *MSNBC*. Percentages of respondents who named each outlet as their main source and who also reported having a college degree or higher are divided into 36 percent, the percentage of all Americans in 2019 with a college degree or higher according to the US Census Report (<https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2020/educational-attainment.html#:~:text=In%202019%2C%20high%20school%20was,from%2029.9%25%20to%2036.0%25>).
5. Pew Research Center, "In Changing News Landscape": Household income of \$75K or more. Index scores are calculated by dividing the percent of the outlet audience sample with this income level by 26 percent (the proportion of all Pew survey respondents with this income level). As with the 2012 education data, index scores for ABC and CBS are based on Pew's category of "evening network news" shows.
6. Education data from Nielsen, "Audience Analysis: Behind the AOL–Huffington Post Deal," February 2011, <https://www.nielsen.com/insights/2011/aol-huffington-post/#>. Nielsen's audience analysis was provided at the moment of AOL's purchase of *Huffington Post*: "44 percent hold a bachelor or postgraduate degree, compared to . . . 25 percent across the entire web."
7. Nielsen, "Audience Analysis," reports that 12 percent of all *HuffPost* page views are from households with more than \$150,000 HHI. US Census (2011) shows 9 percent of the population had HHI over \$150,000. See Nielsen, "Audience Analysis"; [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2012/hinc01\\_001.xls](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2012/hinc01_001.xls).
8. Max Willens, "They Wanted to Unload It Bad: Why HuffPost Made Sense for BuzzFeed—and Verizon Media Group," *Digiday*, November 20, 2020, <https://digiday.com/media/they-wanted-to-unload-it-bad-why-huffpost-made-sense-for-buzzfeed-and-verizon-media-group/>.
9. "Graduated college": Total readership (not only subscribers) from reader profile, based on random survey, produced by Scarborough Research for the Audit Bureau of Circulations/Readership Research Verification Service, *Los Angeles Times*, February 2002–January 2003, for five counties surrounding the city of Los Angeles.
10. Thirty percent of the *Los Angeles Times* online audience (assumed to refer to households), according to the *Los Angeles Times* Advertising Services page, make more than \$100,000, compared to 15.7 percent for all American households, according to the US Census 2004 PINC-1: *Los Angeles Times*, "Advertising Services," August 20, 2018, <https://www.latimes.com/la-market-info-htmistory.html>. For Census data: US Census Bureau, "PINC-01. Selected Characteristics of People 15 Years and Over by Total Money Income in 2004, Work Experience in 2004, Race, Hispanic Origin, and Sex," [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/pinc-01/2005/new01\\_001.txt](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/pinc-01/2005/new01_001.txt).

(continued)

### Online Table 2.1a Continued

11. “Income \$75,000 and up”: Total readership (not only subscribers) from reader profile, based on random survey, produced by Scarborough Research for the Audit Bureau of Circulations/Readership Research Verification Service, *Los Angeles Times*, February 2002–January 2003, for five counties surrounding the city of Los Angeles.
12. The *Los Angeles Times* has, in recent decades, become increasingly aware and self-conscious of disconnects among the demographics of Los Angeles County (50 percent Latinx), the (lack of) diversity of its newsroom, and the audiences that the *Los Angeles Times* attracts; the *Los Angeles Times* editor notes the need to attract audiences “that may not have come to us, that historically may have had reasons to not trust us” (see Joel Brown, “Alum Kevin Merida is Reinventing the *Los Angeles Times*,” Boston University College of Communication, February 28, 2023, <https://www.bu.edu/com/articles/alum-kevin-merida-is-reinventing-the-los-angeles-times/>). In 2020, the *Los Angeles Times* apologized for historically protecting the interests of the White, powerful industrial and landowning classes. The article notes that, in 1978, publisher Otis Chandler said, “the paper was looking for readers in the ‘broad middle class’ and ‘upper classes’ regardless of race or ethnicity. ‘We are not a paper that’s sought after in the lower-class areas.’” See The *Times* Editorial Board, “An Examination of The *Times*’ Failures on Race, Our Apology and a Path Forward,” September 27, 2020, <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2020-09-27/los-angeles-times-apology-racism>.
13. In 2002, 63 percent of Slate’s audience had a college degree or higher; 23 percent of the US adult population had a college degree or higher. See *Slate*, “Media Kit,” August 14, 2002, [https://www.slate.com/articles/briefing/media\\_kit/2000/12/\\_14.html](https://www.slate.com/articles/briefing/media_kit/2000/12/_14.html); US Census, “Table 1a. Percent of High school and College Graduates of the Population 15 Years and Over, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, March 2002,” <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/educational-attainment/2002/cps-detailed-tables/tab01a.xls>.
14. In 2002, 48 percent of *Slate*’s audience had an HHI of \$75K or higher; 25.1 percent of US adult population had an HHI over \$75K. See *Slate*, *ibid.*, and U.S. Census, “HINC-01. Selected Characteristics of Households, by Total Money Income in 2002,” [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2003/new01\\_001.txt](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2003/new01_001.txt).
15. *Adweek*, “Washington Post Co. to Acquire Slate,” December 21, 2004, <https://www.adweek.com/brand-marketing/washington-post-co-acquire-slate-76813/> (retrievable via Factiva).
16. Harry Jaffe, “The Smart Set is Reading Dahlia—and the Next Graham is Working at Slate,” *Washingtonian*, October 27, 2009, <https://www.washingtonian.com/2009/10/27/the-smart-set-is-reading-dahliaand-the-next-graham-is-working-at-slate/>.
17. Estimate based on Scarborough (2017) survey data of *amNewYork* audience with a BA degree+ (33 percent) and US Census (2017) data for adults age 18+ (31.5 percent) (see Scarborough, *amNewYork*, “2018 Media Kit,” [https://assets.projects.newsday.com/2018\\_amNY\\_MediaKit.pdf](https://assets.projects.newsday.com/2018_amNY_MediaKit.pdf); US Census, “Educational Attainment of the Population 18 Years and Over, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin,” <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/educational-attainment/2017/cps-detailed-tables/table-1-1.xlsx>). This estimate accords with data we provide for similar urban free newspapers, such as *20 Minutes* (see Table 2.1c for France). Reflecting the close overlap in target audiences of all newspapers of this type, Schneps acquired *Metro NY* in 2020 and merged the paper with *amNY*, creating *amNewYork METRO*: Schneps Media, “Schneps Media Acquires Metro New York and Metro Philadelphia,” January 10, 2020, <https://www.schnepsmedia.com/news/schneps-media-acquires-metro-new-york-and-metro-philadelphia/>.
18. Estimate based on *amNewYork* media kit (*ibid.*, 2018, with 2017 data) showing that 38 percent of the *amNewYork* audience had an HHI (household income) over \$75,000. The US Census (2017) shows that 40.6 percent of the adult population had an HHI over \$75,000. See US Census, “HINC-01. Selected Characteristics of Households, by Total Money Income in 2017,” [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2018/bridge/hinc01\\_1.xls](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2018/bridge/hinc01_1.xls).
19. *Metro*’s 2013 media kit reports its “employed” readership has a mean HHI of \$89,700; the US Census reported in 2013 that the mean HHI for all households “with earnings” was \$75,498. Dividing the Census figure into the *Metro* figure generates an index of 119. See Metro Media, “Metro US General Presentation 2013,” August 15, 2013, <https://www.slideshare.net/slideshow/metro-us-general-presentation/25275557>; American Community Survey, “S1902: Mean Income in the Past 12 Months (in 2013 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars),” US Census Bureau, <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST1Y2013.S1902?q=Income%20and%20Earnings&y=2013>.



20. According to a 2011 report produced by *BuzzFeed's* Director of Sales, 44 percent of *BuzzFeed's* audience had a college degree (BA) or higher, compared to US Census data showing that 30.4 percent of all US adults had a college degree: Chris Puckett, "BuzzFeed Intro," *Slideshare*, February 15, 2011, [https://www.slideshare.net/Chris\\_Puckett/buzz-feed-intro?from\\_action=save](https://www.slideshare.net/Chris_Puckett/buzz-feed-intro?from_action=save); US Census, "Census Bureau Releases New Educational Attainment Data," February 24, 2022, <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2022/educational-attainment.html#>.
21. Twenty-four percent of *BuzzFeed's* audience had an HHI over \$100,000, while 21 percent of the US population had an HHI over \$100,000 in 2011. BuzzFeed Internal Audience report (full 2011 report no longer publicly accessible): [https://www.google.com/search?q=buzzfeed+news+incoming+24%25+hhi+over+100&rlz=1C1GCEA\\_enGB989GB989&oq=buzzfeed+&gs\\_lcrp=EgZjaHJvbWUqCAgCEEUYJxg7MgYIABBFgDsyDggBEEUYJxg7GIAEGIoFMggIAhBFGCcYozIGCAMQRRg8MgYIBBBFGDwyBggFEUYPDIGCAYQRRhBMgYIBxBFGGEHSAQgzNjM5ajBqNKgCALACAQ&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8](https://www.google.com/search?q=buzzfeed+news+incoming+24%25+hhi+over+100&rlz=1C1GCEA_enGB989GB989&oq=buzzfeed+&gs_lcrp=EgZjaHJvbWUqCAgCEEUYJxg7MgYIABBFgDsyDggBEEUYJxg7GIAEGIoFMggIAhBFGCcYozIGCAMQRRg8MgYIBBBFGDwyBggFEUYPDIGCAYQRRhBMgYIBxBFGGEHSAQgzNjM5ajBqNKgCALACAQ&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8) <https://www.paved.com/sites/buzzfeed-news-incoming>; US Census data: US Census, "HINC-01. Selected Characteristics of Households, by Total Money Income in 2011," [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2012/hinc01\\_001.xls](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2012/hinc01_001.xls).
22. Max Willens, "They Wanted to Unload It Bad."
23. Danny Funt, Chava Gourarie, and Jack Murtha, "The New Yorker, BuzzFeed, and the Push for Digital Credibility," *Columbia Journalism Review*, June 27, 2016, [https://www.cjr.org/special\\_report/newyorker\\_buzzfeed\\_trust.php](https://www.cjr.org/special_report/newyorker_buzzfeed_trust.php). The authors note that there are limitations of their sampling procedure, likely over-selecting for less elite audience members, but the relative difference between *The New Yorker* and *BuzzFeed* remains.
24. *Star Tribune*, "Media Kit" (reporting 2016 data). According to Scarborough Research Corporation (2016 Mpls./St. Paul CBSA, <http://mediakit.startribunecompany.com/target/affluent-adults/>), 50 percent of *Minneapolis Star Tribune* readers have a college degree or advanced education. According to the US Census Bureau (United States, 1960 to 2021; 25 years and older), 33 percent of all Americans in 2016 had a college degree or more, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/184260/educational-attainment-in-the-us/>.
25. See *Star Tribune* 2016 data on audience purchases of airline tickets and consumer electronics: *Star Tribune*, *ibid*.
26. Education and income data are for the Washington, DC, metropolitan area (not readership of outlet): proportion of adults 25 and over with college degree (index provided in report; US = 100); proportion of households with incomes of \$100,000 or more (Index, US = 100). From *Washington Post*, "MarketBook 2017," [https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-stat/ad/public/static/media\\_kit/16-3762-01-MktBook-web.pdf](https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-stat/ad/public/static/media_kit/16-3762-01-MktBook-web.pdf).
27. *Ibid*.
28. A 228 high-income index is based on the percentage of *Washington Post* print readers in 2016 with an above \$150,000 HHI (*Washington Post*, Marketbook 2017, 14) compared to the percentage for that category from the US Census (31 percent vs. 13.6 percent), using the US Census HHI table: US Census, "HINC-01. Selected Characteristics of Households, by Total Money Income in 2016," [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2017/hinc01\\_1.xls](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2017/hinc01_1.xls).
29. *Vice*, "Digital Media Kit," January 2016, <https://upload-assets.vice.com/files/2016/01/15/1452894236compressed.pdf>: 39 percent of the *Vice* audience has a household income of \$100,000 or higher (vs. 28 percent of all US); 44 percent of the *Vice* audience are college graduates or higher (versus 33 percent of all US). For all US proportions, see Statista, "Educational Attainment Distribution in the United States from 1960 to 2022," <https://www.statista.com/statistics/184260/educational-attainment-in-the-us/>, which is based on US Census data; US Census, "Income Distribution to \$250,000 or More for Households: 2016," <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/cps-hinc/hinc-06.2016.html#list-tab-747725566>.
30. Education data for printed newspaper, from *Christian Science Monitor*, "Print Advertising," January 16, 2017, <https://web.archive.org/web/20170116002456/https://www.csmonitor.com/About/Advertise/Print-advertising>.
31. *Christian Science Monitor*, "Online Advertising," June 8, 2016, <https://web.archive.org/web/20190401084947/https://www.csmonitor.com/About/Advertise/Online-advertising>.
32. September 12, 2021, email from Drury University Professor Jonathan Groves to Rodney Benson. Based on the fieldwork Groves did with Carrie Brown for a decade-long study of the paper ending in 2019 (Brown and Groves, *Transforming Newsrooms* [London: Routledge, 2020]), Groves reported that during the move online earlier in the decade the *Christian Science Monitor* developed "personas" of their intended audience: "an educated couple in their 50s interested in 'solutions.'"
33. *CIR/Reveal* has news distribution partnerships with NPR and other outlets with affluent audiences, such as *The Atlantic* and *The Guardian*: Ina Pira, "How Journalism Nonprofit Reveal is Reaching New Audiences with Video," *Vimeo Blog*, August 16, 2019, <https://web.archive.org/web/20190916043510/https://vimeo.com/blog/post/reveal-investigative-reporting-video-marketing/>.

(continued)

### Online Table 2.1a Continued

34. Emily Ramshaw, “T-Squared: A New Partnership with CIR’s Reveal,” *Texas Tribune*, March 9, 2015, <https://www.texastribune.org/2015/03/09/t-squared-new-partnership-cirs-reveal/>.
35. Andrew Wallmeyer, “Survey Finds Our Readers Civically Engaged and Passionate About MinnPost and Minnesota,” *MinnPost*, July 8, 2014, <https://www.minnpost.com/inide-minnpost/2014/07/survey-finds-our-readers-civically-engaged-and-passionate-about-minnpost-and/?hilite=reader+survey>.
36. In 2014, 25 percent of *MinnPost* readers (2014) had an HHI over \$150,000; 11.3 percent of US citizens had an HHI over \$150,000. See Wallmeyer, “Survey Finds Our Readers Civically Engaged”; US Census, “HINC-01. Selected Characteristics of Households, by Total Money Income in 2014,” [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2015/hinc01\\_1.xls](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2015/hinc01_1.xls).
37. Page 1070, in Rodney Benson, “Can Foundations Solve the Journalism Crisis?,” *Journalism* 19, no. 8 (2017): 1059–1077.
38. Education and income data are from a *ProPublica* 2017 reader survey: Jill Shepherd, “Results of Our 2017 Reader Survey,” *ProPublica*, May 9, 2017, <https://www.propublica.org/article/results-of-our-2017-reader-survey>: 85 percent of readers have a college degree or higher; 43 percent of readers have a household income over \$100,000. According to the US Census, 34 percent of US population had a bachelor’s degree or higher (“Educational Attainment in the United States: 2017,” <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2017/demo/education-attainment/cps-detailed-tables.html>) and 29 percent of US households had a household income over \$100,000 (“Household Income in 2017,” <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/cps-hinc/hinc-06.2017.html#list-tab-747725566>).
39. In 2010, 90 percent of *Texas Tribune* readers responding to a reader survey had a college degree or higher; 27.3 percent of all US adults had a college degree or higher. See Evan Smith, “T-Squared: We Know Who You Are,” *Texas Tribune*, May 27, 2010, <https://www.texastribune.org/2010/05/27/t-squared-we-know-who-you-are/>; US Census, “Table 1. Educational Attainment of the Population 18 Years and Over, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin,” <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/educational-attainment/2010/cps-detailed-tables/table1-01.xls>. Note that the *Texas Tribune*’s 90 percent is based on readers who opted to fill out the survey and may not be broadly representative of all *Texas Tribune* readers.
40. In 2010, 58 percent of *Texas Tribune* readers responding to a survey had an HHI over \$100,000; 20.4 percent of all US adults had an HHI over \$100,000. See Smith, “T-Squared: We Know Who You Are”; US Census, “HINC-01. Selected Characteristics of Households, by Total Money Income in 2010 (Based on Census 2010 Population Controls),” [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2011/hinc01\\_001.xls](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2011/hinc01_001.xls).
41. Smith, “T-Squared: We Know Who You Are.”
42. In 2014, 62 percent of public radio listeners had a college degree or higher; 29.3 percent of all US adults had a college degree or higher. See GC90.7FM/HD, “The Benefits of Underwriting on Public Radio vs. Advertising on Commercial Radio,” <https://web.archive.org/web/20161222170206/https://gc907.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Underwriting-Packet2.pdf>; US Census, “Educational Attainment of the Population 18 Years and Over, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 2014,” <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/educational-attainment/2014/cps-detailed-tables/table-1-01.xlsx>.
43. In 2014, 57 percent of public radio listeners had an HHI over \$75K; 36.2 percent of all US adults had an HHI over \$75K. See GC90.7FM/HD (ibid.); US Census, “HINC-01. Selected Characteristics of Households, by Total Money Income in 2014,” [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2015/hinc01\\_1.xls](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/tables/hinc-01/2015/hinc01_1.xls).
44. This index score is based on 2023 data showing that the average *PBS* viewer is 44 percent more likely than the typical TV viewer (thus an index of 144) to hold a doctorate degree: Daren Wellman, “Who Watches *PBS*—A Breakdown of Demographics,” *Market Enginuity*, <https://blog.marketenginuity.com/who-watches-pbs-a-breakdown-of-demographics>, drawing on data also reported in Sponsorship Group for Public Television, “Audience Insights,” *PBS*, 2023, <https://sgptv.org/pbs-audience-insights/> (MRI Simmons Spring 2023 Doublebase, A18+, watched *PBS* in past 30 days). The article also reports that *PBS* viewers are more likely to be highly educated, white-collar professionals than the typical viewer.
45. *PBS* viewers are 126 percent (thus an index of 226) more likely than a “typical” viewer to have an investment portfolio worth over \$250,000 and “also tend to have higher income than the average consumer” (Wellman, “Who Watches *PBS*”).

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.1b) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.1b** Sweden: Audience Education and Income by Outlet

	1 = Elite 2 = Omnibus <sup>46</sup>	Average of Education & Income Index Scores <sup>47</sup> (Approx. +130 Elite/-130 or lower Omnibus)	Education: 2+ Years of College (Orvesto legacy + online 2020 <sup>48</sup> )	Education: College Degree+ (SOM 2017 <sup>49</sup> , print or online, but not both) <sup>50</sup>	Income: 42K SEK/ month+ (\$54,000/year) (Orvesto 2020 legacy + online)	Income: Average Income (Orvesto 2020 legacy + online)	Income: 45K SEK/month+ (\$59,000/year) (SOM 2017) <sup>51</sup>	Other Sources
SvD	1	200	163	250 online 159 (within survey calculation)	202	130	258 online 235 (within survey calculation)	—
MetroSW <sup>52</sup>	2	84	—	109 print 100 print “Any free newspaper” <sup>53</sup>	—	—	42 print “Any free newspaper”	—
DagNyh	1	173	157	232 online 145 (within survey calculation)	172	121	200 187 (within survey calculation)	—
DagETC	2	115	150 print	—	99 print	95 print	—	—
GPosten	1	146	133	177 print	156	118	—	—

(continued)

Online Table 2.1b Continued

	1 = Elite 2 = Omnibus <sup>46</sup>	Average of Education & Income Index Scores <sup>47</sup> (Approx. +130 Elite/-130 or lower Omnibus)	Education: 2+ Years of College (Orvesto legacy + online 2020 <sup>48</sup> )	Education: College Degree+ (SOM 2017 <sup>49</sup> , print or online, but not both) <sup>50</sup>	Income: 42K SEK/ month+ (\$54,000/year) (Orvesto 2020 legacy + online)	Income: Average Income (Orvesto 2020 legacy + online)	Income: 45K SEK/month+ (\$59,000/year) (SOM 2017) <sup>51</sup>	Other Sources
KIT	1	est. <sup>54</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	—
JPosten	2	90	90	100 print	73	97	—	—
N24	2	est. <sup>55</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dagen (Print)	2	103	132 (2017 sample)	—	86 (2017 sample)	91 (2017 sample)	—	—
Barom	2	92	97	105 print	72	95	—	—
DagAren	1	est. <sup>56</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	—
GefleDag	2	95	95	109 print	82	94	—	—
Norran	2	95	70	118 print	101	91	—	—
SR <sup>57</sup>	2	124	124	177 110 (within survey calculation)	133	114	108 104 (within survey calculation)	—
SVT <sup>58</sup>	2	120	110	173 110 (within survey calculation)	123	107	108 107 (within survey calculation)	—

46. This overall characterization of each outlet's audience as either socially elite or omnibus is based on a holistic analysis of the available data. As with our other national samples, we use an approximate 130 average of elite indexes (higher education, professional/managerial occupation [only available for France] and/or highest levels of income [not available for France]) as a rough cut-off between omnibus (around 130 or below) and elite (above 130). At the borderline, we also take into account other quantitative and qualitative indicators, including interviews with editors or experts.
47. This figure is the average of all indexes reported in the table for each outlet.
48. Proprietary Orvesto Konsument [Orvesto consumer] 2020 survey (conducted by Kantar Sifo, <https://www.kantarsifo.se/rapporter-undersokningar/rackviddsmatningar/orvesto-konsument>) of online and legacy media audiences. Orvesto figures for public media (SVT and SR) are average of legacy and mobile/ desktop, calculated separately (vs. legacy newspaper data, which are combined and calculated by Orvesto); e.g., SVT figures are average of SVT 1 (daily reach 5 min + ) and SVT mobile/ desktop.
49. From a 2017 SOM (Samhälle, Opinion, Medier [Society, Opinion, Media]) national survey of media use (conducted annually by the SOM Institute at Gothenburg University, <https://www.gu.se/en/som-institute/the-som-surveys/about-the-som-surveys>); The SOM survey, extracted and processed expressly for this book by Peter M. Dahlgren (<https://peterdahlgren.com>), provided data on audiences' education and income: we received online audience data for national newspapers *Dagens Nyheter* and *Svenska Dagbladet*, and legacy audience data for all other newspapers and public broadcasters.
50. SOM higher education indexes are calculated as follows: 2017 SOM users ("often") of the outlet with a college degree (years not specified) level of education or higher (post-graduate)/2017 Sweden census of all adult individuals with 3+ years of college (22 percent, no data available on 2+ years of college). For the four Swedish national outlets—SvD, DN, SR, and SVT—that generated very large, high degree of confidence samples in the SOM survey, we also present "within survey" indexes based on the following formula (email from Peter M. Dahlgren, Researcher, University of Gothenburg, May 21, 2023):  $pct\_often \leftarrow (total\_often / (total\_seldom (including\ never) + total\_often)) * 100$ ;  $index \leftarrow (column\_percent / pct\_often) * 100$ . The term "pct\\_often" refers to the percentage of the total sample that often reads the publication; the column\\_percent refers to the percentage of the particular subgroup (income, education, etc.) that often reads the publication.
51. SOM income indexes are calculated as follows: 2017 SOM users ("often") of the outlet making 45K SEK/month, 2017 Sweden census of all adult individuals making 42K SEK/month (12 percent; 500,000 SEK/year is the cut-off used in the census). As noted in the previous footnote, we also present "within survey" indexes for income for the outlets with large enough samples.
52. This "omnibus" coding determination for *Metro* is partly based on an estimate by Dr. Jonas Ohlsson, Nordicom director, University of Gothenburg, email communication with Rodney Benson, July 30, 2021. We also assume that *Metro* Sweden has a similar type of omnibus audience as roughly comparable outlets like *amNew York* (US) and *20 Minutes* (France), for which we also have data showing an omnibus audience.
53. The "any free newspaper" sample includes *Metro* and is presented as supplementary evidence given the much larger sample size (1,767, compared to 334 for *Metro*); the income sample for *Metro* is too small to present significant results.
54. Elite coding for *KIT* is an estimate based on a Martin Schori (news editor for six months in 2015) interview with Carl Ritter, March 12, 2021, in which Schori described *KIT*'s "key audience" as "pretty well-educated," "middle-aged," and "big city." It also accords with the media outlet's stated mission to provide "quality content" (although quality is not specified): see WAN-IFRA Staff, "Swedish Startup Kit Making the Most of Digital Distribution," April 5, 2017, <https://wan-ifra.org/2017/04/swedish-startup-kit-making-the-most-of-digital-distribution/>.
55. *Nyheter24's* coding determination is based on an estimate confirmed by Dr. Jonas Ohlsson, Nordicom director, University of Gothenburg, email communication with Rodney Benson, July 30, 2021.
56. Estimate derived from *Dagens Arena* website, "Message to Advertisers," <https://www.dagensarena.se/annonsera>: "Advertise with us—reach Sweden's leading politicians and opinion leaders. *Dagens Arena* offers an opportunity to reach Sweden's opinion leaders as well as a broad audience of politically and culturally interested people. Our site has at least

(continued)

### Online Table 2.1b Continued

200,000 pageviews every month. Our newsletter also reaches over 20,000 recipients, many of whom are among the country's decision-makers. And that's where we primarily offer advertising space. *Dagens Arena* is an important voice in the daily debate about politics, culture and ideas."

57. For data showing that Swedish public media (radio and TV) still reach a broad, omnibus audience (versus *Dagens Nyheter* and *Svenska Dagbladet*, which reach much more elite audiences), see Annika Bergström, Jesper Strömbäck, and Sofia Arkhede, "Towards Rising Inequalities in Newspaper and Television News Consumption? A Longitudinal Analysis, 2000–2016," *European Journal of Communication* 34, no. 2 (2019): 175–189.
58. SVT programming director Jan Helin (Zoom interview with Rodney Benson, August 21, 2020) stressed the omnibus character of SVT's target audience: "If you look at *Dagens Nyheter* and *Svenska Dagbladet* it's more of an upmarket journalism and more of an educated audience. Public service is almost afraid of going in that direction, it really needs to keep it simple and straight. I mean we have many more different programs that are more specialized, but in the news coverage I would say mainstream is a good thing for public service, and we're trying to be not upmarket and not down market."

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.1c) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.1c** France: Audience Education and Occupation by Outlet

	1 = Elite 2 = Omnibus <sup>59</sup>	Average of Education & Occup. Index Scores <sup>60</sup> Approx. + 130 Elite/ -130 Omnibus	Education: Bachelor+4 or more (ACPM 2020) <sup>61</sup>	Education: Bachelor+5 or more (Médiamétrie 2020) <sup>62</sup>	Occupation: Professional/ Managerial (ACPM 2020) <sup>63</sup>	Occupation: Professional/ Managerial (ACPM 2016) <sup>64</sup>	Occupation CSP+ (Médiamétrie 2020) <sup>65</sup>	Occupation CSP+ (Médiamétrie 2016) <sup>66</sup>	Occupation CSP- <sup>67</sup> 2020 Médiamétrie (Context: Not included in Index Average)	Occupation CSP- 2016 Médiamétrie (Context: Not included in Index Average)	Occupation: Laborer 2020/ 2016 ACPM (Context: Not included in Index Average)
TF1	2	120	—	120	—	—	125	109	115	103	—
Metnews <sup>68</sup>	2	126	—	—	—	—	133	119	109	98	—
LeHPO <sup>69</sup>	1	166	167	—	165	—	—	—	—	—	71 (2020)
LeFigaro <sup>70</sup>	1	139	134	—	134	149	—	—	—	—	79/71
LeMonde	1	158	154	—	152	169	—	—	—	—	78/69
Rue89 <sup>71</sup>	1	149	152	—	138	157	—	—	—	—	69/66
Slate.fr	1	146	—	168	—	—	140	129	116	89	—
ViceFr	1	144	—	150	—	—	158	124	105	76	—
Libé	1	179	172	—	173	193	—	—	—	—	84/61
LaCroix	1	165	186	—	147	161	—	—	—	—	44/31
L'Huma	1	158	—	155	—	136	201	141	60	58	88 (2016)
Mediapt	1	150	—	166	—	—	157	126	84	57	—

(continued)

Online Table 2.1c Continued

	1 = Elite 2 = Omnibus <sup>59</sup>	Average of Education & Occup. Index Scores <sup>60</sup> Approx. + 130 Elite/ -130 Omnibus	Education: Bachelor+4 or more (ACPM 2020) <sup>61</sup>	Education: Bachelor+5 or more (Médiamétrie 2020) <sup>62</sup>	Occupation: Professional/ Managerial (ACPM 2020) <sup>63</sup>	Occupation: Professional/ Managerial (ACPM 2016) <sup>64</sup>	Occupation CSP+ (Médiamétrie 2020) <sup>65</sup>	Occupation CSP+ (Médiamétrie 2016) <sup>66</sup>	Occupation CSP- <sup>67</sup> 2020 Médiamétrie (Context: Not included in Index Average)	Occupation CSP- 2016 Médiamétrie (Context: Not included in Index Average)	Occupation: Laborer 2020/ 2016 ACPM (Context: Not included in Index Average)
OuestFr <sup>72</sup>	2	123	120	—	121	127	—	—	—	—	92/101
FrInfo (TV + radio online)	2	126	—	131	—	—	125	122	104	92	—

59. This overall characterization of each outlet’s audience as either socially elite or omnibus is based on a holistic analysis of the available data. As with our other national samples, we use a 130 average of elite indexes (higher education, professional/managerial occupation [only available for France] and/or highest levels of income [not available for France]) as a rough cutoff between omnibus (around 130 or below) and elite (above 130), interpreting the data in relation to the national context of the distribution. At the borderline, we also take into account other quantitative and qualitative indicators. In the French case, these include scores of relative presence of less advantaged audiences (CSP-).

60. This figure is the average of all indexes reported in the table for each outlet.

61. ACPM (Alliance pour les chiffres de la presse et des médias) 2020 OneNext Global v1. Index is calculated by dividing the percentage for each outlet of its audience with the high school “BAC” (successful completion of the national high school exam) plus four or more years of higher education (ranging from 24.04 percent to 37.15 percent in our sampled outlets) by the average of the total sample population (19.97 percent).

62. Médiamétrie/Net Ratings 2020 (October) Audience Internet Global (online only)—France: Audience Composition. Index figures provided by Médiamétrie/Net Ratings.

63. ACPM 2020 OneNext Global v.1.

64. ACPM 2016 OneNext Global T1 (combined digital and print, 2016 2nd quarter).

65. CSP+ (catégorie socio-professionnelle+, or “higher social-professional category”) refers to individuals in managerial or professional occupations, assumed to have relatively higher levels of education and income.

66. Médiamétrie/Net Ratings 2016 (October) Audience Internet Global (online only)—France: Audience Composition. Index figures provided by Médiamétrie/Net Ratings.

67. CSP- (catégorie socio-professionnelle-, or “lower social-professional category”) refers to individuals in clerical, service, or manual occupations, assumed to have relatively lower levels of education and income.

68. *Metronews* audience data not available; figures are for *20 Minutes*, which is likely somewhat more elite than *Metronews*.



69. *Le HuffPost* from the 2020 ACPM sample are the average of fixed internet, mobile phone, and tablet audiences (for occupation, 16.07 percent/9.76 percent for the total sample).
70. Le Figaro Group Deputy CEO Jean-Luc Breyse described *Le Figaro* as “a right-wing, conservative paper whose core audience is high-end, wealthy and rather senior” (cited in Brian Veseling, “Brand Extension, Diversification are Crucial—Figaro Group Deputy CEO,” *WAN-IFRA*, June 9, 2017, <https://wan-ifra.org/2017/06/brand-extension-diversification-are-crucial-figaro-group-deputy-ceo/>).
71. *Rue89* Professional/Managerial 2016 ACPM data are based on *L’Obs*; in that year, *Rue89* was a part of the *L’Obs* website.
72. *Ouest-France* closely parallels the popular daily newspaper *Le Parisien* in its audience’s social location, and seems to be even more popular (working class): for example, for the 2020 ACPM sample, *Le Parisien* has a 135 index score for CSP+/professional/managerial occupation (vs. 121 for *Ouest-France*), the same index score as *Ouest-France* for laborer occupation (92), and nearly the same for Bachelor+4 education (122 vs. 120 for *Ouest-France*). See also Philippe Wallez, *Local and Regional Information in the Age of Electronic Media: A Comparative Study*, Thèse pour obtenir le grade de Docteur d’Aix-Marseille Université en Sciences de l’information et de la Communication, 2017 (Appendices, 57), for results of a *Ouest-France* internal survey (2013–2014) showing that the composition of its regular readers was slightly above average compared to the national population in holding professional occupational job categories (“PCS+,” 31 percent vs. 25 percent, 124 index) and identical to the national population in holding non-professional occupational job categories (“PCS–,” 35 percent vs. 35 percent, 100 index). Wallez also reports (2017, 160) that French regional newspapers (such as *Ouest-France*) have significantly lower rates of high-income readers than do national newspapers (such as *Le Monde*, *Le Figaro*, *Libération*): 21 percent for regional newspapers vs. 37 percent for national newspapers.

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.2a) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.2a** US: Audience Partisan Preferences by Outlet

	1–3 Left, Mixed/ Balanced, Right <sup>73</sup>	Pew 2014: Left, Mixed, Right <sup>74</sup>	Pew 2019: Left, Mixed, Right <sup>75</sup>	Reuters Institute 2017: Scale –0.50 (left) to +0.50 (right) <sup>76</sup>	2018 Benkler et al. <sup>77</sup> (Link Map)	2017 <sup>78</sup> Alexa or 2022 <sup>79</sup> Similarweb searches	Regional Populace or Other Sources
ABC	2	Mixed	Mixed	–0.06 (Mixed)	—	—	—
CNN	1	Left	Left	–0.15 (L)	—	—	—
HuffPo	1	Left	Left	–0.22 (L)	—	—	—
LAT	1	—	—	–0.22 (L)	(link map, 49) near: <i>Daily Beast</i> <i>New York Mag.</i>	(2022) <i>Washington Post</i> , <i>New York Times</i> , <i>CNN</i>	—
USAT	2	Mixed	Mixed	–0.13 <sup>80</sup> (M)	(link map, 49) near: <i>Wall Street Journal</i> <i>Bloomberg</i>	(2022) <i>Washington Post</i> , <i>New York Times</i> , <i>Fox News</i>	—
CBS	2	Mixed	Mixed	–0.06 (M)	—	—	—
Fox	3	Right	Right	+0.24 (R)	—	—	—
NYT	1	Left	Left	–0.25 (L)	—	—	—
SlateUS	1	Left	—	—	—	—	—
MetroUS	2 (est.)	—	—	—	—	(2017) mostly omnibus <i>Phillyvoice</i> , <i>NBCNY</i> , <i>Gothamist</i> , <i>AM-NY</i> , <i>NBCPhil</i> , <i>Boston Herald</i> , <i>6ABC</i>	Data for <i>Metro</i> or similar free newspapers in other urban markets suggests “Mixed” <sup>81</sup>

	1-3 Left, Mixed/ Balanced, Right <sup>73</sup>	Pew 2014: Left, Mixed, Right <sup>74</sup>	Pew 2019: Left, Mixed, Right <sup>75</sup>	Reuters Institute 2017: Scale -0.50 (left) to +0.50 (right) <sup>76</sup>	2018 Benkler et al. <sup>77</sup> (Link Map)	2017 <sup>78</sup> Alexa or 2022 <sup>79</sup> Similarweb searches	Regional Populace or Other Sources
BuzzF	1	Left	Left	-0.19 (L)	—	—	—
MinnST	1 (est.)	—	—	—	—	(2022) <i>MinnPost</i> , <i>Washington Post</i>	The Minneapolis metropolitan region leans strongly Democratic (e.g., the Hennepin Co. Dem. (Clinton) presidential vote margin in 2016 was 34.9%). <sup>82</sup>
WPost	1	Left	Left	-0.24 (L)	—	—	—
ViceUS <sup>83</sup>	1	—	Left	-0.28 (L)	—	(2017) mostly left <i>BuzzFeed</i> , <i>HuffPost</i> , <i>Washington Post</i> , <i>The Guardian</i> , <i>New York Times</i> , <i>NPR</i> , <i>Slate</i>	—
CSMon	2 (est.)	—	—	—	—	(2017) mix of left, center, and right: <i>The Hill</i> , <i>Washington Times</i> , <i>Newsweek</i> , <i>Politico</i> , <i>Daily Caller</i> , <i>Boston Globe</i> , <i>NBC News</i> , <i>Salon</i> , <i>The Daily Beast</i>	Interviews with editors <sup>84</sup>
CIR/R	1 (est.)	—	—	—	—	(2017) <i>ProPublica</i> <i>Columbia Journalism Review</i> (2022) <i>The Intercept</i> , <i>nakedcapitalism.com</i>	National partners: <i>NPR</i> , <i>AP</i> <i>Houston Chronicle</i> , <i>The Nation</i> , <i>Texas Tribune</i> . <i>PBS</i> <sup>85</sup>

(continued)

Online Table 2.2a Continued

	1–3 Left, Mixed/ Balanced, Right <sup>73</sup>	Pew 2014: Left, Mixed, Right <sup>74</sup>	Pew 2019: Left, Mixed, Right <sup>75</sup>	Reuters Institute 2017: Scale –0.50 (left) to +0.50 (right) <sup>76</sup>	2018 Benkler et al. <sup>77</sup> (Link Map)	2017 <sup>78</sup> Alexa or 2022 <sup>79</sup> Similarweb searches	Regional Populace or Other Sources
MinnP	1 (est.) <sup>86</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	Donors (2012) are much more likely than Minnesota voters, as a whole, to give to Dem. Obama than Republican Romney. <sup>87</sup> The Minneapolis metropolitan region leans strongly Democratic (e.g., the Hennepin Co. Dem. (Clinton) presidential vote margin in 2016 was 34.9%). <sup>88</sup>
ProPub	1 (est.) <sup>89</sup>	—	—	—	—	(2017) <i>Mother Jones, The Nation, The New Republic</i>	Internal survey: 88% left-“liberal” (2019) <sup>90</sup> National partners: <i>The Atlantic, Foreign Policy, CIR/Reveal, New York Times, Washington Post, NPR, New Yorker, Mother Jones</i> <sup>91</sup>
TexTrib	1 (est.) <sup>92</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	Internal survey: 42% Democrat, 18% Republican <sup>93</sup> Donors lean Democratic (although not as much as at <i>MinnPost</i> ) <sup>94</sup>
NPR	1	Left	Left	–0.26 (L)	—	—	—

	1–3 Left, Mixed/ Balanced, Right <sup>73</sup>	Pew 2014: Left, Mixed, Right <sup>74</sup>	Pew 2019: Left, Mixed, Right <sup>75</sup>	Reuters Institute 2017: Scale –0.50 (left) to +0.50 (right) <sup>76</sup>	2018 Benkler et al. <sup>77</sup> (Link Map)	2017 <sup>78</sup> Alexa or 2022 <sup>79</sup> Similarweb searches	Regional Populace or Other Sources
PBS	1	Left	Left	–0.22 (L) (offline) <sup>95</sup>	—	—	—
Wall Street Journal (for context)	2	Mixed	Mixed	–0.08	—	—	—

73. Left (highest proportion of an outlet’s audience holds left of center ideological views or party preferences), Mixed/Balanced (highest proportion of an audience holds mixed left and right views and/or a roughly even proportion of an outlet’s audience holds left and right ideological and party preferences), Right (highest proportion of an audience holds right of center ideological views or party preferences). Categories of Left, Mixed/Balanced, and Right are relative to each national political field’s distinctive ideological/partisan spectrum (e.g., views that may be considered slightly right of center in one country may be considered left of center in another, and far left parties and citizen views are generally stronger in France and Sweden than in the United States), and there are some borderline cases, for which we explain our coding determinations as needed. For the United States, because of the relative comprehensiveness of their samples, we privilege the Pew 2014 and 2019 surveys (which produced nearly identical results for outlets in both surveys) along with Fletcher et al.’s 2017 Reuters Institute survey in determining codes (Richard Fletcher, Alessio Cornia, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen, “How Polarized Are Online and Offline News Audiences? A Comparative Analysis of Twelve Countries,” *International Journal of Press/Politics* 25, no. 2 [2020]: 169–195). Other studies (Yochai Benkler, Robert Faris, and Hal Roberts, *Network Propaganda: Manipulation, Disinformation, and Radicalization in American Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018) and data sources are used as needed as alternative or supplementary/contextual sources.

74. The Pew 2014 survey data on “ideological placement of each source’s audience” was first reported in Pew Research Center, “Political Polarization & Media Habits,” Figure: Media Outlets by the Ideological Composition of Their Audience, October 21, 2014, <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2014/10/21/political-polarization-media-habits/>. The Pew 2014 spectrum refers to consistently liberal, mostly liberal, mixed, mostly conservative, and consistently conservative. We compressed this data to the three categories of Left, Mixed, and Right. The survey identifies the “average ideological placement on a 10-point scale of ideological consistency of those who got news from each source in the past week.” This definition leaves open the question of whether audiences got news from print, audio-visual, or online versions of the news source (outlet).

75. Pew 2019 survey data reported in Pew Research Center, “U.S. Media Polarization and the 2020 Election: A Nation Divided; 2. Americans are Divided by Party in the Sources They Turn to for Political News,” Figure: Average audience placement of each news outlet based on party and ideology,” January 24, 2020, <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2020/01/24/americans-are-divided-by-party-in-the-sources-they-turn-to-for-political-news/>.

76. Fletcher et al., “How Polarized are Online and Offline News Audiences?”; see Online Supplement, Table 14: USA news outlets included, “Cross-platform audience political leaning score” (except for *PBS NewsHour*, “offline audience”), open access (online\_supp.pdf at <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161219892768>). The study draws on a Reuters Institute survey conducted in 2017.

77. Benkler et al., *Network Propaganda*, 49.

78. Timothy Neff search of Alexa database, <https://web.archive.org/web/20170130105710/http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo>, January 30, 2017.

79. similarweb.com author searches, December 2022.

80. In the Fletcher et al. (2020) US data (Table 14), *USA Today*’s score was among the closest to the center, after *Yahoo*, *ABC News*, *CBS News*, *MSN*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and *AOL News*.

81. See audience data for Metro in Sweden (Table 2.2b) and urban free newspapers in France (Table 2.2c).

82. Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State, 2016 General Election for U.S. President, Clinton-Trump Margin by County, Official Results, <https://www.sos.state.mn.us/media/2818/us-president-results-map-margin-by-county.pdf>.

(continued)

## Online Table 2.2a Continued

83. A business magazine profile also documents *Vice's* youthful, culturally liberal audience: Will Yankowicz, "Vice Media: From Voice of Montreal to Voice of the Millennial Generation," *Inc.*, November 24, 2014, <https://www.inc.com/will-yakowicz/vice-media-finds-success-by-telling-different-story.html>.
84. The *Christian Science Monitor's* editor has publicly identified the audience as politically mixed and middle-of-the-road (Laura Hazard Owen, "The Christian Science Monitor is Betting Big on Constructive, Non-depressing (but Paid-for) News," *NiemanLab*, January 18, 2017, <https://www.niemanlab.org/2017/01/the-christian-science-monitor-is-betting-big-on-constructive-non-depressing-but-paid-for-news/>); *Christian Science Monitor* readers are "all over the map politically," according to [Editor Marshall] Ingwerson. "From either side of center, there's an openness and desire" for a news product like this. "On the extremes, there are people who feel very clear about who the enemy is. Those people are not so interested in seeing or understanding where the other side is coming from. That's okay; those people may not be that interested in what we're doing." See also Jonathan Groves and Carrie Brown, "Changing 'Habits of Thought,'" *International Symposium on Online Journalism* 8, no. 1 (2018), regarding the *Christian Science Monitor's* non-partisan conception of its audience; Groves (email to Rodney Benson, September 12, 2021) also confirmed that this was his assessment of the *Christian Science Monitor's* audience.
85. Nick Massella, "PBS NewsHour Partners with Reveal from The Center for Investigative Reporting," *PBS NewsHour*, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/press-releases/pbs-newshour-partners-reveal-center-investigative-reporting>. Also see David Uberti, "The Center for Investigative Reporting Bets It Can Change Audio Journalism—and Itself," *Columbia Journalism Review*, April 25, 2016, [https://www.cjr.org/the\\_feature/center\\_for\\_investigative\\_reporting.php](https://www.cjr.org/the_feature/center_for_investigative_reporting.php).
86. *MinnPost* produces primarily for its website audience. A *MinnPost* 2014 audience survey does not report partisan identification, but other indicators suggest readers are overwhelmingly Democratic/liberal: most readers live in the liberal Minneapolis/St. Paul metro area (even more so than the *Minneapolis Star Tribune*) and, as reported in Table 2.1a, nearly half have graduate degrees, a demographic associated with more liberal/left viewpoints. See Andrew Wallmeyer, "Survey Finds Our Readers Civically Engaged and Passionate About MinnPost and Minnesota," *MinnPost*, July 8, 2014, <https://www.minnpost.com/inside-minnpost/2014/07/survey-finds-our-readers-civically-engaged-and-passionate-about-minnpost-and/?hilite=reader+survey>.
87. James T. Hamilton, *Democracy's Detectives* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018), 206.
88. Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State, 2016 General Election for U.S. President, Clinton-Trump Margin by County, Official Results, <https://www.sos.state.mn.us/media/2818/us-president-results-map-margin-by-county.pdf>.
89. This is based on internal audience surveys, known audiences of national partners, and Alexa data on websites with similar audiences. However, it is important to stress that *ProPublica* stories also reach many regional media with ideologically mixed audiences (e.g., Jackson, MI *Clarion-Ledger*; Des Moines *Register*; Charleston, SC *Post and Courier*). See *ProPublica* "Report to Stakeholders, May–August 2016," *ProPublica*, <https://propublica.s3.amazonaws.com/assets/about/propublica-2016-2nd-interim-report.pdf>.
90. A 2019 *ProPublica* unscientific internal survey showed a website audience that was overwhelmingly left "liberal" (88 percent, versus 25 percent of the US population): Jill Shepherd, "2019 Reader Survey Results: A Loyal Audience Craving Government Coverage," *ProPublica*, May 17, 2019, <https://www.propublica.org/atpropublica/2019-reader-survey-results-a-loyal-audience-craving-government-coverage>.
91. *ProPublica* Report to Stakeholders, May–August 2016.
92. This is based on internal audience surveys and research on donors. While the *Texas Tribune's* audience appears to be less left-of-center than at some nonprofits, on a 1 to 3 scale its audience is still better categorized as a 1 than a "mixed" 2.
93. Justin Ellis, "The Texas Tribune is 5 Years Old and Sustainable. Now What?," *NiemanLab*, November 3, 2014, <https://www.niemanlab.org/2014/11/the-texas-tribune-is-5-years-old-and-sustainable-now-what/>: "The [Texas Tribune] audience is . . . physically close to the capital—45 percent of the readers in the survey said they live in the Austin area—and by party line, they look a lot more like Austin than the rest of Texas: 42 percent of its readers said they were Democrats compared to 18 percent identifying as Republican." In addition, nearly half of the *Texas Tribune's* audience (49 percent) is from out of state (primarily California, New York, and Florida). See *Texas Tribune*, "Audience," <https://mediakit.texastribune.org/audience.html>.
94. Similar to the *MinnPost*, the majority of individual donors to the *Texas Tribune* are Democrats, but one of the *Texas Tribune's* largest donors is also a major donor to a conservative superPAC; also, while *MinnPost* donors' ratio of Democratic to Republican campaign contribution dollars is 16 to 1, the *Texas Tribune* donors had a ratio of Democratic to Republican campaign donation dollars of 2.7 to 1 (Hamilton, *Democracy's Detectives*, 205).
95. Data for *PBS NewsHour* is for "offline audience": Fletcher et al., "How polarized ...?," online supplement, Table 14.

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.2b) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneymbenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.2b** Sweden: Audience Partisan Preferences by Outlet

	Audience Partisan Preference (1–3) Left-Mixed/ Balanced- Right <sup>96</sup>	Average of Ratios (A+B+C+D, as available)	(A) 2020 Orvesto <sup>97</sup> Average Mainstream Left (SocDem)/Right (Moderate) or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) (S) vs. (M) <sup>98</sup>	(B) 2017 SOM <sup>99</sup> Average Mainstream Left (SocDem)/Right (Moderate) or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) (S) vs. (M)	(C) 2020 Orvesto Combined Center & Right Parties/ Left Parties or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) <sup>100</sup>	(D) 2017 SOM Political Ideology Right-left or Left-right Index ratio (x/1) <sup>101</sup>	2020 Orvesto + Top Parties' -Bottom Parties' Indexes <sup>102</sup> (For Context)	Alexa 2017: Similar Websites by Audience Overlap <sup>103</sup> / Pew Research Center: L-R (0–6 scale) <sup>104</sup> (For Context)
SvD	3	1.74 R	150.5 M/82 S 1.84 R	137 M/ 74 S 1.85 R	140.6 C&R/ 86.7 L 1.62 C&R	135 R/83 L 1.63 R	+ Liberal (180), Moderate (150.5) – Left (79), S (82)	Pew L–R 3.5/6 (furthest R)
MetroSW <sup>105</sup>	2	1.07 R	—	112 M/ 109 S 1.03 R	—	94 R/85 L 1.11 R	—	Alexa 2017 Audience overlap with N24
DagNyh	2	1.17 L	119 S/97 M 1.23 L	98 S/95 M 1.03 L	136.8 L/ 108.4 C&R 1.26 L	116 L/100 R 1.16 L	+ Liberal (170), Green (156.5) – SwDem (58), ChrDem (82.5)	Pew L–R 3.3/6
DagETC (print)	1	5.93 L	138.5 S/25 M 5.54 L	—	237.8 L/ 37.7 C&R 6.31 L	—	+ Left, (359.5), Green (215.5) – Moderate (25), SwDem (26.5)	—

(continued)

Online Table 2.2b Continued

	Audience Partisan Preference (1-3) Left-Mixed/ Balanced- Right <sup>96</sup>	Average of Ratios (A+B+C+D, as available)	(A) 2020 Orvesto <sup>97</sup> Average Mainstream Left (SocDem)/Right (Moderate) or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) (S) vs. (M) <sup>98</sup>	(B) 2017 SOM <sup>99</sup> Average Mainstream Left (SocDem)/Right (Moderate) or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) (S) vs. (M)	(C) 2020 Orvesto Combined Center & Right Parties/ Left Parties or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) <sup>100</sup>	(D) 2017 SOM Political Ideology Right-left or Left-right Index ratio (x/1) <sup>101</sup>	2020 Orvesto + Top Parties' Indexes -Bottom Parties' Indexes <sup>102</sup> (For Context)	Alexa 2017: Similar Websites by Audience Overlap <sup>103</sup> / Pew Research Center: L-R (0-6 scale) <sup>104</sup> (For Context)
GPosten	2	1.27 R	137.5 M/94.5 S 1.46 R	108 M/ 97 S 1.11 R	117.4 C&R/ 90.5 L 1.30 C&R	110 R/90 L 1.22 R (print)	+ Moderate (137.5), Liberal (134), ChrDem (133.5) - Centre (72.5), Green (84)	—
KIT <sup>106</sup>	1 (est.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	Alexa 2017 Audience overlap with DagETC and DagAren
JPosten	2	1.05 R	119.5 S/112 M 1.07 L (0.94 R)	116 M/106 S 1.09 R	105.9 C&R/90.7 L 1.17 C&R	102 L/100 R 1.02 L (0.98 R)	+ Centre (143), Chr Dem (129.5) - Left (66), Sw Dem (69.5)	Alexa 2017 Audience overlap with Barom and DagETC
N24 <sup>107</sup>	2 (est.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	Alexa 2017 Audience overlap with MetroSW, <i>Expressen</i> , <i>Aftonbladet</i> , SVT, and TV4



	Audience Partisan Preference (1-3) Left-Mixed/ Balanced- Right <sup>96</sup>	Average of Ratios (A+B+C+D, as available)	(A) 2020 Orvesto <sup>97</sup> Average Mainstream Left (SocDem)/Right (Moderate) or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) (S) vs. (M) <sup>98</sup>	(B) 2017 SOM <sup>99</sup> Average Mainstream Left (SocDem)/Right (Moderate) or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) (S) vs. (M)	(C) 2020 Orvesto Combined Center & Right Parties/ Left Parties or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) <sup>100</sup>	(D) 2017 SOM Political Ideology Right-left or Left-right Index ratio (x/1) <sup>101</sup>	2020 Orvesto + Top Parties' Indexes -Bottom Parties' Indexes <sup>102</sup> (For Context)	Alexa 2017: Similar Websites by Audience Overlap <sup>103</sup> / Pew Research Center: L-R (0-6 scale) <sup>104</sup> (For Context)
Dagen	3	2.86 R	68.5 M/63.5 S 1.08 R	—	295.3 C&R/ 63.8 L 4.63 C&R	—	+ Chr Dem (1090.5), Centre (160) - Left (53.5)	—
Barom	2	1.01 L	103 S/101.5 M 1.01 L	106 S/93 M 1.14 L	111.9 C&R/ 94.3 L 1.19 C&R (0.84 L)	105 L/99 R 1.06 L	+ Chr Dem (155.5) - Green (84)	—
DagAren <sup>108</sup>	1 (est.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	Alexa 2017 Audience overlap with DagETC and aktuelltfokus.se
GefleDag <sup>109</sup>	2	1.05 R	103.5 M/97 S 1.07 R	—	106.2 L/ 100.0 C&R 1.06 L (0.94 R)	115 R/100 L 1.15 R	—	—
Norran <sup>110</sup>	2	1.14 L	126.5 S/80.5 M 1.57 L	116 M/ 100 S 1.16 R (0.86 L)	112.5 L/ 97.7 C&R 1.15 L	100 R/97 L 1.03 R (0.97L)	+ Lib, SocDem - Moderate, ChrDem	—

(continued)

Online Table 2.2b Continued

	Audience Partisan Preference (1-3) Left-Mixed/Balanced-Right <sup>96</sup>	Average of Ratios (A+B+C+D, as available)	(A) 2020 Orvesto <sup>97</sup> Average Mainstream Left (SocDem)/Right (Moderate) or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) (S) vs. (M) <sup>98</sup>	(B) 2017 SOM <sup>99</sup> Average Mainstream Left (SocDem)/Right (Moderate) or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) (S) vs. (M)	(C) 2020 Orvesto Combined Center & Right Parties/ Left Parties or Inverse Index Ratio (x/1) <sup>100</sup>	(D) 2017 SOM Political Ideology Right-left or Left-right Index ratio (x/1) <sup>101</sup>	2020 Orvesto + Top Parties' Indexes -Bottom Parties' Indexes <sup>102</sup> (For Context)	Alexa 2017: Similar Websites by Audience Overlap <sup>103</sup> / Pew Research Center: L-R (0-6 scale) <sup>104</sup> (For Context)
SR	2	1.39 L	131.5 S/91 M 1.45 L	117 S/85 M 1.38 L	148.7 L/ 107.5 C&R 1.38 L	122 L/92 R 1.33 L	+ Green (158.5), Left (156) - SwDem (72)	—
SVT	2	1.15 L	112 S/104.5 M 1.07 L	115 S/88 M 1.31 L	116.5 L/ 110.5 C&R 1.05 L	113 L/96 R 1.18 L	+ Lib (132.5) - SwDem (90.5)	Pew L-R 3.3/6

96. Left (highest proportion of outlet's audience holds left of center views or party preferences), Mixed/Balanced (highest proportion of audience holds mixed left and right views and/or a roughly even proportion of the outlet's audience holds left and right ideological and party preferences), Right (highest proportion of audience holds right of center views or party preferences). As noted in Table 2.2a, categories of left, mixed/balanced, and right are relative to each national political field's distinctive ideological/partisan spectrum. When quantitative indexes are available (for Sweden and France), we found that the following three ratio ranges best captured ideological differences in outlet audiences, roughly: 1.5 and above left-to-right ratio of indexes (Left, coded 1), between 1.49 and 1.0 either left-to-right or right-to-left (Mixed/Balanced, coded 2), and right-to-left ratio 1.5 and above (Right, coded 3). Other data sources (Alexa, Pew) are used as needed to provide alternative or supplemental documentation.

97. Proprietary Orvesto Konsument [Orvesto consumer] 2020 survey (conducted by Kantar Sifo, <https://www.kantarsifo.se/rapporter-undersokningar/rackviddsmatningar/orvesto-konsument>) of online and legacy media audiences. Orvesto figures for public media (SVT and SR) are averages of legacy and mobile/desktop, calculated separately (vs. legacy newspaper data, which are combined and calculated by Orvesto); e.g., SVT figures are average of SVT 1 (daily reach 5 min +) and SVT mobile/desktop. Orvesto Sample 2020 is combined print and online: all those who regularly read a news outlet in print, online, or both. For each outlet, percentages indicate the proportion of a given outlet's audience that will "definitely" or "perhaps" vote for a given party (an average of the two levels of support); index scores situate this outlet audience percentage in relation to the percentage for the sample of the national population. (A 100 score represents parity, a score below or above 100 indicates underrepresentation or overrepresentation, respectively, in relation to the national population.)

98. The index ratios (x/1) presented in columns (A) and (B) present two survey results for the relative predominance of an outlet's audience that is likely to vote for the leading mainstream left party (Social Democrat, "S") versus the leading mainstream right party (Moderate, "M"), or vice versa.

99. From a 2017 SOM (Samhälle, Opinion, Medier [Society, Opinion, Media]) national survey of media use (conducted annually by the SOM Institute at Gothenburg University, <https://www.gu.se/en/som-institute/the-som-surveys/about-the-som-surveys>); The SOM survey, extracted and processed expressly for this book by Peter M. Dahlgren (<https://peterdahlgren.com>), provided data on audiences' partisan preferences. SOM indexes are based on a survey question that required respondents to choose their "first best" political party, even if they were not a dedicated supporter of the party at all. The percentage of respondents not at all supportive varied by party and across outlets, but these differences are not accounted for in the results presented here. The indexes are calculated based on the following formula (email from Peter M. Dahlgren, affiliated researcher, Gothenburg University, May 21, 2023):  $\text{pct\_often} \leftarrow (\text{total\_often} / (\text{total\_seldom} + \text{total\_often})) * 100$ ;  $\text{index} \leftarrow (\text{column\_percent} / \text{pct\_often}) * 100$ . The term "pct\_often" refers to the national percentage level for that particular media; "seldom" includes never; and column\_percent refers to the particular subgroup (ideological preference, income, education, etc.). Taking *Svenska Dagbladet* as an example: In the national sample, 909 read it often and 7,560 read it seldom/never (909 / 909 + 7560), producing a "total often" percentage of 10.7. Using the same calculations for the sub-category of respondents with a "right" ideology, we find that 14.4 percent of respondents with a "right" ideology "often" read *Svenska Dagbladet*. Thus:  $14.4 / 10.7 = 1.35 \times 100 = 135$  "R" index (see column D). Respondents with a right ideology are 35 percent more likely to often read *Svenska Dagbladet* than the entire sample of respondents asked about their reading of *Svenska Dagbladet*.
100. This index ratio ( $x/1$ ) is constructed using the following steps: (1) sum and average the audience index scores of the center (Centre, Liberal) and right (Moderate, Christian Democrat, Sweden Democrat) parties, (2) sum and average the three major left parties (Left, Green, Social Democrat), and (3) divide the smaller average score into the larger.
101. SOM 2017 sample for online audience for outlets, except as indicated otherwise. "Center" parties' percentages are not calculated as part of the Right because they were very similar across the reported outlets, ranging from 24 percent at *Svenska Dagbladet* to 28 percent at SVT.
102. Sweden parties, from left to right, are: Left, Feminist (only in 2017 SOM sample), Green, Social Democrat (S), Liberal, Centre, Moderate, Christian Democrats, and Sweden Democrats.
103. Timothy Neff search of Alexa database, <https://web.archive.org/web/20170130105710/http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo>, January 30, 2017.
104. All Pew L–R 0–6 scores are from Pew Research Center, "News Media and Political Attitudes in Sweden," May 17, 2018, <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/fact-sheet/news-media-and-political-attitudes-in-sweden/>. Position refers to sampled Swedish news outlets: *Svenska Dagbladet* (3.5 on 0–6 Left–Right scale), *Expressen* and TV4 (3.4), and *Dagens Nyheter*, SVT, and *Aftonbladet* (all 3.3). Notably, the Swedish range using this methodology is narrower than for France in a comparable Pew research report: Pew Research Center, "Where Users Place Outlets' Ideologies," *News Media Attitudes in France*, April 23, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2019/04/23/where-users-place-outlets-ideologies/>.
105. *Metro* coding determination is partly based on an estimate confirmed by Dr. Jonas Ohlsson, Nordicom director, University of Gothenburg, email to Rodney Benson, July 30, 2021.
106. The *KIT* coding is partly based on information provided in an interview with Martin Schori by Carl Ritter, March 12, 2021.
107. *Nyheter24* coding determination is partly based on an estimate confirmed by Dr. Jonas Ohlsson, Nordicom director, University of Gothenburg, email communication with Rodney Benson, July 30, 2021.
108. *Dagens Arena* coding determination is based on interview with *Dagens Arena* editor-in-chief Jonas Nordling by Erik Thyselius, August 2020.
109. *Gefle Dagblad's* SOM sample is relatively small (43), compared to the Orvesto sample of 226. However, inclusion of the SOM sample does not dramatically change the results, which—with or without the SOM sample—suggests that *Gefle Dagblad* has an audience that is roughly balanced between right and left.
110. *Norran's* SOM sample is relatively small (49), compared to its Orvesto sample of 269. However, inclusion of the SOM sample does not dramatically change the results, which—with or without the SOM sample—suggests that *Norran* has an audience that is roughly balanced between right and left.

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.2c) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.2c** France: Audience Partisan Preferences by Outlet

	1-3 Left-Mixed/ Balanced- Right <sup>111</sup>	2012/2014 Average Left/Right or Right/Left Index ratio (x/1) (L) A + B/2 (R) C + D/2	(A) 2012 IFOP <sup>112</sup> % Hollande (L)	(B) 2014 IFOP Left <sup>113</sup> (L)	(C) 2012 IFOP Sarkozy (R)	(D) 2014 IFOP Right or Center (R)	2017 Reuters Institute <sup>114</sup> : Scale -0.50 (left) to +0.50 (right)	2019 Pew <sup>115</sup> Mean 0-6 L- R Ideology	2019 Institut Montaigne French Media Ecosystem (FME) and/or 2017 Alexa Similar Websites by Audience Overlap <sup>116</sup>
TF1	3	66.1 L/133.7 R <b>2.02 R</b>	60.7	71.4	140.7	126.7	+0.09 (R)	3.3/6 (same as LF)	—
Metnews <sup>117</sup>	2	103.6 L/104.7 R <b>1.01 R</b>	100	107.1	92.6	116.7	-0.02 (M)	—	—
LeHPo	1	—	—	—	—	—	-0.18 (L)	—	Near <i>Le Monde</i> (FME)
LeFigaro	3	46.5 L/213.0 R <b>4.58 R</b>	42.9	50.0	225.9	200.0	+0.13 (R)	3.3/6	—
LeMonde	1	171.4 L/82.3 R <b>2.08 L</b>	160.7	182.1	77.8	86.7	-0.12 (L)	2.9/6	Near center, in “Left” cluster (FME)
Rue89 (L’Obs) <sup>118</sup>	1	183.9 L/69.3 R <b>2.65 L</b>	185.7	182.1	51.9	86.7	-0.22 (L) (for Rue89)	—	Rue89 in “left-leaning” cluster with <i>Libération</i> , <i>Le Nouvel Obs.</i> (FME)
Slate.fr	1 (est.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Near <i>France Culture</i> , <i>Libération</i> , <i>L’Humanité</i> (FME) Audience overlap with <i>Libération</i> , <i>Le HuffPost</i> (Alexa)

	1-3 Left-Mixed/ Balanced- Right <sup>111</sup>	2012/2014 Average Left/Right or Right/Left Index ratio (x/1) (L) A + B/2 (R) C + D/2	(A) 2012 IFOP <sup>112</sup> % Hollande (L)	(B) 2014 IFOP Left <sup>113</sup> (L)	(C) 2012 IFOP Sarkozy (R)	(D) 2014 IFOP Right or Center (R)	2017 Reuters Institute <sup>114</sup> : Scale -0.50 (left) to +0.50 (right)	2019 Pew <sup>115</sup> Mean 0-6 L- R Ideology	2019 Institut Montaigne French Media Ecosystem (FME) and/or 2017 Alexa Similar Websites by Audience Overlap <sup>116</sup>
ViceFr	1 (est.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	In “mainstream” left cluster with <i>Le Monde</i> , to the right of <i>Libération</i> (FME) <sup>119</sup>
Libé	1	221.4 L/38.3 R 5.78 L	210.7	232.1	33.3	43.3	-0.22 (L)	2.5/6	—
LaCroix <sup>120</sup>	2	85.7 L/154.3 R 1.80 R	75.0	96.4	118.5	190.0	+0.03 (M)	—	Part of “Cluster 2” grouped with <i>La Tribune</i> , <i>Challenges</i> , as well as with <i>Le Nouvel Obs</i> and many “left- leaning” media (FME)
L’Huma	1	105.4 L/17.1 R 6.16 L	39.3	171.4	7.4	26.7	—	—	—
Mediapl	1	—	—	—	—	—	-0.30 (L) (furthest left in survey)	2.3/6 (furthest left in survey)	Near <i>Le Nouvel Obs</i> , <i>Le Media</i> (FME)
OuestFr <sup>121</sup>	2	105.4 L/90.4 R 1.17 L	110.7	100.0	107.4	73.3	-0.07 (M) (borderline b/w 1 & 2)	—	Mainstream cluster, near <i>L’Express</i> , BFM TV, <i>L’Equipe</i> (FME)
FrInfo (radio)	2	103.6 L/103.0 R 1.01 L	110.7	96.4	92.6	113.3	—	—	Mainstream overlapping with left cluster (FME)
FrTV(Fr2)	1	134.0 L/88.6 R 1.51 L	128.6	139.3	88.9	83.3	-0.08 (L) (borderline) <sup>122</sup>	3.1/6	—

(continued)

### Online Table 2.2c Continued

111. Left (highest proportion of outlet's audience holds left of center views or party preferences), Mixed /Balanced (highest proportion of audience holds mixed left and right views and/or a roughly even proportion of the outlet's audience holds left and right ideological and party preferences), Right (highest proportion of audience holds right of center views or party preferences). Categories of left, mixed/balanced, and right are relative to each national political field's distinctive ideological/ partisan expanse. When quantitative indexes are available, we found that the following three ratio ranges seemed to best capture ideological differences in outlet audiences: 1.5 and above left- to- right ratio of indexes (Left, coded 1), between 1.49 and 1.0 either left- to-right or right- to- left (Mixed/Balanced, coded 2), and 1.5/ 1 and above right- to- left ratio (Right, coded 3). Other data sources were used as needed to support our coding determinations.
112. IFOP [Institut français d'opinion publique], "Analyse du vote selon les habitudes médias" [presidential election], *Marianne*, April 12, 2012, <https://www.ifop.com/publication/analyse-du-vote-selon-les-habitudes-medias/>. The survey provides the percentage for each outlet of audience voting preferences for each party's presidential candidate as well as the percentage of the French population as a whole.
113. IFOP [Institut français d'opinion publique], "Analyse du vote au premier tour des élections municipales en fonction des habitudes médias," *Marianne*, March 23, 2014, <https://www.ifop.com/publication/analyse-du-vote-au-premier-tour-des-elections-municipales-en-fonction-des-habitudes-medias/>. Prior to the vote in the first round of municipal elections, the survey provides a percentage for each outlet of audience voting preferences for political parties (no candidates named), as well as the percentage of the French population as a whole.
114. Richard Fletcher, Alessio Cornia, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen, "How Polarized Are Online and Offline News Audiences? A Comparative Analysis of Twelve Countries," *International Journal of Press/Politics* 25, no. 2 [2020]: 169–195; see Online Supplement, Table 8: France news outlets included, "Cross-platform Audience Political Leaning Score, open access (online\_supp.pdf at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161219892768>).
115. Nami Sumida, Mason Walker, and Amy Mitchell, "News Media Attitudes in France," Pew Research Center, April 23, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2019/04/23/news-media-attitudes-in-france/>. Audience is defined as respondents who say they get news regularly from that outlet (not specifying a medium: print, TV, or website).
116. The French Media Ecosystem (FME) study was first reported in Institut Montaigne, "Media Polarization à la française: Comparing the French and American Ecosystems," May 2019, <https://www.institutmontaigne.org/en/publications/media-polarization-la-francaise>. This study was carried out in close partnership with academic institutions, including the Sciences Po Médialab, the Sciences Po School of Journalism, and the MIT Center for Civic Media. MIT researcher Ethan Zuckerman supervised the statistical analysis in the report, using similar methods as in Benkler et al.'s (2018) *Network Propaganda*, which we use as a supplemental source of audience data for our US sample (Zuckerman also closely collaborated with the Benkler book authors). The FME results are presented as groupings of outlets "based on the number of Twitter users they share" (see fig. 3). Alexa similar websites are from Timothy Neff search of Alexa database, [https://web.archive.org/web/20170130105710/ http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo](https://web.archive.org/web/20170130105710/http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo), January 30, 2017.
117. *Metronews* IFOP 2012 data is for "a free newspaper" (a category primarily consisting of *Metronews* and *20 Minutes*).
118. We use *L'Obs* audience data as a proxy for *Rue89*, given that the 2012 and 2014 surveys did not include questions about *Rue89* use. Beginning in December 2011, *Rue89* was part of the *L'Obs* website.
119. See also Alexandre Hervaud, Jérôme Lefilliâtre, and Quentin Müller, "Vice France, a Business of Small Virtue," *Libération*, May 18, 2018, [https://www.liberation.fr/france/2018/05/18/vice-france-un-business-de-petite-vertu\\_1651221](https://www.liberation.fr/france/2018/05/18/vice-france-un-business-de-petite-vertu_1651221).
120. *La Croix* is distinctive in having by far the highest proportion of its audience supportive of the centrist François Bayrou (29 percent) in the 2012 presidential survey (not shown in table). (In the 2017 election, which pitted conservative Nicolas Sarkozy and socialist Ségolène Royal, Bayrou declined to endorse Sarkozy, and, in a 2007 interview, he described himself as a "democrat" and a "Clintonian" [Elaine Sciolino, "A 'Neither/Nor' Candidate for President Alters the French Political Landscape," *New York Times*, March 8, 2007]. On the international western stage and within French politics, from at least the 2000s onward, Bayrou had clearly become a figure of the center rather than the right.). *La Croix's* audience's high score for "right/center right" in the 2014 survey may be largely due to support for the center-right rather than traditional right parties. The Reuters 2017 survey (see Fletcher et al. 2020) finds *La Croix's* online audience firmly in the center of the French media landscape, and we ultimately defer to it, as well as to the FME study, showing *La Croix* to be part of both the business and the "left-leaning" news clusters, in ultimately judging *La Croix* to be mixed/balanced rather than either left or right.
121. IFOP 2012 data is for "regional newspaper," not specific to *Ouest-France*.
122. *FranceTV's* Reuters scale score of -0.08, coded as L, is borderline with M (mixed/balanced), but is parallel to *TF1* at +0.09, coded as R.

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.3a) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.3a** US: Primary Funding, Revenues, and Audience Size by Outlet<sup>123</sup>

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Philanthropy both Large and Small Donations 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Public Funding 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Total Revenues 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Audience Size: Digital Monthly Unique US Visitors, Comscore, January 2015 with US rank in parentheses <sup>124</sup>  Digital Monthly Unique US visitors, Alexa, 2017 <sup>125</sup>  Percentage of national adult population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>126</sup>  Other measures and years as noted
ABC (Disney)	1	≈93% <sup>127</sup> (2012)	—	—	—	\$658M <sup>128</sup> (ABC News)	128.0 million monthly unique visitors, <i>Yahoo-ABC News</i> network (#1, Comscore 2015) 19.6 million monthly unique visitors, <i>ABC News</i> (Alexa 2017) 13% of national population with weekly online use (2016)
CNN	2	39% <sup>129</sup>	61% Cable fees	—	—	\$1.402 B (Pew 2016)	101.5 million monthly unique visitors (#2, Comscore 2015) 52.8 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 21% of national population with weekly online use (2016)

(continued)

Online Table 2.3a Continued

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Philanthropy both Large and Small Donations 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Public Funding 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Total Revenues 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Audience Size: Digital Monthly Unique US Visitors, Comscore, January 2015 with US rank in parentheses <sup>124</sup>  Digital Monthly Unique US visitors, Alexa, 2017 <sup>125</sup>  Percentage of national adult population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>126</sup>  Other measures and years as noted
HuffPo (Verizon)	1	≈100% <sup>130</sup>	—	—	—	\$146M (2014) <sup>131</sup> \$126.0B (all Verizon) <sup>132</sup>	100.0 million monthly unique visitors (#4, Comscore 2015) 57 million monthly unique visitors (April 2016) <sup>133</sup> 42.9 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017)
LAT (Tribune Publishing/ Tronc [as of June 2016])	1	54.3% <sup>134</sup> (Tronc)	29.8% (Tronc)	—	—	≈\$400M (estimated LAT only, 2017) <sup>135</sup> \$1.6B <sup>136</sup> (Tronc 2016)	24.8 million monthly unique visitors (LAT only) (#21, Comscore 2015) 21.4 million monthly unique visitors (LAT only) (Alexa 2017)



	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Philanthropy both Large and Small Donations 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Public Funding 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Total Revenues 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Audience Size: Digital Monthly Unique US Visitors, Comscore, January 2015 with US rank in parentheses <sup>124</sup>  Digital Monthly Unique US visitors, Alexa, 2017 <sup>125</sup>  Percentage of national adult population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>126</sup>  Other measures and years as noted
USAT (Gannett)	1	56% (Gannett) <sup>137</sup>	37% (Gannett) <sup>138</sup>	—	—	\$3.0B (Gannett)	78.8 million monthly unique visitors ( <i>USA Today</i> “sites”) (#6, Comscore 2015) 33.2 million monthly unique visitors ( <i>USA Today</i> ) (Alexa 2017)
CBS	1	≈93% <sup>139</sup> (CBS News)		—	—	\$8.9B <sup>140</sup> (CBS Entertainment, including News)	84.2 million monthly unique visitors (CBS News #5, Comscore 2015) 20.2 million monthly unique visitors (CBS news, Alexa 2017)
Fox <sup>141</sup>	2	40% (Fox News)	60% Cable fees	—	—	\$2.46B	56.9 million monthly unique visitors (Fox News #9, Comscore 2015) 32.9 million monthly unique visitors (Fox News Alexa 2017)

(continued)

Online Table 2.3a Continued

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Philanthropy both Large and Small Donations 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Public Funding 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Total Revenues 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Audience Size: Digital Monthly Unique US Visitors, Comscore, January 2015 with US rank in parentheses <sup>124</sup>  Digital Monthly Unique US visitors, Alexa, 2017 <sup>125</sup>  Percentage of national adult population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>126</sup>  Other measures and years as noted
NYT	2	37.4% <sup>142</sup>	56.7% <sup>143</sup>	—	—	\$1.56B <sup>144</sup>	57.1 million monthly unique visitors (#8, Comscore 2015) 51.2 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 85 million monthly unique visitors/2.9 million paid subscribers (print + digital) (2016) <sup>145</sup>
SlateUS (Graham Holdings)	1	≈90% <sup>146</sup> (Slate)	≈10% (Slate)	—	—	\$20.5M <sup>147</sup> (2015)	18.3 million monthly unique visitors (#26, Comscore 2015) 13.7 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 18,000 digital subscribers (end of 2016) <sup>148</sup>

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Philanthropy both Large and Small Donations 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Public Funding 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Total Revenues 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Audience Size: Digital Monthly Unique US Visitors, Comscore, January 2015 with US rank in parentheses <sup>124</sup>  Digital Monthly Unique US visitors, Alexa, 2017 <sup>125</sup>  Percentage of national adult population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>126</sup>  Other measures and years as noted
MetroUS	1	100% <sup>149</sup>	—	—	—	\$40 M (2004) <sup>150</sup>	0.4 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 4.1 million monthly readership (2019, combined print/online monthly visitors) <sup>151</sup> 6% of national population with weekly use (any free city paper “like <i>Metro</i> ,” offline) (Reuters Institute 2016)
BuzzF	1	100% <sup>152</sup>	—	—	—	\$250M <sup>153</sup>	78.0 million monthly unique visitors (#7, Comscore 2015) 31.4 million US monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017)
MinnST	1	55%	45% <sup>154</sup>	—	—	\$230M <sup>155</sup>	2.7 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017)
WPost	1	≈65%	≈35% <sup>156</sup>	—	—	\$350M <sup>157</sup>	47.8 million monthly unique visitors (#11, Comscore 2015) 38.9 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017)

(continued)

Online Table 2.3a Continued

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Philanthropy both Large and Small Donations 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Public Funding 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Total Revenues 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Audience Size: Digital Monthly Unique US Visitors, Comscore, January 2015 with US rank in parentheses <sup>124</sup>  Digital Monthly Unique US visitors, Alexa, 2017 <sup>125</sup>  Percentage of national adult population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>126</sup>  Other measures and years as noted
ViceUS	2	≈45%	≈55% <sup>158</sup>	—	—	\$900M <sup>159</sup> (2015)	15.6 million monthly unique visitors (#31, Comscore 2015) 7.8 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017)
CSMon	3	10%	20%	70% <sup>160</sup>	—	\$18.6M <sup>161</sup> (2012)	2.4 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 40,000 print magazine paid circulation (2012) <sup>162</sup>
CIR/R	3	—	—	98% <sup>163</sup>	—	\$10.1M <sup>164</sup>	0.2 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 260,000 monthly <i>page views</i> (2016) <sup>165</sup> 200,000 monthly unique visitors (2012) <sup>166</sup>

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Philanthropy both Large and Small Donations 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Public Funding 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Total Revenues 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Audience Size: Digital Monthly Unique US Visitors, Comscore, January 2015 with US rank in parentheses <sup>124</sup>  Digital Monthly Unique US visitors, Alexa, 2017 <sup>125</sup>  Percentage of national adult population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>126</sup>  Other measures and years as noted
MinnP	3	≈32% <sup>167</sup>	—	67% <sup>168</sup>	—	\$1.3M <sup>169</sup>	0.4 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 270,000 monthly unique visitors (2012) <sup>170</sup> 433,000 monthly unique visitors (2023) <sup>171</sup>
ProPub	3	—	—	95% <sup>172</sup>	—	\$14.5M <sup>173</sup>	1.2 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 2 million monthly <i>page views</i> (2016) <sup>174</sup> 580,000 monthly unique visitors (2012) <sup>175</sup>
TexTrib	3	—	—	90% <sup>176</sup>	—	\$6.9M <sup>177</sup>	0.8 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 1.1 million monthly unique visitors (2016) <sup>178</sup>

(continued)

Online Table 2.3a Continued

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Philanthropy both Large and Small Donations 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Revenues from Public Funding 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Total Revenues 2016 (unless otherwise noted)	Audience Size: Digital Monthly Unique US Visitors, Comscore, January 2015 with US rank in parentheses <sup>124</sup>  Digital Monthly Unique US visitors, Alexa, 2017 <sup>125</sup>  Percentage of national adult population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>126</sup>  Other measures and years as noted
NPR	3	—	—	51% direct (2019–2023) <sup>179</sup>	≈5% (est. 2019–2023) <sup>180</sup> 25.6% (of total network revenues, including local taxes and public universities) <sup>181</sup>	\$218M (revenues) \$347M (assets) NPR Inc. <sup>182</sup> \$1.26B Combined national and local public radio network <sup>183</sup>	26.6 million monthly unique visitors (#19, Comscore 2015) 24.5 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 9% of national population with weekly use (offline) (Reuters Institute 2016) 41 million monthly unique visitors across all digital platforms (2016) <sup>184</sup>
PBS NewsHour	3	—	—	65% <sup>185</sup>	35% <sup>186</sup> 44.6% <sup>187</sup>	\$25–\$30M ( <i>PBS NewsHour</i> , 2014) <sup>188</sup> \$1.82B National and local public TV network <sup>189</sup>	19.9 million monthly unique visitors (all PBS) (Alexa 2017) 9% of national population with weekly use (offline) (Reuters Institute 2016) 7.5 million monthly unique visitors ( <i>PBS NewsHour</i> online) (2020) <sup>190</sup>

123. All figures in the table are for 2016 unless indicated otherwise.
124. Pew Research Center, "Digital: Top 50 Online News Entities" (based on the industry standard ComScore data), April 29, 2015, <https://web.archive.org/web/20150429153944/http://www.journalism.org/media-indicators/digital-top-50-online-news-entities-2015/>.
125. Timothy Neff search of Alexa database, <https://web.archive.org/web/20170130105710/http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo>, January 30, 2017.
126. Nic Newman, with Richard Fletcher, David A. L. Levy, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen, *Reuters Institute Digital News Report* (Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, 2016).
127. Figure is based on topline findings for 2012 "Network TV program ad revenue" and "Other network TV news revenue," from Jesse Holcomb and Amy Mitchell, "The Revenue Picture for American Journalism and How it is Changing," Pew Research Center, March 26, 2014, <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2014/03/26/the-revenue-picture-for-american-journalism-and-how-it-is-changing/>. The report's topline findings report ad revenue for ABC's *World News Tonight* and *Good Morning America* programs: <https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/2014/03/Revenue-picture-for-American-Journalism-topline.pdf>. Pew notes that data include estimates: "Market research firm Kantar Media estimates that the big three broadcast network morning and evening programs generated \$1.7 billion in TV advertising revenue in 2012. But that is not the only revenue stream for this sector: VSS projects 2012 revenue from 'online and mobile platforms' as a share of total broadcast (network + local) revenues. We took the share (12%) and applied it to the subtotal that was already calculated using TV ad revenue actuals. VSS estimates that 3.6% of total broadcast TV revenue comes from retransmission fees (split up between local affiliates and the networks). These fees generally reach local stations, which then pass along about half of those fees to the networks. Analysts calculated a total sum for retransmission fees that reach local stations, projecting a sum that filter through to the newsroom budgets. That sum was then divided, and about half was applied to the network TV news total revenue estimate."
128. Estimate based on topline findings from Pew 2014 for "Network TV program ad revenue" for ABC's *World News Tonight* and *Good Morning America*. The figure also includes "Other Network TV news revenue," which aggregates revenue from retransmission feeds and digital ads for ABC, CBS, and NBC. This aggregate figure is divided by three and added to ad revenue for the two ABC programs to render this estimate of overall news revenue (Holcomb and Mitchell, "The Revenue Picture for American Journalism"). The report's topline findings can be found at <https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/2014/03/Revenue-picture-for-American-Journalism-topline.pdf>. Revenues for Disney's broadcasting segment, which includes *ABC News*, totaled \$7.1 billion in fiscal year 2016: Walt Disney Company, "The Walt Disney Company Reports Fourth Quarter and Full Year Earnings for Fiscal 2016," November 10, 2016, <https://thewaltdisneycompany.com/app/uploads/q4-fy16-earnings.pdf>.
129. CNN revenues are for 2016 and are from Pew Research Center, "Cable News Fact Sheet," July 13, 2021, <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/fact-sheet/cable-news/>.
130. *HuffPost* has been, since its origins, free access and entirely supported by advertising. In 2019, an editor proposed a new "membership" program that would allow some readers to directly contribute to the *HuffPost*, similar to the *Guardian's* membership program (no content would be behind a "paywall"). See [https://www.huffpost.com/entry/introducing-huffpost-plus\\_n\\_5ca6a984e4b047edf957c68c](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/introducing-huffpost-plus_n_5ca6a984e4b047edf957c68c). According to the UNC Hussman School of Journalism and Media, Center for Innovation and Sustainability in Local Media, "Case Study: Huffington Post," <https://www.cislm.org/case-study-huffington-post/> (undated, with data presented through 2018), *HuffPost* made most of its money from: "corporate clients in search of health and wellness tools, and sponsorships/online content."
131. Michael Sebastian, "Huffington Post Said to Break Even on \$146 Million in Revenue Last Year," *AdAge*, June 30, 2015, <https://adage.com/article/media/huffington-post-broke-146-million-revenue/299293>.
132. See the Chair's letter in Verizon, "Building a Connected World: 2016 Annual Report," [https://www.verizon.com/about/sites/default/files/annual\\_reports/2016/letter.html](https://www.verizon.com/about/sites/default/files/annual_reports/2016/letter.html).
133. Insider Intelligence, "Huffington Post Faces Several Challenges Without Its Founder," *Business Insider*, August 12, 2016, <https://www.businessinsider.com/huffington-post-faces-several-challenges-without-its-founder-2016-8>.
134. Advertising and circulation percentages are based on combined 2016 advertising and circulation revenues for troncM, which includes newspaper properties, and troncX, which includes digital properties. Of the total combined revenues of \$1.6B for these two segments, \$877.4M came from advertising and \$482.3M came from circulation. The remaining \$257.2M (15.9 percent) came from sale of digital content and other sources. See Tronc, Inc., "Form 10-K," US Securities and Exchange Commission, December 25, 2016, <https://epoxymaterials.com/interactive/trnc2016/page.php?nn=1&zz=306&up=1>.

(continued)

### Online Table 2.3a Continued

135. Based on two indicators: (1) High data point: Media analyst's estimates that the *Los Angeles Times* alone accounts for 30 percent to 40 percent of Tronc revenues of approx. \$1.6B (see fn 148): Paul Farhi, "Los Angeles Times Owner Sells Paper to Local Billionaire Patrick Soon-Shiong, Ending a Long-Troubled Relationship," *Washington Post*, February 7, 2018, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/los-angeles-times-owner-will-sell-paper-ending-a-long-troubled-relationship/2018/02/06/60f5f42e-0b5f-11e8-95a5-c396801049ef\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/los-angeles-times-owner-will-sell-paper-ending-a-long-troubled-relationship/2018/02/06/60f5f42e-0b5f-11e8-95a5-c396801049ef_story.html); (2) Low data point: Tronc reported that the *Los Angeles Times* and *San Diego Union Tribune* had combined \$470 million in revenue in 2017: Globe Newswire, "tronc, Inc. Announces Sale of the Los Angeles Times and The San Diego Union-Tribune to Dr. Patrick Soon-Shiong for \$500 Million Plus the Assumption of \$90 Million in Pension Liabilities," *tronc*, February 7, 2018, <https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2018/02/07/1335389/0/en/tronc-Inc-Announces-Sale-of-the-Los-Angeles-Times-and-The-San-Diego-Union-Tribune-to-Dr-Patrick-Soon-Shiong-for-500-Million-Plus-the-Assumption-of-90-Million-in-Pension-Liabilities.html>.
136. Reuters, "Tronc Inc Sees FY 2016 Revenue \$1.61 Billion," January 30, 2017, <https://www.reuters.com/article/idINASB0AXDA>.
137. From Gannett's 2016 Annual Report (not only *USA Today*): Gannett, "2016 Annual Report," [https://www.annualreports.co.uk/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/g/NYSE\\_GCI\\_2016.pdf](https://www.annualreports.co.uk/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/g/NYSE_GCI_2016.pdf).
138. From Gannett, "2016 Annual Report." The remaining 6 percent of revenues are from other commercial ventures.
139. Figure is based on topline findings for 2012 "Network TV program ad revenue" and "Other network TV news revenue," from Holcomb and Mitchell, "The Revenue Picture for American Journalism." The report's topline findings report ad revenue for CBS's *Evening News* and *This Morning* programs: <https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/2014/03/Revenue-picture-for-American-Journalism-topline.pdf>.
140. CBS Entertainment segment revenues, which includes *CBS News* as part of its CBS Television Network sub-segment: CBS Corporation, "Form 10-K," US Securities and Exchange Commission, December 31, 2016, [https://www.annualreports.co.uk/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/c/NYSE\\_CBS\\_2016.pdf](https://www.annualreports.co.uk/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/c/NYSE_CBS_2016.pdf).
141. Pew Research Center, "Cable News Fact Sheet," July 13, 2021, unless otherwise noted, <https://web.archive.org/web/20210819132105/https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/fact-sheet/cable-news/>.
142. Advertising and circulation (digital and print audience) revenues are from New York Times Co., "2016 Annual Report," [https://www.annualreports.com/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/n/NYSE\\_NYT\\_2016.pdf](https://www.annualreports.com/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/n/NYSE_NYT_2016.pdf). *The New York Times* earned 6 percent of its total revenues from other commercial sources.
143. Ibid.
144. Ibid.
145. Ibid.
146. Estimate. The *Slate Plus* subscription was launched in 2014, but in 2017 it was described as providing very small revenues: "Slate Plus revenue is barely a drop in the bucket compared to Slate's overall ad revenue." See Sarah Sluis, "Slate Expands Subscription Program Due To Post-Election Membership Bump," *Ad Exchanger*, January 18, 2017, <https://www.adexchanger.com/publishers/slate-expands-subscription-program-due-post-election-membership-bump/>. By 2020, Slate had 60,000 paying subscribers, with podcasts being a primary draw: Max Willens, "'We Seized on Podcasts': How Slate Used Audio as the Foundation of Its First-party Data Strategy," *Digiday*, November 6, 2020, <https://digiday.com/media/we-seized-on-podcasts-how-slate-used-audio-as-the-foundation-of-its-first-party-data-strategy/>.
147. Estimate is based on the combined estimated ad revenues of \$20M in 2013 and \$500,000 in estimated subscriber revenue in 2015: Keith J. Kelly, "Slate Seeking a Few Paying Customers," *New York Post*, April 22, 2014, <https://nypost.com/2014/04/22/slate-seeking-a-few-paying-customers/> and [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slate\\_\(magazine\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slate_(magazine)).
148. As reported by Sluis, "Slate Expands Subscription Program."
149. *Metro* is a free access website and print newspaper, a business model "reliant upon advertising alone," according to Michael Serazio, "Free Newspapers," in Christopher H. Sterling, ed., *Encyclopedia of Journalism* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2008), 649; see also Joshua Levine, "Paper Tiger," *Forbes*, June 6, 2013, <https://www.forbes.com/global/2002/0429/028.html?sh=24ed254e25fe>.



150. Based on a reported \$10 million revenue in 2004 for *Metro Boston*, multiplied by 4 (assuming similar revenues for *Metro Philadelphia* and twice that for the larger *Metro New York*: Global Newswire, “The New York Times Company and Metro USA Enter Into Venture in Boston,” *Metro International*, January 4, 2005, <https://www.globenewswire.com/en/news-release/2005/01/04/320921/939/en/The-New-York-Times-Company-and-Metro-USA-Enter-Into-Venture-in-Boston.html>. Metro’s 2019 media kit indicates *Metro New York* has more than twice the circulation of the other two papers: Metro, “Media Kit 2019,” [https://media.metro.us/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/metromediakit-2019\\_nyc.pdf](https://media.metro.us/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/metromediakit-2019_nyc.pdf).
151. Combined readership is based on 2019 Nielsen Scarborough: Metro, “Media Kit 2019,” [https://media.metro.us/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/metromediakit-2019\\_nyc.pdf](https://media.metro.us/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/metromediakit-2019_nyc.pdf).
152. From its inception, BuzzFeed has been a free access website, funded by display advertising, brand sponsorships, product sales, and other commercial sources (Ben Smith, *Traffic* [New York: Penguin, 2023]). By 2014, most of BuzzFeed’s advertising revenue came from “native advertising” or “brand sponsorships”—advertisements often produced in cooperation with advertisers to look like news articles (Mike Isaac, “A Move to Go Beyond Lists for Content at BuzzFeed,” *New York Times*, August 10, 2014, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/11/technology/a-move-to-go-beyond-lists-for-content-at-buzzfeed.html>). BuzzFeed started a “membership” donation program in 2018, but it only generated revenues in the “tens of thousands” of dollars: Christine Schmidt, “What Does Membership Mean for BuzzFeed News—at a Company That’s Already Raised Nearly \$500 Million in Venture Capital?” *NiemanLab*, December 10, 2018, <https://www.niemanlab.org/2018/12/what-does-membership-mean-for-buzzfeed-news-at-a-company-thats-already-raised-nearly-500-million-in-venture-capital/>. As of 2019, BuzzFeed earned about equal amounts of revenue from display advertising and what they labeled “content+,” or “advertising-like videos, articles, and media” (essentially sponsored content/native advertising); in subsequent years, display advertising (in the lead), content+, and e-commerce all were major revenue sources (Benjamin Mullin and Amrith Ramkumar, “BuzzFeed Clashed with NBCUniversal as it Pursued SPAC Deal,” *Wall Street Journal*, August 18, 2021, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/buzzfeed-clashed-with-nbcuniversal-as-it-pursued-spac-deal-11629284161>).
153. Amol Sharma and Lukas I. Alpert, “BuzzFeed Set to Miss Revenue Target, Signaling Turbulence in Media,” *Wall Street Journal*, November 16, 2017, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/buzzfeed-set-to-miss-revenue-target-signaling-turbulence-in-media-1510861771>.
154. Estimate based on Rick Edmonds, “Why Does the Star Tribune Outperform the Pack of Metros: An Update,” *Poynter*, May 2, 2018, <https://www.poynter.org/business-work/2018/why-does-the-star-tribune-outperform-the-pack-of-metros-an-update/>. By the end of 2016 and 2017, data provided by Edmonds suggests that circulation and other revenues (events, printing, etc.) had almost pulled even with advertising; by 2018 they clearly were the highest source of revenues. The *Minneapolis Star Tribune* is thus a borderline case. By 2018, it was the only regional newspaper, other than the *Boston Globe*, that was seen as approaching a level of digital subscriptions that could be a sustainable revenue source. See Keach Hagey, Lukas I. Alpert, and Yaryna Serkez, “In News Industry, a Stark Divide Between Haves and Have-Nots,” *Wall Street Journal*, May 4, 2019, <https://www.wsj.com/graphics/local-newspapers-stark-divide/>.
155. Annual revenues without a specific year, cited in Tony Silber, “Star Tribune Publisher: Newspapers Can Survive but Things Have to Change. Lots of Things,” *Forbes*, April 11, 2018, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/tonysilber/2018/04/11/star-tribune-publisher-newspapers-can-survive-but-things-have-to-change-lots-of-things/?sh=41d69e5fb10f>.
156. This is an estimate, based on a low starting point for *Washington Post* reader revenues joined to significant increases during this period and a company strategy oriented toward increasing reader revenues. As of July 2016, total audience funding (print and digital subscriptions) were said to make up only 30 percent of Washington Post Co. total revenues: “They need a couple million people to make subscription digital business at the low price point that would bring in more than 50 percent of their overall revenue [from readers],” according to publishing analyst Ken Doctor, quoted in Digiday, “How the *Washington Post* Grew Digital Subscriptions 145 Percent,” *Digiday*, July 12, 2016, <https://digiday.com/media/washington-post-grew-digital-subscriptions-145-percent/>. In 2017, Jeff Bezos emphasized the importance of putting readers first and the unreliability of Internet programmatic advertising as a funding source (Matt Rosoff, “Jeff Bezos Has Advice for the News Business: Ask People to Pay. They Will Pay,” *CNBC*, June 21, 2017, <https://www.cnb.com/2017/06/21/jeff-bezos-lessons-from-washington-post-for-news-industry.html>). By 2019, a *Wall Street Journal* report showed that while the *Washington Post* was among the outlets with the highest reader to subscriber conversion rates, it still was slightly under the 2 percent threshold said to be needed to make digital subscriptions a sustainable revenue source (Hagey et al. 2019).

(continued)

### Online Table 2.3a Continued

157. This is an estimate of total revenue circa 2016, as reported in Gabriel Sherman, “Good News at the *Washington Post*,” *New York Magazine*, June 28, 2016, <https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2016/06/washington-post-jeff-bezos-donald-trump.html>.
158. In 2015, *Vice* self-reported that it had generated about \$915 million in revenues and that the majority of these revenues derived from “content sales to broadcasters.” See Sydney Ember and Andrew Ross Sorkin, “As *Vice* Moves More to TV, It Tries to Keep Brash Voice,” *New York Times*, May 3, 2015, <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/04/business/media/as-vice-moves-more-to-tv-it-tries-to-keep-brash-voice.html>.
159. Estimate for 2015, from Maryam Sanati, “Shane Smith Will Take Your Money Now,” *The Globe and Mail*, May 26, 2016, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/rob-magazine/why-vice-media-is-valued-in-the-billions-and-why-thats-totally-crazy/article30169513/>. *Vice*'s revenue target for 2017 was “more than \$800 million,” according to Sharma and Alpert (“BuzzFeed Set to Miss Revenue Target”).
160. This estimate that the Christian Science Church endowment, followed by other donations (including continuing church subsidies), made up about 70 percent of the *Monitor's* 2016 revenues is based on figures provided in Carrie Brown and Jonathan Groves, *Transforming Newsrooms* (London: Routledge, 2020) and in Rick Edmonds, “Christian Science Monitor Sees Traffic, Revenues Rising After 3 Years of Web-first Strategy,” *Poynter*, May 2, 2012, <https://www.poynter.org/reporting-editing/2012/christian-science-monitor-sees-traffic-revenues-rising-after-3-years-of-web-first-strategy/>. Groves confirmed that this estimate is roughly correct for that time period in an email to Benson, September 12, 2021.
161. “Operating budget” for FY ending 2012, reported in Edmonds, “Christian Science Monitor Sees Traffic.”
162. Reported in Edmonds, “Christian Science Monitor Sees Traffic.”
163. CIR, “2016 Form 990,” ProPublica Nonprofit Explorer tax filing database, <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/942434026>.
164. Ibid.
165. Reported in David Uberti, “The Center for Investigative Reporting Bets It Can Change Audio Journalism—and Itself,” *Columbia Journalism Review*, April 25, 2016, [https://www.cjr.org/the\\_feature/center\\_for\\_investigative\\_reporting.php](https://www.cjr.org/the_feature/center_for_investigative_reporting.php). Page views tend to be much higher than monthly unique viewers, so this figure cannot be directly compared to monthly unique visitors at other outlets.
166. Knight Foundation, “Finding a Foothold: How Nonprofit News Ventures Seek Sustainability,” October 29, 2013, 13, <https://knightfoundation.org/reports/finding-foothold/>.
167. MinnPost, “2016 Form 990,” ProPublica Nonprofit Explorer tax filing database, <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/260573427>: 32 percent of revenues attributed to “program services” (“advertising” is listed as a “program service”).
168. Ibid.
169. Ibid.
170. Knight Foundation, “Finding a Foothold,” 11.
171. Jay Boller, “What’s the State of Alternative Media in the Twin Cities,” *Racket*, June 29, 2023, <https://racketmn.com/whats-the-state-of-alternative-media-in-mn-twin-cities>.
172. ProPublica, “2016 Form 990,” ProPublica Nonprofit Explorer tax filing database, <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/142007220>.
173. Ibid.
174. Uberti, “The Center for Investigative Reporting Bets.”
175. Knight Foundation, “Finding a Foothold,” 13.
176. Texas Tribune, “2016 Form 990,” ProPublica Nonprofit Explorer tax filing database, <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/264527097>.
177. Ibid.
178. 2016 figure in Texas Tribune, “2017 Texas Tribune Annual Report,” 5, <https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.texastribune.org/media/documents/2017/2017%20Texas%20Tribune%20Annual%20Report.pdf>.
179. This percentage includes “corporate sponsorships” (39 percent) and “contributions of cash and financial assets” (12 percent). Additional foundation and individual donations likely help local stations pay the membership fees (31 percent of total revenues) required to run the national programs produced by NPR, although they are not calculated

separately. Thus, total corporate, foundation, and individual donations are likely the original source of much more than 51 percent of total NPR revenues. See NPR, “Public Radio Finances,” <https://www.npr.org/about-npr/178660742/public-radio-finances>. Member station fees are distinct from commercial cable fees (for *CNN* and *Fox News*) in that NPR (or PBS) audiences are not required to pay the fees to access the content, and thus cannot also be considered funded by “paying” audiences. See also NPR, Inc., “2016 Form 990 (fiscal year ending September 2016),” ProPublica Nonprofit Explorer tax filing database, <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/520907625/201742239349301919/full>.

180. According to NPR’s own website, it receives less than 1 percent of its funding directly from the federal Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) (NPR, “Public Radio Finances”). However, NPR receives additional indirect federal, state, and local funding from the fees paid to it by local public “member” radio stations/websites (31 percent of total funding), many of which rely much more heavily on federal and state and local public (governmental) funding. According to David Folkenflik (“NPR Quits Twitter After Being Falsely Labeled as ‘State-affiliated Media,’” April 12, 2023, <https://www.npr.org/2023/04/12/1169269161/npr-leaves-twitter-government-funded-media-label>): “Most of NPR’s funding comes from corporate and individual supporters and grants. It also receives significant programming fees from member stations. Those stations, in turn, receive about 13 percent of their funds from the CPB and other state and federal government sources.” If 31 percent of funding comes from local stations that, in turn, receive 13 percent of their revenues from public funding, that means NPR receives an extra 4 percent of its revenues originally generated from public funding: thus, our estimate of total public funding of 5 percent.
181. This is “tax-based revenue” for the public radio network for fiscal year 2016, which includes percentages of total revenue deriving from CPB, state governments, state colleges and universities, local governments, federal grants and contracts, and other colleges and universities. See Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), “Public Broadcasting Revenue: Fiscal Year 2016,” <https://www.cpb.org/sites/default/files/reports/revenue/2016PublicBroadcastingRevenue.pdf>.
182. NPR, Inc., “2016 Form 990 (fiscal year ending September 2016),” 1. In a 2023 article, NPR journalist David Folkenflik seems to be using NPR assets to represent its total budget of “\$300 million” (Folkenflik, “NPR Quits Twitter”).
183. Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), “Public Broadcasting Revenue: Fiscal Year 2016.”
184. *Ibid.*, 2.
185. PBS NewsHour, “Frequently Asked Questions about Support,” <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/support/frequently-asked-questions-about-support>. Another report for the “public media system” (PBS and member stations) shows philanthropic funding at 53 percent (individuals at 31 percent, foundations at 10 percent, businesses at 12 percent), public funding at 43 percent (federal at 15 percent, state at 13 percent, local at 3 percent; universities [likely public] at 8 percent, public broadcasters [member stations, at least partially relying on public funding] 4 percent), and miscellaneous at 4 percent (investments and other sources), <https://www.pbs.org/foundation/areas-of-focus/sustaining-pbs/#:~:text=Because%20PBS%20is%20commercial%2Dfree,%241.40%20per%20taxpayer%20per%20year>.
186. PBS NewsHour, “Frequently Asked Questions about Support.”
187. This percentage is derived from all tax-based sources of revenue for the entire public television network in the fiscal year of 2016. See Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), “Public Broadcasting Revenue: Fiscal Year 2016.”
188. Elisabeth Jensen, “WETA to Take Ownership of ‘PBS NewsHour,’” *New York Times*, June 18, 2014, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/19/business/media/weta-to-take-owners-hip-of-pbs-newshour.html>; see also Philanthropy News Digest, “PBS’s ‘NewsHour’ Grappling with Funding Woes,” May 20, 2008, <https://philanthropynewsdigest.org/news/pbs-s-newshour-grappling-with-funding-woes>, which reports a *NewsHour* annual budget of \$27 million.
189. Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), “Public Broadcasting Revenue: Fiscal Year 2016.”
190. PBS NewsHour, “PBS NewsHour history,” <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/about/history/>.

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.3b) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.3b** Sweden: Primary Funding, Revenues, and Audience Size by Outlet<sup>191</sup>

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016	Philanthropy (Large or small donations) 2016	Major Revenues from Public Press Subsidies or Legacy TV/Radio “License Fees” <sup>192</sup>	Total Revenues 2016 <sup>193</sup>	Audience Size  Percentage of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>194</sup>  Other indicators as noted
SvD <sup>195</sup>	2	33.7%	58.1%	—	5.9%	\$88.7 M \$1.84 B (Schibsted) <sup>196</sup>	22% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016)  45,000 digital subscribers (2016) <sup>197</sup>
MetroSW <sup>198</sup>	1	≈100%	—	—	—	\$16.2 M \$38 M (Metro Nordic Sweden)	10% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016)
DagNyh <sup>199</sup>	2	≈41%	≈59%	—	—	\$169.5 M \$2.8 B (Bonnier AB)	25% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016)
DagETC <sup>200</sup>	2	2%	57%	4% (reader donations)	37%	\$10.3 M (ETC media operations)	8,300 total subscribers (2016) <sup>201</sup>

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016	Philanthropy (Large or small donations) 2016	Major Revenues from Public Press Subsidies or Legacy TV/Radio “License Fees” <sup>192</sup>	Total Revenues 2016 <sup>193</sup>	Audience Size  Percentage of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>194</sup>  Other indicators as noted
GPosten (Stampen Local Media) <sup>202</sup>	2	40% (Stampen Local Media)	45% (Stampen Local Media)	—	—	\$150.1 M (media operation) \$190.1 M (total) (Stampen Local Media)	16% of national population w/weekly online use: <i>Göteborgs- Posten</i> (Reuters Institute 2016)
KIT <sup>203</sup>	1	≈100% <sup>204</sup>	—	—	—	\$884,000	600,000 daily online readers (2016) <sup>205</sup>
JPosten	1	“Ads were our biggest source of revenue in 2016” <sup>206</sup>	—	—	—	\$60.1 M (Hallpressen)	19% of national population with weekly online use (any regional/ local newspaper website) (Reuters Institute 2016)
N24 (Group) <sup>207</sup>	1	98% [+2% other commercial revenues] (N24 Group)	—	—	—	\$33.5 M (N24 Group)	16% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016)  2 million weekly unique readers (Nyheter24 plus Tourn Content Discovery) <sup>208</sup>

(continued)

Online Table 2.3b Continued

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016	Philanthropy (Large or small donations) 2016	Major Revenues from Public Press Subsidies or Legacy TV/Radio “License Fees” <sup>192</sup>	Total Revenues 2016 <sup>193</sup>	Audience Size  Percentage of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>194</sup>  Other indicators as noted
Dagen	2	≈11% (2020) <sup>209</sup>	≈65% (2020)	—	≈25%	\$6.5 M <sup>210</sup>	16,000 total subscribers (2016) <sup>211</sup>
Barom (Gota Media chain)	2	≈40% (2018) <sup>212</sup>	≈59% (2018)	—	—	\$120.0 M Gota Media	19% of national population with weekly online use (any regional/ local newspaper website) (Reuters Institute 2016)
DagAren (nonprofit assoc.) <sup>213</sup>	3	—  15% (Misc. commercial: not advertising)	—	85% total (≈60% LO labor union; 25% Individuals and associations)	—	\$730,000	40,000 digital monthly unique visitors <sup>214</sup> (2012)  6,218 newsletter subscribers (2016) <sup>215</sup>
GefleDag (Mittmedia AB)	2	38% (Mittmedia AB)	54% (Mittmedia AB)  Gefle Dagblad- Only: Readers were primary funding source in 2016 (interview) <sup>216</sup>	—	—	\$170.1 M (Mittmedia AB)	19% of national population with weekly online use (any regional/ local newspaper website) (Reuters Institute 2016)  17,300 total subscribers (2016) <sup>217</sup>

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016	Philanthropy (Large or small donations) 2016	Major Revenues from Public Press Subsidies or Legacy TV/Radio “License Fees” <sup>192</sup>	Total Revenues 2016 <sup>193</sup>	Audience Size  Percentage of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>194</sup>  <b>Other indicators as noted</b>
Norran	1	“In 2016, advertising revenue was greater than audience revenue” <sup>218</sup>  [Also: unspecified real estate and stock investments]	Unspecified	—	—	\$13.7 M <sup>219</sup>	19% of national population with weekly online use (any regional/ local newspaper website) (Reuters Institute 2016)  19,700 total subscribers (2016) <sup>220</sup>
SR	4	—	—	—	≈100%	\$311 M <sup>221</sup>	24% of national population with weekly online use; 40% weekly offline use (Reuters Institute 2016)
SVT	4	—	—	—	≈100%	\$549.0 M <sup>222</sup>	13% of national population with weekly online use; 57% weekly offline use (Reuters Institute 2016)

(continued)

### Online Table 2.3b Continued

191. All revenue figures are from 2016 company Annual Reports (sometimes supplemented with 2015 data, if the annual report refers back to a previous year), unless otherwise noted. All dollar equivalents for Swedish outlets are based on an exchange rate of SEK to USD = 0.10989010989 (the average in December 2016 from Ekonomifakta, data from Riksbank), unless indicated otherwise.
192. All press public subsidy amounts are from the MPRT (Swedish government agency) two subsidies reports from 2016: “Beviljat Distributionsstöd—2016,” [www.mprt.se](http://www.mprt.se), 2016, <https://www.mprt.se/globalassets/dokument/stod-till-medier/beviljade-stod/distributionsstod/beviljat-distributionsstod-2016.pdf>; “Beviljat Driftsstöd—2016,” [www.mprt.se](http://www.mprt.se), 2016, <https://www.mprt.se/globalassets/dokument/stod-till-medier/beviljade-stod/driftsstod/beviljat-driftsstod-2016-rev.pdf>.
193. Total revenues are “net turnover” + “other income,” the standard measure in Sweden, and are derived from the 2016 company annual report, unless otherwise indicated.
194. Nic Newman, with Richard Fletcher, David A.L. Levy, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen, *Reuters Institute Digital News Report* (Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, 2016).
195. For the percentage of advertising, audiences, and public subsidies, total revenues and operating profit, see “Annual Report 2016,” Schibsted, <http://hugin.info/131/R/2096898/793519.pdf>; “Annual Report 2016,” HB Svenska Dagbladets AB & Co, <https://www.allabolag.se/9020043619/handelsbolaget-svenska-dagbladets-aktiebolag-co>.
196. Schibsted (a Norwegian-based company) figures are based on an exchange rate of NOK to USD = 0.1159 (the average in December 2016 from Riksbank).
197. The number of SvD digital subscribers is calculated based on information provided in “Stor ökning av digitala prenumeranter för SvD,” *Svenska Dagbladet*, March 16, 2018 (accessed through the Media Archive Retriever, April 21, 2022).
198. Funding sources and total revenue provided in Årsredovisning [Annual Report] Tidnings AB Metro, “Tidnings AB Metro—Årsredovisning 2016, Stockholm,” (hitta.se December 2016), <https://www.hitta.se/f%C3%B6re-tags-info/rmat/ion/tidnings+ab+metro/5564891678> and in Årsredovisning [Annual Report] Metro Nordic Sweden AB, See also: Alex Hartelius, “Brakförlust för Metro” [Huge Loss for Metro], *Resumé*, 28 August, 2018, [<https://www.resume.se/kommunikation/media/brakforlust-for-metro/>].
199. Funding sources and total revenues are derived from “Årsredovisning [Annual Report],” AB Dagens Nyheter, Årsredovisning 2016 (hitta.se December 2016), <https://www.hitta.se/f%C3%B6re-tags-info/rmat/ion/dagens+nyheter/5562468172>. The annual report of AB Dagens Nyheter 2016 only gives exact numbers for paying audiences, not for advertising revenue. Advertising percentages can, however, be closely approximated based on the paying audiences number, net revenue and other income information given in the report.
200. Percentages for funding (date unspecified) provided by *Dagens ETC* publisher Johan Ehrenberg, January 13, 2021, email to Carl Ritter; Andreas Gustavsson, *Dagens ETC* editor-in-chief, in a Zoom interview with Carl Ritter, February 5, 2021, provided similar figures current for that date. Total revenue for ETC media operation is found in: Johan Ehrenberg, Anna Varvouzos, and Tommy Rundqvist, “Så går det för ETC-familjen” [This is how the ETC family is doing], *Dagens ETC*, Sept 7, 2017, <https://www.etc.se/inrikes/sa-gar-det-etc-familjen>.
201. Kantar Sifo, “Upplage-Och Räckviddsutveckling 2007–2016”; Kantar Sifo, “Upplage-Och Räckviddsutveckling 2008–2017.” We thank Johanna Ollevik, Senior Media Specialist with Kantar Media, for providing us with circulation data and for explaining to us how to interpret it.
202. Stampen Lokala Medier AB Årsredovisning (Annual report) 2016, *Hitta.se*, December 2016, <https://www.hitta.se/f%C3%B6re-tags-information/stampen+lokala+medier+aktiebolag/5562201052#>. Percentages are derived from Stampen Local Media revenues of \$150.1 M, which include other revenue sources besides advertising and paying audiences, including \$9.5 M from “electronic media,” of which the funding sources are not disclosed. The \$190.1 M total also includes other income and debt restructuring. Stampen Local Media (Stampen Lokala Medier) publishes *Göteborgs-Posten*, several local newspapers, eight advertising-funded free newspapers and various online platforms. The revenue numbers for *Göteborgs-Posten* only are not reported in the annual report. GP is, however, by far the largest newspaper in the group and the dominant source of paying audience revenue. A Tidningsutgivarna (Swedish Media Publishers’ Association) 2017 survey showed average paying audience revenue of 55.1 percent versus 44.9 percent for advertising (print + digital), up from around 53 percent and 47 percent, respectively, in 2016. For city newspapers (Stockholm, Gothenburg, etc.) paying audience revenue proportions were on average slightly higher. Based on this data, we estimate that *Göteborgs-Posten’s* primary funding in 2016 was from paying audiences. Rågsjö-Thorell, Andreas, “Så växer



- läsarintäkter i betydelse för svenska morgontidningar” [This is how reader revenues are growing in importance for Swedish morning newspapers], *Resumé*, Sept. 13, 2017. <https://www.resume.se/kommunikation/media/sa-vaxer-lasarintakter-i-betydelse-for-svenska-morgontidningar/>.
203. Total revenues are from KIT Media AB, “Annual report 2016,” <https://www.retrievergroup.com/sv/product-business-foretag>.
  204. Martin Schori, editor of *KIT* in 2015, confirmed for Carl Ritter in an interview that funding was “predominantly” from advertising (March 12, 2021). The same reliance on advertising was stressed in a 2017 media report: “So far, advertising revenue accounts for almost all of KIT’s turnover [up until 2017].” Olle Aronsson, “Kit Har Bränt Över 40 Miljoner—Får Låna Pengar Av Ågaren Bonnier,” *www.breakit.se*, April 2017, <https://www.breakit.se/artikel/8207/hajpade-kit-gor-ny-storforlust>.
  205. F. Thambert, “KIT: Vi når 600 000 per dag,” *Resume.se*, July 14, 2016, <https://www.resume.se/kommunikation/media/kit-vi-nar-600-000-per-dag/>. This figure, however, has been criticized as being inaccurate. See E. Wisterberg, “Har Kit 600 000 läsare om dagen? (Nja, inte riktigt),” *Dagens Media*, April 18, 2016, <https://www.dagensmedia.se/medier/digitalt/har-kit-600-000-lasare-om-dagen-nja-inte-riktigt/>.
  206. Marie Johansson Flyckt to Carl Ritter on Facebook Messenger, May 6, 2023. Johansson Flyckt added: “It was in 2020 or 2021 that subscription revenue overtook ads.” Mikael Nestius, CEO of Bonnier Local, which purchased *Jönköpings-Posten* in 2019, confirmed in an email to Carl Ritter, January 12, 2024, that in 2020 65–70 percent of *Jönköpings-Posten*’s revenues came from subscribers and 30–35 percent of revenues came from advertising.
  207. Nyheter24 Group, “2016 Annual Report.”
  208. Halvårsrapport, *Tourn International*, July 18, 2016, <https://news.cision.com/se/tourn-international/r/halvarsrapport-2016,c2047699>.
  209. *Dagen* advertising and audience revenues are based on estimates provided by an interview with a *Dagen* editor conducted in August 2020.
  210. Årsredovisning [Annual Report] Tidnings AB Nya Dagen Årsredovisning 2016, *Hitta.se*, [https://www.hitta.se/f%C3%B6retagsinformation/tidnings+ab+nya+dagen+\(publ\)/5561977025#reports](https://www.hitta.se/f%C3%B6retagsinformation/tidnings+ab+nya+dagen+(publ)/5561977025#reports).
  211. Kantar Sifo, “Upplage-Och Räckviddsutveckling 2007–2016”; Kantar Sifo, “Upplage-Och Räckviddsutveckling 2008–2017.”
  212. Barometern 2018 percentages of advertising and audience funding were provided by a Gota Media employee to our research team in 2020. As of 2016 Barometern-OT was one of the few Swedish newspapers keeping their circulation steady with only 0.8% reduction of volume, when others were losing around 10%, a result of keeping high levels of editorial content according to management. See Jonathan Nilsson, “Barometern-OT står sig starkt: “Vi når fler läsare än någonsin” [Barometern-OT remains strong: “We are reaching more readers than ever”], *Barometern-OT*, March 9, 2017, <https://www.barometern.se/kalmar/barometern-ot-star-sig-starkt-vi-nar-fler-lasare-an-nagonsin/>
  213. Jonas Nordling, editor-in-chief, *Dagens Arena*, in a telephone interview with Erik Thyselius, August 2020, defined *Dagens Arena* as a “donation-funded media”; Håkan A. Bengtsson, CEO, *Dagens Arena*, in a January 14, 2021 email to Carl Ritter, reported the specific percentages reported here, including miscellaneous “income from other operations.”
  214. Voxeurop, “Dagens Arena,” <https://voxeurop.eu/en/source/dagens-arena-2/>.
  215. Arena Verksamhetsberättelse 2016, *Arenagruppen*, <http://www.arenagruppen.se/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/arena-vb16.pdf>.
  216. Email from Anna Gullberg, former editor of *Gefle Dagblad* (in 2016), to Carl Ritter, May 4, 2023: “Readers” were the primary funding source for *Gefle Dagblad* in 2016. “Even then, the advertising market was no longer like it was in the olden days. Incidentally, GD did not have press support during my time. Unthinkable for a liberal newspaper. The owner foundation probably had strong views.” Email from Mikael Nestius, General Manager of Bonnier, to Carl Ritter, January 12, 2021, confirmed that for *Gefle Dagblad*, the “distribution of revenues [for 2020] is as follows: subscription revenues 58.5%, press subsidy 22.5%, ads 19%.”
  217. Kantar Sifo, “Upplage-Och Räckviddsutveckling 2007–2016”; Kantar Sifo, “Upplage-Och Räckviddsutveckling 2008–2017.”

(continued)

**Online Table 2.3b** Continued

218. Email from Anders Westermark, former CEO of *Norran*, to Carl Ritter, May 6, 2023. Westermark added, however: “Today (2023), for a normal media corporation, audience revenues are probably significantly greater than advertising revenue.”
219. *Norran*, “Annual Report,” <https://www.retrievergroup.com/sv/product-business-foretag>.
220. Kantar Sifo, “Upplage-Och Räckviddsutveckling 2007–2016”; Kantar Sifo, “Upplage-Och Räckviddsutveckling 2008–2017.”
221. SR, “Annual Report 2016,” <https://www.retrievergroup.com/sv/product-business-foretag>.
222. SVT, “Annual Report 2016.”

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.3c) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.3c** France: Primary Funding, Revenues, and Audience Size by Outlet

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016	Philanthropy (Large or Small Donations) 2016	Major Revenues from Public Press Subsidies or Legacy TV/ Radio Public “License Fees” 2016	Total Revenues 2016	Audience Size Percentage of national population with weekly use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>223</sup> Other sources as noted Monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) <sup>224</sup>
TF1	1	≈90% <sup>225</sup>	—	—	—	2.06 B euros (TF1 Group, 2016) <sup>226</sup>	9% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters 2016) 12.4 million monthly unique visitors (Médiamétrie, 2016) <sup>227</sup> 4.1 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017)
Metnews	1	≈100% <sup>228</sup>	—	—	—	2.06 B euros (TF1 Group, 2016)	19% of national population with weekly online use ( <i>20 Minutes</i> ) (Reuters Institute 2016) 14.8 million monthly unique visitors ( <i>20 Minutes</i> , from Médiamétrie 2016) <sup>229</sup>
LeHPo	1	≈100% <sup>230</sup>	—	—	—	—	13% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) 4.1 million monthly unique visitors (2016) <sup>231</sup> 4.6 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa, 2017)

(continued)

Online Table 2.3c Continued

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016	Philanthropy (Large or Small Donations) 2016	Major Revenues from Public Press Subsidies or Legacy TV/ Radio Public “License Fees” 2016	Total Revenues 2016	Audience Size Percentage of national population with weekly use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>223</sup> Other sources as noted Monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) <sup>224</sup>
LeFigaro <sup>232</sup>	2	≈40% (est.)	≈55%	—	≈1–5% 2.4 M euros (6 cents per print copy) <sup>233</sup>	351.1 M euros <sup>234</sup>	15% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) 8.9 million monthly unique visitors (Comscore 2013) <sup>235</sup> 9.1 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) 50,000 digital subscribers (2016) <sup>236</sup> 205,000 digital subscribers (2020) <sup>237</sup>
LeMonde	2	≈30%	≈65% <sup>238</sup>	—	≈1–5% 1.7M euros (6 cents per print copy) <sup>239</sup>	327 M euros (Groupe Le Monde) <sup>240</sup>	18% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) 8.3 million monthly unique visitors (Comscore 2013) <sup>241</sup> 9.6 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017)
Rue89	1	100% <sup>242</sup>	—	—	—	—	9% of national population with weekly online use ( <i>L’Obs</i> , of which <i>Rue89</i> became a vertical in 2016) (Reuters Institute 2016) 6.4 million monthly unique visitors (for <i>L’Obs</i> , of which <i>Rue89</i> became a vertical in 2016) (Alexa, 2017)

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016	Philanthropy (Large or Small Donations) 2016	Major Revenues from Public Press Subsidies or Legacy TV/ Radio Public "License Fees" 2016	Total Revenues 2016	Audience Size Percentage of national population with weekly use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>223</sup> Other sources as noted Monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) <sup>224</sup>
Slate.fr	1	100% <sup>243</sup>	—	—	—	0.9 M euros total revenues <sup>244</sup>	3.4 million monthly unique visitors <sup>245</sup> (Médiamétrie, 2016) 2.2 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa, 2017)
ViceFr (Vice Group)	2	45%	55% <sup>246</sup>	—	—	(see Vice US)	2.1 million monthly unique visitors (Médiamétrie, 2016) <sup>247</sup> 1.3 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa, 2017)
Libé	2	<25% <sup>248</sup>	≈60%	—	≈12–15% 4.9M euros (27 cents per print copy) <sup>249</sup>	36 M euros (2018) <sup>250</sup>	8% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) 3.9 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa, 2017) 12,500 digital subscribers (2018) <sup>251</sup>
LaCroix	2	6% (2018) <sup>252</sup>	82% (2018) <sup>253</sup>	—	12% (2018) <sup>254</sup> 4.1 M euros (14 cents per print copy) <sup>255</sup>	35 M euros (2014) <sup>256</sup> 30 M euros (2018) <sup>257</sup>	2.2 million monthly unique readers (digital + print) (ACPM One Global, 2016) <sup>258</sup> 1.2 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa, 2017) 80,000 total subscriptions; 13,500 digital only (2018) <sup>259</sup>
L'Huma <sup>260</sup>	2	6.5%	61%	13.2%	13.3% 3.4 M euros (38 cents per print copy) <sup>261</sup>	23.9 M euros <sup>262</sup>	1.2 million monthly unique visitors <sup>263</sup> (Médiamétrie, 2016) 0.5 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa, 2017)

(continued)

Online Table 2.3c Continued

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016	Philanthropy (Large or Small Donations) 2016	Major Revenues from Public Press Subsidies or Legacy TV/ Radio Public "License Fees" 2016	Total Revenues 2016	Audience Size Percentage of national population with weekly use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>223</sup> Other sources as noted Monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) <sup>224</sup>
Mediapt	2	—	100% <sup>264</sup>	—	—	11.4 M euros <sup>265</sup>	8% of national population with weekly online use (Reuters Institute 2016) 2.1 million monthly unique visitors (Médiamétrie, 2016) <sup>266</sup> 1.7 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa, 2017) 131,000 paying digital subscribers (2016) <sup>267</sup>
OuestFr	2	≈40% (est.) <sup>268</sup>	≈60%	—	5.8 M euros (2 cents per print copy) <sup>269</sup>	952 M euros (Groupe SIPA Ouest-France, 2015) <sup>270</sup>	15% of national population with weekly online use (any regional/ local paper website); 6% of national population with weekly use ( <i>Ouest-France</i> print version) (Reuters Institute 2016) 3.8 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa, 2017) 10,600 digital subscribers (2016) <sup>271</sup>
FrInfo	4	6.6% All Radio France (2016) <sup>272</sup>			88.4% All Radio France <sup>273</sup>	652.8 M euros (All Radio France) <sup>274</sup> <i>Franceinfo</i> 55.5 M euros (est., 2015) <sup>275</sup>	17% of national population with weekly <i>offline</i> use of public radio news (Reuters Institute 2016) 13.5 million monthly unique visitors ( <i>Franceinfo</i> ) <sup>276</sup> (Médiamétrie, 2016)

	Primary Funding: Advertising (1); Audience (2); Philanthropy (3); Public (4)	Revenues from Advertising 2016	Revenues from Paying Audiences 2016	Philanthropy (Large or Small Donations) 2016	Major Revenues from Public Press Subsidies or Legacy TV/ Radio Public “License Fees” 2016	Total Revenues 2016	Audience Size Percentage of national population with weekly use (Reuters Institute 2016) <sup>223</sup> Other sources as noted Monthly unique visitors (Alexa 2017) <sup>224</sup>
FrTV	4	11.7% (All French public TV) <sup>277</sup>	—	—	83.3% (All French public TV) <sup>278</sup>	3.0 B euros (All French public TV) <sup>279</sup>	15% of national population with weekly online use ( <i>FranceTVInfo</i> ); 35% with weekly offline use of <i>France Télévisions</i> news (Reuters Institute 2016) 6.4 million monthly unique visitors (Alexa, 2017)

223. Nic Newman, with Richard Fletcher, David A.L. Levy, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen, *Reuters Institute Digital News Report* (Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, 2016).

224. Timothy Neff, search of Alexa website, January 30, 2017.

225. Non-subscription, non-public channel: advertising is, by definition, the main if not virtually sole revenue source. We estimate 90 percent to make room for possible miscellaneous revenue sources (film rights, foreign sales, cable fees, etc.). For the entire TF1 Group, advertising made up approximately 75 percent of total revenues. See “Chiffres d’affaires publicitaire Groupe” as percentage of “Chiffre d’affaires consolidé,” TF1 Le Groupe, “Rapport d’activité 2016,” [https://groupe-tf1.fr/default>pdf-financiers,rapport\\_dactivite\\_2016\\_fr\\_vdef.pdf](https://groupe-tf1.fr/default>pdf-financiers,rapport_dactivite_2016_fr_vdef.pdf), 3.

226. “Chiffres d’affaires consolidé” [consolidated revenues], TF1 Le Groupe, “Rapport d’activité 2016,” 3.

227. MYTF1 monthly unique visitors, October 2016, Médiamétrie/NetRatings, Audience Internet Global, data provided to Rodney Benson by Médiamétrie, December 2020.

228. The *Metronews* website (as with the print version) was made freely available without any reader purchase or subscription, and thus advertising was the dominant funding source.

229. *20 Minutes* monthly unique visitors, October 2016, Médiamétrie/NetRatings, Audience Internet Global, data provided to Rodney Benson by Médiamétrie. *Metronews*, absorbed by the LCI cable news channel owned by TF1 Group, was closed in fall 2016, and likely had a much smaller online audience than *20 Minutes* prior to its closing.

230. *Le HuffPost* was (and is) freely accessible, without digital subscriptions, and thus is nearly entirely advertising funded. Editor-in-chief Eric Ackermann reported: “We depend almost 100 percent on advertising, both native and display.” See WAN-IFRA Staff, “Think Local to Build a Global News Product,” *WAN-IFRA, World Association of News Publishers*, September 27, 2016, <https://wan-ifra.org/2016/09/le-huffington-post-think-local-to-build-a-global-news-product/>.

231. Audience size attributed to Eric Ackermann, *Le Huffington Post* editor-in-chief, in WAN-IFRA Staff, “Think Local to Build a Global News Product.”

232. The primary funding source is estimated. A 2016 French Senate report found that French national daily newspapers on average earned only 28 percent of their total revenues from advertising, whether print or digital, down from 32 percent in 2013: <https://www.senat.fr/rap/a17-112-42/a17-112-421.html/>. Compared to US newspapers, which earned

(continued)

### Online Table 2.3c Continued

- on average 80 percent of their revenues from advertising until the early 2000s, French newspapers historically earned 40 percent or less on average. See, for example, World Association of Newspapers [WAN], *World Press Trends* (Paris: World Association of Newspapers and ZenithOptimedia, 2007). In the early 1990s, *Le Figaro* was one of the few French newspapers earning the majority of its revenues from advertising, and we thus estimate that *Le Figaro* has continued to earn more from advertising than other French newspapers. But there is no indication that it was able to avoid the internet-driven collapse of daily newspaper print advertising revenues after 2000 (in constant euros, from an index of 100 in 2000 to 28 in 2013): see Jean-Marie Charon, “Presse et numérique—L’invention d’un nouvel écosystème, Rapport à Madame la Ministre de la culture et de la communication,” June 2015, 79. Instead, the larger Le Figaro Group sought to diversify and increase its capacity to generate advertising revenues through acquisition of a group of non-news media websites. See Alexandre Joux, “Stratégies de marques et stratégies éditoriales du Groupe Figaro,” *Réseaux* 5, no. 205 (2017): 117–143.
233. The French Ministry of Culture, “Press Aid, 2016,” <https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Thematiques/Presse/Aides-a-la-Presses/Tableaux-des-titres-et-groupes-de-presse-aides-en-2016>.
234. Bilan gratuit, “Société du Figaro,” December 31, 2016, <https://www.societe.com/bilan/societe-du-figaro-542077755201612311.html>.
235. Comscore, “Table: Top 10 News and Information Sites Ranked by Unique Visitors,” *Comscore MMX*, November 2013, <https://www.comscore.com/fre/Perspectives/Infographics/7-out-of-10-French-Internet-Users-Visit-a-News-and-Information-Website>,
236. Nicolas Madelaine, “Le groupe Figaro estime avoir retrouvé un modèle solide,” *Les Echos*, March 1, 2022, <https://www.lesechos.fr/tech-medias/medias/le-groupe-figaro-est-ime-avoir-retrouve-un-modele-solide-1390439>.
237. Reported in Alice Antheaume, “France,” *Digital News Report 2021* (Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, 2021).
238. *Le Monde’s* mix of audience funding versus advertising is a conservative estimate. As of 2018, *Le Monde* reported that “reader revenue” accounted for “75 percent of total revenue across print and digital.” See Lucinda Southern, “How Le Monde Site Tweaks Helped Increase Subscriptions by 20 Percent in 2018,” *Digiday*, January 21, 2019, <https://digiday.com/media/le-monde-site-tweaks-helped-increase-subscriptions-20-percent-2018/>.
239. The French Ministry of Culture, “Press Aid, 2016.”
240. *Le Monde* revenues are reported in Marc Baudriller, “Les résultats 2016 due groupe Le Monde sont en hausse,” *Challenges*, February 16, 2017, [https://www.challenges.fr/media/presse/les-resultats-2016-du-groupe-le-monde-sont-en-hausse\\_453586](https://www.challenges.fr/media/presse/les-resultats-2016-du-groupe-le-monde-sont-en-hausse_453586).
241. Comscore, “Table: Top 10 News and Information Sites Ranked by Unique Visitors.”
242. *Rue89* early in 2016 became a vertical within the *L’Obs* website and appears to have continued, at least for a time, to have been free access and thus solely advertising funded. There are no “abonnés [subscriber]”-only titles for any of the content on January 15, 2016, <https://web.archive.org/web/20160115021957/http://rue89.nouvelobs.com/>.
243. In 2016, *Slate.fr* was freely accessible, without digital subscriptions, and thus entirely advertising funded. The site was considering, as of 2017, adding a subscription service, but had not yet: “Mais, à terme, le site sera peut-être forcé de se convertir à l’abonnement payant, sur lequel sa direction mène des réflexions.” See Alexandre Piquard, “Slate.fr, or the Difficulties of Balancing a Free News Site,” *Le Monde*, August 18, 2017, [https://www.lemonde.fr/economie/article/2017/08/18/slate-ou-les-difficultes-d-equilibrer-un-site-d-information-gratuit\\_5173956\\_3234.html](https://www.lemonde.fr/economie/article/2017/08/18/slate-ou-les-difficultes-d-equilibrer-un-site-d-information-gratuit_5173956_3234.html).
244. Nicolas Madelaine, “Slate.fr propose à ses lecteurs un volet payant,” *Les Echos*, October 18, 2016. See also Piquard, “‘Slate.fr,’ or the Difficulties of Balancing a Free News Site.”
245. *Slate.fr* monthly unique visitors, October 2016, Médiamétrie/NetRatings, Audience Internet Global, data provided to Rodney Benson by Médiamétrie, December 2020.
246. See the estimate for Vice Group, headquartered in the United States, which is the chief shareholder of *Vice France*: In 2015, Vice self-reported that it had generated about \$915 million in revenues and that the majority of these revenues derived from “content sales to broadcasters.” See Sydney Ember and Andrew Ross Sorkin, “As Vice Moves More to TV, It Tries to Keep Brash Voice,” *New York Times*, May 3, 2015, <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/04/business/media/as-vice-moves-more-to-tv-it-tries-to-keep-brash-voice.html>



247. Vice Media Group Network, monthly unique visitors, October 2016, Médiamétrie/NetRatings, Audience Internet Global, data provided to Rodney Benson by Médiamétrie.
248. In 2016, *Libération* received press subsidies in “support of publications with low advertising revenues” (The French Ministry of Culture, “Press Aid, 2016”). To receive this extra subsidy, it needed to earn less than 25 percent of total revenues from advertising (see Ministère de la Culture, “Le fonds d’aide aux publications nationales d’information politique et générale à faibles ressources publicitaires,” December 15, 2017, <https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Thematiques/Presse-ecrite/liste-des-aides-a-la-presse-et-des-appels-a-projets/Le-fonds-d-aide-aux-publications-nationales-d-information-politique-et-generale-a-faibles-ressources-publicitaires>).
249. The French Ministry of Culture, “Press Aid, 2016.”
250. Jamal Henni, Figure “Les résultats de *Libération*,” *Capital*, April 20, 2022 (updated August 31, 2022), <https://www.capital.fr/entreprises-marches/liberation-va-mieux-mais-a-toujours-besoin-dargent-1434257>.
251. By 2021, *Libération*’s number of digital subscribers had risen to 51,500. Henni, Figure “Les résultats de *Libération*.”
252. Percentages for 2018, from La direction de *La Croix*, “2018, *La Croix* élargit son rayonnement,” *La Croix*, December 27, 2018, <https://www.la-croix.com/Economie/Medias/2018-Croix-elargit-rayonnement-2018-12-27-12009918>.
253. Ibid.
254. Ibid.
255. The French Ministry of Culture, “Press Aid, 2016.”
256. Isabelle Hanne, “‘La Croix’ fait son chemin,” *Libération*, March 17, 2014, [https://www.liberation.fr/ecrans/2014/03/17/la-croix-fait-son-chemin\\_987895/?redirected=1](https://www.liberation.fr/ecrans/2014/03/17/la-croix-fait-son-chemin_987895/?redirected=1).
257. La direction de *La Croix*, “2018, *La Croix* élargit son rayonnement.”
258. ACPM One Global for *La Croix*, reported in Table, “L’audience globale en hausse,” in La direction de *La Croix*, “2018, *La Croix* élargit son rayonnement.”
259. La direction de *La Croix*, “2018, *La Croix* élargit son rayonnement.”
260. Revenue source percentages (misc. not included) derived from Patrick Le Hyaric, “Comptes 2016 de *L’Humanité*: Une amélioration à conforter,” *L’Humanité*, July 12, 2017, <https://www.humanite.fr/culture-et-savoirs/presse-ecrite/comptes-2016-de-lhumanite-une-amelioration-conforter-638745>.
261. The French Ministry of Culture, “Press Aid, 2016.”
262. Total revenues (Chiffres d’affaires) for 2016 are from Société Nouvelle Du Journal *L’Humanité*, “Fiche entreprise: chiffres d’affaires, bilan et résultat” [Company sheet: turnover, balance sheet and results], <https://www.verif.com/bilans-gratuits/SOCIETE-NOUVELLE-DU-JOURNAL-L-HUMANITE-562085308/>.
263. *L’Humanité* monthly unique visitors, October 2016, Médiamétrie/NetRatings, Audience Internet Global, data provided to Rodney Benson by Médiamétrie.
264. Edwy Plenel, “Construire l’indépendance,” in *Mediapart, Huit ans d’indépendance: 2008–2016* (Paris: Mediapart, 2016). According to the report, *Mediapart* also generates revenues from books and a print magazine, presumably without advertising, and does not accept government or industry (e.g., Google) subsidies or donations.
265. Edwy Plenel, “Mediapart Celebrates its Ninth Year: The Story in Figures,” *Mediapart*, March 12, 2017, Chart: Evolution du chiffre d’affaires annuel, <https://blogs.mediapart.fr/edwy-plenel/blog/120317/mediapart-celebrates-its-ninth-year-story-figures>.
266. *Mediapart* monthly unique visitors, October 2016, Médiamétrie/NetRatings, Audience Internet Global, data provided to Rodney Benson by Médiamétrie. *Mediapart*, from its own internal analysis, reported a monthly average of 2.6 million monthly unique visitors in 2016 (see “Audience 2016” in Plenel, “Mediapart Celebrates its Ninth Year: The Story in Figures”).
267. Plenel, “Mediapart Celebrates its Ninth Year: The Story in Figures,” Chart: Evolution des Abonnés.

(continued)

### Online Table 2.3c Continued

268. Estimate. We estimate 40 percent, given that *Ouest-France* had historically earned more in advertising than most French newspapers; thus, we place it higher than the 28 percent average for all French daily newspapers in 2016. However, we assume that its participation in the general downturn in advertising revenues experienced across the French daily press led it to earn less from advertising (print + digital) than audience payments (print subscriptions and daily purchases, and a growing but still small number of digital subscriptions). Philippe Wallez (“Local and Regional Information in the Age of Electronic Media: A Comparative Study,” Thèse pour obtenir le grade de Docteur d’Aix-Marseille Université en Sciences de l’information et de la Communication, 2017, 29) provides operating revenues for French regional newspapers from 1985 through 2015, which show that circulation revenues exceed advertising revenues every year during that period, and that starting around 2008, the gap between circulation and advertising widens substantially. These percentages do not take into account government press subsidies.
269. The French Ministry of Culture, “Press Aid, 2016.”
270. Wallez (2017, 197): 2015 revenues for Groupe SIPA Ouest-France, which includes other newspapers besides *Ouest-France*, including a half ownership share of *20 Minutes* (see also p. 282).
271. *Ibid.*, 234.
272. Based on raw data provided in Rapport d’activité 2016 de Radio France, pp. 81–82.
273. *Ibid.*
274. *Ibid.*
275. Estimate based on *FranceInfo* receiving 8.5 percent of the total Radio France budget, as sourced to the Rapport d’activité 2015 de Radio France, in *Le Billet économique* (podcast), “Où part l’argent de votre redevance?,” France Culture, <https://www.radiofrance.fr/franceculture/podcasts/le-billet-economique/ou-part-l-argent-de-votre-redevance-2039654>.
276. *Franceinfo*, monthly unique visitors, October 2016, Médiamétrie/NetRatings, Audience Internet Global, data provided to Rodney Benson by Médiamétrie.
277. France Télévisions, Comptes annuels au 31 décembre 2016, Official budgetary document registered with the Tribunal de Commerce de Paris, July 25, 2017, “France Télévisions A.A.— Compte de Résultat au 31 décembre 2016, 7.
278. *Ibid.*
279. *Ibid.*

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.4a) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.4a** US: Owner Partisan Preferences by Outlet

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>280</sup>	Owners and/or Executives or Board Members ~2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>281</sup>
ABC	1	Walt Disney Co. Publicly traded company, no dominant shareholder	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b> CEO or other info: Left  Board members or other info etc. (10): 6 Left, 2 Mixed or No Information, 2 Right <sup>282</sup>
CNN	2	Time Warner Publicly traded company, no dominant shareholder	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> CEO: Left  Board Members (10): 5 Left, 5 Right <sup>283</sup>
HuffPo	2	Verizon Publicly traded company, no dominant shareholder	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> CEO: Right  Board Members (13): 5 Left, 6 Mixed or No information, 2 Right <sup>284</sup>
LAT	2	Tribune Media Tribune Publishing/Tronc (as of June 2016) Publicly traded company, no dominant shareholder	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> CEO (Jack Griffin, until February 2016; Justin Dearborn, after February 2016): 2 Mixed  Board Members (8): 2 Left, 5 No Information, 1 Right <sup>285</sup> Michael Ferro, largest (but far from majority) shareholder in Tribune Media as of February 2016 and a major Republican donor, joined the board in 2016 as non-Executive Chairman.
USAT	2	Gannett Publicly traded company, no dominant shareholder	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> CEO: No Information  Board Members (10): 4 Left, 5 No Information or Mixed, 1 Right <sup>286</sup>

(continued)

Online Table 2.4a Continued

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>280</sup>	Owners and/or Executives or Board Members ~2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>281</sup>
CBS	2	<p>Sumner Redstone (80%) Dominant shareholder of stock market traded company, but in February 2016 gave up management oversight to daughter Shari<sup>287</sup></p> <p>Shari Redstone (20%) Only other controlling shareholder, involved in struggle for succession CEO Leslie Moonves (took over management of <i>CBS News</i> in 2016)</p>	<p>Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b></p> <p>Sumner Redstone, until February 2016, was chairman and CEO (and majority shareholder). He described himself as a “liberal Democrat” and contributed almost exclusively to Democratic politicians and organizations.</p> <p>Leslie Moonves, CEO, mostly contributed to Democrats in the 1990s, but from the 2000s onward, his contributions were either to CBS Corp. PAC (which gave money nearly equally to both parties) or to non-partisan or Republican individuals or groups.</p> <p>Shari Redstone, from 2014-2016 onward, gave more to Republicans than Democrats.</p> <p>Shari Redstone (not in direct control in 2016), a large shareholder who eventually took control of the company, as of 2016 had not publicly stated her political affiliation but has spoken favorably of Trump and proposed launching a conservative competitor to Fox: <a href="https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/general-news/shari-redstone-explores-plan-launch-fox-news-competitor-1247475/">https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/general-news/shari-redstone-explores-plan-launch-fox-news-competitor-1247475/</a>.</p>
Fox	3	Rupert Murdoch, dominant shareholder of stock market traded company	<p>Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b></p> <p>Dominant shareholder Rupert Murdoch well-known for conservative and Republican affiliation</p>

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>280</sup>	Owners and/or Executives or Board Members ~2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>281</sup>
NYT	1	Sulzberger Family Trust: Dominant shareholder with control of voting shares of stock market traded company Seven Ochs/Sulzberger family descendants are Trustees of the 1997 Adolph Ochs Trust and as such control election of Class B Share Directors, providing them with 70% of voting shares on the Board. <sup>288</sup>	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>  Of the seven appointed Trustees of the Trust, current as of 2016: 5 only donated to Democratic candidates; 2 no information <sup>289</sup>
SlateUS	1	Owned by Graham Holdings, a stock market traded company with a dominant shareholder; Graham family members own most of the shares with the right to elect a majority of the Board of Directors: Donald Graham alone is by far the largest shareholder. <sup>290</sup>	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>  Borderline between 1 & 2, given lack of political donations, but the overall pattern of actions suggests that Graham is closer to Democrats than Republicans. <sup>291</sup>
MetroUS	2	Pelle Törnberg, dominant shareholder of privately held company	Overall Partisan Preference (estimate): <b>Neutral/Balanced</b>  No information found on political affiliation or contributions
BuzzF	1	Privately held company Jonah Peretti, CEO & founder Kenneth Lerer, Executive Chairman Through November 2016, <i>BuzzFeed</i> had 8 funding rounds that raised a total of \$496 M: The largest investor by far was NBC Universal, which invested \$400M total in 2015–2016. <sup>292</sup>	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>  Jonah Peretti, as founder and CEO, seems to have had effective management control over <i>BuzzFeed</i> ; by the time of the “SPAC” stock market listing in 2021, Peretti negotiated to secure 65% of the voting power over the company post-SPAC. <sup>293</sup> No political donations found.

(continued)

Online Table 2.4a Continued

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>280</sup>	Owners and/or Executives or Board Members ~2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>281</sup>
MinnST	3	Glen Taylor, a billionaire, is the sole owner	<p>In 2008, Peretti worked closely with other <i>Huffington Post</i> founders to promote Obama’s presidential primary candidacy (Ben Smith, <i>Traffic</i>). Peretti refused Trump ads during 2016 campaign—one of only a few large media outlets to do so: <a href="https://www.newyorker.com/business/currency/buzzfeeds-lonely-anti-trump-stand">https://www.newyorker.com/business/currency/buzzfeeds-lonely-anti-trump-stand</a>.</p> <p>Largest venture capital investor (80% of total invested by end of 2016): NBC Universal, owned by Comcast. Brian Roberts, CEO and representing Roberts family, has 33% of Comcast voting shares. Roberts is a large political donor to both parties, but has given substantially larger total contributions to Democrats than to Republicans. Board members, representing earlier venture capital rounds, did not make substantial contributions to political candidates.<sup>294</sup></p> <p>Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b></p> <p>Glen Taylor, sole owner of the <i>Star Tribune</i>, is a former Minnesota state senate Republican leader and has given \$1 million to causes and candidates, mostly Republican; however, he has a “moderate” reputation.<sup>295</sup></p>

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>280</sup>	Owners and/or Executives or Board Members ~2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>281</sup>
WPost	2	Jeff Bezos, the billionaire founder of Amazon, is the sole owner.	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b>  Bezos' politics are described as mixed, according to a <i>Washington Post</i> article shortly before Bezos' purchase. Bezos's reported political giving has favored Democrats, most of them incumbents from Washington state or serving on congressional committees with jurisdiction over "Internet-related issues." The Amazon PAC, to which he has also contributed, splits its contributions more or less evenly between candidates from both parties. <sup>296</sup>
ViceUS	1	Shane Smith, CEO, founder Venture Capitalists on Board	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>  Founder and CEO Shane Smith, in 2016: Left Board (as of 2016): 2 Left, 1 Unknown, 1 Right <sup>297</sup>
CSMon	2	Church of Christ, Scientist	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b>  See statements of the church's officially non-partisan position. <sup>298</sup>
CIR/R	1	501(c)(3) tax-exempt nonprofit association (Board of Directors)	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>  Board Members (16): 10 with donations predominantly to Democratic candidates/groups, 4 No donor information, 2 with donations predominantly to Republicans <sup>299</sup>
MinnP	1	501(c)(3) tax-exempt nonprofit association (Board of Directors)	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>  Board Members (33): 23 Left (4 est.), 9 No Information, 1 Right <sup>300</sup>

(continued)

Online Table 2.4a Continued

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>280</sup>	Owners and/or Executives or Board Members ~2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>281</sup>
ProPub	1	501(c)(3) tax-exempt nonprofit association (Board of Directors)	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>  Founding donors Herbert and Marion Sandler were major Democratic and progressive donors: <a href="https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2007/10/investigating-herbert-and-marion-sandler-the-funders-of-the-new-investigative-journalism-outfit.html">https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2007/10/investigating-herbert-and-marion-sandler-the-funders-of-the-new-investigative-journalism-outfit.html</a> Board Members (10): All 10 are Democratic party donors or have other Democratic party affiliations. <sup>301</sup>
TexTrib	1	501(c)(3) tax-exempt nonprofit association (Board of Directors) <sup>302</sup>	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>  Original founder and largest donor, John Thornton, was a major donor to Democrats, within and beyond Texas, but stopped donating in 2009, the year of <i>Texas Tribune's</i> founding: <a href="https://blog.chron.com/texaspolitics/2009/07/those-donations-from-texas-tribune-founder-john-thornton/">https://blog.chron.com/texaspolitics/2009/07/those-donations-from-texas-tribune-founder-john-thornton/</a> Board Members (12): 7 with connections to Democrats, (donations or campaign/government work), 5 no information, 0 Republicans <sup>303</sup>
NPR	2	501(c)(3) tax-exempt nonprofit (created by federal government) No owner per se; NPR Board appoints itself	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> (borderline case: majority are officially nonpartisan, but Democratic donors outnumber Republican donors)  Board Composition (19) (because of transition to larger board): <sup>304</sup> 7 Left, 10 No Information, 2 Right <sup>305</sup> *Public non-partisan identity is almost universally maintained by “member” directors, many of them journalists, who represent member stations.



	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>280</sup>	Owners and/or Executives or Board Members ~2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>281</sup>
PBS	2	501(c)(3) tax-exempt nonprofit (created by federal government) No owner per se; PBS Board appoints itself	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> (borderline case: majority are officially nonpartisan, but Democratic donors outnumber Republican donors) President/CEO Paula Kerger has served under both Democratic and Republican administrations Board Composition <sup>306</sup> (27): 11 Left, 14 No Information, 2 Right <sup>307</sup> *Public non-partisan identity is almost universally maintained by “member” directors, many of them journalists, who represent member stations.

280. Left (highest proportion of outlet’s individual owner(s), dominant shareholders, or board directors holds left-of-center ideological views or party preferences); Neutral/Mixed/Balanced (highest proportion of owners holds neutral/mixed left and right views and/or a roughly even proportion holds left and right ideological and party preferences); Right (highest proportion of owners holds right of center ideological views or party preferences). Categories of left, neutral/mixed/balanced, and right are relative to each national political field’s distinctive ideological/partisan spectrum. In our analysis of owners, we include a positional category - “neutral”—that we do not use for audiences. It becomes relevant given the greater public character of owners’ partisan preferences compared to the average audience member. A neutral owner may have partisan preferences yet may also choose to remain officially nonpartisan (not participating in party activities, not taking public political stances, not making political donations, etc.) for any number of reasons: avoiding unwanted attention or controversy, avoiding any impression of politically pressuring journalists, and so on.
281. For the United States, after identifying individual owners, dominant shareholders or board members with ultimate budgetary and hiring control over a news organization as reported in company annual reports or other media/journalistic websites and publications, we rely as much as possible on public records of political campaign contributions from approximately 2000 through 2018, via <https://www.opensecrets.org/donor-lookup>. Open Secrets is a non-partisan organization that researches data on political contributions for US elections. Totals reported include individual contributions (of \$200 or more) and company PACs (political action committees): the vast majority of contributions are from individuals. For the United States, we primarily rely on donation information to guide our assessments of owner partisan preferences; we supplement this data with official biographies or other reputable sources identifying political party/government positions held (elected or appointed, paid or unpaid) or unequivocal public statements indicating a clear party affiliation or ideological stance. For a similar use of the OpenSecrets database, see Matthew Gentzkow and Jesse M. Shapiro, “What Drives Media Slant? Evidence from U.S. Daily Newspapers,” *Econometrica* 78, no. 1 (2010): 35–71.
282. CEO and Board members are identified from the Disney “About” webpage, <https://web.archive.org/web/20151220071432/https://thewaltdisneycompany.com/about/>, December 20, 2015. Partisan preferences are identified from [opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org) Donor Lookup and/or other public sources.
283. CEO and Board members are identified from the Time Warner 2016 Annual Report: <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1105705/000119312517053483/d300508d10k.htm>. Partisan preferences are identified from [opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org) Donor Lookup and/or other public sources.
284. CEO and Board members are identified from the Verizon Board of Directors webpage, <https://web.archive.org/web/20160220125242/http://www.verizon.com/about/investors/board-directors>, February 20, 2016. Partisan preferences are identified from [opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org) Donor Lookup and/or other public sources.

(continued)

### Online Table 2.4a Continued

285. CEO and Board members are identified from the Tribune Publishing "Board of Directors" webpages, <https://web.archive.org/web/20151218053952/http://www.tribpub.com/about/board-of-directors/>, December 18, 2015, and <https://web.archive.org/web/20160302231232/http://www.tribpub.com/about/board-of-directors/>, March 2, 2016, thus encompassing the changes in membership during this time period. Partisan preferences are identified from opensecrets.org Donor Lookup and/or other public sources.
286. CEO and Board members are identified from the Gannett 2016 Annual Report, p. 8, [https://www.annualreports.com/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/g/NYSE\\_GCI\\_2016.pdf](https://www.annualreports.com/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/g/NYSE_GCI_2016.pdf). Partisan preferences are identified from opensecrets.org Donor Lookup and/or other public sources.
287. Jonathan Kandell, "Sumner Redstone Dies at 97; Built Media Empire and Long Reigned Over It," *New York Times*, August 12, 2020, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/12/obituaries/sumner-redstone-dead.html>. Partisan preferences for Sumner Redstone, Shari Redstone, and Leslie Moonves are identified from opensecrets.org Donor Lookup.
288. See "2016 Proxy Statement," <https://www.nyco.com/investors/proxy-statements/>.
289. <https://www.opensecrets.org/donor-lookup/>. One of the 2016 trustees, Michael Golden, also employed by the *New York Times* in 2016, appears to only have made political donations after he retired at the end of 2016.
290. The Graham Holdings 2016 Annual Report specifies that Class A stock holders have "the right to elect a majority of the Board of Directors" (see: [https://www.annualreports.com/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/g/NYSE\\_GHC\\_2016.pdf](https://www.annualreports.com/HostedData/AnnualReportArchive/g/NYSE_GHC_2016.pdf)). Most Class A shares are owned by Graham family members, and Donald Graham alone as of 2022 owned 57% of Class A shares. Donald Graham was CEO of the company until 2015 and remains chairman of the Board (see Graham Holdings Company, US Securities and Exchange Commission, Schedule 14A, March 2022, "Stock Holdings of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management," pp. 14-16, <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/104889/000119312522083932/d229673ddef14a.htm>).
291. On Opensecrets.org there is no information about political donations from Donald E. Graham. However, Graham worked with the national finance chair of the Democratic party to set up the DreamUS scholarship fund for Dreamers (undocumented children of undocumented immigrants). He has also advocated for the Dreamer Act, but urged Democrats to support the wall to help Dreamers: [https://omaha.com/opinion/donald-e-graham-build-the-wall-congress--and-save-the-dreamers/article\\_964f5f0da9e5-589b-86b3-45070a31f52f.html](https://omaha.com/opinion/donald-e-graham-build-the-wall-congress--and-save-the-dreamers/article_964f5f0da9e5-589b-86b3-45070a31f52f.html). In 2010, Graham sold *Newsweek* to Sidney Harman, a billionaire with strong Democratic party ties, and husband of Democratic congresswoman Jane Harman: <https://www.opensecrets.org/news/2010/08/thanks-to-her-husband-billionaire/>. During the years when the Graham family controlled the *Washington Post*, it endorsed more Democrats than Republicans for public office: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/patrick-pexton-the-posts-endorsement-historically-tend-democratic/2012/11/02/6890a49a-250a-11e2-ba29-238a6ac36a08\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/patrick-pexton-the-posts-endorsement-historically-tend-democratic/2012/11/02/6890a49a-250a-11e2-ba29-238a6ac36a08_story.html).
292. See [https://www.crunchbase.com/organization/buzzfeed/company\\_financials](https://www.crunchbase.com/organization/buzzfeed/company_financials).
293. See Benjamin Mullin and Amrith Ramkumar, "BuzzFeed Clashed with NBCUniversal as it Pursued SPAC Deal," *Wall Street Journal*, August 18, 2021, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/buzzfeed-clashed-with-nbcuniversal-as-it-pursued-spac-deal-11629284161>
294. Based on Open Secrets donor lookup for Brian Roberts and board members (as reported on Crunchbase, <https://www.crunchbase.com/organization/buzzfeed/people>) Will Porteous, RRE Ventures; Chris Dixon, Andreesen Horowitz; Scott English, Hearst Ventures; and Patrick Kerins, New Enterprise Associates.
295. Baird Helgeson, "Star Tribune buyer Glen Taylor has GOP tilt to giving," *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, June 29, 2014, <https://www.startribune.com/star-tribune-buyer-glen-taylor-has-gop-tilt-to-giving/263169991>.
296. Sean Sullivan, "The politics of Jeff Bezos," *Washington Post*, August 7, 2013, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2013/08/07/the-politics-of-jeff-bezos/>; and opensecrets.org Donor Lookup.
297. Based on Open Secrets donor lookup of Smith and board members (identified by Crunchbase, [https://www.crunchbase.com/organization/vice/company\\_financials](https://www.crunchbase.com/organization/vice/company_financials)) Tom Freston, MTV founder and former Viacom CEO; Lance Maerov; James Murdoch, 21st Century Fox; and Jay Hoag, TCV.

298. See: Karen Gibson Cornell, "What are your politics", *Christian Science Sentinel*, October 26, 1968, <https://sentinel.christianscience.com/shared/view/5m1s80su7g>; Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey, "Working in harmony across political lines," *Christian Science Sentinel*, November 20, 2023, <https://sentinel.christianscience.com/issues/2023/11/125-47/working-in-harmony-across-political-lines>.
299. Board members are identified from *CIR/Reveal*, "Board of Directors," April 29, 2015, <https://web.archive.org/web/20150429130109/http://www.revealnews.org/board/>; partisan preferences are identified from [opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org) Donor Lookup.
300. Board members are identified from *MinnPost*, "MinnPost Board of Directors 2015," accessed June 9, 2015, <https://www.minnpost.com>
301. Board Members are identified from *ProPublica*, "Board and Advisors," n.d., accessed June 9, 2015, <http://www.propublica.org/about/leadership/>; partisan preferences are identified from [opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org) Donor Lookup and/ or other public sources.
302. *Texas Tribune*, "About Us," <https://www.texastribune.org/about/#>: "As a nonprofit organization, the *Tribune* does not have an owner and is instead governed by an independent, volunteer board of directors who believe deeply in our mission and in the importance of public service journalism. They influence the direction of the organization, approve budgets and oversee the chief executive officer."
303. Board Members are identified from: The Texas Tribune, "About Us: Board of Directors," accessed July 2, 2015, <https://web.archive.org/web/20150702071612/http://www.texastribune.org/about/board/>; partisan preferences are identified from [opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org) Donor Lookup and/or other public sources.
304. The NPR Board composition was in flux in late 2015 and 2016. Until November 18, 2015, there were 17 members: 10 member (station) directors, five public directors, the NPR President, and the chair of the NPR Foundation. At the November 2015 meeting, the board confirmed the member station vote to expand the board from 17 to 23 members, adding two member directors and four public directors. As far as we are able to determine, this change happened gradually. We include here the two new member directors added in February 2016, but not the public directors that were added in stages beginning with one in May 2016, and more added in September 2016, given that this latter period corresponds with the end of our 2015–2016 content analysis (ending in June 2016).
305. Board Members are identified from NPR, "NPR Board of Directors," accessed June 2015 and February 2016, <https://www.npr.org/about-npr/182676957/npr-board-of-directors>; partisan preferences are identified from [opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org) Donor Lookup and/or other public sources.
306. "The PBS Board of Directors is essential to our mission in public media: to educate, engage and inspire our audiences," said [PBS President and CEO Paula] Kerger. "This exceptional group of people will bring a rich diversity of perspectives and experiences, and play a critical role in guiding our system forward." The 27-person Board includes both Professional Directors, who are station leaders, and General Directors, who serve as lay members of the Board, as well as the PBS President. The PBS Board of Directors is responsible for governing and setting policy for *PBS*. General and Professional Directors of the PBS Board are generally elected to three-year terms and serve without pay. PBS member stations elect the Professional Directors. The Board of Directors elects the PBS President and all General Directors and fills Board vacancies." "About PBS," October 12, 2022, <https://www.pbs.org/about/about-pbs/blogs/news/pbs-announces-new-leaders-to-serve-on-pbs-board/#>.
307. Board Members are identified from PBS, "PBS Board of Directors," accessed June 2015, <https://www.pbs.org/about/about-pbs/board-directors/>; partisan preferences are identified from [opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org) Donor Lookup and/or other public sources.

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.4b) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.4b** Sweden: Owner Partisan Preferences by Outlet

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right	Ownership Form/ Owning Company in 2016	Partisan Preferences: Due to personal integrity rules <sup>308</sup> in Sweden regarding research of political views or actions of individuals (even public figures), we relied on organizational, rather than individual, expressions of manifestly partisan or neutral/balanced political stances. <sup>309</sup>
SvD	2	Part of the stock market-traded Schibsted company (SM-WH)	Overall partisan preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b>  Schibsted company webpage for “Journalism”: <sup>310</sup> Schibsted describes its news properties as a “fundamental force for democracy”  Schibsted-owned <i>Svenska Dagbladet</i> openly identifies itself as politically “moderate” (as in Sweden’s major conservative party, the Moderates): “it is edited on a value foundation of combined [free market] liberalism and conservatism” <sup>311</sup> (a position that long predates Schibsted ownership).  Schibsted also owns left-leaning papers like Sweden’s <i>Aftonbladet</i> .
MetroSw	2	Stock market-traded (SM-DS) Kinnevik	Overall partisan preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b>  Kinnevik website only emphasizes business strategies <sup>312</sup>
DagNyh	2	Privately held Bonnier AB, wholly owned subsidiary of Bonnier Holding AB, a subsidiary of Albert Bonnier AB, wholly owned by the Bonnier family (85 members)	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> (borderline: broad, encompassing definition of “liberal heritage”)  Bonnier webpage (under “The Owners” section) asserts: “Bonnier’s liberal heritage does not give definitive answers on all the issues of the day, but provides scope for difficult conflicts of interest and divergent conclusions. However, there is also a limit to what is allowed within these parameters: Bonnier’s operations will never pursue agendas that diminish the individual or exclude groups from social community. Democracy, the equal value of all and the fundamental freedoms and rights of everyone are our unshakeable foundation.” <sup>313</sup>  <i>Dagens Nyheter</i> , owned by Bonnier family, describes itself as “independently liberal” (center-right in Sweden).

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right	Ownership Form/ Owning Company in 2016	Partisan Preferences: Due to personal integrity rules <sup>308</sup> in Sweden regarding research of political views or actions of individuals (even public figures), we relied on organizational, rather than individual, expressions of manifestly partisan or neutral/balanced political stances. <sup>309</sup>
DagETC	1	Privately owned (until 2020) by co-founder Johan Jenny Ehrenberg	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>  From founder and owner Johan Jenny Ehrenberg, on the occasion of transferring ownership to a foundation (in 2020): "I have owned the ETC companies since the 80s. It has had simple reasons. ETC is fundamentally a political project that is largely about using the media to increase counter-power in society. The ETC magazines, like our web and other media, have the same simple goal with what we do. Equality, feminism, anti-racism, saving the climate, increasing freedom by increasing security. We are democratic socialists and we believe that common security also liberates the individual and increases everyone's opportunity to live a richer life." <sup>314</sup>
GPosten	3	Stampen: Privately owned by Peter Hjärne and family until a December 2016 restructuring (when the Hjärne family control diluted to 44%)	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b>  Stampen website: "When it comes to opinions, Stampen Media's publications must work for a market economy, free competition and social development in a reform-friendly spirit. . ." <sup>315</sup>
KIT	2	Privately held Dominant Shareholder: Bonnier Growth Media (67%)	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> (borderline: broad, encompassing definition of "liberal heritage")  Bonnier website (under "The Owners" section) asserts: "Bonnier's liberal heritage does not give definitive answers on all the issues of the day, but provides scope for difficult conflicts of interest and divergent conclusions. However, there is also a limit to what is allowed within these parameters: Bonnier's operations will never pursue agendas that diminish the individual or exclude groups from social community. Democracy, the equal value of all and the fundamental freedoms and rights of everyone are our unshakeable foundation." <sup>316</sup>

(continued)

Online Table 2.4b Continued

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right	Ownership Form/ Owning Company in 2016	Partisan Preferences: Due to personal integrity rules <sup>308</sup> in Sweden regarding research of political views or actions of individuals (even public figures), we relied on organizational, rather than individual, expressions of manifestly partisan or neutral/balanced political stances. <sup>309</sup>
JPosten	3	Privately held by Hallpressen (Hall Media), owned by Hamrin family/Herenco	<p>Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b></p> <p>Historically <i>Jönköpings-Posten</i> has been connected to the Free Church movement and through active engagement by members of the owner family to the liberal (center-right) People's Party. Its owner/editor-in-chief between 1930 and 1969, Yngve Hamrin, was a member of parliament for the People's Party. As editor-in-chief he valued the newspaper's ideological position more than economic success.<sup>317</sup></p> <p>From <i>Jönköpings-Posten</i>'s mission statement: "The newspaper was first published on January 17, 1865 and then as a weekly newspaper. In 1904 it became a newspaper published six days per week and is today denominated as independently bourgeois [i.e. as right-leaning but not affiliated to a political party]."<sup>318</sup></p>
N24	2	24 Media Network Founders/Largest minority shareholders are Douglas Roos and Patrick Sandberg	<p>Overall Partisan Preference (estimated): <b>Neutral/Balanced</b></p> <p>No political information is available about 24 Media Network AB.</p>
Dagen	3	Mentor Medier Tidnings AB Nya Dagen	<p>Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b></p> <p>Mentor Medier is the owner of several media outlets, including <i>Dagen</i>. The main purpose of the company Mentor Medier is to publish the newspaper <i>Vårt Land</i>, a Christian daily, founded in 1945 by among others the Christian-conservative thinker Ronald Fange. <i>Vårt Land</i> is independent but traditionally close to the Norwegian Christian Democratic party, a center-right party. Norwegian media scholar Sigurd Allern defines <i>Vårt Land</i> as "a conservative Christian paper in religious matters, more social-liberal in politics."<sup>319</sup></p>

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right	Ownership Form/ Owning Company in 2016	Partisan Preferences: Due to personal integrity rules <sup>308</sup> in Sweden regarding research of political views or actions of individuals (even public figures), we relied on organizational, rather than individual, expressions of manifestly partisan or neutral/balanced political stances. <sup>309</sup>
Barom	3	Gota Media Group, owned by foundations Stiftelsen Barometern and Tore G. Wärenstams	<p><i>Dagen</i> was founded by the founder of the (conservative) Swedish Christian Democratic party and the newspaper remains “closely linked” to the party (Right).<sup>320</sup> According to <i>Dagen’s</i> mission statement, its “ideological foundational document is the “Lausanne Declaration” (or “Covenant”): this document expresses evangelical Christian views, some of which are still associated with the Christian Democratic party.<sup>321</sup></p> <p>Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b></p> <p>Stiftelsen Barometern: “The foundation’s mission is to work long-term to ensure that we have continued access to a free and unbound press within the newspapers’ distribution areas. The course stated in the original statutes is to secure the publication of the newspaper <i>Barometern</i> as an organ for Christian values, sound conservative social perception and the preservation of business freedom and property rights.”<sup>322</sup></p>
DagAren	1	Arena Group (nonprofit association)	<p>Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b></p> <p>Arena Group: “Arenagruppen is a non-profit association that engages in radical and progressive idea and opinion formation.”<sup>323</sup></p>
GefleDag	3	Mittmedia Group, owned by liberal foundations Stiftelsen Pressorganisation and Nya Stiftelsen Gefle Dagblad	<p>Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b></p> <p>The Editor-in-Chief (2020 interview) reports that the owner (foundation) has close ties to the (Liberal) party.<sup>324</sup></p> <p>Stiftelsen Pressorganisation: The foundation’s statutes stipulate that its “purpose is to partly work through the acquisition and holding of shares in newspaper companies to ensure the continued publication of newspapers which are in line with the political views represented by the People’s Party Liberals and partly to work for other publishing activities in the same spirit.”<sup>325</sup></p> <p>Nya Stiftelsen Gefle Dagblad, from the foundation register (Stiftelseregistret): “PURPOSE: To work to secure the publication of newspapers with a liberal course in political terms and liberal basic views. . . .”<sup>326</sup></p>

(continued)

Online Table 2.4b Continued

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right	Ownership Form/ Owning Company in 2016	Partisan Preferences: Due to personal integrity rules <sup>308</sup> in Sweden regarding research of political views or actions of individuals (even public figures), we relied on organizational, rather than individual, expressions of manifestly partisan or neutral/balanced political stances. <sup>309</sup>
Norran	3	Stiftelsen Skelleftepress liberal foundation	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b>  Stiftelsen Skelleftepress is a “liberal” foundation, whose charter requires that it operate <i>Norran</i> as a “liberal” newspaper. <sup>327</sup>
SR	2	Förvaltningsstiftelsen för Sveriges Radio AB, Sveriges Television AB och Sveriges Utbildningsradio AB	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b>  The Board is appointed by the government after advice by Parliament using non-partisan criteria, and it exists to protect SR and SVT from political pressure. <sup>328</sup>  Förvaltningsstiftelsen: “The trust’s task is to act as a buffer between the government and the broadcasters Sveriges Radio, SVT and UR. The foundation was created to—by owning and managing all the shares in the broadcasting companies—promote the independence of radio and television in the service of the public. . . . This gives the program companies an independent position because they are not owned by either the state or commercial interests. One of the most important tasks for the foundation is to appoint members of the three broadcasters’ boards. . . . The foundation has a board with thirteen members. Following proposals by the political parties, the members are formally appointed by the government. The Riksdag has determined that political unity is important when electing members and that an immediate impact of political elections should not take place. The year after a parliamentary election, the chairman and six members are appointed. The chairman is appointed for four years and the members for eight years. As of 1 January 2020, no active members of the Riksdag may sit on the board.” <sup>329</sup>



	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right	Ownership Form/ Owning Company in 2016	Partisan Preferences: Due to personal integrity rules <sup>308</sup> in Sweden regarding research of political views or actions of individuals (even public figures), we relied on organizational, rather than individual, expressions of manifestly partisan or neutral/balanced political stances. <sup>309</sup>
SVT	2	Förvaltningsstiftelsen för Sveriges Radio AB, Sveriges Television AB och Sveriges Utbildningsradio AB	Overall Partisan Preference: Neutral/Balanced  The Board is appointed by the government after advice by Parliament using non-partisan criteria, and it exists to protect SR and SVT from political pressure. <sup>330</sup>  Förvaltningsstiftelsen: Same language as for SR, above. <sup>331</sup>

308. In 2019, the newly established Swedish Ethical Review Authority interpreted privacy protections in research to prohibit searches of publicly available sources on the political views of individuals, including public figures, without prior consent. In 2023, 2,489 scholars protested, in an open letter to the government, against an ethical review process deemed draconian and counter to the spirit of free and independent research (2489 Swedish scholars, “Systemet för etikprövningar är ett akut hot mot forskningen” [The System for Ethics Reviews is an Acute Threat to Research], *Dagens Nyheter*, May 15, 2023 (updated May 17, 2023), <https://www.dn.se/debatt/systemet-for-etikprovningar-ett-akut-hot-mot-forskningen/>). On May 17, 2023, the minister of education, Mats Persson, announced that he was sympathetic to the criticism and that the government would conduct an investigation of the current system to protect the academic freedom of Swedish scholars (Mats Persson, “Reglerna för forskarna ska ses över” [The Rules for the Researchers Will Be Reviewed], *Svenska Dagbladet*, May 17, 2023, <https://www.svd.se/abpA9M/mats-persson-reglerna-for-etikprovning-ska-ses-over>). When no public political information was available about the organizational owner, we classified it as neutral/balanced.

309. Unless noted otherwise, company or news outlet websites were accessed in May 2023.

310. Schibsted, “News Media Reduces Costs,” January 24, 2023, <https://schibsted.com/about/we-are-schibsted/news-media/>.

311. *Svenska Dagbladet*, “Contact Svenska Dagbladet,” <https://kundservice.svd.se/omsvd/>. [scroll to ... (publishing mission)].

312. Kinnevik, “Who We Are,” <https://www.kinnevik.com/who-we-are/> (scroll down to the “History” subheading).

313. Bonnier, “What We Want,” n.d., accessed September 26, 2024, <https://www.bonnier.com/en/about-us/the-owners/>.

314. Johan Ehrenberg, “Johan Ehrenberg: Nu startar vi Stiftelsen ETC,” *Dagens ETC*, June 19, 2020; updated October 12, 2022, <https://www.etc.se/ledare/nu-startar-vi-stiftelsen-etc>

315. Stampen Media, “Stampen Medias journalistik,” n.d., accessed September 26, 2024, <https://stampenmedia.se/journalistik/>.

316. Bonnier, “What We Want.”

317. Lars-Åke Engblom, 2002, “Tidningar dör men pressen lever” [Newspapers are dying, but the press lives on], in *Den svenska pressens historia 4 Bland andra massmedier* (after 1945), edited by L.- A. Engblom, K. E. Gustafsson, and P. Rydén, 20–133, Stockholm: Ekerlid.

318. *Jönköpings-Posten*, “Om JP.se,” June 1, 2020, <https://www.jp.se/info/om-jpse>.

319. Vedtekter for Mentor Medier AS [Constitution for Mentor Medier AS], Mentor Medier website, accessed Nov. 26, 2024, [https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/5c99fee86af083e2f3a274ef/61dec20c197a026f6e5d959b\\_Vedtekter%20Mentor%20Medier%20-%202029.%20april%202021.pdf](https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/5c99fee86af083e2f3a274ef/61dec20c197a026f6e5d959b_Vedtekter%20Mentor%20Medier%20-%202029.%20april%202021.pdf); Sigurd Allern, “Journalistic and Commercial News Values: News Organizations as Patrons of an Institution and Market Actors,” *Nordicom Review* (Oct. 2011): 137–152.

(continued)

### Online Table 2.4b Continued

320. Emmanuel Karlsten, former digital editor for *Dagen*, interview with Rodney Benson, October 2017, Gothenburg.
321. *Dagen*, “About Dagen” [Om dagen], n.d., accessed September 26, 2024, <https://www.dagen.se/om-dagen/>. For the particulars of the Lausanne Declaration, see <https://lausanne.org/content/covenant/lausanne-covenant#cov>.
322. Stiftelsen Barometern, “Skilda sidor i samhällslivet,” n.d., accessed September 26, 2024, <https://www.stiftelsenbarometern.se/om-stiftelsen/>.
323. Arena Gruppen, “Om Oss,” n.d., accessed September 26, 2024, <https://arenagruppen.se/om-oss/>.
324. Anna Gullberg, *Gefle Dagblad* editor-in-chief, telephone interview with Erik Thyseius, August 2020.
325. Stiftelsen Pressorganisationen, “Om Stiftelsen Pressorganisationen,” n.d., accessed September 26, 2024, <https://pressorganisationen.wordpress.com/about/>.
326. Stiftelsemedel, “The New Gefle Dagblad Foundation,” n.d., accessed September 26, 2024, <https://stiftelsemedel.se/nya-stiftelsen-gefle-dagblad/>.
327. Stiftelsemedel, “Stiftelsen Skelleftepress,” n.d., accessed September 26, 2024, <https://stiftelsemedel.se/stiftelsen-skelleftepress/>.
328. Jan Helin, former SVT programming director, Zoom interview with Rodney Benson, Aug. 21, 2020: “My impression of [the] SVT board [is that] they are really there to be a sort of safeguard towards the politics. . . They are there to safeguard an institution from political influence and to make sure that this strategy of SVT follows the charter and so on.”
329. Förvaltningsstiftelsen, “Om Stiftelsen,” n.d., accessed September 26, 2024, <https://www.forvaltningsstiftelsen.se/om-stiftelsen>. The governing party in power appoints the chairperson of the foundation board that oversees the other boards, while the other 12 members, by law required to represent all major political parties, are appointed by the government with suggestions from Parliament. Board terms are eight years (with the exception of the Chair, who serves four years) and they are staggered so that half the foundation board leaves every four years. See Rodney Benson, Matthew Powers, and Timothy Neff, “Public Media Autonomy and Accountability: Best and Worst Policy Practices in 12 Leading Democracies,” *International Journal of Communication* 11 (2017): 1–2.
330. Helin interview.
331. Förvaltningsstiftelsen, “Om Stiftelsen.”

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (2.4c) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 2.4c** France: Owner Partisan Preferences by Outlet

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>332</sup>	Owners and/or Top Executives or Board Members in 2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>333</sup>
TF1	3	Owned by TF1, a widely-held stock market-traded company (with widely-held Bouygues Group as the largest shareholder)	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b> (borderline) CEO: No Information (Paolini)/ Right (Pelisson) Board Members: 5 Right, 5 No Information, 2 Mixed <sup>334</sup> Largest (but not majority) shareholder is Right (est.)
Metnews	3	Owned by TF1, a widely-held stock market-traded company (with widely-held Bouygues Group as the largest shareholder)	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b> (borderline) CEO: No Information (Paolini)/ Right (Pelisson) Board Members: 5 Right, 5 No Information, 2 Mixed Largest (but not majority) shareholder is Right (est.)
LeHPo	2	Majority-owned by the stock market-traded company Verizon	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> Verizon (US) 51% shares: Neutral/Balanced (see US HuffPost) Groupe Le Monde: 34% (Bergé, Pigasse—socialist; Niel—“liberal”) Les Nouvelles Éditions Indépendantes: 15% (Pigasse, socialist) <sup>335</sup>
LeFigaro	3	Dassault: Stock market-traded with dominant shareholding family	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Right</b> Dominant shareholder Serge Dassault was a conservative legislator and well-known for his conservative views.
LeMonde	1	Pierre Bergé, Matthieu Pigasse, Xavier Niel: Majority private shareholders	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b> Groupe Le Monde (Bergé, Pigasse—socialist; Niel—“liberal”) <sup>336</sup>

(continued)

Online Table 2.4c Continued

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>332</sup>	Owners and/or Top Executives or Board Members in 2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>333</sup>
Rue89	1	Pierre Bergé, Matthieu Pigasse, Xavier Niel: Majority private shareholders	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b> Groupe Le Monde (Bergé, Pigasse—socialist; Niel—“liberal”)
Slate.fr	2	Privately held company Publication director: Jean-Marie Colombani Largest shareholders (spring 2016): B.&A. de Rothschild, 29%; Founders (mostly journalists), 24%	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral\Balanced</b> Founded in 2009 by the company E2J2, with founders holding more than 50% of capital: Jacques Attali (former senior advisor to socialist President Mitterrand); former <i>Le Monde</i> and <i>Libération</i> journalists Jean-Marie Colombani, Eric Le Boucher, Eric Leser, and Johan Hufnagel. <sup>337</sup> Benjamin and Ariane de Rothschild (European “Liberal”) <sup>338</sup>
ViceFr	1	Majority shareholders: Shane Smith, US Venture Capital; Minority shareholder (after March 2016): Matthieu Pigasse, Les Nouvelles Éditions Indépendantes <sup>339</sup>	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b> Vice-France is majority owned by Vice, based in United States (see entry for ViceUS) Pigasse is associated with the French Socialist party.
Libé	2	Patrick Drahi, majority and controlling shareholder of Altice Media Group, which is majority and controlling shareholder of Libération S.A.R.L.	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> (est.) In 2016, Drahi was not publicly closely associated with any French political party. He is pro-Israel and is concerned with policy and state contracts in relation to his business interests, but otherwise doesn’t seem to be political. <sup>340</sup>

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>332</sup>	Owners and/or Top Executives or Board Members in 2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>333</sup>
LaCroix	2	Catholic Assumptionist Order	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> The Catholic Assumptionist Order sees its role, via Bayard Presse, as serving as a place for dialogue among all Catholics, from the left-Catholics to the traditionalists. <sup>341</sup>
L'Huma	1	Largest shareholders: individual shareholders associated with the French Communist Party (PCF) and left-oriented associations of friends, readers, and employees <sup>342</sup>	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b>
Mediapt	1	Largest/majority shareholders: 1. Founders 2. Employees 3. "Friends of Mediapart"	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Left</b> Shareholders (as of Dec. 31, 2016) <sup>343</sup> Founders: 36.7% Edwy Plenel, former <i>Le Monde</i> editor (left) Marie-Hélène Smiejan, business director (unknown) François Bonnet, former <i>Libération</i> and <i>Le Monde</i> journalist (left) <sup>344</sup> Laurent Mauduit, former <i>Libération</i> and <i>Le Monde</i> journalist (left) Société des salariés (employees): 1.3% (left) <sup>345</sup> Société des Amis (society of friends), represented by mathematician Michel Broué (far left, then Socialist party, activist <sup>346</sup> ): 14.7%

(continued)

Online Table 2.4c Continued

	1 = Left 2 = Neutral/Balanced 3 = Right <sup>332</sup>	Owners and/or Top Executives or Board Members in 2016	Partisan Preferences <sup>333</sup>
QuestFr	2	Non-profit association (French 1901 law association) “The Association For the Support of Democratic Humanist Principles” (L’Association pour le soutien des principes de la démocratie humaniste) (established by Hutin family)	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> The nonprofit association is dedicated to broad civic and democratic principles <sup>347</sup> <i>Ouest-France</i> , reflecting the wishes of the Hutin family, mentions on its website a historical commitment to a particular understanding of Catholic social humanist values (which has led it to oppose euthanasia, cloning, abortion, and a range of medical interventions), while also emphasizing a broad democratic mission to provide quality information, especially local and regional, to refuse “sensationalism,” and to promote “pluralism” <sup>348</sup>
FrInfo	2	French state (CSA oversight agency) and administration board	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> Socialist party in power, appoints the CSA President; the CSA appoints Radio France administration board director Similar regulatory appointment process as with FrTV Radio France Board of Directors: 2 Right, 2 Left, 9 No Information <sup>349</sup>
FrTV (Fr2)	2	French state (CSA oversight agency) and administration board	Overall Partisan Preference: <b>Neutral/Balanced</b> Socialist party in power, appoints CSA President, who appoints FranceTV administration board director Regulations specify appointments by multiple actors, with staggered terms <sup>350</sup> Board members: 5 Left (including the director), 4 Mixed, 3 No Information, 3 Right <sup>351</sup>

332. Left (highest proportion of outlet's individual owner(s), dominant shareholders, or board directors holds left-of-center ideological views or party preferences); Neutral/ Mixed/ Balanced (highest proportion of owners holds neutral/ mixed left and right views and/ or a roughly even proportion holds left and right ideological and party preferences); Right (highest proportion of owners holds right of center ideological views or party preferences). Categories of left, neutral/ mixed/ balanced, and right are relative to each national political field's distinctive ideological/ partisan spectrum.
333. For France, political affiliation or leaning either broadly "left" or "right" was only attributed to individuals who have consistently demonstrated support for left-leaning parties or party candidates or organizations more than to those on the right, or vice versa, as indicated by an imbalance in monetary or in-kind donations, membership affiliation or political appointment to governmental positions, public statements, or descriptions of their political views from credible and knowledgeable insider sources. For each of these types of evidence, situational context was taken into account before attributing a partisan preference. For each individual, we conducted multiple Google and Factiva (national press) searches, in French, using the following strings: "FIRSTNAME LASTNAME" political party; "FIRSTNAME LASTNAME" (specific party OR specific party ETC); "FIRSTNAME LASTNAME" (Right OR Left) political; "FIRSTNAME LASTNAME" ideology. For each search string, we examined the first 30 responses.
334. Executives and Board Members are identified from TF1 Conseil d'administration/administrative board, "Procès-Verbal de la Réunion du Conseil d'Administration du 14 avril 2016," [https://groupe-tf1.fr/sites/default/files/mediatheque/rapp\\_ca\\_reso\\_v2.pdf](https://groupe-tf1.fr/sites/default/files/mediatheque/rapp_ca_reso_v2.pdf); "Sitting Directors," Groupe TF1, accessed April 27, 2023, [http://www.groupe-tf1.fr/sites/default/files/mediatheque/PDF-Finance/assemblee-generale/2012/sitting\\_directors.pdf](http://www.groupe-tf1.fr/sites/default/files/mediatheque/PDF-Finance/assemblee-generale/2012/sitting_directors.pdf); Marie-Catherine Beuth, "Gilles Pélisson, un connaisseur de Bouygues à la tête de TF1," *Le Monde*, October 28, 2015, [http://www.lemonde.fr/entreprises/article/2015/10/28/gilles-pelisson-un-connaisseur-de-bouygues-a-la-tete-de-tf1\\_4798649\\_1656994.html](http://www.lemonde.fr/entreprises/article/2015/10/28/gilles-pelisson-un-connaisseur-de-bouygues-a-la-tete-de-tf1_4798649_1656994.html).
335. Matthew Fleischer, "The Huffington Post Heads to France," *Adweek*, October 10, 2011, <https://www.adweek.com/performance-marketing/the-huffington-post-heads-to-france/>.
336. AFP, "Le Monde news daily sold to billionaire trio," *France24*, June 28, 2010, <https://www.france24.com/en/20100628-france-le-monde-newspaper-sells-billionaire-trio-niel-pigasse-berge>
337. *Les Echos Capital Finance*, "Viveris mise 1,5 M Euros sur Slate.fr," June 8, 2009, <https://capitalfinance.lesechos.fr/deals/capital-risque/viveris-mise-15-m-euros-sur-slatefr-119529>; Jamal Henni, "The Ultra-Chic Shareholders of Slate.FR," *BFM Business*, January 16, 2016, [https://www.bfmtv.com/economie/entreprises/culture-loisirs/les-actionnaires-ultra-chic-de-slatefr\\_AN-201601160063.html](https://www.bfmtv.com/economie/entreprises/culture-loisirs/les-actionnaires-ultra-chic-de-slatefr_AN-201601160063.html).
338. France Inter interview with Christophe Carron, Slate.fr editor-in-chief, April 28, 2021, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aKCLIS\\_TUpA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aKCLIS_TUpA).
339. Nicolas Rauline, "Matthieu Pigasse investit dans Vice France," March 11, 2016, <https://www.lesechos.fr/2016/03/matthieu-pigasse-investit-dans-vice-france-203182>.
340. See, for example, Julia Cagé quote in Benoît Collombat, "Patrick Drahi : un empire à 50 milliards de dette," *Franceinfo*, September 2, 2016, [https://www.francetvinfo.fr/economie/telecom/patrick-drahi-un-empire-a-50-milliards-de-dette\\_1805473.html](https://www.francetvinfo.fr/economie/telecom/patrick-drahi-un-empire-a-50-milliards-de-dette_1805473.html). See also the discussion in chapter 6 of Amaury de Rochemonde and Richard Sénéjoux, *Médias: Les Nouveaux Empires* (Paris: First Editions, 2017).
341. See Jean-François Polo, "Bayard: The Assumptionists at the Heart of the Media," *Les Echos*, June 3, 2010, <https://www.lesechos.fr/2010/06/bayard-les-assomptionnistes-au-coeur-des-medias-1086359>. See also Isabelle Hanne, "La Croix fait son chemin," *Libération*, March 17, 2014, [https://www.liberation.fr/ecrans/2014/03/17/la-croix-fait-son-chemin\\_987895/](https://www.liberation.fr/ecrans/2014/03/17/la-croix-fait-son-chemin_987895/), and Augustins de l'Assomption, "Qui sommes-nous?," *Augustins de l'Assomption*, <https://www.assomption.org/qui-sommes-nous/>.
342. *L'Obs*, "Qui possède quoi? *L'Humanité*" [Who owns what? *L'Humanité*], January 24, 2007 (updated September 2, 2008), <https://www.nouvelobs.com/medias/medias-pouvoirs/20070124.OBS8585/qui-possede-quoi.html>; Frantz Durrupt, "Pour ses 112 ans, *L'Humanité* a besoin d'argent," *Libération*, April 18, 2016, [https://www.liberation.fr/futurs/2016/04/18/pour-ses-112-ans-l-humanite-a-besoin-d-argent\\_1447016/](https://www.liberation.fr/futurs/2016/04/18/pour-ses-112-ans-l-humanite-a-besoin-d-argent_1447016/).

(continued)

### Online Table 2.4c Continued

343. Edwy Plenel, “Mediapart Celebrates its Ninth Year: The Story in Figures,” *Mediapart*, March 12, 2017, <https://blogs.mediapart.fr/edwy-plenel/blog/120317/mediapart-celebrates-its-ninth-year-story-figures>, see “2008–2016 Nine Years of Independence (pdf),” 7, accessed May 14, 2023.
344. Bonnett and Mauduit are regular contributors to a Quebec-based “left” website. See <https://www.pressegauche.org/>.
345. *Mediapart* journalist Jade Lindgaard interview with Rodney Benson, June 2016: *Mediapart* journalists are on the “left.”
346. Broué’s political affiliations are listed on his Wikipedia page, linked to from an official *Mediapart* article about its capital investors: <https://blogs.mediapart.fr/la-redaction-de-mediapart/blog/170419/mediapart-et-xavier-niel-sur-un-racontar>, April 17, 2019.
347. “L’association à but non lucratif est actuellement constituée de soixante membres, des femmes et des hommes venant d’horizons différents qui se réfèrent à des valeurs communes : la démocratie, l’humanisme, la solidarité, le dialogue, la liberté de la presse et le pluralisme des idées.” From “Ouest-France: Une association. une indépendance,” *Ouest-France*, April 27, 2021, <https://www.ouest-france.fr/medias/ouest-france/em-ouest-france-em-une-association-une-independance-e1053c70-921a-11eb-8153-111acea7321d>.
348. Former *Ouest-France* deputy editor Paul Goupil (zoom interview with Rodney Benson, November 16, 2021) recounts that *Ouest-France*’s long-time publisher, the Hutin family, is careful not to stray too far from the “Bishops” in its ideological positioning. The paper, however, primarily highlights a broader mission (accessed December 24, 2021): “*Ouest-France* is not a ‘business’ and its purpose is not profit. Economic success is experienced as a means in the service of ethics and the guarantee of independence.” See also Jeanne-Emmanuelle Gapsys-Hutin, “Ensuring Independence at *Ouest-France*,” in *Is There a Better Structure for News Providers?*, ed. David A. L. Levy and Robert G. Picard (Oxford, UK: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, 2011), 85–95.
349. Board Members are identified from: <http://www.radiofrance.fr/l-entreprise/conseil-d-administration>, accessed November 2015; partisan affiliations/preferences are identified from board member profiles and other public sources.
350. From Benson and Powers 2011, 33. In 2015, the president of CSA appointed the directors of France Télévisions and Radio France. An administrative board is responsible for more direct oversight of France Télévisions. The primary task of the board is to oversee the long-term financial planning for France Télévisions; an independent external evaluation concluded that the board is “hardly involved in daily management.” The board has 14 members, each serving five-year terms, and is composed of two members of parliament (one appointed by the National Assembly, the other by the Senate); five civil servants appointed by the government in power; five members appointed by the CSA who must be “qualified” to serve in the capacity of broadcast regulation; and two members appointed by the staff of France Télévisions.
351. Board Members are identified from: <http://www.francetelevisions.fr/groupe/conseil-d-administration>, accessed November 2015; partisan affiliations/preferences are identified from board member profiles and other public sources.



Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (7.1a) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 7.1a** US: Major Owners, Donors, and Associated Businesses or Organizations by Outlet

	<b>Major Shareholders/Major Foundation Donors/Major Associated Businesses or Organizations (Up to 10 Maximum; 2015–2016)*</b>
ABC	Walt Disney Company; Laurene Powell Jobs; Vanguard Group; State Street Corp.; FMR, LLC; State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.; BlackRock Institutional Trust Co.; Bank of New York Mellon Corp.; Massachusetts Financial Services Co.; Goldman Sachs Group
CNN	Time Warner; JP Morgan Chase & Co.; Vanguard Group; Dodge & Cox; BlackRock Institutional Trust Co.; Massachusetts Financial Services; State Street Corp.; Royal London Asset Management; Capital World Investors; Bank of New York Mellon Corp.
HuffPo	Verizon; AOL; Vanguard Group; Capital Research Global Investors; State Street Corp.; BlackRock Institutional Trust Co.; Capital World Investors; Wellington Management Co.; Bank of America Corp.; BlackRock Fund Advisors
LAT/Chicago Tribune	Tribune Publishing; Michael Ferro; Merrick Ventures; Patrick Soon-Shiong; Nant Capital; Oaktree Capital Management; Primecap Management Co.; JP Morgan Chase & Co.; Towle & Co.; Contrarius Investment Management Limited
USAT/Des Moines Register	Gannett; Vanguard Group; New South Capital Management; Capital International Investors; Smead Capital Management; BlackRock Fund Advisors; Acadian Asset Management; Nicholas Company; Dimensional Fund Advisors; BlackRock Institutional Trust Co.
CBS	CBS Corporation; National Amusements; Sumner Redstone; Viacom; Capital World Investors; Vanguard Group; State Street Corp.; JP Morgan Chase & Co.; BlackRock Institutional Trust Co.; Franklin Resources Inc.
Fox	News Corp; Rupert Murdoch Family Trust; International Value Advisers; Sterling Capital Management; Pzensa Investment Management; Thompson, Siegel & Walmsley; State Street Corp.; Vanguard Group; BlackRock Institutional Trust Co.; Sheffield Asset Management
NYT	New York Times Co.; Carlos Slim; Sulzberger Family; Fairpointe Capital LLC; Vanguard Group; JHL Capital Group; Contrarius Investment Management Limited; BlackRock Fund Advisors; Wellington Management Co.; State Street Corp.
MinnST	Star Tribune Media Co.; Glen Taylor; Taylor Corp.

(continued)

Online Table 7.1a Continued

---

	<b>Major Shareholders/Major Foundation Donors/Major Associated Businesses or Organizations (Up to 10 Maximum; 2015–2016)*</b>
WPost	Jeff Bezos; Amazon; Amazon top shareholders: Price (T. Rowe) Associates Inc.; Vanguard Group; Capital World Investors; FMR, LLC; State Street Corp.; Capital Research Global Investors; BlackRock Institutional Trust Co.; Baillie Gifford and Co.
Boston Globe	John Henry; Boston Globe Media Partners
CSMon	The First Church of Christ, Scientist
MinnPost	Northwest Area Foundation; McKnight Foundation; Bush Foundation; Joyce Foundation; Charles K. Blandin Foundation; Saint Paul Foundation; Minneapolis Foundation; Martin and Brown Foundation; Carl and Eloise Pohlada Family Foundation; John S. and James L. Knight Foundation
TexTrib	Ford Foundation; Houston Endowment; Austin Community Foundation; Meadows Foundation; Cynthia and George Mitchell Foundation; John S. and James L. Knight Foundation; William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; Sid W. Richardson Foundation; Michael and Susan Dell Foundation; Laura and John Arnold Foundation
ProPub	John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation; John S. and James L. Knight Foundation; Ford Foundation; Sandler Foundation; Laura and John Arnold Foundation; Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; Marisla Foundation; William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; Open Society Foundations; Dyson Foundation
NPR	Corporation for Public Broadcasting; Public Broadcasting Service; John S. and James L. Knight Foundation; Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; Wallace Foundation; Ford Foundation; Open Society Foundations; Kresge Foundation; Alfred P. Sloan Foundation; Kendeda Fund
PBS	Corporation for Public Broadcasting; Public Broadcasting Service; BNSF Railway; Lincoln Financial Group; MD Anderson Cancer Center; XQ The Super School Project; John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation; Carnegie Corporation of New York; Rockefeller Foundation; David and Lucille Packard Foundation

---

\* Mentions of philanthropic donors may refer to grants started in the years immediately preceding 2015-2016.

---

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (7.1b) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 7.1b** Sweden: Major Owners, Donors, and Associated Businesses or Organizations by Outlet

	<b>Major Shareholders/Major Foundation Donors/Major Associated Businesses or Organizations (Up to 10 Maximum; 2018–2019)</b>
SvD	Schibsted Media Group; Blommenholm Industrier; Tinius Trust; Folketrygdfondet; Baillie Gifford & Co.
Aftonbladet	Schibsted Media Group; LO (Swedish Trade Union Confederation); SSU (Trade Union Confederation youth wing); Blommenholm Industrier; Tinius Trust; Folketrygdfondet; Baillie Gifford & Co.
DagNyh/Expressen	Bonnier; Adlibris
GPosten	Stampen Media; Hjärne; Ernström Kapital; Dan Sten Olsson; Styviken Invest; Polaris Media; NWT Gruppen; PNV Media; Schibsted; Fabian Hielte

Rodney Benson et al., Online Table (7.1c) in *How Media Ownership Matters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2025), <https://rodneybenson.org/publications/how-media-ownership-matters/online-appendix>.

**Online Table 7.1c** France: Major Owners, Donors, and Associated Businesses or Organizations by Outlet

	<b>Major Shareholders/Major Foundation Donors/Major Associated Businesses or Organizations (Up to 10 Maximum; 2018–2019)</b>
LeFigaro	Dassault; Top shareholders in Dassault Aviation and Dassault Systèmes: Airbus; T. Rowe Price; Vanguard; BlackRock; Charles Edelstenne; Bernard Charlès; Parametric Portfolio Associates; Aristotle Capital Management; Fisher Asset Management
Libé	Altice; SFR; Patrick Drahi; Next Alt; EuroPacific Growth Fund; FMR LLC; Goldman Sachs; Alain Weill; Sotheby's; Numericable
LeMonde	Xavier Niel; Matthieu Pigasse; Daniel Kretinsky; Prisa; Lazard; Free Mobile; EPH; Czech Media Invest; Casino; Uniper
Le Parisien	LVMH; Bernard Arnault; Christian Dior; Arnault family group; Thornburg Investment Management; Moët Hennessy; Louis Vuitton

