

Transcript

Speaker 1

Welcome to the future of journalism podcasts from the Redis Institute for the Study of Journalism. I'm Rasmus Nielsen, director of the institute.

Speaker 1

For today's episode, I'm joined by Fiona Fox, chief executive of the Science Media Centre. She works with journalists and members of the scientific community to ensure that accurate and evidence based scientific information reaches the public and policymakers via.

Speaker 1

Fiona's recent book, *Beyond the hype*, the inside story of Science biggest media controversies looks at her 1st 20 years at the science media.

Speaker 1

Centre and demonstrates the vital importance of scientist. Open to the media. I'm on the record calling the book engaging, illuminating and important, and I'm happy to.

Speaker 1

Repeat that here.

Speaker 1

Fiona has man many accolades for her work, including honorary fellowships at the Academy of Medical Sciences, the Royal Society of Biology, and the British Pharmacological Society, as well as an honorary doctorate from the University of.

Speaker 1

In 2013 she was in Ward and OB, one of the UK's highest honours for her services to science. Fiona welcome and thank you for being with us today.

Speaker 2

Thank you, thanks for inviting me.

Speaker 1

So a lot of discussions of why we are sometimes LED astray by what we hear and see. Start with populist politicians spreading false or misleading information with shock Jock television personalities, foreign states information operations or nefarious actors in social media.

Speaker 1

Your book starts with the BBC with Greenpeace and with the.

Speaker 1

Why is there what? Why is that where you started? Your discussion of the role of media in science and some of the biggest controversies?

Speaker 1

Of our time.

Speaker 2

Well, it's not because I think the Guardian and Greenpeace and the BBC are the problem. It is because GM was what had to be one of the first chapters in this book. So the science media Centre was set up in 2002 and it was after.

Speaker 2

Media funeral raise over MMR.

Speaker 2

GM crops and animal rights, extremism, stroke research. So GM. Definitely the debate. The media coverage of GM was one of the key reasons the Science Media Centre was set up, so it's the first story because of of of the book is stories that we've been involved in. And however, I think.

Speaker 2

It's actually really good the way you've you've asked this question, because I think it isn't just the right wing populist press that brings an editorial line up to some of these issues, and I think we.

Speaker 2

See and and it's perfectly legitimate. As you will know and anyone who's understands journalism knows that newspapers in particular.

Speaker 2

It's perfectly legitimate for them to take an editorial line, but it isn't the case that only only the right wing press.

Speaker 2

Therefore mislead the public. If newspapers take strong editorial line.

Speaker 2

Lines and if based on those editorial lines they are selective about the kinds of stories they run. They are selective about the kinds of experts that they want to interview to confirm those editorial lines. Then my argument would be the public can often be misled and and that.

Speaker 2

I think is I think it's a if that is a point you've.

Speaker 2

Taken from the book.

Speaker 2

Then I think that's a good point. We saw it so clearly in in the pond.

Speaker 2

Mick, where you've got your kind of telegraphing and male who were anti locked down and you've got your guardian independent observer who were more likely to be pro locked down. And while I reject those those.

Speaker 2

Representations of pro or anti lockdown 'cause we're all anti all of it and I think they're they're a good shorthand to say that there were very distinct editorial lines and I could sit here and tell you, you know, of of journalists on from all of those newspapers who explicitly emailed us and said, can you get me someone who will support?

Speaker 2

The government doing this or will condemn the government and every time like a mantra we would email back and say, no, that's.

Speaker 2

Not what we'll do we.

Speaker 2

Or put an open ended question to the list of senior scientists on our database and we will give you the answer.

Speaker 2

Whatever the answer is, it will be based on expertise. We're not going to find you, the scientists that will back your editorial line.

Speaker 1

I mean, I, I think you give examples here from the last years of navigating the pandemic and the epidemic around it.

Speaker 1

But for people who aren't necessarily across the case of the discussions around genetically modified foodstuffs in the early 2000s.

Speaker 1

Or aren't familiar with the form that debate took.

Speaker 1

In the UK I I think it is worth just being very clear here that the language you use in the book is very strong.

Speaker 1

These are the GM wars, and you write that there are occasions where the public and policymakers were misled, and I highlight that because I, I think sometimes we.

Speaker 1

Tend to assume that there was a golden age of the media and that we now live in a in a sort of a fall.

Speaker 1

A state, but this is all well before many of the things that tend to drive worries today about what might lead the public astray.

Speaker 1

And you quote, Lord, may the then president of the Royal Society and former chief scientific adviser to the UK government, talking about material that the BBC.

Speaker 1

Was putting out as hysterically inaccurate and error strewn pieces of propaganda, and this is a quite a strong language of an organisation that unlike the newspapers.

Speaker 1

A man is not supposed to have a clear editorial line. Do you want to say a little bit more about?

Speaker 1

You know how you feel broadcasters then and now have navigated some of these very high stakes and complicated but also quite divisive issues.

Speaker 2

Well, I think I mean.

Speaker 2

The the quote that you used there from Bob.

Speaker 2

May who was?

Speaker 2

Head of the Royal Society, and before that he was chief scientist to the government was actually on a drama and I would. I would make that distinction because it was it was a 2 hour Saturday night drama.

Speaker 2

About GM crops, which was, as I highlight in the book, which was written by the editor of The Guardian, had taken a short sabbatical to do something he'd wanted to do.

Speaker 2

Which was right, a drama? The mistake there or I think what went badly wrong there was that the BBC started to see this drama as a contribution.

Speaker 2

To the public debate about GM.

Speaker 2

And we would not have had anything to do with it. Drama is drama drama. We watch all kinds of you know unrealistic mad movies every every night on television.

Speaker 2

But the BBC were reaching out to the scientific community in plant science institutes. That's how we got to hear about this. And saying that we want.

Speaker 2

This drama to kick off a really important debate within the British public about the possible.

Speaker 2

Impact of these crops and the storyline was that GM was jumping across the species barrier from a crop in a field trial into animals and then into humans with catastrophic consequences. Something that I mean any good scientists will tell you that everything is plausible. Theoretically possible, but very.

Speaker 2

Very, very, very unlikely, including from the scientific advisor to the programme and and yet they were doing something different with this drama.

Speaker 2

They weren't treating it like other dramas and they in fact set up a big online discussion. This was the early days of this.

Speaker 2

Nothing in the BBC. An educational discussion that would take place afterwards. A studio debate of experts who had discussed the themes raised and some of the media coverage that was coming out from the BBC beforehand as well as that this was an important drama that would be a contribution to the debate. So that was what was really alarming.

Speaker 2

I think, and if you if you are going to do that then absolutely you have to go back to the kind of editorial values that you expect the BBC to apply to news and information which is around impartiality and objectivity and accuracy.

Speaker 2

And you're of course allowed to move away from those with drama, but this was some kind of hype.

Speaker 2

Grid and that's why it was such a big row. I think, and broadcasters inject. I think the tradition of.

Speaker 2

Uhm of newspapers being allowed and encouraged and part of their history to campaign to take an editorial line to have campaigning object.

Speaker 2

Tab does distinguish them from the news media. Whatever your criticisms are of broadcast media, whatever your criticisms are of broadcast media, there is much more of a sense in the broadcast media of sticking with objectivity and neutrality and impartiality, whereas the newspapers aren't even.

Speaker 2

Aiming to do that.

Speaker 1

Yeah, I mean. And as you say, of course the BBC would be the first to point out the difference between the BBC News and BBC drama and I'm sure of course that the writers of any piece of drama, whether by the BBC.

Speaker 1

Or others would.

Speaker 1

Be very quick to point that out as well.

Speaker 1

But again, I, I think what you describe has some resonances with the pandemic in the sense that I think many of us.

Speaker 1

We'll have had sensations of watching a piece of drama, contagion, or or other shows or movies, and feeling that they helped us think about the situation in which the world was and perhaps over time, might also have influenced the conclusions that each of us came to about what that meant for for us or those we we care about. And and for our communities.

Speaker 1

But if we want to stick with news come, I want to ask you to tell us a little bit more about the sort of model or principle of the work that you do at the science media centre where you write in the book that the media will do signs better when scientists do the media better. But also it seems pretty clear if you know that.

Speaker 1

You don't trust scientists to do better on their own since you've set up the science media centre to help.

Speaker 1

Let's do it. So tell us a little bit more about how concretely you work to ensure that this interface between scientists and media work better.

Speaker 2

So I think that that really does take me back to the beginning of this and actually one one person who emailed me just yesterday who who'd read the book was around at the time and was involved

in the committee that was set up to help set up the SMC and the point she made was that you were literally given a remit to improve.

Speaker 2

The quality of science reaching the public through the media. That was how vague it.

Speaker 2

So so this that that phrase that you repeat and and what we actually do all comes from a period of one or two years of head scratching.

Speaker 2

And I mean really like, how do you do that? How do you do that? And you you must know this Rasmus. I mean the number of people who who's?

Speaker 2

Objective in life, whose aspiration is his passion, is to improve the media coverage of any one of many issues.

Speaker 2

Is and we can all talk about it. We can all give lectures about it. We can all believe in it. How the hell do you do it? And I just.

Speaker 2

And we we sat round for a couple of years. I would say, saying, how do we get in and actually in some ways the the the media will do science better when scientists do the media better was almost.

Speaker 2

A quick and easy kind of apology for the fact that we can't change the media there was there wasn't a single newspaper editor or broadcaster who would come and see me and do what I say.

Speaker 2

We didn't have that influence. We didn't have that control. We're a a small, independent charity set up outside of the media.

Speaker 2

We weren't set up by the media at all. It was set up by the scientific community. They're not going to listen to us so, so the head scratching, really.

Speaker 2

Came out with the fact that we're going to have to find what I call kind of pinch points. Which bits can we get into? How can we do this on a practical level, how can we make a difference?

Speaker 2

And and none of it can be grand statements or big lectures. Or this has to be if journalists don't use us, it's irrelevant what we do, and if if the stuff that scientist is given to journalists isn't meeting their needs, it's irrelevant what we do and we just didn't want to be.

Speaker 2

Another initiative of which there are many that do good things. There's so many good initiatives out there, but but when you really look hard at them, they're not making a difference.

Speaker 2

So the three things we do are based on that. So, so how do we get in there? Well, this breaking news, one thing that we have is breaking news.

Speaker 2

So every morning when we get up, we are not sure what will be the the the, the news that none of us anticipated. The example that comes to mind straight away.

Speaker 2

Is the day that I woke up turned on the radio and heard that a Chinese scientist had come?

Speaker 2

Uhm Genome edited 2 babies to actual babies and approach that is not legal around the world and approach that many stem cell scientists and researchers are interested in pursuing to genome edited embryos to protect against serious illnesses.

Speaker 2

But it's not scientifically proven, and there has been no global debate about the ethics of doing it, and it was way too soon, so I jumped out of bed and I went to the science Media Centre database and we have 3000 very senior top.

Speaker 2

Good quality scientists on that database and they have keywords next to them, so we put in all the right keywords and outcomes a list of maybe 30-40 fifty leading experts on this kind of area of science and we say to them it's absolutely critical that you drop everything and give us your reaction to this.

Speaker 2

News and within an hour very very quickly. And speed is key. We will probably have 234 from people like Professor Robin Lovell badge, who works at the Crick Institute.

Speaker 2

Leading expert Kathleen Icon, who is the first scientist globally to apply for permission to the H FPA to do this kind of research.

Speaker 2

That they are coming in thick and fast, saying this is wrong. This is unethical. This is too soon. It's not scientifically safe.

Speaker 2

Yes, we haven't had the necessary ethical debates with the public, and so that's really great for the journalists because they they have a stock of quotes that they can copy and paste into their news, which then.

Speaker 2

Will be accurate, reliable from from very trusted expert.

Speaker 2

It, but be they will see that out of the 12 quotes that the Science Media Centre has sent them from a real range of experts in different universities and research institutes that the vast majority is not all are saying similar things so they can safely say as the headline of their article, the scientific community condemned.

Speaker 2

And the news from South Korea that that this Chinese scientist is genome edited embryos. So that's just a little kind of proof of concept.

Speaker 2

We do that on an almost daily basis and and it's our way in. It's our way of saying to the journalists you will like us. You'll have only just woken up to this story. You will as much.

Speaker 2

You're brilliant science journalist.

Speaker 2

Or health journalists or environment journalists. You'll be struggling to work out. What are the right experts on this? How can I physically get to them in time to put something up very, very quickly 'cause it's been on BBC so we've got to get something out and you are helped to do that. So it's this really nice thing that we've worked out on. You know how how?

Speaker 2

How can we rely on the journalists using us then when they use us, what are we given them that is going to improve the quality and make sure that what the public read or hear on the airwaves is from trusted sources, is reliable and accurate represents?

Speaker 2

The weight of scientific opinion or the weight of evidence it the the media using us is is the most important bit of this.

Speaker 2

If they're not using it, it doesn't work, but if they use us, it's then an opportunity to fulfil this goal, and then we do similar things with our roundups. It's a bit different because there.

Speaker 2

It's usually studies that are coming out in The Lancet or the BMJ or science or nature, and we have a bit more notice so we will see the study at the same time that the journalists see it, which is often two or three days before the embargo.

Speaker 2

Shifts and we'll be able to identify sometimes we cheque with the journalist. Which of these studies do you do?

Speaker 2

You think your editors will want to splash on the front page as the cure coffee is the cure for cancer or coffees.

Speaker 2

The cause of cancer, and again we we go back to the keywords on the database and say to these scientists new study out in The Lancet.

Speaker 2

Saying coffee causes cancer and they will read the paper and get back to us and say.

Speaker 2

I actually, you know, beautifully designed study from our friends in Oxford and Edinburgh University. However, it's a small observational study.

Speaker 2

It cannot prove X causes Y and actually there are very good quality randomised control trials that have been conducted that actually show there isn't a link so.

Speaker 2

So you'll just again, you're those quotes are then copied and pasted into that article. It's not on the front page, it's on page 6 because it's a lot more nuanced. A lot more measured, and it it's a way of us improving the quality.

Speaker 2

Off the science that people are reading and consuming so the whole the UN steel question really is finding those little pinch points where we can make a difference and that's why we we we have that phrase of that that if scientists do this for us if they take the time to read that study and give us a comment if they get up in the morning and and spend 20 minutes.

Speaker 2

Of their day, reacting to breaking news. They will be used and they will be making a difference to the media.

Speaker 1

The first case we discussed of GM wars in the UK was early 2000s a I think 2002, so the year before Myspace and LinkedIn was created.

Speaker 1

Then two years before Facebook was created, whereas the genome editing case said you just described this much later where.

Speaker 1

Hundreds of 1,000,000 or even billions of people.

Speaker 1

Across the world.

Speaker 1

Use social media to access many kinds of info.

Speaker 1

Patient, how do you feel that this has changed? The work of the Science Media Centre? I mean, I should add here, of course, that there are many who are quite worried about the reliability of some of the information that that circulates on social media and researchers, including ourselves here at the Reuters Institute have found that in some cases.

Speaker 1

Relying on social media or messaging applications. For example, during the coronavirus pandemic was associated with higher belief in vaccine misinformation.

Speaker 1

So how do you feel that the rise and popularity of social media has influenced the work that you do at the science media centre?

Speaker 2

Well, I'm I'm going to say something that I think will surprise some of your listeners. And and then I'm going to try and defend it and we we don't work on social media.

Speaker 2

The Science media centre doesn't do social media and and I know when I do talks to scientists I can see the ripple of utter dismay because as you rightly say.

Speaker 2

It's social media where most of the disinformation circulates the nature of social media, the nature of Twitter where these short messages just just everything that people fear about misinformation and. And, you know, ignoring nuances and not being able to explain the science.

Speaker 2

Properly, it is focused on social media and yet we don't do social media. But I'm going to defend it on the basis that we're a very small team. So there are five press officers at the Science Media Centre, five of us.

Speaker 2

And ten years ago, when you rightly, your characterization is absolutely right. I mean, there wasn't even 24/7 news media when we set up.

Speaker 2

We would we would work with a journalist who would be working on one or two articles for tomorrow's newspaper and they would have the whole day to write them, and it was usually 800 words or five. If it was the the tabloids.

Speaker 2

And over the next few years that that print media turned into online media where they were writing 5-6 articles online.

Speaker 2

Mean immediately, instantly and and looking for asking us, can you give us fact sheets so we can copy and paste the whole factory to fill up we need to fill up the papers so everything the the proliferation of social media had changed but also the the way the mainstream news media operated had changed. So we're very aware of those changes.

Speaker 2

Uhm, but there are five of us and we and back to this point I was making about just an incredibly kind of practical group of people who saying how and where can we make the difference.

Speaker 2

We believe that we believe in expertise. Actually we we in in science we love it and and and in our area of work we love it.

Speaker 2

So we are actually not experts on drama on television. We are experts on the news. We're not experts on social media. We're experts on the news.

Speaker 2

But we think that how, and you know if somebody did give us a million pounds, I think we would acknowledge that social media.

Speaker 2

And is influencing the wider public, and we would move into working with social media. No one has yet offered as a million pounds.

Speaker 2

We're actually not allowed to take more than 5% of our running costs from anyone, so no one is allowed to give us more than £30,000, and it doesn't look like we're we're going to expand soon, so we made a choice about 10 years ago.

Speaker 2

On our 10th anniversary, we had a kind of strategy review to maintain that focus and to say to the scientific community, all of whom. By the way, if you go into a university or a research press office, you'll find a completely different answer.

Speaker 2

They have moved exactly the opposite way. They've moved away from what they call in a negative way and media first.

Speaker 2

Approach we no longer do a a media first approach. We have embraced, you know our website creating content using social. So a lot of press teams in universities and the rest of science are.

Speaker 2

More focused on social media than they are on mainstream news media. And we've what we say to them is we understand now that that that your skills in terms of news media have been slightly diluted because of the direction you've gone in. Come and use us when and if you feel the need and actually couldn't have been more.

Speaker 2

That couldn't have been a more.

Speaker 2

Sound decision that we made. Then in the pandemic, where as your research showed at the Reuters Institute, people were coming back to mainstream news media in droves as as a more trusted source.

Speaker 2

So they were still consuming social media and they were enjoying themselves and they were all sharing it. But in terms of, you know.

Speaker 2

We have journalists who were saying I did an explainer yesterday about uh modelling and imperial modelling and data and got 3,000,000 hits. You know, something they've never had before.

Speaker 2

So we maintained that expertise in news media and a lot of people came back to us for that. So I I think, and I think, also Rasmus again, just not so much with your Reuters hat on, but one of the things I found very interesting about the recent Royal Society report about misinformation.

Speaker 2

On the Internet.

Speaker 2

Was a point that jumped out at me.

Speaker 2

That actually one way of that, a lot of people talk about is to kind of ban misinformation or or somehow eradicate misinformation from these social media networks. And another one is to create this positive communications ecosystem in which.

Speaker 2

Good, accurate evidence based science is proliferating and we see our bit of that as the mainstream news media. Bit of that many of the stories that end up on social me.

Speaker 2

Media come from mainstream news media, so if we can focus all our energies on making sure that the mainstream news media is covering science in an accurate, robust, rigorous measured way, then that will feed into social media.

Speaker 1

That's a nice segue into the last question. I'd like to hear your thoughts on in closing here, which is that?

Speaker 1

Uhm, while I think all scientists are full of admiration when they see sign conflict, scientific work presented well in the news media.

Speaker 1

It's perhaps also fair to say that sometimes, when scientists choose to express themselves on social media, for example, it's also in part because.

Speaker 1

Of a disappointment or a discontent with how science.

Speaker 1

Is sometimes covered by the mainstream media.

Speaker 1

I'm a scientist. I I work every day with journalists from around the world and it's a pleasure and a privilege, and it often strikes me how.

Speaker 1

At the same time, these two tribes of scientists and journalists have a lot in common. Both of them are committed to seeking truth and reporting it. Even if the nature and pace of the reporting is rather dramatically different.

Speaker 1

But they're also really very different in in many ways, and you highlight this, of course, throughout your book. In part, you use a quote from Quentin Cooper or Science journalist who used to work the BBC, who writes that science values detail precision, the impersonal, the technical, the lasting facts, numbers.

Speaker 1

Being right.

Speaker 1

Journalism, Cooper's own profession. Values, brevity, approximation the personal the colloquial, the immediate stories words and being right now.

Speaker 1

And as he concludes, there are going to be tensions. What do you see in your own work, recognising the commonalities and shared mission to some extent? What do you see as the biggest tension between science and journalism?

Speaker 2

I think I I I love that quote and I I particularly endorsed the last bit of that quote. We one of the main aims of the science media.

Speaker 2

Centre has been to to.

Speaker 2

Encourage the scientific community to have mutual respect so so there's been a lot of snottiness. A lot of snippiness.

Speaker 2

About what you've just described, because they do all of those things because they have brevity because it'll be imperfect because they have to have it now that they are inferior to what we do.

Speaker 2

We will spend two years on the scientific paper. They will, you know, spend a couple of hours writing that up. Therefore, we are better than them. So what one of the?

Speaker 2

Things I want to say is that we, I think one of our successes has been to encourage mutual respect. That is their job, that is, their trade, that is their craft, and it is what it is.

Speaker 2

The fact that you spent two years on this research paper makes science wonderful, but it doesn't make it better.

Speaker 2

So how about that we have this mutual respect in terms of your question about why the tension lies, I still think it is this this thing about.

Speaker 2

News, I suppose the theme of this this discussion, and the newness so so editors and journalists still see that if it's new, it's significant, and that is really, really not.

Speaker 2

I would say I'm going to say not always the case. I think it's not often the case.

Speaker 2

And but by new what that means is a journal, have published it and it's a new study. And yes, it is a new study, but but when often when we email and say, can you give us a comment on this study?

Speaker 2

One of the things I often notice is there are six people saying there's nothing new here. There's nothing new here. There's nothing new here.

Speaker 2

And you do. I remember in the early days kind of scratching my head if there's nothing new. How did this piece of science get funded?

Speaker 2

How has it been published and what you discover of course, is that it's not very new. It's not scientifically significantly new, but it's one other way of asking the question so you will have the question does coffee cause cancer? Does coffee cure cancer?

Speaker 2

And then you might have a slightly different question. Does does Colombian coffee?

Speaker 2

Cause cancer or cure cancer. Does Columbian coffee drunk during the night have a?

Speaker 2

Day so so there's small.

Speaker 2

Incremental differences, and that is exactly what science is when you, when you've asked the question in 100 different ways and kept asking it and kept refining it, you have something called a body of evidence.

Speaker 2

And that's good. You know, my husband always says to me, why should I believe scientists when they you know one, says Red wine is bad for you?

Speaker 2

One says red wine is good for you, but if I took any two studies one would be saying red wine.

Speaker 2

Is is quite good for the heart if you have one glass at night and the other is saying 5 glasses of red wine is not good for your overall health, so it's not that they're both that they're asking exactly the same question coming to complete completely different conclusions and therefore we should disregard him. We should want scientists to ask the questions in lots of different ways.

Speaker 2

But that's the bit where it just feels to me like still, the news release arrives and it's in The Lancet, or it's in the BMJ, or it's in science or nature.

Speaker 2

There's a news release, therefore it's significant and and the the the editor says write big new study out even if the word significant does not apply to that because.

Speaker 2

In fact, like I was saying earlier, we met statins. This was such an issue in statins. The do you know it took years. It took 1020 years, but there were huge randomised control trials.

Speaker 2

Conducted all over the world, multicenter the amount of data where they were searching in these trials for side effects of this drug and they found very small side effects.

Speaker 2

It is there, but it's very small. Fast forward a couple of years and some university does a little observational study that shows.

Speaker 2

20% of people get side effects from statins, but it's observational so you can't prove it.

Speaker 2

But that is considered new evidence shows that statins give you view, and there's no comparison between the quality and significance of this small study which cannot prove one causes the other to this.

Speaker 2

The evidence we've already looked at, but it's seen as the same in a newsroom. So I think, and that if you look at all these third party.

Speaker 2

Roundups quite often what they're saying to the journalist is actually. This might be new to you, but it's not significant news.

Speaker 2

And our our favourite days at the Science Media Centre is when a journalist writes and says thanks for that. Based on this, I've asked the editor not.

Speaker 2

To run this story.

Speaker 1

I mean, that's an incredibly important part of journalism, of course, because editing is also making decisions about what not to run.

Speaker 1

So I think a powerful reminder of the the challenges of making the interesting, significant and the significant interesting, but also, of course, a reminder that you know scientists have a huge.

Speaker 1

Responsibility to make themselves available individually or through the Science Media Centre or your sister institutes across the.

Speaker 1

World to help.

Speaker 1

Journalists do their reporting and inform the public about science and the implications of scientific.

Speaker 1

Findings for society. Thank you very much, Fiona for joining us today. Thank you for your work at the Science Media Centre and for your book Beyond the hype. The inside story of science. Biggest media controversies.

Speaker 1

Uhm, make sure for those of you listening to follow our podcast channel on Spotify or Apple Podcasts so you don't miss the next episode.

Speaker 1

And if you don't want to miss any news from the Reuters institute, subscribe to our weekly newsletters by clicking the link on our Twitter bio or on our homepage. Thank you Fiona for joining us.

Speaker 2

Thank you.

Speaker 1

And thank you for listening to the future of journalism. I'm rosmus Nelson. We'll be back soon.