

# The Weekly Listen: Can news influencers replace traditional media, in-store sampling, and is social media addictive?

Audio



On today's podcast episode, we discuss the likelihood that news influencers will replace traditional media, whether in-store sampling can make a comeback, how many ads are enough ads, what the science says about social media being addictive, why more brands don't encourage consumers to recycle, where daylight savings time actually comes from, and more. Tune in to the discussion with our vice president of content Suzy Davidkhanian and analysts Bill Fisher and Carina Perkins.

*Subscribe to the “Behind the Numbers” podcast on [Apple Podcasts](#), [Spotify](#), [Pandora](#), [Stitcher](#), Podbean or wherever you listen to podcasts. [Follow us on Instagram](#)*



Episode Transcript:

Marcus Johnson:

Insider Intelligence subscribers can now take advantage of the exclusive opportunity to meet directly with our team of thought leaders in the financial services space. Through the new

Analyst Access program, expect to leave equipped with what you need to drive profitable sales, legitimize strategic ideas, and develop models of addressable markets and opportunities. Visit [insiderintelligence.com/analystaccess](https://insiderintelligence.com/analystaccess) to learn more.

Hello everyone, and thanks for hanging out with us for the Behind the Numbers Weekly Listen and E-marketer podcast. This is the Friday show that is coming out on a Thursday, because we're off tomorrow. It's also the show that it's having itself a bit of a morning, as you could probably tell from Bill's expressions throughout the episode. I'm your host, Marcus Johnson. In today's show, will news influences replace traditional media?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

The journalist who has a page and is doing their own thing as a journalist understands sources, fact checking. That's why we turn to the news, right? To news outlets.

Marcus Johnson:

Is in-store sampling making a comeback?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

But most sales are still happening in brick and mortar stores. So to succeed, brands need to take advantage of touchpoints in store, and more traditional forms of retail media like sampling and in-store radio.

Marcus Johnson:

Enough ads is enough.

Bill Fisher:

People obviously don't want more ads. But they understand that more ads might mean the continuation or improvement in quality of service, given it might bring in more revenue for broadcasters. So evidently, enough isn't enough in the UK. There's room for a little bit more.

Marcus Johnson:

Is social media addictive, why more brands aren't encouraging folks to recycle, and where did daylight savings actually, actually come from?

Join me in this episode. We have three people. Let's meet them. We start with our vice president of content who heads up our retail and E-commerce team based out of New York City. Ladies and gentlemen, of course, Suzy Davidkhanian.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Hi. You forgot to mention proud Canadian.

Marcus Johnson:

That wasn't by accident. We're also joined by one of our senior analysts who is on that retail and E-commerce team based in the UK on the South Coast. This is Carina Perkins.

Carina Perkins:

Hi, Marcus. And proud to be British.

Marcus Johnson:

Yes, indeed. Same. Same. Great shirt, by the way. That "proud to be British" shirt you're wearing, amazing.

Carina Perkins:

Are you pleased with it? Yeah, I made it myself.

Marcus Johnson:

It's fantastic. For people watching the video podcast-

Suzy Davidkhanian:

I'm [inaudible 00:02:27].

Marcus Johnson:

... Just disregard.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

I'm dying. And Bill is like, "What am I doing here?"

Marcus Johnson:

And finally, joining us rather reluctantly, also in the UK, a few towns over on the South Coast, our principal analyst who covers everything in that very country, it's Bill Fisher.

Bill Fisher:

Hello, Marcus. I'm indifferent to all nationalities.

Marcus Johnson:

Perfect. Also, host... He has to be. He's the host of Around the World, our other podcast. So he's neutral. He's neutral.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Oh, yes. That's a great one.

Marcus Johnson:

How Swiss of you. Well played. Right. What do we have in store for you today? Well, we're going to start by talking about the story of the week, and whether news influencers are going to replace traditional media, or have they already perhaps? Kind of? We then move to the Game of the Week where our contestants, Suzy, Bill and Carina try to compete for the championship belt. And then finally, Dinner Party Data, the random trivia portion of the show. Let's start the episode. "For the love of God," says Bill's face. We start with the story of the week.

Will news influences replace traditional media? A recent Washington Post article by Taylor Lorenz notes that millions of independent creators are reshaping how people get their news, especially the youngest viewers. The piece notes that news consumption hit a tipping point during the early days of the pandemic, with more folks turning to social media platforms than to traditional news sites, at least according to the latest digital news report by the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. According to Britain's Office of Communications, Ofcom, young adults now spend more time watching TikTok than broadcast TV. One in five young people use it as a source of news, TikTok, that is.

Ms. Lorenz points out that whilst a few national publications, New York Times, Washington Post, Wall Street Journal have seen their digital audiences grow, allowing them to reach hundreds of thousands more readers than a decade ago. The economics of journalism have shifted. Well-known news outlets have seen a decline in the amount of traffic flowing to them

from social media sites. Folks, what do we think? Will news influencers ultimately replace traditional media?

Bill Fisher:

I think it's happening in front of our eyes. I've got an anecdote for you. I like a personal anecdote. It tends to involve my children. So talking about social platforms becoming the source of news, it's becoming the source of truth. So I don't know if anyone's familiar with the Ballon d'Or. It's the French Media Award that is given to the world's best footballer. And that ceremony happened a couple of weeks ago. Everybody knew Lionel Messi was going to win it. However, it was happening in the evening, late evening time, GMT.

My kids came to me after dinner to tell me that Lionel Messi had won the award. And I said, "I'm pretty sure they haven't awarded it yet." But they'd seen it on TikTok. They saw the video. That was the truth. And I had to sit them down and educate them again, because I feel that my kids are quite well-educated. I talked to them about how to use social media responsibly, check multiple sources. What is the source of this news? They hadn't done it. This was their source of truth, and it was all rubbish. It was a manufactured video, stitched together old video clips, and so I had to reeducate my kids.

And so I, at university, I studied English language and I did a unit on culture and communication. I figured in a couple of generations time, this kind of education would've filtered down into early years' education, but it hasn't. Kids aren't being educated in how to use social media, and so we're really in danger of traditional media being very quickly overrun by these sources of truth.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Well, it's scary. Just what you've said now is super scary. And then you throw in the AI bit around false news. But I think the headline is misleading a tiny little bit, because even with that stat around one in five use TikTok, but are they using the creator news stories? Or are they using CNN? And CNN or BBC or whoever, whatever news outlet has figured out how to use social platforms to deliver news in a different way to a younger generation? Which I'm guessing from Bill's story, probably most of them are using some random influencer who's trying to amplify news that they are creating. But is that what everybody's doing? I don't know.

Bill Fisher:

Right.

Marcus Johnson:

Well, they don't always get the choice because of the algorithm. It will feed them what it thinks it wants them to see.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Well, we were talking about this at work the other day. If you hover long enough on dad jokes and kitten videos, or if your friend sends you enough kitten videos, then that's all you get. You don't actually even get news. So that is what I would recommend.

Marcus Johnson:

Someone sending you too many... This sounds personal. Is it someone-

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Yeah.

Marcus Johnson:

Okay.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Karen. Karen, I know you always listen.

Marcus Johnson:

Carina, is that-

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Thank you.

Marcus Johnson:

Is that on you?

Carina Perkins:

No, I was going to-



Marcus Johnson:

No, no. Sorry. Is that your name?

Carina Perkins:

Oh, is that me? Oh, yeah.

Marcus Johnson:

Yeah, Karen-ina.

Carina Perkins:

Karen. Karen.

Marcus Johnson:

Yeah, if you could stop it, we'd appreciate it.

Carina Perkins:

I love a cat video. I love a cat video.

Marcus Johnson:

Real Carina, what do you think?

Carina Perkins:

Well, I think an element of this as well is that people are just tired of the news, and they don't want to watch the BBC anymore because it's really, really depressing because we've had COVID, we've had wars, we've had inflation, we've had... It's all just really bad news, isn't it? And so they go to social media sites looking for a bit of entertainment, and then actually, there are some people talking about the news, but that's easier for them to digest than watching the BBC perhaps version of it. So I think there's an element of people just being tired of the news, looking for entertainment, and that's inevitably going to be social media. And I think perhaps the way that creators or news influencers are delivering the information, it's a bit more about the debate. It's a bit more lively, I guess, than what they're getting through the traditional news channels.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

But I think the one thing we probably needed to start with was the difference between a journalist posting on social and a random influencer wanting to become a journalist, right? Because to Bill's point, the journalist who has a page and is doing their own thing as a journalist understands sources, fact checking. That's why we turn to the news, to news outlets. And even when you turn to news outlets that maybe lean one way or the other, you still know you're getting it with that lens because it's very, very... Everybody knows. So you don't get that from these random influencers that are trying to go big.

Marcus Johnson:

It's like saying screen time. It could be good screen time. Maybe you're texting your parents or you're in a group chat with your family or whatever. Or it could be bad screen time. Maybe you're wasting time just scrolling through meaningless content.

Carina Perkins:

I mean, I think the mainstream news outlets also have themselves to blame a little bit for this shift because I think especially in this country, in the UK, tabloid journalism, I think that while journalists have been taught to have very high ethical standards and check sources and be neutral on certain things, I don't think that is necessarily the case, especially the way that the news ownership, I guess, the mainstream news outlets are owned. So I think people are really tired of that, and they would prefer to go to their peers who they feel perhaps have less of an agenda than a big mainstream news outlet.

Marcus Johnson:

In many cases, influencers run traditional media, right?

Carina Perkins:

Yeah, exactly.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Well, I also thought you were going to go with... If a CBC, the Canadian Broadcast Corporation, had... Felt like I needed to throw in a Canadian station. So if they have a social-

Marcus Johnson:

T-shirt's not enough.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

... Page, which I will definitely start to follow after today, the other problem that we see is the clickbait, right? As they're trying to maneuver into this news bite, 30 seconds, scroll through... It's not even 30 seconds, let's be honest. You have three seconds to get their attention. So the headline is just so clickbait-y. There's no other better word for it. So then you're going to their website because that's how they're monetizing, but it's not always the right thing for the consumer.

Carina Perkins:

Yeah, you're right. And I think that's, again, putting people off mainstream news outlets when they just see on... All they're seeing on social from these news outlets is clickbait-y headlines. I think that really puts people off.

Marcus Johnson:

Yeah. There's definitely a drop in the trust in traditional media. And going into what you were saying about a drop in... People paying attention to the news, there's some numbers from Pew showing people aren't following the news as much as they used to. Pew Research Center has some numbers on this, showing that from 2018 to 2022, so those four years, the share of Americans who said they follow the news all or most of the time fell from 52% to 38. And as you mentioned, there's been wars during that time. There's been the pandemic during that time. There's been plenty of other elections. There's been plenty of stuff for people to pay attention to. There's not been an evaporation of things to tune into.

By demographic from 2016 to 2022, over those six years. Older folks, 65 plus, went from 75% to 65 in terms of paying attention to the news, and 20 year olds went from 27, which is already low, to 19. But yeah, it's interesting. It's not the same journalistic quality, even though you're getting one report from here and one report from there. It's the same topic. But Jay Rosen, Associate Professor of Journalism at NYU is saying, "It's never been easier to be both informed and misinformed," Bill, to what you were saying, "About world events." Regardless of that though, half of US adults got at least some of their news from social media.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

But I do think there's a lot of tension. Even if you think about the regular news outlets here, there's that Citizen app where people are posting in real time things, and then ABC is using...

They're sourcing it, but they're like, "Here's Citizen footage of what's happening," and then they're reporting it as news. So I think it's a little bit like everybody's to blame and there's a lot of tension.

Carina Perkins:

Yeah, I think that news outlets using social media, people posting on social media, as news, happens a lot now as well, and I think that's slightly dubious.

Marcus Johnson:

Survey from Kagan as well I thought was quite interesting from this summer, Americans who get most of their information about news and breaking events through social media, they had it by generation, 77% of Gen Zs, 67 for millennials, half of Gen X, just 28% of Baby Boomers. So yeah, we can see the effects of this shift. Ms. Lorenz was noting that some outlets that even started on the internet have begun to struggle. Newsfeed saying they're shutting last April, Vice entering bankruptcy, Gawker shutting down for the second time in February, and the trend likely to continue, Reuters Institute Director, Rasmus Kleis Nielsen saying, "There are no reasonable grounds for expecting that those born in the 2000s will suddenly come to prefer old-fashioned websites, let alone broadcast and print simply because they grow older."

That's all we've got time for for the story of the week. Let's move to the Game of the Week. Today's game is brand new today. I'm kidding. It's "What's The Point." I read out for... The panic in Suzy's face. I read out four stories. Suzy, Bill, and Carina give us their main takeaway of each. Okay? Answers get one point, good answers get two, and answers that give you the same feeling as when a baby smiles at you...

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Bill. Come on.

Marcus Johnson:

Yeah, Bill's not... No, Bill? What?

Bill Fisher:

I'm happy with that.

Marcus Johnson:

Oh, okay. You didn't seem terribly impressed. It's happened once.

Bill Fisher:

There isn't normally a camera. Do you want to just see more excitement?

Marcus Johnson:

We're get to see all of your personality now, Bill. All of it.

Bill Fisher:

Yes. Wow, that's amazing. Yeah, it's great.

Marcus Johnson:

Answers that leave you with that feeling, I guess they get you three points. You get 20 seconds to answer before you hear this noise. There we go. If you run long, you get a pie thrown at you. We can't do that because everyone's remote, but wouldn't that be fun?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

That would be fun.

Bill Fisher:

Yes.

Marcus Johnson:

High stakes.

Bill Fisher:

It really would.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Oh, that got you excited.

Marcus Johnson:

Better, Bill. Better. So yeah, don't run long, is the point. Carina, no keynotes. Okay?

Carina Perkins:

Sure. Sure.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

She's practicing for AP.

Marcus Johnson:

Most points wins. We'll start with round one and we're going to start with Carina. Let's see how this goes. Is in-store sampling making a comeback? Our retail briefings, [inaudible 00:14:40] Rachel Wolf writes, "In-store sampling is regaining popularity, as brands look for ways to make up for diminishing returns from online ads. Walmart is expanding its sampling program to over 1000 stores, while Wakefern Food Corp said in May it would add vending machines with samples to nearly 100 ShopRite and the Fresh Grocer locations." But Carina, in-store sampling making a comeback, what's the point?

Carina Perkins:

I think the point here is that it's foolhardy for grocery brands to rely on online advertising alone. There's been a big surge towards E-commerce, and we've seen a big surge towards retail media as a result, but most sales are still happening in brick and mortar stores. So to succeed, brands need to take advantage of touchpoints in store, and more traditional forms of retail media like sampling and in store radio, as well as digital screens. And that's something we've seen in this country at least, retailers really doubling down on in-store retail media via digital screens in stores.

Marcus Johnson:

Bill?

Bill Fisher:

Yeah. I mean, I don't know what you think, Carina. I haven't really seen much evidence of this happening locally in the UK, but I love a free sample, so hopefully it will make a comeback. I think it makes a lot of sense. Another route to consumers in amongst all this difficulties with targeted advertising, privacy issues, cookie deprecation and all that, it's a very direct, experiential approach. So I definitely think there's room for this thing. And we've seen a return to in-store shopping, certainly in the UK, post-pandemic. So yeah, good idea. More free samples, please.

Marcus Johnson:

Suzy?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Me too. I'm all about samples. Everybody knows it's why I go to Costco when I get the chance. But I do think there might be a little leap between tasting-

Marcus Johnson:

And then leaves again. Next time, buy something. Okay?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

That's exactly what I do. Then I go for the \$2 hot dog and then... With the drink. And then I go home.

Marcus Johnson:

She's out.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

But honestly, I do think that there's a... I agree with everything everybody just said. But I do think there's a leap between tasting something and buying something and that you need some sort of sense of urgency, whether it's a coupon or if it's limited time in the store, or some sort of reason why you're buying it today and not a different day when you go back to the store. Grocery shopping is a mix of going in with a list and or impulse, depending on who you are. And so sampling is more or less impulse purchases, right? So it just depends on what kind of shopper you are.

Marcus Johnson:

Let's move to round two. Good start, folks.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Wait, what's the score?

Marcus Johnson:

Already?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Yes.

Marcus Johnson:

Jesus.

Carina Perkins:

Yeah. We need more transparency around scoring.

Marcus Johnson:

Carina, don't get involved. Ah, don't encourage her.

Carina Perkins:

Oh, there we go. I'm going to get a zero, no?

Marcus Johnson:

Yes.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

No, I already got the zero. We can't both have zero.

Bill Fisher:

You do it your way, Marc.

Marcus Johnson:

[inaudible 00:17:22].

Bill Fisher:

You do it your way.

Marcus Johnson:

Thank you. Thank you. Oh, Bill, you got an extra point. How'd that happen?

Suzy Davidkhanian:



You know what? Bill as a host is more empathetic about this hosting situation. Oh, he's going to win for sure.

Marcus Johnson:

Yeah. Because he didn't ask for the score after round one. That's crazy. It's like if you're a boxer. After round one you went to the corner, to the judge. You were like, "How's it going?"

Suzy Davidkhanian:

"Am I winning?"

Marcus Johnson:

"Oh, just focus on the fight? Okay, nevermind."

Suzy Davidkhanian:

"Do I have any bruises?"

Marcus Johnson:

Everyone's got two. Round two though. We start with Bill. "Enough ads is enough," reads an article by Frankie Cara of Mountain Research. The company outlined a few findings recently. One, folks who saw a CTV ad six times within an hour had the highest awareness at 92% recall. If you had four exposures to the ad, it dropped to 85. If you had just one, it dropped to 64%. Number two, there was a 16% drop in viewer's intent to buy from one exposure to six. So the more you were shown, the more you intend to buy dropped. And three half of viewers said they will switch to another streaming service or unsubscribe if they get the same ad too often. But Bill, enough ads is enough. What's the point?

Bill Fisher:

Yeah. I'm going to take an interesting angle here, a local perspective. So the media regulator over here, Ofcom, has just recently been reviewing what it refers to as COSTA rule. That stands for the Code of Scheduling of Television Advertising. There are pretty strict rules for public service broadcaster advertising, PSB advertising over here. Lots of sub-clauses and stuff. But essentially there's a strict limit on the number of ads that can be shown on TV and CTV per hour and the duration of time they take up.

Well, Ofcom has done a bunch of research into consumer attitudes, market influence of non-PSB channels and other related stuff, and it's recommending that these strict regulations are relaxed. It doesn't think that the restrictions are justified. It found that there was some audience elasticity with regards to opinions on advertising. People obviously don't want more ads, but they understand that more ads might mean the continuation or improvement in quality of service, given it might bring in more revenue for broadcasters. So evidently, enough isn't enough in the UK. There's room for a little bit more.

Marcus Johnson:

Maybe I'll stay in America. Suzy.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

So what I thought was the lackluster insight was that the more ads you get, the more you recall things, obviously, right? The more you see something, the more you're going to remember. What I thought was fascinating was apparently if you see one ad, your recall is 64%, and so I wonder if you really do need to see six of the same ad to have strong recall. What I also thought was interesting was that, which is exactly the opposite of what Bill just said. But in the US apparently, people associate too many ads to bad live-streaming service and don't have that empathy around, "Oh, I get it. They need to run a business."

And so, one in two say they would switch live stream platforms, but the truth is, that's also not possible because you're usually tied to a show that is available at one platform and so you're not going to just change because seeing too many ads. You're just going to go get chips or popcorn or whatever it is. It's like saying to a retail store, "I'm not going to come and buy your private label from you because you're annoying." It's not going to happen if you're in love with that private label.

Marcus Johnson:

Carina.

Carina Perkins:

Yeah. So my insight is slightly different, or the thing I found interesting and slightly different. We've all seen the same ad repeatedly over and over again and found it really annoying. I think it does depend on how good the ad is. Sometimes if an ad's really funny, you can see it a few more times and it's not annoying yet. But for me, the really interesting thing here was the

suggestion that ad channels like CTV are making it easier to track the effectiveness of campaigns being served on TV screens. And I think that's a really interesting point because I think as advertising evolves, it's becoming harder and harder for marketers to hide behind smoke and mirrors because there's evidence in what impact those tactics are having on consumer habits and that's happening across advertising, and I think it's really interesting to see whether that eventually is going to result in a more enjoyable experience for consumers.

Marcus Johnson:

Nice, folks. At the halfway mark, Bill just ahead with five, Suzy and Carina tied in joint second place, also known as joint last, on four. We start with Suzy for round three. Is social media addictive? Here's what the science says, writes Matt Richtel of the New York Times. He explains that a group of 41 states just filed a suit against Meta, Facebook and Instagram's parent company, contending that it knowingly used features on its platforms to cause kids to use them compulsively. But the piece questions whether young people are becoming addicted to social media and the internet. David Greenfield, a psychologist and founder of the Center for Internet and Technology Addiction in Connecticut says devices law uses with powerful tactics. One is called intermittent reinforcement, which creates the idea a user could get a reward at any time. Think slot machines. Adults are susceptible, kids even more so because their brains aren't fully developed yet. But Suzy, is social media addictive? What's the point?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

There's no point. It's addictive. We all know. Anything that's mindless entertainment, whether it's social, whether it's games, whether it's, for some people, shopping, anything that brings you that sort of peace and quiet, whatever that looks like for you, is going to be addictive, especially as we think about how not great the world is right now. So there's no point. I also didn't understand this "intermittent rewards." I don't get rewards for being on social. What are the rewards?

Carina Perkins:

People like your post.

Marcus Johnson:

It's intermittent reinforcement. So it's just the opportunity to get rewarded at any time. So whether that's with certain-

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Nobody's given me money randomly.

Marcus Johnson:

No, but I think he means... Not an actual slot machine. Go on, Bill.

Carina Perkins:

It's when people like your tomato plant.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

I should post more then. I'm going to send you... There are so many more you guys aren't even going to believe [inaudible 00:23:30]-

Marcus Johnson:

Please don't post more.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

... November here. I'm going to send the picture for the Instagram page.

Marcus Johnson:

I don't want to speak on behalf of the world, but I think we're done with the tomato plants.

Bill, you were going to help explain-

Bill Fisher:

It's okay. I'll explain when it's my turn, because I'll talk all about reward.

Marcus Johnson:

Bill, well played, sir. Round of applause for Bill. Okay, enough. Enough applause.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

He knows how to game the system.

Marcus Johnson:

He does. Carina, you're up.

Carina Perkins:

Yeah. I think it's interesting because social media and the internet as a whole is quite an interesting paradox because it's got the potential to do so much good, and on the other hand, it's got the potential to do so much harm. I think Suzy's right. Of course, it's addictive. I guess there's some argument in the kind of harm that it causes. Is being addicted to social media, as the other consequences, as bad as being addicted to drugs or gambling? I guess it's what you are looking at on social media. If you're addicted to online shopping, that might have some financial consequences, I guess. But I do think social networks need to do more to protect younger users, but I think that's probably less about addiction and more from harmful content. And I think it's going to be really interesting to see what the online safety bill can achieve in the UK to that.

Marcus Johnson:

Bill.

Bill Fisher:

Yeah, so I'm a case in point. I think I've spoken many times about my mild addiction to TikTok. I clearly have a very young brain, because I'm very susceptible to this temptation reward. And the reward is the dopamine hit that I get. So I want the next video because I think it's going to be better than the last one. I'm waiting for a good video to come. And I'm going to keep scrolling until I get that really good video that's going to make me laugh and it's going to give me that dopamine hit. That's the reward. And I get pulled into this vicious cycle and that's why I spend two hours or more watching TikTok each day.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Or more.

Carina Perkins:

Or more.

Bill Fisher:

Yeah.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Did you hear how soft [inaudible 00:25:24] was?

Carina Perkins:

Almost. [inaudible 00:25:27].

Marcus Johnson:

Do some work, Bill.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

It's research.

Marcus Johnson:

Do some work.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

It's research.

Marcus Johnson:

I thought it was interesting-

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off. I cut him off. Sorry about that.

Marcus Johnson:

She did.

Bill Fisher:

No, I finished. That's it. That's it. I mean, the algorithms, I guess, is something else that are feeding this cycle, but it's dangerous. It's addictive. It really is.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Well, this is how I feel about the Weekly Listen, about the reward of winning.

Marcus Johnson:

That it's addictive?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Yeah.

Carina Perkins:

It's addictive.

Marcus Johnson:

Oh, winning? Not listening?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Bill is very, very-

Marcus Johnson:

I thought you meant listening to the show.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

That too, but winning.

Marcus Johnson:

No, it's fine.

Carina Perkins:

My internet addiction is looking at adverts for horses that I can't afford.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

That's cute. I play games. It's very sad.

Marcus Johnson:

Moving on. I thought it was interesting that there's no addiction definition. So it's saying 10 years ago the idea of internet gaming addiction was introduced. Dr. Michael Rich, Director of Digital Wellness Lab at the Digital Wellness Lab at Boston Children's Hospital, saying he prefers the term... Staying away from addiction, preferring the term, "problematic internet

media use," a term that's gained currency in recent years because he doesn't like the term addiction because the internet can be used, Carina, to your point, for a lot of good. But yeah, the idea of getting some kind of definition of addiction or problematic internet media use, I think, is quite interesting.

All right, folks. Let's move to round four. Bill's still out in front by just one point. So all to play for and double points, round four. We start with Carina. Encouraging consumers to recycle is a marketing win for brands. So why aren't they doing more of it? Questions Robert Clara of Adweek. He cites chemical engineer and paper scientist, Richard Venditti, who is a professor teaching unit ops of pulp and paper environmental lifecycle assessment and bioeconomy at North Carolina State University. Good god. Who says all pizza boxes can... All pizza boxes can, folks, in fact be recycled, according to him, who's somewhat of an expert, as you can tell from his title. "Encouraging customers to recycle their products is a potential win for brands," says Mr. Clara, who wrote the piece. "But most pizza brands have stayed away from the recycling issue, unwilling to wade into the morass of confusion that surrounds it." But Carina, encouraging folks to recycle, marketing win for brands apparently, but they're not doing it nearly enough, the article suggests. What's the point?

Carina Perkins:

Well, yeah. I think this is an interesting one because I think brands do do it more here in the UK and we've got a slightly different system here in the UK. But I think the point is that brands and consumers can have all the will in the world to recycle, but if the infrastructure isn't there, it's going to fail. So perhaps in the UK, we're a little bit ahead from the US on recycling, but I think that's partly because we're a much smaller country. It's much easier to get a joined up approach than it is somewhere like the US where you've got so many different states, so many different regions. And even here, rules will vary depending on regions. Some areas will recycle tetra pipe, others won't, and it's a confusing matter. So I think if we're ever going to really achieve a circular economy, we need to think outside the box... and find a way to-

Marcus Johnson:

Oh, there's more. Wait, why did you [inaudible 00:28:24]-

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Wait. Not only did she put a pun in there, but she had to tell us. Guys, that was awesome.



Carina Perkins:

I paused.

Marcus Johnson:

Oh, that's what it was. I thought you finished your answer. I was like, "Well, that's-"

Carina Perkins:

I was waiting for the hilarious laughter.

Marcus Johnson:

That was abrupt.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

I smiled.

Marcus Johnson:

You just finished. I've got a laugh track.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

No.

Carina Perkins:

We're going to have think outside the box and find ways to have a much more joined up approach across the government and business.

Marcus Johnson:

Well played. Bill.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

[inaudible 00:28:51].

Carina Perkins:

You can insert the [inaudible 00:28:53].

Marcus Johnson:

We won't. Just a tumbleweed. Do we have a tumbleweed on this nose machine? Vi, help us out. Bill, what you got mate?

Bill Fisher:

Yeah. Sorry. I'm getting over that joke.

Carina Perkins:

I stunned him into silence.

Bill Fisher:

Yeah.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

He's laughing. [inaudible 00:29:10] for the baby thing.

Carina Perkins:

I'm going for the sympathy points now.

Bill Fisher:

I agree with a lot of what Carina says there. I wonder if cost has got something to do with it. I think the piece talks a bit about different standards for different municipalities when it comes to recycling. In the UK, this was used recently as a political tool. The government talked about bringing in a six bin national service level whereby all households would get six bins into which they'd need to separate their various waste, and recycling the pushback from local councils was that it was just going to be prohibitively expensive to roll that out. So I just wonder for brands too, if there's some kind of similar consideration to that. Also, a realization that they can't just claim to be green by encouraging recycling, this green washing thing. They need to back it up with action, but that action might be a bit too costly at the moment.

Marcus Johnson:

Suzy.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

So I agree with everything. The other extra thing I would add to all of that is asking consumers to do mental math and adding a layer of complexity that seems counterintuitive is hard. And so when you have that component, plus the green washing, I think it's hard. It's asking for everybody to hold hands across the entire ecosystem and then putting all your faith in the consumer who will actually go through the trouble of recycling. Too hard. Sad, though.

Marcus Johnson:

All right, folks. That's all we've got time for the Game of the Week. Oh, interesting. 2021 P&PB study showing 57% of folks were aware that pizza boxes are recyclable. But yeah, I feel like everyone just knows anecdotally. You ask folks, some people will be like, "That is recyclable. That's not." No one can seem to agree just in life, in general, in our personal lives. So yeah, we can understand the confusion. All right, folks, that's all we've got time for for the Game of the Week. This week's winner. A drum roll. A drum roll.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

My hands are sweaty. Come on.

Marcus Johnson:

Bill is this week's winner of the Game of the Week. That's the best... That's all I've got on this. I don't know what I normally do. Let's just do round of applause.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Carina and I are on pins and needles over here waiting for you to call Bill's name.

Marcus Johnson:

Yeah, it was always going to be Bill. Congratulations to Bill.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

We already knew that.

Marcus Johnson:

He is the winner of the Game of the Week.

Carina Perkins:

Well done, Bill.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Well done. Woo.

Marcus Johnson:

Didn't feel as genuine from Suzy. Bill, you had 13, carina 12. That puts Suzy in last place [inaudible 00:31:36].

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Oh, come on. Nobody [inaudible 00:31:38] you.

Carina Perkins:

That's a pretty clear British win then.

Marcus Johnson:

Yeah. Yeah, yeah. Gold, silver. No one really remembers bronze.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Well, you are British, so obviously.

Marcus Johnson:

Actually, I'm American. Born in the States.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

You know what? We were wondering... I'm not going to say who the we were, but it's not just me and it was not my idea so I'm not taking any credit for this. Are you keeping track of the Weekly Listen, the people who've won the most in a year?

Marcus Johnson:

It won't be you, so don't worry. Bill, do you have any last final words?

Bill Fisher:

I've never won this thing, to your question, Suzy-

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Oh, says everybody.

Bill Fisher:

... I don't think I have. I've never prepared for a final word. Beware of TikTok, kids. It's dangerous. It rots your brain.

Marcus Johnson:

Nevermind kids. Adults, everyone. Bill, we've got to get you out more. You live on the South Coast. It's beautiful. Let's move on. It's time now for Dinner Party Data. This is the part of the show where we tell you about the most interesting thing we've learned this week.

We start with Bill, because he won.

Bill Fisher:

Okay. So we've talked about news. So I thought I'd regale you with a couple of newspaper stats. The UK's first daily newspaper first went into circulation in 1702. It was called the Daily Courant, C-O-U-R-A-N-T. Lots of newspapers followed. And 144 years later, a newspaper called The Daily News hit the streets in 1846. And it had a very famous editor. Think of the year. Any guesses on who that editor might be? It's seasonal as well. There's a clue.

Marcus Johnson:

Oh, no.

Bill Fisher:

It was Charles Dickens. Charles Dickens was the first editor-

Marcus Johnson:

I was going to Charles Dickens. Yeah.

Bill Fisher:

... Of the Daily News.

Carina Perkins:

Yeah. Cool.

Marcus Johnson:

[inaudible 00:33:32] because it's Bill, but there's a delay from the US to [inaudible 00:33:36].

Bill Fisher:

Yeah. And he was a supporter of the Liberal Party and he wanted a commentary that would compete with the Times, which was a more right-wing publication. So again, evidence that influencers have always been a part of media publications.

Marcus Johnson:

Interesting. Very nice. Very nice. Let's go Carina because she was second. Not Suzy.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Thanks.

Carina Perkins:

I thought I would do some fun recycling facts.

Marcus Johnson:

Oh, well played.

Carina Perkins:

Yeah, thanks. So each UK household produces over one ton of waste per year, which is the same weight as a small car.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Wow.

Marcus Johnson:

England.

Carina Perkins:

Every year, the average dust bin contains enough unrealized energy for 500 baths, 3,500 showers, or 5,000 hours of television. I don't know how many hours of TikTok, Bill. And on average, every person in the UK throws away their own body weight in waste every seven weeks.

Marcus Johnson:

Oh. Could've done without that last one. Anything else, Carina?

Carina Perkins:

Yeah. Up to 60% of the waste that ends up in the bin could be recycled.

Marcus Johnson:

60%?

Carina Perkins:

60%.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Especially food.

Marcus Johnson:

Oh. Wow. Okay. That was depressing, but sobering. Thanks for bringing those. We've got a long weekend to look forward to here, Carina. Not anymore. Not anymore. Who's next? Suzy.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

So I told a lot of friends that I had Friday off for Remembrance Day, and nobody knew what I was talking about.

Marcus Johnson:

Oh, good.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Which made me realize that here it's called Veterans Day in the US, and I still think of it as Remembrance Day, which is observed by all of Commonwealth countries-

Marcus Johnson:

Oh, you still call it Remembrance Day back in Canada?

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Yeah.

Marcus Johnson:

Oh, nice.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Observed by Commonwealth countries to honor those who died on the front line of World War I, and it was the end of the hostilities. It is marked on November 11th at 11:00 AM with a two minutes of silence, which is when World War I ended in 1918. It was once called Armistice Day until World War II, and then it moved into Remembrance Day. I assume you guys also have the poppies. The poppies are what symbolizes Remembrance Day. There are veterans that are walking around handing them out for a little donation, which I think is very sweet. And when we were kids, I don't know about you all in the UK, but we had to learn the poem. It's a Canadian author, so maybe you didn't have to learn it. In Flanders Field, which was penned in 1915 by a doctor and a Lieutenant Colonel, John McCrae.

Marcus Johnson:

Very good.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Did you guys learn the poem?

Carina Perkins:

Can you read us the poem?

Marcus Johnson:

The whole poem? No, no, no. We don't have time.

Carina Perkins:

Well, a snippet.



Suzy Davidkhanian:

When I was learning it 30 some more years ago, it was In Flanders Field "where the poppies grow," but now it's "blow," so I'm not really sure what happened that they switched up the word. I don't know if there was something wrong with the word grow, because it's a bit of a sad reason why the poppies grow.

Carina Perkins:

Perhaps they don't actually there.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Apparently it's the poppies are in a lot of the landscapes in that part of the world.

Marcus Johnson:

Very nice.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

So happy Remembrance Day, and if you're listening from the US, Happy Veterans Day.

Marcus Johnson:

Same. Yeah. Yes, indeed. Very nice, very nice. I've got one for you real quick. Where daylight savings comes from. So Olivia B. Waxman of TIME Magazine seems to have figured it out. Here's a short history for you. The first daylight savings time policy began in Germany, May 1st, 1916, in the hopes that it would save energy during World War I, as according to Michael Downing, author of Spring Forward, which is the book about it. British builder William Willett in 1907 was arguing, so this is the year after, that the sun shines for several hours each day whilst we're asleep, and passed way before they wrote it into law, but England soon adopted daylight savings time after that. I don't know why he was championing it. I guess he's a builder, so maybe he wants more time in the daylight to work. But anyway. England got it very shortly after.

And then the first US law on daylight savings time went into effect March 19th, 1918 for the same fuel saving reasons. It was a bit of a patchwork until 1966 where the Uniform Time Act was signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson, became the first peace time daylight savings time law. However, Arizona and Hawaii are the two states who don't observe daylight savings.

That's where it came from. Some people think it's because of farmers, but it's not, apparently. It could be. Who really knows any of this stuff? Not me.

One other fact though, recent Pew Research article notes that only about a third of the world's country's practice daylight savings. Most of Europe, North America, Canada, Mexico, US, Brazil, Chile, Mongolia, Australia, New Zealand, and a few others. Egypt actually got rid of it and then brought it back, and about half the world used to observe daylight savings. Just a third does now. So miserable, isn't it? Miss me with the, "Oh, an extra hour of sleep." That lasts for an hour and then you have to just be in darkness for the next five months. I can't be around it. I have to be. I live here. Thank you so much to my guests for hanging out today. Thank you to Suzy.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Thanks for having me.

Marcus Johnson:

She came in last. Thank you to Carina.

Carina Perkins:

Thanks, Marcus. Great as always.

Marcus Johnson:

She came in second and gets the silver. Well played. And finally, thank you to Bill, winner of the Game of the Week with the magnificent gold.

Bill Fisher:

Thank you, Marcus. That was incredibly enjoyable.

Marcus Johnson:

You are more than welcome.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Without even a smile.

Marcus Johnson:

Well played. Thank you to Victoria who edits the show. James, who copy edits it. Stewart, who runs the team, Sophie who does the social media. Thanks to everyone for listening in. Our surprise question, giveaway question, if you missed it was, what was the Beatles official debut single? If you know the correct answer, you can email us at [podcastmarketer.com](mailto:podcastmarketer.com) or DM us on Instagram, [insiderintelligence](https://www.instagram.com/insiderintelligence), one word is where you can find us. And please include a screenshot of your review of this podcast, and you could win a free Behind The Numbers branded water bottle. We're off tomorrow though for Veterans Day. Thanks to all of the men and women for serving or who have served, which includes my dad who served in the US Air Force for 20 years. Couldn't be prouder of you. We'll see you guys hopefully on Monday, because we're off tomorrow, for the Behind The Numbers daily and E-marketer podcast. Happy, happy weekends.

Stuart, if you're watching this, I'd love some lights. It'd be great. Can you just sit in the corner of the room and just wait and then just press the button? Bring a laptop in or a snack perhaps so you have something to get up to. It looks like I've just got, just from here, just half a face.

Suzy Davidkhanian:

Oh, yeah. I didn't notice.

Carina Perkins:

Yeah. It looks quite good, actually. Yeah.

Marcus Johnson:

Thanks. Appreciate it.

Carina Perkins:

Yeah. Looks like a green screen.

Marcus Johnson:

Stuart, the lights. Don't worry, I've got a light in my phone. Stuart, the lights.