List A (Print media):

This article is from The Conversation and is titled as "Australians say AI shouldn't produce political news, but it's OK for sport: new research". The article can be accessed online at [The Conversation](#) website.

Although this article is presented online in web format, it can still be classified as **print media**. The structure of a traditional newspaper, the written language style, and the purpose of dissemination are more in line with the style of traditional publications.

The article outlines that **Australian public acceptance of AI-generated news varies depending on the topic type**. The public is more tolerant of sports and entertainment content (with acceptance rates of 31% and 26%, respectively), but significantly less acceptance of political or crime-related topics (with acceptance rates of only 19% and 21%, respectively).

The first paragraph of the article gives readers an introduction to the rise of generative AI tools like ChatGPT and sets the stage for the discussion: news organizations are already using these technologies to generate content. This **background** information helps readers who are unfamiliar with the current situation to realize that AI is already widely involved in news writing, understand why this issue is important now.

The **lede** to this article is in the second paragraph:

> "But what does the public think about the increasing role of AI in the production of news?"

It serves as a 'hook,' shifting the focus from the background to the research itself. By posing a question, it encourages readers to reflect on the keyword public attitude in relation to their own circumstances, thereby further stimulating their curiosity.

The **summary** of the article is in the middle of the article:

> "This year's Digital News Report: Australia 2024 finds Australians prefer news that is made by humans, rather than AI, but the degree of discomfort depends on the topic."
> "The online survey of 2,003 adult Australians finds they are much more comfortable with sport (31%) and entertainment (26%) news being produced mainly by AI than with politics (19%) and crime (21%) news being produced the same way (see the chart below)."

These two paragraphs present the most important data results to readers in a concise manner, using clear data and data sources. Using a large amount of real data in this way makes readers feel more convinced.

The **main results** of the article are in the fifth and sixth paragraphs:

> "59% say they feel uneasy about news produced by AI with human oversight."

> "Compared to 28% who say they're uncomfortable about news that is mainly produced by human journalists with AI assistance."

Unlike some articles that place the main finding at the end, this news article places it in the before half of the article, ensuring that readers can quickly access the key conclusions. The latter section includes three

supporting analyses, which are further explained with three aspects: the public's understanding of AI in the news, the public's trust in AI, and the public's attitude towards the use of AI. Based on such article structure, placing the main results at the beginning helps readers form a clear initial view before reading the more specific analyses.

Print B (Blog posts):

This article is from FiveThirtyEight and is titled as "How Many People Can You Remember?". It can be accessed online through the [FiveThirtyEight](#) website.

This article is a typical **blog post**. It uses a letter format and informal first-person expression, allowing complex scientific research results to be presented in an understandable and engaging way.

The article explores **how many faces and names a person can remember cognitively**. By drawing on psychology, social experiments, and evolutionary theory, the article clearly states that human memory is limited, and we can usually only reliably remember about 150 relationships.

The **background** information for this article is provided in the third paragraph. It begins with common knowledge that everyone knows, giving readers a basic understanding of facial memory issues. This structure is designed to lower the threshold for readers, making it easier for them to engage with the article.

This article does not have a clear **lede** that summarizes the content of the article. However, the author cleverly begins with sentences in letter format and sentences that interact with actions, with the following words:

> *"Dear Joe,*
>
> *First up, let me try to look at faces."*

This highly interactive sentence can increase the reader's empathy and quickly draw them into the discussion of the topic.

The **summary** of the article is in the middle of the article:

> *"Most research has focused instead on how many people you know and can remember (along with their names). I'll share some of it here because it's pretty interesting and still relevant to your question."*

This passage clearly explains to readers the shift in the research question of the article: from the question that is difficult to quantify ("How many faces or names can people remember before?") to a more practical topic that has been widely studied ("How many other people can people recognize and remember?").

The **main result** is located at the end of the article:

> *"From all this, Dunbar inferred that "there is a cognitive limit to the number of individuals with whom any one person can maintain stable relationships." So, chances are, there are about 150 people whose names and faces you can remember without a prompt — and a hell of a lot more acquaintances that would come to mind with the right encouragement."*

This structural arrangement allows readers to easily remember the conclusion after reading the article. Meanwhile, combined with the special letter format, this structure allows readers to feel as if they have worked hard with the author to reach the conclusion, rather than simply being presented with a conclusion, leaving a deeper impression on readers.

List C (Presentations/Video):

This analysis is sourced from the YouTube channel Guardian Australia, with the title "How did Australia's housing market get so bad and is it all negative gearing's fault?". It can be accessed online through [YouTube](#).

This is clearly an explanatory news **video**. It is posted on YouTube, a video-sharing website, and conveys information to the public through the reporter's commentary and images.

The video explores **what negative gearing is and whether it is the root cause of Australia's housing crisis**. The video mentions that while it does play a role, other factors—such as tax policies (particularly capital gains tax discounts)—have also contributed to the current housing crisis.

The **background** introduction is approximately in the 0:05－0:25 of the video. Using a simple and easily understandable time series chart of personal disposable income and housing prices as an example, the video gives viewers an overview of changes in the Australian housing market from 1990 to 2022. Since the video is targeted at the public, this introduction quickly provides viewers who are unfamiliar with the housing market with an overall concept, allowing them to begin to think about why this situation has arisen.

The **lede** of this video is the first sentence at the beginning. Accompanied by the dynamic display of charts on the screen, it makes viewers who click on the link curious about what will happen next.

The **summary** section of the video is roughly between 0:40 and 1:10. It quickly introduces the argument that negative gearing is not solely to blame, but rather the result of multiple factors. This allows viewers to quickly grasp the key points of the video.

The **main result** section is between 3:50 and 4:30 in the video. The statement, *"Negative gearing is just the spark that needed a lit match to set it alight,"* clearly identifies the housing crisis because of multiple factors. This section is positioned during the peak attention period for viewers. With the help of rhetorical devices, this structural arrangement allows viewers to immediately remember the conclusion, providing them with a memorable quote.