

Audience Use and Perceptions of AI Assistants for News

Research Findings
October 2025

BBC



Contents

- Introduction3**
 - About the Research..... 5**
- AI summaries – trusted by many, but are often inaccurate6**
- All errors matter....but some matter more.....8**
 - Factual Errors..... 8**
 - Opinion as Fact 9**
 - Sourcing and Attribution Errors.....10**
 - Introduction of Opinions.....11**
- What audiences take from this?..... 12**
- The Chain of Accountability: Who Pays the Price? 13**
- Appendix – Technical note..... 15**
 - Nationally representative survey: 15
 - Online deliberative focus groups: 15
 - AI summaries and errors: 16

Introduction

Over recent years, the news landscape has grown increasingly complex for audiences to navigate. Traditional news outlets have been joined by new brands, social platforms, and influencers. Off-platform discovery is mediated by algorithms and has changed how people encounter and judge news in the first place. Misinformation and fake news are a concern too. More than half (56%) of the UK audience instinctively agree it is hard to know who to trust for online news.

AI assistants have now joined this landscape. Assistants like OpenAI's ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Microsoft Copilot, and Perplexity provide users with AI-generated summaries of the news. These summaries draw on reporting from a range of news providers, taking what they have written about a topic and using that content as the basis for an AI-generated summary. For example, an AI assistant might respond to a user query "what's the latest on the war in Ukraine?" by accessing content from a range of publishers and then constructing an AI-generated summary of those sources. The sources can include established news outlets, smaller and newer publishers, specialist sources, and individual voices.

The use of AI assistants for news appears to be growing in popularity. The Reuters Institute's Digital News Report¹ suggests that 7% of people who access news on the internet use AI assistants for news, but that doubles to 15% for under-25s.

However, research undertaken by the BBC and the EBU found that 45% of responses from leading AI assistants contained at least one significant error².

This study was designed to explore these issues from an audience perspective. Specifically, it aimed to:

- **Explore audience perceptions** of using AI tools for news.
- **Investigate how audiences respond to errors** in AI-generated news summaries.
- **Identify who is held accountable for these errors** and what the broader impact is on trust in media.

So what did we find?

First – despite the errors we know can exist in AI summaries, many users perceive AI assistants as trustworthy. Our study found that just over a third of UK adults say they trust AI to produce accurate summaries of information. And this figure rises to half of under 35s.

Second – we tested the real-world impact of these errors on audience trust. We found that the presence of errors had a significant impact on people's trust in AI summaries. 84% said a factual error would have a major impact on their trust in an AI summary, with 76% saying the same about errors of sourcing and attribution. This was also high for errors where AI presented opinion as fact (81%) and introduced an opinion itself (73%).

Third – people don't just blame the AI assistant for the error. While 36% of UK adults say AI providers should ensure the accuracy and quality of AI responses, and 31% say the Government or regulators should set and enforce the rules. 23% say news providers should carry responsibility for content associated with their name – even when the error is a product of AI summarisation. Because association carries weight, an error in an AI summary can dent confidence in the outlet named alongside it, not just in the tool. More than 1 in 3 (35%) of UK adults instinctively agree the news source should be held responsible for errors in AI-generated news.

These findings raise major concerns. Many people assume AI summaries of news content are accurate, when they are not; and when they see errors, they blame news providers as well as AI developers – even if those mistakes are a product of the AI assistant. Ultimately, these errors could negatively impact people's trust in news and news brands.

About the Research

This work uses a robust, UK-focused methodology designed to move beyond surface-level opinion and uncover the deeper, more complex attitudes audiences have towards AI in the sensitive context of news.

- **A nationally representative survey:**

A 10-minute online survey of 2,000 UK adults (aged 16-75) was conducted in May 2025. To move beyond stated opinion and capture subconscious attitudes, the survey incorporated Ipsos's Binary Response Time (BRT) methodology. This technique measures the speed of agreement or disagreement, revealing the gap between what audiences say and what they instinctively feel. This was critical for uncovering the tension between AI's perceived utility and the underlying anxiety it provokes. The survey also quantitatively measured the impact of different types of error on trust.

- **Online Deliberative Focus Groups:**

We conducted six in-depth online workshops with 36 participants representing a cross-section of UK nations, ages, genders, and levels of digital familiarity. Rather than discussing AI in the abstract, participants were presented with a series of real-life AI-generated news summaries. These summaries contained one of four types of error: factual inaccuracies (e.g. wrong dates), sourcing errors (e.g. attributing information to the wrong news brand), opinions presented as fact, and the introduction of new, unsourced opinions. These summaries had been generated using market-leading AI assistants, and the errors were present in the original responses.


This deliberative exercise allowed us to explore their immediate reactions upon discovering an error, understand how it affected their trust in both the AI and the news brand, and identify who they ultimately held accountable.

AI summaries – trusted by many, but are often inaccurate

AI summaries promise speed and clarity and are perceived as valuable. Nearly half of people (47%) instinctively agree that “I find news summaries helpful for understanding complex topics.”

Part of their appeal is that AI summaries are assumed to be accurate. In our research we found that just **over a third of UK adults say they trust AI to produce accurate summaries of information. And this figure rises to half of under 35s.**

For many, this trust is built on the assumption that AI-generated summaries are inherently correct. Many believe that because Gen AI is a machine, it is less prone to error or bias. This creates passive trust, where confident, well-written output is taken at face value rather than interrogated.

 **We as humans expect other humans to make mistakes, but with AI, you'd expect it to give out the right answer no matter what. It's artificial intelligence after all and it uses information from the internet so naturally, you'd expect it to always know the answer.”**

Male, 55+, high-med digital familiarity.

However, as noted in the introduction, other research has highlighted how AI summaries can often contain errors. This research, undertaken by the BBC and the European Broadcasting Union (EBU)², shows that error rates are high and systemic across markets and languages. In fact, 45% of responses contained at least one meaningful error. Sourcing is the single biggest cause of these issues (31%), followed by accuracy (20% of responses contained an accuracy error).

Why do many people think they're accurate when they are often not?

Our previous research shows that audiences scan responses for cues like dates, figures, and named sources. When these are present, the content feels credible, current, and safe to accept – even when it is not.

We also find is that there is a clear gap between what people say they *do* and what they will *actually do*. For example, though 64% instinctively agree that it is important to watch out for errors in AI content, only 38% instinctively say that they would question the information presented in a summary that was generated by AI. In reality, when copy looks neutral and cites familiar names, the impulse to verify is low.

“I think it’s fine if you’re using AI for things like news summaries because it’s just a simple or simplified tool to gather information, but I would probably still fact-check anything that comes out of it. It’s easy for AI to use opinions as facts, so you want to make sure you’re getting actual facts from it.”

Female, 18-34, high-med digital familiarity.

“People say they’ll be cautious, but most of us skim and don’t notice small errors – unless it’s something big.”

Male, 55+, high-med digital familiarity.

This is the real risk of Gen AI in news: its veneer of objectivity can lull audiences into a false sense of certainty. The same convenience that makes summaries so appealing can dull the instinct to double-check. In a fast, fragmented feed of information, this creates a blind spot where small errors, missing context, and subtle bias slip by unnoticed – quietly eroding understanding and trust.

All errors matter... but some matter more

To understand the real-world impact of AI inaccuracies on audience trust, this study presented participants with AI-generated news summaries which contained one of four types of error. These summaries had been generated using market-leading AI assistants, and the errors were present in the original responses. The types of error were:

- Factual inaccuracies (e.g. an incorrect date for an event)
- Opinions presented as fact (e.g. framing a subjective viewpoint as an objective statement)
- Sourcing and attribution errors (e.g. incorrectly attributing information to the wrong news brand)
- Introduction of opinions (e.g. adding a subjective layer of analysis not present in the original article)

Across the board, errors damaged confidence, not only in the summary but in how the named source was seen. Each type carried a distinct implication for how audiences judge credibility, impartiality, and control.

Factual Errors

Accuracy is the baseline audiences expect from news. When an AI summary gets a simple fact wrong – a date, a name, a number – **it doesn't feel like a small slip, it feels like the whole thing cannot be trusted.**

84% of UK adults say a factual error would have a major impact on their trust in an AI summary. When participants were told the summary contained an error, many described a jolt of disbelief, followed by a sense of being let down. On sensitive or fast-moving stories, many said it reads less like an error and more like misinformation. In the moment, many said they'll check elsewhere, share less and be more cautious next time, especially on high-stakes topics.

In practice, intentions don't always match behaviour: when a later summary looks clean and cites recognisable outlets or institutions, some revert to skimming rather than verifying. Where doubt lands also depends on the error. For a technical slip, such as a wrong date, people tend to fault the AI tool. When a mistake changes meaning – for example, misreporting key figures or presenting opinion as fact – the weight shifts towards the named source and its process.

“If AI is supposed to be so good, how is it making mistakes on the dates in the summary? There’s so many articles with the correct dates so what’s it doing wrong?”

Female, 55+, high-med digital familiarity.

Opinion as Fact

Errors of interpretation unsettle in a different way. When an AI summary packages a viewpoint as if it were an established fact, the boundary between reporting and opinion is crossed.

81% say this would have a major impact on trust in an AI summary. It's harder to spot than a wrong date, which is part of the problem. Calm tone and tidy prose can make a judgment sound like 'truth', especially when a known outlet, journalist or public institution is name-checked. The effect intensifies on high-stakes topics such as politics, public services, or health, where even a small slip in tone colours the whole piece. Two things drive the reaction. First, impartiality feels compromised: a neutral-sounding machine adopting a stance suggests hidden bias. Second, agency is misread: the system appears to "think" or take a side. That error felt to our participants like a betrayal rather than a slip, and why clarity matters so much. Separating what's known from what's conjecture, preserving quotes verbatim, attributing viewpoints to named individuals, and using clear labels for analysis all help readers keep their bearings.

“You don't expect AI to be opinionated, because when you're using it, you're looking for fact and not opinions. When you use AI putting your trust in it to give you the correct information, not opinions which are debateable.”

Female, 18-34, high-med digital familiarity.

Sourcing and Attribution Errors

Names, links, and timestamps are the quick checks people use to decide if something can be believed. When those cues are wrong, confidence collapses. 76% say a sourcing or attribution error would damage their trust in an AI summary. At first glance, things like a recognisable masthead, a named journalist, and working links function as credibility signals on whether to continue to read. Misattributing a claim to a respected outlet lends false legitimacy to weaker material. Miscrediting a lower-quality source to a trusted name unfairly harms the latter. Either way, doubt spreads beyond the summary.

If a trusted outlet or authority is attached to something that doesn't sound right, people questioned both the content and the name attached. Sourcing errors also raised expectations about oversight. Many said that publishers should care how their names and stories travel, even when the wording is generated by AI. Where provenance is clear and consistent (e.g. publisher, author, publication time, update notes, and working links), summaries feel sturdier.

“To me, it discredits the sources in a way. For example, here, the 1st one is related to the BBC. For me, I'd think, hang on a minute, what's the BBC doing involved in this? It almost makes me not want to believe the sources that are listed.”

Female, 18-34, low-med digital familiarity.

Introduction of Opinions

When an AI summary adds analysis or a viewpoint that wasn't in the original reporting, a boundary is crossed. This isn't just another accuracy issue; it feels like the system has started to "have a view" of its own. 73% say the introduction of unsourced opinion would damage their trust in AI summaries. It's harder to spot than a wrong date, which is part of the problem. Calm, tidy language can make a judgement sound like truth, especially when a recognisable outlet, journalist, or public institution is cited alongside it. On high-stakes topics – such as politics, public services, or health – even a small speculative line colours the whole piece.

What makes this land so hard is control and clarity. Audiences expect a summary to reflect what the underlying articles actually say. When a new opinion appears without attribution, the boundary between reporting and commentary blurs, and intent is misread. The summary feels like it's steering, not explaining. This also creates a reputational effect. If an AI summary introduces opinion while citing a trusted source, the source can appear partial even though it didn't write the wording. The outlet's impartiality looks compromised by an addition the outlet didn't make, yet its name is still what audiences see and judge.

Visible care helps to steady confidence. Separating what's known from what's conjecture, preserving quotes verbatim, attributing viewpoints to named individuals, and linking to fuller context gives readers a way to keep their bearings. Where editorial ownership is clear and update notes are visible, trust starts to recover.

“ I think AI can easily damage reputations for different organisations...for example, people might begin to distrust the BBC because of this – it's not really fair for them.”

Female, 55+, high-med digital familiarity.

What audiences take from this?

When asked to weigh different mistakes, **audiences consistently ranked factual errors as the most damaging to trust**. Yet the gap between error types is narrow. Only 11% said any mistake would have no impact at all, which reinforces a simple truth in news: all errors matter. In fact, in glance-based settings where readers make quick judgements, small inaccuracies don't stay small. A wrong date or a misplaced credit in the first version of an AI summary can anchor understanding before any correction is seen.

Once errors are made salient, attitudes and behaviour shift quickly. After being made aware that summaries may contain mistakes, those who instinctively disagreed with "I trust Gen AI to summarise news for me" rose by 11 percentage points. 45% said they'd be less likely to use Gen AI to ask about the news in future, rising to 50% among those aged 35+. Audiences feel this isn't just about AI adoption, it affects willingness to engage with news more broadly. That raises the bar on first-time accuracy, care with quotes and sourcing, and corrections that are easy to spot.

The damage also doesn't stay with the Gen AI output. Trust erosion extends to the platform and, most critically, to the original source named within it. What helps recover confidence are clear signals of care: provenance that travels, working links, timestamps and update notes, and timely corrections tied back to the reporting. Audiences also expect fixes to be reflected wherever they're likely to see the summary again, not just in one place.

The Chain of Accountability: Who Pays the Price?

When an AI summary goes wrong, responsibility doesn't stop with the technology. Audiences spread accountability across the chain that creates, governs, and distributes what they see. That expectation is tied to a wider unease about the craft itself: 54% of UK adults instinctively agree they're concerned about the impact of AI on the future of journalism. With that concern in mind, people want to know who ensures quality up front and who steps in when mistakes happen.

On responsibility for getting it right, most UK adults say AI providers (36%) and the UK Government or regulators (31%) should ensure the accuracy and quality of Gen AI responses, with one in four (23%) saying news providers should carry responsibility for content associated with their name. When assigning blame for an error, the pattern is similar: high fault is placed on the AI tech (20%) and the AI providers behind it (18%), but news providers still receive some blame (13%) whenever their name appears in or alongside the summary (and an error is found).

Views differ a little by age. Under-35s are more likely to point to regulators first, arguing that clearer rules should already be in place. Over-35s tend to fault the technology, while still expecting publishers and regulators to step in when things go wrong. Across groups, people held the source cited in the summary at least partly responsible for any errors.

Association carries weight. If a trusted outlet is cited in an AI summary, many expect that outlet to stand behind what appears on screen, regardless of how it was produced. It's an ethical expectation as much as a technical one: if a name signals trust in one context, care is expected when that name travels into another.



Ethically, I think the journalists need to review whatever AI spits out and make sure they're happy with it. It only takes a couple of minutes to make sure things are right."

Female, 55+, high-med digital familiarity.

54% of UK adults instinctively agree “I am concerned about the impact of AI on the future of journalism”

The implication is simple. Errors made by third-party Gen AI tools create direct reputational exposure for the sources they cite. Audiences look for signs that responsibility is being taken in practice: provenance that travels with the summary, working links back to the reporting, timestamps and update notes, and timely corrections where the summary is actually encountered. They also expect the fix to be reflected wherever the summary appears, not just in one place.

Taken together, these expectations set the tone for what comes next. If accountability is shared but reputational risk concentrates on the named source, the next question is how each link in the chain makes that accountability real – who acts first, how fixes travel, and what standards make responsibility visible.

Appendix - Technical note

Nationally representative survey:

This study was conducted by Ipsos on behalf of the BBC. Ipsos conducted a 10-minute online survey of a representative sample of 2,000 participants aged 16-75 in the UK. Fieldwork took place in May 2025. The survey incorporated Ipsos's Binary Response Time (BRT) methodology, a technique that measures the speed of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements.

The sample was split into 2 equal groups, with one being a control group that was simply shown an AI news summary and the test group being shown an AI news summary with additional text explaining that journalists have checked and found errors within this response. Each of the 2 groups was also split evenly into sub-groups and shown one of 4 AI news summaries (which contained one of the four errors outlined in this study), with the test group also seeing an explanation of the error type that was relevant to the summary they saw.

All data were weighted to nationally represent of the UK market in terms of age within gender, region, educational attainment and working status. The data for each subgroup sample were weighted to be nationally representative by age within gender, region, educational attainment and working status.

Online deliberative focus groups:

Ipsos conducted six in-depth online workshops in May 2025 with 36 participants representing a cross-section of UK nations, ages, genders, and levels of digital familiarity. During these sessions, participants were presented with a series of real-life AI-generated news summaries. These summaries contained one of four types of error factual inaccuracies (e.g. wrong dates), sourcing errors (e.g. attributing information to the wrong news brand), opinions presented as fact, and the introduction of new, unsourced opinions. These summaries had been generated using market-leading AI assistants, and the errors were present in the original responses.

- x6 2-hour deliberative workshops with 36 participants in the UK
- Split by age groups and digital familiarity

Sample Specification

Per workshop, participants had:

- An even mix of gender
- Mix of ethnicity
- All to engage with core areas of interest, e.g. content (news, weather, sport, education) and media types (broadcast/VOD, radio, sounds, etc.)
- A mix of social seg and income
- Split by age bracket and level of digital familiarity in the UK follows:


UK						
Workshop #	1	2	3	4	5	6
Age	18-34		35-54		55+	
Digital Familiarity	Med/High	Low/Med	Med/High	Low/Med	Med/High	Low/Med

AI summaries and errors:

Below are details of the 4 AI summaries included within both the survey and focus groups, including an example of the test used to explain each of the error types these contain:

Factual inaccuracies

“Journalists have checked this response and found it contains factual errors, such as numbers, dates or other information being summarised inaccurately.”


NEWS AI

What happened to Michael Mosley?

Dr. Michael Mosley, the renowned science broadcaster and program creator, has tragically passed away at the age of 67. His body was discovered on the Greek island of Syml, four days after he went missing^[1].

Disappearance and Discovery
Dr. Mosley was last seen on Wednesday, October 30, 2024, at approximately 13:30 local time (11:30 BST) when he left Agios Nikolaos beach to go for a walk^[2]. After he was reported missing, Greek authorities launched an extensive search operation amid scorching temperatures^[2].

On Sunday, November 3, 2024, Dr. Mosley's body was found on a hillside near Agia Marina beach bar^[2]. A bar manager discovered the body after the island's mayor noticed something unusual near the fence of the bar and alerted staff^[2].


Cause of Death
According to a police source, Dr. Mosley had been deceased "for a number of days" when his body was found^[2]. An initial post-mortem examination has concluded that he died of natural causes, and foul play has been ruled out^[2]. CCTV footage reportedly shows Dr. Mosley disappearing from view as he descends a hillside near where his body was eventually discovered^[3].

Family Statement
Dr. Clare Bailey Mosley, Michael's wife, issued a statement expressing the family's relief that he had come so close to making it back safely^[2]. She described how her husband had braved the intense heat and rocky terrain to cross to the other side of the bay, stating, "He did an incredible climb, took the wrong route, and collapsed where he couldn't be easily seen by the extensive search team."^[2]

Sources:
[1] <https://www.bbc.com/mediacentre/2024/michael-mosley-just-one-thing-series-honouring-late-broadcaster>
[2] <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c1dd7elyrpyo>
[3] <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c3gg149832do>

Opinions presented as fact

“Journalists have checked this response and found it contains opinions presented as facts errors, such as opinions of people involved in or commenting on the news being stated as fact.”


NEWS AI

Who could use the assisted dying law?

The proposed assisted dying law in England and Wales would allow terminally ill adults who are expected to die within six months to seek assistance to end their own lives.^[1] To be eligible, individuals must meet several criteria:

- 1. Residency:** They must be residents of England or Wales and registered with a GP for at least 12 months.^[2]
- 2. Mental Capacity:** They must have the mental capacity to make the decision and express a clear, settled, and informed wish to die, free from coercion or pressure.^[2]
- 3. Life Expectancy:** They must be expected to die within six months.^[2]
- 4. Legal Declarations:** They must make two separate declarations, witnessed and signed, about their wish to die.^[2]
- 5. Medical Approval:** Two independent doctors must confirm the person's eligibility, and a High Court judge must also review the case.^[2]


The person themselves must self-administer the approved substance, and no one else is allowed to administer it.^[1] The law includes strict safeguards to prevent coercion and ensure that the decision is made freely and with full understanding.

It's a significant and sensitive topic with strong opinions on both sides. What are your thoughts on this proposed law?

Sources:
[1] <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/ckgpkp79npg0> [2] <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cx207m6r65do>

Sourcing and attribution errors

“Journalists have checked this response and found it contains sourcing errors, such as links to original news articles that don’t contain the relevant information.”

NEWS AI

How is the UK addressing the rise in shoplifting incidents?

The UK is taking several measures to address the rise in shoplifting incidents.^[1] Here are some key actions being implemented:


- Increased Police Presence:** Police forces across the country, including Southampton and Cambridgeshire, have increased patrols in high-crime areas to deter shoplifters and provide reassurance to business owners.^{[1][2]} This includes high-visibility patrols and working with private security firms.^{[1][2]}
- Days of Action:** Police have organized specific “days of action” to target shoplifting hotspots.^[1] These operations involve plain-clothes officers and increased collaboration with local businesses to identify and apprehend repeat offenders.^[1]
- Community Engagement:** Police forces are engaging with local communities to raise awareness and encourage reporting of shoplifting incidents.^[1] This includes meeting with business owners and shoppers to discuss solutions and show that their concerns are being taken seriously.^[1]
- Legal Consequences:** There have been numerous arrests and prosecutions of prolific offenders.^[1] For example, in Bath, four prolific offenders were charged with multiple shoplifting offences, and in Erdington, police are targeting persistent shoplifters with additional resources.^{[1][3]}
- Support for Shop Workers:** Efforts are being made to support shop workers who face threats and abuse from shoplifters.^[1] This includes providing faster support and reassurance to those who regularly deal with aggressive behavior.^[1]

These measures aim to reduce the impact of shoplifting on businesses and communities, but the challenge remains significant. What are your thoughts on these efforts?

Sources:
[1] <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-hampshire-68152250> [2] <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c5y77qeyko>
[3] <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c3e8kn9nqyzo>

Introduction of opinions

“Journalists have checked this response and found it contains introducing opinion errors, such as introducing opinions or views on the story that are not present in the original sources.”

NEWS AI

Why are people moving to BlueSky?

People are moving to Bluesky for a variety of reasons, including:

Decentralization: Bluesky is a decentralized social media platform, meaning that it is not owned by a single company. This makes it more resistant to censorship and manipulation.^[1]

Privacy: Bluesky is focused on user privacy, and it does not collect as much data as other social media platforms.^[2]

Open source: Bluesky is open source, which means that its code is freely available to anyone. This allows for greater transparency and accountability.^[3]

Community-driven: Bluesky is a community-driven platform, and users have a say in how it is developed. This allows for a more democratic and inclusive platform.^[4]

It is important to note that Bluesky is still a relatively new platform, and it is not yet clear whether it will be able to compete with larger platforms such as Twitter and Facebook.^[5] However, it has already attracted a significant number of users, and it is likely to continue to grow in popularity in the coming years.

Sources:
[1] <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c8dm0lq4y6o#>
[2] <https://www.privateinternetaccess.com/blog/is-bluesky-private>
[3] <https://code3.com/resources/bluesky-social-platform-explained>
[4] <https://www.serotonin.co.uk/news/is-bluesky-the-new-twitter-the-decentralized-platform-everyones-talking-about>
[5] <https://www.carat.com/thoughts-and-views/bluesky-the-metabolic-rise-of-a-decentralized-social-network>

Endnotes

¹ [Digital News Report 2025](#), Reuters, January-February 2025

² [News](#) Integrity in AI Assistants, BBC & EBU, October 2025

About Ipsos

In our world of rapid change, the need for reliable information to make confident decisions has never been greater. At Ipsos we believe our clients need more than a data supplier, they need a partner who can produce accurate and relevant information and turn it into actionable truth.

This is why our passionately curious experts not only provide the most precise measurement, but shape it to provide True Understanding of Society, Markets and People. To do this we use the best of science, technology and know-how and apply the principles of security, simplicity, speed and substance to everything we do.

So that our clients can act faster, smarter and bolder.

For more information

Yas Asare-Anderson
yas.asareanderson@ipsos.com

Tim Bond
tim.bond@ipsos.com

3 Thomas More Square
London
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

www.ipsos.com/en-uk
<http://twitter.com/IpsosUK>

