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ABSTRACT

• This paper reports the findings of a 13-country comparison of Webcasting business practices, and the results of a test of the robustness of the Webcasting business model framework suggested by Ha and Ganahl (2004). The globalness of the Webcast medium is also examined. The study establishes the variety of business practices by different types of Webcasters, and the domination of domestic Webcasters and domestically produced content in Webcast services.
Hypotheses and Findings

- Clicks-and-bricks Webcasters are more likely to employ the branded content model – **YES**
- Clicks-and-bricks Webcasters are more likely to repurpose or simulcast audio-video content – **MIXED**
- More diversified transmission method, more diversified revenue sources – **YES**
- Most leading Webcasters are domestically owned - **YES**
- Majority of leading Webcasters’ content is domestic production - **YES**
Method

• Only leading webcasters in major broadband markets were selected – trend-setters for other markets
• Informant interviews to identify leading Webcasters in each country
• Content Analysis of Leading Webcasters
• Larger market sample size = 20. Smaller market sample size =10.
• Total sample size = 220 from 13 countries: Australia, China, Canada, Germany, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, United Kingdom, U.S.A., Greece, Netherlands, Spain, Hong Kong.
Conclusion

• Show Robustness of Ha and Ganahl (2004)’s Webcasting Business Models Framework.
• Non-profit Webcasters and public broadcast traditions reflected in Webcasting
• Clear diversification of revenue sources
• Participatory content distinct feature of Webcasting
• Different popularity of branded content and content aggregators in different countries
• Limitations of Webcasting as a Global Medium
Profile of Leading Webcasters
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SITE NATURE
- ISP Provider
- Pure-plays
- Clicks-and-brick
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Webcast Ownership by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Study</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Foreign webcaster
- Joint venture
- Domestic webcaster
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Webcast Content by Origin
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ORIGIN OF CONTENT
- ALL FOREIGN
- PRIMARILY FOREIGN (ORIGINAL LANGUAGE)
- PRIMARILY FOREIGN (SUBTITLES)
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- HALF DOMESTIC
- PRIMARILY DOMESTIC
- ALL DOMESTIC
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Business Model by Country

Count

USA
CANADA
UNITED KINGDOM
AUSTRALIA
GERMANY
NETHERLANDS
SPAIN
GREECE
HONG KONG
CHINA
JAPAN
KOREA
TAIWAN

business model
- branded content
- content aggregator
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## Business Models by Webcaster Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Content Aggregator</th>
<th>Branded Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=111</td>
<td>N=109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicks-and-Bricks</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure-Plays</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISPs</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Revenue Sources by Business Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Content Aggregator (N=111)</th>
<th>Branded Content (N=109)</th>
<th>Total (N=220)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Commerce</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-per-view</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content syndication</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip-Jar/</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>