

De que campo do jornalismo estamos falando?

Of what field of journalism are we talking about?

GISLENE SILVA*

Professor of the Post Graduate Program in Journalism
of the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC).
PhD. in Social Sciences / Antropology, PUC-SP.

RESUMO

Pensar o campo do jornalismo como possuidor ou não de um estatuto científico próprio, menos ou mais dependente de arcabouços conceituais, metodológicos e teóricos de outros campos das ciências sociais e humanas, vem tornando-se, nos últimos anos no Brasil, uma questão de destaque na rotina acadêmica da área. As tentativas de demarcação do campo científico do jornalismo como autônomo, porém, parecem ignorar as reflexões epistemológicas já em andamento sobre o campo maior no qual ele está inserido, o da Comunicação. Este trabalho pretende analisar diferentes conceitos de campo empregados nesse debate atual, com críticas a impasses colocados (a) pelo uso indiscriminado dos conceitos de campo científico, campo acadêmico, campo profissional e campo epistêmico e (b) pelo equívoco em reduzir o objeto de estudo do Jornalismo à prática da profissão ou em promover a fragmentação de seu objeto.¹

Palavras-chave: campo científico, campo jornalístico, teoria do jornalismo, jornalismo, epistemologia

ABSTRACT

To envision the field of journalism as having, or lacking, its own theoretical status, somewhat dependent on conceptual and theoretical paradigms borrowed from the human and social sciences has become an important issue in academic discussions of journalism in Brazil. Tentative demarcations of an autonomous scientific field of research for journalism seem to ignore the ongoing epistemological debate of the bigger field in which journalism is inserted, that of Communication. This article aims at analysing different concepts of field used in this debate criticizing (a) the indiscriminate use of terms such as scientific field, academic field, professional and epistemological fields and (b) the equivocal effort to reduce the object of study of the Journalism to practices of profession or in promoting fragmentation of its object.

Keywords: scientific field, journalistic field, theory of journalism, journalism, epistemology

¹An initial version of this article was presented at the GT *Epistemologia da Comunicação* / XVIII Encontro da Compós, PUC-MG, Belo Horizonte, MG, June 2009.

PROFESSIONAL FIELD, SCIENTIFIC FIELD, ACADEMIC FIELD AND EPISTEMIC FIELD

To envision the field of journalism as having, or lacking, its own theoretical status, somewhat dependent on conceptual and theoretical paradigms borrowed from the human and social sciences has become an important issue in academic discussions of journalism in Brazil. Frequently, such arguments are founded on Bourdieu's notion of field.

A field is a structured social space, it is a field of struggle – there are dominants and dominated forces, there are permanent struggles for equality which are exerted within this space – which is also the struggle to transform or maintain this field coherent. Inside this universe, each one concurs to preserve his own power (relative), which detains and defines his status in relation to the other forces, and which, consequently, defines each one's strategies. (Bourdieu, 1997: 57)

Such concept is capital not only to an understanding of the interrelations among social agents involved in their activities or profession but also for reflecting on social practices as places of symbolic production. Because of this, we have political field, intellectual field, legal field, artistic field and... scientific field and journalistic field. It is from the imbrications of these last two terms that confusion on the current debate of a "science of journalism" arises.

In order to understand the mechanisms of journalistic practice, Bourdieu (1997 and 2005) defines the journalistic field as a microcosm with its own rules, limited by its worldwide position and by the influence it is subjected to from other microcosms. The sociologist calls attention to the internal mechanics of journalistic practice and in so doing he discusses the ambiguous autonomy of the field alongside the field's double dependency on the economic and political fields while foregrounding the "forever amplified" influence of journalism subjected to the pressures of commercial logic over the common citizen, over journalists themselves and also on the other social fields and, even more strongly, over the cultural and artistic field. In regard to the concept of scientific field, Bourdieu (1983: 122-155) defines it as that space of struggle for scientific authority, which results from a combination of technical expertise and political power. Thus, the position of each force in the field would, concomitantly, be a scientific and political one. Immacolata Lopes and Fuentes Navarro (2005: 9), while discussing the epistemology of Communication, have also noted that scientific knowledge is always a product of certain concrete conditions of production. Such conditions being scientific, institutional and social. One can not

ignore, however, that for Bordieu, as Martino (2006) recalls, the concept of scientific field is to be found at the limits of the sociology of science and has the objective of explaining how, from social, institutional and scientific vectors, the dynamism of scientific production balances the symbolic capital of scientific discourse. Thus, it becomes necessary to say that these two concepts are not enough in order to understand journalism's knowledge production.

Perhaps we should start by noticing the differences between the notions of academic and scientific field. While the concept of scientific field encompasses knowledge derived from the productive logic of various different institutions that carry scientific research, either funded by government or privately owned business; academic field encompasses knowledge produced in universities at the level of their graduate, post graduate or extension courses, (in Jairo Ferreira, 2007 and 2004, we also find a differentiation of academic and epistemological field). Among the specific institutional and political conditions inside the universe of the academy, that work *a fortiori* on the processes and results of scientific production, we should focus our discussion on the concept of epistemic field in order to express more clearly what types of journalistic knowledge we are referring to. An epistemic field has to do with the conceptual, methodological and theoretical investment. These fields thrive on a regime of cross examination. The epistemic field has, or should have, its place clearly marked out by the scientific practices which take place in the academic space, including there the knowledge produced outside of what we traditionally understand by the term science. That is, we should also take into consideration the knowledge emanating from art and philosophy. This question is, however, infinitely more complex than simply opposing two perspectives over the scientific field, one sociological concept over an epistemological way of thinking (as Martino suggests, 2006).

In analyzing the construction of an epistemological bearing for Communication, Fuentes Navarro (2003: 20) points out that we can not forget sociopolitical acts which, preserved their weights, determine the epistemological analyses of knowledge we grant validity – scientific knowledge, submitted both to the conditions of rationality and political power. Thus, epistemological conflicts would also be, inevitably, political. It is impossible today for someone to dissociate both in any scientific discipline, including Communication Studies, especially because of that researcher dedicated to epistemological investigation – scientific legitimating comes precisely from that imbrications between the cognitive institutionalization (concepts, methods, theories) and that social-political institutionalization (programs, publications, sponsoring, etc.) (Fuentes Navarro, 2003:18). Besides this, if we want to take the idea of any form of scientificity to journalism ahead, it helps if we consider the conceptual distinction between social, scientific, academic and epistemic fields. L. C. Martino's is right to observe (2006: 34-41) in respect to the imprecision of the generic concept of field – in this case communicational field – when this option surfaces as a way of avoiding the problems surrounding the concepts of science or scientific discipline.

For the author, another motivation, much less neutral, also leads one to take the adoption of the concept communicational field. This one has to do with the notion of field in favor of the non-disciplinary nature of communicational knowledge which considers transdisciplinarity a new epistemological paradigm. My article will not dwell on the question of the communicational field. However, it will make clear the intense reverse movement that takes place in the academic debate on journalism. That is, while in Communication the most commonly held position ignores or refuses disciplinary definition, grounded on the current post modern scientific debate, in Journalism the discussion clearly leans towards disciplinary marking, perhaps as an effort to consolidate it as “journalistic science” (see Groth in Belau, 1966 and in Berger, 2007). In Communication, there would be an increasing gap between the progressive consolidation of the institutional field and the lack of autonomy of the epistemological field (Caparelli and Stumpft, 2005: 67). Either this, or, a contrary analysis that amounts to an apparent paradox, the concomitance between the “institutionalization of the specificity of the academic field” of Communication, its so-called institutional autonomy, and the “grounding of a transdisciplinary theoretical body” that would allow its epistemological demarcation (Lopes, 2003: 290).

It is clearly noticeable the strengthening of Journalism as an institutional-scientific field in the last five years in the country (check the recent creation of the SBPJOR and of many academic publications, lines of research and post-graduate programs that specialize in journalism etc.). In tandem with the institutionalization of the scientific field follows the specification of academic reflection, in the direction of disciplinary method, in defense of a marked space for the production and reproduction of journalistic knowledge. In opposition to the centrifugation observed in Communication transdisciplin (see Martino, 2003 and 2006; Fuentes Navarro, 2003), there occurs in this centripetal movement of the potential discipline of Journalism, I affirm quite paradoxically, a turning away from any epistemological approach – which is fundamental when one thinks of a Theory of Journalism or Journalistic Field. Even so, something that already happens in the bigger area of Communication in relation to the epistemological treatment, also takes place in Journalism: planned escape, presumptuous refuse, arrogant spite, dazzling vanity, will for power, disloyal forgetfulness, inconsequent efforts, prudent suspicion, eulogy of error (J. Machado da Silva, 2002) versus a critique to the discourse of unaccommodation and theoretical laziness (W. Gomes, 2003); the need to respond to theoretical obligations versus immediate organizational and professional demands. A lot of misunderstood reflection on the field arises from that.

Little benefit, to the consolidation of a Theory of Journalism or to the creation of its own episteme, arises from obsessively observing the institutional constitution of the field, its advances in the face of history. John D. Peters (cited by Fuentes Navarro, 2003: 24; 30-31) questions the pertinence of any contemporary discourse analysis that forgets the original, highly undifferentiated, infected by common-

place, conceptual plasma from which communication paradigms arise. Among the reasons for this malformation, Peter criticizes the fact that it is the institutional rather than the theoretical argumentation that provides the articulating space for Communication knowledge to take place – “self-reflection as institutional apology” would also help explain the “intellectual poverty” of the field, revealing an “in place of theoretical depth, bigger academic territories” attitude. The same rationale can be applied to Journalism. Results are the same already pointed out by Fuentes Navarro: one confuses the ongoing demands of a professional market for the constitutional demands of an intellectual field and, consequently, legitimizes competitive institutions instead of academic competence.

Thus, it also becomes problematic, in journalism’s investigation, to treat epistemological questions resorting to a sociology of science, thinking that Bourdieu’s notion of journalist field could accommodate an episteme of journalism. The combination of the two fields, journalistic field and scientific field, also lacks the necessary strength needed to fill in the gaps presented by epistemological perspective of the journalistic field. The picture gets even more complicated by the indiscriminate usage, in research, of the concept of journalistic field in place of professional field, this last term clearly merely one among many others social fields. “In choosing a sociological perspective, the question of knowledge is displaced by the question of power and nothing besides the fight for power, recognition and status is seen” (Martino, 2007: 25). When one thinks of journalism’s knowledge production perhaps we should pay more detailed attention to the concepts of scientific-academic field before we got into the epistemic field, working from the margins of epistemological autonomy when facing the institutional-political dependencies of the scientific field, as a way of achieving the same kind of intellectual investment that has been given to the political-institutional capital (Bourdieu, 2004). First, it would be necessary to step out of the many incapacitating deadlocks suggested by the variations present in various reflections: knowledge «of» journalism, «in» journalism, «for» journalism, «on» journalism, «studies of» journalism and «theories of» journalism (E. Meditsch, 1997 e 1992; C. Franciscato, 2008; E. Machado, 2004). This type of approach looks for Journalism’s specificity by means of a narrowly defined strategy: it sees in the professional practices of journalism the field’s scientific certificate, that is, journalism’s scientific knowledge is revealed from the internal demands made by developing practices. In order to achieve this, a dubious rupture between professional practice, scientific object and the teaching of journalism is made as if the object of study of this so-called science could be this much fragmented. The division made between studies «of» journalism, which come from the social sciences and studies «in» journalism which come from the Theory of Journalism; or, furthermore, the division between «knowledge of» (daily, intuitive) and «knowledge on» (systematic, analytic). All this without even mentioning the division between Communication and Journalism, one that invests on the autonomy of Journalism – an eminently communicational phenomenon from the perspective of this article in what it has of mediatic,

interrelational, social interaction, communicative act, exchange, persuasion, seduction, power ..., even if there are specificities such as news media, which deserves serious investigation and more appropriate methods. The ultimate reason for these many ruptures has been journalistic practice itself, the professional field, the materiality of journalistic output. Thus, one defines the technical professional performance and its processes and daily products as the unique *locus* of journalistic theory, which springs from practice then.

It also does not help to analyze the question of journalistic knowledge from the separation of professional community (product), academy (discourse) and productive sector (process) (Franciscato, 2008). One does not understand the journalistic-communicational phenomenon better by investing on a separation between a « systematic gnosiology (medialogic studies)» and «demands of empirical nature (mediatic studies)» (J. M. Melo, 2003: 111). Even if one supposes the aggregation of this knowledge, the strategies consider the sum of their parts to form the totality of the journalistic phenomenon, but the notion of the whole object of study is lost. To sum up the multiple knowledge on the journalistic phenomenon would enable us to compose a «journalistic thought», such as Bernard Miège talks about communicational thinking: an articulation of theoretical contributions (academic knowledge) and contributions from the professional and social activities (mediatic knowledge), that is, a form of thinking that equally emanates from the professionals and social actors, gaining both from the practice and from the theoretical propositions (2000). However, the present article focus on theoretical, systematic contributions, knowledge that, as researchers, we produce in order to understand the journalistic phenomenon – and does not focus on knowledge that journalistic practice entails. In *Cenários, teorias e epistemologias da Comunicação*, José Luiz Braga (2007) points out to different orders of knowledge, among them that of experience “(not ‘externally’ reflected upon but merely acted out), focussed on the objectives of human and social interaction” and that of an reflective exercise “(thus generating watchful and ideational thinking) restricted to more or less specialized instances.” In the same book Jairo Ferreira (2007) also discusses the differences among socially produced knowledge and knowledge that is produced academically, calling this last one reflexive abstract thinking.

OPENING UP JOURNALISM

The conceptual, methodological and theoretical effort, that epistemological work that aims at describing what a Theory of Journalism is all about, can not be undertaken without some standing up. From the outset, breaking up with the excesses of spontaneity seeing beyond mere practices and facing the “epistemological obstacle”._When our perspective is restricted to journalistic practice, to the material expression of specific objects, one is prevented from achieving enough critical distance to clearly see the

object of study of the epistemic field of Journalism – one is also prevented from criticizing the very phenomenon becoming restricted to descriptions of productive routines or becoming backed up by an historical analysis of its institutions (associations, scientific magazines, post-graduate programs, academic production presented at conferences). “The identity of the field can not be devised only from a historical narrative of its emergence” (Martino, 2006: 46). These two choices, if fostered, take us to two paradigms that have already been noted in the broader field of Communication: (1) the restriction of a potential Theory of Journalism to a News Theory – that which in Communication Studies would correspond to, *mutatis mutandis*, placing the object of study not on communicational phenomena but on mediatic processes; and (2) the inventory and confused categorization of «the research on the research», of what we have been investigating in the area in the country.

In relation to the first paradigm: because journalism is definitely also a media –incorporating various technologies, languages and audiences –, this fact causes many researches to neglect their (having done away with many researchers’) worries on the nature of the phenomenon – in contrast with what generally takes place in the debate about the communicational phenomenon, in which “mediacentrism” is criticized in favor of social and interpersonal conversation, or one defends the specificity of historically configured (either by technique or market) collective communication means and that, today, are central to the organization of globalized society. As we have discussed in another text (G. Silva e F. Pontes, 2008), in Journalism, there exists a descriptive empiricism that acquires more visibility in certain types of investigation. Such investigations that we can locate in the universe of News Theory, which are generally understood as those restricted to professional techniques, processes and routines. Because of this, for the most part the answers that explain Journalism are metonymy, taking a parts as the whole. These answers emphasize that the Journalism’s object is the process by means of which news is produced – newness criteria, the daily routine of journalists, the journalistic language/discourse, and the themes chosen – (Gomis, 1991; Souza 2002; and Traquina 2004). Considering News Theory and Theory of Journalism as synonyms (as does Sousa 2004: 02), one takes part of the object of Journalism as the whole object of Theory of Journalism. As a result, these investigations describe a lot, but their conclusions either take a content centered perspective (see this criticism in F. Resende, 2008) or offer more explanation on social themes or administrative and economic logic than on the place and meaning of the public phenomenon of producing and receiving news. Research done in this manner usually relies on the false premise that empiricism of the profession’s practical world, either in the form of its processes or its products, naturally stands in for theory without much need for work on its object of study, this one always theoretically constructed. The naturalization of an object of study, be that in Communication as in Journalism, covers up more than it reveals.

What the object of study of Journalism needs then are theoretical resources in order to be grasped because it can not be spontaneously, immediately perceived. Escaping spontaneity isn't easy, not even for the sociologist; "whose difficulty lies in not being able, in his theoretical inheritance, a means to radically abandon current language and common sense" (Bourdieu, Chamboredon e Passeron, 2005: 23). Such epistemological obstacle is not any easier in journalism. Here too the «the illusion of transparency» leads to «scholarly common-sense». In journalism such situation becomes more striking not only because the subject matter of journalism is information collected from common-sense and public opinion for a collectivity of laic readers/spectators/listeners/web surfers but because many researchers confuse the work of the scientist/researcher with the work of the journalist without ever managing to make the much needed «epistemological cut» that is necessary to separate scientific interpretation from the evidences of common-sense or, a case in point, professional practices (Bourdieu, Chamboredon e Passeron, 2005: 32-44, reaffirming Bachelard's "epistemological rupture" and "epistemological hindrance"). If journalist work demands thinking against the grain of facts, in order to go from common-sense to critical sense (S. Moretzhon, 2007), acting on research in journalism demands to «fight the journalist within» the professional journalist, immersed in practices; or better said, it demands fighting an apology of the profession within epistemological enterprises – Bourdieu, Chamboredon and Passeron once again resort to Bachelard, "every chemist must fight the alchemist within", to suggest that each sociologist must fight the social prophet which he is forced to incarnate in various situations. All this because, when lacking a proper scientific theory, some researchers impulsively propel themselves to a practice that aims at finding in itself its very own theoretical foundations, while others continue to feed on tradition (2005: 37 e 39). In the case of Journalism, grounding itself in its practice means investigating its technological mutations, as if knowledge of these technological transformations would explain in and by itself the Field of Journalism and its object of study; while sticking to tradition means normative researches on the rules and premises of journalism that repeat the textual, genres or principles (actuality, objectivity) of writing rules and of ethical principles of the profession (impartiality, truthfulness).

As for (2) the rather confusing categories of «the research on the research», of what has been actually researched in the area, there can be great concerns on the descriptive and methodologically careless character with which one intends to classify the researched segments, as I have discussed elsewhere (G. Silva, 2008). Intent on explaining the scientific status of Journalism (M. Benetti Machado, 2004; E. Machado, 2004; E. Meditsch e M. Segala, 2005; e J. M. Melo, 2006), these readings of the body of work from conferences, research trends and book are encompassing. What one finds on these researches of the scientific production in Journalism is a body of work that mixes themes, methodologies, data analysis techniques and technological support without ever distinguishing them as the proper categories they really are. Soon, we see categorization organize research in: discourse analysis, history of journalism,

digital journalism, narrative theories, specialized journalism, news production, reception, theories of journalism, ethics of journalism, linguistic studies, journalism and education, studies of the professional journalistic practice, coverage analysis, popular/alternative journalism, new technologies, a critique of journalism, teaching journalism among others such as trends in socio-ethical, technical-editorial, political-ideological and critical-professional. These non-distinctions – an amalgam of non mixing categories taken as themes, objects of study, theoretical paradigms, methodological questions, technical specification – do not help understanding the research problems in the Journalistic Field. The lack of criticism employed in these divisions also become visible in the organization of many work groups, research lines and communication rounds at meetings and conferences. In these, besides of what we have just made clear, there is either a separation perpetrated by the logic of technological support (TV, radio and, recently and more vigorously, the web) or a separation ruled by the traditional inheritance that separates the three elements of the circuit: (a) production/routine > (b) product in circulation/message/languages/ discourses > (c) consumption/reception. To speak of research in these terms says something about the institutionalization of the scientific field and little of what is happening in research in journalism from either a methodological, theoretical or epistemological point of view.

Books published around here on the Theory of Journalism also do not contribute much to an investigation of the field since the repeat what Martino has been criticizing in relation to books on Communication Studies (Martino, 2007). These do not guarantee a common theoretical denominator for the field, these don't discuss the affiliation of these journalistic theories in the bigger field of Communication or the influences they are prone to receive from other theoretical fields, these also do not show the peculiarities, these don't even question the limitations of the episteme in use. One's intention, however, is not to find a general theory or reach consensus. A general theory, after all that has been discussed on the debates of complex thinking and transdisciplinarity (E. Morin, 1990; B. S. Santos, 2000; I. Wallerstein, 1996; F. Saintout, 2003), not only has become untenable but also dangerous. This condition, however, does not free ourselves into not thinking the more «general question», as recognized by Braga (2002: 268), or, in other terms, it does not free ourselves into not studying the object of study of Journalism, its gravity center, its objectifiable nucleus, its epistemic nucleus (G. Silva, 2009).

Working to create the Journalistic Field would demand, at the same time, more epistemological research that investigates in what ways concepts and theories are consolidated and surpassed, a finer methodological approach and theoretical accuracy in respect to individual researches, especially in relation to the empirical ones which normally exhausts in and by themselves their descriptive efforts – normally because they take their empirical materiality as their object of study, which is a matter of individual choice but that we know to be theoretically construed and, precisely because of this, should be regarded as one of the manifestations of the object of study of the field – this question has been widely

discussed in another text which deals with the «immateriality of the object de study of Journalism» (G. Silva, 2009). There isn't really a problem in supporting applied research, provided we avoid newer versions of administrative research. Critical approaches may help understanding the place theory deserves in fighting positivist formulations and normative statements on the formation of the professional journalistic practice. However, it is a very reductionist will to envision the journalistic field as having as its object "the nature of the journalistic practice" and that the «function» of research would be merely to "contribute to the perfection of journalism as social practice" (E. Machado, 2004). While debating courses of Communication Theory under the light of Journalism (in Ferreira, G. e Martino (orgs.), 2007), Martino observes that theory must be considered as a way of seeing things and, therefore, of formulate problems. Theory represents a step back from immediate reality in order to formulate – not only solving – problems as they appear in the practical dimension. "From which we understand the failure that technical perspectives end up having of theoretical courses which do not match the expectations of the profession for a body of useful, immediate solutions" (p.106). Such disappointment would translate, one among others, in a «technization» of theory (a confusion and replacement of theory for technical knowledge, or *know-how*).

Technicism demands of theory what it can not offer, it demands that it performs functions analogous to the 'help' function found on computer programs (...) theory can not be seen as a tool box from which all kinds of incantations and placebos suddenly spring out to solve professional problems. (Martino em Ferreira, G. e Martino, 2007: 106)

If the intention is to arrive at the nature of the object of study of Journalism, it would be the nature of the journalistic phenomenon, understood not merely as professional practices but in the integrity of its social, political, economical, technological configurations, as discourse, narrative, imagination, technique and cultural manifestation; both constituted by and constituting life in society. This amounts to focus Journalism's object of study, refining concepts, fundamentals and methods, making research obtain results and compose theories for Journalism. In order to do that, and in opposite direction to the idea of consolidating Communication as a discipline from a hard shell of a knowledge domain (Martino, 2001) –, we would necessarily have to open up the very concept of journalism from the one that has been adopted in the so-called theories of journalism. From the outset incorporating the historical process in order to account for changes of definition, as in every other conceptual construction, which because of this, can not reduce the object of «science of journalism» to the phenomenon we have today – hegemonic, in spite of cultural differences. Opening up Journalism also in respect to ways of reporting, genres; «softening» the hard concepts of new and of journalistic fact in order for the Theory of

Journalism not to be reduced to the study of hard news, lead and sub-lead, of journalism of reference, of status editorials such economic and political, but a definition encompassing soft news, culture and art, literary journalism, sensational, gonzo and popular.

A concept of news is necessarily beyond the output that descriptive analysis can produce (G. Silva e F. Pontes, 2008). We should place this concept inside the Theory of Journalism and, after problematizing it, elect it as a central category, as did Adelmo Genro Filho (1987) with the categories of singularity and particularity in treating journalism epistemologically. Classic categories of modern journalism – objectivity, impartiality, newness – do not account for the complexity of the journalistic-communicational process. The same need to be done in respect to the concept of journalistic fact (event). One should also seek theoretical resources when explaining and understanding the myriad of empirical manifestations that characterize the object of study called journalistic phenomenon. At first paradoxical, these conflicts help, at the same time, to bring the object of the epistemic field into focus while opening up for the creation of an integral concept of the object, one that does not separate practice-product from theory, one that works out the immateriality of journalism's subject matter and the materiality of both the bodily and abstract products. Anyway, a lot of what has been covered by research in Communication helps setting up Journalism Studies – denying a relation among them hinders the task at hand, be that by means of a denial made by those who desire to limit an autonomous field for a journalistic science or by means of those who, such as Martino, placing their arguments on the possibility of an epistemological ballast for Communication, refuse to think of journalism as a communicational knowledge (em Ferreira, G. e Martino (orgs.), 2007: 108) and end up, equally reducing its subject to mere practice.

There is a lot to be done in order to make up for the emptiness of the Theory of Journalism, to its conceptual and theoretical frailties, to its difficulty in dealing with the intimate relation between the practice of journalism and common-sense – even before we can think of the “second epistemological break up” which is mentioned by Boaventura S. Santos for a post-modern science – one that sees the reencounter of science and common-sense, inside of a new *cognitive configuration*, in which limitations from both fields are surpassed in the benefit of a new form of knowledge (B. S. Santos, 1989: 34-45). The Journalistic Field, its theories and its concepts result from each and every article, dissertation, thesis and from the meta-theory (epistemological reflections) in its extent or in its micro-territories, as for example, specialized journalism, specific media technologies, editorial themes or its interfaces with the arts and other sciences. It may be necessary to bring together the concepts of field and journalistic field, and the other concepts related to Bourdieu's symbolic production (capital, trade, property, violence, power) that occur within and between different fields, in order to better understand how the press moves among these social fields, from its power to “make believe” and “make sense of the world” and, especially, in identifying

which types of knowledge are at stake in the research we do on the knowledge produced by Journalism². Lucien Sfez, in *Communication*, makes a distinction between episteme and symbolic form, when he understands communication from four angles: as episteme, practice, ideology and symbolic form. Communication place itself on a *continuum* that goes from the epistemic core, describable, readable and interpretable, to the other extreme, the symbolic form, which "involves so much our thoughts and our actions which, in theory, one can not describe it. (...) not everything is observable, visible and legible "(L. Sfez, 1994: 9-16). In the case of Journalism, it seems that the way this has been studied, practice swallows the symbolic form of the phenomenon, making it hard to understand its episteme. Good questioning, however, often leads to better answers.

REFERENCES

- BELAU, Angel Flaus (1966) *La ciencia periodística de Otto Groth*. Pamplona, Espanha: Instituto de Periodismo de la Universidad de Navarra.
- BERGER, Christa (2002). Jornalismo na Comunicação. In: WEBER, M.H.; BENTZ, I.; HOHLFELDT, A. (orgs). *Tensões e objetos da pesquisa em comunicação*. Porto Alegre: Sulina.
- BERGER, Christa; MAROCCO, Beatriz (orgs.) (2007). *A Era Glacial do Jornalismo: teorias sociais da imprensa*. Porto Alegre, Editora Sulina.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre (1983). O campo científico. In: *Bourdieu* (Coleção Grandes Cientistas Sociais). São Paulo: Ática.
- _____ (1997). *Sobre a televisão*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.
- _____ (2004). *Os usos sociais da ciência: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico*. São Paulo: Editora Unesp.
- _____ (2005). The political field, the social science field, and the journalistic field. In: BENSON, R.; NEVEU, E. *Bourdieu and the journalistic field*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre; J-C. Chamboredon; J-C. Passeron (1968). *Ofício de sociólogo: metodologia da pesquisa na sociologia*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2004.
- BRAGA, José Luiz (2002). Análises. In: WEBER, M.H.; BENTZ, I.; HOHLFELDT, A. (orgs.). *Tensões e objetos da pesquisa em comunicação*. Porto Alegre: Sulina/Compós.
- _____ (2007). Introdução: pequeno roteiro de um campo não traçado. In: FERREIRA, Jairo (org.). *Cenários, teorias e epistemologias da Comunicação*. Rio de Janeiro: E-papers.

² As an example of an adequate usage of Bourdieu's conceptual resources on symbolic production, I remember the research *Campos em confronto: a terra e o texto* (Christa Berger, 1998), which very describes the relation between symbolic capital / journalistic field.

- CAPARELLI, Sergio; STUMPF, Ida R.C. El campo académico de la comunicación, revisitado. In: LOPES, M.I.V.; FUENTES NAVARRO (comps.) (2005). *Comunicación: campo y objeto de estudio – perspectivas reflexivas latinoamericanas*. Guadalajara, México: UTESO; Universidade de Guadalajara; Aguascalientes, México: Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes; Colima, México: Universidad de Colima.
- FAUSTO NETO, Antonio (2002). A pesquisa vista “de dentro da casa” (ou reflexões sobre algumas práticas de construção de objetos de pesquisa em comunicação). In: WEBER, M.H.; BENTZ, I.; HOHLFELDT, A. (orgs.). *Tensões e objetos da pesquisa em comunicação*. Porto Alegre: Sulina/Compós.
- FERREIRA, Jairo (2004). Campo acadêmico e epistemologia da comunicação. In: LEMOS, A.; PRYSTON, A.; SILVA, J.; SÁ, S. (orgs.). *Mídia.br: Livro da XII Compós 2003*, Porto Alegre: Sulina/Compós.
- _____ (2007). Questões e linhagens na construção do campo epistemológico da comunicação. In: FERREIRA, Jairo (org.). *Cenários, teorias e epistemologias da comunicação*. Rio de Janeiro: E-papers.
- FRANCISCATO, Carlos E. (2008). “Desafios para pensar a geração de conhecimento no campo do jornalismo”. Anais do XXXI Congresso Brasileiro de Ciências da Comunicação. Intercom – Sociedade Brasileira de Estudos Interdisciplinares da Comunicação. Natal, RN, 2 a 6 de setembro de 2008.
- FUENTES NAVARRO, Raúl (2003). La producción social de sentido sobre la producción social de sentido: hacia la construcción de un marco epistemológico para los estudios de la comunicación. In: LOPES, M. I. V. (org.). *Epistemologia da comunicação*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- GENRO FILHO, Adelmo (1987). *O segredo da pirâmide: por uma teoria marxista do jornalismo*. Porto Alegre: Editora Tchê.
- GOMES, Wilson (2003). O estranho caso de certos discursos epistemológicos que visitam a área da Comunicação. In: LOPES, M. I. V. (org.). *Epistemologia da Comunicação*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- GOMIS, Lorenzo (1991). *Teoría del periodismo: como se forma el presente*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- GROTH, Otto (1961). Tarefas da pesquisa da ciência da cultura. In: BERGER, C; MAROCCO, Beatriz (orgs.). *A Era Glacial do Jornalismo: Teorias sociais da imprensa*. Porto Alegre, Editora Sulina, 2007, pp. 182-306. Original publicado em 1961. Tradução de Luís Marcos Sander e Geraldo Korndörfer.
- HOHLFELDT, Antonio; STRELOW, Aline (2007). “Metodologias de pesquisa: o estado da arte no campo do jornalismo – os núcleos de pesquisa da Intercom”. V Encontro Nacional de Pesquisadores em Jornalismo - SBPJor, Aracaju, Se, novembro de 2007.
- LOPES, M. Immacolata Vassalo de (2003). Sobre o estatuto disciplinar do campo da Comunicação. In: LOPES, M. I. V. (org.). *Epistemologia da Comunicação*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- LOPES, M.Immacolata Vassalo de; FUENTES NAVARRO (comps.) (2005). *Comunicación: campo y objeto de estudio – perspectivas reflexivas latinoamericanas*. Guadalajara, México: UTESO; Universidade de Guadalajara; Aguascalientes, México: Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes; Colima, México: Universidad de Colima.

- MACHADO, Elias (2004). “Dos estudos sobre jornalismo às teorias do jornalismo (três pressupostos para a consolidação do jornalismo como campo de conhecimento)”. *e-compós* revista eletrônica da Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação. Ed.1, dez 2004. Em: <http://www.compos.org.br/e-compos>.
- MACHADO, Márcia Benetti (2004). “Pesquisa em Jornalismo no Brasil: dados e reflexões sobre três ambientes”. II Encontro Nacional de Pesquisadores em Jornalismo - SBPJor, Salvador, 2004.
- MARTINO, Luiz Claudio (2003). As epistemologias contemporâneas e o lugar da Comunicação. In: LOPES, M. I. V. (org.). *Epistemologia da Comunicação*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- _____ (2006). “Abordagens e representação do campo comunicacional”. *Comunicação, Mídia e Consumo*. v. 3, p. 33-54. São Paulo, 2006.
- _____ (2001) De qual campo da comunicação estamos falando? In: WEBER, M.H.; BENTZ, I.; HOHLFELDT, A. (orgs.). *Tensões e objetos da pesquisa em comunicação*. Porto Alegre: Sulina.
- _____ (2001). Interdisciplinaridade e o objeto de estudo da comunicação. In: HOHLFELDT, A., MARTINO, L.C. e FRANÇA, V. V. (orgs.) *Teorias da comunicação: conceitos, escolas e tendências*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- _____ (2007). Os cursos de teoria da comunicação à luz do jornalismo: obstáculos e impropriedades das posições tecnicista e intelectualista. In: FERREIRA, Giovandro M. e MARTINO, L. C. (orgs.). *Teorias da Comunicação: epistemologia, ensino, discurso e recepção*. Salvador: EDUFBA.
- MARTINO, Luiz C.; BERGER, Charles; CRAIG, Robert T. (2007). *Teorias da comunicação: muitas ou poucas?* Cotia, SP: Ateliê Editorial.
- MEDITSCH, Eduardo (1997). “Jornalismo como forma de conhecimento”. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências da Comunicação*, da Intercom. Vol. XXI, nº 1, jan/jun 1998, p. 25-38. São Paulo.
- _____ (1992). *O conhecimento do jornalismo*. Florianópolis, SC: Ed. UFSC.
- MEDITSCH, E.; SEGALA (2005). “Trends in three 2003/4 journalism academic meetings”. *Brazilian Journalism Research*. Brasília, Br: SBPJor. v. 1, n. 1, semestre 1, 2005.pp. 47-60.
- MELO, J. Marques de (2006). *Teoria do jornalismo: identidades brasileiras*. São Paulo: Paulus.
- _____ (2003). Midiologia brasileira: o resgate das fontes paradigmáticas. In: Lopes, M. I. V. (org.). *Epistemologia da Comunicação*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2003.
- MIÈGE, Bernard (1995). *O pensamento comunicacional*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2000.
- MORETZOHN, Sylvia (2007). *Pensando contra os fatos: jornalismo e cotidiano, do senso comum ao senso crítico*. Rio de Janeiro: Revan.
- MORIN, Edgar (1990). *Introdução ao pensamento complexo*. Lisboa: Instituto Piaget.
- RESENDE, Fernando (2008). “A narratividade do discurso jornalístico – a questão do outro”. 6º. Encontro Nacional de Pesquisadores em Jornalismo / SBPJor, 2008. São Bernardo do Campo, SP.

- SAINTOUT, Florencia (edit.) (2003). *Abrir la comunicación: tradición y movimiento em el campo académico*. La Plata, Argentina: Facultad de Periodismo y Comunicación Social / Universidad Nacional de La Plata.
- SANTOS, Boaventura de Souza (1989). *Introdução a uma ciência pós-moderna*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 2000. 3a. ed.
- SFEZ, Lucien (1992). *Crítica da comunicação*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 1994.
- SILVA, Juremir Machado da (2002). Análises. In: WEBER, M.H.; BENTZ, I.; HOHLFELDT, A. (orgs.). *Tensões e objetos da pesquisa em comunicação*. Porto Alegre: Sulina.
- SILVA, Gislene (2008). “Problemática metodológica em jornalismo impresso”. XXXI Congresso da Intercom. Natal, RN, setembro de 2008.
- SILVA, Gislene (2009). “Sobre a imaterialidade do objeto do Jornalismo”. VIII Lusocom. Lisboa, Portugal, abril de 2009.
- SILVA, Gislene; PONTES, Felipe (2008). “Teorias da notícia: impasses para uma Teoria do Jornalismo”. 6º Encontro Nacional de Pesquisadores em Jornalismo / SBPJor. São Bernardo do Campo, SP, novembro de 2008.
- SOUSA, Jorge Pedro (2002). *Teorias da notícia e do jornalismo*. Chapecó: Argos.
- TRAQUINA, Nelson (2004). *Teorias do jornalismo: porque as notícias são como são - Vol. 1*. Florianópolis: EDUFSC.
- WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel *et al.* (1996). *Para abrir as ciências sociais – Comissão Gulbenkian para a reestruturação das ciências sociais*. São Paulo: Editora Cortez.

e-mail: gislenedasilva@gmail.com