João Canavilhas: notes and reviews on journalism in a digital media culture

João Canavilhas: pontuações e revisões sobre o jornalismo em uma cultura midiática digital

■ Interview with JOÃO CANAVILHAS[a]
Universidade da Beira Interior, Laboratório de Comunicação e Artes (Labcom). Covilhã, Portugal

By ALINE TAINÁ AMARAL HORN[b]
Université Lumière Lyon 2, EPIC 485, Laboratoire Centre Max Weber, Click Research Group; Cyber Communication and Culture; JADN International Research Group – Journalisme à l'Heure du Numérique. France/Brazil

By MYRIAN REGINA DEL VECCHIO DE LIMAo[c]
Universidade Federal do Paraná, Graduate Program in Communication. Curitiba – PR. Brazil, Chief of the Click Research Group – Cyber Communication and Culture; Member of the JADN International Research Group – Journalisme à l'Heure du Numérique. Brazil/France

AT THE END OF 2019, researcher João Manuel Messias Canavilhas, from the Universidade da Beira Interior (Covilhã, Portugal), gave this interview during the XI International Congress of Cyberperiodism, in Bilbao, Spain. The excitement around the researcher at the event was justified. Invited to present the lecture "Explorando el periodismo transmedia en la era digital" (Exploring transmedia periodism in the digital era), he is considered one of the greatest experts on the subject in the area under Ibero-American influence.

The interview intended to deepen some facets of Canavilhas' thinking which were already known to the public regarding the theoretical concepts related to the practices of production and consumption of content on the Internet; but with an emphasis on journalism and issues concerning the profession within the scenario of an increasingly broader digital culture, as well as the matter of the exponential growth of disinformation in the digital environment. Canavilhas explored our inquiries on new possibilities for financing journalism, niche editorial positions, interactivity as a characteristic of web journalism, the relationship between content production and new means of consumption, changes and continuities within the profession, and a brief analysis of Iberian and Anglo-Saxon cyber journalism research.

[a] Professor at the Universidade da Beira Interior and researcher at Labcom/IFP – Communication, Philosophy and Humanities. Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2394-5264. Email: jc@ubi.pt

[b] PhD student in Sciences de l'Information et de la Communication da Universidade Lumière Lyon 2 (France Capes scholarship holder from the Full Doctoral Scholarship Overseas. Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6334-2193. Email: hornaline@gmail.com

[c] Professor and researcher at the Graduate Program in Communication at Universidade Federal do Paraná. Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1833-2332. Email: myriandel@gmail.com

Vice-dean and researcher at Labcom/IFP at the Universidade da Beira Interior, where he has been teaching for almost twenty years, João Canavilhas holds a doctorate in Communication, Culture, and Education from the Universidade de Salamanca, in Spain. His research work focuses on various aspects of the relationship between Communication and new technologies, particularly in the areas of online journalism, electronic politics, social media, and journalism for mobile devices. Besides having published ten books by 2019, and dozens of chapters in books and articles in national and international scientific journals, one of his main contributions to digital journalism refers to the theory of the lying pyramid, proposed in one of his most cited works on Google Scholar: "Web journalism: From the inverted to the lying pyramid" (2006). In it, Canavilhas criticizes the inverted pyramid technique on the web, proposing that its use inhibits the creativity and freedom found in the architecture of the open news and free navigation on the Internet.

Among the main points discussed in this interview, Canavilhas highlights interactivity as one of the aspects of web journalism that needs further advancement, suggesting that the investment in gamification, as well as 360º journalism, could be a possible solution for the problem. He also speaks of the need for journalists to recognize the decentralized content production present in newsrooms within communication organizations and signals that, even in the face of changes concerning the profession, the valorization of the reader and the commitment to ethics and the truth are the foundation of what journalism represents until the present days. He draws attention to the fact that "the challenge journalism faces is being where people are, and it must deal with the language that is currently most used," that is, to adapt means of communication with the public via multimedia resources. Canavilhas also notes that, together with multimedia [skills], leadership is one of the skills that must be developed by journalists in newsrooms, integrating teams with professionals from different areas of expertise. Finally, he criticizes the fact that, although the Ibero-American scientific production is much superior to the Anglo-Saxon, "in terms of quantity and quality," "they are two parallel worlds," highlighting the lack of convergence among researchers within the industry.

MATRIZes: Before stepping into the field of journalistic practices themselves, let us explore a few theoretical concepts in the area. In an interview conducted in 2015 for a Brazilian scientific journal (Specht, 2015), you spoke about the evolution of the main characteristics of web journalism, hyper textuality, multimedia, and interactivity, and that the latter was the least developed. What has changed in your assessment since that time?

Canavilhas: Not much has changed. Interactivity is still nothing more than the person clicking on a link to read something and, therefore, there has been no progress. In terms of journalism, the best way to involve people would be through interactivity that would not only make it possible to read the news in a very personal way but to involve them through the creation of small spaces in which everyone lost track of what is reading and had the feeling of accessing another kind of content, one that is more immersive. This is only possible through interactivity. As an example, we must introduce gamification further into web journalism; but this is the case of leading the person who is interacting with certain content to lose track that this is happening. This is as different as watching a news story or a movie on a flat TV or having a 360° projection in which the image we see places us inside the information itself. The only way to take a user into that story is by adding more and more interactivity, making use of all kinds of devices at our disposal. In my opinion, little has changed since 2015. There are more videos, it is true, more spaces where, eventually, more opinions have been presented – something that is strictly not used for anything – but, for the rest of it, interactivity remains that of "click here, click there," "like and dislike," "share and not share". In terms of contributions by news consumers, of what could take them away from the personal/local context and place them within the context of the news or report, this is something that still does not happen. I know that this takes work, in terms of news production and consumption. I also know that people sometimes want things to be faster and do not waste time clicking on many things, but it is also true that there is a part of the audience that demands more and more. So "if within less is more," I think it is better to give more, as those who want little will be satisfied, but those who want a lot will also find an answer there. Therefore, we would have to produce a little more elaborate content, in line with what is called transmedia content. Not that all content must be this way, but a part of it should. We cannot create an audience if we do not make it a habit for people to consume this more interactive content. This is the challenge faced by journalism. It does not seem much, but we are already tagging behind. At this stage, something more should already be happening, so that we will have a higher percentage of more complex than simplified content in the future.

MATRIZes: As a content producer, the journalist not to be making use of the interactive potential of social networks. How do you see this, concerning what is most evident today in the aspect of interactivity, which is also the most traditional form of interaction in journalism, the comments, now online?

Canavilhas: This is a tragedy for the profession. Journalists have always been like that; they close themselves in their ivory tower and think they know everything about that subject. And they think other people know little, and that is not true. That is, statistically, the greater the number of people involved, the more knowledge there is on a given topic. I realize that when you look at a comment box, two-thirds of that is "foolishness" from people who defend one position or another, insulting the journalist. Now you also need to have some spirit to go in search of some quality – and there is always quality information. So, on the one hand, the journalist ignores this to protect himself; on the other, there is a little bit of the journalistic ego saying, "we are the ones who know and you know nothing". But, step-by-step, this must be overcome, because there is a lot of knowledge outside, a lot of people are reading the news. I do not remember any news in which, if you had gone through the many comments, you would not have noticed someone who lived or witnessed the situation, people who work in the area and would be an excellent source to some additional information. Also, I never saw a journalist say: "Look, I really liked the information, call this number or send an email here, because I would like to talk to you". I do not think there is any shame in asking, as not everything is known, much less in the online space. Any contribution from someone, any additional situation could enhance a news story. We must dismiss this idea that we know everything, to give in and say: "Okay, just say what you have to say because it will certainly help us".

MATRIZes: French researcher Denis Ruellan, from the University of Rennes, who worked at the Universidade de Brasília for a while, stated in several published texts several years ago (Ringoot & Ruellan, 2007; Ruellan, 2005; Ruellan & Le Cam, 2014), that journalism was shifting, changing, but that there were continuities that characterized it as such. In this sense, how is the value produced today in journalism, once old criteria have been put in check? What of traditional journalism, the one that has been consolidated over more than a hundred years as a profession, remains in digital journalism?

Canavilhas: On the principles of journalism, look at this example out of an investigation. I researched the statute of editorials, some over a hundred years old, in newspapers at the time they were created and now. I expected to find considerable differences and updates, which, interestingly, did not happen and, therefore, could somewhat serve as an answer to your question. Okay, let us see what was said on a newspaper's first edition about a hundred years ago, and what is said on a first edition today. First, there is a greater appreciation of the role of the reader in traditional journalism, which has to do with the

role of interactivity and comments in current journalism. The second idea or principle is the commitment to ethics and the truth. This second principle has a lot to do with the fact that information circulates faster now. Therefore, what stands out from the analyses of the editorials over time, regarding this question, is that the principles are the same. Newspapers are already committed to the truth and independence, and that reflects in their editorials. I believe it would even be very interesting to compare – in the Portuguese case, I'm studying seven to eight reference newspapers – 100 years old and current newspapers, around 10 years old, both national and local, and realize that there is a set of principles which meet that question. In other words, journalism relies on a set of characteristics that remain the same and, therefore, carries out codes of ethics for everyone; only then do all newspapers begin to introduce peculiarities, and this means that the technological evolution introduces variables. Now, the soul of journalism remains the same, at least in relation to what can be called journalism.

MATRIZes: In Brazil, *TAB*, a digital native project that came up ten years ago on the UOL platform, invested in reports in the *longform* format (Longhi, 2014), by using many multimedia resources to target tablet screens, a mobile device on the rise in Brazil at the time. With the readers' eyes migrating to smartphones and their small screens, *TAB* has, over the years, adapted to their readers' new consumption habits (Ventura & Ito, 2016). How do you see this ongoing rush of content production in front of the technological renovation, which places the reader continually in contact with new means of information consumption?

Canavilhas: This is absolutely essential. No company dedicates itself to producing a product the market does not care about. So, the challenge faced by journalism is being where people are and dealing with the language that is used the most. It is not easy to see. If we have an audience that uses these devices and consumes a certain type of content, it is obviously necessary to make an effort to meet their preferences. Some media outlets have been running this race in search of what the public wants. Now the problem is that the public does not always know what they want. The use of smartphones allows for a little bit of everything. I have argued that, contrary to what we often say, that is, that it is necessary to provide convergent content, we must provide divergent content, in the sense of delivering the content according to the person's context at a given moment. In other words, if I am stopped in one place, as I am doing now – and it is possible to prove through digital technology that I am not on the move –, I can have access to elaborate

content, with a lot of interaction, regardless of it presenting videos or audio. Now, if I am on the move, for example, in a car, my ears are available, but not my eyes. So, regarding the content offered, the choice to be made is a little bit of that, providing divergent content and, depending on the person's situation, on the move or not – and our cellphones can read where we are at each moment – deliver characteristic content that allows for the consumption in that given situation. That is what the newspaper companies are trying to do, that is, deliver content as the person wants, and it would be good to reflect on that context as well. I think this would be a good option, as long as it is accompanied by some type of investigation; and this is an area where universities have a role to play, as history shows that, in terms of journalism, research always goes after companies. The companies test, and then the researchers ask them how things went or analyze how things happened. For once, we should do the opposite. But, until it is done, I think this is a good alternative, and I also hope that a researcher is looking at it and trying to draw some conclusions.

MATRIZes: We already know that journalists working within the digital environment are multitasking and versatile professionals. Some scholars criticize this accumulation of skills and defend the formation of teams including several professionals to produce good digital journalistic articles. A survey carried out at Universidade de São Paulo (USP) between 2017-2018 (Fígaro, 2018), showed that journalists consider themselves to be in "professional dysfunction," although their skills are in high demand in other areas. Could you comment on this scenario linked to the new professional profiles?

Canavilhas: It is obvious that we must work consistently more to train multiplatform and multimedia journalists. Now, journalistic work is teamwork, there is no point in thinking otherwise... That romantic image from the 70s, of the journalist with a hat, a cigarette, and a shot of whiskey, investigating. Doing the work yourself is not a thing; we depend on everything that has to do with research. Computer personnel, for example, with their quick methods of searching for data, can help a lot in the search for information and, therefore, the journalist most definitely needs to work with someone who does data mining. Here we are already introducing a new actor who, previously, had nothing to do with journalism. But we also need someone who works with design; because, if you have a designer, you can present a certain part of the story by replacing a long and massive text with a dynamic and very interesting graphic to enrich the work. We worked on a piece about *techno-actors*, in which we tried to identify the thoughts of the various actors

who are in the newsroom today, namely the journalist, the designer, the professional who works with social media contents, and the programmer. First, we talked to them together and then separately, and two remarkably interesting ideas came up. While separated, each professional highlights their role, saying "no, no, the journalist would not do anything without my work, or he would make a much poorer newspaper, at best". Then there is the second thought, which is interesting because they continue to perceive the journalist as the coordinator of all the work. The idea that we are left with, which is also the real idea, is exactly that; that is, journalistic work is nowadays "gross" work, and all these people are absolutely essential so that any journalist can do a good job. The journalist depends on these people to do his job and is seen as the leader of the group. But now we come to the matter of knowledge. Of course, the journalist needs to master the usual tools of the profession and, now, he also needs to master a language that adds to the others, and this is where the multimedia journalist comes in, and that does not just refer to knowing how to do a good job while editing audio, video, etc. It is not just about that. They must understand something about to achieve a common language. In the past, a journalist who spent three hours writing the news would tell the designer in the end "look, I must close this in fifteen minutes, make me a graph there," and the other replied, "do you think that making an animated graph takes fifteen minutes?". The opposite would also happen. They would make a graph and say, "write me a text for that graph in the next ten minutes". Now, the work needs to be done collectively; the journalist is still the leader, but they need to know themselves a little bit of everything so that they can then talk to others, get a sense of production timing, and get the team to work as one whole. So, I would say, yes, a journalist needs classical training, to know how to make the news, know how to edit it, because they might have to do it immediately on a certain day. You need to know a lot of networks, a little about programming. Basically, the journalist is now a professional who needs to extend their knowledge beyond the journalism environment. But they do not need to be experts in each of these things. What we saw was the emergence of a new generation of journalists who have mastered the technical part but know little about journalism. They can produce news stories in very appealing multimedia terms, but then, there is a huge frustration when it comes to the content. I would say: multiform journalist, yes; multiplatform, yes; multimedia, yes. Someone who can perceive different narratives. But the basis of all this will always lie within the domain of the language, the ability to coordinate a team, and the knowledge regarding each of those things.

MATRIZes: In your opinion, how is journalism produced in the current media ecosystem? Is it possible to speak today about new journalistic practices or a reinvention of journalism? Roseli Fígaro, a researcher at USP who dedicates herself to research the journalistic labor market in Brazil (Figaro, Grohmann & Nonato, 2013; Figaro, 2018), has been questioning whether we can still call journalism whatever will develop in the coming years within an increasingly intense digital culture environment. What is your opinion on this?

Canavilhas: When we talk about journalism, there are half a dozen rules common to the area, regardless of the platform used. Sometimes, I think that there is a bit of confusion between language narratives and journalism. Even if we are talking about television or radio journalism, deep down this is a conversation about narratives; the process is always the same. In other words, an event takes place, the journalist will listen to the sources, collect information, try to contrast the sources, and, in the end, build a product. Only in this final phase are things different, because we apply different means that require different narratives. In this respect, things have not changed in the last two hundred years. The assumption remains the same. It turns out that, suddenly, for economic reasons as well, we understand that people should master more languages, more narratives, and all that. I would say that what is being discussed is not the basic principles of journalism. What we have are these techno-actors of whom I spoke earlier; new characters who arrived at the newsroom and who are not sure whether they are journalists or not. When a computer professional does data mining and provides it to the journalist, he is doing research; he is effectively playing a part in journalism, doing journalistic research. Currently, the journalist's production process goes through several steps. Gathering information is just one of them. Can we call these characters journalists? Not in the least. They are techno-actors. I would say, then, that we are not moving towards anything too different, but we are paving the way for professionals to work around the journalist. We walk with a journalist who has now more skills and recognizes the fact of having to integrate itself with other skills around him. Techno-actors are also knowledgeable about journalism – in those SEO (Search Engine Optimization) teams, they are responsible for saying "ok, look, this is your news title, but I these words are being searched a lot on Twitter; you would have more visits if you managed to keep them". This, in essence, is also journalistic work. It is to say to the other, "if your news reaches a larger audience, it will be more successful". What we have here is an approximation between some groups that worked in journalism, not with the journalist, but who now work in teams. Therefore, I would not say that we are

going to witness the rise of a radically different journalism. We will still have journalism as we do now, but with a content more adapted to the platforms, and with the involvement of more non-journalist people in the production process. In other words, the journalist becomes an element in this group, instead of being *the* element, as it was until now. There is, of course, a change made in favor of the quality of journalism, as those professionals incorporated bring quality to the process, whether we like it or not. But I do not think this is "another journalism". It is the usual journalism, only adapted to new platforms, new audiences, new narratives, and produced by more people.

MATRIZes: The newspaper crisis in many countries – particularly in Brazil – is credited by many scholars to the lack of a business model or adequate financing, and not to the lack of an audience. If a crisis affects the journalistic business model, is it not necessary to think of different ones? How do you see this situation? Are there any trends?

Canavillas: The fundamental problem of digital journalism has always been the lack of a business model. In fact, the crisis started because the digital journalistic content supply is free – history shows that when a product is offered for free in the beginning, people will later refuse to pay for it. In Portugal, a petition has been recently launched to find models to finance the local press. So, what I usually say in these cases is that there is no single model for financing this journalism. What I have defended, the model we call the 360º, is actually not a model, but a set of models. The traditional journalistic business model was based on two things: sales and advertising, with a clear emphasis on advertising as a source of income. It was based on the audiences, but when sales started to drop, advertising also dwindled. To resolve this, since audiences are now online, we need a combination of factors. On the one hand, trying to sell advertising, as in the traditional model; but we also need advertising adapted to the new media and online platforms. Gamification, for example, is something that works very well. Making small games in which people are, at certain times, already immersed in the product is something that helps the advertisement to passing, instead of those traditional banners that nobody sees, as they did not see them in the newspapers. On the other hand, the annual subscriptions model may also be the same – as there is no distribution and there is no paper, it is also cheaper, and could be of some help – but it would need to evolve to an iTunes kind of system, in which the user pays for information units. Even if this information unit's sold at eight in the morning at one price and at ten in the morning at another – if I access the newspaper at eight in the morning and the news talks about something that took place a short time ago, of course, that

has a higher value. Everyone knows when to go to a supermarket, if you want to buy fruits in the morning, they will be fresh, and will be listed at a price; three days later, there is depreciation, so that same fruit will be sold at half the original price because it is almost expiring. And the news is a product with an extremely short shelf-life. So, coupled with that, there must be a product sold under a price per unit, and which will get increasingly cheaper. All this following the advertising models and the content sales model. Besides that, other types of measures must be enforced, and one of them has to do with governmental support to the press, for example. I do not advocate for direct funding support. What I do support are measures that, in some way, put newspapers in competition, as in France, where young people, when they reach a certain age, are entitled to a newspaper subscription. This is an interesting measure: "At 18, you get a six-month subscription to the newspaper.". Choose the one you would like and the State will finance it, which is still a means of financing, but based on the choice of the audience (it is not up to the State to say which newspaper is better or worse). Another action that seems interesting to me would be taxing those who are making money out of journalism. When we buy mobile devices, we are not looking for a smartphone only to talk, which comprises only 10% of what we are actually going to do with the device. What we do is surf the Internet and do two things: check on social networks and look for information, often journalistic. So, if we do not buy smartphones to talk but, instead, to look for information, a percentage of that sale should go to the newspapers. A second line has to do with the operators, that is, the companies that provide the services. Okay, I buy the phone and then I go to some company to hire an Internet service. The logic is the same as before: whoever hires Internet services for their home wants to access content, including newspapers. From there, part of the taxes should also be used to finance newspapers. Finally, a model that is already used in some newspaper companies is that people ask for and fund investigations on certain topics that they believe are not sufficiently investigated and are willing to contribute to financing that investigation.

MATRIZes: History shows us that democratic societies are those that have more means of communication, that is, more ways of doing journalism. In the last decade, there has been an exponential growth of independent journalism media – such as *Nexo Jornal (Brazil), Rue 89 (France), Fumaça (Portugal) –, as well as a popularization of mobile devices and the intense use of social networks for the circulation of news. However, a scenario composed of extreme misinformation, ideological bubbles, and public expressions of hatred towards differences. In this context, how can journalism work to strengthen democracies?*

Canavilhas: All these projects focus on a specific subject and an extremely specific approach; this often means that we do not have a general picture of everything that is going on. If, on the one hand, niche journalism is highly defended, in terms of subject, I believe that leading newspapers, such as *The Guardian, The Washington Post, O Globo, Folha de S.Paulo* – need some to have some space. They are generalist newspapers, exerting a massive effort to avoid aligning themselves to a particular political trend. The challenge faced by some newspapers saying, "ok, we can have more columnists from one side or another," or "we have columnists aligned with the right, the left, whatever... But, above all, we have a group of professionals whose objective is helping people understand the world where they live, giving them the context, and not only saying 'look, you must see it from this perspective'". Whenever we use binoculars to observe a particular detail, we forget everything else around us, and we end up locking ourselves into a bubble. Of course, there is room for journalistic projects dedicated to causes, which will focus on subjects that other media usually does not care about, but the largest newspapers must carry on if we would like to continue trailing this broader path. It is a bit of a romantic point of view, but this type of newspaper needs to exist, otherwise, people will be increasingly polarized between those who read one thing and those who read another; the two bubbles advance side by side, but never really touch each other. I would say that there will always be a role for the journalistic macrostructure to provide a broader view of what societies are.

MATRIZes: Concrete political cases have shown us the power of the media in spreading false and out-of-context information, such as that which led to the election of Trump, Bolsonaro, and other extremely contradictory political figures, with authoritarian and populist profiles. Regarding fact-checking journalism initiatives, it seems that they are unable to verify the immensity of false data produced daily on the Internet. In this sense, what else can journalism do to combat fake news?

Canavilhas: I will split this into two parts. Fake news usually does not make the news. Information on the most various types of manipulation that are may use something that was published in the newspaper as a reference but then manipulate its contents. The problem is that what fact-checking agencies have basically done is analyzing politicians' statements. When a politician makes a statement, that statement is often reproduced by a newspaper associated with the campaign, and the fact-checking agencies will try and see if it is true or false. In a political debate, someone says one thing, someone else says another, then the agencies will analyze both. Well, this is not enough for what

happens. This is not the main issue, as registered newspapers, those that comply with all principles and know that they are subject to the law, do not usually risk themselves with fake news. Fact-checking agencies can catch other types of manipulation when they appear on open networks. That is not the problem. Facebook and Google are already concerned about this subject; search engines themselves now implement more and more systems do not prevent that these types of content circulate. The problem spreads within closed networks. In the specific case of Brazil, there was a study on family groups on WhatsApp. And that is where the problem lies. What we found is that most of the information circulating there was fake. And there is absolutely no control. We had a hard time finding families for the research because they became incompatible after a certain point; there is, they only communicated up to a certain moment, then stopped presenting content. It is also not easy to ask a family, "look, send me your whole exchange of information". We needed people's authorization, and everything was done anonymously. That means we are not aware of the names of the family or who the elements are. When analyzing the information, we found a little bit of everything. And the information rarely came from the newspapers. There were lines about an interview that was actually given by an actor to a newspaper, but all statements were later changed. Photographs were altered, images, small loose phrases placed out of context, and those circulated as if they were true. And nothing can be done about it. When it comes to *memes*, then, that is just ridiculous. We see how false facts circulate and how people in the same family support or reject them. And, very rarely, any member of the family took the trouble to seek the contrast of another point of view. We have seen very polarized families, some defending one side, others defending another; some people apparently had no opinion, but there were no differentiated points of view, supported by arguments. Therefore, I would say that visible *fake news* is relatively easy to fight. Fact-checking agencies do this, especially regarding political discourse. But it will be exceedingly difficult to prevent the circulation of fake news in closed networks, and that is where these things continue to happen. As we saw in the case of Cambridge Analytics, if there are people with access in possession of a set of emails and who can use them to pass on false information, there is no way to solve this issue. How to fight fake news concerning closed groups on mailing lists and Whatsapp groups?

MATRIZes: When thinking now about research in the field of journalism, how does Iberian research on cyber journalism, with a strong tradition and intense exchanges with Brazilian researchers, compare with studies carried out

in the USA, or even in Europe, which seem to have less prominence in Brazil than the research carried out within the Portugal and Spain axis?

Canavilhas: Good question. Let us see. There is a lot of bibliography on online journalism in non-Iberian countries – the big international congress on online journalism takes place in Austin, doesn't it? While the research developed in the USA is very much based on case studies, the one that we develop in the Iberian Peninsula, as well as in the Ibero-American space, goes a little further. In the USA, there is a lot of research in journalism. The research carried out in Portugal, Spain, Brazil, Argentina is an investigation in communication sciences. In other words, the research is not limited to simply looking at what is happening and then transcribing it. It is not a mere count of clicks, or visits to a website, for example. It is more than that. Then, we are fortunate to have relatively similar languages, and this allows us to work closely and, because of that, we end up pulling each other out. But, if we compare the Ibero-American with the Anglo-Saxon space, I believe that the research in web journalism done within the Ibero-American space is much stronger than the one carried out within the Anglo-Saxon space, in which there will be nine or ten references. Here, we will have twenty, thirty references, with questions focused mainly on social communication. On the other hand, we also noticed that, at a certain moment, many people who were dedicated to studying journalism were also attracted to political sciences and to the study of social networks, while we remained on the issue of journalism. A tragedy that we cannot overcome – if we try to measure our production in terms of citations, unfortunately for the Ibero-American space, although our production is much higher in terms of quantity and quality – and I say this without any fear – we realize these are two parallel worlds. In other words, while we, the Ibero-American space, cite their scientific production a lot, Anglo-Saxon scientific production practically does not mention Ibero-American production; and it has nothing to do with the language, because we take the trouble to produce the papers in Portuguese, in Spanish, and in English, and there is no such concern from our counterparts. I am not even talking about the French case anymore, which is a very particular one, as they dedicate a lot of effort to writing in French, but have some connections in Brazil, which does not happen within the Iberian space. So, I would say yes, our Ibero-American production is great in terms of quality and quantity but, unfortunately, Anglo-Saxon researchers are unwilling to look at us. I do not know how to explain it, it is a good question to ask the Anglo-Saxon space. They seem unable to accept us as peers, they will not quote us even when we write in English, except in situations in which we develop joint work. And, if we now have very

stable research networks between Portugal, Brazil, Argentina, Spain, and other countries, we are not going to be here introducing foreign elements to our network just expecting to be quoted later. That is it! There are two parallel worlds; we will continue to work on our scientific production, which is a lot. They will continue to work on theirs. I think the gap is growing larger; that is, we are increasingly more distant, while we produce more and more; and the other block produces less and less. There is a scattered bubble there, which is a small group of Oscar Westlund's *Digital Journalism* magazine, in which there is some concern about obtaining contributions from other countries, from the Asian and Ibero-American space, in the body of the magazine. If things do not happen this way, it is possible that we will keep walking with our backs turned, and that is definitely not our fault, as we have made an effort towards integration. It is enough to say that we had guests from the Anglo-Saxon space in this congress [XI Congreso Internacional de Ciberperiodismo, in Bilbao, Spain], but the opposite is very rare – it happens when there are people and researchers from the Ibero-American space who have participated for about a year in research on their side and, being inside the Anglo-Saxon space, people invite us to their events. I do not know; it is a historic relationship that has not gone well and has not improved. **M**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Canavilhas, J. (2006). Webjornalismo: Da pirâmide invertida à pirâmide deitada. In S. Barbosa (Org.). *Jornalismo digital de terceira geração* (pp. 25-40). Livros LabCom. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/3hs0v2k

Figaro, R., Grohmann, R., & Nonato, C. (2013). *As mudanças no mundo do trabalho do jornalista*. Editora Atlas S.A.

Figaro, R. (Org.) (2018). *As relações de comunicação e as condições de produção no trabalho de jornalistas e arranjos econômicos alternativos às corporações de mídia* [Research report]. Universidade de São Paulo. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/3203R7u

Longhi, R. (2014). O turning point da grande reportagem multimídia. *Famecos*, *21*(3), 897-917. https://doi.org/10.15448/1980-3729.2014.3.18660

Ringoot, R., & Ruellan, D. (2007). Journalism as permanent and collective invention. *Brazilian Journalism*, *3*(2), 67-76. https://doi.org/10.25200/BJR.v3n2.2007.119

Ruellan, D. (2005). Expansion ou dilution du journalisme? *Les Enjeux de l'information et de la communication,* (1), 77-86. https://doi.org/10.3917/enic.005.0077

Ruellan, D., & Le Cam, F. (Dir.) (2014). *Changements et permanences du journalism.* L'Harmattan.

Specht, P. (2015). Provedores de Internet e empresas de tecnologia, que também lucram com a notícia, deveriam ajudar a financiá-la. *Famecos, 22*(3), 215-227. http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/1980-3729.2015.3.21331

Ventura, M. S., & Ito, L. de L. (2016). Inovação no jornalismo brasileiro: O caso das reportagens multimídia TAB, do Uol. *Comunicação & Inovação, 17*(35), 121-134. https://doi.org/10.13037/ci.vol17n35.3738