

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Copyright © 2017
SBPjor / Associação
Brasileira de Pesquisadores em Jornalismo

CLÁUDIA LAGO AND SONIA VIRGÍNIA MOREIRA

Directors

FÁBIO HENRIQUE PEREIRA

Executive Editor

In this second edition of 2017, **Brazilian Journalism Research - BJR** gives continuity to a concern that has marked the editorial line of the journal in the last years: the contradiction between the normative historical discourse on journalism – supporting democracy and emancipatory social practice - and the actual exercise condition of this activity, subject to political and economic constraints. Particularly present in the thematic dossier ‘Journalism and Democracy’ (Vol. 2, n.2, 2016) and in several articles published in the last years, this founding tension was taken up at the last SBPjor congress “The journalism research as a space in which to observe the world: silence, censorship and power”, which gave rise to this special issue. At the same time that it refers to a recurring debate in the academic and professional world (to what extent has journalism fulfilled its social role, particularly in the representation of the other?), the dossier allows the exploration of emerging objects in the context of research in journalism in Brazil and in the world: “independent” media proliferation, political crisis representation and the immigration phenomenon.

The first free theme article, “Governance of Journalism and Alternatives to the Crisis”, by Jacques Mick and Luísa Tavares, to a certain extent, gives continuity to the thematic dossier. The authors take up the debate on the “crisis” that crosses journalism, but from an original perspective: instead of attributing it to the business model collapse, they situate it as a governance crisis, “profoundly related to the erosion of credibility of the prevailing organizational

structure of journalism in Western countries since the 19th century, the journalistic enterprise.” In this sense, overcoming the crisis involves the constitution of alternative governance forms, capable of reinstating journalism’s bonds with the audience. To illustrate this premise, Mick and Tavares present and analyze the case of the French website *Mediapart* and the way in which it sought to creatively respond to the crisis, especially in terms of organizational management in establishing new readers’ participation modalities.

The two articles that close the edition prefer to focus on journalism’s innovations caused by the introduction of technological devices in newsrooms. In the article “Telejournalism in Transformation: The Co-Production of New News-Values”, Fabiana Siqueira explores the impact of the coproduction material supply in the television news selection process. Through a robust methodological triangulation, involving participant observation, semi-structured interviews and content analysis, the author shows how the image selection process sent by the coproducers aims to create a “participation effect”. Another finding revealed by the text is the emergence of the single blatant coproduction as a new news-value employed in television newsrooms. In turn, the work of Ana Marta Moreira Flores, *Innovation Journalism: A Multiple Concept*, reviews the state of the art of the (polysemic) concept of “innovation” applied to journalistic practice. She advances in the definition of what “innovation journalism” would be about from three typologies, which structure the article: 1) content and narrative, 2) technology and format, and 3) business model. The author concludes that innovation journalism would be a “a natural response to the process of renewing journalism in the pursuit of winning new audiences and maintaining relevance for current users or readers”.

It is possible to say that this edition reveals a concern of the Brazilian academic community in problematizing journalism and its relation with society. Undoubtedly, it reflects the current political situation in Brazil and the expectations (and disappointments) created around journalism’s social role. **BJR** assumes a double role here: it is a scientific research dissemination space and an intellectual reflection (in the political sense of the term) on the very nature of journalistic practice. Producing a productive dialogue between the two dimensions was a challenge throughout the entire editing process, but we believe that the final result was a coherent and relevant document on the current state of academic debates about journalism in the country. We hope readers also share this perception.