

ARTICLES
ARTÍCULOS

BROTHERS IN ARMS?

Portuguese and Brazilian journalistic worlds compared

Copyright © 2013
SBPjor / Associação
Brasileira de
Pesquisadores em
Jornalismo

RUI NOVAIS

Universidade do Minho

SÔNIA VIRGÍNIA MOREIRA

Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro

LUÍSA SILVA

Universidade do Porto

ABSTRACT - This study aims to gauge if there is a 'de-territorialized' Portuguese speaking journalistic community or whether diverse professional self-perceptions prevail amongst Portuguese and Brazilian counterparts. Based upon an extensive and manifold comparative analysis of 200 questionnaires – comprising the 'journalism cultures', their trust on social institutions' and the 'perceived influences on news work' - it contrasts the cultural proximity of both countries, alongside a degree of globalization, with their rather dissimilar respective political and media contexts. It concludes that notwithstanding the expected proximity and some signs of convergence between the two countries, the comparative evidence displays some differences which are the result of their respective institutional, social and cultural embedding. Thus, those partially different professional cultures prevent the existence of a translocal Portuguese speaking journalistic culture and corroborate the importance of the contextual conditions.

Keywords: Journalism. Portugal. Brazil. Comparative study. Context.

COMPANHEIROS DE ARMAS?

Uma comparação entre o mundo jornalístico português e o brasileiro

RESUMO - Este artigo tem como objetivo avaliar se existe uma comunidade jornalística de língua portuguesa "desterritorializada" ou se autopercepções profissionais distintas prevalecem entre jornalistas portugueses e brasileiros. Com base em uma extensa análise comparada de 200 questionários – incluindo questões sobre as culturas do jornalismo, a confiança nas instituições e as influências no trabalho de coleta de notícias – o texto avalia a proximidade cultural dos dois países, bem como o índice de globalização, os respectivos contextos políticos e os diferentes meios de comunicação. Apesar da proximidade esperada e de alguns sinais de convergência entre os dois países, o estudo comparado mostra algumas diferenças que são resultantes da respectiva incorporação institucional, social e cultural. Assim, culturas profissionais diferentes impedem a existência de uma cultura jornalística de língua portuguesa "translocal" e confirmam a importância dos contextos.

Palavras-chaves: Jornalismo. Portugal. Brasil. Estudo comparado. Contextos.

¿COMPAÑEROS DE ARMAS?

Una comparación de los mundos periodísticos portugués y brasileño

RESUMEN - Este artículo tiene como objetivo determinar si es posible afirmar que existe una comunidad periodística “desterritorializada” en lengua portuguesa o si, por el contrario, prevalecen autopercepciones distintas entre periodistas portugueses y brasileños. A partir de un extenso análisis comparativo de doscientos cuestionarios —que incluían preguntas sobre la cultura del periodismo, la confianza en las instituciones y las influencias en el trabajo de recogida de noticias—, el texto evalúa la proximidad cultural de los dos países, así como el índice de globalización, los respectivos contextos políticos y los diferentes medios de comunicación. A pesar de la proximidad y de algunos signos de convergencia entre los dos países, el estudio comparativo muestra algunas diferencias que son resultado de su diferente incorporación institucional, social y cultural. Así, esas culturas profesionales distintas se oponen a la existencia de una cultura periodística en lengua portuguesa “translocal” y confirman la importancia de los contextos.

Palabras clave: Periodismo. Portugal. Brasil. Estudio comparativo. Contextos.

This article aims to assess the existence of a translocal Portuguese speaking journalistic culture (APPADURAI, 1996; HANITZSCH, 2007). This will be achieved by conducting a manifold process of comparison (COULDRY; HEPP, 2012) comprising a two-country analysis of the data collected in Portugal and in Brazil at different dimensions: ‘journalism cultures’, ‘journalists’ trust on social institutions’ and the ‘perceived influences on news work’.

Furthermore, developed within the context of an 18-nation Worlds of Journalism Study (WOJS) which intends to analyze the current state of journalism and media organizations across countries around the world (HANITZSCH et al., 2011), the adoption of the micro dual case study analysis hereby proposed also provides an unique opportunity to determine the significance of contextual conditions (MANCINI; HALLIN, 2012). That is so to the extent that such a spatial or cross-territorial comparison comprises a cultural proximity of both countries alongside a degree of globalization, in contrast with rather divergent/dissimilar economic, political and social contexts. Against this background, it assesses whether there is a ‘de-territorialized’ community of Portuguese speaking journalist, or if, on the contrary, structural and cultural distinctive patterns determined by domestic contexts result in rather diverse professional self-perceptions amongst Portuguese and Brazilian counterparts.

Before moving into the findings, however, the next sections propose a brief background of the larger WOJS which sets the contextual background of the study, alongside a distinction between the Portuguese and Brazilian media systems as well as an elucidation of the research design adopted.

1 THE WORLD OF JOURNALISM STUDY

A new model to analyze and define journalism cultures that aggregates concepts often used separately and in different ways in the academic professionals has been recently proposed. The author, argues that *it can be defined as a particular set of ideas and practices by which journalists, consciously or unconsciously, legitimate their role in society and render their work meaningful for themselves and others* (HANITZSCH 2007, p. 369).

Thus, in the perspective of the new conceptualization, journalism culture has three basic constituents: institutional roles, epistemologies and ethic ideologies.

Regarding institutional roles it refers to the concrete and normative functions of journalism in society. It may also involve the perceptions of the professional roles, news functions or the role of media (HANITZSCH, 2007). In this domain, it is possible to distinguish three different dimensions of institutional roles: *interventionism* (referring to the social committed journalist or, on the opposite side, the neutral, observant and objective one); *power distance* (journalism as the fourth estate or journalists who support and stand by the government, being collaborative); and, finally, *market orientation* (in terms of audience orientation or prioritizing the informative and political role of media). Analyzing journalists' role perception also contemplates the trust on social institutions. As a rule, a low trust on such institutions by journalists is connected to their perception of roles, such as considering important to watch and monitor the actions of the power elites.

The second constituent is epistemologies. This concept refers to the question of accessibility to the reality and journalists claim for truth, which involves objectivity and empiricism. With respect to the former it means that journalists tend to accept the absolute existence of objectivity, believe in the possibility of separating facts from values. On the other side are subjectivists that see reality only as representation, effect of an action intrinsically changeable. In what regards the latter, it dwells on the analysis of the means that journalists use to claim the truth.

The poles consist on prioritizing reality through evidence, observation, measure and experiences or resorting to analysis, ideas values and personal opinions.

Finally in terms of the journalistic culture, ethic ideologies examine how journalists respond to ethic dilemmas. Four perspectives are presented here: *standard professional approach*, when journalists refer to universal codes and editorial guidelines; *liberal professional approach* that criticizes the prior perspective through a set of arguments; *cynical approach*, which happens when journalists give no relevance to ethic dilemmas; and *ethical relativists*, that are people who promote *ad hoc* responses to ethic dilemmas.

Another ideology may be presented and was suggested by Plaisance (2005 apud HANITZSCH, 2007), inspired by Donelson R. Forsyth (1980 e 1981, apud HANITZSCH, 2007). That approach organizes ethic ideologies into a couple of dimensions: relativism (belief or rejection of universal codes) and idealism (actions determined by means or outcomes). The intersection between both dimensions, however, results into four rather distinct perspectives: *situacionism* (people who reject universal rules and stand by a case-by-case analysis); *absolutism* (also related to idealistic people, but who feel that the best outcome can be achieved by universal rules); *subjectivists* (people who sustain their judgments on personal values but are receptive to ponder negative means in order to achieve something good); and, finally, *excepcionists* (people who are guided by universal codes but are also receptive to open exceptions when they help to prevent negative consequences) (HANITZSCH, 2007, p. 371-379).

Additionally, the perceived influences on news work are also object of analysis. Indeed, autonomy is to be considered crucial in order that journalists be able to practice their job (KUNELIUS, 2007; McDEVITT, 2003; McQUAIL, 1992; SINGER, 2007 apud HANITZSCH; MELLADO, 2011). Therefore, a number of different factors have been put forward as cross-cultural indicators of the limited impact of external forces upon journalists' personal liberties. More concretely, six domains of influence are advanced by Hanitzsch and Mellado (2011, p. 406-7) comprising *political influences* (government, politicians, censorship); *economic influences* (profit expectations, market research, audience); *organizational influences* (editorial decisions or journalistic routines, such as the influence of media ownership on supervisors and higher editors); *procedural influences* (common constraints, such as lack of resources, space, established standards and routines); *professional influences*

(media conventions, laws, editorial guidelines); and *reference groups* (colleagues in other media, competing news organizations, audience or friends, acquaintances and family).

It is important to mention at this stage that it is rare to find the extreme poles of each of the concepts mentioned so far in the real practice of journalism. Thus they serve as a mere orientation guidelines towards the understanding of journalists' perception in today's world.

Lastly, respondents were presented a list of public institutions (that included the parliament, political parties, the government, the judiciary/the courts, the police, as well as politicians) and were asked to indicate the extent to which they trusted those institutions. This was included bearing in mind that it is usually related to both the journalists' perceptions of their roles and media being frequently accused of playing a key role in the erosion of confidence in public institutions.

2 THE PORTUGUESE AND BRAZILIAN JOURNALISTIC WORLDS

Studies related to Portuguese journalists are quite recent (published in the last decade). Firstly a reference should be made to the most important works centered in the process of professionalization of journalism. Fidalgo (2008; 2009), for example, focused his analysis on the evolution of journalism in Portugal comparing it to the introductive transformations occurred elsewhere in France. The author concluded that, whether for sociological, economic or political reasons, it was only possible for Portuguese journalists to achieve significant work conditions after 1974. Up to that moment, and despite some initiatives that were verified in order to change the state of the profession, Portugal faced some idiosyncrasies that delayed the progress. Whilst journalism in other countries was achieving the status of an independent profession, Portugal was living in a situation of a high level of illiterate people; the media companies had insufficient economic power and had to cope with severe censorship by the dictatorship (SOBREIRA, 2003; FIDALGO, 2008).

In the same vein, Correia and Batista's study (2007) focused on the transformations occurred in the decades of 1950 and 1960 in Portugal. The authors found that the establishment of journalism as a profession was only possible when journalists achieved material dignity and expansion of ethical principles and professional awareness was verified. By then some important technological changes (acquisition of better equipment, for example) also took place alongside to the creation of specific departments within the newsrooms and an increase in terms of the value of journalistic genres (CORREIA; BATISTA, 2007).

Additionally, media companies were extended, competition augmented, the newspapers grew in size and started to embrace more subjects and work conditions bettered or improved (CORREIA; BATISTA, 2007). The tipping-point coincided with the revolution of 25 April, 1974, which established the Portuguese democracy and enabled the existence of press freedom.

Additionally, some other qualitative interviewing studies carried out by different authors also need to be mentioned (CORREIA; BATISTA, 2010; FIGUEIRA, 2009, REBELO, 2011). They offer important data about journalists' perception, not only of past time periods, but also individual foresights of the profession or their opinion about the current state of Portuguese journalism. But being rather subjective, the information collected is not the best term of comparison.

Amongst other sociological studies, we can refer to Oliveira and Garcia, 1988 and 1994 (1988; 1994, apud PINTO; SOUSA, 2003), Garcia and Castro (1993) and most importantly the one coordinated by Rebelo (2011). The main reason is because it is a recent work which makes it more appropriate to be used as an object of comparison to the findings of the WOJS. Furthermore, Rebelo's study also similarly had resourced to qualitative interviewing as one of the research methodologies. Indeed, it included the testimony of 47 professionals chosen according to pre-selected journalistic profiles. Those interviews aimed to understand a number of different issues: the social background of journalists, their strategies of social promotion, their perspective about the profession and its future, how they manage the hierarchical relations within the media organization and also with their peers, which ethical norms they adopt and their perspective towards politics and religion (REBELO, 2011).

Additional data gathered by Rebelo emanates from CCPJ (Comissão da Carteira Profissional do Jornalista - *Journalist Professional License*). The information provided by CCPJ to Rebelo's research team related to 7402 journalists (REBELO, 2011) thus it establishes a fair socio-demographic characterization of journalism professionals between 2005 and 2008. More concretely, the sociological part of Rebelo's study used reliable data that enabled the researchers to reasonably characterize around two thirds of Portuguese journalists, namely the birth location, age, genre, number of years that the individuals work in the profession, specific medium (press, radio, television), education, etc. (REBELO, 2011).

Indeed, sociological studies in Portugal are quite reasonable to characterize Portuguese journalists. Nevertheless, works that gather data through journalists' self-perception of their profession resourced to qualitative interviewing. Thus it makes difficult to carry out unbiased

comparisons.

In the case of Brazil, analyses regarding journalists' profiles and/or professional practice are also rare, in opposition to the studies of journalism in a historical perspective, for instance. In general, researches regarding the field are detached of the newsroom's editorial routines and instances of decision. Or, in another words, researches on journalism seldom consider one of its main actors, the journalists. In this way, the outcomes of the *Worlds of Journalism Study* represent an original exploratory map of the Brazilian contemporary professional journalistic culture¹.

If researches focusing on Brazilian journalists are occasional, the same cannot be said of studies on journalism as a field of knowledge or the press as a subject of great concern. In order to establish itself as a specific domain of study in the greater area broader field of communication, much of the research conducted in a regular basis from the 70's to the end of the 90's were mainly descriptive, related both to newsroom production (such as style books critique) and to editorial organizations (studies on media outlets).

Ethics or ethical dilemmas, on the other hand, have constituted a prominent issue for Brazilian scholars and journalists. In the first group are the works of Karam (1997; 2004); Chaparro (1994); Christofolletti (2008), Toffoli (2008), and Marcondes Filho (2009). Among journalists, ethics are central in the writings of Abramo (1988); Beltrão (1992); Dines (1986; 2009); and Arbex Jr. (2001).

The collection of journalists' testimonies, primarily those involved in innovations that reverberated throughout the country's helping to establish some national journalistic standards, may also be pointed as a significant research topic. Representative works on this matter encompass three texts that interact with each other. The first is a study on journalists' profiles conducted by Melo and Lins da Silva's (1991), which analyzes journalistic routines from the point of view of 20 Brazilian journalists, and addresses issues of censorship, ideology and pedagogy of journalism. The second is Szejder's 2003 dialogue with 7 Brazilian chief editors, gathering their views on professional skills, information procedures, and their perception on journalistic standards. Finally, Abreu, Lattman-Weltman and Dora's 2003 volume incorporate the statements of 6 journalists who had a key role in the recasting or in the creation of news outlets in the last three decades of the 20th century, as a way to recover their journalistic careers and to rebuild a significant period of Brazilian history – the transition from military dictatorship to democratic rule in the late 70's.

Although minor in number in the context of the Brazilian academic production, specific researches on journalists' routines have contributed to build the basis for a core research on journalism cultures as the one proposed by the WOJS. That is the case of Travancas's (1993; 2011) inquiry orientated to the constitution of the journalists' social identity, both inside and outside the newsroom, and also of Adghirni's (1997) observation of the productive habits among reporters of three major daily newspapers in the coverage of political and economy news in Brasilia, the nation's capital.

3 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Originally planned as a pilot project and fielded in 2007-2011, the Worlds of Journalism Research has "carried out interviews with 2.100 journalists from more than 400 news organizations in 21 countries" (HANITZSCH, 2011). As in the larger project, interviews were conducted in Portugal and Brazil with a quota sample, in each case, of 100 working journalists drawn from 20 news organizations, comprising five professionals in each newsroom which had some "editorial responsibility" for the produced content. The interviewed comprised journalists from different types of media: national and local/regional ones; public, state-owned or private; quality (citizen-oriented) and popular (consumer-oriented).

The field research in Brazil began with pilot questionnaires in late 2007, and the majority of questionnaires were applied in 2008, completed with some and information rechecking and a few questionnaires in 2009. In Portugal, they started being carried out in 2010 but were mostly finished in 2011. The gathering of other data was completed in the beginning of 2012. A grant received from a German research foundation, in the case of Brazil, and the Science Foundation in Portugal², provided the funds that contributed to the research outcome in both countries. The data gathering process within the Brazilian journalists' group was not an easy assignment, in part due to journalists' availability, working hours in different time zones, and willingness to participate in the research. In Portugal, some difficulties were additionally found while trying to access media outlets' required information, mostly related to the medium's revenue structure. Finally, some of the questionnaires in both countries were conducted by telephone.

The three main dimensions proposed by the WOJS - journalism cultures, trust on social institutions and the perceived influences on

news work - were object of study, usually on 1 to 5 scale. The 200 questionnaires (100 interviews taken in each country) were object of a comparative analysis of the mean scores using the descriptive statistics test One-Way Anova analysis that grounded the conclusions undertaken. This test was also used once we have a sample higher than 30 which we can consider has having a normal distribution. As Hanitzsch et al. (2011a) situate, with only 100 journalists interviewed in each country, "it is hardly possible to provide that were representative in a statistical sense, we followed Hofstede (2001, p. 463) and decided to construct 'matched samples' that allow for comparison across countries" because of their similar internal compositions.

From an extensive comparative analysis of the results, it was then possible to identify the convergent and divergent points of view and perceptions which prevail within the two countries with close historical and cultural links but distinct political and media systems. In Portugal, a parliamentary system, the broadcast media, for instance, were mainly public until the 80's, when the first private media broadcasters started to operate commercial channels. In Brazil, a presidential system, the broadcast media was first characterized by its educational role, but soon adopted the American industrial model for radio and TV production.

The comparative research enables the study of a "wide range of subject matter and operates from diverse methodological standpoints" aiming "to search for similarity and variance" (MILLS et al., 2006, p. 620). This research method is thus useful once "(...) comparisons not only uncover differences between social entities, but reveal unique aspects of a particular entity that should be virtually impossible to detect otherwise" (Ibid, p. 621). Once the data used in the analysis is integrated in the WOJS, the concepts that sustain the fundamental background of the study were used to contextualize and justify the achieved conclusions. The data and conclusions available since the first field surveys (completed in 2007-2008) were also taken into account.

4 FINDINGS

4.1 Institutional roles

Generally, it is possible to conclude that regarding their role in society both Portuguese and Brazilian journalists guide themselves by the ideals of power distance and neutral observation. Indeed they display reservations towards the power elites by believing that monitoring their

activities should be a priority. Additionally, they aim to provide citizens with interesting information that may inform their political decisions.

While comparing the countries' mean scores it was verified that results were significantly equal in the following variables: 'to be an absolutely detached observer', 'to concentrate mainly on news that will attract the widest possible audience', 'to influence public opinion', and 'to motivate people to participate in civic activity and political discussion'.

It was considered as *very important* the first role and the one of providing interesting information; *somewhat important* or *very important* the latter; and *not important at all* the remaining variables.

Nevertheless, some significantly different results were also found. More concretely, the following roles were perceived differently: 'to act as watchdog of the government'; 'to provide citizens with the information they need to make political decisions'; 'to support official policies to bring about prosperity and development'; 'to advocate for social change'; and 'to convey a positive image of political and business leadership'.

With respect to the variables that were considered as statistically different, Brazil's mean scores revealed that journalists consider overall such roles to be more important than their Portuguese counterparts. Except for the role of 'providing a positive image of the power elites', where Portuguese professionals mean scores are superior: 1,67 and 1,43, respectively, where 1 is *not important at all* and 2 *little important*.

It is fundamental to further analyze the differences. For example, Brazilian journalists considered as being *very important* the role of 'monitoring the government' (4,45 where 5 means *extremely important*) and the mean score of Portugal is 3,80 (3 means *somewhat important*). Thus it could be said that journalists, in Portugal, seem to be less critic and more collaborative of those in power. However, it would be rather simplistic to conclude that they are supportive of the government. This is the case since not only the mean score obtained were not close to the lowest values but also because of other elements, such as the rejection of the importance of conveying a positive image of the power elites, which should be taken into consideration.

Another correlation was also expected to occur between the roles of 'watchdog of government' and 'to act as watchdog of elites'. Hanitzsch et al. (2010) by analyzing the results of the first 18 countries participating in the Worlds of Journalism study concluded that Brazil was one of the countries where that correlation fails to exist (along with Chile, China, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Turkey, and Uganda).

A better example of the differences shown in both countries is the one related to the defense of social change. The mean score of Brazil is 3,49 (between *somewhat important* and *very important*). The mean score of Portugal is 2,63 (2 means *little important*). With this data one would conclude that, from a social perspective, Brazilian journalists tend to adopt a more interventionist attitude than Portuguese journalists or at least to perceive their active role as such. The results could be justified by the contrasting political and social realities that prevail in each country. However, Brazilian journalists considered the neutral observation facet as being very important to the detriment of the setting of the political agenda and the possibility to influence public opinion. Brazilian news professionals, thus, tend to share the values that are traditionally related to Western journalism standard.

'To provide citizens with the information they need to make political decisions' and 'to support official policies' were also more claimed by Brazilian journalists: 4,81 and 3,17, respectively against the 4,49 and 2,64 registered in Portugal. The first presented variable places Brazilian journalists with a market orientation that prioritizes public interest slightly more than Portuguese journalists – the difference lies between *extremely important* and *very important*. The aforementioned reinforces the results previously obtained both in the question related to the audiences and the one about the importance of providing interesting information to the audience. Lastly, it should be noted that both countries prioritize political information.

4.2 Epistemologies

The conclusions achieved within the realm of the news coverage were that journalists from both countries tend to the objectivity pole and to empirically validate information. The following variables were statistically considered as equal: 'I do not allow my own beliefs and convictions to influence my reporting'; 'I provide analysis of events and issues in my work'; 'I think facts can speak for themselves'; 'I always make clear which side on a dispute has the better position'; and 'I always stay away from information that cannot be verified'.

As for 'believing that facts speak for themselves', Portuguese journalists' mean scores were superior to the Brazilian (4,02 and 3,72, respectively, where 4 means *somewhat agree* and 3 *neither agree nor disagree*). The same was shown in the results of work impartiality where the mean score of Portuguese journalists is 4,35 (5 means *strongly agree*) and the Brazilian is 3,98. Regarding the 'claim for truth when based on

substantial evidence and reliable sources', the mean score of Brazil was superior to the one obtained in Portugal (4,71 and 4,46, respectively),

The only variable in which mean scores were below the value 3 is related to making clear which side in a dispute has the better position: 2,26 is the mean answer of Brazil and 2,24 of Portugal. The remaining results converge to the highest values (between 3 and 5).

Therefore it was possible to conclude that journalists generally believe that 'it is possible to separate values from truth' as well as to justify such claim for truth by 'resorting to observation, measure, prove and evidence'. Notwithstanding the question regarding the analysis of events and issues in journalists' work having scored 3,97 (Brazil) versus 4,01 (Portugal) the remaining elements under analysis indicated a low acceptance of an 'analytical and opinionative approach by journalists'. Although the acceptance of objectivity is not linear, once such *concepts are not considered to be absolute; there is a search for the 'truth' of the facts, an ethical and moral concern* (MOREIRA; HELAL, 2009, p. 104).

4.3 Ethical ideologies

Along with external influences, ethical ideologies were the only domain where the mean scores of both countries were significantly equal in most of the statements. The ethic questions that showed the highest values (between number 4 - *somewhat agree* and 5 - *strongly agree*) were: 'there are ethical problems which are so important that they should be followed by all journalists, regardless of their situation and context'; and 'journalists should avoid questionable methods of reporting in any case, even if this means not getting the story'.

Regarding the remaining statements, journalists seemed to not support that 'ethical dilemmas in news coverage are often so complex that journalists should be allowed to formulate their own individual codes of conduct' (the mean scores show values of 2,08 - Brazil and 2,18 - Portugal) and that 'reporting and publishing a story that can potentially harm others is always wrong, irrespective of the benefits to be gained' (2,16 and 2,26, respectively). Also regarding relativism (of what is ethical in journalism) that varies from one situation to another (2,15 and 1,91). Furthermore, the variable 'there are situations in which harm is justifiable if it results in a story that produces a greater good' obtained average scores (3,31 and 3,53).

Therefore, journalists in Portugal and in Brazil tend to accept universal ethics and established editorial guidelines, falling into the category of the standard professional approach proposed by Hanitzsch

(2007). They have low relativistic and idealistic attitudes in the sense that consequences are sometimes justifiable when it involves the achievement of a greater good. Therefore, they take into account universal codes but are able to analyze case-by-case and accept that sometimes exceptions are needed when they help to prevent negative consequences.

Such questions are indeed complex and unanimous. It is difficult to decide what can be considered as ethical or unethical (MOREIRA; HELAL, 2009). "In daily practice in the editorial rooms, ethical questions regarding journalistic activities can receive different interpretations; depending on each particular case" (MOREIRA; HELAL, 2009, p.104). But it is worthy of note that in the open question where Brazilian journalists were encourage to state the essential elements for their professional performance, ethics were the most frequent (57 responses), followed by truth (25); impartiality (20), and accuracy (18 responses). Ethics as essential to "good journalism" prevails among the professionals surveyed (MOREIRA; HELAL, 2009, p.104).

In Portugal, journalists also received ethical questions with some uncertainty. Despite agreeing that there are undeniable situations (such as the right to live), most of the interviewees shared the perspective that ethic dilemmas cannot be generically evaluated on an abstract level.

4.4 Trust in social institutions

Generically, Portuguese journalists seemed to trust more on social institutions than their fellow Brazilian colleagues. Mean values are generally between 2 (*little trust*) and 3 (*somewhat trust*). Statistically speaking, when comparing the mean scores, the results were considered to be significantly equal regarding the 'government', the 'judiciary / court' and significantly different with respect to the 'police', 'politicians in general', 'religious leaders' and 'charitable or voluntary institutions'.

Journalists in both countries tended to attribute/display low trust to 'politicians' and the 'political parties in general'. In Brazil, they trust more on the 'United Nations', 'charitable or voluntary organizations' and the 'media'. In the case of Portugal, journalists additionally trust in the institutions of 'parliament', 'police' and 'the military'. None of the institutions obtained mean scores that showed clear or complete trust by journalists. Regarding the question of the 'trust on the news media', for example, in the case of Brazil, Moreira and Rodrigues Helal (2009, p.105) stated that

"(...) each one believes in the work performed by its team, but not in general, not totally trusting other media. Problems relating to the quality of the information disseminated, economic dependency, political alliances, and other ways of compromising some media can contribute to this mistrust."

The degree of distrust shown in relation to the public sector operates as a motivation for the Brazilians journalists' watchdog role. Problems related to the quality of information conveyed, economic dependence, political alliances and other forms of commitment are beyond doubt the key elements contributing to these circumstances.

4.5 Internal influences

The mean results are higher in Brazil, which means that Brazilian journalists seemed to perceive more internal influences. Additionally, results were considered significantly different in most variables. With regard to the variable 'peers' the mean scores were 4,07 (Brazil) and 3,48 (Portugal); 'supervisors and editors' 4,07 and 3,48, respectively; 'media ownership' 3,13 and 2,30; 'editorial guidelines' 4,13 and 3,50; and 'deadlines' 3,61 and 3,03.

The only variables where the results were considered significantly equal were only three: 'advertisement considerations', 'profit expectations' and 'new technologies'. The first showed a mean score of 2,21 in Brazil and 1,94 in Portugal (1 means *not influential at all* and 2 *little influential*). The variable 'profit expectations' obtained a mean score of 2,52 (Brazil) and 2,44 (Portugal) (3 means *somewhat influential*). 'New technologies' mean scores are 3,55 (Brazil) and 3,42 (Portugal).

In the open question regarding limitations that affect the journalists' work routines, the editorial line, budget constraints, time shortage to dedicate to news report, the influence of advertisers, and matters involving operational resources were cited as the main impediments for the Brazilians journalists' performance. A considerable number of professionals, however, stated that they do not have any limitation in carrying out their duties.

4.6 External Influences

As aforementioned, regarding external influences, the results showed significant similarities. Brazilian and Portuguese journalists tend to statistically disagree only in four factors of external influences: 'readers, listeners or viewers' (3,60 and 3,01 respectively); 'other media' (2,95 and 2,51); 'sensibilities' (3,48 and 3,00); and 'advertisers' (2,06 e 1,64). Such results validate the impression that Brazilian journalists also seem to perceive to have more influences impacting upon their work.

Generically, journalists in Brazil and in Portugal are less influenced by 'friends, acquaintances and family'; by 'colleagues in other media', by 'censorship', 'government officials', 'public relations', 'journalism unions', 'religious leaders', 'advertisers' and 'media watch organizations'.

CONCLUSION

Generically, one of the main conclusions emanating from this study concerns the institutional roles, which points the Portuguese and Brazilian journalists' determination to adhere to the ideals of detachment and neutral observation. Furthermore, they both stay relatively distant to the power elites, monitoring and verifying their actions, while striving to provide relevant and accurate political information. On the contrary, the most significant differences verified between the countries' mean scores on this specific domain refer to the advocacy of social change, the need to provide citizens with relevant information so that they can make political decisions and, finally, the support of official policies that can result in prosperity and development. What is more, Brazilian journalists register the highest scores in all the items present within the survey regarding the institutional roles, which is revealing of their high self-perception when compared with the Portuguese counterparts.

Regarding the different ways to approach news coverage, the results show that journalists of both countries tend to be objective and neutral as well as to empirically validate information. Therefore, Portuguese and Brazilian journalists believe that it is possible to separate values from reality, and justify the claim of truth by observation, evidence and experience. In addition, they share similar views concerning ethical ideologies and the external influences that may impact on their standard routines. On the contrary, Portuguese journalists seem to rely more on social institutions than their Brazilian colleagues.

More concretely, concerning trust on social institutions, Portuguese and Brazilian journalists rely less on politicians, in general, and political parties, in particular. In Brazil, journalists trust more in the United Nations, charitable or voluntary organizations and in the media. In Portugal, in addition to these three institutions, media professionals reveal a significant trust on the members of Parliament, alongside the police and the army. The comparative analysis to the countries' scores also reveals that professionals take into consideration the universal values and ethical principles and editorial guidelines in their daily work. Nevertheless, they also show receptiveness to make exceptions when and if necessary. That is, they are rather pragmatic when analyzing each situation by itself and decide when other means and ends are valid in order to avoid negative consequences or to achieve a greater good.

Finally, in terms of internal and external influences, the study

concludes that organizational, procedural and professional influences are perceived by journalists of both countries to interfere more on the news production to the detriment of political, economic and reference groups' related influences. A possible explanation for this alluded to within the literature is that journalists might not be aware of the real power of the possible potential influences in the everyday news work or it could be the case that the socialization process might lead to the acceptance by journalists that certain influences are to be considered normal anyway.

Thus we concluded that the impact of 'political influences' within news reporting seems to be scarce, something which also applied to the ones emanating from 'economic' and other 'reference groups'. Quite the opposite, intra-media influence - either of 'organizational', 'procedural' or 'professional' nature seemed to interfere more in the journalistic work. The results corroborate Hanitzsch's and Mellado's (2011) findings pointing to the fact that political influences tend to be stronger in countries where the democracy level is lower.

In sum, the differences in journalistic practices and orientations across the two countries resulting from the comparative evidence are determined by the national contexts within which they work. Therefore, the argument put forward in this paper is that the partially different professional cultures verified amongst Portuguese and Brazilian journalists are the result of their specific institutional, social and cultural embeddings which prevents for the time being the existence of a 'de-territorialized' or translocal Portuguese speaking journalistic community.

NOTES

- 1 In historical terms, according to Melo (2009), for almost two centuries the writers who emblemize journalistic thinking in Brazil have been coherent, without disregarding controversy, and have allowed for a certain sense of continuity, without running away from their impasses. These writers value and reinforce a Brazilian way of practicing journalism, which developed after Brazil's political emancipation from Portugal in 1822, and later, between 1831 and 1840, when the country's territorial integrity was secured against regional uprisings (MELO, 2009).
- 2 The Portuguese part was developed within the 'Portuguese World of Journalism' (PTDC/CCI-JOR/111888/2009) financed by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia within the Programa Operacional Temático Factores de Competitividade (COMPETE) of the Quadro Comunitário de Apoio III participado and the Fundo Comunitário Europeu.

REFERENCES

- ABRAMO, C. **A regra do jogo**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1988.
- ABREU, A.; LATTMAN-WELTMAN, F.; DORA, R. **Eles mudaram a imprensa - depoimentos ao CPDOC**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2003.
- ADGHIRNI, Z. L. Rotinas produtivas dos jornalistas em Brasília. In: MOUILLAUD, M; PORTO, S. D. (Org). **O jornal, da forma ao sentido**. Brasília: Paralelo 15, 1997.
- APPADURAI, A. **Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization**. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- ARBEX Jr., J. **Showrnlalismo**, a notícia como espetáculo. São Paulo: Editora Casa Amarela, 2001.
- BELTRÃO, L. **Iniciação à filosofia do jornalismo**. São Paulo: Edusp / Com-Arte, 1992.
- CHAPARRO, M. C. C. **Pragmática do jornalismo**, buscas práticas para uma teoria da ação jornalística. São Paulo: Summus, 1994.
- CHRISTOFOLETTI, R. **Ética no jornalismo**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2008.
- CORREIA, F.; BATISTA, C. **Jornalistas: do ofício à profissão**. Lisboa: Editorial Caminho, 2007.
- CORREIA, F.; BATISTA, C. **Memórias Vivas do Jornalismo**. Lisboa: Editorial Caminho, 2010.
- COULDRY, H.; HEPP, A. Comparing media cultures. In: F. Esser; T. Hanitzsch (Ed.), **Handbook of comparative communication research**. London, UK: Routledge, 2012. p. 249-261.
- DINES, A. **O papel do jornal e a profissão de jornalista**. São Paulo: Summus, 2009.
- FIDALGO, J. **O Jornalista em construção**. Porto: Porto Editora, 2008.
- FIDALGO, J. **O lugar da ética e da auto-regulação na identidade profissional dos jornalistas**. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian / Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, 2009.
- GARCIA, J. L.; CASTRO, J. Os jornalistas portugueses. Da recomposição social aos processos de legitimação profissional. **Sociologia - Problemas e Práticas**, v. 13, p. 93-114, 1993.
- GARCIA, J. L. Para o estado da arte da investigação sobre os jornalistas portugueses. **Revista Media & Jornalismo** (online). v. 9, n. 17 (2 Outono - Inverno), p. 125-140, 2010. Available at: <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/>» Accessed on: 3 January 2011.
- HALLIN, D. C.; MANCINI, P. Comparing media systems: A response to critics. In: ESSER, F.; HANITZSCH, T. (Ed.), **Handbook of comparative communication research**. London, Routledge, 2012. p. 207-220.

HANITZSCH, T. Deconstructing journalism culture: Toward a universal theory. **Communication Theory**, n. 17, p. 367-385, 2007.

HANITZSCH, T. e MELLADO, C. What Shapes the News Around the World? How Journalists in Eighteen Countries Perceive Influences on Their Work. **The International Journal of Press / Politics**, v. 16, n. 4, 2011.

HANITZSCH, T. Populist Disseminators, Detached Watchdogs, Critical Change Agents and Opportunist Facilitators: Professional Milieus, the Journalistic Field and Autonomy in 18 Countries. **International Communication Gazette**, nº 73, p. 477-494, 2011.

HANITZSCH, T., Folker Hanusch, Claudia Mellado, Maria Anikina, Rosa Berganza, Incilay Cangoz, Mihai Coman, Basyouni Hamada, Maria Elena Hernandez, Christopher D. Karadjov, Sonia Virginia Moreira, Peter G. Mwesige, Patrick Lee Plaisance, Zvi Reich, Josef Seethaler, Elizabeth A. Skewes, Dani Vardiansyah Noor & Kee Wang Yuen (2011a): Mapping Journalism Cultures across Nations: A Comparative Study of 18 Countries. **Journalism Studies** vol. 12, nº3, p. 273-293, 2011a.

HANITZSCH, T., Maria Anikina, Rosa Berganza, Incilay Cangoz, Mihai Coman, Basyouni Hamada, Folker Hanusch, Christopher D. Karadjov, Claudia Mellado, Sonia Virginia Moreira, Peter G. Mwesige, Patrick Lee Plaisance, Zvi Reich, Josef Seethaler, Elizabeth A. Skewes, Dani Vardiansyah Noor & Kee Wang Yuen: Modeling Perceived Influences on Journalism: Evidence from a Cross-National Survey of Journalists. **Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly** vol 8, nº 1, p. 7-24, 2010.

HOFSTEDE, G. **Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations**. 2ª ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2001.

KARAM, F. J. **Ética jornalística e interesse público**. São Paulo: Summus, 2004.

MARCONDES FILHO, C. **Ser jornalista**. São Paulo: Summus, 2009.

MELO, J. M. **Journalistic thinking: Brazil's modern tradition**. Journalism, February 10, p. 9-27, 2009.

MELO, J. M.; LINS DA SILVA, C. E. (Org.). **Perfis de jornalistas**. São Paulo: Editora FTD, 1991.

MILLS, M.; BUNT, G. G.; BRUIJN, J. (2006) **Comparative Research Persistent Problems and Promising Solutions**. **Internacional Sociology** (online). Vol 21(5), pp. 619-631. Available at: Sage Publications website: «<http://iss.sagepub.com>» Accessed on: 12 January 2012.

MOREIRA, S. V.; HELAL, C. L. R. Notes on media, journalism education and news organizations in Brazil. **Journalism: Theory, Practice & Criticism**, n. 10, p. 91-107, 2009.

PINTO, M.; SOUSA, H. Journalism Education at Universities and Journalism Schools in Portugal. In: FROHLICH, R.; HOLTZ-BACHA, C. (Ed.) **Journalism Education in Europe and North America, An International Comparison**. New York: Hampton Press, 2003.

REBELO, J. **Ser jornalista em Portugal: perfis sociológicos**. Lisboa: Gradiva, 2011.

SOBREIRA, M. R. **Os jornalistas Portugueses 1933-1974**. Uma profissão em construção. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte, 2003.

SZNEJER, V. **Jornalistas**. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad, 2003.

TOFOLI, L. **Ética no Jornalismo**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2008.

TRAVANCAS, I. **O mundo dos jornalistas**. São Paulo: Summus, 2011.

Rui Alexandre Novais - Phd in Communication and Image Studies at the University of Kent, in Canterbury (UK); Researcher at CECS-University of Minho (Portugal) and University of Liverpool (UK); and Principal Investigator of "Portuguese World of Journalism", project financed by the Portuguese Science Foundation PTDC/CCI-JOR/111888/2009. E-mail: rualais@gmail.com

Sônia Virginia Moreira - Phd in Communication Sciences at the University of São Paulo (Brazil); Professor of Graduate Communication Program at Rio de Janeiro State University; International Relations Director (2011-2014) at Brazilian Society for Interdisciplinary Studies in Communication; associate researcher of the worldwide research network Worlds of Journalism Study. E-mail: soniavm@gmail.com

Luísa Silva - MA in Communication Sciences at the University of Porto (Portugal) and researcher of "Portuguese World of Journalism", project financed by the Portuguese Science Foundation PTDC/CCI-JOR/111888/2009. E-mail: silva.luisamc@gmail.com

RECEIVED ON: 04/03/2012 | APPROVED ON: 07/07/2013

