

**PERIODISMO Y DESINFORMACIÓN
ANÁLISIS Y PERSPECTIVAS**

COLECCIÓN JANO COMUNICACIÓN Y HUMANIDADES

5

DIRECCIÓN – COORDINACIÓN EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

José Ángel Agejas Esteban. Universidad Francisco de Vitoria. España

Francisco García García. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. España

COMITÉ ACADÉMICO ASESOR – ACADEMIC ADVISORY BOARD

Susana Herrera Damas. Universidad Carlos III. España

Jorge Martínez Lucena. Universidad Abat Oliva-CEU. España

Marie-Laure Ryan. Investigadora independiente. Estados Unidos de Norteamérica

Álvaro Abellán-García Barrio. Universidad Francisco de Vitoria. España

Ignacio Blanco Alfonso. Universidad San Pablo-CEU. España

Carmen Marta Lázaro. Universidad de Zaragoza. España

Rogelio del Prado Flores. Universidad Anáhuac. México

Ana María del Valle. Universidad Francisco de Vitoria. España

Guadalupe Arbona Abascal. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. España

Alberto Nahum García. Universidad de Navarra. España

Humberto Martínez-Fresneda Osorio. Universidad Francisco de Vitoria. España

Catalina Martín Lloris. Universidad Católica de Valencia San Vicente Mártir. España

Diego Botas Leal. Universidad Francisco de Vitoria. España

HUMBERTO MARTÍNEZ-FRESNEDA OSORIO
(coord.)

PERIODISMO Y DESINFORMACIÓN
ANÁLISIS Y PERSPECTIVAS

EDITORIAL SINDÉRESIS
2023

1ª edición, 2023

© Los autores

© 2023, editorial Sindéresis

Calle Princesa, 31, planta 2, puerta 2 – 28008 Madrid, España info@editorialsinderesis.com
www.editorialsinderesis.com

ISBN: 978-84-19199-91-1

Depósito legal: M-28964-2023

Produce: Óscar Alba Ramos

Imagen portada: "Wall Street Journal" by Kevin Dooley is licensed under CC BY 2.0. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://www.flickr.com/photos/12836528@N00/1202823367>

Impreso en España / Printed in Spain

Reservado todos los derechos. De acuerdo con lo dispuesto en el código Penal, podrán ser castigados con penas de multa y privación de libertad quienes, sin la preceptiva autorización, reproduzcan o plagien, en todo o en parte, una obra literaria, artística o científica, fijada en cualquier tipo de soporte.

ÍNDICE

Introducción, <i>Producing journalism in times of uncertainty</i>	7-16
Presentación, <i>Periodismo y desinformación: análisis y perspectivas</i> , Humberto Martínez-Fresneda	17-21
<i>Periodismo de proximidad en catástrofes: análisis de la cobertura informativa de televisión Vega Baja ante la dana que anegó la comarca alicantina en 2019</i> , Antonio Ricardo Anierte Guerrero	23-40
<i>Comunidad UFV, un proyecto híbrido para una formación experiencial</i> , Alfredo Arense Gómez	41-56
<i>El final del “parlamento de papel” (1976) y el estado de alarma (2020): dos situaciones críticas para la prensa</i> , Álvaro de Diego González	57-68
<i>La educación integral de los futuros periodistas: Un estudio de casos</i> , Daniel de la Rosa	69-77
<i>La responsabilidad de los medios de comunicación en la gestión de las emociones en redes sociales: la Generación Z como caso de estudio</i> , Marta García Bruno; Marta Molina Díez	79-95
<i>La accesibilidad a las nuevas tecnologías como factor esencial para la empleabilidad de las personas con discapacidad en el sector audiovisual</i> , Mercedes Herrero de la Fuente - Carlos Jiménez-Narros	97-116

<i>Los periodistas de TVE en la movilización del 8-m de 2018</i> , Carmen María Navarro López	117-129
<i>La alfabetización mediática en España</i> , Virginia Oya Alcalá	131-150
<i>La cláusula de conciencia de los periodistas españoles</i> , Gabriel Sánchez	151-165
<i>Roles played by institutional media and independent journalism amongst the nepali diaspora living in Spain & Portugal</i> , Alexandra Pereira	167-185
<i>La gastronomía como línea de negocio en el grupo de comunicación Vocento</i> , David Varona Aramburu - Isabel García Casado.....	187-198
<i>Actuaciones contra la desinformación y la libertad de recibir o de comunicar informaciones o ideas: regulación y acciones en el seno de la UE y España</i> , Lorena Velasco Guerrero	199-211

INTRODUCTION

PRODUCING JOURNALISM IN TIMES OF UNCERTAINTY

The words ‘precarity’ and ‘uncertainty’ have been among those most associated with journalism in the 21st century following the emergence of digital media and the disruption of commercial media’s business model, which is mostly dependent on advertising. While throughout the 20th century brands had no other serious option than investing in media outlets to reach their consumers, over the last two decades new forms of interaction with consumers have emerged, leading to a significant decline in the investments made by the advertising industry in traditional media and thus in journalism.

With the business on the edge of collapse, those working in a newsroom are currently required to not only be multitaskers – who are capable of producing text, image and sometimes audio - but they are also required to be able to deal with the uncertainty of what lies ahead, while reporting on events that take place in societies that are also troubled by uncertainties. Those uncertainties are brought about by climate change, the economy, health crisis, wars, as well as, in many countries, political instability and the emergence of political actors that challenge the institutions that are central to a liberal democracy, journalism included.

Ironically, over the last few years it has been uncertainty that reminded many citizens of the central role played by journalism in reporting and making sense of reality. In 2020 and 2021, while science and public health authorities were playing their role in keeping people safe and increasing the levels of predictability about the future, it was the uncertainty about the evolution of the virus and its transmission that made it clear how important it is to have access to high-quality information.

Despite the many different strategies adopted by governments to deal with the pandemic, the initial period of the health crisis generated the need among citizens worldwide to eagerly look for information about the virus and its transmission, both online and on legacy media. Evidence collected during the early stages of the pandemic demonstrates that audiences that were disconnected from journalism and received information mostly from social media, increased their consumption of news produced by journalists and distributed by professional media outlets. This seems to indicate that—in varying levels across countries—media and journalism are perceived as

credible institutions in times of uncertainty, to which citizens turn for access to useful information that may help them deal with the unknown and the unexpected.

As in other crises in the past, authorities relied on the media to disseminate relevant information among the population, producing narratives aimed at making sense of the new reality created by COVID-19 while urging people to adopt behaviors that would help stop the uncontrolled spread of the virus. This civic role performed by most media seems to have revived the importance of journalism across large sectors of the public. However, while the pandemic increased the numbers of individuals who accessed news content, it also exposed the fragility of media institutions in the era of the platform economy that has devalued journalism for its inability to generate immediate and measurable revenue for advertisers (Napoli, 2019).

The uncertainty faced by media practitioners and journalists, as well as the institutional settings in which they work, is aggravated by the contemporary information ecosystem marked by the rapid circulation of disinformation and by the frequent attacks on journalists by populist movements that in many countries in Europe, but also in the Americas, in Asia and Africa, have acquired a central role in the political process even in democratic settings.

In this talk, I will mostly focus on these two trends - disinformation and populist discourse. The aim is to demonstrate how both phenomena contribute to exacerbate the uncertainty inside the newsrooms. So let me start by sharing a story that acquired widespread visibility just one year ago.

Journalism: Target of Disinformation

In September 2021, one news story that was making the headlines in the United States but also in other countries, namely the UK, was to warn parents and teachers about the "Slap a Teacher TikTok challenge." The news was first reported by a local television channel in Florida (Local 10 News) that alerted to the dangers of a challenge that was allegedly becoming viral on the social platform Tik Tok. According to the report, teenagers were being urged to slap or punch a teacher at school, record the assault and post it on Tik Tok where it would get a lot of engagement, via likes and comments.

In the US, where the story first gained media attention, school officials told reporters that they would press charges against the students who would slap or punch their teachers. They also promised that these cases would be prosecuted to the "fullest extent of the law".

The story was largely reported on several media outlets, both local and national. *USA Today*, for example, reported that schools across the United States had sent notices to parents urging them to speak to their children so that they would be made aware of the dangers of the challenge. Newspapers and television channels in other countries also reported on the dangers of the new Tik Tok challenge.

Why is this story connected to the challenges faced by journalism today? Well, despite the news being reported on dozens of professional media outlets, like *USA Today*, *LA Times*, *Local 10 News* and many others, the “Slap a Teacher Challenge” never existed! It illustrates the panic that was created inside some communities generated by professional journalists reporting a fake story.

So, the question is: how was this possible? Well, to start, the journalists writing about this alleged story were getting the information online, namely from social media and other websites. Second, due to the downsizing of newsrooms that has taken place in the last two decades, and the focus on reporting fast instead of slow and in-depth, newspapers and broadcasting stations did not take the time to confirm the story via independent sources and thus relied solely on what was being written and shared on social media.

At a time when journalism is under attack from economic and political actors that aim to discredit it by labelling its output as fake news, the fact that sometimes journalists do get it wrong is more troublesome than even. Not only can fake news eventually cause harm to society – or as in the case of ‘Slap a Teacher’ lead to panic – but they also endanger the credibility of journalism as a practice and as a profession. The solution to avoid such incidents is however not an easy one to find. Even though we can point to the simple solution that journalists have to be more rigorous, it is important to state that it is impossible today for understaffed newsrooms to check all the information they are fed without changing the way they operate. On the one hand, we have newsrooms with less resources, while on the other, corporations, political actors and even states are putting more money into disinformation which has permitted the emergence of specialized companies whose only service is the production and dissemination of fake information. Those who invest in disinformation aim to deceive the public but also journalists whose credibility is also a main target. Undermining journalism’s credibility is considered crucial by many economic and political actors who aim to promote their own agendas, irrespective of its actual connection to facts and reality. Once more the ‘Slap a Teacher Campaign’ is a good example of this.

The news on the alleged campaign did not become viral by chance. It was instead the result of a communication operation developed by Targeted Victory, one of the most prominent communication consulting companies in the USA. As was disclosed by *The Washington Post* in March this year, the news item on the ‘Slap a Teacher Campaign’ was funded by Meta, the owner of Facebook, Instagram, and Whatsapp. The aim was to start an anti-TikTok movement by targeting smaller news outlets with fewer resources – which limits their ability to confirm the information they are fed by public relations companies and social media (Lorenz & Harwell, 2022). Big tech platforms that disrupted journalism’s traditional business model by offering brands and companies new and cheaper ways of reaching their consumers, are now taking advantage of the fragilities inside the newsrooms to disseminate stories aimed at undermining their competitors.

According to *The Washington Post*, with this campaign Meta aimed to create the perception that Tik Tok was dangerous for children and teenagers at a time during which Facebook was being criticized for not only failing to counter fake news but also for benefiting from its circulation on its own platforms. On one internal memo, Meta officers explained that their dream was to have newspapers and television channels share “stories with headlines like 'From dances to danger: how TikTok has become the most harmful social media space for kids'" (Lorenz & Harwell, 2022).

This is just one of many possible examples of how journalism can be deceived and used as a tool to promote corporate interests in the digital age.

Of course, using journalism to plant fake news is far from a new phenomenon. Instead, it has been central in the circulation of stories that aim to mold public opinion, and so it is not something we should present as being invented by the digital environment. One of the most famous cases of the entire 20th century was the testimony of a 15-year-old girl at a hearing of a Committee of the American Congress, following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990. The girl named Nayirah described how she had managed to escape from Kuwait after witnessing several crimes committed by the Iraqi forces. One of atrocities she allegedly witnessed was soldiers taking newborn babies from their incubators in a local hospital and placing them on the cold floor to die. As Randal Marlin (2002) highlights, Nayirah’s testimony circulated worldwide on international media and led to a shift in public opinion that then became in favor of an international military operation to expel the Iraqi forces from Kuwait. The story had only one problem: it was not real but was instead created by a PR company based in New York. Nayirah was, in fact, the daughter of the Kuwaiti

Ambassador in the USA, and this fact was only disclosed in 1992 after the international coalition had already expelled the Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

Like today, the 20th century witnessed large investments by state and non-state actors in campaigns aimed at deceiving journalists to publish untrue stories. Another classical example is the story created by the KGB that the HIV virus had been produced in an American laboratory, with the purpose of exterminating a large portion of the world population in the countries that did not support the US hegemony.

So, why is today's disinformation potentially more dangerous than during the Cold War? I would argue that the main difference is that today corporations and political agents no longer depend on their ability to deceive media outlets and journalism to disseminate fake stories. Fake stories can easily be propagated online, via social media, and exist in peoples' minds even if these are not reported by professional journalism. However, ironically or maybe not, journalists are still a main target of disinformation. As the 'Slap a Teacher Campaign' makes clear, the deception of journalists is a common strategy of those who work in the industry of disinformation.

Contrary to considering this as something that is only negative, I believe that it also has a positive side (and I know this is a controversial statement to make at a journalism conference). It is obviously negative because, as I have discussed, newsrooms are clearly understaffed and are likely to fall into the traps set up by professionals of disinformation. But there is also a positive dimension to it all, because this means that powerful corporations – even Meta – and political agents understand that journalism's role in society is very relevant today and, despite the collapse of its business model, it remains a central institution in the creation of the general public's perceptions of reality. It is this centrality that makes it a main target of disinformation.

The concept of disinformation is itself troubling and used to describe different phenomena. In this talk I don't have the time to discuss it properly, namely its connection to propaganda. However, I would like to make clear that it is crucial to distinguish it from misinformation, which is an involuntary phenomenon, contrary to disinformation that is a conscious process aimed at deceiving people.

Countering disinformation – I believe – represents a challenge for journalism and it may well be one of its more important tasks. While in the past we relied on newspapers and broadcasters to tell us the news, today information is present in a plethora of platforms and reaches even those who take mostly a passive stance and don't search for news and information. This means that

journalists, instead of being obsessed with being the first to report a story, should consider that one of their main tasks is to assess the quality, the relevance and the credibility of the news that circulates on the different platforms, offering audiences a curated selection of what is indeed relevant and meaningful. For this to be possible, the focus inside the newsrooms has to shift from speed to quality reporting. Despite not being an original idea, we have all witnessed how difficult it has been for journalists to alter their mindsets and practices. Daily routines are still very much focused on the need to generate more clicks instead of producing meaningful content that would help journalism regain its prestige in society.

One serious obstacle to the creation of a healthier information environment is the fact that news circulates online at high speed, and is shared without taking into account the source and the context in which such information was produced. Furthermore, many citizens share content not based on its credibility but instead on its entertainment value which tends to benefit stories that stir fear, hate and outrage. With the risk of sounding too pessimistic, today's information scenario seems to embody what Walter Lippmann wrote in his seminal book *Public Opinion* published in 1922. According to Lippmann, "under certain conditions men respond as powerfully to fictions as they do to realities, and (...) in many cases they help to create the very fictions to which they respond (1922: 30)."

Several audiences have a clear predisposition not only to believe but also to share false content because it is "more fun" as opposed to the "more boring" nature of fact-based information (O'Shaughnessy 2020). By using the entertainment potential as a criterion for information sharing, citizens seem to also validate what Neil Postman described in 1985 in his book *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. Although this work is about television, many of the practices described by Postman are prevalent today and many individuals seem to give up on facts in exchange for being entertained.

This, I believe, is an opportunity for journalism to affirm itself as a credible source that citizens can turn to whenever seeking meaningful information that will help them cope with uncertainty and make sense of the complex realities within contemporary societies. The fact that journalism is still a repository of credibility – even in countries where it has been greatly discredited by powerful actors – has made it become one of the main targets not only of autocratic regimes but also of populist movements.

Journalism: Targeted by Populism

Far from being exclusive to countries once placed in authoritarian (Siebert, Peterson, & Schramm, 1956) or polarized pluralist models (Hallin & Mancini, 2004), populism has occupied center stage over the last decade in countries formerly thought to have well-established traditions of media freedom and information-oriented journalism. This demonstrates that the classical division between states with a liberal and non-liberal approach to the media no longer serves to explain what is occurring worldwide. It also illustrates how urgent it is to foster discussion among scholars who utilize different concepts and perspectives in their scholarly approaches.

One of the difficulties in promoting discussions about media and populism is the fact that the concept of populism itself is far from a homogenous phenomenon and can indeed assume different forms. As Silvio Waisbord (2013) has underscored, it “is an extremely elastic concept and has been used very lightly to describe a wide variety of political phenomena” making it a concept “full of inconsistent definitions.” Acknowledging that one can “meaningfully speak of [different] degrees of populism” (2017, p.40), Jan-Werner Müller notes that populism is always anti-elitist and anti-pluralist. Populists claim “that they, and they alone, represent the people” (2017, p.3).

Despite the different characteristics that populist movements assume in different places and times, all invest significantly in a form of mediated communication that aims to amplify simplistic messages and create an emotional relationship between the leader and the followers (those presented as the “real people”). Populist leaders also invest significant time and money in discrediting journalism so that their ideas are not subject to scrutiny and that their followers believe whatever they are told notwithstanding its connection to reality. Even the success that has been achieved by populist leaders varies from country to country, in many nations they have been very effective in contributing to an erosion of trust in journalism. According to the 2022 Reuters Digital News Report, in a sample of 46 countries, the United States and Slovakia lead distrust in media. Only 26% of Americans and Slovaks say they trust the news most of the time. While in the US political polarization and President Trump have contributed to these numbers, the same can be said about the populist party Ordinary People and Independent Personalities founded in 2011 and that now leads the Slovakian government.

In recent years there has been vast literature production discussing how journalism has been responding to this autocratic turn in politics and to the importance that populism has acquired in many countries. I do not want to go

back to such a debate but instead I would like to discuss what needs to change inside journalism itself so it can deal with the challenges brought by digital disinformation and populism – two sources of uncertainty that have gained particular importance over the last decade and that add to the many other sources of uncertainty existent in newsrooms.

A Need for Change

In *The Journalism Manifesto* published early this year, Barbie Zelizer, Pablo Boczkowski and C.W. Anderson, the authors, make the case that journalism needs to embrace its surroundings. Instead of continuously invoking “widely used practices, oft-proclaimed values and publicly heralded standards” (2022: 1), it should “rethink its priorities, rekindle relevancies gone dormant and questions its default settings” (p. 2). In other words, journalism needs to embrace change and adapt to its current context instead of being filled with unrealistic aspirations and practices that no longer serve society and that, on the contrary, create disconnection with the communities which journalism is supposed to serve.

This also poses a challenge for many of us in this auditorium. As academics who train new generations of journalists, it may be time for us to take a step back and start questioning what we teach about “journalism imaginary” and journalistic norms. In a time in which disinformation abounds, we need to train journalists capable of dealing with the contemporary information and disinformation ecosystem instead of focusing on the idea that journalism is all about balance, objectiveness and unbiased news. As Michael Schudson (1978) has masterly described, these concepts were born in the late 19th century and in the early 20th century and soon transformed into rules of the profession. However, today – I believe - journalism is as much about reporting stories as it is about uncovering lies, exposing unfounded claims and unmasking opinions that are presented as facts. So, if we want to train journalists to expose those who profit from disinformation, why still focus on the idea of balanced reporting? Instead of teaching norms and imaginary practices that no longer have a true connection with conditions on the ground, I believe we need to promote new ways of doing what will help journalists deal with disinformation and populist discourses based on blatant lies. Instead of balanced reporting, that gives the same relevance to all parties, we need reporting that counters fake information with facts and that feels comfortable with labelling “alternative facts” as lies, and does not recreate language to conceal reality, which is a propaganda technique masterfully described by George Orwell in his essay

from 1946 *Politics and the English Language*, in which he shares lessons he also learned during the Spanish Civil War.

Moreover, if journalism aims to maintain its centrality in contemporary societies, it needs to embrace its shortcomings and to recognize that it has been mostly reporting on the elites while excluding significant segments of the society. Zelizer, Boczkowski and Anderson (2022) urge journalism to engage with its own exclusions by serving society at large, disrupting the model of an elite journalism, based on elite sources and stories produced mostly for elite audiences. Journalists tend to feel that they themselves belong to the fields of power thanks to the fact that they mostly report on news originating from the political, economic and social elites. Thus, one of the challenges ahead is to bring new voices to news reporting which seems, not only a socially responsible thing to do, but will also help journalism become more relevant for audiences that are still reluctant in acknowledging its economic value.

In most countries the number of people willing to pay for news is quite small. While there seems to be no easy recipe to alter such a scenario, it does seem clear that journalism is at a turning point that calls for reform. This reform needs to guarantee that journalists embrace the exclusions they have been creating but it also requires the adoption of new norms and practices that will help journalism deal with disinformation while making sense of the uncertainties ahead.

Nelson Costa Ribeiro

Referencias

- Hallin, D. C., y Mancini, P. 2004. *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lippmann, Walter. 1922. *Public Opinion*. Harcourt, Brace and Company. New York
- Lorenz, Taylor and Harwell, Drew. 2022. “Facebook Paid GOP Firm to Malign TikTok,” Washington Post, March 30. <https://perma.cc/9ZYY-U6CE>.
- Marlin, Randal. 2002. *Propaganda and the Ethics of Persuasion*. Broadview Press Ltd
- Müller, Jan-Werner. 2017. *What is Populism?*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Napoli, Phillip M. 2019. *Social Media and the Public Interest. Media Regulation in the Disinformation Age*. Columbia University Press
- Neil Postman. 1985. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. Methuen Publishing .
- O’Shaughnessy Nicholas. 2020. “From Disinformation to Fake News: Forwards into the Past,” in *The SAGE Handbook of Propaganda*. London: SAGE Publications, 55–70.
- Schudson, M. (1978). The Ideal of Conversation in the Study of Mass Media. *Communication Research*, 5(3), 320–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365027800500306>
- Siebert, F.S., Peterson, T. and Schramm, W. 1956. *Four Theories of the Press*. University of Illinois Press.
- Waisbord, Silvio. 2013. “Reinventing Professionalism. Journalism and News in a Global Perspective”. Cambridge: Polity. *MedieKultur Journal of media and communication research*. Volumen 31 (58): 150 DOI: 10.7146/mediakultur.y31i58.18079
- Zelizer, Barbie, Boczowski, Pablo J., Anderson, Christopher W. 2022. “The Journalism Manifesto”. *Australian Journalism Review*, Volume 45, Issue 1, Jun 2023, p. 118 – 119 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1386/ajr_00122_5

PRESENTACIÓN

**PERIODISMO Y DESINFORMACIÓN:
ANÁLISIS Y PERSPECTIVAS**

El constante cuestionamiento de la profesión periodística y de los medios de comunicación, acentuado con la aparición de las redes sociales han hecho de la profesión periodística un lugar común. Por este motivo se necesita una profunda reflexión que sitúe en su justo lugar al periodismo marque las líneas de futuro de una profesión y unos profesionales llamados a transformar el mundo. Esto ya lo expresaba hace unos años el papa San Juan Pablo II con motivo del jubileo de los periodistas. Creo que sus palabras no pueden resumir mejor el sentido de este volumen:

“El mundo del periodismo vive un tiempo de profundos cambios. La proliferación de nuevas tecnologías llega ya a todos los ámbitos e implica, en mayor o menor medida, a todos los seres humanos. La globalización ha aumentado la capacidad de los medios de comunicación social, pero también ha acrecentado su exposición a las presiones ideológicas y comerciales. Esto os debe inducir a vosotros, periodistas, a interrogaros sobre el sentido de vuestra vocación de cristianos comprometidos en el mundo de la comunicación”.

¿Qué debe impulsar el periodismo? ¿Cuál es el camino apropiado que dé respuesta a un periodismo cuyo gran objetivo es ser buscadores y comunicadores de la verdad? ¿Cómo equilibrar lo intelectual, lo técnico y lo humano y al mismo tiempo conectar con la realidad y preparar al alumno para una profesión que nace con vocación de servicio?

En este marco, ¿cuál es el perfil idóneo de periodista? ¿Cómo debemos plantearnos nuestro trabajo en los medios de comunicación? ¿Cómo se entiende la relación periodista-sociedad? ¿Y la relación de la sociedad con el periodismo? ¿Qué formación deben dar las universidades a las futuras generaciones de periodistas para asegurar la libertad de información y el servicio a la sociedad?

Tenemos más medios, mejores periodistas que salen formados de las aulas de las universidades con unos conocimientos mucho más completos que los que adquirieron generaciones anteriores, las tecnologías que se han desa-

rollado en el último medio siglo facilitan el trabajo del periodista, posibilitan su acercamiento a la opinión pública, generan mecanismos de eficacia y rapidez en la transmisión de la información, las leyes, tanto las que emanan del poder legislativo como las que nos imponemos nosotros mismos, facilitan la libertad de expresión, el derecho a la información, salvaguardan a colectivos vulnerables por lo que al señalamiento informativo se refiere. Y, sin embargo, reconocemos que la era de la desinformación se ha instalado en nuestra sociedad la mentira. ¿Qué es lo que pasa?

Por otra parte, el usuario de la información, el verdadero cliente de la empresa de comunicación necesita una referencia que le garantice la certeza y la autenticidad de que lo que está consumiendo es cierto, que no está contaminado, que el agua es potable, en una palabra. Para ello, los empresarios de la comunicación se comprometen a defender, frente a quienes intenten impedirlo, estos dos valores:

- Profesionalidad
- Independencia

Se denuncia que el periodismo sufre porque está amenazada la democracia en muchos países, porque la libertad de expresión está en declive en todo el mundo. Lo hemos visto en China a causa de la pandemia. Lo vemos en Rusia con la guerra de Ucrania. Lo vemos en México con el asesinato de periodistas casi a diario. Lo vemos en Irán, en Afganistán con encarcelamientos. Lo vemos en otros países donde se persigue a las empresas de comunicación y se cierran las que no están en la órbita del poder.

Los periodistas denuncian que han perdido el monopolio de decidir qué información debe interesar a los lectores. La agenda Setting ha saltado por los aires y ya no se sabe qué interesa verdaderamente a la opinión pública y quién decide el valor de los contenidos. Y frente a estas denuncias nos preguntamos, ¿está el periodismo en crisis o es el modelo de distribución de las noticias?

La función del periodista es la de disentir y buscar fuentes alternativas a las versiones oficiales, porque hay que disentir, verificar, confirmar, desmentir si lo que se nos está contando no se corresponde con la realidad. Buscar la VERDAD, en una palabra, porque el periodismo es la conciencia crítica del poder. Y ¿cómo se consigue superar este reto? Con honestidad. Con honradez. Con objetividad. Con valor y con mucho trabajo.

El compromiso del periodista, en primer lugar, es con la verdad y después con la sociedad que espera que nuevas generaciones bien formadas, con criterio y sentido ético, salgan a la calle a anunciarles algo nuevo. Lo que el Papa Francisco expresa como el faro a seguir por el periodista es la búsqueda de la verdad, subrayando que la tarea del profesional de la información es hacer posible que se mire "a los demás con más conciencia y también con más confianza".

Con motivo de una ceremonia de entrega de premios a los decanos de la información vaticana, la mexicana Valentina Alazraki y el estadounidense Philip Pulella subrayaron que la tarea del profesional de la información es hacer posible que se mire "a los demás con más conciencia y también con más confianza".

Estas y otras cuestiones se tratan en esta publicación, "Periodismo y desinformación: análisis y perspectivas", en la que el periodista está en el centro de la diana de todo el mundo en un momento de especial sensibilidad para los profesionales.

Como marco general el profesor Nelson Costa Ribeiro introduce las diferentes formas de interacción con los consumidores. Para Costa Ribeiro, el ecosistema informativo contemporáneo está marcado por la desinformación y el continuo ataque a las profesionales por parte de los movimientos populistas de muchos países. Ambos fenómenos contribuyen a exacerbar la incertidumbre en las redacciones. Para ello es precisa una reforma del periodismo que ayude al periodista a luchar con esas incertidumbres.

Los textos

Seguimos para la publicación de los distintos capítulos el orden alfabético de sus autores.

En el capítulo I, "Periodismo de proximidad en catástrofes: análisis de la cobertura informativa de Televisión Vega Baja ante la DANA que anegó la comarca alicantina en 2019", Antonio Ricardo Aniorte Guerrero (Universidad Miguel Hernández) analiza los condicionantes que surgen en el medio audiovisual de proximidad cuando llega el momento de cubrir una catástrofe, prestando atención a los profesionales y a la propia narrativa de los hechos. En concreto, se estudia el caso de la cobertura realizada por Televisión Vega Baja sobre la DANA de 2019 en Alicante.

El capítulo II, "Comunidad UFV: un proyecto híbrido para una formación experiencial" de Alfredo Areñe (Universidad Francisco Vitoria) y

Guillermo Vila (Universidad Francisco Vitoria), analiza la “Comunidad UFV”, un programa de radio realizado por profesores y alumnos del grupo Mirada 21, cuyo principal objetivo es el aprendizaje por imitación. Se estudia la capacidad de impacto formativo, su aportación a la misión e idea de comunidad y la eficacia de la metodología de aprendizaje.

Álvaro de Diego González (Universidad CEU San Pablo) presenta en el capítulo III, “El final del “Parlamento de papel” (1976) y el estado de alarma (2020): dos situaciones críticas para la prensa” mostrando cómo las situaciones políticas excepcionales comportan riesgos para el ejercicio del derecho a la información y de las libertades de prensa. Este trabajo se propone establecer una comparativa entre el preludio de nuestra democracia parlamentaria, de un lado, y la declaración del estado de alarma con motivo de la crisis sanitaria del COVID-19, de otro.

A su vez, “Resultados de aprendizaje en el grado en Periodismo: un estudio de casos” fue abordado por Daniel de la Rosa Ruiz y Carmen de la Calle también ambos de la Universidad Francisco de Vitoria. En este capítulo IV se propone la necesidad de formar éticamente a los periodistas del mañana y conocer sus resultados de aprendizaje. Para ello, se analizan de manera cualitativa los trabajos finales de la asignatura de Responsabilidad social de los alumnos de segundo de periodismo.

En el capítulo V, Marta García Bruno y Martha Molina Díez, ambas profesoras de la Universidad Francisco de Vitoria se centran en “La responsabilidad de los medios de comunicación en la gestión de las emociones en redes sociales: la Generación Z como caso de estudio” con el fin de analizar los mensajes transmitidos en TikTok e Instagram (redes más usadas por la Generación Z) y comprobar si la temática que comparten afecta a la función periodística de servicio al bien común y a la responsabilidad de los medios de comunicación en la opinión pública a través de las emociones.

“Accesibilidad de las nuevas tecnologías como factor esencial para la empleabilidad de las personas con discapacidad en el sector audiovisual” es el título del capítulo VI, de Mercedes Herrero de la Fuente y Carlos Jiménez Narros (Universidad Antonio de Nebrija) quienes ponen el foco en la necesidad de adaptar los dispositivos digitales a las personas con discapacidad en una diversidad de situaciones. A través de entrevistas, se hace un análisis de la situación actual y se apuntan una serie de acciones de mejora para incrementar su inserción laboral.

” En “Los periodistas de TVE en la movilización del 8M de 2018”, en el capítulo VII, Carmen María Navarro López (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) da a conocer la influencia del contexto social y político del 8 de marzo de 2018 en el desarrollo de una actitud más activa por parte de las mujeres periodistas de TVE, cuyas demandas llegaron a provocar cambios estructurales en toda la corporación.

“La alfabetización mediática en España. Cómo formar a la ciudadanía para el uso responsable y crítico de los medios de comunicación” es el tema del capítulo VIII, presentado por Virginia Oya Alcalá (Universidad de Santiago de Compostela) quien considera que en los últimos años España ha evolucionado en la aplicación del concepto de Alfabetización Mediática e Informativa (AMI) a nivel de sociedad civil (con actividades educativas), pero no a nivel institucional. El objetivo es defender que es posible trabajar actividades de AMI desde organismos públicos y privados.

Por su parte, Gabriel Sánchez (Universidad Francisco de Vitoria y Federación de Asociaciones de Periodistas de España) aborda en el capítulo IX el tema “La cláusula de conciencia de los periodistas españoles” donde el autor realiza un estudio exhaustivo sobre la cláusula de conciencia en España, único país que la contempla en el marco de la Constitución. Sin embargo, el autor afirma que España no ha adquirido cultura en torno a esta cuestión y se pregunta por qué los periodistas no invocan este derecho en casos en que los medios denotan un claro posicionamiento ideológico.

Alexandra Cristina Santos Pereira de la Universidad Católica Portuguesa, analiza en el capítulo X, “Roles Played by Institutional Media and Independent Journalism among the Nepali Diaspora in Spain and Portugal”, la presencia y penetración de los medios institucionales y el periodismo independiente, así como el uso de las tecnologías de la información y los medios, en la diáspora nepalí que vive actualmente en España y Portugal.

En el capítulo XI, David Varona (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) e Isabel García Casado (Universidad Francisco de Vitoria) con “La gastronomía como línea de negocio en el grupo de comunicación Vocento” buscan averiguar cómo se integra un negocio basado en la temática “Gastronomía” en un grupo de comunicación como Vocento, cuyo núcleo siempre han sido los medios.

Finalmente, el capítulo XII, “Libertad de recibir o de comunicar informaciones o ideas y los procedimientos de actuación contra la desinformación en la Unión Europea y España” cuya autora es Lorena Velasco Guerrero (Universidad Francisco de Vitoria) analiza la aplicación concreta en

España y la UE de los planes de acción y procedimientos para luchar contra la desinformación. El objetivo es constatar si, en la aplicación de dichos planes, se respetan las garantías esenciales para la libertad de expresión e información de la que es titular toda persona.

Humberto Martínez-Fresneda

Director del Grado en Periodismo