

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2023-07-19

Deposited version:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Crespo, M., Pinto-Martinho, A. & Foa, C. (2019). How to develop internal innovation in the media: A case study of best practices for media outlet. In Paulo Faustino, Iván Puentes, Francisco Belda (Ed.), *Communication, media and creative industries in the digital era*. (pp. 131-164). Porto: Media XXI.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://www.mediaxxi.com/loja/communication-media-and-creative-industries-in-the-digital-era/>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Crespo, M., Pinto-Martinho, A. & Foa, C. (2019). How to develop internal innovation in the media: A case study of best practices for media outlet. In Paulo Faustino, Iván Puentes, Francisco Belda (Ed.), *Communication, media and creative industries in the digital era*. (pp. 131-164). Porto: Media XXI.. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

How to develop internal innovation in the media: a case study of best practices for media outlets

Miguel Crespo, Caterina Foà & Ana Pinto-Martinho

Abstract

The goals intended are to analyze media outlets from the inside, to provide some guidelines on the best practices for media companies that want to shape/reshape their business to survive and grow in the currently troubled media ecosystem. The main questions are to understand how legacy media in Portugal are facing the changing media ecosystem, in special how are they using any kind of internal innovation strategies to outcome the decreasing of sales and/or audiences and advertising revenues. We also pretend to frame this national reality into a broader picture, contextualizing the analysis. So we pose the following questions: are the Portuguese media outlets seeking internal innovation to face and outcome the fall of traditional business models? How legacy media can change from the inside? What processes are they creating/recreating that affect the news production and dissemination? What processes are they creating/recreating that affect the revenue stream? How the Portuguese media ecosystem compares to the international best practices? What guidelines can be identified to help legacy media or journalistic startups to survive in a troubled sea? To achieve the objectives we use non-participatory observation on three Portuguese newsrooms, and interview some of its managers/editorial managers, chosen by its diversity: a TV network that includes, among others, a free-to-air legacy TV channel with the most viewed eight o'clock news program and a 24/7 TV news channel; a national broadcast news radio; an online only newspaper. All three have their online operations, via website and apps. Both the TV and the radio are legacy media that, through different approaches and rhythms, are reshaping their business models, news production processes and news product. Both have internal innovation strategies that we observe, register and analyze. The online newspaper was born has an online only operation, not needing to transform from a legacy/analog operation, but still develops internal innovation strategies to evolve in an always moving digital media landscape. The study cases are built from framed analysis and previous academic work produced by authors like Lucy Kung, Ramón Salaverría, Anderson, Bell & Shirky, Mark Deuze, Bastos & Zamith, Paul Bradshaw, Adelino Gomes, Gureskin, Seave & Graves, Lowe, Gregory & Brown, Storsul, Tanja & Krumsvik, Janine Warner or Barbie Zelizer. So we try to identify the focus on the practices inside the Portuguese case studies, internal innovation strategies on newsrooms, entrepreneurial strategies to change from the traditional business model and boost the financial results. We also try to deliver and promote some guidelines to media outlets that want to innovate and/or to entrepreneurs wanting to create journalistic startups, and to boost the discussion about the need to improve the internal mechanisms of change to survive in a troubled media

ecosystem.

Introduction

Internal innovation is key concept within the theoretical framework of media management and economics (Picard, 2003) and the challenges from technological, economic, strategic, contents production and distribution nowadays are global. Particularly in our research it concerns the effects of digital drive change and new business models in media environment on organizations and employees, namely on work processes and professionals adaptation. Scholars suggest that introduction of new media production technologies affect internal organization, as stated by authors within their researches, as for example by Kueng quoting a journalist:

“I say, ‘You’re a journalist, you are supposed to deal with reality. Let’s not deal with reality in journalism and not deal with reality in our business. Here is the reality in our business’ ... ‘They are taking your readers. We are better than they are, so why should they be viewed as the authority?... Why should they succeed and we shouldn’t?’ It is our fault because we are handing it to them on a silver platter ... We don’t have to abandon our values, we don’t have to be trivial at all... We just have to tell stories in different ways and pay attention to how we disseminate... in a world that is dominated by social media... We are the best at this, so let’s make sure we are the ones that succeed.” (Kueng, 2018: 4).

Portuguese media landscape is the focus of present research due to its complexity within a relative small number of national players, and most of them being legacy media trying to adapt to the new ecosystem.

Aiming to contribute to the debate we design the research posing the following questions and defining the study’s objectives:

1. Are the Portuguese media outlets seeking internal innovation to face and outcome the fall of traditional business models? Particularly we question how legacy media can change from the inside?
2. What processes are they creating/recreating that affect the news production and dissemination? And which ones affect the revenue stream?
3. How the Portuguese media ecosystem compares with the international best practices?
4. What guidelines can be identified to help legacy media or journalistic startups to survive in a troubled sea?

Theoretical framework

The empirical study is based on a theoretical framework from communication sciences and media research analysis.

Considering innovation as an attitude we can look at the challenges highlighted by Kueng as one of the best definition of facing innovation process within media landscape: “Embrace. Embrace the future, embrace developments. You’re not going to stop them so... embrace and be open...These trends and these changes will come... There’s no way of protecting and running away. You have to embrace the change and transformation.” (Kueng, 2018: 4).

Then if globally the media ecosystem is not going to stop changing and surely will not go back to the status quo of the 20th century, and particularly the “legacy organizations need to put as much emphasis on transforming their organizations as they do on transforming their content”, (Kueng, 2018: 7), we assume that these two ideas might be the focus to better understand innovation and explain what drives the digital change.

Adopting and promoting innovation affect the newsroom strategic management, daily routine and resources allocation. Cardoso et al., (2016) propose an analytical description of media business models and applied monetization systems rooted on two research axis. The first axis refers to the SuBMoJour (2012) business model orientation (storytelling-service) and the latter to editorial logic related with audience size (large-niche). This model allows to positioning legacy media on the scope of our research considering broad challenges and cross-over of the decreasing of news economical value while social value raises, the digital change adaptation, new media penetration, advertising revenues flows and new monetization strategies from the newsroom perspective where agenda, teamwork, and journalist routine are constantly adjusting and preserving integrity and quality of journalistic work.

Kueng suggests a list of several key elements that constitute our approach to observe innovation processes within legacy media organizations: i.e. transforming the organizations and content; try to match the agility of Silicon Valley new media; the need to focus on strategy, with long-term goals and clear business models; expertise in digital storytelling; the will to experiment “shiny new things”; the merging of journalism, tech, and data, to develop the interaction and engagement with readers, overcome cultural challenges (leadership and merging content and engineering) and, of course, human resources. Innovation is a complex dynamic where, instead of all, the human capital is central and has to be allied with an investments on resources, technologies and life-long training process to guarantee its effectivity: “It is critical to prioritize hiring and permanent learning: recruitment, because it is critical the organization has the expertise it needs to realize its strategy, and learning, because ensuring all layers of the organization are exposed to new ideas and best practice will shorten innovation cycles and build momentum for transition.” (Kueng, 2018: 8)

One of the biggest challenges the media businesses are facing is the redefinition of distribution (from traditional channels – print, real time radio and real time TV), consumption (on screen “print”, online radio – including on-demand and podcasting, online TV - including on-demand and web video, and online media) and, mostly, the revolution from a one-size-fits-all/ ready-to-wear business model to unlimited business models, each one fitting just one project, in a tailor made way.

The legacy media business model is very simple and worked for all media outlets since Gutenberg started to print “The Bible”: copies sale (by piece or by subscription) and advertising. In print both business model worked fine for centuries. Then radio and TV developed an advertising only business model – also applied to “free” print newspapers and magazines. These revenue streams worked well and with almost no changes until the 1990’s.

“The working assumption now seems to be that print advertising revenues will continue to decline, and will probably disappear in the foreseeable future” (Kung, 2018: 18).

The arrival of the internet as a distribution platform and the growth of online news media created a new ecosystem with major business model challenges:

- 1) “free” news became the mainstream, like radio and TV did in the 20th century. Even for legacy media, advertising only (and at very low prices) become the norm.
- 2) paywalls, on subscription or pay per article, hardly worked. In most cases didn’t work at all.
- 3) non-media online services (including new media, like Google – including Youtube - or Facebook) are getting bigger and bigger shares of advertising budgets from advertisers.

“We’ve had a transition from print to digital, from digital to mobile, from mobile to social media, and we’ve always lost chunks of the cake, big, big pieces of our advertising cake. And the markets are smaller, smaller, smaller each time. It’s really about scale ... Long term there will not be enough money in the markets to finance a big journalism team’, explained The Daily Telegraph.” (Kueng, 2018: 18) This led the traditional media business model to collapse, forcing legacy media and new online only media outlets to innovate and develop new ways to get revenue streams.

Most media outlets worldwide develop some kind of sponsored editorial projects, producing editorial content within the sponsor’s goals. “What we were really doing was transitioning a business model from advertising to consumer supported, which is very, very different’, said The New York Times”. (Kueng, 2018: 18). The digital revolution and business models changes created double-side effects on the relation between media organizations and advertisers as well as between media outlets and their audiences (Cardoso et al., 2016).

As Jay Rosen stated in 2006, maybe it’s still a problem for journalists to share their power. “The people formerly known as the audience wish to inform media people of our existence, and of a shift in power that goes with the platform shift you’ve all heard about. Think of passengers on your ship who got a boat of their own. The writing readers. The viewers who picked up a camera. The formerly atomized listeners who with modest effort can connect with each other and gain the means to speak to the world, as it were.” (Rosen, 2006).

Convergence-based media management highlights a variety of dimensions affecting innovation in product development. Picard (2003) explored the evolution of convergence-based business model for online content providers and we still recognize that product still maintain intrinsic value but all the surrounding ecosystem shift to another logic of production and distribution of informative contents. Cardoso et al. (2016) also focus on convergence-based management solutions and less innovative strategic attitude on product development for legacy media, suggesting how outlets strategies mainly rely on traditional core-product for large audience meanwhile they try diversify revenue sources through monetization systems developed with partners (events, sponsored contents, native advertising, services) for a specific target, or directly segmenting the audience to better matching preferences and behaviors (paywalls, curatorship, editorial networks). Legacy media tend to be contents-based innovation later adopters, instead the organization culture, planning and work flows are suddenly affected by the change happening in the broad landscape.

The new business models are difficult to find and to tailor to each media outlet, but there are some major trends and good practices examples worldwide that resume some success strategies that have been applied according to organizational objectives, company's size and budget, market orientation and audience behavior segmentation:

Long tail – Focused on having a vast offer to a broader audience. You can monetize from volume: i.e. one media that as small audience for each content, but so many and so diverse contents (especially if you have an international audience) that all together assures a good advertising revenue (even at a low price).

Free – You have two kinds of customers: most of them have free of charge access to all content, and this service is supported by revenues from a much smaller group of customers, that are willing to pay in exchange of a way to have access to the bigger group. I.e., this is the business model of many new media outlets, like Facebook or Google.

Freemium – This is a mix of the traditional radio and TV business model and print business model. You have part of the contents delivered for free to your audience (with advertising) and another part behind a paywall (by subscription or by piece).

Membership – This is an evolution of the subscription model. More than a subscriber, you are part of the media outlet. Depending on your membership status (each “grade” gives you different access/benefits), you can not only access contents but also participate in the media outlet development and editorial decisions. I.e. “The Texas Tribune” has a membership system with nine different cost/benefits levels, where you can get a one-year membership from \$10 (a Student membership) to \$5000 (a Chairman's Circle membership).

Sponsorship and philanthropy – These two kinds of funding, very common in the creative industries, are being used worldwide to create and support media outlets, especially start-ups. A company or group of companies (non-media) funds, in total or

partially, a media outlet. This is a way media companies have to guarantee some part of their budget. I.e. “Mi Voz Chile” starts every fiscal year with about 40% of the annual budget assured by a group of Chilean companies. A philanthrope can fund a media project focused on social or political issues (i.e. “The Intercept”, created by senior journalist Glenn Greenwald and funded by Pierre Omidyar, Ebay founder).

Crowdfunding – Collaborative funding system through people’s donation, rewards, lending, toward a specific project. The details depend on each crowdfunding platform (Kickstarter, with a journalism section, and Indiegogo are the two biggest), but a media project can get enough funds to launch or develop. I.e. 99percentinvisible.org started with a campaign on Kickstarter, raising 400% over the \$170k pledged and making it the highest-funded journalism project in Kickstarter at the time (2012).

Advertising Native System – In this business model a brand pays a media outlet to have a branded area inside the media webpage. The contents are editorial and not advertising, mixing editorial contents from the media outlet, from the brand and from guests (specialists on the subject). The main goal is to target specific audiences with well-targeted contents, boosted by the media brand credibility (I.e. The New York Times and Dell computers). “Advertising revenues, ideally scaled native advertising revenues, are at the core of their business model” (Kung, 2018: 19).

Advertorials – Similar to the Advertising Native System but fully managed by the brand (one of the first case study is the partnership between The Atlantic and IBM).

Sponsored Contents – The media outlet produces the content, and a brand pays for it. When published, the content is clearly “sponsored by”. The main goal of the media is to fund more expensive content prior to its production, and for the brand to increase its awareness.

Aggregated paywall – In this system, each reader pays a unique and centralized fee for accessing several media outlets premium contents. Each media outlet gets a percentage of its own traffic, and the aggregator a commission. The most successful example in Europe is the Piano Media platform (piano.io), which example is going to be followed in Portugal by the aggregator Nonio.net, that actually works within a freemium version.

Metered Paywall – Similar to the Aggregated Paywall, but with a fee according to personal interests and/or access profile. I.e. a reader can choose (and pay) only sports and lifestyle content, from the media outlets he chooses, to access through different device/time options (computer on weekdays, smartphone on weekends).

Selling services and products – Several media are developing non-core businesses to get more revenues. The more traditional, and mainly associated with print, are physical products that readers can buy with his subscription/purchase for an extra, usually below market value. These products can go from books or movies to sports or leisure items, or even electronics or cutlery. But other kind of sales occur: e-commerce, in partnership with retailers, or even space lease. Using internal know-how is another source of possible revenues: I.e. content licensing, custom publishing, events organization,

editorial/communication consulting and training (specialized courses or seminars). “Legacy companies are therefore exploring additional revenue streams, particularly events.” (Kung, 2018:20).

The product and monetization strategies innovations directly affect the human resources and human capital management according with unique resources view (RBV) approach that assumes each firm as a collection of those resource unique and valuable from both economical and knowledge-based point of view. This approach is especially important and meaningful in the media industry because of the unique economic characteristics of information products (Chan-Olmsted, 2003).

This conservative approach to the journalistic practices happens even if “for cost control and efficiency, the media groups merge newsrooms or reorganize them. (...) They ask the journalists to re-edit their work to be published in the different platforms”. (Lopes, 2015: 38). This might be a problem “in an environment of growing technological convergence, with contents multiplied over multiple publishing platforms inside the same media group/ editorial project (Jenkins, 2006), journalists face continuously new challenges that impose never-ending adaptation (Artwick: 2004).” (Lopes, 2015: 40)

The interaction with the audience is other main area where journalists agree: it is a key to succeed in the future, but the practice barely match the goal. Once again, this discrepancy it’s not new. “More than 78% say that online journalism must be orientated by interaction between journalists and audiences.” (Cardoso, 2006: 12) “In this renewed information ecosystem, it’s mandatory to adapt the information to a personalized consumption” (Lopes, 2015: 40), made on mobile and on the go.

It’s almost unanimous that a journalist must master different storytelling techniques, according to the different platforms where he must publish/broadcast. But between the theoretical consensus and the daily practice there is a wide difference. We set the hypothesis that it could be possible to observe in 2018 how journalists still have similar priorities as those expressed in a survey conducted in Portugal: “The majority of inquiries reveal they work just for the traditional media, or just have also some other functions to the online edition”. (Cardoso, 2006: 4). In the 2006 survey results we can see that “most of the inquiries considers that a journalist that cannot use the Internet is less valued by the labor market”, and that the Web changed the profession because “almost all inquiries – 94% - consider that Internet changed their own work.” (Cardoso, 2006: 7). If more than a decade ago Cardoso concluded that “working for online don’t captivates the inquiries working for the traditional media” (2006: 5), nowadays we pretend to confirm if still the majority of journalists don’t seem very interested in developing news stories for online platforms.

Methodology

To achieve the above mentioned objectives we set a mixed methodology that included three Portuguese media as study cases, built from framed analysis and previous academic work produced by authors like Lucy Kueng (2015, 2018), Bastos & Zamith

(2012), Adelino Gomes (2011, 2012), Grueskin, Seave & Graves (2011), Lowe, Gregory & Brown (2016), Storsul & Krumsvik (2013).

The newsroom field research was built from non-participatory observation, reporting through a field journal, and semi-directive interviews with members of the editorial board of each media, methods thought to be the best to get the kind of data we need to answer our questions.

Our research is oriented by previous studies, particularly relevant being applied to the Portuguese landscape is Gomes' work (2011), shading lights about research field methodological process "Go to the field, be there for long periods of time; observe every step, with the subjects, in the preparation and execution of the tasks that contribute to the daily edition of the main TV news service of the Portuguese channels, trying to 'illuminate attitudes and make them intelligible' (Park, 1924:153, *apud* Chapoulie, 2001:117), this the main goal designed for this research." (Gomes, 2011: attachment XI). We embrace Gomes approach pretending "through the observation, not to question the reasons for past decisions, but to observe, more than to question, the daily routines that lead to the construction of the 8 o'clock news service in each newsroom." (Gomes, 2011: attachment II). As Gomes did in 2007 and 2008 just for the TV networks, in 2018 we intended to see how media from diverse origins (legacy media, with origins on TV or radio, and a digital-born media) produce their news products. The observation "implied our presence in all the preparation, production and broadcasting/publishing process, as well in the newsroom meeting(s)." (Gomes, 2011: attachment II)

Field research was based on non-participatory observation of three Portuguese newsrooms and on interviewing some of its managers/editorial managers, chosen to be all private capital controlled but also by its diversity and specificity: a TV network that includes, among others, a free-to-air legacy TV channel with the most viewed eight o'clock news program and a 24/7 TV news channel (TVI); a national broadcast news radio (TSF); an online-only newspaper (O Observador). All three have their online operations, via website and apps. Both the TV and the radio are legacy media that, through different approaches and rhythms, are reshaping their business models, news production processes and news product. Both have internal innovation strategies that we observe, register and analyze. The online newspaper was born has an online-only operation, not needing to transform from a legacy/analog operation, but still develops internal innovation strategies to evolve in a permanent changing digital media landscape.

The quotes from the interviews and the notes registered in our field journal, stating procedures, dialogues and debates we witnessed, make part of the description of the newsrooms practices in order to contribute to build answers for our research questions. The observation is documented in a detailed field journal of the daily 8 to 12 hours in which we accompanied, together with editors, the daily routines.

Besides the semi-directive interviews to members of each media editorial board, we had some informal conversations with senior journalists to collect more information, but

these last will not be quoted. Relevant information was registered in the field journal and is used as part of the observation, without quoting. “Only the interviews will be quoted (...), to respect the anonymity (...) even when we got direct and specific answers in person.” (Gomes, 2011: attachment II)

During the observation periods, from March 12th to April 23rd 2018, chosen by mutual convenience between researchers and each of the newsrooms editorial board, “we were very alert to the actions and reactions of all the subjects involved”. (Gomes, 2011: attachment II) Speaking of the journalists (excluding all the editors), our focus on the field was to register their specific routines in each newsroom. Santos (2011) used a “new media production ethnography” to observe the digital transition of a national daily newspaper. “Given the importance of news media and news culture in today’s society, ethnography is an efficient tool for delivering insights into the nature of news work.” (Clausen, 2003: 38) Jerónimo (2015) sums up several pioneer research from the first years of the century. “Through participatory observation and interviews, the researchers arrive at common conclusions: reduced news production specific for the Web (mainly original and adapted to the platform); great subjection from external production (press-releases and news agencies) and fixation of the journalists in the newsrooms – ‘the sitting journalist’ (Pereira, 2003).” (Jerónimo, 2015: 76)

From all the precautions we must have, the first one, even before the field research, is to have the awareness to leave “the unique point of view, central, dominant, almost divine, where the observer is (...) to be able to get the best of the different co-existent perspectives and that sometimes are directly coexisting”. (Bourdieu, 1993: 9-10). The challenges we face on the field are always diverse and multiple and, many times, they lack an immediate answer. “What should we do with the results of an observation developed within a community? Discuss the conclusions with the community? Show the results? When? Before presenting the final report? How to solve the problem, inevitable, of the contamination the presence of the researcher on the field do to the observed subjects, except, how advises Firmino da Costa (2003: 134-5), ‘consider it, control it and objectivate it as much as possible?’”. (Gomes, 2011: attachment XII)

“The observation face a group of other questions – the preparation and selection of places and persons and their credibility; how to take notes, write the final research or report. To these, we can add the questions related with privacy issues and the effects of a long stay and contact from the researcher/reporter with the research subjects (common in ethnography, but not impossible at all in journalism.” (Gomes, 2011: attachment XII)

One of the main questions raised when using the observation method is how to make clear, as much as possible, the researcher role. Is it just an observer? Or a participant, besides being an observer? Some authors tried to define strategies for participant observation (Lindeman, 1924, apud DeWalt and DeWalt; Spradley, 1980; DeWalt and DeWalt, 2002; Gold, 2003) and, together, they offer a wide diversity of strategies, from pure observation to total participation, and even to observing the participation (Tedlock, 2005). “The observation I made in the newsrooms allowed me to witness technical-professional procedures from the editorial board and editors, namely in the phases of selection, alignment and broadcasting of the information.” (Gomes, 2012)

Spradley (1980: 58-60) enumerate five degrees of participation, in a way that helped us no manage the researchers behavior during the field observation: non-participatory (just analyze documents and behaviors through records and not going into the field), passive participation (the observer have direct contact with the subjects but should avoid all interaction and might even not be identified as an observer), moderate participation (the observer is in the field and can occasionally, but not intentionally, interact with the subjects), active participation (the observer is in the field and active in most activities, trying to merge in the group culture) and full participation (the observer is in the field and becomes, even for a short period of time, a member of the group).

In this research, both researchers and subjects have common, or at least similar, backgrounds, experience and professional knowledge in journalism. So, when going to the field, the researchers already have some knowledge of what to expect, regarding methods, procedures and production schedules of news making. “We started, however, with the conscience of facing that knowledge with double cautions, so what could be an advantage (Weinberg, 2002:139) don’t turn out to be a fatal disadvantage (to blur the observation due to previous contacts or knowledge).” (Gomes, 2011: attachment XIII)

This awareness and the need to reduce the risks of behavior induction (Almeida e Pinto, 1975; Becker, 1997; Costa, 2003; Campenhoudt, 2003: 38-40) determined that the researchers tried to be just (invisible) observers. So, using Spradley enumeration, we can consider our field observation can fit between “passive participation” and “moderate participation”, as Gomes (2011) did.

As for the semi-directive interviews that were made to members of each media editorial board, the option for that kind of method was based on the possibility that they give to get richer information and reflection elements than if we had chosen a questionnaire¹, for example. The semi-directive interviews enabled the possibility of the interviewed members to express their opinions and speak freely, being at the same time guided in a way that didn’t disrupt their thoughts. And they are a complement to the observation strategy prior explained, as they are more directed towards specific questions to complement the observation method that took place, and better understand some of the questions we wanted to answer and even some of the questions raised during the non-participatory observation. One of the downfalls pointed to interviews is the possible difficulty of the researchers to stay in focus and let the interviewee speak very broadly², but given the work we have done, we think we could stay in focus, and get very interesting content out of the interviews that were made.

The interviews were oriented to deep focus on different elements and consequences of internal innovation adoption process, as newsroom organization, newsroom practices, including editorial meetings (decision making for the current day, next day, next week or long term, i.e. months to come; evaluation from the previous day), guidelines for the

¹ Raymond Quivy. Luc Van Campenhoudt. Manual de investigação em Ciências Sociais., pp 192, 2013, 6th Edition in Portuguese, Gradiva, Lisbon.

² Raymond Quivy. Luc Van Campenhoudt. Manual de investigação em Ciências Sociais., pp 194, 2013, 6th Edition in Portuguese, Gradiva, Lisbon.

newsroom, skills, monetization strategies, opportunities and challenges for the next 12 months.

Portrait of Media environment in Portugal

The Portuguese media landscape is mainly controlled by five media groups, with some new internet-based media titles slowly starting to build a strong online presence (Bastos: 2010, 2012; Cardoso: 2006, 2016; Gomes: 2011, 2012; Jerónimo: 2015; Santos: 2011).

These five media groups hold most of news production and distribution in Portugal, three of them with a strong TV presence – RTP (public Radio and TV broadcaster), Media Capital (owned by PRISA, with TVI channels and several radios), and IMPRESA (SIC TV channels and Expresso newspaper). The remaining two groups have a strong printed press roots – Global Media (owner of two newspapers: *Diário de Notícias*, *Jornal de Notícias* and TSF radio), and Cofina (*Correio da Manhã* newspaper and a recent move into cable TV news with the same brand as it's print newspaper, and *Negócios* – the leading print business newspaper)³. 2018 is also marked by the rising of a new media group called Trust in News. The new group bought all the magazines from Impresa group that is now betting on their TV products (SIC TV channels) and weekly historic newspaper *Expresso*.

The Portuguese media environment is thriving for financial sustainability, trying to get a grip on innovation. The recent economic recession that took place mainly between 2011 and 2015 allied to low stock market capitalization and high exposure to debt⁴ put the general media landscape in financial trouble.

The willingness of the Portuguese public to pay for online news is quite low, the Reuters Digital News Report 2017 shows that only 9% are up to pay for them. Even so, there are some newspapers that have paywalls in place, although the biggest part of their revenue comes from advertising. At present, there's an initiative, Nónio, that aggregates most of the media groups that give the public the chance of accessing most of the media outlets with only one login. Due to lack of financial liquidity of the media companies, the Digital News Initiative has been one of the main sources for recent innovations⁵. TV is still the most important media in terms of news consumption, according to the Reuters Digital News Report, with the importance of online news consumption remaining stable since 2015 (the year Portugal entered the study)⁶, with radio facing concentration⁷ and newspapers struggling audiences.

³ Reuters Digital News Report 2017, Portuguese Chapter – Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, Oxford University, <http://www.digitalnewsreport.org/survey/2017/portugal-2017/>

⁴ Ibidem

⁵ Fonseca, Pedro, "Quanto pagou a Google aos media portugueses?", 2017, European Journalism Observatory – Portugal, <https://pt.ejo.ch/jornalismo/quanto-pagou-google-aos-media-portugueses>

⁶ Reuters Digital News Report 2017, ibidem

⁷ As Rádios Locais em Portugal. Caracterização, tendências e futuros, 2018, Obercom, <https://obercom.pt/as-radios-locais-em-portugal-caracterizacao-tendencias-e-futuros/>

As mentioned above the three chosen media chosen to analyze are TSF (Radio), TVI (TV) and *O Observador* (online newspaper). The first two are legacy media, with a big story in the Portuguese media landscape.

TSF Radio, the oldest of them, was founded in 1989, when the great radio boom took place in Portugal, with a lot of pirate radios being legalized. At the time the radio began the transmissions its positioning was innovative, as they positioned themselves as a news oriented radio. At present the radio is owned by Global Media Group, that also holds among others, historical newspaper *Diário de Notícias* and *Jornal de Notícias*, another newspaper more regionally oriented towards the north of Portugal. The Radio employs 70 journalists that work in shifts so that they cover a wide range of hours, and the radio characterizes itself as a breaking news radio. Besides the radio transmission it also has a website and an app that represent 2 million unique users per month and 8 million page views per month.

TVI began its operations in 1993, after it won one of the licenses for private operators (until then Portugal only had public TV broadcast service). At its the TV station was founded by a group of entities of the Catholic Church, meanwhile the group changed hands and it's now still in the hands of Prisa Media group (the Spanish owner of newspapers like *El País*), because although Altice (Portuguese Telecom Company) bought the group for 450 million euros the business is still not concluded due to the fact that the Portuguese Regulatory Communication Body still hasn't given the permission, due to possible interest clashes. In the last 13 years, TVI has been ahead of the audiences, and as it shows a strong bet in fiction and entertainment has also continued to bet on information (it also has a News Channel called TVI 24), with a strong online presence.

O Observador is the youngest media object of this research, it is digital born and it's focused on the digital operations. It started in 2014 and it doesn't belong to any of the previous mentioned media groups. The media outlet has been growing since then, and newspaper's number point out that in August 2017 it had 12 million unique users and 46 million page views, with 40 journalists working at the newsroom. Branded content and Costume Publishing are part of their business model as they pave their way to get a recognized news brand in Portugal.

Main findings

In legacy media the traditional media (radio or TV) continues to be the focus, both in terms of production and business. But the observed newsrooms are in permanent reorganization in search of better efficiency, as Kueng advise: "Legacy media should put as much emphasis on transforming the organization as they do transforming their product." (Kueng, 2018: 9).

There are differentiated working shifts in all the observed newsrooms. In 2018, the news production cycle requires a very early start and a very late end of production, which can

span from 6 a.m. until after 1 a.m. One observed consequence of this long news production daily cycle is the fact that regular sources (i.e. politicians, commentators, scholars, specialists) also must have similar availability.

It's common to have multidisciplinary teams working in all of the observed newsrooms. In addition to journalists the news production also include producers, designers, technical editors (audio or video, i.e.), etc. This might not look any different from what could be observed in the past, but the daily practice in 2018 is to have all kinds of non-journalists working on newsrooms present in all phases of news production, from editorial planning meetings until the writing/editing process.

The observation allowed us to confirm that editorial teams (not only journalists) are well organized, making it possible to extend production time of any news story just seconds before the moment it should be published or aired (when there are time obligations, i.e. TV or radio). And, of course, have it ready. In the news making, the political or sports agenda limits the editorial decisions. I.e., football and exceptional events condition the normal flow of news in all media, making it clear that the agenda restrain the production and dissemination of news.

In all the observed media, the national news agency (Lusa) is fundamental for the website operation, as it guarantees volume of news without implying many human resources to deliver. Most of the news published by Lusa go directly online in the media outlets websites with no confirmation or editing. The objective is to publish a big number of news every day, without assigning resources to produce it. So the in-house production of news for the website has a lower volume compared to "news agency content", but is considered as very relevant (most of the times is related to with two kinds of news: mainly breaking news, that arrive from any kind of official or non-official sources, but also "exclusive" news stories or, at least, different approaches to a subject) and the available human resources should be focused on these. This editorial option also reveals a large (maybe exaggerated) confidence in Lusa. Besides the Portuguese news agency, the observed media outlets also use the major international agencies as sources.

In all the studied media outlets, breaking news are priorities. Despite any editorial plan, everything changes in seconds if something unexpected occur. The will and pressure to be the first overcomes any other priority or plan, so making changes to the plan of a TV or radio news report or the headlines of a website happens very frequently (at least several times a day, according to the observation).

The balance between the importance of the news itself (according to the public interest) and producing news to please the audience (according to the interest of the public) is difficult to achieve, and even more difficult to measure. In this study, during the observation days, it looked that pleasing the audience might be more important, according to published/ broadcasted news. But all editorial board members interviewed were unanimous, and their view can be summed in this sentence: "News are more important than loyalty" (editorial board member)

Another big question we tried to analyze was the media outlets strategy to keep or gain audiences in the diverse media they are in. All three study cases have clear strategies, but always non-explicit or public. All editorial board members agreed that all the news production and dissemination is submitted to the internal strategy, and that it won't change according to any events. "The defined strategy remains but the tactic changes" (editorial board member) somehow sums how these media outlets act.

In all the three newsrooms observed there are, according to the editorial board members, some keywords that can define the focus of the daily action of the people working in the newsroom. The most recurrent ideas present in the interviews are "rigor" (to be very strict to journalistic ethics, deontology and rules to produce a news story), "speed" (to be fast in all aspects, from the way they react to breaking news to deliver a news story efficiently), "insight" (to see and go beyond the obvious), but the "volume" of production is important (producing a lot of news stories, the max possible).

In the observed media outlets, the retrospective evaluation of the work produced and disseminated is not thorough or systematic. It is discussed, but only in an exceptional and not systematic or regular way, although the interviewed editorial board member agree that "evaluation of results is fundamental". (as an editor in chief explained in the interview)

Newsroom organization

The observed newsrooms are mainly organized according to a traditional scheme, and that reflects on the way the floor plan is organized. All the three newsrooms have an editorial board, with an editor-in-chief and several associates managing the newsroom. Most of the journalists are then organized by areas or into theme sections, each of this sections of the newsrooms with one or more editors. These editors manage the relation between the board and the journalists. In Portugal, photojournalists, photo editors, audio editors, videographers and video editors are considered journalists. The non-journalistic areas (i.e. design or graphic) have the same organization.

Besides this organization, all the observed newsrooms have additional journalists and/or editors within other organizational logics. I.e., on radio and television there are broadcasting editors, whose mission is to manage one (or more) news service, like the morning radio news service or the prime time TV news report. These editors work in parallel with the newsroom, following the editorial board guidelines to build the alignment to the broadcast they are responsible for, and sourcing from the area editors the news stories that will fit their plan. When the observed media have various distribution channels (TV and web, radio and web, etc.) there are also editors for the additional online media or medias (if we considered a website and social media as different medium). These online or social media editors manage their distribution channels in parallel with the main media. Even with autonomy to decide, the guidelines for these editors is always to support and follow the major news stories according to the main media (TV or radio) editorial priorities.

Not all the journalists are organized as part of the areas or the themes sections. In all the observed newsrooms, there are some journalists with special assignments or different organizational profiles. Some reporters have autonomy and are theme or area free, having time and resources to develop long form stories. Others are allocated to broadcast logics (i.e. early morning TV or radio news services), specialized news products (i.e. cinema, science and technology or crime) or even to specific media (website and/or social media).

One of the main changes in newsroom management and organization in the last five years appointed by the interviewed members of the editorial boards are related to the need to be always alert and ready to broadcast or publish. The “live” content is, according to the editorial managers, mandatory and much more needed than in the recent past. The consequence is the need to plan and manage more live content, and have more resources to broadcast and/or publish live from anywhere, both material and human. I.e., since a reporter that is covering some news story will be requested to do live reporting several times (while the event is underway), other journalist in the newsroom will need to get all the non-edited text, audio or video and build a traditional news story to publish and/or broadcast in the TV or radio news service, websites and/or social media.

“The website news service do not impose anything to the broadcast. It should follow the broadcast guidelines and priorities, use or reuse the news stories already made, and sometimes can have a different approach. The website can help disseminate the news stories, and the broadcast can make mention to the website, when possible, but that’s it.” (editorial board member)

So, in both cases of legacy media outlets, the websites are always subordinated to broadcast priorities, even with some autonomy and sometimes with a special focus on more specific news subjects. I.e., one website can focus more on politics and international news in general, with great attention to sports, but only breaking news. In all three observed cases, the in-house stories, especially exclusives, are always on the top of the headlines.

In all cases, the online monitoring tools are very important to decision making. The most viewed news articles, the trending topics, the trending searches on Google and the most popular hashtags on Twitter are very relevant to the websites (and social media), even if the online news decision are not subjected to data (but can be influenced by it).

Newsroom practices

The newsrooms practice includes several editorial meetings every day. These meetings are fundamental to the newsroom flow and routine. There are three main kinds of meetings, all scheduled in regular basis, at least one time per day, in all the observed media. The three main meetings are preparation meetings, evaluation meetings and operational meetings.

The main preparation meetings, in all the observed media, are in the morning, but the exact moment depends on the internal organization and broadcasting/publishing schedule (i.e. the main meeting could be at 5.30am, 9 a.m. or 10.30 a.m.). In these meetings the editorial board and themes/areas editors discuss and do all the decision making for the present day (mainly), next day, next week or long term (i.e. months to come), according to the agenda, external or in-house. Here the editor-in-chief give their view on the main news subjects to focus on and manages the participation of each editor. While discussing the news agenda of each editor, the team makes all the arrangements necessary to produce each of the news story: human and material resources, focus, if there will be any live (for broadcast), special audio or video editing, or graphic features needed, and even how the website (in both legacy media cases) and social media should work to boost the stories. For that reason, these meetings join not only members of the editorial board and area/theme editors, but also the broadcasting editors (in both legacy media), online and social media editors, producers, audio or video editors and design/graphics editors. More than 90 percent of the meeting is about the present day, with just a mere 10 percent dedicated to the mid (one week time) and long term (more than one week ahead).

According to the members of the editorial board, in interview, the main guidelines and concerns for the editorial meetings are:

“It’s fundamental to follow the agenda of the main news subjects”, explains one member of an editorial board.

“Being able to anticipate the agenda is a big plus. When we can do it, we can search for sources that can speak to us, preferably on the record; to get reactions, comments from alternative sources, whether official or not.” (member of an editorial board).

“We have to promote our exclusive news stories” (member of an editorial board)

“It’s very important to anticipate what’s going to be in the news and how we are going to cover it. At least one day before, preferably on the week before” (member of an editorial board)

Evaluation from the previous day meetings

In all the observed newsrooms, the main preparation meeting or another editorial board and editors meeting is a place to make the evaluation from the previous day work.

All the interviewed members of the editorial board consider the evaluation is a very important part of the job and of the editorial meetings.

“We always do the balance of the day before” (member of an editorial board).

“Of course we look at the news stories we did, especially our exclusives. And the audiences matter... Even if we do not change our strategy just because of the people that follow our news.” (member of an editorial board)

Despite the fact that all editorial board members agree that evaluation is very important, in the observation the time reserved for evaluation was very small, and all the evaluation discussed was very generic and not very much pragmatic. The audience data (on TV and web, since there are no daily data for radio in Portugal) was discussed just for special news stories or unusual or unexpected results, and there was no particular evaluation of any news story. There were not suggestions on how to make a better coverage of some subject, or strategic guidelines for events with follow up.

Operational meetings

After the main editorial meetings, in all the newsrooms observed there are very different and smaller meetings, with focus on operational questions, especially about how to produce and broadcast/publish the news stories approved for the day in the main meeting. In this meetings are usually present all the editors or equivalent involved in a news service or a special project (i.e. to cover a state visit of the president or the prime minister, a relevant sports event, a national celebration day, or a relevant date, as “six months after the great forest fires that killed more than 50 people”, etc.)

We could observe that in this meetings it is also common to start to prepare some of the news coverage for the next day, according to the agenda, to assure that all the resources needed are available (specially technical or operational resources, i.e. equipment that will be required, vehicles to go somewhere, travel or accommodation arrangements; but sometimes human resources also). They always prioritize the exclusive stories, allocating them more resources (or, at least, allocating them first), and taking more time to discuss the approach, possible live presence to make the stories more lively (on radio and TV) or guests to invite do discuss or comment the story.

As the agenda is checked, all the possible sources for the news stories are picked, according to the relevance (politicians or specialists, mainly) and contacted, so all arrangements can be made with time (i.e. if a specialist is needed, on radio or TV it can be invited to come to the studio to record or comment live. In this cases, there are logistic issues to arrange).

In this meetings there are also time to discuss the plan from the previous news service, but just to check what was not broadcasted/published and evaluate if those news stories still make sense, as they are or updated. A mid-term plan may also be discussed, if the agenda already has information of a relevant and more complex event that might need more than a journalist or team to cover it.

From the meetings routine, we can conclude that the focus of any of the three observed newsrooms is the daily routine and news production and broadcasting/ publishing. Just 10 percent of the planning in related to mid and long term strategy.

The practice of the newsrooms (and of the journalists that work in it) are, therefore, mainly focused on the present, on delivering the assigned news stories as soon and in the best way possible. In the two legacy media observed, the focus is the broadcasting,

and the online (website and social media) operation is always seen as an add-on, an extra. Or, in other words, as something less important in journalistic terms.

In the newsroom

All looks decided in the meetings, but in the newsrooms there are also discussion, and the plans can change at any moment, according to any unexpected events that can (and do) occur.

In the observation, we could see the news stories evolve from what was discussed and decided at the previous meetings. This news story evolution is not exceptional, but almost a rule for journalists, since there are new ideas to make it better, new data to add, new sources do find and listen and, of course, planned actions that became impossible to achieve (i.e. a source is unreachable, it's not possible to go to the place planned, etc.). So the news stories are always evolving, but not always in the ways planned nor desired.

One important note about this evolution of the news story is that, not being a new thing in journalism, is a practice that was largely spread inside the newsrooms thanks to the current news production and dissemination cycle. During the observation periods, several times the journalists point the need to be fast and to produce and publish from very early in the day until late night as the two main motives to create the need of being always recreating their news stories, editing them several times according to the news service, time of the day or media where it will be broadcasted/published. But apart that, the routine in the newsrooms is very similar, with each journalist working on the news stories that was assigned to him, even if it's common to see journalists discussing questions, problems and solutions related with the news stories.

Another action observed in the newsroom is the non-stop monitoring of the direct competition (other TV networks, news radios or news websites, depending on the observed media), and the attention given to news alerts from every possible source (from the national and international news agencies to Twitter and Facebook relevant accounts).

Guidelines for the newsroom

In all the newsrooms there are main guidelines, both for news production and broadcasting/publishing. We observed that most of the main concerns are coherent with the basic principles of journalism as they are generally accepted in a consensual way in democratic and free societies since the 20th century.

One of the main concerns is to show different points of view over each subject to guarantee a broader view of the events, and to correctly identify all the sources quoted on the news stories (name and occupation, plus institution, when relevant). This approach also demands journalists to make an effort to get reaction quotes to each news story (and many times we observed journalists discussing with their colleagues who will be the best people or institutional source to contact). Other main focus in all

the newsrooms is the search for a scoop or exclusive news story, since they get more exposure and the editorial board are willing to allocate more resources for it.

In broadcasting/publishing there are also main guidelines. The alignment for broadcasting or main headlines for publishing always have a defined strategy, and it is always designed according to the audience and/or broadcasting/publishing time (all the observed media have their “prime time” perfectly identified and clear). But this strategy is general and showed to be very flexible, as it can change at any moment, according to relevant breaking news, social interest or exclusive long form reporting.

Since all the observed media have secondary dissemination channels, the news stories are getting more transmedia, and several times (but not all, and probably not even half of the stories) a news story for the main media has additional information disseminated through other media (i.e. a TV or radio report have a website report with more/additional information or approach and social media teasers).

One constant we could observe in all the newsrooms was the big growth of video in all online media (websites and social media), in traditional or more alternative formats (square or even vertical, especially design to smartphone consumption).

Other major change, confirmed by the editorial board members during the interviews and even by the journalists during observation, is the constant use of social media as a source for news (using Tweetdeck and good source lists, i.e.) and also as the main tool to establish an interaction with the audiences. This interaction can go from the basic discussion on social media posts to crowdsourcing information.

“The crowdsourcing tools we use work very well and, at this point, our audience already know them and how they work. When there are some major event, we do not need to make nothing in particular to start receiving information from the audience.” (member of an editorial board)

This crowdsourcing looks to be on the rise, but in all the observed newsrooms that information is only used and broadcasted/published “after a journalistic evaluation of veracity, news value and editorial interest”, as a member of an editorial board stated.

Skills in the newsroom

One of the most mentioned (and observed) change in the newsrooms are the skills required from journalists. When media outlets were single-media, the journalists need to master only one kind of news-telling language (text, audio or audiovisual), but that times look to be (almost) over.

“A decade ago, a journalist worked for one sole purpose: press, radio or TV. And in all of them, the main goal was to produce a news story for one sole product”, as stated by a member of the editorial board (i.e. a text for the next day paper or a TV story for the evening news). “Now journalists can still maintain the focus on his main media, but have to master the storytelling techniques for additional media.”

“In 2018 a journalist needs to know how to write for the web, create good headlines, to record and edit audio and video. The most he knows, the best for him and for the media outlet he works for.” (member of the editorial board)

“We see and feel the transmedia skills in the newsrooms... how journalists master different storytelling skills” (member of the editorial board)

But according to the interviewed members of the editorial boards, not everything is sorted out in the journalist’s skills. Many old school journalists in newsrooms are not interested in developing new skills, and the young ones are not fully prepared to enter a newsroom.

“The future journalists arrive at the newsroom without an idea of what to expect from the profession and how things work in a working environment. They don’t seem prepared to bring a news story to life, to do it fast and how to put good use to their skills.” (member of the editorial board)

So what should future journalists know? “The main skill is to feel journalism inside them. If it happens it will a good starting point. But they have to be curious, open-minded and news addicts. If you don’t see the world around you, you can never be a journalist.” (member of the editorial board)

All the interviewed agree that the newsrooms are much more open to digital media (online and social media) than five years ago. “Journalists take much more advantage of the available storytelling, editing as publishing tools, using new production workflows. And they are aware to the communication trends, especially online video.” (member of the editorial board)

“The evolution of journalists is not quite consistent. They adapt to the new practices, or not, at different rates and extent. But is very important to keep the identity of the newsroom, the memory only the ones with more experience have... if the older ones are enough open-minded to evolve.” (member of the editorial board)

How to make money: how monetization strategies affect or influences the newsroom

“If there is a moral we can take from the postwar history of the news business, it is that an organization can practice journalism in order to do business, or do business in order to practice journalism.” (Gorman, 2015: 235). Applying this might be an objective, but not as simple as it might look. “The key to understanding the structural weaknesses of cyber journalism in Portugal is based in the fact that media companies, until today, didn’t manage to find a viable and sustained business model.” (Bastos & Zamith, 2012: 121)

In the three cases we have study, the new business models applied in very different ways, and the consequences the new reality brought to the newsroom had very different impact, also. For legacy media outlets, the online media work as an additional dissemination channel and also as a new monetization source. The original media, in

each case, have evolve in different paths: in one case there are no advertising revenues stagnation nor fall; in other, the fall of traditional revenues is well compensated by innovative editorial approaches. For the online media only, the new monetization business models are in its DNA since the first moment.

“High revenue editorial projects are fundamental to our business model. Organizing events and different kinds of sponsored contents, i.e., can make up to 50% of our revenues. So we are always trying to diversify and try different approaches, since we have the goal to make this projects grow in number and value.” (member of an editorial board)

So we have media outlets that rely on the traditional business model (advertising) and have no problem with it, media outlets that seek editorial innovation to make products that can leverage the revenues, and media outlets that try to master both. With all the three observed cases stating that they have no major revenue problem, and that sponsored contents are not a problem or pose any limitations to the editorial content.

“We can’t say sponsored content have any negative effect on our editorial goals, mission or strategy. Even if I admit they can pose some limitations in terms of flexibility and adaptability... and maybe impact the audience results.” (member of an editorial board)

Opportunities, challenges and risks for the next 12 months

The six major internal transformation levers for best-practice legacy transformation, according to Kueng (2018): long-term strategy, agility, “shiny new things”, leadership, people and culture.

In the interviews with the members of the editorial boards of the three case studies, we tried to understand the main opportunities, challenges and risks at short/medium term. In common, all were very vague, what can be due to two main factor: secrecy about future plans, or lack of concrete applied strategy.

Regarding opportunities, all interviewees agreed that the biggest opportunities to audience development are major crises, national or international, since all consider they are “regarded as breaking news media”, as a member of an editorial board synthesized , and that’s what the audience looked for in the first place. But positive news can also be a great push in audiences:

“The best that can happen for our business in 2018 will be Portugal winning the Football world Cup. This is the kind of events that grow audiences for a period of time, catches the attention of advertisers and always drives audiences even after the event.” (member of an editorial board)

The biggest challenges are very different for every one of the observed media, as they depend of the main particular goals. The only thing that all agreed without hesitation was the need to consolidate the production according to the various dissemination channels available.

“We seek to gain a new irreverence, to reinvent ourselves in a time when the audiences might think they don’t need good journalism to be informed.”
(member of an editorial board)

“Work hard, if needed turning ourselves upside down every day, so the audience keeps coming back and don’t forget we are here for them.” (member of an editorial board)

“Do the best we can, even if we have less than half of the people we would like, and produce all we need to feed our broadcasting/publishing. And do that without pushing our team to work for 12 hours a day.” (member of an editorial board)

“To achieve the perfect marriage between producing good journalism and be appealing to the audiences: be relevant and keep the audience interested.”
(member of an editorial board)

In what regard the biggest risks their media can face in the next 12 months, there were few answers, and two main concerns: to stay behind the competition in online media development and losing audiences. “We risk waking up late to the challenges and be known as the media that everyone respects but has no audience. And if that happens we are dead.” (member of an editorial board)

SWOT analysis of the observed media outlets

We tried to summarize the results in a SWOT analysis:

| Strengths | Weaknesses |
|--|---|
| Media professionals (journalists, audio or video editors, designers, etc.) are very engaged with the media outlets they work on. | The retrospective evaluation of the produced and disseminated work is not thorough or systematic. |
| Newsrooms are in permanent reorganization in search for better efficiency. | In-house production of news for the website has a lower volume compared to “news agency content”. |
| Multidisciplinary teams work in all of the observed newsrooms. | There’s a lack of specialized journalists in some areas. |
| Editorial teams are well organized. | Media outlets center their work mostly on the present. |
| There are specialized journalists who report better on special issues. | |
| Exclusive stories area prioritized. | |
| The competition is monitored, although it’s still in a superficial way. | |
| Opportunities | Threats |

| | |
|---|---|
| Put in place transmedia strategies. | The will and pressure to be the first overcomes any other priority or plan. |
| Willingness to bet on feature stories. | The balance between the importance of the news itself (according to the public interest) and producing news to please the audience (according to the interest of the public) is difficult to achieve, and even more difficult to measure. |
| Better profit from data concerning readers/spectators/users. | Being monitored by the competition. |
| Have more planned work to get more feature stories. | Losing the journalistic capital of older journalists, that don't master digital skills. |
| Newsrooms are more open to digital media. | |
| Consolidate the production according to the various dissemination channels available. | |

Main findings

“Journalism is being turned upside down. It is on a roller-coaster ride that can be exhilarating but rather scary”, wrote Beckett (2008: 9), before asking “What’s wrong with the news media business?”

In legacy media, the traditional media (radio or TV) continues to be the focus, both in terms of production and business. “We are now at the end of the digital beginning. Two decades after the emergence of the internet the structure of a new media ecosystem is becoming clear, as are the challenges this poses for organizations with substantial activities in legacy products.” (Kueng, 2018: 9)

People engaged and permanent reorganization were observed, so we can confirm “organizations *are* being transformed, but in a piecemeal rather than systematic way.” (Kueng, 2018: 9)

All this confirms the “five internal transformation levers”, according to Kueng (2018): “Ensuring strategy really is strategic, implanting ‘agility building blocks’ in advance, a clearly articulated process for ‘shiny new things’, high-calibre people processes – particularly recruitment and learning, and active culture management.” (Kueng, 2018: 8)

The editorial teams are well organized, and the news production cycle can span from 6am until after 1am and involves multidisciplinary teams.

The national news agency is fundamental for the news volume, but the in-house production is considered very relevant, especially “exclusive” news stories. An Duc Nguyen (2008) speaks of the online journalism as a “fantasy trip”, since instead of developing specific contents for the new publishing platform, they focused on a copy-paste practice, reducing costs but making the legacy the only one with profits. In Portugal the same happened, with more reaction than action, as Bastos (2011) states. And the retrospective evaluation of the work produced and disseminated is not thorough or systematic.

The balance between the importance of the news itself and producing news to please the audience is difficult to achieve, but it looked that pleasing the audience might be more important. The strategy to keep or gain audiences are non-explicit or public. “Transformation is a process. One interviewee described to me how easy it is to ‘talk the talk’ but how difficult to ‘walk the walk’.” (Kueng, 2018: 10)

The keywords that can define the daily action in the newsroom can be “rigor, “speed” and “insight”, but “volume” is important. “When you practice journalism to do business, the product becomes a men to an end: advertising space to be sold, a property to be flipped, a source of wealth to be monetized.” (Gorman, 2015: 240)

We can conclude that at different rates and needs, the observed media are trying to explore new business models. From the legacy media, one is fully committed to get most of its revenues from other sources than traditional advertising, as a way to overcome steadily decreasing revenues in the past years. In another case, there are no revenues problem, so the rate of business models innovation is slower, even it is also a main goal. In the online only media, the search for new revenue streams is a main goal since the beginning and the search for innovative editorial contents is permanent.

As Kueng underlines, “in conclusion, it notes that transforming organizations is hard and often thankless, but the sustainability of a critical set of organizations depends on their ability to match the transformation of their product with a similar rebirth of their organizations.” (Kueng, 2018: 8)

Bibliography:

Almeida, João Ferreira de & José Madureira Pinto (1975) *A Investigação nas Ciências Sociais*. Lisboa, Editorial Presença, 93-101.

Bastos, Hélder (2010) *Origens e Evolução do Ciberjornalismo em Portugal: Os primeiros quinze anos (1995-2010)*. Porto, Edições Afrontamento.

Bastos, Hélder & Zamith, F. (org) (2012). *Ciberjornalismo – Modelos de Negócio e Redes Sociais*. Porto, Afrontamento.

Becker, Howard S. (1997) *Métodos em Ciências Sociais*, São Paulo, Editora Hucitec.

Beckett, Charlie (2008) *Supermedia*. Chichester, Blackweel Publishing.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1993) *La misère du monde*, Paris, Editions du Seuil.

Campenhoudt, Luc Van (2003) *Introdução à Análise dos Fenómenos Sociais*. Lisboa, Gradiva.

Cardoso, Gustavo et al (2006) *O jornalismo Hoje. Uma análise de 14 redações de TV, Rádio e Jornais*. Lisboa, Obercom

Cardoso, Gustavo, Magno, C., Soares, T.M. & Crespo, M. (org.) (2016) *Modelos de negócio e Comunicação Social*. Coimbra, Almedina.

Chan-Olmsted, S. M., & Kang, J. W. (2003). Theorizing the strategic architecture of a broadband television industry. *The Journal of Media Economics*, 16(1), 3-21.

Clausen, Lisbeth (2003) *Global News Production*. Copenhagen, Copenhagen Business School Press.

Costa, António Firmino da (2003) *A Pesquisa de Terreno em Sociologia*, em Augusto Santos Silva e José Madureira (orgs.), *Metodologia das Ciências Sociais*. Porto, Afrontamento, 129-149.

Dewalt, Kathleen M. e Billie R. Dewalt (2002), *Participant Observation. A Guide for Fieldworkers*, Oxford, AltaMira Press.

Fuller, J. (2010). *What is happening to news: The information explosion and the crisis in journalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gold, Raymond I. (2003) *Jeux de rôles sur le terrain. Observation et participation dans l'enquête sociologique*, em Daniel Cefaï (org.), *L'Enquête de Terrain*, Paris.

Gomes, A. (2011) *O telejornal e o zapping na era da Internet: Estudo do comportamento de editores e telespectadores nos jornais televisivos das 20 horas da RTP1, SIC e TVI, (2006-2010)*. Lisboa, PhD thesis in sociology, ISCTE-IUL

Gomes, Adelino (2012) *Nos bastidores dos telejornais*. Lisboa: Edições Tinta-da-China.

Gorman, Brian (2015) *Crash to Paywall: Canadian Newspapers and the Great Disruption*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Graham, Gary et al (2015). *Content is king – News Media Management in the Digital Age*, New York: Bloomsbury.

Grueskin, B., Seave, A., & Graves, L. (2011). *The story so far: What we know about the business of digital journalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jerónimo, Pedro (2015) *Ciberjornalismo de proximidade*. Covilhã, Labcom.

Kueng, Lucy (2000) *Inside the BBC and CNN – Managing Media Organisations*. London, Routledge.

Kueng, Lucy (2015). *Innovators in digital news*, Oxford: Reuters Institute.

Kueng, Lucy (2018) *Going digital – A Roadmap for Organizational Transformation*, Oxford: Reuters Institute.

Lopes, Felisbela (2015) *Jornalista: profissão ameaçada*. Lisboa, Alêtheia

Lowe, Gregory e Brown, C. (org) (2016). *Managing Media Firms and Industries – What’s so special about media management?*, , New York, Springer.

Nguyen. A.D. (2008) *The Penetration of Online News*. Saabruken: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller.

Picard, R.G. (2003) *Cash Cows or Entrecôte: Publishing Companies and New Technologies*, *Trends in Communication*, 11(2):127–136.

Raymond Quivy. Luc Van Campenhoudt. *Manual de investigação em Ciências Sociais.*, 2013, 6th Edition in Portuguese, Gradiva, Lisbon.

Rosen, Jay (2006) *The People Formerly Known as the Audience*, blog post available online at http://archive.pressthink.org/2006/06/27/ppl_frmr_p.html; https://www.huffingtonpost.com/jay-rosen/the-people-formerly-known_1_b_24113.html

Santos, Luís António (2011) *Journalism in transition: A study of change at Jornal de Notícias’ online newsroom*. PhD thesis. Braga: Universidade do Minho.

Spradley, James (1980) *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (Reissued Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2016)

Storsul, Tanja e Krumsvik, A.H. (2013). *Media Innovations – A multidisciplinary Study of change*, Gotemburg: Nordicom.

Tedlock, Barbara (2005), —*The Observation of participation and the Emergence of Public Ethnography*||, em Norman K. Denzin e Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London, Sage Publications (third edition), pp. 467-382.