Aspectos estruturais do sistema midiático brasileiro

Structural aspects of the brazilian media system

*Laura Cervi**

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelo (UAB), Barcelona, Catalunha, Espanha.

ORCID:0000-0002-0376-0609

*Autor Correspondente (e-mail: Laura.Cervi@uab.cat)

Abstract: With the widespread diffusion of social networks and "participatory platforms", the process of collecting, creating and distributing information is no longer the exclusive competence of professional journalists and media outlets: it potentially involves all citizens, turning information into a real common good. In this context, despite their concerns, big broadcasters have been forced to adapt and include User Generated Content (UGC) in their programming, both as a way to engage their users and to benefit from the opportunity offered by a potential infinite source of information. This article, through a structural and qualitative analysis of structure, usability, verification systems and legal aspects of four amongst the most relevant international broadcasters' User generated Content platforms (BBC, France 24, CNN and Al Jazeera), tries to understand if the outputs of these initiatives actually create a new form of dialogic journalism, showing that these relatively young practices present a mix of user engagement and active participation, but it's too early to speak about real dialogic communication. The main limits are still related to the verification process, the crediting – and consequently with free labor - and the responsibility attributions. The article ends with some recommendations geared toward building a real community of trust.

Keywords: UGC. Participation. Media. Television. Citizen Journalism.

1. Introduction

The Internet has emerged as a great transformative force: the vertical and unidirectional communication model typical of industrial society and mass media has been replaced by a horizontal and multidirectional model (CASTELLS, 2001), in which individuals become prosumers, at the same time consumers and producers of information. Alex Bruns (2008) defined this phenomenon as "produsage". This syncretic neologism defines those users who, disengaging themselves from the classic passive role, assume a more active role in the process of creation, production, distribution and consumption of the good that defines our society: information.

The widespread diffusion of social networks and of the various "participatory platforms" make it increasingly evident that, never as in the present historical context, information has become a real common good. information is no longer the exclusive competence of a "caste" of professionals, but potentially involves every citizen (FUCHS, 2008).

New technologies have produced, therefore, a change in the balance of power that has transformed the markets of information, communication and culture: this change of paradigm, which implies the democratization of information, is leading inexorably to the democratization of journalism (PAPACHARISSI, 2010). The traditional hierarchy between the journalist-issuer, unquestionable in his ways and times of work, and the citizen-receiver, relegated to a passive condition, is questioned (ALLAN, 2013).

As Jenkins already stated in 2006, the public, somehow emancipated from these new technologies, occupies a space at the intersection of old and new media, and claims the "right to participate in culture", to interact, dialogue and collaborate with media, to verify the quality of the service, and finally to have an active role in the new production processes. The traditional media seem to emerge destabilized by this technological revolution (BOWMAN & WILLIS, 2003) , but not everything is lost either for television or for journalism: just as in the past recessions were followed by moments of revival, even today the crisis, if well managed, could regenerate the potential of the vehicle.

It is clear, however, that for the television information to survive, and perhaps regain ground, it needs decisive repositioning (ROSEN, 2006), made of new formats that open the doors to the participation of users, thus allowing companies on one side to reconnect with all those users who have / are about to abandon them, on the other to capitalize that potentially infinite source of information inherent in citizenship itself.

However, as previously mentioned, television information cannot escape the idea that the news generated by users and those generated by professionals can complement each other. In this sense, if it is true, as Dan Gilmor (2004, p.84) said, that "our readers, collectively, know more than us", combining the training, experience and skills of the professional journalist, with collective intelligence and the ability to contribute from its readers, it can generate a collaborative journalism capable of healing the health of a journalism crisis.

2. Statement of the problem

According to some authors the relationship between information and user-generated content has always existed (DAUGHERTY, EASTIN & BRIGHT, 2008): just think of the very famous photos of Kennedy's assassination, but there is no doubt that the systematic use of user-generated content is something modern and linked to the technological developments previously mentioned.

According to Dan Gillmor (2008), for example, on September 11, 2001, American society and traditional media would understand the importance of the contents, then still defined as amateur. In fact, on the day of the attack, all the web pages of traditional media have collapsed and both the relatives of the victims and the citizens and journalists of the whole world have started to look for information on the personal blogs of people who published the events they were witnessing.

Others claim that it all began on the day of the tsunami caused by the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake, stating that: "For the first 24 hours the best and the only photos and videos came from tourists armed with telephones, digital cameras and camcorders and if not you had those pictures, you were not on the piece." (BURUM, 2016, p.34). In media studies, researches about user-generated content in online newspapers are well developed (SINGER & ASHMAN, 2009; HERMIDA & THURMAN, 2008; THURMAN, 2008), but the ones about television information are recent and not very numerous (COLISTRA, BUCHMAN & DUVALL, 2016).

Mostly they are case studies of individual broadcasters (HARRISON 2010; WARDLE AND WILLIAMS, 2010) and generally focus on the changes in the editorial staff or in the general challenges for the newsroom practices (WARDLE, DUBBERLEY AND BROWN, 2017). In other words, they take the journalists' point of view to understand how this material can improve or create difficulties in their daily work.

Although they are very interesting, these works completely ignore the other side of the coin: users, those who want to participate, and in fact they do participate in generating content, as the general user who is faced with new content and new opportunities.

For this reason, my work intends to create a bridge between participative communication and classical media studies, adopting the users' perspective and tries to understand what kind of experience is offered in the platforms of user generated content.

This work analyzes BBC, France24, CNN and Al Jazeera platforms for three fundamental reasons: first of all, because they represent the main information channels on a global level, with audience all over the world; secondly because they geographically represent different continents, and therefore they belong to different media, legal and journalistic cultures; and in conclusion because they are generally considered the global benchmarks.

The latter criterion justifies, in particular, the choice of France24, preferred to Euronews, although worse positioned in the world ranking in terms of users, due to the specificity of its offer of user generated content.

Theoretical framework

3. Citizen journalism

The tools of journalism have changed: with relatively low investments, a common citizen has (almost) the same material that once only an editorial staff could have (WESTLUND, 2013). Specifically, the same smartphone, which anyone carries in his pocket, is a multifunctional and versatile device, equipped with a camera to record video and take photos, which also works as an audio recorder and as an editing tool, which can, however, perform live streaming, upload contents in real time, spread them and, at the same time, allow peer-to-peer interaction with other users (NUNEZ DE SOUSA & CERVI, 2017).

As Mark Briggs effectively explains, mobile devices have become like "electronic Swiss Army knives, arming anyone and potentially everyone with all-in-one media tools that can view, capture and publish or broadcast" (2016, p.137).

In short, paradoxically, the same technologies that have contributed significantly to the configuration of a concentrated communication scenario, have opened the door to the direct participation of citizens in the production of information, allowing them, for the first time, to have a speaker through which they can contradict or offer alternatives to dominant discourses (KAUFHOLD, 2010). The rise of this form of "mobile journalism", understood as journalism exercised with the use of portable devices (QUINN, 2009), has become particularly evident during the most recent terrorist attacks (Barcelona, London and Paris) or in the case of serious natural disasters, like the 2010 Haiti earthquake.

This change of model opens the door to citizen journalism, a phenomenon that describes a sea magnum of practices that are difficult to classify.

So far, there is no exhaustive definition of this phenomenon: although "citizen journalism" seems to be the most used formula, we speak indiscriminately of civic journalism, participatory journalism and a host of other names (ATTON, 2003).

And the choice of one or the other definition seems to depend more on the ideological point of view of those who describe it, than on the real differences in terms of practices.Many academic discourses tend to be optimistic, believing that this technological revolution will destroy the rigid hierarchical model of mass media (CASTELLS, 2001) transforming journalism into an "open conversation", in which journalists, renouncing to their monopoly of news production, would become the new moderators of a public debate. News that would no longer be an "objective" story, but a heterogeneous narrative built from multiple voices that ultimately will lead to an enhanced public debate, a healthier public sphere that will lead to a substantial reform of the quality of our democracies in a more participatory sense (DEUZE, 2009).

These approaches tend to refer to the concept of collective intelligence, firstly proposed by Pierre Levy (1997) and later developed by Malone (2010), to refer to that collaborative activity based on a model of mobile communication, omnipresent and asynchronous, in which public and private are confused. This definition is directly linked to the idea of smart mob, by

Howard Rheingold, understood as that group of people who "can collaborate even if they do not know each other, thanks to the use of devices with a capacity of communication and calculation": this together, contrary to the usual negative connotation of "mass", behaves in an intelligent or efficient way because of the exponential growth of the connections in the network (RHEINGOLD, 2002, p. 56-58).

Another approach, linked to the aforementioned concepts, sees citizen journalism as an answer to the incapacity - or blame - of the mainstream media, of providing truthful information.

In other words, according to these authors, since the "fourth power" has moved away from citizens, serves interests other than those of citizens, hence losing credibility. So common people, through the use of technology, are assuming the role of watch-dogs, of guardians of the media (PAPACHARISSI, 2010).

This is why many people concentrate the definition of this new form of journalism almost exclusively on the "alternative" or activist side: citizen journalism, for example, according to Radsch (2016), is an alternative form and activist of news gathering, which operates outside the institutions. and traditional media, often in response to shortcomings in the field of professional journalism, which uses similar journalistic practices, but is driven by different goals and ideals and depends on alternative sources of legitimacy compared to traditional or conventional journalism. Carpentier, on the other hand, argues that it is necessary to focus on "decisions on the use of production technologies, on the use of space and places, on the visibility of the participants, on the use of language, genres and formats, etc." (CARPENTIER, 2016, p.81).

In the Ibero-American context, especially in Latin America, this approach is connected with the idea of communitarian communication and the emancipation of the communities themselves: in this sense, Clemencia Rodríguez (2001) defines community journalism as a concept that implies a collective interaction "which challenges social codes, legitimate identities and institutionalized social relations as a means to empower the community".

On the other hand, of course, we find the hyper-pessimistic critics, who, considering these practices as a form of amateur exercise of a profession, focus on the potential dangers that would create both journalism and the whole society.

For this reason, several authors, among them Vincent Maher (2010), have decreed the death of citizen periodism, and many professional associations, such as the Spanish FAPE (Federation of Journalists), tend to consider it as something that "is neither journalism nor a citizen".

On the same side of the barricade, we encounter many Marxist and post-Marxist scholars, who, despite being equally critical, are for diametrically opposed reasons, interpreting the "free" amateur culture of Internet, the so-called "gift economy for the exchange of information" (Hardt & Negri, 2000:112), as a sort of enchantment that in reality would hide a logic of mobilization of "immaterial labor" useful and instrumental to capitalist exploitation.

4. Internet and the television crisis

Data shows that television, even if it remains, after more than fifty years of history, the most widespread means of communication, loses market shares to the point of supposing that its decline is an unavoidable process.

Television has already inexorably lost the so-called Millennials, or the first generation of "digital natives" born about between 1980 and 2000: according to Nielsen data, globally, millennials watch 19 hours and 18 minutes of TV a week, compared to 34 hours and 32 minutes for all US adults, preferring the digital world and mobile devices. The pervasiveness of mobile devices and the emergence of platforms that make it easier to choose what to see and plan what to see in the future, has, in fact, provided consumers with the opportunity to consume media contents in different ways.

Moreover, according to the prediction, things may get worse for television: 2019 will be the year of the final overtaking. Globally, the average user will spend an average of 170.6 minutes a day on online activities, and will spend a little less time - 170, 3 minutes - watching TV.

5. The crisis of journalism

If television is in crisis, so is journalism. There is a great amount of evidence documenting the fall of confidence in journalism for more than a decade.

The 2017 survey for the Reuters Institute's "Digital News Project" showed that confidence in the media in the United Kingdom fell by 7% in a year, and that 33% of the population has abandoned traditional information sources, mainly because they believe of part.

These figures are largely confirmed by Edelman's global report on trust, which revealed that government, business, media and NGOs are considered the least reliable institutions in the world, with the largest decline for the media, which is considered unlikely in over 80% of the countries examined.

Globally, 66% of respondents believe that the media are too obsessed with the audience and too little concerned about the quality, while 65% believe that they sacrifice accuracy in favor of speed; finally, just under 60% believe that the media prefer to defend an ideology rather than inform the public in an impartial manner.

6. Method

Very often, media studies are pervaded by the 'sociological approach'; i.e. they tend to consider participation only as taking part in particular social processes (NUNEZ DE SOUSA & CERVI, 2017): when this approach is applied to the use of UGC, as previously mentioned, research tends to focus on the media professionals. Perspective (WARDLE, DUBBERLEY AND BROWN, 2017) that completely ignores the users.

In this study I will take the 'political approach' (Carpentier 2016) that provides a much more restrictive definition of participation, focusing on the equalization of power inequalities in decision-making processes.

In this way the results will allow us to understand if, and to what extent, these platforms approach the definitions, even the minimum, of citizen journalism, that is, they give the possibility for citizens to cooperate in the construction of the informative history or simply use the material as a source free information.

The study, of an analytical-descriptive type, considers the functionality of the platforms considering the usability and focuses on the following criteria, displayed by Table 1: structure and functionality of the platform, legal aspects and verification tools.

As for the structure, the categories are meant to explain the users' experience, in terms of usability and functionality (linguistic diversity; age limit; possibility to upload; registration; possibility to share content through social network) and have been created following Wardle, Dubberley and Brown's (2017) model.

Legal aspects are important to understand under which conditions of freedom, constraint or risk (GERVAIS, 2009) the user operates and takes into account responsibility, remuneration, copyright and crediting.

Finally, the categories related to verification process (explanation of the method and direct contact) are intended (Murrell, 2018) to understand if the verification process is helpful not only for the newsrooms but for users themselves.

In addition, we consider if the platforms have a dedicated program and a media literacy section in order to assess whether they value citizens' empowerment thorough education (PÉREZ TORNERO & VARIS, 2014).

First, I will analyze each case and then I will compare them to assess similarities and differences.

7. BBC

The BBC, as seen previously, can be considered the pioneer, since it began to include the content generated by users in 2005, during the London bombings, and it was the first to establish a dedicated editorial, the "UGC hub".

Given the success, the BBC established a permanent section called "Have your say" on the general web page, thanks to which any user can share content through Twitter, Whatsapp or directly by uploading them to the portal.

The "UGC hub" can verify and filter the material; nevertheless, the operation of the verification process is never explained.

Any user over the age of 13 can register simply by providing an e-mail address (or through Facebook and other social networks) and upload content to the web page.

The legal terms are set out in the BBC's general legal disclaimer, updated on November 28, 2016: the BBC acquires the right to "examine, modify, remove or decide not to display" the material, and claims the right to use it anywhere in the world, in any medium (such as TV, Internet, radio), and forever.

Regarding copyrights, the channel differentiates between copyright and moral right: the author maintains the copyright, but renounces automatically to the latter, guaranteeing the channel the right to use the material without identifying the creator.

On the other hand, however, the user is held personally accountable for what he publishes and assumes the responsibility for not publishing anything illegal, obscene, defamatory, pornographic or ignoring the hate speech.

The channel, finally, expressly declares that "for no reason will pay for this content".

8. France 24

The all-news channel of French public television is the only one to have a specific television program - with two editions, one weekly and one monthly -, *Les observateurs*, dedicated to the contents created by users.

Les Observateurs, in addition to a program, is a collaborative web page, available in 4 languages (French, Arabic and Farsi) that contains texts, photos and above all videos of "observers", ie citizens who are in the heart of some fact, especially of international politics.

Users can upload the material they are within the platform, not through social networks.

Operation is particularly interesting: the team of journalists find amateur images on social networks and try to contact the author, or, in a different way, spontaneously any person, after registering, can upload content onto the platform.

The journalists of the editorial office verify the account so much when the material offered and the verification methods are explained in the portal in detail, using a clear and easy to understand language.

If both are valid, an online article is published. The article takes the form of an introduction written by one of the journalists, providing the context and explaining who the observers are and why their contribution is relevant. This is followed by a first person account of the "observer", taken from a telephone interview or an exchange via social media.

Once an observer has contributed, he automatically becomes a reliable source and begins a relationship with the Channel, becoming a sort of stable "collaborator".

From a legal point of view, France24, contrary to the BBC's choice referring to the general terms, makes specific legal terms available directly on the *Les Observateurs* portal and does not specify the presence or absence of remuneration.

However, the agreement does not differ much from that of the BBC: the user loses copyright on his images and the channel claims the right to use it anywhere in the world, in any medium (eg TV, Internet, radio), and forever, but France24 promises to always indicate the name (or pseudonym) of the observer.

Also in this case, the user is held responsible for what he publishes and assumes the responsibility not to publish anything illegal, obscene, etc. but the attention is placed more on the protection on any third party persons mentioned by the loaded content, to which the user is obliged to request authorization.

Curiously, in the legal terms no age limit is specified.

Finally, France 24 offers to all users small courses on how to record a video, on how to optimize the potential of a smartphone, but also courses definable media literacy, concerning the protection of privacy or false information.

9. CNN

iReport is a multi-platform, launched in 2006, which allows users to contribute videos, photos and texts on CNN's general web page.

Anyone aged 13 or over can register using an email address or an account of the main social networks, upload material to the platform or send it via Facebook, Instagram and Twitter.

The platform is organized for "Assignments", tasks, through which journalists ask users to contribute with material on a specific topic (for example "Share your photo of space and the stars"), but free contributions are also allowed.

iReport receives on average 500 iReports per day: everything is published with a very visible "Not Verified for CNN" banner and a team of moderators examines the published content and collects the unsuitable material.

CNN producers choose the most interesting content that, contextualized, will be part of the CNN coverage: the functioning of the selection and verification process, however, is not specified.

When a story is selected, the "Not Verified for CNN" bar disappears and is replaced by a red "CNN iReport" bug, which allows the community to know that a story has been verified.

Also in the case of CNN the legal terms are specific to iReport.

CNN and its parent company, Turner Broadcasting, System, Inc., asume "the right and license exempt from rights, perpetual, irrevocable, non-exclusive, but not the obligation to use, publish, reproduce, modify, adapt, and otherwise exploit" content created by users worldwide, in any form, media or technology without payment.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, CNN is the only channel that provides explicit compensation: where the channel sells an iReport to third parties not affiliated with CNN, "it commits to pay a percentage of the license fees actually received based on the rates set by licensing division of CNN, ImageSource".

In addition, CNN is the only channel that explicitly prohibits its employees, and all Cable News Network, Inc. employees from sending content without supervisors' permission.

10. Al Jazeera

Al Jazeera opens its platform dedicated to citizen journalism with the name "Sharek". (Sharek means to contribute or share in Arabic), in 2008.

At the height of the Arab Spring, Sharek received up to 1,600 videos a day, which pushed the broadcaster to work on the renewal of the platform, which in 2012 reappears enhanced by new features such as recording live webcams and live streaming from mobile phones.

It is currently only available in Arabic, so the uploaded content is mainly used by Al Jazeera Arabic. Soon, Sharek will allow users to view and upload content in English, Arabic, Serbo-Croatian, Turkish and Swahili.

The platform allows users to upload video material via the website, via email or directly from their mobile phones via Whatsapp and social networks.

The project is quite similar in concept to CNN's iReport, with the exception of content that is always screened before publication.

Only those who contribute regularly (even if it does not explicitly mean what "regular" means) are "accredited" and can publish without moderation, but the criteria for verification are not available.

Also in this case, Sharek users must refer to the general terms to understand their rights and duties.

The legal terms do not differ much from the previous ones: the responsibilities of the user are slightly more rigid than the commitment not to publish images "illegal, obscene, defamatory at the political level, threatening, pornographic (...) or that violate the law, culture or internationally accepted norms and codes of ethics".

The substantial difference lies in the fact that, by uploading material, the user automatically confers to "Al Jazeera a global, non-revocable, exclusive, royalty-free and transferable license to transmit, distribute, display, reproduce, cut, modify, and sell without no limitation".

Al Jazeera is, therefore, the only emitent who claims the right to make money on the material sent spontaneously.

11. Results

The purpose of the study is to describe the type of experience that the different platforms offer to the user, especially in terms of usability, verification and legal terms. Table 1 shows a comparative analysis of the different platforms: the differences are not particularly evident, but they hide different approaches.

Table 1: Comparison.

Canale	BBC	France 24	CNN	Al Jazeera
Dedicated TV program	no	yes	no	no
Upload zone	yes	yes	yes	yes
Possibility to sed via social	yes	no	yes	yes
Requires Registering	yes	yes	yes	yes
Agelimit	13	not specified	13	not epecified
Linguistical diversity	no	yes	no	in futuro
Explain verification system	no	yes	no	no
Direct contact with user	not specified	yes	not specified	not epecified
General legal terms	yes	yes	yes	yes
Specific Legal Terms	no	yes	yes	yes
Explicit user responsibility statement	yes	yes	yes	yes
Explicit presenc/obsence of remuneration	yes	no	yes	no
Possibility to sell UGC	not specified	not specified	yes (by payback)	yes
Renounce to copyright	yes	yes	yes	yes
Crediting users	yes	no	no	no
Media literacy	no	yes	no	no

Source: elaborated by the author.

First of all, we can observe that only one channel, France24, has a program dedicated to the content created by users, and, together with Al Jazeera, have a dedicated web page; the other issuers include the platform in their generic web pages.

In terms of usability, but also of participation, the fact of having a dedicated space increases the sense of community.

In particular, the idea that a material will be given for free without even knowing why and in what contexts it will be used could discourage, or at least not favor, the willingness to participate.

In this sense, the case of France 24 is particularly interesting, since it not only offers a reserved space, but also confers a name, "observer", to the participants, who even if they do not reach the rank of "journalist", being given a name underlines the fact that
they are an integral part of newsmaking.

At the same time, the channel is the only one that promises to mention the author/source.

All broadcasters offer the possibility to send the content through the portal, but France24 chooses not to give the possibility to do it through social networks.

This choice, although somewhat limiting, can be understood in the previously mentioned sense to require some form of compromise, underlined, moreover, by the amount of data requested at the time of registration.

All platforms, in fact, allow you to enter through the accounts of the main social networks, while Frace24 requires a traditional register and a telephone number.

As anticipated, it favors on the one hand the responsibility of those who contribute and on the other hand agitates the process of verification.

As for the linguistic diversity, it should be said that if the goal is to collect and offer different perspectives, restricting the possibility to a single language, although this language is the most widespread in the world, is limiting.

As for the verification system, once again France24 turns out to be the best performer: all the platforms affirm to implement a system of verification of the sources, but none of them is explicit. Only France24 explains in detail what the verification processes are and makes them available to users so that they can make good use of them.

The same applies to contact with the user: only France24 requires an explicit contact, which on the one hand guarantees the quality of information and on the other encourages the user to collaborate; the other broadcasters do not specify it.

As for the legal terms, I will not enter into jurisprudential themes; however, it is very important to underline that, beyond the availability of the availability (the simpler tofind the more you will read), all the broadcasters make the same mistake: the legal terms are written in technical language which is difficult to understand.

Perhaps, paradoxically, only the BBC that refers to the general terms uses more accessible language.

This discourse refers to that on the attribution of responsibility to the user, to the waiver of copyright and, ultimately, to media literacy.

The average user, in fact, is not - and cannot be - informed on most legal limits relating to the exercise of the journalistic profession (publication of images or video, responsibility with respect to third parties, privacy, or, in some contexts, to honor, etc.), therefore, it should be the responsibility of the platform to implement media literacy initiatives aimed not only, as in the case of France24, to provide technical skills, but also basic knowledge of its rights and duties and development of a critical spirit with respect to the possible personal and social consequences related to the functions they are carrying out.

As far as remuneration is concerned, the Anglo-Saxon channels are much more explicit: both BBC and CNN explain the free transaction, while France24 and Al Jazeera omit this information.

This undoubtedly depends on the different legal systems to which they belong (see CNN specificity on sales to third parties), but also reflects a different approach towards citizen-journalists.

On the one hand, we have France24, which establishes a quasi-working relationship with the usual "observers", so as to invite them to France or to contribute economically to their observer duties; on the other hand, we see Al Jazeera, who reserves the right to make money on material obtained for free.

As for age limits, as we can see, it varies between 13 in the Anglo-Saxon countries to the non-definition of the French broadcaster and that of Qatar.

12. Discussion and recommendations

In order for user participation to lead to a new form of journalism and truly different content, at least three key issues need to be addressed.

First of all, the verification tools should be optimized to ensure that journalists use veridical material and do not run the risk of spreading fake news, or even worse than being unwitting accomplices of some political agenda (especially when it comes to international contributions), but especially explicit, to teach users how to apply them to their work before loading it on the platforms and, ultimately, to guarantee users a quality material.

Secondly, the theme of crediting, which in turn carries with it two fundamental themes: copyright protection and the attribution of authorship of a journalistic work.

The complicated copyright discourse and the consequent legal implications will give work to jurists all over the world: it is well known that, especially in the United States, many citizens are organizing themselves in a cooperative way to create news agencies, in fact, order to claim their right to be remunerated for the services offered.

And, from the point of view of journalistic practices, in most cases, as we have observed, we use content arbitrarily, keeping the creator in the dark about how/where his creation will be used.

The attribution of authorship of a content, in all respects journalistic in the first place, and the involvement of the author in the choices on the use of the material, would increase the sense of responsibility by creating a relationship of mutual trust that, ultimately, would increase the quality of the materials themselves.

And to conclude, the big question still pending is that of media literacy. On the one hand, in fact, citizens are asked to cooperate freely, on the other they are required to assume responsibility in most cases totally unknown.

The condition sine qua non of the relationship of mutual trust previously mentioned, therefore, lies in the ability to put citizens in a position to make responsible choices.

And the only way to make responsible choices in the exercise of the journalistic profession is to acquire knowledge, albeit minimal, regarding the functioning of the media.

It is therefore the responsibility of companies to provide potential content generators not only with technical indications, but also with appropriate information on rights and obligations, on the possible legal and ethical implications of their actions, which allow them to fully understand the role they are playing.

13. Conclusions

Our study allows us to conclude that, among the cases analyzed, the only issuer that offers the user an experience worthy of being called participatory is Les Observateurs from France 24, offering a dedicated program and the possibility to intervene directly in the creation of the information product.

In all other cases, in fact, the role seems to be limited to that of suppliers of free raw material, to be used and modified without giving any guarantee and no explanation about its use.

The use of interactivity in the media and the adoption of innovation in the editorial offices, therefore, are not determined solely by technological availability, but also by the wider social context in which the technology is used.

In other words, the inclusion of user generated content in the information palimpsests is neither automatic garnziage nor a real participatory experience on the part of the people, nor real innovation of the journalism.

References

ALLAN, Stuart. **Citizen Witnessing**, Cambridge, MA, Polity, 2013.

ATTON, Breton. What is "alternative journalism"?, **Journalism**: Theory, Practice and Criticism 4, no. 3, p. 267-400, 2003.

BRIGGS, Mark, J**ournalism Next**, Los Angeles (USA): Sage, 2016.

BOWMAN, Saine, WILLIS, Chris. We Media | How audiences are shaping the future of news and information, Reston VA., **The Media Center at The American Press Institute**, 2003.

BRUNS, Alex. **Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and Beyond**: From Production to Produsage, New York, Peter Lang, 2008.

BURUM, Ivo, **Democratizing Journalism through Mobile Media**: The Mojo Revolution, New York, Routledge, 2016.

CARPENTIER, Nico. Beyond the Ladder of Participation: An Analytical Toolkit for the Critical Analysis of Participatory Media Processes, **Javnost - The Public**, 23:1, p.70-882016, 2016.

CASTELLS, Manuel. The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business and Society. Oxford: **Oxford University Press**, 2001.

COLISTRA, Rita, BUCHMAN, Eva, DUVALL, Kevin. User-Generated Content and Television News Stations, in **Electronic News** 11:3, p. 123-144, 2016.

DAUGHERTY, Terry, EASTIN, Matthew & BRIGHT, Laura. Exploring Consumer Motivations for Creating User-Generated Content. **Journal of Interactive Advertising**. 8, 2008.

DEUZE, Mark. The Future of Citizen Journalism, in **Citizen Journalism: Global Perspectives, edited by Stuart Allan and Einer Thorsen**, New York: Peter Lang, , p. 255-264, 2009.

FUCHS, Christian. Internet and Society: Social Theory in the Information Age. New York: **Routledge**, 2008.

GERVAIS DJ, 2009, The tangled web of UGC: Making copyright sense of user-generated content", **Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment and Technology Law**, vol 11, no 4, pp 841–870.

GILMOR, Dan. **We the Media, Sebastopol**, California, O'Reilly, 2004.

HARDT, Michael & NEGRI, Antonio. Empire, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, **England: Harvard University Press**, 2000.

HARRISON, Jay. User-generated content and gatekeeping at the BBC hub, **Journalism Studies**, 11:2, 243-256, 2010.

HERMIDA, Alfred & THURMAN, Neil. A clash of cultures: The integration of user-generated content within professional journalistic frameworks at British newspaper websites. **Journalism Practice**, 2(3), p. 343-356, 2008.

JENKINS, Henry. Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide, New York, **New York University Press**, 2006.

KAUFHOLD, Kelly. Citizen Journalism and Democracy: How User-Generated News Use Relates to Political Knowledge and Participation, in **Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly** 87,p. 515-529, 2010.

LEVY, Pierre, **Collective intelligence**: mankind's emerging world in cyberspace. New York ; London :Plenum Trade, 1997.

MALONE, **Collective Intelligence and Group Performance**, in Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24, 2015 420-424.

MURRELL, C. (2018). **The global television news agencies and their handling of user generated video from Syria**. Media, War & Conflict, Vol. 11, no.3 289-308.

NUNEZ DE SOUSA, Ana Lucia., CERVI, Laura. **Video activism in the Brazilian protests: genres, narratives and political participation**, Northern Lights: Film & Media Studies Yearbook, 2017.

PAPACHARISSI, Zizi, A Private Sphere: **Democracy in a Digital Age.**, Cambridge: Polity, 2010.

PÉREZ TORNERO, José Manuel & VARIS, Tapio. **Alfabetización mediática y nuevo humanismo**, Barcelona, UOC, 2014.

QUINN, Stephen. **MoJo - Mobile journalism in the Asian Region**. Singapore (Singapore): Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, 2009.

RADSCH, Courtney. **Cyberactivism and Citizen Journalism in Egypt**, New York, Palgrave Macmillan US, 2016.

RODRÍGUEZ, Clemencia, **Fissures in the Mediascape**. An International Study of Citizens' Media,Cresskill, NJ, Hampton Press, 2001.

ROSEN, Jay. What Are Journalists For, New Haven and London: **Yale University Press**, 2006.

RHEINGOLD, Howard. **Smart Mobs**: The Next Social Revolution, London, Basic Books, 2002.

SINGER, Jane B & ASHMAN, Ian. 'Comment Is Free, but Facts Are Sacred':User-generated Content and Ethical Constructs at the Guardian. J**ournal of Mass Media Ethics**, 24(1), pp. 3-21, 2009.

THURMAN, Neil. **Forums for citizen journalists?** Adoption of user generated content initiatives by online news media. New Media & Society 10(1): 139-157, 2008.

WARDLE, Claire & WILLIAMS, Andrew. Beyond user-generated content: a production study examining the ways in which UGC is used at the BBC. **Media, Culture & Society**, 32(5), p. 81–799, 2010.

WESTLUND, Oscar. Mobile News: A review and model of journalism in an age of mobile media, **Digital Journalism**, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2013, p. 6–26 2013.

Webs

V. Maher, V. (2010), Citizen Journalism is Dead. Personal blog.Available at:http://www.kombinasi.net/citizen-journalism-is-dead. Retieved 11, Sept., 2018.

FAPE, Available at:http://fape.es/el-llamado-periodismo-ciudadano-ni-es-periodismo-ni-es-ciudadano/ Retrieved 11, Nov, 2018.

France 24, "Les observateurs", Available at: http://observers.france24.com/en/Retrieved 1, Oct., 2018.

BBC "Have your say", Available at:https://www.bbc.com/news/have_your_say Retrieved 11, Nov, 2018. Retrieved 11, Nov, 2018.

CCN IReport, Available at: https://edition.cnn.com/specials/opinions/cnnireportRetrieved 11, Nov, 2018.

Al Jazeera Sharek, Available at: http://sharek.aljazeera.net/ Retrieved 11, Nov, 2018.

Reuters Institute, "Digital News Project", Available at: http://www.digitalnewsreport.org/ Retieved 11, Oct., 2018.

Nielsen, http://www.nielsen.com/eu/en/insights/news/2018/perspectives-what-we-need-to-talk-about-when-we-talk-about-connected-tv.html Retrieved 11, Nov, 2018.

Zenith Media, Available at:https://www.zenithmedia.com/ Retrieved 11, Nov, 2018.

Magna, IPG Mediabrands., Available at:https://magnaglobal.com/ Retrieved 11, Nov, 2018.

Tow Center for Digital Journalism, Amateur Footage: A Global Study of User-Generated Content in TV and Online News Output, Available at:http://usergeneratednews.towcenter.org/ Retieved 11, Nov, 2018.