Comunicación y Sociedad
Departamento de Estudios de la Comunicación Social
Universidad de Guadalajara

Working conditions of Ibero-American journalists. Temporary and geographical differences in Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Spain and Portugal

Las condiciones laborales de los periodistas iberoamericanos. Diferencias temporales y geográficas en Brasil, México, Chile, España y Portugal

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32870/cys.v2020.7636

David Blanco-Herrero[1]
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7414-2998
Martín Oller Alonso[2]
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2256-5681
Carlos Arcila Calderón[3]
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2636-2849

This article presents a longitudinal and comparative statistical analysis of the results of the first (2007-2011) and second wave (2012-2017) of Worlds of Journalism Study surveys about the sociodemographic profile and working conditions of journalists in Spain, Portugal, Chile, Mexico and Brazil. Despite the disparities between countries, in general the role of women has been revalued, while the working conditions of all professionals working in the media are increasingly precarious, associated to a decrease in professional stability and the need to exercise multi-employment.
Keywords: Worlds of Journalism Study, working conditions, journalists profile, Ibero-America, journalists, longitudinal and comparative study.

Se presenta un análisis estadístico longitudinal y comparado de los resultados de la primera (2007-2011) y segunda oleada (2012-2017) de encuestas del Worlds of Journalism *Study sobre el perfil sociodemográfico y las condiciones laborales de los periodistas en España, Portugal, Chile, México y Brasil. A pesar de las disparidades entre países, observamos que, en general, el rol de la mujer se ha revalorizado, a la vez que se han precarizado las condiciones laborales de los profesionales que trabajan en medios de comunicación, expuestos a una menor estabilidad profesional y a la necesidad de pluriemplearse.*
Palabras clave: Worlds of Journalism Study*, Condiciones laborales, Perfiles profesionales, Iberoamérica, Periodistas, Estudio longitudinal y comparativo.*

How to cite:
Blanco-Herrero, D., Oller Alonso, M. & Arcila Calderón, C. (2020). Working conditions of Ibero-American journalists. Temporary and geographical differences in Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Spain and Portugal. *Comunicación y Sociedad*, e7636. https://doi.org/10.32870/cys.v2020.7636

[1] University of Salamanca, Spain.
david.blanco.herrero@usal.es
[2] Università degli Studi di Milano Statale, Italy.
martin.oller@unimi.it
[3] University of Salamanca, Spain.
carcila@usal.es
Submitted: 04/10/19. Accepted: 12/03/20. Published: 08/07/20.

Introduction and theoretical justification

The written press did not end in the year 2020 as Martínez Albertos (1997, pp. 23-24) had predicted. However, since the advent of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in the sector, the journalistic profession has undoubtedly faced an ever changing and evolving context. The crisis of the traditional model of journalism has been reflected in the emergence of digital news media and new ways of doing journalism, like blogging and citizen journalism (Alburquerque, 2012). These changes have forced journalists to develop new professional profiles and competencies (López et al., 2017; Scolari, 2008) and have also impacted their working conditions, often towards greater precarization, around the world (Arnebring, 2018) and in the Ibero-America context (Figueras-Maz et al., 2012; López Hidalgo & Mellado Ruiz, 2006).

In the case of Ibero-American journalists, in addition to this new reality, they also face a complex situation motivated by the lack of job offers, the surplus of Journalism and Social Communication graduates (Oller & Chavero, 2018), low salaries (Mellado, 2012), precarious work (Figueras-Maz et al., 2012), job instability (Iglesias, 2004), media concentration and state interventionism (Oller, 2015). Moreover, journalists' low wages and need to survive lead them to accept multiple independent jobs, sell advertising, work simultaneously in multiple media companies and live under the risk of crime, drug trafficking and pressure from power elites (Hughes, 2006).

At the same time, and according to the report presented by Reporters Without Borders in 2011, Latin America was the second most dangerous region in the world to practice journalistic, just behind the Middle East. Thus, although the region is undergoing a formal and widespread process of democratization, journalists still face limited professional autonomy, which is defined by commercial and political interests as well as cultural conventionalisms (Hughes & Lawson, 2004). In turn, there is still a high level of media concentration and collusion between media and political and economic elites, although freelance journalists are taking on a leading role in the diversification of the media sphere (Garcés & Arroyave, 2016; Guerrero & Márquez, 2014; Hellmueller et al., 2016; Novais et al., 2013; Oller, 2015).

This diversification, however, has not resulted in lower levels of precarious work, but all the opposite, as Roses (2011) has observed in the Spanish context, where freelance journalists often have low incomes. This has also been confirmed by international studies (Gollmitzer, 2014) that have found a correlation between non-standard forms of employment in journalism with higher levels of precarious work. This article addresses the working conditions of Ibero-American journalists based on these and other variables (such as years of professional experience and educational level) that are often associated with precarious work and/or low wages. Although these are two distinct problems, the literature review shows that they often occur jointly and have similar effects on journalists' working conditions. Thus, the views of journalists on job-related factors influencing these issues will be addressed in the next pages.

These factors include the weight of gender, given that it has been observed in Ibero-American countries that, although there seems to be a reduction in the gender gap in journalism (De-Miguel et al. , 2019), it is still immense (Amado, 2017; De-Miguel et al., 2017; Retegui, 2019), making women's working conditions even more precarious and uncertain. The article also analyses journalists' professional experience, which is strongly influenced by age and has been shown to have effects on salaries (Roses, 2011), in the same way that low levels of union membership have been correlated with low job security in the profession (Del Palacio & Olvera, 2017; Iglesias, 2004) and that higher educational levels result in greater job stability (Josephi, 2017; Reese & Cohen, 2000).

Moreover, hybridization (Mancini, 2015), the advocative character of Latin American journalistic culture (Hanusch & Hanitzsch, 2019) and the polarized ideological journalistic model of the Iberian region (Hallin & Mancini, 2004) have maintained in the journalism of this region a pulse between regional and national governments, which have high levels of influence, pressure and interest in controlling the media, and the dominant media conglomerates, which have hegemonic ambitions and long for the concentration of economic and information powers (Globo, Televisa, Prisa, etc.). This tension defines the working conditions of Ibero-American journalists, who, for the most part, carry

out their professional activity as employees of the private media (Oller et al., 2017). In this scenario, the importance of contextual analysis and the possibility of confronting the various journalistic realities and their evolution in the Ibero-American subregions and countries lies in the fact that, although these countries are close at the cultural and historical levels, they are not so close at the media and journalistic levels (Oller, 2015). Thus, we should be aware of the lack of homogeneity and the hybrid character of Latin American journalistic culture caused by its colonial history and the adoption of certain Western professional practices (Hanusch & Hanitzsch, 2019). Media processes are determined, influenced and conditioned by the contextual and professional reality in which they occur (Mellado, 2009), as it has been observed in the evolution of Ibero-American journalism since the advent of online journalism, which has often been determined by factors such as the history, politics and economy of each country (Salaverría, 2016).

In the cases included in this study, we can talk about more or less consolidated political systems, although they have experienced regime changes, the most relevant being the one that occurred in Brazil, with the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff. However, these changes, in general, have not had the dimensions of the transformations that occurred in Mexico with the arrival of López Obrador, in Brazil with Bolsonaro, and even in Spain, with the first coalition government in its history, which took place after the period analyzed here (2007-2017). The large protests that took place in Chile and other countries in the region in 2019 are neither included in this period. Thus, we can talk about socio-political contexts with some stability –greater in the systems of Chile, Portugal and Spain than in those of Brazil and Mexico–, accompanied by two very important phenomena that deserve mention: the beginning of the Odebrecht corruption scandal, which broke out in 2016 and had a great impact throughout Latin America; and, the most relevant element, the economic crisis, which had a particularly negative impact in Spain and Portugal –which at the end of the analyzed period showed slight symptoms of improvement– and Brazil –with a delayed entry and exit from the crisis–.

This leads us to highlight the possible differences between the countries under study and especially between the two geographical

subregions: Latin America and the Iberian Peninsula. These potential sub regional and national differences, which can occur in an area as broad and diverse as Ibero-America, have generated an increased interest in comparative studies of the journalistic practices and cultures in each of the Ibero-American subregions over the past decade (Oller, 2017; Oller et al., 2017; Weaver & Willnat, 2012; Hanitzsch et al., 2019). As Wright et al. (2019) have pointed out, this research trend in the Ibero-American region should not assume the existence of a "linear progress" in which Europe and the United States position themselves as the advanced regions and models, which would involve falling into the simplistic binary construction of two homogeneous categories –the West versus the rest of the world–. Along this line, the literature has indicated that any attempt to define journalists (Deuze, 2005; Hanitzsch, 2007; Oller & Meier, 2012) and journalism (Wyatt, 2007) should start by considering how to develop this definition (Löffelholz & Weaver, 2008) and then include an analysis that combines local/ regional nuances (Hanitzsch, 2019) with the global perspective of the journalistic profession (Murray & Moore, 2003), to finally establish journalists' sociodemographic profiles and professional situation in the different countries and regions of the world (Oller, 2017).

Taking into account the previous observations, this study seeks to identify differences in the possible changes experienced in Ibero-America between so called "developed" countries (Spain and Portugal, belonging to the Iberian Peninsula, in Europe) and "developing" countries (Brazil, Mexico and Chile, the Latin American region). It is also appropriate to delve into the changes that have been experienced not only between journalists in both regions, but also among journalists from different countries, following the line of multiple comparative studies (Gutiérrez et al., 2017). For this reason, the study has included the analysis of the two most populous countries in Ibero-America (Brazil and Mexico), which are also particularly representative for being examples of the business concentration of the sector in Ibero-America, with Globo and Televisa as dominant conglomerates in Brazil and Mexico, respectively. For its part, Chile continues to be regarded, despite recent protests, as the model of "neoliberal progress" in Latin America, so its participation adds interest to this cross-national

comparative study. The study also includes the two European countries of the region (Portugal and Spain), allowing contrasts between the two subregions of Ibero-America (Latin America and the Iberian Peninsula).

The outstanding comparative studies that have been carried out during the last quarter of the 20th century have become the grounds for this type of analysis at the international level. Some of these studies have included Ibero-American countries (Donsbach & Klett, 1993; Donsbach & Patterson, 1996; Hallin & Papathanassopoulos, 2002; Johnstone et al., 1976; Weaver, 1998; Weaver et al., 1986; Wilke, 1998), which have become an empirical and theoretical basis for this work. However, the Ibero-American region has had little impact within the significant number of cross-national comparative research on journalism (Cushion et al., 2014; Henkel et al., 2019; Örnebring, 2009). Moreover, the number of academic approaches to the evolution of the journalistic profession in Latin America from a longitudinal perspective is even smaller. This is surprising given the need to empirically analyze the changes experienced by Ibero-American journalists in their socio-demographic profiles and daily working conditions, including precarious work and changes in the gender gap.

This article aims to fill this knowledge gap by conducting a comparative analysis between subregions, between Ibero-American countries and between periods of time. The objective is to establish the extent to what the journalistic profession in Ibero-America has changed from 2007 to 2017, a ten-year period in which the paradigm shift in the sector was confirmed and in which a powerful economic crisis hit several Ibero-American countries very hard.

Based on the previous objectives, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- RQ1: Have the sociodemographic profiles and working conditions of Ibero-American journalists changed between 2007 and 2017?
- RQ2: Has the relationship between journalists' gender and working conditions changed between 2007 and 2017 in Ibero-America?
- RQ3: Are there any differences in the way the Ibero-American countries studied have experienced these changes?

Methods

Sample and procedure

With regards to the research design, this is a longitudinal trend analysis based on two international surveys applied to journalists from five Ibero-American countries (Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Spain and Portugal). Journalists were interviewed as part of the Worlds of Journalism Study (WJS)[4], the most ambitious global project on journalism and journalists (Hanusch & Hanizsch, 2019). The study, which released its data in 2019 for free reuse, is currently in its third phase, carrying out fieldwork between 2020 and 2022 in more than one hundred countries. The first wave, carried out between 2007 and 2011, included 21 countries and about 2 100 journalists, and focused on the analysis of journalistic cultures. The second wave took place between 2011 and 2016, reaching 27 500 journalists in 67 countries, and incorporating a focus on the changes experienced in the field of journalism in recent years.

The fieldwork of the first two waves of the WJS allows us to examine the evolution of the sociodemographic profile and working conditions of Ibero-American journalists from Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Spain and Portugal[5] between 2007 and 2017. The selection of these countries is justified by the fact that they are the only five Ibero-American countries present in the first two waves of the WJS, which allows for data comparison between the two time periods. It must be noted that this sample has a limitation imposed by issues out of the reach of this study. However, we consider that it is an adequate sample because it includes the two most populous countries in the region and the Latin American country with the most differentiated economic model (Chile), and because it allows for comparisons between Latin America and the Iberian Peninsula.

---

4 Official website of the WJS: https://www.worldsofjournalism.org/

5 The authors would like to thank the Principal Investigators who coordinated data collection in the first two waves of the WJS in each of the five countries: Rosa Berganza, Rui Novais, Claudia Mellado, Sonia Virginia Moreira, Sallie Hughes and Mireya Márquez.

The first survey was conducted between 2007 and 2011 on a sample of 100 journalists per country, for a total of n=500. The second survey was executed between 2012 and 2017 on a wider sample to improve the representativeness of cases (n_{Mexico}=377, n_{Chile}=491, n_{Brazil}=376, n_{Spain}=390 and $n_{Portugal}$=407), with at least 95% confidence level and a 5% sampling error depending on estimated populations, for a total of n=2,041. In both cases, a multi-stage sampling was carried out: first, a cluster sampling to obtain a list of news media organizations in each country, and then a stratified sampling based on rank in the newsroom, to assure the inclusion of junior and senior journalists, which was performed randomly. Following this procedure, in the first wave, 20 media organizations were selected in each country and five journalists in each medium (Hanitzsch & Berganza, 2012). In the second wave, the number of news organizations selected depended on the sample size of each country (which had to have a 95% confidence level and stay within a maximum error margin of 5%) while the number of selected journalists in each medium was three for small newsrooms and five for large news media (the size of the media company was determined by the Principal Investigators of each country according to each national context), as instructed in the field manual[6] prepared for the study and other works, such as Berganza et al. (2016). Whenever necessary, the Principal Investigators could adapt these processes to the particularities of each country to meet the sampling and data collection requirements.

The sum of participants in both surveys is n=2,541. The surveys were completed in 2011 and 2017, respectively, by a team of researchers previously trained in each country. Preference was given to personal (face-to-face) and telephone interviewing. Online and e-mail interviewing methods were used only in exceptional cases and due to accessibility issues.

It should be noted that the sample of the first wave followed a probabilistic design but was not representative, as it acted as a sort of pilot study. However, this first sample size is considerable (100 journalists per country) and was randomly selected, as in the second

6 See https://worldsofjournalism.org/wojwordpress/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Field_Manual_1.3-1.pdf

wave. This article assumes the deficit that this and the lack of similar works may entail, given that the same variables are analyzed under the same perspectives. Considering that this is the first comparative study of the conditions of Ibero-American journalists in two periods of time, the sample is considered large enough for an exploratory study like this, which in any case would benefit from an update after the third wave of the WJS.

Measures

Both waves included variables related to journalists' working conditions, as well as basic socio-demographic questions. The questionnaires were validated by experts prior to their application. Pilot tests were also carried out in some countries to ensure the items were understood as intended. Between the first and second waves the measurement levels and direction were slightly modified in some variables (e.g. by opening or closing answer options), without affecting the measurement intent of the constructs. The measures included in this study are those that measure aspects related to precarious work. Thus, as a general rule, and based on the previous literature review, having several jobs inside or outside the sector, less experience, lack of specialized university studies in the sector, no union membership and no full-time employment tend to increase journalists' precarious work. Below are the measures used for the comparative analysis of the data:

- Multi-employment: indicates whether the journalist works for multiple newsrooms (1) or for a single newsroom (2).
- Employment besides journalism: indicates whether the journalist engages in other paid activities outside the journalistic profession (1) or not (2).
- University studies: indicates whether the journalist holds a college/Bachelor's degree or equivalent (1) or not (2).
- Specialization in journalism or similar: shows whether the journalist holds a university degree in journalism and/or communication (1) or not (2).
- Professional experience in journalism: number of years working as a journalist.

- Union membership: indicates whether the journalist belongs (1) or not (2) to any professional association or union.
- Employment status: four dummy variables that indicate the type of contract the journalist has: full-time (yes=1, no=2), part-time (yes=1, no=2), freelancer (yes=1, no=2) or other (yes=1, no=2).

The questionnaire also included sociodemographic variables: age (in years), gender (woman=1, male=2), income (on a 1-10 scale, with country-specific salary ranges, with 1 being the lowest salary and 10 the highest salary), and rank in the company (journalist or news writer=0, journalist with management positions=1).

Except in the case of age, years of professional experience and income, which are metric or scale variables, the other variables are categorical or nominal. However, they have been measured in relation to a unit (they are separated by a unit; between 0 and 1 or between 1 and 2), which turns them into dummy variables that can be statistically treated as metric variables in reference analyses.

Similarly, it is worth noting two categorical variables that, together with gender, acted as factors for the comparison of the rest of the variables: wave of the WJS (first and second) and country (Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Spain and Portugal; which can be grouped into two subregions to expand the response to RQ3, so that Brazil, Chile and Mexico constitute the American subregion, while Spain and Portugal constitute the Iberian subregion).

Analysis

SPSS v25 was used to carry out an exploratory analysis of data to verify the presence of extreme values and the number of missing cases (without inputting missing values to any variables). Univariable analyses and contingency tables were then executed to answer the descriptive research questions. Finally, several inferential tests of mean contrast were carried out: one-way ANOVA and Student t-tests for independent samples (taking as reference the values α=0.05, α=0.01 y α=0.001).

The objective of these tests was to contrast the existence of differences in each of the variables shown in the previous section based on three factors: the two waves (to answer RQ1 on the hypothetical

existence of temporal differences, and which are the contrasts shown in the first two parts of the Results section), gender (which, in addition to a study variable, also acts here as an analysis factor, to answer RQ2 on the hypothetical existence of gender differences, which is presented in the third part of the Results section), and country (answering RQ3 on the hypothetical differences between countries and between subregions, which is presented in the fourth part of the Results section).

Results

Changes in the sociodemographic profile of Ibero-American journalists in the first two decades of the 21st century (2007-2017)

Before studying the results, an exploratory analysis of the data was carried out to approach the sociodemographic changes that have occurred between the two waves, performing Student t-tests for independent samples depending on the different waves. One of the most striking results is that the average age of journalists was significantly lower in the second wave [M_1=38.35, SD_1=8.952; M_2=36.67, SD_2=9.937; t(825.101)=3.644, p<0.001, d=0.18]. In terms of gender (1-2, being 1=woman y 2=man), in both cases the values have remained homogeneous [M_1=1.57, SD_1=0.495; M_2=1.58, SD_2=0.494, t(2537)= -0.112, p=0.911], with slight superiority in the number of men. As for the rank of journalists in the companies where they work (0-1, being 0= journalist or news writer, and 1= journalist with management positions), the volume of journalists and reporters has increased in relation to those in management/editorial positions [M_1=0.40, SD_1=0.490; M_2=0.32, SD_2=0.466; t(741.278)=3.323, p<0.01, d=0.17]. This result could explain, to some extent, the significant and huge decline in wages (1-10, being 10 the highest income level) [M_1=5.07, SD_1=2.515; M_2=3.68, SD_2=1.994; t(684.444)=11.021, p<0.001, d=0.61], an aspect which, in turn, also contributes to the increase in precarious work. In this case, the effect size –measured with Cohen's d (1988)– ranges from medium to large and, together with the values mentioned above, the economic crisis has probably been very relevant in this decrease in wages, as it hit stronger countries such as Spain, Portugal and Brazil in the period corresponding to the second wave (2012-2017).

Changes in the working conditions of Ibero-American journalists between 2007 and 2017

Student's t-test for independent samples shows that variations have occurred between the two waves of the WJS in the five Ibero-American countries under study. It is observed, for example, that multi-employment has increased significantly. An example of this is that there is a greater number of journalists who work for more than one newsroom (1-2, being 1=works for more than multiple newsrooms and 2=works for a single newsrooms) [M_1=1.84, SD_1=0.367; M_2=1.73, SD_2=0.446; t(900.943)=5.981, p<0.001, d=0.27] and have jobs outside the journalistic profession (1-2, being 1=works outside of journalism and 2=works just as a journalists) [M_1=1.84, SD_1=0.366; M_2=1.78, SD_2=0.417; t(841.459)=3.440, p<0.01, d=0.15]. The need for a second job –both within and outside the field of journalism– is growing, although it is not yet the majority. This tendency to precarious work is complemented by the fact that the number of journalists who hold a full-time position (1-2, being 1=full-time job and 2=other forms of employment) [M_1=1.09, SD_1=0.286; M_2=1.20, SD_2=0.398; t(1027.159)=-6.896, p<0.001, d=0.32] has declined significantly, while the number of shares of journalists who have part-time contracts (1-2, being 1=part-time job and 2=other forms of employment) [M_1=1.98, SD_1=0.147; M_2=1.88, SD_2=0.324; t(1778.065)=9.952, p<0.001, d=0.40] and work as freelance (1-2, being 1=works as a freelance and 2=other forms of employment) [M_1=1.96, SD_1=0.196; M_2=1.93, SD_2=0.261; t(982.002)=3.198, p<0.01, d=0.13] have increased. These significant differences are reaffirmed by the effect size of some of them, especially those related to the type of employment (permanent or temporary positions), whose effect size is close to medium. Thus, it can be said that the employment of Ibero-American journalists has shifted towards greater flexibility and less stability.

Regarding the formal education of journalists, there are no significant changes in the level of education completed (1-2, being 1=holds a university degree and 2=does not hold a university degree) [M_1=1.91, SD_1=0.287; M_2=1.91, SD_2=0.283; t(2520)=-0.190, p=0.85], with the consolidation of the importance of higher qualifications as a gateway to the profession, thanks to the high percentage of Ibero-American

journalists with university degrees. However, there are changes in the volume of respondents with a university degree in journalism and/or communication, which has increased significantly and whose effect size ranges from small to medium (1-2, being 1=with studies in the field of journalism/communication and 2=without studies in the field) [M_1=1.31, SD_1=0.463; M_2=1.15, SD_2=0.353; t(656.081)=7.348, p<0.001, d=0.39], reaching relatively high percentages. In turn, it has been found that the professional experience of journalists has also decreased significantly, with an effect size between small and medium [M_1=15.35, SD_1=8.587; M_2=12.43, SD_2=9.129; t(858.643)=6.553, p<0.001, d=0.33]. The nearly three years of average difference can be largely explained by the decreasing average age of journalists.

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS OF THE TWO WJS SURVEYS TO IBERO-AMERICAN JOURNALISTS

	Wave 1			Wave 2		
Variables	N1	M1	DT1	N2	M2	DT2
Age***	497	38.35	8.952	2012	36.67	9.937
	t(825.101)=3.644, p<0.001, d=0.18					
Gender	500	1.57	.495	2039	1.58	.494
	t(2537)=-0.112, p=0.911					
Income***	479	5.07	2.515	1471	3.68	1.994
	t(684.444)=11.021, p<0.001, d=0.61					
Rank in the company**	500	.40	.490	1995	.32	.466
	t(741.278)=3.323, p<0.01, d=0.17					
Multiemployment***	500	1.84	.367	2024	1.73	.446
	t(900.943)=5.981, p<0.001, d=0.27					
Employment besides journalism**	497	1.84	.366	2024	1.78	.417
	t(841.459)=3.440, p<0.01, d=0.15					
University studies	499	1.91	.287	2023	1.91	.283
	t(2520)=-0.190, p=0.85					
Specialization in journalism or similar***	498	1.31	.463	1901	1.15	.353
	t(656.081)=7.348, p<0.001, d=0.39					
Professional experience in journalism***	497	15.35	8.587	1662	12.43	9.129
	t(858.643)=6.553, p<0.001, d=0.33					

	Wave 1			Wave 2		
Variables	N1	M1	DT1	N2	M2	DT2
Union membership	500	1.65	.476	2027	1.67	.472
	T(2525)=-0.467, p=0.641					
Full-time employment***	500	1.09	.286	2038	1.20	.398
	t(1027.159)=-6.896, p<0.001, d=0.32					
Part-time employment***	500	1.98	.147	2038	1.88	.324
	t(1778.065)=9.952, p<0.001, d=0.40					
Freelancer**	500	1.96	.196	2038	1.93	.261
	t(982.002)=3.198, p<0.01, d=0.13					
Other types of employment**	500	1.97	.165	2038	2.00	.070
	t(543.567)=-3.060, p<0.01, d=0.24					

Legend: *=p<0.05, **=p<0.01, ***=p<0.001.

Source: The authors.

Changes in the relationship between the gender and working conditions of Ibero-American journalists between 2007 and 2017

Student t-tests for independent samples indicate that, although now with gender as a comparison factor, the most significant aspect is the strong inequality that exists in terms of age [M_{men}=38.48, SD_{men}=10.331; M_{women}=35.03, SD_{women}=8.576; t(2473.804)=-9.128, p<0.001, d=0.36], income level (1-10, being 10 the highest income level) [M_{men}=4.19, SD_{men}=2.259; M_{women}=3.79, SD_{women}=2.133; t(1812.437)=-3.949, p<0.001, d=0.18] and rank (0-1, being 0= journalist or news writer and 1= journalist with management positions) [M_{men}=0.39, SD_{men}=0.488; M_{women}=0.26, SD_{women}=0.439; t(2384.665)=-7.002, p<0.001, d=0.28] according to journalists' gender between the two waves[7]. With regards to the gender differences assessed in working conditions, they are significant in the first wave, with effect sizes greater than 0.2, which Cohen (1988) considers "small", in holding a university degree (1-2, being 1=holds a university degree and 2=does not hold a university degree) [M_{men}=1.88, SD_{men}=0.320; M_{women}=1.94, SD_{women}=0.231; t(496.560)=2.393, p<0.05, d=0.21] and years of professional experience

7 These three comparisons, which put the situation into context, reflect aggregated data from both waves.

[M_{men}=16.83, SD_{men}=8.869; M_{women}=13.35, SD_{women}=7.773; t(480.504)=-4.648, p<0.001, d=0.42].

In the second wave, significant gender differences were found in a greater number of variables related to the employment status of Ibero-American journalists: working for more than one newsroom (1-2, being 1=works for multiple newsrooms and 2=works for a single newsroom) [M_{men}=1.67, SD_{men}=0.469; M_{women}=1.80, SD_{women}=0.404; t(1970.171)=6.283, p<0.001, d=0.30], having another job (1-2, being 1=works outside of journalism and 2=works just as a journalist) [M_{men}=1.74, SD_{men}=0.437; M_{women}=1.82, SD_{women}=0.385; t(1951.273)=4.125, p<0.001, d=0.19], holding any university degree (1-2, being 1=holds a university degree and 2=does not hould a university degre) [M_{men}=1.89, SD_{men}=0.317; M_{women}=1.95, SD_{women}=0.223; t(2015.025)=5.064, p<0.001, d=0.22], holding a degree in journalism and/or communication (1-2, being 1=with studies in the field of journalism/communication and 2=without studies in the field) [M_{men}=1.18, SD_{men}=0.382; M_{women}=1.10, SD_{women}=0.305; t(1894.593)=-4.642, p<0.001, d=0.23], professional experience (measured in years) [M_{men}=13.57, SD_{men}=9.627; Mwo_{men}=11.03, SD_{women}=8.271; t(1651.832)=-5.776, p<0.001, d=0.28], and union membership (1-2, being 1=union member and 2=not a union member) [M_{men}=1.64, SD_{men}=0.479; M_{women}=1.69, SD_{women}=0.461; t(1879.923)=2.321, p<0.05, d=0.11].

TABLE 2
GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE WORKING CONDITIONS OF IBERO-AMERICAN JOURNALISTS IN THE TWO WJS SURVEYS

		Wave 1			Wave 2		
Variables	Gender	N1	M1	DT1	N2	M2	DT2
Multiemployment	Women	213	1.87	.333	856	1.80	.404
	Men	287	1.82	.389	1166	1.67	.469
		t(487.593)=1.788, p=0.074			t(1970.171)=6.283, p<0.001, d=0.30		
Employment besides journalism	Women	212	1.83	.376	854	1.82	.385
	Men	285	1.85	.359	1168	1.74	.437
		t(495)=-0.570, p=0.569			t(1951.273)=4.125, p<0.001, d=0.19		

		Wave 1			Wave 2		
Variables	Gender	N1	M1	DT1	N2	M2	DT2
University studies	Women	213	1.94	.231	857	1.95	.223
	Men	286	1.88	.320	1164	1.89	.317
		t(496.560)=2.393, p<0.05, d=0.21			t(2015.025)=5.064, p<0.001, d=0.22		
Specialization in journalism or similar	Women	213	1.32	.467	827	1.10	.305
	Men	285	1.30	.460	1072	1.18	.382
		t(496)=0.417, p=0.677			t(1894.593)=-4.642, p<0.001, d=0.23		
Professional experience in journalism	Women	211	13.35	7.773	742	11.03	8.271
	Men	286	16.83	8.869	918	13.57	9.627
		t(480.504)=-4.648, p<0.001, d=0.42			t(1651.832)=-5.776, p<0.001, d=0.28		
Union membership	Women	213	1.62	.487	856	1.69	.461
	Men	287	1.68	.468	1169	1.64	.479
		t(446.597)=-1.380, p=0.168			t(1879.923)=2.321, p<0.05, d=0.11		
Full-time employment	Women	213	1.099	.299	862	1.2053	.404
	Men	287	1.084	.277	1174	1.1917	.394
		t(498)=0.577, p=0.564			t(2034)=0.766, p=0.444		
Part-time employment	Women	213	1.962	.191	862	1.8712	.335
	Men	287	1.990	.102	1174	1.8884	.315
		t(301.420)=-1.885, p=0.060			t(1787.988)=-1.173, p=0.241		
Freelance	Women	213	1.967	.179	862	1.9316	.253
	Men	287	1.955	.208	1174	1.9225	.268
		t(498)=0.700, p=0.484			t(2034)=0.774, p=0.439		
Other types of employment	Women	213	1.972	.166	862	1.9919	.090
	Men	287	1.972	.165	1174	1.9974	.051
		t(498)=-0.020, p=0.984			t(1257.622)=-1.639, p=0.101		

Source: The authors.

The increase in the number of variables with significant gender differences could be due to worsening inequality between men and women. However, when assessing the average values, it is apparent that certain inequalities have been reduced, just like most effects, so that their higher level of significance was due to the larger size of the second sample. Thus, it would be feasible, as mentioned in the Methods section, that the larger sample size of the second wave is, at least partially, behind these results, and that in terms of gender there is not a very high number of changes in the working conditions of Ibero-American journalists.

Differences between countries in changes in the working conditions of Ibero-American journalists between 2007 and 2017

In order to determine whether there are significant differences in the variables related to the employment situation of Ibero-American journalists between the five countries analyzed, a one-way ANOVA test has been performed for the values of the variables in both waves. It has been observed that there are such differences in both waves. However, in the first wave there are no significant differences across countries regarding the employment status variables full-time, part-time or other, while in the second wave all variables related to employment status exhibit significant differences between countries.

TABLE 3
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COUNTRIES REGARDING VARIABLES RELATED TO THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION OF IBERO-AMERICAN JOURNALISTS IN THE TWO WJS SURVEYS

		Wave 1			Wave 2		
Oneway ANOVA		N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Multiemployment	Brazil	100	1.91	.288	376	1.85	.354
	Chile	100	1.78	.416	479	1.77	.422
	Mexico	100	1.73	.446	374	1.30	.461
	Spain	100	1.90	.302	389	1.80	.401
	Portugal	100	1.88	.327	406	1.87	.335
		F(4, 495)=4.941, p<0.01			F(4, 2019)=132.964, P<0.001		

		Wave 1			Wave 2		
Oneway ANOVA		N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Employment besides journalism	Brazil	100	1.88	.327	373	1.77	.423
	Chile	98	1.74	.438	485	1.72	.452
	Mexico	99	1.80	.404	374	1.65	.477
	Spain	100	1.87	.338	390	1.87	.335
	Portugal	100	1.91	.288	402	1.88	.325
		F(4, 492)=3.426, p<0.01			F(4, 2019)=23.275, p<0.001		
University studies	Brazil	100	1.96	.197	374	1.89	.316
	Chile	100	1.89	.314	479	1.96	.185
	Mexico	100	1.89	.314	375	1.87	.337
	Spain	99	1.99	.101	390	1.97	.180
	Portugal	100	1.82	3.86	405	1.86	.346
		F(4, 494)=5.587, p<0.001			F(4, 2018)=14.171, p<0.001		
Specialization in journalism or similar	Brazil	100	1.02	.141	342	1.02	.151
	Chile	100	1.77	.423	471	1.13	.336
	Mexico	100	1.17	.378	341	1.32	.466
	Spain	98	1.27	.444	373	1.08	.276
	Portugal	100	1.32	.469	374	1.18	.388
		F(4, 493)=52.402, p<0.001			F(4, 1896)=37.238, p<0.001		
Professional experience in journalism	Brazil	100	17.35	9.613	376	11.61	9.689
	Chile	98	11.69	8.259	491	8.46	7.531
	Mexico	100	15.30	7.824	-	-	-
	Spain	100	17.01	8.006	390	15.91	8.909
	Portugal	99	15.32	8.094	405	14.65	8.598
		F(4, 492)=7.061, p<0.001			F(4, 1658)=65.643, p<0.001		
Union membership	Brazil	100	1.49	.502	373	1.59	.492
	Chile	100	1.80	.402	485	1.76	.426
	Mexico	100	1.83	.378	377	1.75	.435
	Spain	100	1.49	.502	389	1.59	.493
	Portugal	100	1.66	.476	403	1.61	.488
		F(4, 495)=12.808, p<0.001			F(4, 2022)=14.595, p<0.001		

		Wave 1			Wave 2		
Oneway ANOVA		N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Full-time employment	Brazil	100	1.08	.273	376	1.40	.027
	Chile	100	1.13	.338	489	1.20	.398
	Mexico	100	1.11	.314	376	1.16	.372
	Spain	100	1.06	.239	390	1.14	.351
	Portugal	100	1.07	.256	407	1.08	.277
		F(4, 495)=1.036, p=0.388			F(4, 2033)=40.341, p<0.001		
Part-time employment	Brazil	100	1.96	.197	376	1.65	.479
	Chile	100	1.95	.219	489	1.90	.301
	Mexico	100	1.99	.100	376	1.90	.305
	Spain	100	1.99	.100	390	1.95	.221
	Portugal	100	2.00	.000	407	2.00	.050
		F(4, 495)= 2.201, p=0.068			F(4, 2033)=77.740, p<0.001		
Freelancer	Brazil	100	2.00	.000	376	1.95	.219
	Chile	100	1.97	.171	489	1.90	.295
	Mexico	100	1.90	.302	376	1.94	.230
	Spain	100	1.97	.171	390	1.91	.290
	Portugal	100	1.96	.197	407	1.93	.249
		F(4, 495)=3.581, p<0.01			F(4, 2033)=2.663, p<0.05		
Other types of employment	Brazil	100	1.96	.197	376	1.99	.073
	Chile	100	1.95	.219	489	2.00	.000
	Mexico	100	2.00	.000	376	1.99	.073
	Spain	100	1.98	.141	390	2.00	.000
	Portugal	100	1.97	.171	407	1.99	.121
		F(4, 495)=1.361, p=0.246			F(4, 2033)=3.117, p<0.05		

Source: Authors' own creation.

On the other hand, despite the historical and cultural ties of all Ibero-American countries, there is a geographical and circumstantial separation between the American countries (Brazil, Mexico and Chile) and the European countries (Spain and Portugal). This divergence creates

the need to test the hypotheses through one-way ANOVA, assigning a value of (2) to American countries and a value of (-3) to European countries. This type of analysis allows us to identify the differences that exist between the two subregions and to identify the region with the greater volume of significant differences in the second wave of the WJS. In the first wave, variables linked to working for other media, having other jobs, union membership and working as a journalist with a part-time contract showed significant differences between American and European countries. In the second wave, along with these variables, significant differences were found in years of professional experience and full-time employment.

TABLE 4
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO IBERO-AMERICAN SUBREGIONS REGARDING THE VARIABLES RELATED TO THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION OF JOURNALISTS IN THE TWO WJS SURVEYS

		Wave 1			Wave 2		
Variables	Subregion	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Multiemployment	America	300	1.81	0.396	1229	1.65	0.476
	Europe	200	1.89	0.314	795	1.84	0.370
		t(455.411)=-2.636, p<0.01			t(1722.380)=-10.921, p<0.001		
Employment besides journalism	America	297	1.81	0.394	1232	1.71	0.453
	Europe	200	1.89	0.314	792	1.88	0.329
		t(459.272)=-2.590, p<0.05			t(1923.221)=-9.427, p<0.001		
University studies	America	300	1.91	0.282	1228	1.91	0.283
	Europe	199	1.90	0.295	795	1.91	0.282
		t(261.293)=0.326, p=0.745			t(1368.258)=-0.545, p=0.0586		
Specialization in journalism or similar	America	300	1.32	0.467	1154	1.15	0.361
	Europe	198	1.29	0.456	747	1.13	0.341
		t(324.572)=0.723, p=0.470			t(1301.505)=1.419, p=0.156		

		Wave 1			Wave 2		
Variables	Subregion	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Professional experience in journalism	America	298	14.80	8.885	867	9.83	8.671
	Europe	199	16.17	8.074	795	15.27	8.769
		t(436.823)=-1.829, p=0.68			t(1323.712)=-23.196, p<0.001		
Union membership	America	300	1.71	0.456	1235	1.71	0.455
	Europe	200	1.57	0.496	792	1.60	0.490
		t(381.762)=3.090, p<0.01			t(1566.894)=4.669, p<0.001		
Full-time employment	America	300	1.11	0.309	1241	1.25	0.434
	Europe	200	1.07	0.247	797	1.11	0.317
		t(471.638)=1.665, p=0.0.97			t(1781.790)=8.652, p<0.001		
Part-time employment	America	300	1.97	0.180	1241	1.82	0.383
	Europe	200	2.00	0.071	797	1.97	0.160
		t(319.128)=-2.461, p<0.05			t(1251.544)=-13.045, p<0.001		
Freelancer	America	300	1.96	0.204	1241	1.93	0.255
	Europe	200	1.97	0.184	797	1.92	0.270
		t(351.196)=-0.478, p=0.633			t(1539.160)=0.994, p=0.321		
Other types of employment	America	300	1.97	0.171	1241	2.00	0.057
	Europe	200	1.98	0.157	797	1.99	0.086
		t(379.704)=-0.338, p=0.736			t(694.356)=1.101, p=0.271		

Source: Authors' own creation.

The two previous sets of tests indicate that divergences, both between countries and between subregions, have been accentuated in the second wave of the WJS. Thus, although the increase in the number of significant differences or significance level could be due to the larger sample used in the study conducted between 2012 and 2017, the *t* and *F* values are considerably higher in the second wave, confirming the increase in inequalities between countries and regions.

Finally, the contrast tests of means between independent samples (Student's t) have allowed us to briefly observe disaggregated data, and to analyze how each country has evolved from the first to the second wave, which in turn will allow us to contextualize and better understand the previous results. Starting with Brazil, there have been significant changes in the percentage of journalists claiming to have other jobs outside the profession of journalism (1-2, being 1=works outside of journalism and 2=works just as a journalist) [M_1=1.88, SD_1=0.327; M_2=1.77, SD_2=0.423; t(197.665)=2.879, p<0.01, d=0.29], in the proportion of journalists who hold a university degree (1-2, being 1=holds a university degree and 2=does not hold a university degree) [M_1=1.96, SD_1=0.197; M_2=1.89, SD_2=0.316; t(250.824)=2.825, p<0.01, d=0.27], in the years of professional experience [M_1=17.35, SD_1=9.613; M_2=11.61, SD_2=9.689; t(474.000)=5.272, p<0.001, d=0.59], in the proportion of journalists who have a full-time employment (1-2, being 1=works full-time and 2=other forms of employment) [M_1=1.08, SD_1=0.273; M_2=1.41, SD_2=0.492; t(288.023)=-8.845, p<0.001, d=0.83], a part-time contract (1-2, being 1=works part-time and 2=other forms of employment) [M_1=1.96, SD_1=0.197; M_2=1.65, SD_2=0.479; t(396.298)=9.933, p<0.001, d=0.85] or work as freelance (1-2, being 1=works as a freelancer and 2=other forms of employment) [M_1=2.00, SD_1=0.000; M_2=1.95, SD_2=0.219; t(375.000)=4.467, p<0.001, d=0.32]. It is also worth noting the sharp decline in journalists' average age [M_1=39.44, SD_1=10.138; M_2=34.68, SD_2=11.223; t(474)=3.844, p<0.001, d=0.45] and salary (1-10, being 10 the highest income level) [M_1=6.53, SD_1=2.552; M_2=3.09, SD_2=1.535; t(119.859)=12.850, p<0.001, d=1.63] and in the number of journalists interviewed with managing positions (0-1, being 0= journalist or news writer and 1= journalist with management positions) [M_1=0.41, SD_1=0.494; M_2=0.17, SD_2=0.379; t(131.464)=4.462, p<0.001, d=0.55], with high effect sizes, which confirm that Brazil is the country with the greatest variations between the first and second waves. It can be said that the situation between 2012 and 2017 is significantly less stable and more precarious than that recorded between 2007 and 2011, as there has been a decrease in the percentage of full-time employed journalists, years of accumulated experience, rank, age and, more significantly, salary, accompanied by an increase in the percentage of journalists working part-time, as freelance, and outside journalism.

TABLE 5
DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS OF THE TWO WJS SURVEYS TO BRAZILIAN JOURNALISTS

		Wave 1			Wave 2	
Variables	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Age***	100	39.44	10.138	376	34.68	11.223
		t(474)=3.844, p<0.001, d=0.45				
Gender	100	1.55	.500	376	1.51	.501
		t(474)=0.746, p=0.456				
Income***	100	6.53	2.552	355	3.09	1.535
		t(119.859)=12.850, p<0.001, d=1.63				
Rank in the company***	100	.41	.494	376	.17	.379
		t(131.464)=4.462, p<0.001, d=0.55				
Multiemployment	100	1.91	.288	376	1.85	.354
		t(186.756)=1.652, p=0.100				
Employment besides journalism**	100	1.88	.327	373	1.77	.423
		t(197.665)=2.879, p<0.01, d=0.29				
University studies**	100	1.96	.197	374	1.89	.316
		t(250.824)=2.825, p<0.01, d=0.27				
Specialization in journalism or similar	100	1.02	.141	342	1.02	.151
		t(440)=-0.200, p=0.841				
Professional experience in journalism***	100	17.35	9.613	376	11.61	9.689
		t(474.000)=5.272, p<0.001, d=0.59				
Union membership	100	1.49	.502	373	1.59	.492
		t(471)=-1.842, p=0.66				
Full-time employment***	100	1.08	.273	376	1.41	.492
		t(288.023)=-8.845, p<0.001, d=0.83				
Part-time employment***	100	1.96	.197	376	1.65	.479
		t(396.298)=9.933, p<0.001, d=0.85				
Freelancer***	100	2.00	.000	376	1.95	.219
		t(375.000)=4.467, p<0.001, d=0.32				
Other types of employment	100	1.96	.197	376	1.99	.073
		t(106.296)=-1.730, p=0.087				

Legend: *=p<0.05, **=p<0.01, ***=p<0.001.
Source: Authors' own creation.

In the Chilean case, there are significant differences between the two waves in terms of the percentages of journalists who hold a university degree (1-2, being 1=holds a university degree and 2=does not hold a university degree) [M_1=1.89, SD_1=0.314; M_2=1.96, SD_2=0.185; t(113.734)=-2.288, p<0.05, d=-0.27], who hold a degree in journalism and/or communication (1-2, being 1=with studies in the field of journalism/communication and 2=without studies in the field) [M_1=1.77, SD_1=0.423; M_2=1.13, SD_2=0.336; t(126.849)=14.220, p<0.001, d=1.68], the years of professional experience [M_1=11.69, SD_1=8.259; M_2=8.46, SD_2=7.531; t(587.000)=3.815, p<0.001, d=0.41], the percentage of freelance journalists (1-2, being 1=works as a freelancer and 2=other forms of employment) [M_1=1.97, SD_1=0.171; M_2=1.90, SD_2=0.295; t(237.556)=3.043, p<0.01, d=0.29], and the percentage of journalists with other forms of employment (1-2, being 1=works with other forms of employment and 2=works full-time, part-time or as freelancer) [M_1=1.95, SD_1=0.219; M_2=2.00, SD_2=0.000; t(99.000)=-2.283, p<0.05, d=-0.32]. In general, Chilean journalists have become significantly younger [M_1=35.87, SD_1=8.497; M_2=32.99, SD_2=8.482; t(585)=3.088, p<0.01, d=0.34], predominantly male (1-2, being 1=women and 2=men) [M_1=1.39, SD_1=0.490; M_2=1.57, SD_2=0.496; t(589)=-3.283, p<0.01, d=0.37], earned lower wages (1-10, being 10 the highest income level) [M_1=5.46, SD_1=2.347; M_2=4.82, SD_2=2.513; t(464)=2.185, p<0.05, d=0.26] and given lower ranks (0-1, being 0= journalist or news writer, and 1= journalist with management positions) [M_1=0.40, SD_1=0.492; M_2=0.26, SD_2=0.439; t(133.024)=2.624, p<0.05, d=0.30].

For their part, journalists in Mexico showed differences between the two waves in terms of the percentages of them who work for more than one newsroom (1-2, being 1=works for multiple newsrooms and 2=works for a single newsroom) [M_1=1.73, SD_1=0.446; M_2=1.30, SD_2=0.461; t(160.100)=8.405, p<0.001, d=0.95], have non-journalistic jobs (1-2, being 1=works outside of journalism and 2=works just as a journalist) [M_1=1.80, SD_1=0.404; M_2=1.65, SD_2=0.477; t(177.457), p<0.01, d=0.34], hold a degree in journalism and/or communication (1-2, being 1=with studies in the field of journalism/communication and 2=without studies in the field) [M_1=1.17, SD_1=0.378; M_2=1.32,

SD_2=0.466; t(195.797)=-3.231, p<0.01, d=-0.35], and have a part-time contract (1-2, being 1=works part-time and 2=other forms of employment) [M_1=1.99, DT_1=0.100; M_2=1.90, DT_2=0.305; t(456.928)=5.025, p<0.001, d=0.28]. Salaries have also shown significantly lower values among Mexican journalists in the second wave (1-10, being 10 the highest income level) [M_1=4.21, SD_1=2.459; M_2=3.07, SD_2=1.749; t(125.864)=4.354, p<0.001, d=0.53].

Both countries showed fewer variables with significant changes than Brazil. However, there is a similar, albeit weaker, trend towards precarious work, with more journalists in need of other jobs, with lower volumes of employed journalists holding a permanent position and lower wages. The two variables with the greatest changes in the whole study have also been found in these countries: in Chile, the percentage of journalists who hold a degree in journalism and/or communication has increased radically, ceasing to be an unusual situation to resemble the averages of the rest of the countries; in Mexico, the share of journalists working for more than one newsroom has become a majority, moving away from the norm in other countries, where, despite increases, it remains to be rare.

TABLE 6
DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS OF THE TWO WJS SURVEYS TO CHILEAN JOURNALISTS

		Wave 1			Wave 2	
Variables	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Age**	100	35.87	8.497	487	32.99	8.482
		t(585)=3.088, p<0.01, d=0.34				
Gender**	100	1.39	.490	491	1.57	.496
		t(589)=-3.283, p<0.01, d=0.37				
Income**	90	5.46	2.347	376	4.82	2.513
		t(464)=2.185, p<0.05, d=0.26				
Rank in the company *	100	.40	.492	491	.26	.439
		t(133.024)=2.624, p<0.05, d=0.30				
Multiemployment	100	1.78	.416	479	1.77	.422
		t(577)=0.253, p=0.800				

		Wave 1			Wave 2	
Variables	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Employment besides journalism	98	1.74	.438	485	1.72	.452
		t(581)=591, p=0.555				
University studies*	100	1.89	.314	479	1.96	.185
		t(113.734)=-2.288, p<0.05, d=-0.27				
Specialization in journalism or similar***	100	1.77	.423	471	1.13	.336
		t(126.849)=14.220, p<0.001, d=1.68				
Professional experience in journalism***	98	11.69	8.259	491	8.46	7.531
		t(587.000)=3.815, p<0.001, d=0.41				
Union membership	100	1.80	.402	485	1.76	.426
		t(583)=0.801, p=0.423				
Full-time employment	100	1.13	.338	489	1.20	.398
		t(160.359)=-1.732, p=0.85				
Part-time employment	100	1.95	.219	489	1.90	.301
		t(184.380)=1.947, p=0.53				
Freelancer**	100	1.97	.171	489	1.90	.295
		t(237.556)=3.043, p<0.01, d=0.29				
Other types of employment*	100	1.95	.219	489	2.00	.000
		t(99.000)=-2.283, p<0.05, d=-0.32				

Legend: *=p<0.05, **=p<0.01, ***=p<0.001.

Source: The authors.

TABLE 7
DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS OF THE TWO WJS SURVEYS TO MEXICAN JOURNALISTS

		Wave 1			Wave 2	
Variables	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Age	100	37.93	8.212	370	38.41	10.377
		t(193.235)=-0.487, p=0.627				
Gender	100	1.70	.461	377	1.68	.466
		t(475)=0.350, p=0.727				
Income***	99	4.21	2.459	368	3.07	1.749
		t(125.864)=4.354, p<0.001, d=0.53				
Rank in the company	100	.40	.492	376	.41	.493
		t(474)=-0.268, p=0.788				

		Wave 1			Wave 2	
Variables	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Multiemployment***	100	1.73	.446	374	1.30	.461
		t(160.100)=8.405, p<0.001, d=0.95				
Employment besides journalism**	99	1.80	.404	374	1.65	.477
		t(177.457), p<0.01, d=0.34				
University studies	100	1.89	.314	375	1.87	.337
		t(473)=0.552, p=0.581				
Specialization in journalism or similar**	100	1.17	.378	341	1.32	.466
		t(195.797)=-3.231, p<0.01, d=-0.35				
Professional experience in journalism	100	15.30	7.824	-	-	-
		-				
Union membership	100	1.83	.378	377	1.75	.435
		t(175.184)=1.868, p=0.63				
Full-time employment	100	1.11	.314	376	1.16	.372
		t(179.636)=-1.491, p=0.138				
Part-time employment***	100	1.99	.100	376	1.90	.305
		t(456.928)=5.025, p<0.001, d=0.28				
Freelancer	100	1.90	.302	376	1.94	.230
		t(131.167)=-1.363, p=0.175				
Other types of employment	100	2.00	.000	376	1.99	.073
		t(474)=0.730, p=0.466				

Legend: *=p<0.05, **=p<0.01, ***=p<0.001.

Source: The authors.

In the Portuguese case, significant differences between the two surveys were only observed in the percentage of journalists with studies in the area (1-2, being 1=with studies in the field of journalism/ communication and 2=without studies in the field) [M_1=1.32, SD_1=0.469; M_2=1.18, SD_2=0.388; t(137.442)=2.657, p<0.01, d=0.33], demonstrating that in this country the situation of journalists has not changed dramatically. However, in the second survey there are no values on salaries, a variable that has undergone significant changes in the other countries, so this aspect cannot be assessed. In the other European country included in the study, Spain, significant differences have been found in the percentages of journalists who work for more than one newsroom (1-2, being 1=works for multiple newsrooms and 2=works

for a single newsroom) [M_1=1.90, DT_1=0.302; M_2=1.80, DT_2=0.401; t(198.951)=2.764, p<0.01, d=0.28], hold a degree in journalism and/or communication (1-2, being 1=with studies in the field of journalism/communication and 2=without studies in the field) [M_1=1.27, SD_1=0.444; M_2=1.08, SD_2=0.276; t(117.466)=3.872, p<0.001, d=0.51], have full-time contracts (1-2, being 1=works full-time and 2=other types of employment) [M_1=1.06, SD_1=0.239; M_2=1.14, SD_2=0.351; t(221.959)=-2.809, p<0.01, d=0.27], have part-time contracts (1-2, being 1=works part-time and 2=other types of employment) [M_1=1.99, SD_1=0.100; M_2=1.95, SD_2=0.221; t(358.701)=2.751, p<0.01, d=0.23], and work as freelancers (1-2, being 1=works as freelancer and 2=other types of employment) [M_1=1.97, SD_1=0.171; M_2=1.91, SD_2=0.290; t(261.511)=2.761, p<0.01, d=0.25]. In this country, the changes have followed the trend towards lower labour stability, which has also been observed in the rest of the Ibero-American region, also mimicking a significant and dramatic decline in journalists' salaries (1-10, being 10 the highest income level) [M_1=5.94, SD_1=1.344; M_2=3.72, SD_2=1.439; t(466)=13.673, p<0.001, d=1.59].

TABLE 8
DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS OF THE TWO WJS SURVEY TO PORTUGUESE JOURNALISTS

	Wave 1			Wave 2		
Variables	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Age	97	38.88	9.147	390	39.00	8.811
	t(485)=-0.123, p=0.902					
Gender	100	1.63	.485	405	1.54	.499
	t(154.853)=1.638, p=0.103					
Income	94	3.18	2.115	-	-	-
			-			
Rank in the company	100	.39	.490	362	.42	.494
	t(460)=-0.536, p=0.592					
Multiemployment	100	1.88	.327	406	1.87	.335
	t(504)=0.217, p=0.828					

		Wave 1			Wave 2	
Variables	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Employment besides journalism	100	1.91	.288	402	1.88	.325
		t(500)=0.828, p=0.408				
University studies	100	1.82	3.86	405	1.86	.346
		t(140.693)=-0.987, p=0.325				
Specialization in journalism or similar**	100	1.32	.469	374	1.18	.388
		t(137.442)=2.657, p<0.01, d=0.33				
Professional experience in journalism	99	15.32	8.094	405	14.65	8.598
		t(502)=0.704, p=0.482				
Union membership	100	1.66	.476	403	1.61	.488
		t(154.821)=0.927, p=0.355				
Full-time employment	100	1.07	.256	407	1.08	.277
		t(505)=-0.444, p=0.657				
Part-time employment	100	2.00	.000	407	2.00	.050
		t(505)=0.495, p=0.621				
Freelancer	100	1.96	.197	407	1.93	.249
		t(185.204)=1.133, p=0.259				
Other types of employment	100	1.97	.171	407	1.99	.121
		t(124.117)=-0.840, p=0.402				

Legend: *=p<0.05, **=p<0.01, ***=p<0.001.
Source: The authors.

TABLE 9
DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS OF THE TWO WJS SURVEY TO SPANISH JOURNALISTS

		Wave 1			Wave 2	
Variables	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Age	100	39.63	8.270	389	39.23	9.166
		t(487)=0.395, p=0.693				
Gender	100	1.60	.492	390	1.59	.493
		t(488)=0.186, p=0.853				
Income***	96	5.94	1.344	372	3.72	1.439
		t(466)=13.673, p<0.001, d=1.59				
Rank in the company	100	.40	.492	390	.35	.477
		t(488)=0.953, p=0.341				

		Wave 1			Wave 2	
Variables	N1	M1	SD1	N2	M2	SD2
Multiemployment**	100	1.90	.302	389	1.80	.401
		t(198.951)=2.764, p<0.01, d=0.28				
Employment besides journalism	100	1.87	.338	390	1.87	.335
		t(488)=-1.593, p=0.112				
University studies	99	1.99	.101	390	1.97	.180
		t(275.902)=1.709, p=0.089				
Specialization in journalism or similar***	98	1.27	.444	373	1.08	.276
		t(117.466)=3.872, p<0.001, d=0.51				
Professional experience in journalism	100	17.01	8.006	390	15.91	8.909
		t(488)=1.126, p=0.261				
Union membership	100	1.49	.502	389	1.59	.493
		t(487)=-1.779, p=0.76				
Full-time employment**	100	1.06	.239	390	1.14	.351
		t(221.959)=-2.809, p<0.01, d=0.27				
Part-time employment**	100	1.99	.100	390	1.95	.221
		t(358.701)=2.751, p<0.01, d=0.23				
Freelancer**	100	1.97	.171	390	1.91	.290
		t(261.511)=2.761, p<0.01, d=0.25				
Other types of employment	100	1.98	.141	390	2.00	.000
		t(99.000)=-1.421, p=0.158				

Legend: *=p<0.05, **=p<0.01, ***=p<0.001.
Source: The authors.

Conclusions

This study is the result of the collective interest of the team of Ibero-American researchers who participated in the WJS to determine to what extent the profiles and working conditions of Ibero-American journalists have changed over the last years (2007-2017). The lack of research on the professional reality of journalists in the subregions of Latin America and southern Europe has led us to follow this line of work. Hence, the greatest contribution of this study is its comparative approach to the situation of journalists.

Variations in the age of journalists has been a reliable indicator of the volatility and movements of the media market in other longitudinal

comparative studies carried out at the international and regional levels (Weaver et al., 2007 and Novais, 2018, respectively). It is important to note that in Ibero America, the age of journalists continues to decline and that, in turn, the youngest journalists are, for the most part, women. In this regard, in response to RQ2, there has also been some reduction in gender differences. This trend is accompanied by three factors closely related to the working conditions of journalists: first, the stability that the most educated journalists get (Josephi, 2017; Reese & Cohen, 2000) and the importance given to university education through the requirement of a degree to practice the profession –increasingly in the field of Journalism and/or Communication–, demonstrating that the number of journalists with a university degree is increasing (Band, 2013). Secondly, the structural changes undergone by media systems in general and news organizations in particular, which have transitioned towards digital platforms and content, often characterized by flexibility and greater mobility between platforms, as demonstrated by the declining accumulated experience and the lower proportion of full-time employment in favor of part-time and freelance contracts. Third, and related to the previous point, the strong economic crisis that hit the whole world and the increase in precarious work that has led media companies to change their hiring strategies and business models. In this sense, as the main response to RQ1, it is worth noting the significant level of precarious work, instability and multi-employment in the journalism sector in Ibero-America, worsening phenomena that had already been detected in the past (Figueras-Maz et al., 2012; Iglesias, 2004; Mellado, 2012).

In response to RQ3, it should be added that, although these trends exist in all countries, the disparities between them are undeniably due to their political, economic, social and media particularities, both between countries and between the two subregions included in the study, as it is noted that Latin American countries have yielded more adverse values than those found in countries from the Iberian Peninsula. Brazil is the country where the conditions have changed the most, increasing work precariousness, while Portugal has experienced the least changes. This can be partially explained by Portugal's economic recovery, which in 2017 already showed significant signs of improvement, while Brazil

–which together with Russia, India, China and South Africa is part of BRICS, the group of emerging countries with more promising prospects for growth in the first decade of the 21st century– entered the crisis later, delaying the recovery as well. However, this explanation is insufficient, because Spain, with an economic trend very similar to Portugal, yields significantly more negative values, close to those of Mexico and Chile. The three Hispanic countries, although with a more moderate perspective than Brazil, also reflect troubling behaviors that should continue to be analyzed in future studies.

Despite the significant findings of this study, two important limitations should be highlighted. First, the possible bias caused by the larger sample used in the second wave –already mentioned in the Methods section– which makes the differences seem significant in a greater number of cases, although the effect size (d) has been incorporated in the statistical analyses to avoid this bias. Second, the methods section also highlighted the small number of Ibero-American countries included in the first wave of the WJS, which has prevented the analysis of more countries in the comparative study, and requires us to be careful when it comes to generalizing research findings. In this regard, future waves of the WJS surveys and other parallel projects are expected to provide up-to-date data on a greater number of countries in this region to allow further work. Future research work should also compare the field of journalism with other professions, to be able to determine whether the precarious employment situations this study has found are unique to the journalistic sector or are common to labor markets in other industries.

Bibliographic references

Alburquerque, A. (2012). O paralelismo político em questão. *ComPolítica*, *2*(1). http://compolitica.org/revista/index.php/revista/article/view/23

Amado, A. (2017). Las periodistas desde los estudios del periodismo: perfiles profesionales de las mujeres en los medios informativos. *Cuestiones de género: de la igualdad y la diferencia*, *12*, 325-346. https://doi.org/10.18002/cg.v0i12.4846

Banda, F. (2013). Introduction. In F. Banda (Ed.), *Model Curricula for Journalism Education* (pp. 7-21). UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000221199

Berganza, R., Herrero, B. & Carratalá, A. (2016). La (des)confianza de los periodistas españoles hacia las instituciones públicas a partir del estudio de factores organizacionales. *Anuario Electrónico de Estudios en Comunicación Social "Disertaciones"*, *9*(1), 24-43. https://doi.org/10.12804/ disertaciones.09.01.2016.02

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cushion, S., Aalberg, T. & Thomas, R. (2014). Towards a rolling news logic in fixed time bulletins? A comparative analysis of journalistic interventions in the US, UK and Norway. *European Journal of Communication*, *29*(1), 100-109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323113504373

De-Miguel, R., Hanitzsch, T., Parratt, S. & Berganza, R. (2017). Mujeres periodistas en España: Análisis de las características sociodemográficas y de la brecha de género. *El profesional de la información*, *26*(3), 497-506. https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2017.may.16

De-Miguel, R., Parratt, S. & Berganza, R. (2019): Las percepciones de las mujeres periodistas sobre su trabajo. La variable género en la cultura profesional. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, *74*, 1818-1833. https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2019-1412-95

Del Palacio, C. & Olvera, A. J. (2017). Acallar las voces, ocultar la verdad. Violencia contra los periodistas en Veracruz. *Argumentos*, *30*(85), 17-35. https://argumentos.xoc.uam.mx/index.php/argumentos/article/view/18/17

Deuze, M. (2005). What is journalism? Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered. *Journalism*, *6*, 442-464. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884905056815

Donsbach, W. & Klett, B. (1993). Subjective Objectivity. How journalists in four countries define a key term of their profession. *Gazette*, *51*, 53-83. https://doi.org/10.1177/001654929305100104

Donsbach, W. & Patterson, T. (1996). News decisions: Journalists as partisan actors. *Political Communication*, *13*, 455-468. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.1996.9963131

Figueras-Maz, M., Mauri-Ríos, M., Alsius-Clavera, S. & Salgado-De-Dios, F. (2012). La precariedad te hace dócil. Problemas que afectan a la profesión periodística. *El profesional de la información*, *21*(1), 70-75. https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2012.ene.09

Garcés, M. & Arroyave, J. (2016). Los periodistas en el contexto del conflicto armado colombiano. Explorando los niveles de influencia y autonomía en el ejercicio del periodismo en Colombia. In A. Amado & M. Oller (Eds./Coords.), *El periodismo por los periodistas* (pp. 48-63). Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.

Gollmitzer, M. (2014). Precariously Employed Watchdogs? Perceptions of working conditions among freelancers and interns. *Journalism Practice*, *8*(6), 826-841. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2014.882061

Guerrero, M. & Márquez, M. (2014). El modelo "liberal capturado" de sistemas mediáticos, periodismo y comunicación en América Latina. *Temas de Comunicación*, *29*, 135-170. http://revistasenlinea.saber.ucab.edu.ve/temas/index.php/temas/article/view/2242/2107

Gutiérrez, F., Odriozola, J. & Domínguez, J. J. (2017). La satisfacción de los periodistas de Ecuador, Chile y México frente a la formación universitaria y sus implicancias en el ejercicio profesional. *Revista de comunicación*, *16*(1), 76-96. https://doi.org/10.26441/rc16.1-2017-a4

Hallin, D. & Papathanassopoulos, S. (2002). Political clientelism and the media: Southern Europe and Latin America in comparative perspective. *Media, Culture & Society*, *24*, 175-195. https://doi.org/10.1177/016344370202400202

Hallin, D. & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: three models of media and politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Hanitzsch, T. (2007). Deconstructing Journalism Culture: Toward a Universal Theory. *Mass Communication Theory*, *17*(4), 367-385. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2007.00303.x

Hanitzsch, T. (2019). Journalism studies still needs to fix Western bias. *Journalism*, *20*(1), 214-217. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884918807353

Hanitzsch, T. & Berganza, R. (2012). Explaining Journalists' Trust in Public Institutions Across 20 Countries: Media Freedom, Cor-

ruption, and Ownership Matter Most. *Journal of Communication*, *62*(5), 794-814. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01663.x

Hanitzsch, F., Hanusch, J. Ramaprasad & de Beer, A. (Eds.). (2019). *Worlds of Journalism. Journalistic Cultures Around the Globe*. Columbia University Press.

Hanusch, F. & Hanitzsch, T. (2019). Modeling journalistic cultures. A Global Approach. In T. Hanitzsch, F. Hanusch, J. Ramaprasad & A. de Beer (Eds.). *Worlds of Journalism. Journalistic Cultures Around the Globe* (pp. 283-307). Columbia University Press.

Hellmueller, L., Mellado, C., Blumell, L. & Huemmer, J. (2016). The Contextualization of the Watchdog and Civic Journalistic Roles: Reevaluating Journalistic Role Performance in U.S. Newspapers. *Palabra Clave*, *19*(4), 1072-1100. https://doi.org/10.5294/pacla.2016.19.4.6

Henkel, I., Thurman, N. & Deffner, V. (2019). Comparing Journalism Cultures in Britain and Germany: Confrontation, Contextualization, Conformity. *Journalism Studies*, *20*(14), 1995-2013. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2018.1551067

Hughes, S. (2006). *Newsrooms in conflict. Journalism and the democratization of Mexico*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Hughes, S. & Lawson, C. (2004). Propaganda and Crony Capitalism: Partisan Bias in Mexican Television News. *Latin American Research Review*, *39*(3), 81-105. www.jstor.org/stable/1555469

Iglesias, M. (2004). Precariedad laboral de los periodistas, la mordaza de la prensa libre. Tentación peligrosa de pasividad. In F. Sierra Caballero & F. J. Moreno Gálvez (Eds.), *Actas del III Encuentro Iberoamericano de Economía Política y lógicas culturales* (pp. 503-526). Instituto Europeo de Comunicación y Desarrollo de la Universidad de Sevilla.

Johnstone, J., Slawski, E. J. & Bowman, W. W. (1976). *The news people. A sociologial portrait of American journalists and their work*. University of Illinois Press.

Josephi, B. (2017). Journalists for a Young Democracy. *Journalism Studies*, *18*(4), 495-510. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2015.1065199

Löffelholz, M. & Weaver, D. (2008). *Global journalism research. Theories, methods, findings, future*. Blackwell Publishing.

López, X., Rodríguez, A. I. & Pereira, X. (2017). Competencias tecnológicas y nuevos perfiles profesionales: desafíos del periodismo actual. *Comunicar: Revista científica iberoamericana de comunicación y educación*, *53*(25), 81-90. https://doi.org/10.3916/C53-2017-08

López Hidalgo, A. & Mellado Ruiz, C. (2006). Periodistas atrapados en la Red: rutinas de trabajo y situación laboral. *Estudios Sobre el Mensaje Periodístico*, *12*, 161-170. https://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/ESMP/article/view/ESMP0606110161A

Mancini, P. (2015). The News Media Between Volatility and Hybridization. In J. Zielonka (Ed.), *Media and Politics in New Democracies: Europe in a Comparative Perspective* (pp. 28-34). Oxford University Press.

Martínez Albertos, J. L. (1997). *El ocaso del periodismo*. CIMS.

Mellado, C. (2009). Evolución del campo ocupacional y académico del periodista latinoamericano: lógicas de mercado y esquemas de formación. *Opción*, *25*(59), 11-24. https://produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/opcion/article/view/6468

Mellado, C. (2012). The Chilean Journalists. In D. H. Weaver & L. Willnar (Eds.), *The Global Jouranlist in the 21th Century* (pp. 382-399). Routledge.

Murray, M. D. & Moore, R. L. (2003). *Mass communication education*. Iowa State Press

Novais, R., Moerira, S. & Silva, L. (2013). Brothers in arms? Portuguese and Brazilian journalistic worlds compared. *Brazilian Journalism Research*, *9*(1), 76-95. https://doi.org/10.25200/BJR.v9n1.2013.486

Novais, R. (2018). Mutatis mutandis? The stably evolving Portuguese Journalism. *Brazilian Journalism Research*, *14*(2), 342-363. https://doi.org/10.25200/BJR.v14n2.2018.1086

Oller, M. (2015). Comparison between the journalistic cultures of Switzerland, Spain and Ecuador: the effects of context influences on the journalists' perception of professional roles and the idea of objectivity. *Intexto*, *33*, 90-132. https://doi.org/10.19132/1807-8583201533.90-132

Oller, M. (Ed.). (2017). *Cultura(s) Periodística(s) Iberoamericana(s). La diversidad de un periodismo propio*. Sociedad Latina de Comunicación Social.

Oller, M. & Chavero, P. (2018). *Journalism in Latin America: Journalistic Culture of Ecuador* (2nd Ed.). EAE.

Oller, M., Hughes, S., Amado, A., Arroyave, J., Benítez, J. L., Chavero, P., Garcés, M., Márquez, M., Mellado, C. & Moreira, S. V. (2017). An overview of Latin American Journalistic Culture(s). The profile, professional situation and perception of journalists in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador and Mexico. In M. Oller (Ed.), *Cultura(s) Periodística(s) Iberoamericana(s). La diversidad de un periodismo propio* (pp. 21-60). Sociedad Latina de Comunicación Social.

Oller, M. & Meier, M. (2012). *La cultura periodística de España y Suiza*. Fragua.

Örnebring, H. (2009). Comparative European journalism: the state of current research. *Working Paper, Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism*, 1-22.

Örnebring, H. (2018). Journalists thinking about precarity: Making sense of the "new normal". *Official Research Journal of the International Symposium on Online Journalism*, *8*(1), 109-127.

Reese, S. & Cohen, J. (2000). Educating for Journalism: The Professionalism of Scholarship. *Journalism Studies*, *1*(2), 213-227. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700050028217

Retegui, L. (2019). Mujeres periodistas en el Grupo Clarín: apuntes sobre desigualdades de género. *Razón y Palabra*, *22*(103), 183-210. https://www.revistarazonypalabra.org/index.php/ryp/article/view/1320

Roses, S. (2011). Journalists' salary structure in Spain during the crisis. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, *66*, 178-209. https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-66-2011-929-178-209-EN

Salaverría, R. (Coord.). (2016). *Ciberperiodismo en Iberoamérica*. Fundación Telefónica y Editorial Ariel.

Scolari, C. A. (2008). Proyecto «Comunicadores digitales»: la formación de los comunicadores en Iberoamérica ante el desafío digital.

Anàlisi: Quaderns de comunicació i cultura, *36*, 197-209. https://raco.pre.csuc.cat/index.php/Analisi/article/view/94532

Weaver, D. (1998). *The global journalist. News people around the world*. Hampton Press.

Weaver, D. H. & Willnat, L. (2012). *The global journalist in the 21st century*. Routledge.

Weaver, D., Beam, R. A., Brownlee, B. J., Voakes, P. S. & Wilhoit, G. C. (2007). *The American Journalist in the 21st Century: U.S. News People at the Dawn of a New Millennium*. Erlbaum.

Weaver, D., Wilhoit, G. C. & Cleveland, G. (1986). *The American Journalist*. Indiana University Press.

Wilke, J. (1998). Journalists in Chile, Ecuador and Mexico. In D. H. Weaver (Ed.), *The Global Journalist. News People around the World* (pp. 433-454). Hampton Press, Inc.

Wright, K., Zamith, R., & Bebawi, S. (2019). Data Journalism beyond Majority World Countries: Challenges and Opportunities. *Digital Journalism*, *7*(9), 1295-1302. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2019.1702472

Wyatt, W. N. (2007). Foreword. *Journal of mass media ethics*, 22(4), 239-240. https://doi.org/10.1080/08900520701583495