

Article

The timeliness of constructionist theory in the process of journalistic content production in the digital age

Cantífula de Castro^{1,*}, Bruno F. Gonçalves²

¹ UCM, Universidade Católica de Moçambique, Nampula 3100-821, Mozambique

² CIEB, Instituto Politécnico de Bragança, 5300-253 Bragança, Portugal

* **Corresponding author:** Cantífula de Castro, padrecantifula@gmail.com

CITATION

de Castro C, Gonçalves BF. The timeliness of constructionist theory in the process of journalistic content production in the digital age. *Insight - News Media*. 2024; 7(1): 670. <https://doi.org/10.18282/inm670>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 27 September 2024

Accepted: 30 October 2024

Available online: 20 November 2024

COPYRIGHT



Copyright © 2024 by author(s).

Insight - News Media is published by PiscoMed Publishing Pte. Ltd. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY)

license.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Abstract: This research explores the relevance of constructionist theory in the production of journalistic content in the digital age. Constructionist theory posits that reality is socially constructed and shaped by the discursive practices of the media, gaining significance within a media landscape profoundly transformed by digitization, the proliferation of social networks, and the use of algorithms. The investigation employs a qualitative methodology, utilizing a systematic literature review of publications from 2013 to 2023, aiming to map the principal theoretical and empirical approaches that discuss the impact of new technologies and communicative practices on contemporary journalism. The findings indicate that the digital era has intensified the constructionist nature of news production, given the multiplicity of voices and agents involved in the mediation process, including an actively participating public in the creation and dissemination of content. It was further observed that digital platforms, by personalizing news consumption through algorithms, create fragmented realities and filter bubbles, challenging the notion of a shared news reality. Moreover, the emergence of misinformation and “fake news” underscores the importance of a constructionist approach to understanding how news narratives are continuously negotiated and reconstructed. It is concluded that constructionist theory remains a valid analytical framework for understanding the dynamics of journalistic production in the digital age, particularly in a context where the boundaries between news producers and consumers have become increasingly fluid.

Keywords: misinformation; fake news; algorithms; journalism; and fact-checking

1. Introduction

In recent decades, journalism has undergone profound transformations resulting from the digital transformation of media and the proliferation of digital platforms and social networks. The digital media ecosystem has reconfigured and continues to reshape the processes of production, distribution, and consumption of news, while altering the relationships between journalists and the public. Rather than being mere passive consumers, readers have become active agents in the creation and dissemination of news content, subverting traditional hierarchies of journalistic mediation [1]. These changes, coupled with the use of algorithms that personalize the news experience [2], have generated new dynamics of information production and raised questions about the role of journalism in constructing reality in the digital age.

In this context, constructionist theory emerges as a relevant analytical tool for understanding the process of news content production. This theory historically posits that reality is not merely reported by the media but is actively constructed by them, gaining particular significance in the digital environment where multiple voices and versions of events are negotiated in real time. The personalization of content,

misinformation, fake news, and the increasing interactivity between journalists and audiences complicate the traditional relationship between fact and narrative [3]. Argues, journalists operating within this digital ecosystem must mediate diverse voices and competing realities, making the news construction process even more dynamic and plural.

Given these transformations, the central question guiding this research is: How does constructionist theory apply to journalistic production in the digital environment, characterized by algorithms, social networks, and new dynamics of public participation? Building upon this question, the aim is to explore how the theory can help explain current journalistic practices that involve content curation through algorithmic platforms, the management of misinformation, and the construction of narratives in fragmented digital contexts. By problematizing the notion of journalistic objectivity, constructionism challenges the claim that the media can reflect a “pure reality,” suggesting instead that mediation processes involve editorial choices, technological influences, and complex social interactions.

The objective of this article is to assess the relevance of constructionist theory in the context of digital journalism, considering the changes brought about by the digital transformation of media and the emergence of new forms of news production and consumption. It aims to critically discuss how the theory can be applied to understand contemporary news production, where algorithms, social networks, and interaction with the public play a central role in mediating reality.

In terms of structure, the article is organized into four main sections. The first section provides a literature review focused on constructionist theory as applied to journalism. The second section discusses transformations in the digital media environment, with particular emphasis on algorithms, social networks, and new journalistic practices. The third section presents the methodology and the fourth section provides the analysis of results obtained from the systematic literature review, concentrating on the new dynamics of news production and consumption. Finally, the concludes with a reflection on the ongoing relevance of constructionist theory in digital journalism, suggesting directions for future research.

2. Literature review

2.1. Constructionist theory and journalism

Constructionist theory, widely utilized in the social sciences, posits that reality is socially constructed, meaning there is no objective truth that can be discovered impartially; rather, there are multiple and ever-evolving interpretations shaped by social, cultural, and discursive interactions [4]. In journalism, this approach has increasingly been adopted to explain how news not only reflects reality but also actively participates in its construction. Over the past decade, with the emergence of the digital environment and the proliferation of social media platforms, this theory has been revisited by various scholars who analyze its relevance and evolution within contemporary journalism.

2.1.1. Conceptualization and evolution of constructionist theory in the journalistic context

Constructionism in journalism refers to the idea that journalists, through the selection, interpretation, and transmission of events, actively participate in the construction of social reality. Traditionally viewed as “mirrors” of reality, the media are now understood as mediators that construct narratives based on editorial choices, news values, and framing that influence public perception of events. It is important to note that this construction is not static; it is a continuous process that reflects the institutional, political, and economic pressures faced by newsrooms [1].

The digital environment has intensified this dynamic by introducing new forms of mediation. Indeed, the rise of social media as news distribution platforms has subverted traditional editorial hierarchies [5]. In this new digital ecosystem, the construction of news reality is largely guided by algorithms that select and personalize content based on users’ prior interactions. This creates fragmented realities, where different audiences have access to distinct versions of events, reinforcing the notion that media reality is plural and shaped by various factors.

The application of constructionism in journalism has evolved significantly over the last few decades. In the pre-digital era, journalists played a central role in the “routinization” of reality by deciding which events became news and shaping public perception of them. During this time, journalism was characterized by a fundamentally unidirectional communication model, where journalists and the media traditionally held a monopoly on the production and distribution of information. It was an era of informational linearity [6], in which the public primarily acted as a passive consumer, lacking the capacity to directly influence news content. The journalistic production process, from fact-checking to final editing, was highly centralized in newsrooms, with print, television, and radio being the primary distribution channels.

In this context, the credibility of journalism in the pre-digital era was closely linked to the authority of media institutions and the control they exercised over fact-checking and selection. Traditional journalism focused on maintaining objectivity and the role of the journalist as an impartial mediator between events and the public [7]. However, this mediation, while ensuring a form of quality control in information, also limited the active participation of the public in the construction of narratives. With the advent of digital technologies, the lines between news producers and consumers have become less defined, as noted by [8]. The interactivity and active participation of the public on digital platforms have created a new media environment where constructionism is widely shared among journalists, readers, and algorithms.

Over the past decade, constructionism has been extensively discussed in light of these technological and cultural changes. On one hand, digitization has expanded the plurality of voices involved in news production. According to [9], the public now plays a more active role in constructing news reality, collaborating not only in the dissemination of content but also in the creation and redefinition of journalistic narratives. This dynamic is particularly evident on social media, where users can reinterpret, criticize, and even distort news, as seen during controversial events such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

On the other hand, the introduction of algorithms in journalism has also presented new challenges to constructionism. The analysis conducted by [10] corroborates that algorithms personalize users' news experiences, determining which content is prioritized based on personal data, past behavior, and explicit preferences. This "algorithmic management" intensifies the role of technology in constructing reality, making it even more subjective and personalized [2]. The constructive process of news, which was previously predominantly human, now involves significant algorithmic mediation, influencing which realities are more visible to different audiences.

2.1.2. Contemporary implications of constructionism in digital journalism

The relevance of constructionism in digital journalism extends beyond news production to encompass the understanding of misinformation and fake news. The proliferation of misinformation on digital platforms challenges journalism's capacity to construct coherent and credible narratives. According to [11] the spread of fake news during political events and health crises has revealed journalism's fragility in dealing with competing narratives, emphasizing the need for a constructionist approach that recognizes the multiple versions of media reality in circulation.

In this context, the practice of fact-checking has become a central response, aiming to restore trust in the veracity of information. However, even fact-checking participates in the construction of reality [12] by selecting which claims warrant verification and how the facts are presented to the public. Thus, constructionism not only aids in understanding the news production process but also illuminates attempts to re-establish truth within the digital ecosystem.

The application of constructionist theory to traditional journalism reveals significant challenges and implications, particularly when critically analyzed in light of journalistic practices predating the digital era. Traditional journalism, rooted in principles of objectivity and impartiality, has always been understood as a "mirror" of reality, tasked with reporting facts in a neutral and informative manner. However, constructionism challenges this view, arguing that journalism, like other communicative practices, actively participates in the construction of social reality, shaping public perceptions of events, social actors, and social processes.

Historically, traditional journalism has been grounded in ideals of objectivity, emphasizing the distinction between "facts" and "opinions." This model was dominant, especially throughout the twentieth century, as newspapers and television broadcasters solidified their roles as primary sources of public information. Constructionist theory, however, posits that objectivity is an illusory goal, as the choices of which events to cover, which sources to consult, and how to frame a story involve a selection and interpretation process inevitably influenced by social, political, and cultural factors [13].

Thus, when applied to traditional journalism, constructionism suggests that even in its most "objective" forms, journalism is deeply involved in constructing reality. Newsrooms adhere to productive routines that entail editorial choices that ultimately define what is reported and how it is reported. Gaye Tuchman, a pioneer in applying constructionism to journalism, argues that journalists are not merely passive mirrors of reality; they are "news makers" who, through practices such as source selection, narrative organization, and framing of reports, construct a particular news reality.

The concept of “news values” is crucial for the constructionist analysis of traditional journalism. These values determine which events or situations are more likely to become news based on criteria such as geographical proximity, relevance to the audience, and potential impact [14]. In this way, constructionism reveals that traditional journalism has a structuring function: by selecting what is worthy of attention, it creates a hierarchy of relevance that shapes the reality perceived by the public.

This application of constructionist theory to traditional journalism also highlights the limitations of the concept of impartiality. When applying constructionist theory to traditional journalism, it becomes evident that journalists, even unintentionally, reproduce worldviews that reflect the norms and values of political and economic elites, thereby compromising the diversity of narratives and perspectives.

While applying constructionist theory to traditional journalism offers a powerful critique of the ideal of neutrality, it also presents limitations within this type of journalism. The institutional structure of large newsrooms, with well-established practices and journalistic standards, constrained the scope for a plurality of narratives. In many cases, mass media were concentrated in a few corporations, which restricted alternative voices and representations. Such homogenization was, to some extent, a reflection of the very constructionist practice in journalism, where “newsworthy realities” were predominantly shaped by perspectives aligned with the status quo [10].

Furthermore, in traditional journalism, the public had limited participation in constructing media reality. Access to news production and dissemination was restricted to trained professionals and centralized newsrooms, rendering the construction of reality a unidirectional process from journalists to the public. In contrast to the current digital journalism landscape, where interactivity and public participation are facilitated by social media, traditional journalism rarely offered the public the opportunity to directly influence the media agenda or actively construct alternative narratives.

Another critical point raised by the application of constructionism in traditional journalism is the relationship between media and institutional power. Constructionist theory, by describing the media as constructors of reality, highlights how political, economic, and cultural institutions influence news content. The traditional journalism is often captured by economic and political interests, which affects its ability to provide a fair and balanced representation of reality.

In this sense, constructionism applied to traditional journalism reveals the influence of elites in defining what constitutes news. Indeed, the large corporations that control the media are intrinsically linked to economic and political interests [15] which affects how events are covered. Constructionism, therefore, sheds light on the invisible forces that shape media coverage, evidencing that traditional journalism has never been entirely independent of institutional power.

2.2. Transformations in journalism in the digital era

The digital era has ushered in a profound set of transformations that have reconfigured both the production and consumption of news. These changes have not

only altered journalistic practices but also impacted the relationship between journalists and the public, creating a dynamic and multifaceted information ecosystem.

Recent literature suggests that digital transformation has led to the decentralization of information production, enabling anyone with internet access to become a co-producer of content. Digital platforms, particularly social media, have redefined the role of journalists [11], shifting from being the sole mediators of reality to facilitators of a broader debate where multiple voices are present. Social media platforms, blogs, and independent news websites have allowed previously marginalized voices to gain visibility, challenging the monopoly of large media corporations and leading to a plurality of perspectives and narratives. However, this openness has also introduced challenges, such as the proliferation of misinformation and fake news [8].

Misinformation and fake news have emerged as pressing issues in the digital age, affecting how society constructs its reality. These phenomena play a significant role in shaping perceptions and constructing social reality. Fake news spreads more rapidly than true news on social media [16] due to its emotional appeal. This dynamic not only distorts public perception of events and social issues but also contributes to polarization and distrust in institutions.

Moreover, the repetition of false information can lead to its acceptance as truth, a phenomenon known as the “mere exposure effect” [17]. The spread of misinformation represents not only an informational problem but also a challenge to democracy itself, as it undermines citizens’ ability to make informed decisions.

In response to the growing tide of misinformation, fact-checking has become an essential practice in contemporary journalism [18]. However, the impact of fact-checking is not one-dimensional. While it may be effective in correcting beliefs, it can also have counterproductive effects [19], further reinforcing the convictions of those already predisposed to reject contradictory information. This complexity necessitates innovative approaches that not only verify truthfulness but also engage the public more effectively.

Social media and digital platforms have enabled immediate and constant interaction between news producers and the public, creating a new information ecosystem characterized by interactivity and rapid dissemination. However, it is important to highlight that this new communicative environment has also presented numerous challenges to the traditional model of credibility, as processes for verifying information have become more fluid and dispersed. Algorithms play a central role in news production in the digital era [20]. Platforms utilize recommendation systems that personalize the consumption experience, determining which content is most visible to users based on their interaction history [2]. While this practice enhances the relevance of content to the audience, it also raises concerns about information homogenization, as users may be exposed only to narratives that reinforce their pre-existing beliefs [21], creating “echo chambers” [22].

Algorithmic personalization has also raised new questions regarding the fragmentation of the public sphere. [23] introduced the concept of “filter bubbles” to describe the phenomenon wherein individuals, exposed to personalized content, isolate themselves in worldviews that reinforce their beliefs, limiting the plurality of perspectives. This fragmentation represents a rupture from the pre-digital era, where

traditional media operated with broad and diverse audiences, providing a more cohesive narrative of reality.

Despite these profound transformations, continuities between the pre-digital and digital eras persist. Journalism continues to play a fundamental role in constructing social reality, as proponents of constructionist theory suggest [24] and digital transformation has encouraged innovation in formats and styles of news presentation. Multimedia journalism, which combines text, audio, video, and graphics, has become increasingly common. This approach not only enriches the user experience but also necessitates that journalists acquire new technical skills. The use of infographics, podcasts, and short videos on social media has transformed how information is consumed and interpreted [25].

However, the current landscape imposes more complex challenges regarding credibility and neutrality, as digital platforms and algorithms profoundly influence the visibility of certain content and narratives. Moreover, digital journalism has not replaced traditional journalism [26]; rather, it complements it, creating a hybrid environment where traditional media coexists with new forms of news production and distribution. The incorporation of multimedia formats and interactivity are distinctive features of digital journalism, yet the essence of journalism—the pursuit of facts and the responsibility to inform accurately—remains central. Social media has emerged as a primary source for news consumption. Platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram enable users to access information quickly and interactively, often prioritizing speed over veracity [8]. This shift in consumption dynamics has also transformed the role of the journalist, who must now adapt to an environment where the speed of information often surpasses its accuracy.

The rise of news consumption via mobile devices and the demand for instant information have altered audience reading and attention patterns. Users expect real-time access to news, leading media organizations to become agile and adaptable [5]. This expectation pressures newsrooms to prioritize constant updates, often at the expense of in-depth analysis.

The speed with which news can be shared on social media enables near-instantaneous coverage of events. This agility, however, comes with the risk of disseminating unverified or inaccurate information. The impact of viral news, often driven by emotions and clicks, also leads to a prioritization of sensationalist content over in-depth reporting.

Digital platforms such as Google News, Facebook News, and news aggregators have transformed how information is accessed. These platforms play a critical role in content curation, shaping what users see and how they interact with news.

Digitization has also impacted journalism's business models. Traditional advertising revenues have declined, prompting media organizations to explore new monetization avenues, such as subscriptions, crowdfunding, and partnerships with digital platforms. These changes require journalists to be more adaptable and innovative in how they generate revenue and engage their audiences [5]. Digitization has necessitated that newsrooms adopt new editorial practices that align with audience expectations and the speed of news.

3. Methodology

The methodology adopted for this qualitative research followed a systematic literature review model, aimed at evaluating the relevance of constructionist theory in the process of producing journalistic content within the digital environment. The central objective was to understand how digital transformations, including the increasing influence of social media and algorithmic technologies, have impacted contemporary journalism, particularly concerning misinformation, fake news, and new forms of news curation.

The first step involved clearly defining the analysis period, focusing on publications from 2013 to 2023. This temporal framework was chosen as it encompasses the most critical years of media digitization, as well as the emergence of dynamics such as algorithmic personalization, the proliferation of fake news, and the growth of digital platforms as information sources. This approach allowed for the capture of the most recent changes and key trends in the field of digital journalism.

Subsequently, the selection of databases was conducted. Widely recognized academic platforms such as Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, and the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) were consulted. The choice of these databases was due to their comprehensiveness and the access they provide to a vast array of relevant publications in the field of communication and journalism studies. Searches in these databases were conducted through the combination of specific keywords, utilizing Boolean operators to expand or restrict results as needed. Keywords such as “misinformation,” “fake news,” “algorithms,” “journalism,” “filter bubbles,” and “fact-checking” were employed, as these terms reflect the primary themes discussed in recent literature regarding the impact of digital transformation on journalism.

The search process was refined to optimize the retrieval of articles and reports of theoretical and empirical relevance. Inclusion criteria were established to ensure the quality and pertinence of the sources. Peer-reviewed articles, scientific reports, and books addressing the effects of digital transformation on journalism, including the impact of misinformation and algorithms on journalistic practice and society, were included. Opinion pieces, blogs, or non-peer-reviewed texts, as well as publications outside the defined period, were excluded from the analysis, except for essential classic works foundational to the understanding of constructionist theory.

Following the initial collection, a screening phase was conducted based on the established criteria. This screening allowed for the exclusion of studies that did not meet the inclusion requirements, such as those presenting superficial analyses or lacking robust empirical or theoretical grounding. The selected publications then underwent thorough and detailed reading, a critical phase for in-depth qualitative analysis. At this stage, the content was coded into thematic categories, utilizing content analysis techniques to identify patterns, emerging themes, and divergences within the studies. This process facilitated mapping the primary discussions in the literature, such as the impact of fake news on public perception, the influence of algorithms on the mediation of journalistic content, and the effectiveness of fact-checking initiatives.

In the final phase, an integrative synthesis of the data was performed, organizing the main findings into a comparative framework. This approach allowed for the

confrontation of different authors' conclusions and the identification of gaps in the literature. For instance, a growing concern emerged regarding the role of algorithms in creating filter bubbles, while some authors emphasized the need for increased investment in media literacy and more transparent news curation practices. The analysis also revealed a convergence around the idea that, although digital transformation has expanded the dissemination of information, it has also introduced new challenges for the veracity and credibility of journalism.

Finally, the discussion of the results focused on the implications of these findings for journalistic practice and society. The role of journalism as a constructor of reality was reaffirmed, with the caveat that, in the digital context, this construction becomes more complex due to multiple voices and algorithmic mediation. The research concluded with the suggestion that future studies should explore innovative approaches to address the challenges posed by misinformation and the fragmentation of news reality in the digital age.

4. Analysis and discussion of results

4.1. The relevance of constructionist theory

The analysis of recent studies reaffirms the significance of constructionist theory in the digital age, emphasizing how journalistic practices continue to play a crucial role in shaping reality, albeit within a more complex and multifaceted context. Constructionist theory, which posits that reality is socially constructed through communication, finds new dimensions as information becomes more accessible and diverse on digital platforms.

In the digital era, journalism not only reports facts but also shapes perceptions through the selection and presentation of information [27]. Journalistic practices thus become a contested arena where different narratives vie for public attention. This competition is intensified by the proliferation of digital platforms, where the speed and ease of information sharing further underscore journalists' responsibility to construct narratives that reflect societal complexities.

Moreover, digital transformation has introduced new elements that influence reality construction. Social media plays a pivotal role in mediating the flow of information [25] allowing various voices and perspectives to be heard. This results in a multiplicity of narratives that, while enriching, can also lead to confusion and misinformation. Consequently, constructionist theory needs to be adapted to consider these new dynamics, recognizing that journalistic practices now operate within a constantly evolving ecosystem characterized by a continuous flow of information and social interactions.

Evidence that journalistic practices continue to construct reality emerges from studies analyzing how news is consumed and interpreted. [28] argues that audiences are not merely passive recipients but are actively engaged in the interpretation and dissemination of information, implying a co-construction of meanings. Social media not only amplifies journalists' voices but also those of the public, resulting in an environment where reality construction becomes a collaborative process.

However, this multifaceted reality construction also presents challenges. Audience fragmentation and opinion polarization complicate the development of

narratives that are both comprehensive and representative. These distortions can hinder journalism's capacity to construct a shared reality [29] highlighting the necessity for a critical and reflective approach.

Thus, while constructionist theory retains its relevance, the digital age demands a reevaluation of its premises. The complexity of social interactions, power dynamics on digital platforms, and the plurality of voices render reality construction an even more intricate phenomenon. Journalists, therefore, must be cognizant of their role not only as informers but also as active builders of narratives that can ultimately influence perceptions and understandings of the world.

4.2. New dynamics of content production and consumption

The digital age has ushered in profound transformations in the interaction between journalists and the public, significantly enhancing the co-construction of narratives. This change is evident in the ways digital platforms facilitate bidirectional communication, enabling citizens not only to consume news but also to actively participate in the creation and dissemination of information. Communication mediated by digital technologies allows users to act as "content producers" [8] not only sharing information but also contributing to public discourse and shaping journalistic narratives. This phenomenon transforms the traditional relationship between journalists and audiences from a one-dimensional interaction into a dynamic dialogue.

The expansion of narrative co-construction is evident in various cases of citizen journalism, where communities mobilize to report local events and share relevant information in real time. Thus, the integration of diverse voices enriches public debate and provides a broader array of perspectives [30]. However, this dynamic is not without challenges. The inclusion of multiple voices can lead to the proliferation of unverified information and, consequently, misinformation, necessitating a new critical and ethical approach from journalists in content curation.

On the other hand, the role of algorithms in mediating journalistic reality is a central aspect of this new dynamic. Algorithms, which determine which content is displayed to which users, significantly influence how news is consumed and interpreted. They not only personalize the user experience but can also create "filter bubbles" [31] where individuals are predominantly exposed to information that reinforces their existing beliefs. This situation raises concerns about the plurality of perspectives, as the diversity of voices may be silenced in favor of more popular or polarizing narratives.

Furthermore, the centrality of algorithms in content distribution creates a dependency on digital platforms, which shape not only access to information but also the construction of narratives. Algorithmic mediation facilitates the circulation of information [32], but also configures it in ways that can limit the objectivity and diversity of the discourses presented. Thus, the challenge for contemporary journalism lies in finding a balance between leveraging the benefits of digital interactions and mitigating the risks associated with algorithmic manipulation.

4.3. Misinformation and the construction of reality

The impact of fake news on the construction of public perception is a critical topic in the discussion of misinformation and journalism. Fake news not only distorts reality but also influences public beliefs and behaviors, contributing to a fragmented and polarized worldview. False information spreads more rapidly and widely than true information, particularly on social media, where emotions play a central role in content dissemination. This dynamic threatens not only the integrity of information but also undermines trust in journalistic institutions [17].

In this context, the role of journalism in reconstructing narratives based on facts becomes increasingly relevant. Fact-checking emerges as a primary tool in the fight against misinformation, providing the public with accurate and contextualized information. Thus, fact-checking initiatives can help restore public confidence in the news [18], especially when presented clearly and accessibly. Additionally, transparency in journalistic practices and the promotion of responsible journalism are fundamental to ensuring that constructed narratives are evidence-based, contributing to a more informed and critical public perception.

However, the challenge of news reality fragmentation complicates this task. The proliferation of information sources, combined with algorithmic personalization, results in audiences consuming content that reflects their own beliefs and opinions. Consequently, news reality fragmentation not only hinders the creation of consensus but also fuels distrust in information that does not align with pre-existing views [30]. The result is an informational environment where the struggle for credibility and truthfulness becomes a constant challenge for journalists, who must strive to stand out in a sea of misinformation and noise.

The search for solutions to these challenges requires a collaborative effort among journalists, digital platforms, and the public. Promoting media literacy is essential to empower citizens to discern reliable information from unreliable sources, fostering a culture of questioning and critical analysis. Furthermore, journalists' engagement in open dialogues with audiences can contribute to the construction of a more cohesive informational environment where credibility and truthfulness are valued.

5. Conclusion

The analysis conducted throughout this study reveals the complexity and relevance of the new dynamics of production and consumption of journalistic content in the digital age. The synthesis of the main findings highlights that, despite the challenges posed by misinformation and the fragmentation of news reality, constructivist theory remains a fundamental theoretical framework for understanding how narratives are constructed and shaped by journalistic practices. This theory, which emphasizes the social co-construction of reality, is even more pertinent in a digital environment where journalists and audiences interact in a dynamic and collaborative manner.

The digital age has not only transformed the relationship between journalists and audiences but has also imposed new challenges related to algorithmic personalization. Algorithms play a decisive role in mediating journalistic reality, influencing which content is accessible to different audiences. While this personalization offers benefits

in terms of relevance and engagement, it also raises concerns about the creation of informational bubbles that may restrict the diversity of perspectives. The struggle for credibility and truthfulness in contemporary journalism, therefore, becomes increasingly urgent, demanding a continuous commitment from journalists to ensure that their practices are grounded in facts and transparency.

Furthermore, the fight against misinformation emerges as a central challenge. The proliferation of fake news not only distorts public perception but also undermines trust in media institutions. In this context, fact-checking journalism and the promotion of media literacy become essential tools for restoring credibility and fostering an informed and critical society.

To further explore the topic, future lines of research could investigate the effectiveness of different fact-checking approaches in various cultural and social contexts, as well as examine the impact of emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence, on the production and dissemination of journalistic content. Additionally, it would be relevant to analyze how audiences perceive and respond to algorithmic personalization, investigating its implications for the construction of a healthy public sphere.

Author contributions: Conceptualization, CdC; methodology, CdC; software, CdC; validation, CdC; formal analysis, CdC; investigation, CdC; resources, CdC; data curation, BFG; writing—original draft preparation, CdC; writing—review and editing, BFG; visualization, BFG; supervision, BFG; project administration, BFG. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. CARLSON, M. Fake news as an informational moral panic: the symbolic deviancy of social media during the 2016 US presidential election. *Information, Communication & Society*, v. 23, n. 3, p. 374–388, 2020.
2. JUST, N.; LATZER, M. Governance by algorithms: reality construction by algorithmic selection on the Internet. *Media, culture & society*, v. 39, n. 2, p. 238–258, 2017.
3. PAVLIK, J. V. Innovation and the future of journalism. *Digital journalism*, v. 1, n. 2, p. 181–193, 2013.
4. BERGER, P.; LUCKMANN, T. *The social construction of reality. Em: Social theory re-wired.* [s.l.] Routledge, 2016. p. 110–122.
5. NIELSEN, R. K.; GANTER, S. A. *The power of platforms: Shaping media and society.* [s.l.] Oxford University Press, 2022.
6. SCHUDSON, M. *The sociology of news* WW Northon & Company. 2003.
7. ROSENSTIEL, T. *The elements of journalism: What newspeople should know and the public should expect.* [s.l.] Three Rivers Press, 2014.
8. HERMIDA, A. *Tell everyone: Why we share and why it matters.* [s.l.] Anchor Canada, 2016.
9. ZELIZER, B. Why journalism is about more than digital technology. *Digital journalism*, v. 7, n. 3, p. 343–350, 2019.
10. BUCHER, T. *If... then: Algorithmic power and politics.* [s.l.] Oxford University Press, 2018.
11. TANDOC JR, E. C.; LIM, Z. W.; LING, R. Defining “fake news” A typology of scholarly definitions. *Digital journalism*, v. 6, n. 2, p. 137–153, 2018.
12. GRAVES, L.; CHERUBINI, F. *The rise of fact-checking sites in Europe.* Digital News Project Report, 2016.
13. TUCHMAN, G. *Making news: A study in the construction of reality.* Free Press, 1978.
14. GALTUNG, J.; RUGE, M. H. The structure of foreign news: The presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus crises in four Norwegian newspapers. *Journal of peace research*, v. 2, n. 1, p. 64–90, 1965.
15. MCCHESENEY, R. “Rich Media Poor Democracy. *The Political Communication Reader*, p. 2, 2023.

16. VOSOUGHI, S.; ROY, D.; ARAL, S. The spread of true and false news online. *science*, v. 359, n. 6380, p. 1146–1151, 2018.
17. LEWANDOWSKY, S.; ECKER, U. K. H.; COOK, J. Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the “post-truth” era. *Journal of applied research in memory and cognition*, v. 6, n. 4, p. 353–369, 2017.
18. GRAVES, E. K. *Covering Extended Reality Technologies in the Media*. [s.l.] Taylor & Francis, 2023.
19. PENNYCOOK, G.; RAND, D. G. Fighting misinformation on social media using crowdsourced judgments of news source quality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, v. 116, n. 7, p. 2521–2526, 2019.
20. VAN DIJCK, J.; POELL, T.; DE WAAL, M. *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. [s.l.] Oxford university press, 2018.
21. TUFEKCI, Z. Algorithmic harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent challenges of computational agency. *Colo. Tech. LJ*, v. 13, p. 203, 2015.
22. SUNSTEIN, C. *# Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. [s.l.] Princeton university press, 2018.
23. PARISER, E. *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. [s.l.] penguin UK, 2011.
24. BENNETT, W. L.; SEGERBERG, A. *The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics*. [s.l.] Cambridge University Press, 2013.
25. MCCHESENEY, R. W. *Rich media, poor democracy: Communication politics in dubious times*. [s.l.] New Press, The, 2016.
26. SINGER, J. B. Sem medo do futuro: ética do jornalismo, inovação e um apelo à flexibilidade. *Comunicação e Sociedade*, v. 25, p. 49–66, 2014.
27. SCHEUFELE, D. A.; KRAUSE, N. M. Science audiences, misinformation, and fake news. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, v. 116, n. 16, p. 7662–7669, 2019.
28. STROUD, N. J. Attention as a valuable resource. *Political Communication*, v. 34, n. 3, p. 479–489, 2017.
29. LAZER, D. M. J. et al. The science of fake news. *Science*, v. 359, n. 6380, p. 1094–1096, 2018.
30. BRUNS, A. *Gatewatching and news curation: Journalism, social media, and the public sphere (Digital Formations, Volume 113)*. [s.l.] Peter Lang Publishing, 2018.
31. GAGLIARDONE, I. et al. *Countering online hate speech*. [s.l.] Unesco Publishing, 2015.
32. ZHAO, B.; BILEN, H. Dataset condensation with differentiable siamese augmentation. *International Conference on Machine Learning. Anais...PMLR*, 2021.