



## Partecipazione e Conflitto

<http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/paco>

ISSN: 1972-7623 (print version)

ISSN: 2035-6609 (electronic version)

PACO, Issue 19(1) 2026: 201-220

DOI: 10.1285/i20356609v19i1p201

Published 15 March, 2026

Work licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non commercial-Share alike 3.0 Italian License

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# Guardians of Journalism and Free Expression: Brazil's CDJor Coalition in Democratic Flux

**Rui Alexandre Novais**

*Centre for Philosophical and Humanistic Studies (CEFH), Universidade Católica Portuguesa*

**Rogério Christofolletti**

*Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina*

**ABSTRACT:** This article analyzes the interplay between civic activism and communicative resilience in safeguarding freedom of expression and journalistic integrity, centering on the understudied Brazil's Coalition in Defense of Journalism (CDJor) that emerged to counteract systemic persecution of the press, and eroding public trust under Jair Bolsonaro's authoritarian regime. Using a multi-dimensional qualitative approach, the study explores two intertwined strands: the social movements dynamics, which include the coalition's lifecycle, collaborative partnerships, and governance models; and communicative resilience, which examines how CDJor has strategized to overcome challenges and achieve initial achievements despite structural barriers. It concludes that a defining feature of CDJor's communicative resilience lies in its refusal to normalize the belligerent press-state relations institutionalized by Bolsonaro. Instead, it championed democratic restoration, cultivating shared narratives about journalism's societal role and mobilizing cross-organizational communication channels for counter-repression. Following the political transition to Lula da Silva's administration, CDJor has strategically pivoted from reactive resistance to proactive adaptation, prioritizing dialogue and institutional collaboration in a more pluralistic yet still precarious democratic environment. This shift underscores its flexibility and dual imperative: ensuring vigilance against ongoing threats to freedom of expression while leveraging its political influence to enhance media integrity and restoring public trust in journalism.

**KEYWORDS:** Brazil, civic alliances/social movements, communicative resilience, freedom of expression and journalism, information disorders.

**CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:** [rnovais@ucp.pt](mailto:rnovais@ucp.pt)

## 1. Introduction

While disinformation (the intentional dissemination of fabricated or misleading content), misinformation (the unintentional sharing of false or inaccurate material), and malinformation (the strategic circulation of factual information aimed at inflicting harm) - are age-old phenomenon, the prevalence of information disorders has increased significantly over the last decade (Broda and Strömbäck 2024; Wardle and Derakhshan, 2017, 2018). Recent political events and crises have heightened concerns the impact of such dangerously polluted information ecosystem on divided societies, fragmented and mediatized public spheres, as well as the overall damage they inflict on democratic institutions (Fowler-Watt et al., 2024; Kermer and Nijmeijer, 2020; McNair, 2024; Monsees, 2023; Ognyanova et al., 2020). Furthermore, by adding to the complexities of an increasingly chaotic social world, the escalating prevalence of information disorders has particularly exacerbated animosity toward media institutions and public trust in journalism (Hameleers and Minihold, 2022; Ognyanova et al., 2020; Waisbord, 2020).

Despite the growing body of literature on communicative resilience, civic activism - including social movements, organizations, and activists - and media institutions, which play a critical role in combating the detrimental effects of misinformation, fake news, alternative facts, and deepfakes during social turmoil and elections, there is a surprising lack of research examining how civic coalitions formed to defend professional journalism, a significant target for disinformation agents, enact resilience communicatively amidst information disorders (Afifi and Cornejo, 2020; Balčytienė and Horowitz, 2024; Buzzanell, 2010, 2019; Chakravarty et al., 2018; Fletcher and Sarkar, 2013; Kaltwasser and Taggart, 2016; Kuang et al., 2022; Meyer and Tarrow, 2018; Novais, 2023, 2025; Peißker et al., 2024; Westlund et al., 2024; Windle et al., 2011; to name a few). This gap is unexpected, given the prominent role of civil society organizations in curbing disinformation while promoting freedom of expression and the press.

This study aims to help fill that gap by exploring how a civic coalition in a Global South country - facing low disinformation resilience, democratic erosion, and press delegitimization after public health crises and polarized elections - combats information disorders (Guedes-Neto and Peters, 2021; Marques, 2024; Novais, 2025; Sbaraini Fontes and Marques, 2023). Focusing on Brazil's Coalition in Defense of Journalism (CDJor), formed post-COVID and 2022 elections amid far-right radicalization, weaponized disinformation, and attacks on democracy (Ozawa et al., 2023), the research explores its efforts to protect journalists, foster a plural media ecosystem, and enhance public trust. Bia Barbosa (Reporters Without Borders) stressed CDJor's goal to strengthen "credibility, public debate, and a diverse informational landscape" (Abraji, 2024).

Employing a holistic qualitative methodology - that complements narrative interviews with inductive content analysis - the study investigates two interconnected dimensions: social movement dynamics - spanning the coalition's evolution, collaborative alliances, and governance frameworks - and communicative resilience - analyzing CDJor's tactical responses to systemic constraints and its capacity to secure early successes. Central to this resilience is CDJor's rejection of the adversarial press-government dynamics entrenched during Bolsonaro's rule (2019-2022). Rather than acquiescing to this hostility, the coalition reasserted democratic principles by fostering collective narratives about journalism's civic value and activating cross-institutional communication networks to mitigate repression. In the post-Bolsonaro era under Lula da Silva (2023-present), CDJor has transitioned from defensive resistance to strategic adaptation, embracing dialogue and cooperative engagement within a democratically reinvigorated, and yet fragile political landscape. The study illustrates how civic movements evolve through their (short) lifecycle from crisis-driven resistance to resilient institutionally embedded advocacy, balancing oppositional vigor with pragmatic engagement. CDJor's shift reflects the need for strategic communicative resilience adaptability to achieve tangible policy gains in changing political climates.

This article begins by synthesizing key scholarship at the intersection of social movements theory and the communication theory of resilience, establishing a foundation to address its exploratory research question. Following an overview of the methodological framework and data sources, the empirical analysis examines the emergence of the CDJor coalition. It traces how the coalition initially adopted reactive oppositional strategies to counter the acute disruptions stemming from Jair Bolsonaro's presidency, characterized by attacks on press freedom and democratic norms. Over time, however, CDJor shifted toward a stance of proactive recalibration under Lula da Silva's administration, emphasizing institutional dialogue, collaborative advocacy, and adaptive engagement to foster governmental accountability and responsiveness.

## 2. Literature Review

This study examines the dynamics of CDJor through the lens of social movements framework and the communication resilience theory in analyzing how it navigated the political turbulence of Brazil's Bolsonaro era and adapted its strategies under Lula da Silva's subsequent presidency. The development and the impact of social movement activism hinges on contextual factors both of an internal and external nature (Amenta 2014).

Moreover, three strands of extant research on social movements are of interest: the lifecycle, collaborative partnerships, and governance models. To start with it should be noted that scholars outline distinct phases in civic activism (Blumer, 1995; Christiansen, 2009; Novais, 2023; Della Porta and Diani, 2006). Building on this, the initial "emergence" stage (also termed "social ferment") involves fragmented discontent, where individuals recognize an issue but lack collective organization. During this phase, potential participants may voice grievances informally without considerable coordinated action. Only later does activism progress to the "coalescence" and "bureaucratization" (or "formalization") stages marked by formal organization, strategic leadership, and collective tactics (Christiansen, 2009). This shift enables movements to articulate clear demands and mobilize visible power, moving beyond initial discontent to structured advocacy. The last phase of a social movement's life cycle is called "decline" (or "institutionalization"), and although it suggests a decrease in momentum, it does not necessarily indicate failure.

Closely related to this are considerations of leadership and governance models. In contrast to informal bottom-up, organic structures characterized as "organizing without organizations," coalitions of pre-existing institutions are more aligned with the "networked social movements" concept which presupposes coordinated communication among established collectives (Castells, 2012; Juris, 2008; Novais, 2023; Shirky, 2008). Similarly, coalitions are expected to adopt more traditional organizational templates to sustain adaptable, collaborative activism. Quite the opposite, other frameworks on leadership in civic activism support either a "swarm intelligence" model (Hardt and Negri, 2005), where leadership is fluid (liquid) and decentralized, or a heterarchical structure (Mercea, 2013) - horizontal and leaderless in form, yet characterized by distributed leadership. This model rejects rigid hierarchies while avoiding absolute "leaderlessness," instead fostering a dynamic where aggregated individuals intermittently assume leadership roles.

Lastly, by building coalitions with or among institutions social movements can enhance their impact through resource-sharing and unified advocacy via innovative partnerships (Paar-Jakli, 2024). Coalitions and alliances are formed to pursue shared objectives, serving as dynamic and essential components within political systems. While political regimes often tend to be static, these adaptable alliances offer valuable insights into the results of interactions, even in situations where broader institutional frameworks remain unchanged. This collaborative approach is particularly important in hybrid regimes and flawed democracies, where systemic constraints limit journalists' ability to combat misinformation and uphold press freedom (Armitage and Vaccari, 2021). Additionally, transnational alliances formed through partnerships with international

counterparts play a crucial role during crises situations. They help monitor threats, protect journalists under pressure, and preserve media credibility, which is vital for maintaining public trust in challenging contexts (Perreault et al., 2024).

But to unpack how CDJor has strategized to overcome challenges and achieve initial achievements despite considerable structural barriers, however, the above social movement apparatus needs to be combined with the forces at play belonging to the communicative resilience theoretical research realm.

Resilience is commonly defined as the ability to ‘bounce back’ and adapt during times of disruption, stress, and adversity, and is best understood as a dynamic process rather than a static outcome (Beck 2016; Brown and Kulig, 1996; Fletcher and Sarkar, 2013; Olsson et al., 2015; Pfefferbaum et al., 2005; Windle et al., 2011). Brown and Kulig (1996) further emphasize that resilience involves actively recovering from adverse events and proactively reshaping environments to mitigate future risks. This perspective moves beyond the simplistic notion of "bouncing back" to highlight the importance of intentional action in creating safer, adaptive communities (Norris et al., 2008).

Additionally, resilience prioritizes adaptability over rigid stability (Handmer and Dovers, 1996; Waller, 2001). What Buzzanell (2019) called “adaptive-transformational tensions”, for instance, illustrate this idea of flexibility, allowing for diverse responses to changing conditions (Brown and Kulig, 1996; Sonn and Fisher, 1998; Gunderson, 2000). Furthermore, resilience – whether to “specific” crisis or broad range of unforeseen or unpredictable shocks – refers to the capacity to adapt within limits following a shock, rather than returning to its exact pre-crisis state (Walker et al., 2004). Post-crisis recovery does not necessarily imply a return to the status quo, but an adaptation to a “new normal” or recalibrating to altered conditions while enabling institutions to maintain essential functions and identity (Walker and Salt, 2012; Cork, 2010). In sum, this adaptive process underscores resilience as dynamic evolution, not mere restoration.

Finally, it should be mentioned that resilience operates through dual dimensions: “reactive” and “anticipatory” (Buzzanell, 2019). Reactively, resilience processes navigate disruptive events as they occur. Anticipatorily, resilience reflects preparedness, shaped by proactive efforts to build adaptive capacities such as cultivating resources, strategies, and mindsets to enhance readiness for future challenges and before disruptions occur.

Accordingly, drawing on the extant literature - namely Buzzanell (2019) and Norris and colleagues (2008) - resilience is understood in this study as a process connecting adaptive capacities - dynamic resources shaped by communication and collaboration - to sustained positive functioning both in anticipation of and in response to crises or disruptions. At the heart of such a definition of resilience lies communication as a dynamic process that cultivates shared meaning, amplifies collective needs, and strengthens communal bonds, forming the bedrock of adaptive communities (Buzzanell, 2019; Ganor and Ben-Lavy, 2003; Norris et al., 2008; Pfefferbaum et al., 2005). Thus, resilience emerges not merely from material resources but from the stories crafted to reinterpret challenges and sustain cohesion. This process involves creating collaborative frameworks and inclusive spaces where individuals or institutions articulate concerns, values, and perspectives, fostering adaptability and collective agency (Goodman et al., 1998). Integral to this are narratives or stories that embed shared identity and purpose into collective experiences, reframing struggles and reinforcing connections (Norris et al., 2008; Rappaport, 1995; Sonn and Fisher, 1998). These narratives, rooted in place and identity, not only navigate and resist adversity but also forge resilience by transforming crises into opportunities for solidarity and renewal.

The communication theory of resilience offers a framework for understanding how to navigate crises through five interrelated communicative processes (Buzzanell, 2010, 2019). Central to this framework is “crafting normalcy” as referring to the effort to restore stability by maintaining existing routines or developing new, sustainable patterns that define a revised sense of normalcy or a sustainable “new normal.” The second

process, “affirming identity anchors,” involves grounding responses to disruptions in core identities, values, or roles (e.g., professional journalistic culture) to foster coherence and purpose. Third is “maintaining or rebuilding communication networks”, which emphasizes mobilizing both close connections (strong ties) and broader connections (weak ties) to secure practical or informational resources. The fourth process, “constructing alternative logic,” centers on reframing adversity through narratives or perspectives that reinterpret the significance of disruptive events, transforming their emotional or cognitive impact. Finally, “foregrounding productive action” entails balancing acknowledgment of distress with a focus on actionable steps that align with meaningful goals, channeling energy toward constructive outcomes amid uncertainty. Together, these processes highlight resilience as an active, communicative practice for adapting to and reshaping experiences of crisis.

Building on such a contextual foundation, this exploratory study seeks to address the following research question: What dimensions of communicative resilience has CDJor demonstrated throughout its existence in defending freedom of expression and journalism within shifting political landscapes in Brazil?

### 3. Methodology

This work relies on a mixed methods approach, encompassing a case study approach combined with semi-directive in-depth interviews and complemented by an inductive content analysis of the primary data collected during the interviewing process (Cancela, 2021; Gillham, 2005; Vears and Gillam, 2022; Yin, 2014).

As for the case study, the CDJor is a response to the weakening of traditional information ecosystems in a complex, dynamic society that systematically tests the resilience of its democracy.<sup>1</sup> It was founded in 2024, in the aftermath of the Covid 19 and after the successful monitoring of the violence during the 2022 presidential elections that represented a bigger radicalization of the extreme right in terms of hate speech and circulation of disinformation to distort reality, subvert political environment and cement social divisions (Ozawa et al. 2023). Indeed, a diverse array of Brazilian civil society collaborated with international partners to form other coalitions addressing disinformation, employing various approaches. These coalitions included policymakers, electoral courts, influencers, fact-checking agencies, politicians, social movements, researchers, journalists, online gamers, artists, NGOs, and community members. Such individuals and groups played a crucial role in fact-checking misleading content and promoting counter-disinformation efforts (Rubio and Monteiro, 2023). Alliances of this type play a crucial role in contexts of threat to democratic regimes, as was the case in Brazil during the government of Jair Bolsonaro when attacks on journalism and persecution of journalists were frequent (Marques, 2024; Novais 2024; Novais and Lind, 2024; Novais and Araújo, 2025; Ozawa et al., 2023; Sbaraini Fontes and Marques, 2023). Despite operating in a context heavily influenced by the disinfodemic (Novais, 2025; Possetti and Bontcheva, 2020a, 2020b), CDJor is not an alliance of fact-checkers or debunkers. However, it indirectly contributes to combating disinformation in Brazil by prioritizing the integrity of the information space. CDJor primarily focuses on addressing violence against journalists and news organizations, as well as ensuring the sustainability of journalism in the country. To achieve this, CDJor engages in dialogue with society and authorities, influences political discussions, monitors attacks and aggressions, and issues public statements regarding violations and concerning incidents.

Brazil, a nation of 214 million people, ranks as the world’s fifth-largest country by area and stands among the top ten global economies. It is a leading producer of food and animal protein, and is recognized for its exceptional biodiversity, vast water resources, and significant reserves of oil and minerals. Since becoming a

---

<sup>1</sup> More information available at < <https://emdefesadojornalismo.org.br/> > Accessed on April 4, 2025.

republic in 1889, Brazil has developed one of the most participatory democracies in the Western world, with more than 158 million registered voters. Although military dictatorships marked approximately one-fifth of its history (1937–1945 and 1964–1985), the country has enjoyed regular multiparty elections, peaceful transitions of power, and universal suffrage since 1989.

In the media domain, Brazil represents the largest news market in Latin America. Historically, media ownership has been highly concentrated, dominated by a few family-owned conglomerates with close ties to political and financial elites. While Brazilian journalism often meets high professional standards, the sector faces persistent threats, including economic pressure, judicial harassment, and physical violence. In recent years, attacks on journalists have become increasingly frequent, positioning Brazil as one of the most dangerous countries for the press in the region (Voces del Sur, 2024).

A broader context of everyday violence contributes to the normalization of aggression toward journalists. In 2024, more than 44,000 people died from intentional violent acts - a rate of 20.8 per 100,000 inhabitants, one of the highest in the world (Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública, 2025). Public security is the third most pressing concern for Brazilians, behind only the economy and health. Throughout the 20th century, censorship was the most documented form of violence against journalists (Medina, 2002; Kushnir, 2004; Mattos, 2005; Jorge, 2008; Nonatto, 2016). More recently, however, violence has taken on more complex and dynamic forms, influenced by political and digital transformations.

Scholars such as Gould and Blotta (2022) frame violence against journalists within the larger phenomenon of disinformation, linking it to what Galtung (1990) termed “cultural violence” - suggesting a structural feature of Brazilian society. Rios and Bronosky (2019) emphasize that such violence threatens not only individual journalists but the public’s right to information, which is essential to democratic governance. Lima and colleagues (2024) further highlight the psychological impact of these attacks, documenting how repeated threats and aggression impair journalists’ mental health and professional practice.

Impunity remains a critical issue. According to the Public Prosecutor’s Office, only 50% of the 64 journalist homicides committed between 1995 and 2018 were properly investigated and resolved (Freire, 2018). Violence manifests in varied contexts: in remote areas like the Amazon (Instituto Vladimir Herzog, 2024), through judicial harassment in courts (Abraji/UNESCO, 2024), in online environments (Sakamoto, 2016; Christofoletti, 2018, 2022a, 2022b; Lelo, 2021), and through targeted aggression toward specific groups such as women journalists (Novais and Araújo, 2025; Campos Mello, 2020; Silva et al., 2023; Iavorski et al., 2024).

The administration of Jair Bolsonaro (2019–2022) marked a particularly intense period of “state-sponsored violence” (Christofoletti and Oliveira, 2022). The president not only personally attacked journalists but also encouraged supporters and mobilized state resources to target critics. Ramos and Corrêa (2022) note that this wave of violence began during the 2018 electoral campaign and intensified throughout his term. These attacks - both physical and digital - were often perpetrated by ordinary citizens emboldened by Bolsonaro’s rhetoric (Nicoletti & Flores, 2022; Repórteres Sem Fronteiras, 2022).

Although Bolsonaro did not secure reelection, the hostile environment for journalists persists. Monitoring by the Brazilian Association of Investigative Journalism (Abraji) revealed that, although verbal attacks previously dominated, physical assaults, equipment destruction, and death threats became more common in early 2023 (Abraji, 2023). While reported cases decreased by 36.4% in 2024, over 40% of recorded incidents still involved serious physical and legal threats (Abraji, 2025). The National Federation of Journalists (Fenaj, 2025) corroborated these findings, noting a rise in gender-based violence and the return of censorship practices. The 2024 electoral cycle further exacerbated the situation, with 38.9% of attacks occurring between May and October. During just two months of that year, more than 57,000 attacks were documented on social media platforms including TikTok, Instagram, and X (Coalizão em Defesa do Jornalismo, 2024).

The coalition brings together eleven Brazilian and foreign organizations that defend the professional practice of journalism, freedom of expression, and the right to information. Its members are civic organizations that understand that an effective democratic regime depends on a free, active, autonomous, and vigilant press. They are organizations that believe that human rights must be respected and that journalism must be defended and preserved in the face of a scenario that threatens its existence. Moreover, it has members that are already consolidated entities – such as the Federação Nacional dos Jornalistas (Fenaj), created in 1946 – and newly created organizations, such as the Instituto Tornavoz, from 2022. With distinct but complementary profiles, the members of CDJor try to act in a cooperative, coordinated and articulated way around the defense of journalism and the information ecosystem, as seen in Table 1:

Table 1: Members of the Coalition in Defense of Journalism (CDJor)

| Organization   | Type  |
|--|---|
| Abraji – Associação Brasileira de Jornalismo Investigativo | Brazilian organization that defends the professional practice of journalists and promotes investigative journalism                            |
| Ajor – Associação de Jornalismo Digital                    | Brazilian Association of Online Media Outlets   |
| Artigo 19  | Brazilian chapter of Article 19, an international organization that defends the right to information and freedom of expression                |
| CPJ - Committee to Protect Journalists                     | Chapter for the Americas of the Committee to Protect Journalists, an international organization for the defense and protection of journalists |
| Fenaj – Federação Nacional dos Jornalistas                 | The federation, a professional association for journalists, is made up of 31 Brazilian unions   |
| Instituto Palavra Aberta                                   | Organization created by associations of communications companies to defend free speech and press freedom                                      |
| Instituto Tornavoz   | Association of lawyers for defense in legal proceedings that violate freedom of thought and free speech                                       |
| Instituto Vladimir Herzog                                  | Civil society organization for the defense of democracy, human rights, free speech and press freedom  |
| Intervozes   | Collective that defends the right to communication, democracy and human rights  |
| Jeduca – Associação de Jornalistas de Educação             | Association of journalists specializing in education that works to train professionals and improve coverage of the topic in the country       |
| RSF - Reporters Without Borders                            | Brazilian chapter of Reporters Sans Frontières, an international organization for the defense and protection of journalists                   |

Source: Authors with information from the organizations' websites<sup>2</sup>.

To describe the emergence, composition, aims, functioning and communicative resilience of CDJor, semi-directive in-depth interviews were conducted with representatives of all member organizations of the coalition to examine their storied experiences.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, eleven interviews were conducted in February 2025 via video calls (via RNP's ConferenciaWeb system<sup>4</sup>), instant messaging applications (WhatsApp), and email, totaling

<sup>2</sup> Article 19 < <https://artigo19.org/> >; Abraji < <https://www.abraji.org.br/> >; Ajor < <https://ajor.org.br/> >; CPJ < <https://cpj.org/pt> >; Fenaj < <https://fenaj.org.br/> >; Jeduca < <https://jeduca.org.br/> >; Intervozes < <https://intervozes.org.br/> >; Open Word Institute < <https://www.palavraaberta.org.br/> >; Reporters Without Borders < <https://rsf.org/pt-br> >; Tornavoz Institute < <https://tornavoz.org/> >; and Vladimir Herzog Institute < <https://vladimirherzog.org/> > Accessed on July 30, 2025.

<sup>3</sup> Female leadership - though not explored in this study - remains a distinctive and integral feature of the coalition's organizational ethos.

<sup>4</sup> RNP is the National Education and Research Network, a Brazilian public digital infrastructure maintained by several ministries to interconnect universities, research centers, funding agencies, educational institutions and technology hubs,

almost four hours of recordings. The audio and video files were transcribed automatically with the help of AI by Google PinPoint, and the material was later reviewed by humans. All interviewees formally agreed to participate in the data collection phase of this study after being informed of their rights as participants. The identities of the research participants were not kept confidential because they were not vulnerable individuals. All interviewees are leaders of organizations that defend journalists, and this transparency strengthens the system of protecting journalism by giving visibility to responsible social actors. The conditions of consent and authorization for the use of the data collected are part of the Free and Informed Consent Form, a document to which participants had access before the interviews.<sup>5</sup>

The fundamental methodological criterion for selecting potential respondents were: a) to hold decision-making and executive positions in their organizations; b) to be directly involved in CDJor's governance. All interviewees met these requirements, as shown in Table 2:

Table 2: Interviewed representatives of CDJor member organizations

| Organization   | Interviewees  |
|--|---|
| Abraji – Associação Brasileira de Jornalismo Investigativo | Katia Brembatti, President  |
| Ajor – Associação de Jornalismo Digital                    | Carla Egydio, Director of Institutional Relations   |
| Artigo 19  | Maria Tranjan, Coordinator of Protection and Democratic Participation                         |
| CPJ - Committee to Protect Journalists                     | Cristina Zahar, Coordinator for Latin America   |
| Fenaj – Federação Nacional dos Jornalistas                 | Samira de Castro, President   |
| Instituto Palavra Aberta                                   | Patricia Blanco, President  |
| Instituto Tornavoz   | Charlene Nagae, Executive Director  |
| Instituto Vladimir Herzog                                  | Dyego Pegorario, National Coordinator of the Journalists and Communicators Protection Network |
| Intervozes   | Ana Mielke, Executive Coordinator   |
| Jeduca – Associação de Jornalistas de Educação             | Camilla Salmazi, Executive Coordinator  |
| RSF - Reporters Without Borders                            | Bia Barbosa, advocacy coordinator in Latin America  |

Source: Authors based on participant information

Topics covered in the semi-directive in-depth interviews with representatives of the eleven CDJor member organizations included valuable insights of the storied experiences of key representatives and decision-makers from the institutions into the way they perceive complex internal dynamics of the alliance such as the lifecycle, collaborative partnerships, and governance models. Furthermore, the in-depth interviews also allowed to explore and shed light to how the communicative resilience are interwoven and occur in changing political contexts as well as to the challenges lying ahead from the perspective of participants.

Then a qualitative content inductive analysis and iterative coding was performed. Such a bottom-up process where codes are generated or surfaced directly from the interviews' narratives was further subject to iterative coding, that is repeated multiple times for cyclical cross-comparison and dynamic refinement or adjustment. Through this process - coding, comparing, grouping, and subdividing codes - the data was distilled into content categories and subcategories. Naturally, these categories often align closely with the research

providing virtual environments for learning, communication and scientific exchange. It was created in 1989 and was decisive for the implementation of the Internet in Brazil.

<sup>5</sup>Available at < <https://encurtador.com.br/LiYM5> >

questions guiding participant interactions, ensuring findings remain anchored to the study's objectives. All relevant material included in the study, namely excerpts considered to be significant and provided in the following results section, was then translated from the original language Portuguese to English by the authors.

## 4. Results

Employing a holistic qualitative methodology – that complements narrative interviews with inductive content analysis - the results of the study aim to shed light to the interconnected dimensions of CDJor's dynamics spanning from the coalition's evolution, collaborative alliances, and governance to its key

### *4.1 From Pre-Inception to Emergence: Navigating Crisis-Driven Resistance Amid Bolsonaro's Hostile and Unresponsive Regime*

What began as an effort to spotlight a likely surge in election-related violence against journalists evolved into a necessary alliance. The concern was far from exaggerated. The Bolsonaro government presented a “tough period for the media,” remembers Cristina Zahar (CPJ), who in her three-decade career had never witnessed such a hostile environment. “A dangerous line was crossed,” she notes, compelling press freedom organizations worldwide to collaborate more closely, exchanging information and strategizing on how to support the persecuted.

The data underscores this reality: Fenaj documented 1,442 attacks on journalists in four years, with 39% originating from the President, his allies, and his political sons (Fenaj 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023). Jair Bolsonaro's rhetoric created what Marques (2024) terms a “critical incident” for journalism, shattering traditional press-state relations. This institutionalization of violence, described by Fenaj's president Samira de Castro as “heavily influenced by the discourse of stigmatization,” manifested in refused press conferences, public humiliation of reporters, and the legal weaponization of institutions like the Federal Police and the since-abolished National Security Law. According to Maria Tranjan (Artigo 19), these communication setbacks and escalating authoritarianism had a paradoxical effect: they galvanized and intensified collaboration among the very organizations working to defend against them.

### *Crafting normalcy and affirming identity anchors*

During this embryonic period, the dimension of “crafting normalcy” within CDJor's communicative resilience became evident. Statements condemning violent attacks began to be co-signed by multiple press freedom organizations, reflecting a collective effort to anticipate and reconstruct a sense of normality amid disruption. Here, “normal” functions dually: as a fluid, adaptive process and as an aspirational endpoint infused with societal and journalistic values. Confronted with destabilized norms - a reality “turned upside down” - CDJor engaged in foundational communicative work, deliberately establishing new routines, expectations, and frameworks to replace eroding conventions. Through collaborative discourse and shared meaning-making, these warnings gained greater repercussion, visibility, and political strength.

Ana Mielke (Intervozes) highlights one of CDJor's clearest social impacts during this phase: reinforcing the idea that free journalism is a cornerstone of Brazilian democracy. “In a context where journalistic work is discredited by the rising far right and undermined by low wages, precarious conditions, and mass layoffs, defending journalism becomes a crucial task,” she notes. Dyego Pegorario (Instituto Vladimir Herzog) adds that CDJor has enhanced dialogue with state actors and elevated public debate around press freedom. “The

combination of expertise and prestige expands access and enriches the construction of debates and normative frameworks. There is still much to be done, but this articulation is undeniably an important advance for the communication field in Brazil.”

While several interviewees acknowledged the challenge of objectively measuring social impact, most agreed that CDJor has significantly strengthened and refined public discourse on journalism’s role in democratic efficacy. “We have managed to draw attention to serious violations of press freedom and to impunity in crimes against journalists,” says Cristina Zahar (CPJ). Bia Barbosa (RSF) emphasizes that the coalition’s public condemnations of attacks help shape critical public opinion. CDJor has also established agreements with public prosecutors in major Brazilian states to file complaints and monitor cases of rights violations.

Notably, Ana Mielke and Dyego Pegorario point to CDJor’s prominent role in seeking accountability for the 2022 murders of journalist Dom Phillips and indigenous activist Bruno Pereira in the Amazon. Even prior to its formalization, member organizations pressured the Brazilian government to accelerate investigations and punish both perpetrators and masterminds. “We also demanded the creation of the National Program for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, Journalists, and Environmentalists,” Mielke adds. As a result, Kátia Brembatti (Abraji) reflects: “What I notice is that journalists who receive our support are heartened to see so many organizations working together. Strengthened journalism is vital for societal health.” Samira de Castro (Fenaj) concludes, “Those invested in press freedom have seen the coalition help elevate these issues as fundamental rights, beyond mere professional interests.”

The impending October 2022 reelection bid of Jair Bolsonaro - which threatened another term of violence against journalists - prompted several organizations in May to begin discussing joint protective actions for the election period. What started as an email list soon evolved into a WhatsApp group named “Plantão Eleições” [Election Watch], conveying a sense of urgency, recalls Samira de Castro. Organizations with prior monitoring experience, such as RSF, naturally proposed systematizing the recording of attacks during this tense time, while others provided operational and informational support. The resulting report - produced by Abraji, Ajor, Jeduca, CPJ, RSF, Artigo 19, Instituto Tornavoz, Instituto Vladimir Herzog, Instituto Palavra Aberta, Intervezes, and Fenaj - was delivered to the federal government in February 2023 and served as the embryo of CDJor, explains Carla Egydio (Ajour).

Another pivotal event underscoring the need for coordinated action was the January 8, 2023, invasion of Brazil’s Congress, Supreme Court, and presidential offices by supporters of Bolsonaro protesting his electoral defeat. Mirroring the January 6, 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol, the events of January 8 provoked national outrage and international condemnation, leading to official investigations and a renewed sense of institutional vulnerability. Journalists were among those targeted, highlighting once again the urgent need for collective defense.

These events collectively “made it very clear that it made sense for us to continue working together,” affirms Bia Barbosa (RSF). Following the successful election monitoring effort, the organizations began meeting biweekly to share information and plan collective actions, recalls Kátia Brembatti (Abraji). Although the space remained primarily strategic, the evolution was organic, notes Samira de Castro (Fenaj). According to Maria Tranjan (Artigo 19), the formalization of the coalition was proposed during a January 2023 meeting in Brasília, where the group’s name, visual identity, and communication strategy were discussed. Through internal debate, CDJor’s objectives crystallized around three pillars: political advocacy, including dialogue with authorities; public defense of journalism via public statements; and monitoring of violence cases to produce reports and publications.

*Benefiting from the communication networks and coordinated strategic endeavor of a transnational alliance*

CDJor's transnational composition further strengthened the coalition's collective capacity to pursue shared objectives. Of its eleven members, three are chapters of global organizations - Reporters Without Borders, the Committee to Protect Journalists, and Article 19 - reflecting the coalition's alignment with international frameworks. Camilla Salmazi (Jeduca) values this global dimension, noting the extensive expertise these organizations contribute in protecting journalists and defending free expression. Carla Egydio (Ajour) adds that CDJor's structure enables comparative analysis between Brazil and other nations on issues like democracy, human rights, information integrity, media sustainability, and press freedom. "Impunity is not exclusive to Brazil," she explains. "It's crucial to learn from policies that work - which countries have successfully implemented UNESCO protocols? Where do they succeed or fail?"

Samira de Castro (Fenaj) highlights another advantage: international members often access diverse funding sources, enhancing the coalition's sustainability and capacity to implement actions. She also notes that global organizations maintain close ties with bodies like the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, helping elevate Brazil's press freedom challenges on the international stage. "Despite being a democracy, Brazil still struggles to fully guarantee freedom of the press and expression," Castro observes.

For Bia Barbosa (RSF), participating in CDJor is both strategic and natural. As advocacy director for Latin America, she monitors journalism across 20 countries and collaborates with local groups. Similarly, Cristina Zahar (CPJ) finds dual value in the coalition: staying informed of serious cases in Brazil and amplifying them globally, including by facilitating emergency support such as relocation for journalists under lethal threat.

No concerns were raised about the coalition being co-opted by foreign interests. Instead, CDJor's diversity enables multifaceted, complementary action: Fenaj represents media workers, Ajour focuses on digital journalism sustainability, Instituto Tornavoz provides legal defense, while Jeduca and Instituto Palavra Aberta work in media education. Intervezes and Instituto Vladimir Herzog emphasize the right to communication, whereas Artigo 19, RSF, and CPJ monitor international human rights systems, elevating local issues to global forums. Carla Egydio (Ajour) underscores that mutual trust among members has been essential to CDJor's effectiveness - fostering unity, synergy, and efficiency within a democratic and functional space. This trust is also why there are no current plans to expand: new members could disrupt this careful balance.

Operating as a network allows CDJor to leverage each organization's resources, reach, and governmental or international connections. Collective representation also enhances legitimacy in negotiations and public claims. "Working together generates more robust responses and avoids duplicated efforts," says Cristina Zahar (CPJ). A dedicated website and social media presence increase visibility, while a WhatsApp group streamlines urgent communication like drafting public statements. More complex decisions are made during biweekly meetings. Advocacy efforts include monitoring legislation, shaping public policy, tracking violence, and engaging with judges, lawmakers, and public prosecutors.

The international presence has not skewed internal dynamics. All organizations, irrespective of origin, participate equally through Brazilian representatives. Interviewees describe a horizontal governance structure based on consensus, without hierarchy. Meeting agendas are set collectively, and any member can introduce topics. While debate is open, actions require full consensus, as Carla Egydio (Ajour) emphasizes. CDJor has no central office, executive secretariat, or dedicated staff. Bureaucracy is minimal, limited to meeting minutes and formal referrals. This flexibility does not encourage informality, notes Maria Tranjan (Artigo 19); rather, the coalition draws organically on years of activist experience and existing structures within member

organizations. CDJor has no independent funding and operates through the donated time and labor of its members' teams, explains Bia Barbosa (RSF).

Although reactive resistance alone could not counter Bolsonaro's influence or fully reverse the decline in press-state relations, CDJor mobilized enough resources to mitigate the impact by fostering a sustainable information ecosystem and institutionalizing safer labor practices (Norris et al., 2008). In Brazil's sociopolitical context, CDJor represents a civic initiative that transcends sectoral interests, framing its mission not merely as defending journalistic rights, but as advancing the universal right to communication. While CDJor's early efforts helped stabilize journalistic practice, the recalibration of traditional power dynamics only became possible following decisive shifts in the political environment.

#### *4.2. A refined approach following formalization and under Lula da Silva*

CDJor was officially announced on May 5, 2024, during a meeting of the Social Communication Council of the Federal Senate. The date was deliberately chosen to coincide with World Press Freedom Day. By that time, CDJor had already shifted toward proactive institutional collaboration, prioritizing dialogue and pragmatic engagement within Brazil's revitalized democratic framework. This recalibration balances vigilance against persistent threats to free expression with efforts to leverage political access, advance media integrity, and rebuild public trust - transforming crisis-driven resistance into resilient, institutionally embedded advocacy.

The political context at the time of the interviews differed significantly from CDJor's origins. Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, elected with over 60.3 million votes, assumed the presidency promising prosperity, social peace, and institutional rebuilding. His administration restored dialogue with journalists and demonstrated concern for press freedom by establishing the Observatory of Violence against Journalists and Communicators - a stark contrast to the Bolsonaro era. We asked CDJor members whether a democratic government would undermine the coalition's agenda or alter its dynamics of resistance and resilience.

Patrícia Blanco (Instituto Palavra Aberta) anticipated reduced workload and improved government dialogue. Two years later, however, the assessment is that activity levels remain high, dialogue has improved, but tangible results are still disappointing. "Violence against journalists has decreased but remains a concern. Conversations at the Observatory have not progressed as we hoped," she noted, a sentiment echoed by other interviewees.

"The expectation was that the Lula government would turn a page, but unfortunately we've seen a rise in other forms of violence, such as judicial harassment and the abusive use of the justice system to silence journalists," stated Samira de Castro (Fenaj). Kátia Brembatti (Abraji) agrees that violence remains "worrying and at a high level." Data from Fenaj's 2024 annual report support this: while attacks decreased by 52% in 2023 compared to the previous year, they remained 34% higher than in 2018. Cristina Zahar (CPJ) adds that other challenges persist, including online attacks, stigmatizing discourse, threats, and the financial precarity of independent media, especially in news deserts.

Although problems endure, Bia Barbosa (RSF) notes that decision-makers are now at least aware of press freedom issues. This allows CDJor to propose public policies, discuss sector-wide initiatives, and demand regulatory measures. "The actions are very different under a democratic government, but just as necessary as in more authoritarian periods," she emphasizes. Ana Mielke (Intervezes) concurs: "Threats to democracy have not been overcome." She points to CDJor's election monitoring in 2024, which revealed frequent attacks on journalists in popular, alternative, and community media - a trend that compromises press freedom and freedom of expression.

Had Jair Bolsonaro been reelected, CDJor's actions would likely be more reactive than proactive, suggests Charlane Nagae (Instituto Tornavoz). "The dynamic would be different. We still respond to violence, but now

we also propose policies and engage in dialogue. Progress is slow, but I prefer the coalition to exist proactively in a democracy.” Nagae attributes limited advances to a lack of public funding and insufficient government infrastructure for communication issues: “After the first half of the term, this is still not a government priority.”

All interviewees rejected the idea that the coalition would become irrelevant in a democratic context. Dyego Pegorario (Instituto Vladimir Herzog) highlights the composition of the governing alliance: a strong parliamentary opposition and a broad party coalition hinder decisive action in some areas. According to Pegorario, Bolsonaro’s legacy of discrediting institutions, including the press, and weakening state structures requires ongoing rebuilding efforts. “It is not true that a democratic government undermines CDJor’s work. Now is the time to expand the agenda with the government.” If CDJor resisted persecution under Bolsonaro, under Lula it is pursuing resilience by adapting to a more open and dialogic context.

### *Prioritizing proactive collaboration and restoration of trust though not without challenges*

Kátia Brebatti (Abraji) highlights a key achievement of the Coalition in Defense of Journalism (CDJor): its systematic monitoring of online attacks against journalists during Brazil’s 2024 municipal elections. Public reports on the coalition’s website documented incidents, categorized attack types, and analyzed trends. Bia Barbosa (Reporters Without Borders/RSF) underscores the broader significance of this work, noting that such monitoring not only raises public awareness but also tracks democratic progress or regression. “Data-driven evidence, rather than mere perceptions, strengthens political advocacy with concrete foundations,” she adds. Carla Egydio (Ajour) emphasizes CDJor’s unique authority in debates on communication and democracy, attributing this to its diverse coalition: “Our specialized member organizations provide technical expertise to develop context-specific security protocols.”

These discussions find a platform in the Observatory of Violence Against Journalists and Communicators, established by Brazil’s Ministry of Justice in February 2023. CDJor played a pivotal role in the observatory’s creation, as detailed by Samira de Castro (National Federation of Journalists/Fenaj). Following the January 8, 2023, attacks on democratic institutions, Fenaj and Abraji collaborated to document real-time violence against journalists, geolocate incidents, and compile recommendations for enhanced protections. Their report, delivered to President Lula’s administration, directly informed the observatory’s launch. “The justice minister reviewed our findings thoroughly and swiftly acted to establish the observatory,” Castro explains, linking CDJor’s advocacy to tangible institutional reform.

The Observatory operates as an advisory body under Brazil’s National Secretariat of Justice, tasked with documenting attacks on journalists, monitoring legal cases, expediting investigations, compiling data, and proposing protective policies. Composed of representatives from government ministries and civil society organizations focused on press freedom, its members are appointed through government decrees to coordinate strategies addressing surges in violence. Despite being hailed as a landmark achievement of the CDJor coalition, member organizations reported frustration with the Observatory’s sluggish progress in its first two years. Bureaucratic inefficiencies, procedural delays, and frequent leadership turnover within the Ministry of Justice are cited as key factors undermining the body’s effectiveness, limiting its ability to deliver timely protections for journalists.

Charlene Nagae (Instituto Tornavoz) highlights CDJor’s legal contributions: advancing the definition of “judicial harassment” - a tactic that stifles journalism through intimidation and legal paralysis - and influential advocacy work with the country’s main courts in shaping key judicial decisions. Notably, the coalition influenced a landmark Supreme Court ruling on media liability, successfully advocating against strict liability standards that risked press freedom, self-censorship, and punitive damages. The court’s balanced verdict aligned with democratic principles, a win CDJor celebrated.

As a newly formed initiative, the members of CDJor recognize that they will face medium- to long-term challenges in sustaining and strengthening the coalition. Interviews highlighted several operational and structural obstacles that are inherently time-intensive and necessitate collaboration with external stakeholders. Key tasks involve improving internal procedures to make the coalition more functional, proactive, and less reactive. Interviewees frequently mentioned the coalition's brief existence as a barrier to gaining broader recognition and public visibility. Despite ongoing efforts to raise awareness, CDJor remains relatively unknown, even among journalists.

Kátia Brebatti (Abraji) emphasized the need for CDJor to enhance its public visibility and gain recognition from government decision-makers, parliamentarians, and the judiciary. Dyego Pegorario (Instituto Vladimir Herzog) summarized that the coalition must establish itself as a respected and significant brand. Carla Egydio (Ajour) stressed the importance of leveraging accumulated experience to act more decisively in the upcoming 2026 elections. She, along with Ana Mielke (Intervozes), expressed concerns about the potential return of the extreme right to power, which could lead to renewed violence, persecution, and threats to democracy. Camilla Salmazi (Jeduca) and Maria Tranjan (Artigo 19) pointed out a critical challenge: CDJor's achievements need to be transformed into public policies or definitive frameworks that can endure changes in government and provide robust legal and institutional structures.

Additional complex challenges are also on the horizon. Cristina Zahar (CPJ) highlighted the necessity of restoring Brazilian society's trust in journalism. She posed questions such as, "How can we demonstrate that freedom of the press is not just for journalists and the media, but for everyone? How can we make it clear that, without democracy, there is no freedom of the press?" According to Samira de Castro (Fenaj), this debate must be embraced by society to understand that the right to information is at risk when journalists face persecution, censorship, and prosecution. Charlene Nague (Instituto Tornavoz) defined the establishment of clearer technical parameters in the courts as urgent. This would make judgments on cases involving freedom of the press and freedom of expression more predictable and less subject to the idiosyncrasies of judges. Bia Barbosa (RSF) underscored that case law needs to reflect Brazilian reality and should not be influenced by partisan motivations. She noted, "Historically, Brazil is a country that is very violent towards journalists. Between 2010 and 2020, at least 30 journalists were murdered because of their work. Combating this violence is a historic challenge." She also highlighted structural problems that CDJor needs to address, such as media monopolies and the fragile financial sustainability of local media outlets.

## 5. Conclusion

In essence, the study addresses the exploratory question of what elements of communicative resilience did CDJor exhibit in safeguarding freedom of expression and journalistic integrity across Brazil's evolving political contexts. By tracing this trajectory, the research illuminates how movements navigate short lifecycles, balancing adversarial resolve with institutional integration to sustain advocacy in volatile democratic contexts. Studying an arrangement of organizations like CDJor is an opportunity to revisit relevant aspects of the civic struggle for healthier, better-informed, and more functional societies. The CDJor is not a response whose main objective is to combat disinformation, but its work includes defending the integrity of the information space by strengthening journalism.

The in-depth narrative interviews revealed CDJor's role as a civic force advocating for press freedom and expression, while also exposing its challenges: low public visibility and operational constraints. Though Brazilian society has yet to widely recognize the coalition as a critical defender of information rights, it has gained traction among policymakers, legislators, and judicial figures open to dialogue. CDJor aspires to evolve

beyond reactive advocacy into a proactive, indispensable actor in shaping communication policy. However, its current influence still leans heavily on the credibility of its member organizations rather than its own institutional recognition.

While the coalition's diverse membership sparks occasional disagreements, interviewees frame this diversity as complementarity - enhancing its effectiveness through varied expertise. Horizontal governance and collective engagement have navigated these tensions, maintaining functional cohesion despite complexities. It represents a coordinated strategic effort to counteract an eventual institutional decline. CDJor's work addresses systemic threats - disinformation, financial instability, and violence against journalists - positioning it as a potential long-term safeguard for press freedom. Its coordinated efforts mark a historic milestone in Brazil: Whatever the outcome of CDJor in terms of its resilience or persistence and legitimacy over time, since the 1808 launch of *Correio Braziliense*, no initiative has unified such broad, cohesive advocacy to protect journalism and information as a public good.

In concluding this study, we also recognize its limitations. The research was conducted at the beginning of the coalition's trajectory, barely three years after its first actions. CDJor is an object of analysis directly linked to the Brazilian context and, therefore, influenced by its unique circumstances. This research focused only on the testimonies of representatives of all members, leaving aside documents produced by the coalition and other materials.

Despite its constraints, this work advances communicative resilience theory by addressing a critical gap: how civic coalitions defending journalism - prime targets of disinformation disorders - enact adaptive resistance in democratic crises. Analyzing Brazil's CDJor coalition within asymmetric Global South conditions (institutional erosion, violent press delegitimization), it reveals resilience as a cyclical resistance-adaptation dynamic. CDJor pivots contextually: from resistance (countering Bolsonaro's weaponized disinformation) to adaptation (forging dialogue under Lula's precarious pluralism). This fluidity redefines resilience as both discursive (cultivating journalism's democratic narrative) and structural (cross-sectoral vigilance networks). Critically, CDJor's dual imperative - vigilance vs. legitimization - exposes how civic alliances balance moral authority with pragmatism in volatile democracies. Yet adaptability risks institutional co-option if dialogue weakens accountability. By operationalizing an innovative working definition of communicative resilience, the study reframes collective action theory around contextual fluidity, arguing coalitions must function as ecosystems of adaptability to shield free expression amid political paradoxes and democratic flux - a vital framework for Global South democracies under siege.

## Funding

The work of the first author was funded by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) through the Centre for Philosophical and Humanistic Studies (CEFH), under project no. UIDB/00683/2020 and grant no. 2020.03101.CEECIND/CP1628/CT0001 (doi: 10.54499/2020.03101.CEECIND/CP1628/CT0001), while the second author acknowledges support from the project "Induction of Systems of Journalistic Deontological Self-Regulation in Afro-Ibero-American Spaces," funded by the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq, Brazil).

## References

Abraji, 2025. Monitoramento de ataques a jornalistas no Brasil – Relatório 2024. Brasília: Abraji.

- Afifi, W.A. and Cornejo, M., 2020. # CommSoWEIRD: The question of sample representativeness in interpersonal communication research. In M. L. Doerfel & J. L. Gibbs (Eds.), *Organizing inclusion* (pp. 238–259). Routledge.
- Amenta, E., 2014. How to analyze the influence of movements. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*, 43(1), pp. 16–29.
- Armitage, R. and Vaccari, C., 2021. Misinformation and disinformation. In Tumber, H., & Waisbord, S. R. (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to media disinformation and populism* (pp. 38-48). Routledge.
- Balčytienė, A. and Horowitz, M.A., 2024. Public Service Media and National Resilience in the Age of Information Disorders: A Two-Dimensional Conceptualization for Policy-Making. In *Media Influence on Opinion Change and Democracy: How Private, Public and Social Media Organizations Shape Public Opinion* (pp. 99-116). Cham: Springer.
- Beck, G.A., 2016. Surviving involuntary unemployment together: The role of resilience-promoting communication in familial and committed relationships. *Journal of Family Communication*, 16(4), pp.369-385.
- Blumer, H., 1995. Social movements. In H. Blumer (Ed.), *Social movements: Critiques, concepts, case-studies* (pp. 60-83). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Broda, E. and Strömbäck, J., 2024. Misinformation, disinformation, and fake news: lessons from an interdisciplinary, systematic literature review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 48(2), pp.139-166.
- Brown, D. and Kulig, J. (1996) 'The Concept of Resiliency: Theoretical Lessons From Community Research', *Health and Canadian Society*, 4, pp. 29–52
- Buzzanell, P.M. 2019. Communication theory of resilience in everyday talk, interactions, and network structures. In Steven. R. Wilson and Sandi. W. Smith (Eds), *Reflections on Interpersonal Communication Research* (pp. 65–88). San Diego: Cognella.
- Buzzanell, P.M., 2010. Resilience: Talking, resisting, and imagining new normalcies into being. *Journal of Communication*, 60(1), pp.1-14.
- Campos Mello, P., 2020. *A Máquina do Ódio. Notas de uma repórter sobre fake News e violência digital*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Cancela, P., 2021. Between structures and identities: Newsroom policies, division of labor and journalists' commitment to investigative reporting. *Journalism Practice*, 15(9), pp.1361-1382.
- Castells, M., 2012. *Networks of Outrage and Hope. Social Movements in the Internet age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Chakravarty, P., Kuo, R., Grubbs, V. and McIlwain, C., 2018. # communicationsowhite. *Journal of Communication*, 68(2), pp.254-266.
- Christiansen, J., 2009. Four stages of social movements. *Theories of Social Movements*, pp.14-24..
- Christofoletti, R. and de Oliveira, J.S., 2022a. Violencia de Estado contra periodistas: cómo el gobierno de Bolsonaro ataca el periodismo en Brasil. In Paredes-Otero, G.; López-Redondo, I. (Org.) *Cultura audiovisual, periodismo y política: nuevos discursos y narrativas en la sociedad digital* (pp. 551-574). Dykinson.
- Christofoletti, R. 2022b. Como a violência contra jornalistas atinge você. In, Christofoletti, R; Lima, S.P.; Braga, M.J.. (Org.) *Ataques ao Jornalismo e ao seu Direito à Informação* (pp. 22-3). Florianópolis: UFSC.
- Christofoletti, R., 2022. O presidente e a pandemia: respostas imunológicas e deontológicas do jornalismo Brasileiro. *Comunicação e resistência: práticas de liberdade para a cidadania* (pp.59-72). São Paulo: Intercom.
- Coalizão em Defesa do Jornalismo (CDJOR), 2024. *Monitoramento de ataques contra a imprensa – Eleições 2024*. Brasília: CDJor.
- Cork, S. 2010. Introduction and synthesis of key themes. In S. Cork (Ed.), *Resilience and transformation: Preparing Australia for uncertain times*: 3–4. Collingwood, VIC: CSIRO Publishing.
- Della Porta, D. and M. Diani (2006) *Social movements: an introduction*, Oxford MA: Blackwell.
- Fenaj, 2020. *Violência contra jornalistas e liberdade de imprensa no Brasil: relatório 2019*. Brasília: Fenaj. Retrieved April 5, 2025 <[https://fenaj.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/relatorio\\_fenaj\\_2019.pdf](https://fenaj.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/relatorio_fenaj_2019.pdf)>

- Fenaj, 2021. Violência contra jornalistas e liberdade de imprensa no Brasil: relatório 2020. Brasília: Fenaj. Retrieved April 5, 2025 <[https://fenaj.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/relatorio\\_fenaj\\_2020.pdf](https://fenaj.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/relatorio_fenaj_2020.pdf)>
- Fenaj, 2022. Violência contra jornalistas e liberdade de imprensa no Brasil: relatório 2021. Brasília: Fenaj. Retrieved April 5, 2025 <<https://fenaj.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/FENAJ-Relatório-da-Violência-Contra-Jornalistas-e-Liberdade-de-Imprensa-2021-v2.pdf>>
- Fenaj, 2023. Violência contra jornalistas e liberdade de imprensa no Brasil: relatório 2022. Brasília: Fenaj. Retrieved April 5, 2025 <<https://fenaj.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/FENAJ-Relatório-2022.pdf>>
- Fenaj, 2024. Violência contra jornalistas e liberdade de imprensa no Brasil: relatório 2023. Brasília: Fenaj. Retrieved April 5, 2025 <<https://fenaj.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Relatório-da-Violência-2023.pdf>>
- Fenaj, 2025. *Violência contra jornalistas e liberdade de imprensa no Brasil – Relatório 2024*. Brasília: Fenaj. Retrieved July 30, 2025 <<https://fenaj.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Relatorio-da-Violencia-2024.pdf>>
- Fletcher, D. and Sarkar, M., 2013. Psychological resilience: a review and critique of definitions, concepts, and theory. *Eur Psychol*, 18: 12–23.
- Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública, 2025. *Anuário Brasileiro de Segurança Pública*. São Paulo: FBSP.
- Fowler-Watt, K., McDougall, J. and Murphy, J., 2024. The hidden threat: Journalism and resilience in the age of 'information disorder'. In Lisa Bradley and Emma Heywood (Eds) *Journalism and Resilience in the Age of 'Information Disorder* (pp 79-88), Peter Lang.
- Freire, L.N.M., 2018. Relatório: *Violência contra comunicadores no Brasil – um retrato da apuração dos últimos 20 anos*. Brasília: CNMP/ENASP.
- Ganor M, Ben-Lavy Y. , 2003. Community resilience: Lessons derived from Gilo under fire. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*.;79(2/3):105-8.
- Gillham, B., 2005. *Research interviewing: The range of techniques*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Goodman, R.M., Speers, M.A., McLeroy, K., Fawcett, S., Kegler, M., Parker, E., Smith, S.R., Sterling, T.D. and Wallerstein, N., 1998. Identifying and defining the dimensions of community capacity to provide a basis for measurement. *Health education & behavior*, 25(3), pp.258-278.
- Gould, L.; Blotta, V.S.L., 2022. Desinformação e violência contra jornalistas como violências contra a comunicação: análise de casos entre 2021 e 2022 em São Paulo e no Brasil. *Rumores*, 32(16):17-38
- Guedes-Neto, J.V. and Peters, B.G., 2021. Working, shirking, and sabotage in times of democratic backsliding: An experimental study in Brazil. In M. W. Bauer, B. G. Peters, J. Pierre, K. Yesilkagit, & S. Becker (Eds.), *Democratic backsliding and public administration* (pp. 221–245). Cambridge University Press.
- Hameleers, M. and Minihold, S., 2022. Constructing discourses on (un) truthfulness: Attributions of reality, misinformation, and disinformation by politicians in a comparative social media setting. *Communication Research*, 49(8), pp.1176-1199.
- Handmer, J.W. and Dovers, S.R., 1996. A typology of resilience: rethinking institutions for sustainable development. *Industrial & Environmental Crisis Quarterly*, 9(4), pp.482-511.
- Iavorski, C.; Woitovicz, K.J.; Rocha, P.M.; Pontes, F.S., 2024. Mulheres jornalistas sob ataques: violências de gênero e riscos na cobertura política brasileira durante o Governo Bolsonaro. *Estudos em Jornalismo e Mídia*, Vol.21, nº 1, pp.147-159
- Instituto Vladimir Herzog, 2024. *Fronteiras da Informação: relatório sobre jornalismo e violência na Amazônia*. São Paulo, IVH.
- Juris, J.S., 2008. Performing politics: Image, embodiment, and affective solidarity during anti-corporate globalization protests. *Ethnography*, 9(1), pp.61-97.
- Kaltwasser, C.R. and Taggart, P., 2016. Dealing with populists in government: A framework for analysis. *Democratization*, 23(2), pp.201-220.
- Kermer, J.E. and Nijmeijer, R.A., 2020. Identity and European public spheres in the context of social media and information disorder. *Media and communication*, 8(4), pp.28-39.

- Kuang, K., Wilson, S.R., Tian, Z. and Buzzanell, P.M., 2022. Development and validation of a culturally adapted measure of communication resilience processes for Chinese contexts. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 91, pp.70-87.
- Lelo, T. V., 2021. A naturalização do assédio moral no jornalismo digital. *Media & Jornalismo*, 21(38), pp.207-221.
- Lima, L.C.; Cunha, R.C.; Barbosa, B.S., 2024. Jornalistas vítimas de violência: estudo das circunstâncias e repercussões subjetivas. *Cadernos de Psicologia Social do Trabalho*, 27, pp.1-15.
- Marques, F.P.J., 2024. Populism and critical incidents in journalism: has Bolsonaro disrupted the mainstream press in Brazil?. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 29(4), pp.825-846.
- McNair, B., 2024. The global public sphere: Fourth estate or new world information disorder?. In . In M. L. Lacy & P. Wilkin (Eds.), *Global politics in the information age* (pp. 171-185). Manchester University Press.
- Medina, C. As múltiplas faces da censura. In: Carneiro, M.L.T. (org.) *Minorias silenciadas: história da censura no Brasil*. São Paulo: Edusp/ Imprensa Oficial do Estado, pp. 421-434.
- Mercea, D., 2013. Probing the implications of Facebook use for the organizational form of social movement organizations. *Information, communication & society*, 16(8), pp.1306-1327.
- Meyer, D.S. and Tarrow, S. eds., 2018. *The resistance: The dawn of the anti-Trump opposition movement*. Oxford University Press.
- Monsees, L., 2023. Information disorder, fake news and the future of democracy. *Globalizations*, 20(1), pp.153-168.
- Nicoletti, J.; Flores, A.M.M., 2022. Violence Against Journalists on Jair Bolsonaro's Youtube Channel: analysis of the rest 100 days of the Covid-19 pandemic in Brazil. *Brazilian Journalism Research*, 18 (1), pp.4-35.
- Nonato, C., 2016. Liberdade de expressão e seus limites: agressões, ameaças e mortes como forma de censura a jornalistas. In: Costa, C. (org.) *Comunicação e Liberdade de Expressão: Atualidades*. São Paulo: ECA-USP, pp. 186-199.
- Novais, R.A. and Araújo, V., 2022. Tensioned Civility. *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, 78(4), pp.1533-1560.
- Novais, R.A. and Araújo, V., 2025. Targeted for being women and reporting on the presidency: gendered-based violence against female journalists by populists in office. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 34(7), pp.1008-1022.
- Novais, R.A. and Lind, A.G., 2024. Liquid populism applied to anti-media hostility: Bauman's strangeness versus Bolsonaro's enemy construction of the press'. *International Journal of Applied Philosophy*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 39-55.
- Novais, R.A., 2023. Organizing with self-organization?: The ramifications of the strategic use of facebook in informal civic activism. In *International Management Association (Eds.), Research Anthology on Social Media's Influence on Government, Politics, and Social Movements* (pp. 75-97). IGI Global.
- Novais, R.A. 2024, Divide et Impera? Populist digital anti-media criticisms. in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Communication and Applied Technologies 2023 (ICOMTA 2023)*. Atlantis Highlights in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities (pp. 322-331). Atlantis Press.
- Novais, R.A., 2025. Journalistic resistance against populist othering of the press in the age of polarization and disinfodemic. In *The Palgrave Handbook on Right-Wing Populism and Otherness in Global Perspective* (pp. 203-225). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Norris, F.H., Stevens, S.P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K.F. and Pfefferbaum, R.L., 2008. Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American journal of community psychology*, 41, pp.127-150.
- Ognyanova, K., Lazer, D., Robertson, R.E. and Wilson, C., 2020. Misinformation in action: Fake news exposure is linked to lower trust in media, higher trust in government when your side is in power. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*.
- Ognyanova, K., Lazer, D., Robertson, R.E. and Wilson, C., 2020. Misinformation in action: Fake news exposure is linked to lower trust in media, higher trust in government when your side is in power. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*.

- Olsson, L., Jerneck, A., Thoren, H., Persson, J. and O'Byrne, D., 2015. Why resilience is unappealing to social science: Theoretical and empirical investigations of the scientific use of resilience. *Science advances*, 1(4), p.e1400217.
- Ozawa, J.V., Lukito, J., Lee, T., Varma, A. and Alves, R., 2024. Attacks against journalists in Brazil: Catalyzing effects and resilience during Jair Bolsonaro's government. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 29(4), pp.847-868.
- Paar-Jakli, G., 2024. The Digital Agora Fights Back: Building Disinformation Resilience One Initiative at a Time. *Studies in Media and Communication*, 12(3), pp.335-348.
- Peißker, A., Cowburn, M. and Klinger, U., 2025. Disinformation Resilience in Backsliding Democracies: Media Trust, Civil Society, and Institutional Capture.
- Perreault, G.P., 2024. Mitigating Hostility in Digital Journalism: Digital Hostility as Ossifier of Field Boundaries. *Digital Journalism*, pp.1-20.
- Pfefferbaum, B.J., Reissman, D.B., Pfefferbaum, R.L., Klomp, R.W. and Gurwitch, R.H., 2007. Building resilience to mass trauma events. *Handbook of injury and violence prevention*, pp.347-358.
- Posetti, J. and Bontcheva, K., 2020a. Disinfodemic. *Deciphering Covid-19 disinformation, Policy brief, 1*. Retrieved March 29, 2025 (<file:///C:/Users/roger/OneDrive/Ambiente%20de%20Trabalho/374416eng.pdf>>).
- Posetti, J. and Bontcheva, K., 2020b. Disinfodemic: Dissecting responses to COVID-19 disinformation. Policy Brief 2. Unesco. Retrieved March 29, 2025 (<file:///C:/Users/roger/OneDrive/Ambiente%20de%20Trabalho/374417eng.pdf>>).
- Ramos, D.O.; Correa, E.N.S., 2022. Jornalistas, assédios e violências nos ambientes digital e físico: o cenário brasileiro. *Estudos em Jornalismo e Mídia*, 19 (2), pp.37-47.
- Rappaport, J., 1995. Empowerment meets narrative: Listening to stories and creating settings. *American Journal of community psychology*, 23, pp.795-807.
- Rubio, R. and Monteiro, V.D.A., 2023. Preserving trust in democracy: The Brazilian Superior Electoral Court's quest to tackle disinformation in elections. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 30(3), pp.497-520.
- Sbaraini Fontes, G. and Marques, F.P.J., 2023. Defending democracy or amplifying populism? Journalistic coverage, Twitter, and users' engagement in Bolsonaro's Brazil. *Journalism*, 24(8), pp.1634-1656.
- Shirky, C., 2008. *Here comes everybody: The power of organizing without organizations*. Penguin.
- Silva, G. B., Fontes, G. S., Marques, F. P. J., 2023. Risks and Resilience in the Case of Brazilian Female Journalists: How Women Perceive Violence Against Media Professionals and Cope with its Effects. *Journalism Studies*, 24(7), pp. 956-975.
- Sonn, C.C. and Fisher, A.T., 1998. Sense of community: Community resilient responses to oppression and change. *Journal of community psychology*, 26(5), pp.457-472.
- Vears, D.F. and Gillam, L., 2022. Inductive content analysis: A guide for beginning qualitative researchers. *Focus on Health Professional Education: A Multi-Professional Journal*, 23(1), pp.111-127.
- Voces del Sur, 2024. A imprensa latino-americana sob ataque: violência, impunidade e exílio. *Relatório sombra sobre a liberdade de imprensa na América Latina - 2023*.
- Waisbord, S. 2020a. "Mob Censorship: Online Harassment of US Journalists in Times of Digital Hate and Populism." *Digital Journalism* 8 (8): 1030–1046
- Walker, B. and Salt, D., 2012. *Resilience thinking: sustaining ecosystems and people in a changing world*. Island press.
- Walker, B., Holling, C.S., Carpenter, S.R. and Kinzig, A., 2004. Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. *Ecology and society*, 9(2).
- Waller, M.A., 2001. Resilience in ecosystemic context: Evolution of the concept. *American Journal of orthopsychiatry*, 71(3), pp.290-297.
- Wardle, C. and Derakhshan, H., 2017. *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking* (Vol. 27, pp. 1-107). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- Wardle, C. and Derakhshan, H., 2018. Thinking about ‘information disorder’: formats of misinformation, disinformation, and mal-information. *Journalism, ‘fake news’ & disinformation*, pp.43-54.
- Westlund, O., Belair-Gagnon, V., Graves, L., Larsen, R. and Steensen, S., 2024. What is the problem with misinformation? Fact-checking as a sociotechnical and problem-solving practice. *Journalism Studies*, 25(8), pp.898-918.
- Windle, G., Bennett, K.M. and Noyes, J., 2011. A methodological review of resilience measurement scales. *Health and quality of life outcomes*, 9, pp.1-18.
- Yin, R. K., 2014. *Case study research: Design and methods*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

### **Authors’ Information:**

**Rui Alexandre Novais** (PhD, University of Kent) is a Researcher and Invited Auxiliary Professor at Universidade Católica Portuguesa, affiliated with the CEFH. His research focuses on journalism safety, gender-based violence against women journalists, journalistic roles, and media–populism relations. He has recently published in leading journals and co-edited *Representations of Refugees, Migrants, and Displaced People as the ‘Other’* (Springer) and the *Palgrave Handbook on Populism and Otherness*. He leads *Mapping Risk and Uncertainty for Journalism in Lusophone Countries* and coordinates WJS and JRP in Portugal.

**Rogério Christofolletti** (PhD, University of São Paulo) is a Professor at the Federal University of Santa Catarina and a Researcher at Brazil’s National Council for Scientific and Technological Development. Author and editor of 20 books and more than 160 publications, he studies communication ethics, media technologies, disinformation, and structural crises in journalism. He is a member of the International Center for Information Ethics and the Red Iberoamericana de Investigación en Integridad Académica.