Places of critique in the media culture[1]

Lugares da crítica na cultura midiática

Rosana de Lima Soares[2]
Gislene da Silva[3]

Abstract *Since the establishment of the place of critique as a theoretical field, from the emergence of different cultural circuits of artistic productions, much is discussed about who should and/or could make critique, judgments and evaluations, purposes and, in particular, on making the audience's opinion. In the specific case of the incipient field of media criticism research, such issues are also presented, especially for the same pendulum movement historically observed in other instances of cultural production assessment, the one among comprehensive theories and particular analysis. In the larger perspective of the study of theoretical, methodological and technical productions for a cultural critique of the media, this article aims to discuss the perception of criteria and the values specific to the media criticism, the social interaction between the critic and the audience, and the critique theories, always considering, in the wide variety of media empirical objects, the less distant sharing among producers and recipients.*

Keywords: *Media criticism; Discursive practices; Audiovisual culture; Journalistic production*

Resumo *Desde a constituição do lugar da crítica como campo teórico, a partir do surgimento de diversos circuitos culturais de produções artísticas, discute-se muito sobre quem deve e/ou pode fazer a crítica, juízos e valores, finalidades e,*

[2] Universidade de São Paulo – USP, São Paulo, SP, Brasil.
E-mail: rosanasoares@gmail.com
[3] Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina – UFSC, Florianópolis, SC. Brazil.
E-mail: gislenedasilva@gmail.com

mais especialmente, sobre formação de público. No caso específico do incipiente campo de pesquisa da crítica de mídia, tais questões também nos são postas, com destaque para o mesmo movimento pendular historicamente observado em outras instâncias de apreciação de produção cultural, aquele entre teorias abrangentes e análises particulares. Na perspectiva maior do estudo de aportes teóricos, metodológicos e técnicos para uma crítica cultural da mídia, este artigo tem como objetivo discutir a percepção de critérios e valores próprios da crítica de mídia, a interação social entre crítico e públicos, e as teorias da crítica, sempre considerando na grande diversidade de objetos empíricos midiáticos o compartilhamento menos afastado entre produtores e receptores.

Palavras-chave: *Crítica de mídia; Práticas discursivas; Cultura audiovisual; Produção jornalística*

ARTICLE

Since the establishment of the *place of critique* as a theoretical field, from the emergence of different cultural circuits of artistic productions, much is discussed about who should and/or could make critique, judgments and evaluations, purposes and, in particular, on making the audience's opinion. In the specific case of the incipient field of media criticism research, such issues are also presented. In the larger perspective of the study of theoretical and technical productions for a cultural critique of the media, this article aims to discuss the perception of criteria and the parameters specific to the media criticism, the social interaction between the critic and the audience, and the critique theories, always considering, in the wide variety of media empirical objects, the less distant sharing among producers and recipients.

The problem that we bring to reflection is configured as part of a larger project linked to the Grupo de Pesquisa *Crítica de Mídia e Práticas Culturais* (Research Group for Media Criticism and Cultural Practices) (a USP/UFSC inter-institutional group), created for the investigation of media criticism modalities, under the inspiration of how the film and literature critique, more consolidated, was constituted. Therefore, what we are interested in are both the critique circulating in the media itself as the academic critique addressed to the media products and processes – both interpretations supported in studies of media criticism and media culture. Of large empirical scope, the range of our research predominantly notes the audiovisual production and the journalistic production, targeting television, cinematography or online digital speeches and also the understanding of journalism as a culture product and producer, and the understanding of news practices as a cultural experience.

In addition to dealing with great variety and volume of empirical objects, this research task is also long-term, with a vocation for many ramifications, especially when one considers, in the case of postgraduate research, the diffuse interest in critically analyzing the media and the number of master and doctoral students involved with the problem. In this complex scenario, there is also a research gap on what kind of media criticism is placed in countless theses and dissertations completed, and

which theories implicitly or explicitly guide this critique. It is in this frame full of gaps and perspectives that we, researchers of the group, chose as a great purpose to treat the media criticism as a specific field of research and teaching, studying Brazilian experiences in dialogue with international research.

In the combination of these possibilities and demands, we think we can study the media criticism in different levels or modes:

A. in the perception of parameters of the "how to criticize," observing the operationalization of the critique work and, when in the field of journalism, with attention to ethical and aesthetic implications of the coverage of events reported;

B. in the study of the media criticism circulating by the media itself, made by those recognized as critics, meaning that they have knowledge that the audience does not master;

C. in the media criticism as a text genre practiced by experts from certain conventions recognized by the audience, allowing its circulation to people in spaces already institutionalized, such as newspapers, magazines, blogs, columns, among others;

D. in the metacritic experiences, in terms of content and form, of the aesthetic and stylistic innovations disseminated in the media itself, which by proposing a new format or genre, undertake a critique to what is established as standard, making it not as an analysis of the media, but in the media deeds themselves;

E. in the social interactions of critique, in which recipients criticize in a dispersed and informal way materials conveyed in the media and also reveal in their critique social images that they have from the various means and practices, confirming or questioning fundamentals of media production, as is, for example, the case of reporting news;

F. in reading modes and profiles of the audience of media criticism;

G. in the study of "critique theories," theorizing about the ways of "how to make a critique" and "how to make a critique of those who

make critique," be it focused on the media criticism practices be it on academic research;

H. and with regard to the specific nature of journalism, news media criticism as a didactic and pedagogical resource for education and for training professionals.

Among these modalities, as we have said, we point out at this moment the combination of three of them: the perception of the criteria and values that belong to the media criticism, the social interaction between the critic and the audience, and theories of critique, trying an initial answer to: what are the *ways to make the media criticism*, to develop concepts and criteria for its achievement? However, before turning our attention to these aspects and following the initial question about the *role of the media criticism*, we think it is relevant to resume briefly some of its assumptions, from the 1960s to recent years.

Media criticism and perspectives of the critical thinking

An heir of the *media criticism* in its North American side, since its inception critical thinking about the media was constituted from different perspectives. In the European dimension – in which the currents developed in Brazil are included –, it was organized around the arising Critical Theory of the (school of social theory and philosophy) Frankfurt School. On the American side, it turned to the evaluation or monitoring of the performance of the media with reference to socially established values. In Freitas' words, two trends are presented when taking this field of research:

> In the perspective of the "Critical Theory," departing from Marxism, the discussion revolves around the issues of power and domination, of media ownership and the class conflict. Whereas from the media criticism perspective the studies have aimed to analyze the mediae as a standard with reference to compliance with the ideas and desires that a certain society proposes to itself, with ethical statutes which government regimes must comply with, with professional ideals that guide the practices (FREITAS, 1991, p. 88).

Under the bias of the Frankfurt School Critical Theory, we can recognize, widening its scope, vehicles of alternative press or independent media, studies on the quality of media production, initiatives for literacy, or media literacy, and those aimed at a critical reading of the mediae. Analogously, when observing the scope of the media criticism, we find a strong presence in the critique to journalism, especially the printed one, as well as television and, more recently, digital, by columns published on newspapers themselves, the presence of ombudsmen and the creation of media observatories responsible for systematically monitoring the production and performance of the mediae. It is in this multifaceted and porous scenario that we also see the academic production on media criticism arranged in two directions: in the effective realization of critical analyzes of forms and media content or in research devoted to the study of criticism produced in/by the mediae.

In this scenario, an absence is evidenced: a place for media criticism to establish the link between the media practices and the analyses of their social impact. This bond used to be essential to the achievement, at least until the 1980s, of two important functions of the media criticism: the monitoring of the mediae and the communication with the recipient, working "to improve ethical, cultural and professional standards of this performance and extending to the media recipients, contributing to the education of a selective audience, articulate and endowed with the power of discernment and judgment" (FREITAS, 1991, p. 89).

This conception, according to Freitas, understands that the critique presupposes a given representation of society, carrying out the analysis of the media from this representation, i.e., in a sense, what we see circulating in the mediae is part of a culture that is constituted and returned to society as self-image that in it is perpetuated, reaffirming its fundamental values: "The standards established are relational, i.e. based on values. It is precisely the agreement on these values that make them valid and universal standards. The integration of the critique to the system takes place exactly by the function of supervising or monitoring the effectiveness of these standards" (FREITAS, 1991, p. 91).

Updating the issue regarding the conservative or transgressor potential of the critique, Rancière asks about the possibility of a break presupposed in the artistic activity. When addressing the relationship between politics and aesthetics, the author presents two models briefly reviewed here: the *pedagogical* one, targeting the education of the audience from preestablished bases (including functionalism and the critical theory, often focused on the content of the objects analyzed); and the *transforming* one, interested in sharing what is sensitive through searching the viewer's emancipation and recognition (based on the absence of a source or purpose, and triggering identification processes). For the author, the role of art would be of creating alternative fictions in relation to those taken as consensual: "Art practices are not tools that provide forms of awareness or mobilizing energies in favor of a policy that is foreign to them, but neither leave themselves to become forms of collective political action. They contribute to design a new landscape of what is visible, speakable and feasible" (RANCIÈRE, 2012, p. 75).

The intervention of art in social relations would not be automatically achieved, but offers, in this case, the possibility of interfering with sharing what is sensitive, forging "against the consensus other forms of 'common sense', forms of a polemical common sense" (RANCIÈRE, 2012, p. 75). From these reflections, we state that the critical power would not be only in the object itself (it is not internal), but also outside it (in the context and in the reception). That is, there would not be a single way of representing reality or something that needs to be unveiled, but the reconfiguration of what is sensitive under other modes of perception and meaning: "The collective intelligence of emancipation is not the understanding of a global process of submission. It is the collectivization of the capacities invested in these scenes of dissension" (RANCIÈRE, 2012, p. 49). Unlike the proposition engendered by the media criticism, which requires less knowledge of the audience in relation to the experts, if we extend the considerations presented above to the media practices, we can see dynamics of feedback among producers/

authors and recipients/viewers that interferes and modifies products and processes present in them.

As we can see, several schools of thought provide contributions, more or less directly, to guide us in this investigation, as each *analytical* target assumes a *philosophical* perspective and a *historical* experience. This is how we see the critical possibilities unfolding from authorship studies; cultural studies; gender studies; reception studies; dialogism; discourse analysis; discursive genres; rhetoric; hermeneutics; mythology; history; sociology; structuralism; ethnography; technologies. In the 1990s, when dealing with television critique, Vande Berg and Wenner (1991) conducted a unique venture for media studies: recognizing the maturation of the analyses on television, the authors present the theoretical paths in which this medium is studied, through different approaches and applications. Beforehand, still in the 1970s, Newcomb (2007) had already published a major work on television critique, and in the years 2000, Davin and Jackson (2008), among others, used the theme with new critical analyses.

More than presenting case studies on television programs of various genres, with greater or lesser recognition (both in terms of quality, ratings or innovation) – and that could be replaced by others, more current –, Vande Berg and Wenner (1991) emphasize two issues: first, they demonstrate the variety of critical and theoretical biases and possible interpretations for television studies; then they highlight the uniqueness of such studies in relation to the place of speech taken on by each of the researchers, who bring to the analyses assumptions and perceptions as viewers who experience different ways of watching television. In undertaking this double articulation, the book shows at least three fundamental aspects for media criticism today, be it on television, film, music, news, radio, digital: there is no possibility of having a consensus on the ways of doing the media criticism; it is not possible to do it without regard to its conditions of production and reception; it is not possible either to make the critique without looking at concrete/empirical objects (products, processes and discourses) effectively circulating in the mediae.

The critique activity would therefore be eminently plural, built from different perspectives aiming to relate producers, works and audiences "in its own ways of discernment, setting in motion a wide range of analytical methods and explanatory or understanding procedures" (NUNES, 2007, p. 61-62). We are talking about the great paradigms that guide the ways of making cultural critique, which can also guide the media criticism, when we take those crucial questions: who is allowed to criticize, what their purpose, judgments and values involved in it are, the audience education, among others. At the moment, apart from these, we want to emphasize a question about the different ways to practice media criticism, which point to two trends in the way of addressing the object criticized: the comprehensive theories about the media and the specific analyses of media products.

In a previous article published, Silva and Soares (2013) argue that media criticism should, according to Braga's perception, "leave behind totalizing judgments on the media, addressing them to the media products" (BRAGA, 2006, p. 17). What Braga suggests is that we depart from the generalized analysis to the one that is more specific, taking from the mediae unique products in order to recognize the repertoire there articulated. Similarly, Machado follows in the direction of particular analyses, indicating, in the case of television, the establishment of a "heterogeneous collection of audiovisual works" that must be addressed from an "evaluative perspective" inscribed in the materiality of its programs (MACHADO, 2008, p. 24). Braga's statement, here highlighted, provides a path for such an undertaking: "The more developed the critique mechanisms are, the more likely that they turn to an analysis of specific products (and less to analyses of the medium in its generality)" (BRAGA, 2006, p. 61).

The argument in defense is that, when looking at what is specific, the guiding criteria of "how to make the critique" become more visible and palpable. According to Braga, "asking more specific questions about unique products is what enables realizing different structuring, making finer judgments about quality and more related to the criteria stated (as

'quality' is not an absolute or definable value in the absence of social references)" (BRAGA, 2006, p. 53). For the development of the media criticism process, he notes that, despite the difficulties in achieving "stable critical genders and mechanisms," it is necessary to invest in the need to "study the most promising angles of analysis, developing each in terms of an open systematics, an explicit awareness of their concrete approaches, objectives and results," for both knowledge of the media object as for the recipients' interpretive ability (BRAGA, 2006, p. 274).

What we have then is some kind of contest among perspectives of making media criticism: one that opts for particular analyses and another one seeking more general analyses of wholes. This tension has been dealt with by França in a recent publication. The researcher discusses the cyclical nature of the communication critical approaches in the last forty years in Brazil, reaffirming the importance of rescuing more comprehensive looks, able to interpret the communicative practices in their relation with the social maintenance or change. She remembers that in the 1970s and 1980s the theories would denounce the commodification of culture, the emptying of what was symbolic, and the disputes for hegemony in the interpretation of reality. "The next twenty years were marked by a certain abandonment of the critical bias in favor of more specific approaches, dealing with more specific aspects of the process and the communicative product" (FRANÇA, 2014, p.101).

Supported by Boltanski's (2009) recent reflections, França suggests hosting the synthesis carried out by the French sociologist when, after a long trajectory toward specific practices, he turns to the mutual dependence and complementarity between the "critique" and the "metacriticism," highlighting the limits of the critique pragmatic sociology, since in it the notion of the whole is lost – and without this comprehensive perspective it would not be possible to move from the actors' fragmented and specific critique to a concerned global critique of society. França calls for a permanent targeted critique in communication studies, "a perspective that, given what is specific and singular, does not close to self-sufficient objects and reasoning, and can always resubmit

these objects to the larger context in which they exist, act, condition and undergo conditionings" (FRANÇA, 2014, p.114). Her concern is not alone among Brazilian researchers. Braga also concludes at the end for the need for "a conceptual construction of the critical-interpretative work, based on references to the main existing processes and prospects of 'making critique' on media" (BRAGA, 2006, p. 67), which would be a conceptual construction designed to expand and diversify the scope of the critique due to its social goals.

Places in movement

If we are all immersed in the culture of the mediae – and the very academic critique is inserted in it –, the questioning about the *places of the critique* expands and returns, in an amplified way, to the initial questions: who can make the critique of the critique? What can the academic critique do? One possible indication would be to say that the media criticism should highlight dissonant views on the media and question formats considered hegemonic. In this sense, besides pointing stabilities or reaffirming genres already recognized, the media criticism would be a place of questioning and disruption within the mediae themselves.

If, as De Certeau (1994) had stated, the everyday life is the locus where several reports convey in a conflicting and asymmetrically way in the contention for hegemony spaces, the discursive practices amplify the different social voices through shared interpretive frameworks, understood as systems of signification: "Inseparable from the present *moment*, of *specific* circumstances and a *deed* (producing language and changing the dynamics of a relationship), the act of speaking is a use of language and an operation *on* it" (DE CERTEAU, 1994, p. 96). Therefore, the author proposes the delineation of such operations by a different light, not as related to a closed system, but as "*forces of relations* defining the networks which they are part of and that delimit the circumstances that they can take advantage of. (...) It is about fights or games between the strong and the weak, and the *actions* that the weak can undertake" (DE CERTEAU, 1994, p. 97).

It would be up to the media criticism to trigger repertoires constituents of the social imagery in order to repeat or reverse certain speeches. It is as if it performed a turn on itself, the criticism – transformed into metacriticism (cf. FUCHS, 2010) – it searches codes of the media culture to return them to their own mediae, returning what it had taken from them to undertake an interpretation beyond the common places recurring in it. By taking a critical perspective when looking at the mediae, even if it is from within, the analyst stands for quality – values and criteria – of the products examined, turning to society and its parameters of judgment, thus interfering in disputes at stake in the symbolic field.

As shown above, there are at least two possibilities for the media criticism when viewed from this angle: on the one hand, to conduct an analysis of the mediae that is indeed critical and, on the other, thinking the place of criticism as a deconstruction of crystallized speeches. If this double movement does not take place, or a *fold* of the critique over itself, we see the multiplication in the media of opinionated or superficial analyses that are called "critical" but actually only repeat what is already known, without showing what they state. Thus, as we said, it is the role of the university not only to make the media criticism, but also study the criticism made of it, pointing out aspects of the construction modes of the enunciation of different media discourses and society questioning in which they are inserted. In doing so, the media criticism also makes the critique of the ways in which the representation is constructed – or what is visible – and turns not only to aspects of production, but also of the reception and education of the audience, of an audience who, as we have seen, also participates in the critique circuit.

If the critical activity, as a method that seeks to examine media practices, presupposes values and criteria, it is necessary that both the concepts used in its analyses as well as the praxis to which they turn, recognize the empirical objects analyzed as symptoms of a particular historical time, putting them in crisis. It is by aiming this that we can say that the critique activity is a place of speech depending on the beholder's place, determining what may or may not be seen and also to whom this speech is directed.

ARTICLE

Thus, the issues raised here point us to three fundamental aspects for a systematic study of media criticism. The first one concerns the demarcation of what can be allocated under this heading; the second one asks the ways of its realization and dissemination; and the third one aims to define objects that are specific to those to which the media criticism could devote itself. Such exercises of constant observation and distinction of media products would take place both from theoretical and methodological choices in scientific research, as outside the academic sphere, by experts operating in the field of journalistic disclosure, by the audience and by producers.

Final Considerations

Throughout the article, we have raised some assumptions that we believe are interesting for the analysis of the mediae which are intended to make critique and, moreover, for the study of the critique in/by the media. In general terms, we emphasize that criticizing means to draw the boundaries that place the object in crisis, expanding it beyond its more intrinsic textual relations. We understand that, at the same time, these same linkages are what shape its discursive integration and circulation in the mediae, which marks a turning point in relation to the criticism of traditional art. Without incurring in hierarchies that place again in the debate the division between high and low culture, or between popular, mass and erudite culture, it is in the field of media culture that we insert it.

We stress, therefore, a demarcation between the critique that emerges in modernity to think about standards of judgment in view of objects arising – that is, to explain to "laymen" a new art, not easily assimilated – and the contemporary critique, especially the one facing the mediae, in which each of us takes part in different positions, inquiring about the critique failure or currency. In the words of Didi-Huberman, we find a reflection of our concerns:

> We now need to recognize this dialectical movement in all its *"critical"* dimensions, i.e., simultaneously in its dimension of crisis and symptom – as the turmoil shaking the course of the river – and in its dimension of *critical analysis,* of negative reflexivity, of challenge – as the turmoil that reveals and accuses the structure, the river bed itself (DIDI-HUBER-MAN, 1998, p. 171).

Be it as crisis, be it as a symptom, the relevance of thinking about the place of criticism today is unquestionable, crossed by technological injunctions and a media culture radiated into the social fabric. As we forward to the provisional conclusions of this exercise of thinking about media criticism, a recent work can help us return to some points and projection of others. On the Argentinian film *The Film Critic* (2014), by Argentinian director and writer Hernán Guerschuny, besides the title that highlights this job, we see the main character, a demanding film critic, honored in newspapers for which he writes and known for his rigorous analysis of films, turning against the current film productions. Interestingly, the genre films are those who suffer most from his attacks, especially romantic comedies, for him a byproduct of what one day would have been "great art." At the beginning of the narrative, we hear the critic openly say that "movies are dead" and that their best productions are in the past. Lonely and bitter, the character gets inadvertently caught in a romantic plot over which he has no control. So begins the story twists and its metalinguistic apparatus is placed in operation in the various narrative layers of the film. While witnessing the deconstruction of the genre in question, we are involved on a film that replicates and updates its clichés.

The narrative game does not take place only at the level of statements, but also in the enunciation, actively involving the viewer. Thus we have a genre film that builds on an authorial perspective (oscillating between these two narratives) which, in addition to evoking a consolidated genre – romantic comedies –, addresses to it a severe criticism while proposing its renewal, subverting the USA formula of humor and love, reinventing it with local colors. By deconstructing the generic form

to which it belongs to build it otherwise, we note approaches and distancing in relation to the distinctive features of romantic comedies. As in other recent productions, "the film evokes echoes (redundancies) in relation to the established standard and also ruptures (resonances) that differentiate from this standard, presenting a generic format as an experimental crossing point and not as a target fixation" (SOARES, 2006, p. 174).

In this sense, the criticism is not made from the outside, but from the very filmic fabric; that is, the film which we saw the carries in itself such movement, making a criticism in the form of expression, not just in the content form: "By understanding gender as a place that is external to the work, from where the narrative sense is produced and consumed, that is, by convention, the work would get out of itself, triggering its ability to communicate" (FOLLAIN, 2010, p. 59). But a unique factor stands out: the metalinguistic way with which the film refuses and extols the romantic comedies materializes in the professional critic – a profession which gives its name to the film – i.e., a second fold is established in the criticism that the film makes and in that moment inside itself about the same films with which it shares this film genre. In an article that deals with crime novels, Follain draws attention to a recurrence in contemporary works, whether literary or film: to please the audience and allow them to be recognized in the stories told and at the same time maintaining the critical dimension of the work through different reading levels.

In the author's words, on the one hand, "the plot is preserved, without prejudice to the one reader who seeks to have fun with the story," ensuring their identification with the narrative. On the other hand, "something beyond the story is offered, a metalinguistic and reflective dimension, reinforced by numerous quotes, which allows another type of reader to contemplate, in a distanced and also nostalgic way, the narrative strategies that create the fascination in the first dimension" (FOLLAIN, 2010, p. 61). This is when we see the critic who hates romantic comedies beginning to live in his daily life the generic conventions and innovations of the format that he despises. Another ruse doubles this fold: the

character that has in film criticism his professional vocation is called to write a film script. The film that he imagined mimics his own life and re-produces, step by step, the elements constituting the romantic comedies that he despises and, in his words, are consolidated into a clear narrative form, as can be seen in numerous films of dubious quality.

This movement can be identified in the unusual dialogue between the character and a girl he falls in love with. When questioned by her about his work, the critic replies that "he writes film reviews" and is "an intermediary between the films and the audience." The character sol-emnly presents his work: "Thanks to my work, people can discern a work of art from a bad product." We return here to the starting point of the text – and of the traditional place of the critique – and, in a spiral mode, the end point of the article previously presented (SILVA; SOARES, 2013). At that moment, Follain would challenge us on two fundamental points, which we hope have found a target in the text now rehearsed. The first one relates to the differences between art criticism and media criticism and the adequacy of the model of one to the other. The second one refers to the function of the critique in the proposition of distinguishing criteria extrinsic to the works analyzed, which would place again to the mediae a separation between qualified cultural products or those of triv-ial entertainment.

Between forming in an authorial way the (good) taste of the audience and actively participating in a common genre, the place of media criti-cism in view of a diversified production, as Follain (2013) notes, departs from that carried out by the art critic, "owning to the process of art cre-ation as an autonomous field, having as an assumption its dissociation from other spheres" (FOLLAIN, 2013)[4].

A turning point appears for the continuation of our studies: the greater accessibility and proximity of the media culture with the current taste, in Follain's words (2010), would make dispensable the mediation of interpreters – as for example the critic on the film about the critique

---

[4]   Vera Follain de Figueiredo, in her report on the work by SILVA, G. and SOARES, R. L. at GT Culture of the Midiae, at the Brazilian annual meeting XXII Encontro Anual da Compós, Salvador, UFBA, 2013.

activity. However, when investing in products of light consumption and commercial success (such as the critic's romantic comedies), the mediae would lose their transforming and breakthrough power if considered from the art criticism criteria. We agree that this fact is not, in itself, neither positive nor negative, seeing in it a path to be followed in order to get parameters by which we can think about the media criticism singularities.

For Follain (2010), "if the modern work of fiction was, by definition, difficult to interpret, arousing a feeling of strangeness, causing a shock to the reader, the postmodern work wants to pass as something familiar, leading the audience with more repertoire to be suspicious of this familiarity and recover its complex dimension covered by this apparent simplicity" (FOLLAIN, 2010, p. 62). We dare say that if the elements discussed in this article are considered, we can see areas of innovation, which should be confirmed in future analyses when confronted with specific empirical objects. Finding critical gaps around ordinary products because they belong to the ordinary life does not mean evoking the role of the traditional cultural critique to the media culture, which would result precisely in emptying the criticism.

If thought dynamically, media criticism can be perceived as a kind of in-between place where various fields mix their specificities and are renewed. And by privileging the connections among the various media practices, the critique activity allows the insertion of a certain media object in a network of relationships generating new meanings, observing and articulating its historical, political, social, cultural and economic implications. But in media criticism the value judgments which can be drawn upon to perform it are shared much more interlaced with the audiences and ratings than we usually see in literary criticism practices and even movies criticism. In this perspective, media criticism should be done with criteria and values internal to it, since the audiences that it targets share, in different measures, the same media culture, participating and interfering in it.

Therefore, many and several challenges are presented to the task of researching on media criticism in Brazil. This article has proposed to suggest ways in which systematize and discuss media criticism, both in what is projected in relation to its procedures as in what is recognized in terms of its achievement, focusing on the specificity of theoretical and technical contributions to cultural media criticism. The task remains, therefore, of separating from a wide range of media practices those that can be analyzed to confirm or refute work hypotheses. We believe, both in the academic sphere and in the sphere of the experts and the audience, that a gap is opened for this route. We hope to develop some of its routes in future investigations.

References

BOLTANSKY L. *De la critique. Précis de sociologie de l'émancipation.* Paris: Gallimard, 2009.

BRAGA, J. L. *A sociedade enfrenta sua mídia: dispositivos sociais de crítica midiática.* São Paulo: Paulus, 2006.

DAVIN, S.; JACKSON, R. (ed.). *Television and criticism.* Bristol: Intellect Books, 2008.

DE CERTEAU, M. *A invenção do cotidiano. Artes de fazer.* 2ª. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1994.

DIDI-HUBERMAN, G. *O que vemos, o que nos olha.* São Paulo: Editora 34, 1998.

FOLLAIN DE FIGUEIREDO, V. L. N*arrativas migrantes. Literatura, roteiro e cinema.* Rio de Janeiro: 7 Letras, 2010.

FUCHS, C. Alternative media as critical media. *European Journal of Social Theory.* v. 13, n. 2, p. 173-192, 2010.

FRANÇA, V. R. V. Crítica e metacrítica: contribuição e responsabilidade das teorias da comunicação. *MATRIZes*, São Paulo, v. 8, n. 2, p.101-116, jul./dez. 2014.

FREITAS, J. M. M. A crítica na tradição norte-americana (*journalism review*). *Cadernos de Jornalismo e Editoração.* São Paulo, v. 12, n. 28, p. 87-99, dez. 1991.

MACHADO, A. Televisão: a questão do repertório. In: BORGES, G.; REIA-BAPTISTA, V. *Discursos e práticas de qualidade na televisão.* Lisboa: Livros Horizonte/UAL-Ciac, 2008.

NEWCOMB, H. (ed.). *Television – The critical view.* 7th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

NUNES, B. Crítica literária no Brasil, ontem e hoje. In: MARTINS, Maria Helena. *Rumos da crítica.* 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora Senac, 2007.

RANCIÈRE, J. *O espectador emancipado.* São Paulo: Martins Fonte, 2012.

SILVA, G.; SOARES, R. L. Para pensar a crítica de mídias. *Revista Famecos* (Online), v. 20, p. 820-839, 2013.

SOARES, R. L. Essa não é mais uma história de amor. In: SANTANA, G. & LYRA, B. *Cinema de bordas.* São Paulo: a lápis, 2006.

VANDE BERG, L. R.; WENNER, L. A. *Television criticism: approaches and applications.* New York: Logman, 1991.

About the authors

Rosana de Lima Soares – Full Professor at Escola de Comunicações e Artes (School of Communication and Arts) at Brazilian Universidade de São Paulo, with a postdoctorate graduation at King's College London (King's College London (London, United Kingdom). Leader of the Research Group Media Criticism and Cultural Practices. Scholarship holder of Productivity in Research (CNPq).

Gislene da Silva – Professor of the Postgraduation Program in Journalism at Brazilian Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, with a postdoctoral graduation at ECA-USP and at Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain). Leader of the Research Group Media Criticism and Cultural Practices. Scholarship holder of Productivity in Research (CNPq).