

Show, don't tell

Mostrar, e não contar

https://doi.org/10.14195/2183-6019_16_1

Abstract:

The influence of technology on the media is not a new phenomenon. Several innovations occurred in print production throughout the years and allowed newspapers to improve their design and visual storytelling, following the idea that sight is our dominant sense. This also applied to the digital world: broadband networks made it possible to upload and download large image files, enhancing the importance of visual content. The advent of user-generated content encouraged professional journalists to try harder to create and deliver material of the highest possible journalistic, aesthetic and technical standard. By the end of the first decade of the 21st century, the use of photography, video, audio and data visualisation on the web had come together into something genuinely new - the form of digital storytelling known as “multimedia”. The increasing dominance of social media, and especially social video, has affected media organisations profoundly. Publishers and broadcasters have become reliant on social traffic, and many find that their visual content is increasingly being accessed outside their own domain. We should also be

aware of the forces pulling in a different direction — also towards visuals, but in the truncated, shallow and trivialised form that succeeds on social media. The future of serious journalism is facing numerous challenges.

Keywords: Visual communication, journalism, multimedia.

Resumo

A influência da tecnologia nos media não é um fenómeno novo. Uma série de transformações marcou a produção impressa ao longo dos anos e permitiu que os jornais aprimorassem o seu design e estratégias de storytelling visual, seguindo a ideia de que a visão é o sentido dominante. Isso também se aplica ao mundo digital: as velocidades da banda larga possibilitam carregar e descarregar grandes ficheiros de imagem, aumentando a importância do conteúdo visual. O advento do conteúdo gerado pelos utilizadores incentivou os jornalistas profissionais a empenharem-se ainda mais na criação e distribuição de conteúdos de altos padrões jornalísticos, estéticos e técnicos. No final da primeira década do século XXI, o uso de fotografia, vídeo, áudio e visualização de dados na

web transformou-se em algo genuinamente novo - a forma de narrativas digitais conhecida como “multimédia”. O crescente domínio das redes sociais, com especial destaque para o formato vídeo, afetou profundamente as organizações dos media. Os editores e os canais de comunicação tornaram-se dependentes do tráfego nas redes sociais, e muitos constataam que os seus conteúdos estão a ser cada vez mais acedidos fora da sua esfera de controlo. Também deveríamos estar cientes da força que gravita numa direção diferente – uma força também predominantemente visual, mas na forma estrita, superficial e banalizada que prolifera nas redes sociais. O futuro do jornalismo enfrenta inúmeros desafios.

Palavras-chave: Comunicação visual, jornalismo, multimédia.

My life in editorial design began in the final months of a dying age.

In my first job we made our page layouts using paper and glue; journalists composed their stories on typewriters; Time magazine sold 4 million copies a week; and UK viewers had a choice of four TV stations. But when Apple Macintosh computers started appearing in magazine art departments a year or two later, it was the beginning of a cascade of technological upheavals that would change the world of media completely.

The introduction of desktop publishing was followed by improvements in newspaper printing, an explosion in satellite and cable TV channels, the arrival of the internet, and eventually the high-speed wireless networks, smartphones and social media that we now take for granted. Some of these were innovations in production, and some in delivery and consumption. But through all the changes, small and large, the cumulative effect has been the increasing prominence of visual communication and the diminution of the importance of text. Of course text is still with us in print, on the web and in our social lives. But

it is now beginning to seem possible that the written word may one day lose the battle.

The influence of technology on the media is not a new phenomenon. The printing presses which enabled mass periodical production and distribution were by-products of the industrial revolution. Visual journalism first became a phenomenon with the introduction of another technical process — end-grain woodblock engraving — in the second half of the 19th century, giving rise to magazines such as The Illustrated London News, l'Illustration, and Illustrierte Leipzig in Europe, and Leslie's and Harper's Weekly in the United States. The Illustrated London News announced in its first issue that its illustrations would deliver to the audience "the very form and presence of events as they transpire, in all their substantial reality," a prophetic statement about the power of visual reportage which still resonates today. The illustrated periodicals of the 19th century were the first form of mass media to use visuals to explain world events, and to inform and educate the public about different cultures, societies, and environments.

*My life in editorial
design began in
the final months
of a dying age*

Wood engraving was eventually replaced by halftone reprographic techniques which allowed periodicals to print continuous-tone imagery through the use of dots. By the end of the 19th century, photo reproduction had become the norm, preparing the ground for the rise of magazine photojournalism. Photography-based magazines like *VU* in France and *Estampa* in Spain began to appear in Europe in the 1920s, followed in the next decade by *Life* and *Look* in the US. These new titles introduced photojournalism to a wide public. *Look* and *Life* became a showcase for star photographers such as Margaret Bourke-White, Alfred Eisenstaedt, John Dominis, and W. Eugene Smith (and even gave Stanley Kubrick his early break). *Regards* (also in France) and *Picture Post* (UK) followed, publishing powerful images of a type never seen before in mass media, including Robert Capa's photographic reportage from the Spanish Civil War. Photo magazines flourished in the middle decades of the 20th century, before declining in the late 1960s as photojournalism became a staple in mainstream magazines and

newspapers and TV took over as a primary source of visual information.

Incidentally, the concept of a printed magazine that reported on the world through photography did not die with *Life* and *Look*. In the mid-1990s I became art director at *Colors*, a magazine funded by the clothing retailer Benetton, and inspired by archetypal mid-century photo periodicals. *Colors* was the brainchild of photographer/provocateur Oliviero Toscani and the iconoclastic New York design maven Tibor Kalman. Although it was published in multiple languages, it was committed from the beginning to using images as a universal tool of communication. Every page was dominated by photography and text was limited to explanatory captions. Standard magazine procedures were inverted. The whole issue was initially schemed out in a series of drawings, then photography was researched and commissioned, before writers were finally brought in at the end of the process to fill in the captions. At its height, *Colors* achieved a remarkable degree of recognition. Its provocative imagery and early (pre-photoshop) use of photo manipulation

appeared on tabloid front pages all over the world, and provided rich material for Benetton's hard-hitting advertising campaigns. The magazine still exists, but it is no coincidence that it hit its peak just before internet usage and image sharing became widespread.

Innovations in print production in the 1980s and 90s also allowed newspapers to improve their design and visual storytelling. Although still printed in black and white, *The Independent*, launched in the UK in 1986, took full advantage of improvements in newspaper printing and was one of the first daily papers to consider powerful large-scale photography as a valuable journalistic element. During the 1990s, four-colour printing presses which could handle low-quality newsprint paper became widely available. The first newspaper to embrace the possibilities of the new presses was USA Today, launched in September 1992, which made extensive use of full-colour graphics and photographs. The paper's self-consciously visual presentation style and accessible journalism was derided by many critics, who referred

to it as a “McPaper”. Although much of its inspiration came from television news, USA Today’s use of visuals alongside concise nuggets of information and explainers prefigured some of the innovations to come in digital journalism 20 years later.

Alongside developments in printing, computer-based page-make-up systems operated by journalists rather than traditional printers and compositors also revolutionised newspaper production. The new systems gave precise control over typography and page composition and allowed for much more sophistication in design. When *The Guardian* redesigned in 1988, they called on David Hillman from the Pentagram design group. Hillman had come to prominence as art director of *Nova*, one of the most visually inventive magazines of the 1960s and 70s. New technologies now meant that even newspapers could now begin to emulate the visual expression of magazines.

The increasing visualisation of the newspaper was not universally applauded by journalists or readers. As we have seen, *USA Today* was subjected to harsh criticism for what was

perceived as “dumbing down”. When *The Guardian*’s redesign launched in 1988 the English television comedian Spike Milligan famously wrote to the editor saying “I got the comic, where’s the newspaper”? After the developments of the last 30 years it is hard to understand the suspicion with which visual journalism and the influence of designers was viewed in the 1990s. Newspapers were accustomed to having photo editors and photographers on staff, but their contributions had never been taken as seriously as those of writers and editors. The increasing presence and importance of visual elements was seen by many as somehow diminishing the seriousness of the journalism. *The New York Times* (which had earned the nickname “The Grey Lady”) did not publish a colour photograph in the front page until October 16, 1997.

I experienced this prejudice myself. When I joined *The Guardian* after working at *Colors*, the role of designers in news media was still limited. Magazines were expected to have art directors but (apart from the occasional maverick, like Lou Silverstein at *The New York Times*) newspapers

were not. Design and layout were usually the preserve of the more visually aware journalists. Similarly, while broadcast networks had animated logos and title sequences and the occasional infographic, visual artists were at the bottom of the hierarchy. But change was inevitable. When I left *The Guardian* fifteen years later, every major newspaper I knew had an art director, usually with a magazine background.

In retrospect, the development of media in the 19th and 20th centuries looks like an inexorable drive towards visual presentation, through the use of images, information graphics and high-end design and art direction. But why did this happen? Every one of these developments was enabled by new technology. But what was the motivation for such technological innovation? In most cases the driving force was not journalistic, but commercial. Improvements in printing quality and the introduction of colour were demanded by advertisers. The arrival of computers in magazine and newspaper art departments was initially an attempt by publishers to cut costs, by marginalising heavily unionised staff or cutting out external

suppliers of typesetting and colour reproduction. Of course, editors and designers embraced the new opportunities, initially with suspicion and then with enthusiasm. But was it merely a case of “because we can”? Or was the increasing visual sophistication of mass media actually responding to a demand from the audience?

We still have a lot to learn about how the human brain perceives the world. But science seems to confirm that sight is our dominant sense. In the fourth century B.C., Aristotle proposed a hierarchy of senses in which sight was ranked first, followed by hearing, smell, taste and then touch. Modern science seems to confirm that sight is indeed our primary way of understanding the world around us. In the brain, neurons devoted to visual processing number in the hundreds of millions and take up about 30% of the cortex, compared with 8% for touch and just 3% for hearing. Studies of learning styles have also found that At least 65% of people are “visual learners”, that is to say that they respond best to visual stimuli such as photos, graphs, and diagrams when processing and retaining new information.

So there is evidence to suggest that there is indeed a general human appetite for visual information gathering, and that the growth of visual journalism is not just a by-product of technological developments in media but genuinely satisfies the needs of the audience.

While the visualisation of mass media was well underway by the late twentieth century, most of the developments were incremental, and did not really change the fundamental nature of print and broadcast news. But at the same time a true revolution was taking shape. The origins of this radical transformation are purely technical. Packet-switching communication networks originating in military programmes like ARPANET, protocols developed for the exchange of information between supercomputers in science labs, and the rollout of fibre-optic data cabling all played their part. When these systems collided, they gave birth to the World Wide Web.

In the early days of the global internet, it was difficult to imagine the

radical changes to come. Web 1.0 was still a very limited technology. Most households did not have computers. Those that did had to battle limited bandwidth and primitive 56kbps dial-up modems to access web pages which were largely text-based. Hypertext was the core of the experience, and visuals were limited to tiny bitmapped images and GIF buttons. Unsurprisingly, many news organisations ignored the upstart medium.

Those that did glimpse the possibilities of the internet began tentatively and with some trepidation. *The New York Times* debuted its first digital offering in 1994 on the America Online portal. In a service called @times, it offered a selection of the day’s news, cultural and entertainment articles, but it was only available to America Online’s four million subscribers. *The Times’s* own homepage “*The New York Times On the Web*” went live in January 1996, stating that the newspaper hoped to become “a primary information provider in the computer age.” *The Guardian* was another early adopter, beginning with a bulletin board for recruitment advertising before launching Guardian

Unlimited in 1998. BBC Online was introduced in 1997.

The naming of these early media websites — “On the Web”, “Unlimited”, “Online” — is significant. There was still a great deal of suspicion around the internet and established media brands were careful to distance their new offspring from core activities. In most cases the distance was also physical. *The Guardian’s* “New Media Lab” was in a separate building some distance from the newspaper. And the new operations were generally staffed by groups of young mavericks and computer nerds, quite detached from the day-to-day operations of the mothership. Even as creative director of the printed newspaper, I had no involvement with the *Guardian’s* website until 2005.

By the early 2000s, the next generation of the internet was bringing in technical improvements that would make the digital experience much richer and more dynamic. Part of the philosophical basis for Web 2.0 was the desire for increased interaction, allowing users to comment on existing content and upload their own. These innovations produced the first social

networks, LinkedIn and MySpace (2003) and Facebook (2004). Smartphones were still a few years in the future, so interactions with these sites were still primarily through desktop and laptop computers. But alongside improvements in browser and server technologies, high-speed “always on” broadband networks were making it possible to upload and download large image files, and visual content was becoming an important part of the digital world for the first time. And just as the new social networks were encouraging users to upload their own photos, camera phones were starting to become available. They appeared first in South Korea and Japan, but by 2005-6, they reached Europe and the US, and image quality was greatly improved. These factors created a paradigm shift, as user-generated visual content became widespread online. Suddenly everybody had a camera in their pocket and an online space where they could share their images.

This raised a philosophical dilemma for publishers and broadcasters, who had always seen themselves as the gatekeepers of image distribution. As a newspaper art director, I was

often involved in debates about whether images were of high enough quality to publish, both aesthetically and technically. These discussions came to a head at *The Guardian* on July 7th 2005, when suicide bombers detonated four explosive devices on the London Underground and buses. Four years earlier, when we reported on the attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York, the photos available to us had been taken almost exclusively by professional photographers. But in the London attacks of 2005, for the first time we had access to photographs taken on camera phones by amateurs who had witnessed the events at first hand. There was an intense debate about whether the news value of the pictures outweighed their poor quality. It seems strange now that the publication of the images was ever in question, but the uncertainty reflects an important moment of insecurity for media professionals, when the rise of “user-generated content” and “citizen journalism” was beginning to feel like an existential threat.

As time passed, the dilemma was resolved. Phone cameras improved, and the resolution and tonal range of

amateur photographs became more acceptable. But more importantly, editors (and art directors) grew to understand the power of on-the-spot imagery, especially from inaccessible locations. Every journalist would now agree that news coverage of events like the Arab Spring protests of the early 2010s or the current turmoil in Iran would be impossible without eyewitness photography and video from the participants on the ground.

The challenge of user-generated content also had the positive effect of encouraging professional journalists to raise their game and try harder to create and deliver material of the highest possible journalistic, aesthetic and technical standard. The advances in network bandwidth that arrived with Web 2.0 opened up a new range of possibilities for professional visual journalism on the web. At the most basic level, web article formats acquired more, larger pictures. Photo galleries became a regular component of news websites. Legacy print publishers began to experiment with video. And digital editors rediscovered information graphics and data visualisation.

Maps, charts and graphs had been in regular use in newspapers, magazines and television since the 1960s, from the black and white graphics of Peter Sullivan in the *London Sunday Times*, to the colourful cartoon-like visualisations of Nigel Holmes in *Time* in the 1980s, and the extensive use of infographics in *USA Today*. The Spanish-speaking world embraced the trend with special enthusiasm, and newspapers in Spain and South America became renowned for publishing large-scale, rich and detailed graphic journalism. A global conference dedicated to news infographics called Malofiej was founded in Pamplona in Northern Spain in 1992, and takes place there every year.

But the potential of information graphics exploded with the advent of the internet. Live data feeds and real-time updates meant that visualisations could become dynamic, increasing their usefulness enormously. And the interactivity offered by web 2.0 allowed users to engage with and manipulate the content. Static maps, charts and diagrams are valuable storytelling tools and continue to be

used extensively. But graphics driven by live data have become essential in sports and election coverage, and the rise of the “interactive graphic” has created a genuinely new experience for audiences. The new medium has also created a new role in newsrooms, — the “data journalist”. News organisations like the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*, the BBC, and — most famously — *The New York Times*, now have large teams, combining artists, cartographers, data scientists, coders and traditional journalists, producing sophisticated data-driven visual stories, often to the same live news deadlines as their writing colleagues.

In fact, data visualisation has been embraced so universally that we should not accept its importance and usefulness without any question. Data visualisations can be so seductive and engaging to the eye that it is tempting to respond to their aesthetic qualities rather than their information value. In 2010, David McCandless, a British writer and designer, published *Information is Beautiful*, a book of “riotously colourful visualisations, charts & concept maps”. The book became

a best-seller worldwide, but the title is itself a clue to how the visual appeal of infographics can sometimes overwhelm the information they are communicating. It requires some discipline to ensure that information graphics are always content-driven and are used only where they enhance the storytelling, rather than providing mere “eye candy”.

It is also a mistake to assume that graphic information is more reliable and truthful than words or photography. Alberto Cairo, a professor in Visual Journalism at the University of Miami, has written a book which provides a valuable counterbalance to *Information is Beautiful*. Cairo’s book — *How Charts Lie* — demonstrates how we tend to take charts, maps and graphs at face value, assuming that numbers and the graphics that represent them, are somehow “objective”. But infographics are even more susceptible to distortion and misinformation than other forms of journalism, and are often used for polemical and propaganda purposes. Data visualisation has become an essential tool for news publishers and broadcasters, but while the work of

the best practitioners is beyond reproach and is a great asset to quality journalism, we should also be aware of the dangers.

By the end of the first decade of the new millennium, the use of photography, video, audio and data visualisation on the web had come together into something genuinely new — the form of digital storytelling known as “multimedia”. The most iconic example is probably “Snow Fall: The Avalanche at Tunnel Creek”, published by *The New York Times* in 2012. Even now, “Snow Fall” remains one of the richest and most immersive packages any news organisation has produced, incorporating video clips, annotations, animated maps, text and photography in a new form of documentary-making that could only exist on the web. “Snow Fall” inspired a tsunami of rich-media spectacles on editorial websites. Most news publishers could not match the resources of the Times, but they were still inspired to create immersive article formats with parallax scrolling designs and elaborately packaged text, images, infographics and video. In a sense, visual journalism had

finally come of age and reached an accommodation with text in a mature form of storytelling that was truly native to digital media.

The increasing visual literacy of audiences has also made the media take visual identity more seriously. A modern news organisation needs consistent branding and a multi-channel, cross-platform design vision. When I ran the teams that redesigned *The Guardian* newspaper, website and mobile apps between 2005 and 2010, we realised that in order to survive we would need not only strong visual content, but also a distinctive and recognisable visual identity. Our project was one of the first in the media sphere to bring a holistic design approach to print, digital, marketing and environments, and there is no doubt that being one of the world’s most recognisable media outlets has helped *The Guardian* to grow a loyal global audience.

But as the journalistic possibilities of Web 2.0 were being consolidated, another revolution was already taking place. This one began on January 9th 2007 when Steve Jobs took the stage at the MacWorld trade

show in San Francisco to announce the launch of the iPhone. The iPhone was not the first “smartphone”. Earlier devices from Palm, Nokia and Blackberry had already combined telephony with email and web browsing capabilities, but always in unappealing packages with small screens and tiny physical keyboards. The iPhone’s large high-resolution screen and unique multi-touch interface, combined with Apple’s impeccable usability and aesthetics, made it a device that people could genuinely fall in love with, and ushered in the world we now inhabit, where 83% of the Earth’s population carries in their pocket a device on which they can make phone calls, send text messages, use satellite navigation, watch video, take photographs, and access the internet.

In some ways, the rise of the smartphone turned the clock back for media companies, as the social media revolution which had seemed such a challenge in the mid 2000s exploded all over again. But this time, the threat was more intense and even more visually-led. Facebook had become the dominant social

media platform before the launch of the iPhone, but it was initially slow to adapt to the mobile environment. There was stiff competition from highly visual mobile-native social apps like Whatsapp (2009) Instagram (2010) and SnapChat (2011), which were growing their user bases quickly. Instagram was created from the start as a photo-sharing experience. Whatsapp and Snapchat began as text-messaging platforms but soon saw the demand from users and added the capability to send pictures and video messages and create visual Stories. Facebook responded to the challenge by attempting to buy all three, and succeeded with two (only SnapChat resisted).

With the growth of image and video-based social media, news organisations were forced to rehearse the arguments over “user-generated content” all over again. When SnapChat added its Stories feature, soon to be copied by Instagram, it posed an even stronger challenge to established media. Now the average person with a smartphone could be not just a photographer or videographer but a designer and documentary-maker

too. Consumers were becoming literate in multimedia storytelling and now had tools in their pocket which allowed them to produce their own mini Snow Fall.

Faster 3g and 4g phone networks and cheaper mobile data plans for users pushed even more visual content onto smartphones, and have now put video at the heart of the average person’s media experience. Fifteen years ago, if we looked at our fellow passengers on the bus or subway, most would be reading books or newspapers. Now they are watching video on their phones. This is reflected in changes in the popularity of social media platforms. As Facebook grew older along with its users, YouTube became the most-used social media app amongst teenagers and young adults. But it is not simply a source of entertainment for young people. In 2020 the Pew Research Centre reported that about a quarter of all U.S. adults (26%) got news on YouTube. More recently, TikTok, which originated as an app for teens to share lip-synch videos, has grown into the latest mainstream platform for content creators. By late 2018, TikTok

had surpassed Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and SnapChat in monthly installs, with more than one billion downloads. Data published by Pew in September 2022 shows that 10% of U.S. adults say they now regularly get news on TikTok.

The increasing dominance of social media, and especially social video, has affected media organisations profoundly. Publishers and broadcasters have become reliant on social traffic, and many find that their visual content is increasingly being accessed outside their own domain. Off-site news video consumption is growing fast, and for some publishers the majority of their video is now consumed through Facebook, YouTube and other social platforms. Some videos can get over 100 million views on social networks, far more than many media outlets could ever expect on their own websites. But this visibility has come at a price, as content creators are forced to adapt form and content to the social environment. The most successful social videos tend to be short (under one minute), are designed to work with no sound, and focus on soft news. This is

a significant challenge to traditional journalistic values. Serious media outlets have always seen depth and complexity as their strength, in contrast to the triviality of commercial and user-generated content. But in order to compete in the social media space, traditional publishers must produce short-form video of the type that is also being created by brands, agencies, and individuals. And in doing so they risk losing the depth, distinctiveness and authority which audiences associate with serious journalism.

It is also becoming clear that visuals can be a potent form of misinformation. We have grown used to image manipulation through the use of Photoshop, and we are increasingly exposed to deepfakes — videos that appear real but have been created using AI-driven algorithms which allow creators to manipulate moving images and put words into the mouths of people who in reality never spoke them. But much visual misinformation involves much simpler forms of deception. A common technique involves recycling legitimate old photographs and videos and presenting them as

evidence of recent events. Psychological research has shown that people are more likely to believe both true and false statements, when they're presented alongside an image. Photos also influence the number of likes and shares that a post receives on social media, along with people's belief that the post is true. Most examples of this type of visual disinformation are deliberate and are knowingly published by pressure groups and fanatics. But under the pressure of 24/7 news production, some of this misinformation has found its way onto mainstream media websites and the danger of contamination is ever-present. A growing suspicion of the reliability of visual content also has the potential to damage trust in media even more.

We live in an age where visual communication is more dominant than ever. From the beautifully-designed interfaces on our phones, to the cinematic richness of video games and the ubiquity of video on social media, our relationship with information is driven less and less by text.

This has raised many challenges for the media. The ease with which consumers can now create and share their own content is a threat to the professional tools and skills which we like to believe make us special. The potential for misinformation that is inherent in imagery and data visualisation damages confidence in media at a time when trustworthy journalism is more important than ever.

But the visualisation of media also brings great opportunities to engage with our audiences in new ways. The smartest traditional news publishers have responded to the challenges with intelligence and commitment. The best examples, (The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Guardian) have put high-quality design, photography, data journalism and video at the heart of their operations, and have seen the benefits in audience engagement that follow. The new media environment has also encouraged a wave of digitally-native news publishers like Vox, Tortoise, Quartz, and The Athletic, who have planned their platforms around visual journalism, social content and experimental formats, while still publishing

traditional long-form text. These brands show us that it is possible to put high-quality visual communication at the core of your mission and see positive results. But we should also be aware of the forces pulling in a different direction — also towards visuals, but in the truncated, shallow and trivialised form that succeeds on social media.

For more than a century, the visualisation of news has been enabled and enhanced by a series of technological innovations, from new printing and reprographic techniques to the advent of computers, the internet, and smartphones. We can see in the behaviour of our audiences that they welcome these developments, and visual content is ever more dominant in media and on social platforms. Is this really a new, unprecedented phenomenon? After all, text has not always been preeminent. Early newspapers and magazines were originally read by a small elite. Only after improvements in education during the nineteenth century did literacy become widespread in the developed world, creating a large reading public and a wide audience for books and

periodicals. In the pre-modern era, when only the rich and powerful could read, the average person would have got their news from the sung or spoken word, or from illustrated broadsides, which might be considered the podcasts and TikTok videos of their day. In the future, we may look back on the age of text-driven mass media as a short-lived phenomenon, and realise that visuals (and sound) have always been the form of communication that humans prefer.

But what does this mean for serious journalism? As our medium becomes ever more visual, will we produce more high-quality, incisive and informative visual journalism? Will the pressure to create simplified, superficial and viral content prove too strong? Or will Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality and the Metaverse bring another revolution that forces us to begin all over again? The future, like always, is impossible to predict.

