



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### On Media and Entrepreneurship as Ways of Being in the World

*A Challenge to Journalism Education*

Deuze, M.

#### Publication date

2017

#### Published in

Global Journalism Education in the 21st Century

[Link to publication](#)

#### Citation for published version (APA):

Deuze, M. (2017). On Media and Entrepreneurship as Ways of Being in the World: A Challenge to Journalism Education. In R. S. Goodman, & E. Steyn (Eds.), *Global Journalism Education in the 21st Century: Challenges and Innovations* (pp. 307-326). Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas.

#### General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

#### Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

## **On Media and Entrepreneurship as Ways of Being in the World: A Challenge to Journalism Education<sup>1</sup>**

*Mark Deuze*

**W**e live in media. Media are to us as water is to fish. The ubiquitous and pervasive nature of contemporary media does not mean people's lives are determined by technology, but it certainly should suggest that our understanding of society and the role of journalism (and journalism education) in it must start with an appreciation of the profound mediatization of everyday life and the lifeworld (the world we experience) (Deuze, 2014). This is all the more important as the ubiquitous and pervasive nature of media in everyday life is a direct function of their disappearance from our active awareness of them. As Meyrowitz (1998) remarked, "Ironically, then, the environment of a medium is most invisible when its influence is most pervasive" (p. 106). His observations about the way people use media (e.g., media as activities) can be extended to considerations about media as artifacts. Meyer (2011), on the basis of fieldwork in Ghana, concluded that "media tend to 'disappear' when they are accepted as devices that, naturally as it were, 'vanish' into the substance that they mediate" (p. 32). Fellow anthropologist Miller (2005) suggested that media, as objects, are important because we do not "see" them:

The less we are aware of them, the more powerfully they can determine our expectations by setting the scene and ensuring normative behavior, without being open to challenge. They determine what takes place to the extent that we are unconscious of their capacity to do so. (p. 5)

---

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of this chapter was published as Deuze, M. (2014). Journalism, media life, and the entrepreneurial society. *Australian Journalism Review*, 36(2), 119-130. The current version has been edited for content and focus. Published with permission.

The invisibility of media, coupled with their connectivity and persistence, forms the human condition of experiencing and acting in the world.

Media and life are mutually implicated physical and emotional infrastructures, in that people's lived experience with media has become so intertwined, ritualistic and natural, to draw distinctions between "us" and "them" seems fruitless. Every aspect of everyday life gets structured by (and in) media, whereas the media in people's lives are shaped by the way they fit into their environment. In the process, our relationships with media become profoundly personal. In a story reviewing a decade's worth of reports covering new technologies for the *New York Times* (November 24, 2010), Pogue (2010) considers as one of the most important insights about the role of technology in people's lives the fact, that "[t]oday's gadgets are intensely personal." We do not just abundantly use media; we really love (and hate) our media too. This puts media on the same level as emotion, the psyche, and the human body: running in the background, increasingly invisible, and generally taken for granted. Fortunati combined this infrastructural approach with Kittler's (2009) appeal for an ontology of media and argued that media both amplify and sacrifice affect in human interaction, as emotions "must submit themselves to the technological limits and languages of a machine" (p. 13). Referring specifically to today's technologies—the mobile phone and Internet—Fortunati works through the various ways in which media *give life* to the global socio-technical system that is our communicative environment. She argues that at the same time as this significant contextualization of our understanding of work, life, and play in contemporary society directs us toward the materiality of the media we care about so much, it asks us to consider its immateriality. In turn, if we acknowledge media's disappearance and reemergence as practices and feelings, it becomes imperative to observe and take seriously the lived experience and agency of people in their use of media and their ways of making sense of everyday life.

With this introduction I am neither saying our lives are completely determined by media, nor that people are necessarily empowered because of the "communication power" (Castells, 2009) they wield while using smartphones, tablet PCs, and the Internet. Rather, I would

like to argue that whether we like it or not, every aspect of our lives plays out in media (in one way or another). During this process, media become part of all our playing, learning, working, and loving. In other words, media constitute individuals' lived experience. In this chapter I explore this "media life" (Deuze, 2012) within the way media industries work, focusing specifically on the currently emerging practices of journalists in the increasingly precarious context of newswork. In the end, the challenges of articulating contemporary journalism with media life are explored vis-à-vis journalism education.

### **Martini Media, Polymedia, Media Life**

Outlining the future of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) in May 2005, Director of New Media & Technology Ashley Highfield argued that the company's approach would be based on the assumption that people want to access media "on their terms—anytime, any place, any how—Martini Media. We'll see what programmes appeal in this new world and how people search, sort, snack and savour our content" (BBC, 2005). The Martini concept refers to a series of 1970s European television and radio commercials for Martini, a popular brand of Italian vermouth. The advertisements featured a jingle with the memorable words: "capture a moment—that Martini moment—any time, any place, anywhere—there is a wonderful place you can share—and the right one, the right one—that's Martini."

Highfield echoed BBC Director-General Mark Thompson (2006), who predicted in the near future media and society would be based on the "Martini media" principle, "meaning media that's available when and where you want it with content moving freely between different devices and platforms."

Highfield and Thompson argue in their speeches and policies that future media professionals would need to do more than publish and publicize their work across many different media platforms—they would also need to recognize their new audience: people who participate and collaborate in finding, producing, sharing, curating, and even remixing content.

This early vision of the BBC seems supported by research on how people use media, consistently showing not only that people worldwide

spend more time with media now than ever before, but they are also concurrently exposed to multiple media (Papper, Holmes, & Popovich, 2004). Simultaneously, people's media use is increasingly "productive" in that most of what we do with media involves making media—varying from liking, sharing, uploading, or forwarding materials online to creating our own media from scratch (such as fan fiction). This mixing and matching between media consumption and production in the context of media exposure occurring across multiple devices is what Henry Jenkins (2006) considers convergence culture. Audiences seeking news—just like people who love watching television on all their devices and advertisers trying to reach everyone everywhere—use media in ways that are anything but stable and seem to flow and spill over between and across media. The best way to describe what people do and experience when using media for news is by their own vocabulary: "reading, watching, viewing, listening, checking, snacking, monitoring, scanning, searching, clicking, linking, sharing, liking, recommending, commenting and voting" (Meijer & Kormelink, 2014, p. 3). Similarly, the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism's annual online surveys (in France, Germany, Denmark, Finland, Spain, Italy, Japan, Brazil, the United Kingdom, and the United States, 2016), and the U.S.-based Pew Research Center's annual State of the News Media (Mitchell, 2014) report that people worldwide use multiple devices to access and share news, each year folding new devices (most notably tablets and smartphones), and new platforms (specifically social media), into their omnivorous news routines.

In the process of using news, people deploy and exchange multiple devices, interfaces, and platforms as they move through their day. This behavior is not random, it has become quite patterned, and it does not change much when new, shiny toys get introduced. Interestingly, the aforementioned surveys suggest most people get news through their online and mobile social networks "even though they did not go there looking for it [news]" (Mitchell, 2014). The challenge for journalism is to become (and stay) part of this routinized round of clicks on computer mouse buttons, touchpads, touchscreens, remote controls, keyboards (and sometimes the turning of printed pages), and therein find a balance between telling people what they need to know and letting the

“people formerly known as the audience” (Rosen, 2006) play a part in the newsgathering and storytelling process.

The media, in the eyes and experiences of users, have always been an ensemble (Bausinger, 1984), as different devices and their uses mix and match in everyday routines. That experience, the feeling of more or less integrated (if not always seamless) media, is typical of media life. In recent years, Bausinger’s observation is being echoed in Nick Couldry’s work (2011, p. 220), who advocates the need to be aware of people’s various ways of using the media, their “media manifold,” and how this influences the way they do things and make sense of the everyday world. Couldry (2004) proposes a definition of media as practice, as ways of acting in the world that are always social. Couldry provides a theoretical foundation for Meikle and Young’s (2012) suggestion, that “For many people, the media are no longer just what they watch, read or listen to or read—the media are now what people *do*” (p. 10).

Miller and Madianou (2012) take this notion of media as practice one important step further, suggesting that we treat the media environment “as an integrated structure of affordances” (p. 4). They introduce a theory of polymedia to both articulate the enveloping media ecosystem in everyday life and to consider “additional layers of meaning, functions and consequences” (Miller & Madianou, 2012, p. 5) when looking at what people are doing with media. This work in turn is informed by the recent convergence of mediation and mediatization studies, emphasizing the ways in which communication media transform social processes while being socially shaped themselves (Hepp & Krotz, 2014).

What all these industry and scholarly approaches have in common (Martini media, convergence culture, media as ensemble, polymedia, manifold and practices, and mediation and mediatization) is a growing awareness that understanding everyday life cannot be separated from an appreciation of the formative role media play, while at the same time recognizing that, in media, people create as much as consume the world.

Our media use is not just a series of individual activities or a set of distinct practices, but rather a social phenomenon specific to media life. Immersed in media we wield all kinds of tools interchangeably to communicate with ourselves and the world around us to make the

world we live in fit and feel comfortable (or, at the very least, to make reality something we can handle). Media practices are neither new nor exclusive to the forms of our media manifold. Instead, the ways we use media, express ourselves in and through media, and give meaning to media should be seen as signaling (and shaping) broader social, economic, and technological trends.

### **Selfies and Mass Self-Communication**

As our media are anytime, anyplace, and anywhere, so are we. In media, we witness crucially intimate occurrences in people's lives from around the world. Whether it is a wedding video of a friend who lives overseas or the beheading of a journalist somewhere in Syria, a series of tweets about a great concert we chose not to attend, or a Facebook status update with shocking news about the suicide of a celebrity we follow, we get confronted by intense emotional life experiences on a minute-to-minute basis. Our media use turns us—at times—from people who listen to and watch stories about people's lives to people who witness other people's lives (and deaths). A mundane media diet is anything but stable in terms of what it exposes us to. We are navigating an ocean of stories that inform, shock, and entertain, contributing ourselves along the way in the form of personal data we directly or indirectly share when using digital media services with media that seem to multiply all the time. Life in media is an emotional rollercoaster, one most people try to control one way or another.

At the heart of understanding people's immersive engagement in media is the reconstruction of the "self as source" (Sundar, 2008). Based on his experimental work on people's media use, Sundar highlighted the importance of ourselves in the co-evolution of technology and psychology, showing that the most seductive part of media is not what they have to offer (in terms of professionally produced content or carefully prepared and neatly packaged experiences), but their potential for customization and individual agency. We can make something of and in media, and media to some extent seem to put us into the driver's seat when navigating the world around us.

A powerful expression of the self as source is the meteoric rise of social media as the major "place" to be in media. This trend prompted

*Time* magazine to make “YOU” its “Person of the Year” in 2006, featuring a front cover with a *YouTube* screen functioning as a mirror (Grossman, 2006). According to the editors of the American magazine, social media put people in control of the information age, effectively turning the Web into “a massive social experiment, and like any experiment worth trying, it could fail” (Grossman, 2006). This supposed control primarily manifests itself in individual self-expression and what some would call oversharing our private lives. The media that connect people also stimulate us to look more or less exclusively at ourselves. Instead of this making us feel in control of the information age, it seems to inspire incessant self-searching and exuberant self-exhibition. Therefore, it is no surprise that seven years later, in 2013, “Selfie” became “Word of the Year” according to the Oxford Dictionary Online (2013) and a host of national associations worldwide. Rather than the selfie being the product of an increasingly narcissistic generation of young people, selfies have become the default operation in media life propagated by people as varied as U.S. President Barack Obama (during a remembrance ceremony for former South African President Nelson Mandela), Pope Francis (regularly during formal visits and informal street meetings), Ellen DeGeneres (during the 2013 Oscars live television show), and everyone else during the “Selfie Olympics,” the 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi, Russia. In fact, selfies have become so banal that they are finally boring enough to warrant serious interest (such as special issues of academic journals and chapters in learned volumes).

Rather than serving a strict function of self-documentation, the selfie’s core purpose is to be shared with others *in media*. Castells terms this at once self-centered yet instantly connected social behavior in media as “mass self-communication” (Castells, 2007):

It is mass communication because it reaches potentially a global audience through the p2p networks and Internet connection .... *And it is self-generated in content, self-directed in emission, and self-selected in reception by many that [sic] communicate with many.* (p. 248, emphasis in original)



As numerous observers note, while people using media are at once and instantaneously connected with large and multiple dynamic groups and networks, they also seem to be ascribed with a deeply individualized and seemingly self-centered value system. Our media certainly seem to single us out, giving us endless customization options—both in terms of technological affordances and content choices—in their embrace of the Martini concept. In doing so, the shared selfie as an act of mass self-communication can be seen as an instance of what Sloterdijk considers our “modern individuality [that is] supported by a complex media environment that enables multiple and permanent auto-references” (2004, p. 235), enabling the individual to form a couple with himself. This “connected self” is at once endlessly archived (in media) as well as impermanent—it is constantly torn between being in the *nowhere* of media and the *somewhere* of life. Indeed, the connection between self-formation and shared locale (Thompson, 1996, p. 207) has become comprehensively mediated. However, this does not necessarily mean that we are not in touch with one another and the world anymore. As Wellman (2002) suggests: “The shift to a personalized, wireless world affords networked individualism, with each person switching between ties and networks. People remain connected, but as individuals rather than being rooted” (p. 16).

What people do with Martini media is not only partake in increasingly complex and at times quite sophisticated media usage patterns, from “binging” on television shows to “snacking” on byte-sized news headlines. They are also producing themselves and their stories online. It would be a mistake to see the emergence of mass self-communication alongside professional Martini media production solely as a consequence of a widespread diffusion of ubiquitous and easy-to-use new information and communication technologies. Using data from social values surveys in 43 countries, Inglehart (1997) observed a global shift of people in their roles as citizens away from nation-based politics and institutional elites toward a distinctly skeptical, globally linked yet deeply personal type of self-centered civic engagement. This shift occurred in the context of a trend, particularly among Western democratic countries’ overdeveloped populations, toward post-materialist values and ideals. This development, which emerged in the early 1970s,

is indicated by a shift in emphasis from economic and physical security toward personal goals that emphasize self-expression and quality-of-life issues. Similarly, during the 1990s authors such as Putnam (2000) and Norris (1998) detailed broad societal trends toward distinctly individualized and often outright anti-authoritarian attitudes, leading Beck (2000) to conclude: “We are undoubtedly living in an anti-hierarchical age” (p. 150). This does not preclude political engagement, as Papacharissi (2014) notes. She outlines the emergence of a fluid, issue-driven politics by “affective publics” that coalesce around emotions and feelings of engagement facilitated through social media. In the same way as social movements mixed with current events (such as police killings) become hashtags on Twitter, outrage online fueled the street demonstrations during the Arab Spring. It is clear that people deeply care about the world they live in, and today’s personal (and social) media amplify and accelerate that emotion.

The current media culture is one where people expect media exactly when and how they want it, engaging in mass self-communication next to (and often mixed with) passive consumption and handling media in intimate and affective ways primarily to explore matters of personal significance. It must be clear that media are central to any understanding of the world. Surely, all of this must be great news to media industries and professionals, and particularly to the practitioners in journalism: their stories fuel what gets shared online, their work flows across all media, and their professional roles and identities set them apart from colleagues in advertising, games, music, and film.

### **The Entrepreneurial Society**

People spend more time with media today than at any previous point in history. The number of media channels, forms, genres, devices, applications, and formats is multiplying. More media are produced every year, and we spend more of our time concurrently exposed to these Martini media. At the same time, the news about work in the media in general, and journalism in particular, is less than optimistic. Reports about continuing layoffs across all media industries are paramount, most notably film and television entertainment, journalism, digital game development, and advertising. This suggests a paradox:

as people engage with media in an increasingly immersive, always-on, almost instantaneous, and interconnected way, the very people whose livelihood and sense of professional identity depend on delivering media content and experiences seem to be at a loss on how to come up with survival strategies. For example, they struggle to discover effective business models and regulatory practices, such as those regarding copyrights and universal access provisions. And perhaps, most specifically, they search for entrepreneurial working conditions that would support and sustain the creative process needed to meet the demands of media life.

In the context of Martini media and people's affective mass self-communication, the ecosystem for media professions in general, and journalism in particular, has been evolving toward what some call a "post-industrial" news model (Anderson, Bell, & Shirky, 2013). Anderson et al. (2013) suggest that for journalism to adapt to the new media environment (with its social, economic, technological, and cultural implications), the profession needs new tactics, a new self-conception, and new organizational structures. They allude to a trend benchmarked by the creative industries: a gradual shift from centralized and hierarchical modes of industrial production to what Castells (2010) coins a network enterprise form of production. Castells argues that the relationships among capital and labor in our at once global and local network society are increasingly individualized (rather than more or less exclusively institutional). This type of post-industrial mode of production integrates the work process globally through digital telecommunications, transportation, and client-customer networks. Workers find themselves collaborating or coordinating their activities with team members in different parts of the company, sometimes located in different parts of the world, working from places that are more often than not like the formally sanctioned office environments of the past (coffee shops, libraries, bare-bones renovated factory spaces, on the road, or simply at home).

In the current digital and network media ecosystem the roles played by different professional disciplines in the production of culture—media makers, financial executives, advertising creatives, and communication managers, including marketing and sales practitioners—are increasingly intertwined. This network characteristic also reveals the

often translocalized nature of the media production process, as media industries offshore subcontract and outsource various elements in the production process to reduce cost and redistribute risk. In journalism this practice is called “remote control journalism,” in which news organizations move certain divisions or departments to another part of the world (Deuze, 2006c). The International Federation of Journalists and the International Labour Organization found adverse effects of the network enterprise at work in journalism in a 2006 survey among journalism unions and associations in 38 countries from all continents. The study signaled the rapid rise of so-called “atypical” work in the media, documenting that close to a third of journalists worldwide work in anything but secure, permanent positions with contracts. It found freelance journalism, independent news entrepreneurship, and uncontracted labor paramount, particularly among young reporters and newcomers in the field.

In recent years, such work trends have continued. For example, in The Netherlands a national survey of journalists found that those under contract and in permanent positions dropped from 77% to 50% from 2000 to 2010 (Hermans, Vergeer, & Pleijter, 2011, p. 15). Also, less than 25% of journalists younger than 35 were “typically” employed. The Dutch national association of journalists, traditionally organized around departments representing different media—newspaper, magazine, broadcast and online journalists—today counts as its largest group “independent” journalists, 2,128 of its 7,400 members. In 2013, several organizations representing journalists in The Netherlands collaborated in a survey of their freelance or otherwise independently working members (some 7,087 reporters, editors, videographers, and photographers). Two thirds of these independently working journalists preferred this kind of arrangement over a permanent, full-time job in a newsroom. They attributed this preference to freedom, flexibility, passion, and opportunity. Although most of these freelance journalists work on average with four different clients from home or within editorial collectives and news startups, many of these independent reporters work within legacy media newsrooms. After all, the legacy media increasingly depends on flexible, part-time, and temporary or uncontracted arrangements to run their departments.

Even though we can find some optimism among the atypically employed, studies in Germany (Ertel, Pech, Ullsperger, Von dem Knesebeck, & Siegrist, 2005); Australia (Gregg, 2011); the United Kingdom (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2010); and the United States (Neff, Wissinger, & Zukin, 2005) consistently show adverse psychosocial effects, rising levels of stress, and overall poor health among freelance media workers. Reports based on interviews with entrepreneurs in various cities across the United States in 2015 suggest that the “high-stress, hyper competitive and demanding lifestyle” of striking out on your own often links to depression (*The Business Journals*, 2015; Twitter hashtag #startupdepression).

The real or perceived freedom of entrepreneurship clearly comes at a cost to many, if not most, media professionals. This picture of increasingly flexible and precarious working conditions for journalists and media workers corresponds with trends in the Dutch labor market as a whole, as 2013 data from the Dutch Central Statistical Agency (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek) show a continuous growth of independent businesses and freelance entrepreneurship despite (or inspired by) the ongoing economic crisis. This trend clearly is not unique to The Netherlands or journalism. It seems to be a feature of all media work (Deuze, 2007) and a structural condition of labor. We therefore need to take a step back and consider entrepreneurship not just as a subset of individual activities necessary to secure survival (and opportunity) in a globally networked economy, but also as *lived experience* increasingly particular to the contemporary arrangement of society as a whole.

As Landström and Johannisson (2001) wrote, “entrepreneurship [is] a phenomenon that lies beyond individual attributes and abilities. Entrepreneurship encompasses, to our mind, the organizing of resources and collaborators in new patterns according to perceived opportunities” (p. 228). Considering the theory of entrepreneurship as a social phenomenon put forward by Landström and Johannisson, it does not seem to be a stretch to argue that navigating access to society for anyone demands an increasingly entrepreneurial skillset. This includes gathering and organizing information, verifying and curating resources, and interacting with many (potential) collaborators. It also involves finding one’s way despite constantly changing systems,

networks, and people. This is true whether one is trying to figure out a country's nebulous tax system, securing a contract with competing service providers (from home insurance policies to telecommunications access), developing a strategy for one's professional "portfolio career" (Platman, 2004), or navigating the frothy waters of our romantic life in a turbulent "post-dating" world (Deuze, 2012, p. 212).

Additionally, entrepreneurship as a social phenomenon cannot be separated from a ubiquitous and pervasive media environment, necessitating an advanced (and critical) multimedia literacy for all. As Hartley (2007) suggested, "Popular self-publication can however now be contemplated because the era of one-way 'read-only' media of mass and broadcast communication is transforming into the interactive era of 'read-write' multimedia" (p. 137). A fundamental issue for developing some kind of consistent and functional literacy model for media life is our rapidly changing media environment. Briggs and Burke (2009) concluded, after comprehensively reviewing the social history of media from the early days of the printing press up to today's "high-definition, inter-drive, mutually convergent technologies of communication" (p. 12), that the entire media system can best be understood as being in continuous flux. In other words, today's media are really complex and difficult to master. And once we have gained some sort of read-write literacy, a new version, device, or system comes along that requires a costly process of deskilling and reskilling. Most of us neither have the time nor the inclination to engage in this process. At the same time, our involvement with media becomes increasingly encompassing and intimate.

As life plays out in media, we have no choice but to engage with the media environment—no one is outside anymore. Society's near-complete mediatization goes hand-in-hand with its increasing complexity. I would argue that the entrepreneurial mindset and its corresponding skill-set are necessary, required for anyone navigating our "hypercomplex" (Qvortrup, 2003) society. Qvortrup suggests that contemporary society is not a permanently unstable network, constantly veering out of control. To account for society's surprisingly stable state given current disruptive social, economical, and technological developments, it is perhaps better to see world society as a global social system that self-organizes through communication (Luhmann, 1990). The advantage of this approach

is that it explains how the stability and coherence of world society is maintained through communication (rather than through the acts or actions of any individual human being or range of technologies), which is particularly poignant to consider in the current context of media life. Seen from this perspective, people's affective mass self-communication contributes to the maintenance of social order even though it seems—in terms of the endless status updates, tweets, posts, and messages sent and published on any given day—to exemplify social chaos.

In this Luhmann-inspired conceptualization of society, no one person or institutional entity (or paradigm, such as capitalism, communism, or Sharia law) is effectively in control as society adapts itself and self-organizes through communication to deal with increasing internal and external complexity. Connecting the pressure and risk of managing hyper-complexity with media life makes entrepreneurs of us all. The organization of resources and collaborators in new patterns to address challenges and opportunities is a way to manage complexity (in society) by complexity (in media), and vice versa.

### **Discussion and Conclusion: A Challenge to Education**

The key to thinking about entrepreneurial journalism as an answer to (or the consequence of) precarity in media work is to recognize how it is tied to broader trends in contemporary society. Society self-organizes itself through communication, and within it people live their lives in media, where media professions both contribute to the experience of complexity and provide the tools (devices and content) to manage complexity. Entrepreneurship is not a set of skills and activities that are somehow exceptional or unique to a particular kind of individual. It is rather a mundane aspect of everyday life, work, and play.

Understanding entrepreneurialism in the context of broader trends in society, technology, and media can be the key for journalism educators to understand not only what's going on in the field but to help their students navigate it. The social, technological, and industrial trends outlined in this chapter all point toward greater *complexity*, *precarity*, and *affect* (as in emotional engagement) marking the way people are in the world (as citizens, consumers, producers, and professionals). Entrepreneurialism, rather than *just* a category particular to the culture

of contemporary capitalism (Sennett, 2006), can also be seen as a way to navigate core components of today's social and media system. As I see it, schools and programs of journalism have a specific role to play here.

But first, the paradigm of journalism education needs to be decided (Deuze, 2006a, p. 24): Should a program or curriculum prepare journalists for future employment or serve to educate “super citizens”? A focus on future employment reduces teaching and training to helping students internalize the occupational ideology and practices of journalism *as is*. Shifting the paradigm to educating super citizens, the industry, and its social and technological context, should continuously be looked at with a critical eye. Journalism, in this sense, should be considered to be the heart of what it takes to perform successfully in the information age. Going beyond the motivations that inspire individual students to choose an education in journalism, one should note that a critical-reflective skillset, toolkit, and outlook of a journalist would benefit all in the global economy.

Second, since media life and entrepreneurialism are integral parts of journalism, they should be recognized in all program decisions (Deuze, 2006a, pp. 26-27). After all, journalism cannot be separated from the community in which it exists: the intimate, pervasive, and unstable ways in which people (and professionals) navigate their “oceans of media.” In terms of the professional ethos of journalism, journalism educators need to decide once and for all whether the journalist is a neutral observer, an outsider to the inner-workings of community life, or a participant—someone who works with elements of the community (while always being mindful of their agendas, biases, and often conflicting interests). A journalist in media life is inevitably drawn into the living archive of (nearly) everything that is the Internet, prompting news organizations worldwide to hastily come up with social media guidelines. Since journalists must participate in the community they cover in order to understand their beats and contemporary media culture, journalism education should teach them how to do so (Deuze, 2006b).

Third, a word on entrepreneurialism as a popular direction for many schools of journalism around the world (Baines & Kennedy, 2010; Briggs, 2011; Claussen, 2011). The common wisdom seems to be to include business skills and knowledge into the curriculum and to add



coursework on entrepreneurship. Although I am not contesting these decisions, entrepreneurship classes should not just focus on journalists setting up their own enterprises in a precarious marketplace. As Storey, Salaman, and Platman (2005) note (referring to Rosen's work):

A significant feature of the concept of enterprise is precisely that it operates at a number of levels—economy/political, organization/institutional, and the individual self. Enterprise thus acts as a fundamental principle of integration among polity, organization, and individual. (p. 1034)

Therefore, any class or curricular entrepreneurial intervention should come with a mode of instruction and pedagogical materials that would inspire critical engagement with a way of being in the world beyond *just* a way of setting up shop.

Finally, in terms of curriculum, media life and the Martini media context open up possibilities and opportunities for what Jenkins calls “transmedia” storytelling (Jenkins, 2003). Jenkins defines transmedia as “a process where integral elements . . . get dispersed systematically across multiple delivery channels for the purpose of creating a unified and coordinated . . . experience” (Jenkins, 2007). In 2009 Jenkins created a list of seven principles of transmedia storytelling, emphasizing how the contemporary professional should consider spreadability, continuity, immersion, seriality, subjectivity, performativity, and world-building when producing media content or experiences. In 2011 Moloney (2011) graduated from the University of Denver with a thesis on transmedia journalism, outlining on his blog how Jenkins' principles might be applied to journalistic storytelling. Where transmedia journalism differs from multimedia journalism (Deuze, 2004) or convergent journalism (Quinn, 2005) is in its use of the audience in all aspects of the creative process: from generating story ideas to gathering information, from contributing parts of the narrative and research to assisting in its funding and distribution, and from marketing the content to following it up with comments and additional story lines. It is my contention that the distinction between crossmedia journalism (also known as multimedia or convergent journalism) and transmedia journalism should be the basis on which journalism schools and programs acknowledge

media life in the future. This should replace the traditional organization into medium-specific sequences (of newspaper, magazine, radio, television, and online journalism).

A teaching curriculum that embraces the implications of entrepreneurialism, super-citizens, media life, a Martini mode of thinking about media, and transmedia journalism would in some ways look quite differently from the traditionally siloed ways of working in schools and programs of journalism. It advocates the following:

- integration of coursework (for example, combining case studies of the business side of the industry with insights from marketing and advertising);
- cross-sectional modules (for example, integrating different media sequences in lab-type courses);
- centralization of ethics and critical reflection on journalism and the role of individual journalists in society as the benchmark for all coursework; and
- a recognition of journalism as a form of atypical and affective labor: It is work that tends not to be defined anymore by clear career trajectories (including benefits and support offered by stable employer-employee relationships), as well as it is work journalists profoundly care about.

In all of this I hope and trust we stay mindful about the affective engagement of publics with their communities, and of journalists with their field—for it is that emotional connection that most intensely determines the way these constituencies experience and give meaning to their roles as citizens, consumers, and journalists.

### References

- Anderson, C. W., Bell, E., & Shirky, C. (2013). *Post-industrial journalism: Adapting to the present*. New York, NY: Columbia Journalism School, Tow Center for Digital Journalism.
- Baines, D., & Kennedy, C. (2010). An education for independence. *Journalism Practice*, 4(1), 1-17.
- Bausinger, H. (1984). Media, technology and daily life. *Media, Culture & Society*, 6, 343-351.
- BBC. (2005). BBC announced iMP content trial. Retrieved from <http://www>.

- bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2005/05\_may/16/imp.shtml
- Beck, U. (2000). *The brave new world of work*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Botton, A. de (2014). *The news: A user's manual*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Briggs, M. (2011). *Entrepreneurial journalism*. New York, NY: CQ Press.
- Briggs, A., & Burke, P. (2009). *A social history of the media*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Castells, M. (2007). Power and counter-power in the network society. *International Journal of Communication*, 1, 238-266.
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford: OUP.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Claussen, D. (2011). CUNY's Entrepreneurial journalism: partially old wine in a new bottle, and not quite thirst-quenching, but still a good drink. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 66(3), 3-6.
- Couldry, N. (2004). Theorising media as practice. *Social Semiotics* 14(2), 115-132.
- Couldry, N. (2011). The necessary future of the audience . . . and how to research it. In V. Nightingale, (Ed.), *Handbook of media audiences* (pp. 213-229). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Deuze, M. (2004). What is multimedia journalism? *Journalism Studies*, 5(2), 139-152.
- Deuze, M. (2006a). Global journalism education: A conceptual approach. *Journalism Studies*, 7(1), 19-34.
- Deuze, M. (2006b). Participation, remediation, bricolage: Considering principal components of a digital culture. *The Information Society*, 22(2), 63-75.
- Deuze, M. (2006c). Remote-control journalism. Retrieved from <http://deuze.blogspot.com/2006/11/remote-control-journalism.html>
- Deuze, M. (2007). *Media work*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Deuze, M. (2012). *Media life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Deuze, M. (2014). Media life and the mediatization of the lifeworld. In A. Hepp & F. Krotz, F. (Eds.), *Mediatized world: Culture and society in a media age* (pp. 207-220). New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Ertel, M., Pech, E., Ullsperger, P., Von dem Knesebeck, O., & Siegrist, J. (2005). Adverse psychosocial working conditions and subjective health in freelance media workers. *Work & Stress: An international Journal of Work*, 19(3), 293-299.
- Gregg, M. (2011). *Work's intimacy*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Grossman, L. (2016, December 25). You—yes, you—are Time's person of the year. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1570810,00.html>
- Hartley, J. (2007). There are other ways of being in the truth: The uses of multimedia literacy. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 10(1), 135-144.
- Hepp, A., & Krotz, F. (2014). (Eds.), *Mediatized world: Culture and society in a media age*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Hermans, L., Vergeer, M., & Pleijter, A. (2011). *Nederlandse journalisten in*

2010. Nijmegen: Radboud University.
- Hesmondhalgh, D., & Baker, S. (2010). *Creative labour: Media work in three cultural industries*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Consuming the romantic utopia: Love and the cultural contradictions of capitalism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jenkins, H. (2003, January 15). Transmedia storytelling. *MIT Technology Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.technologyreview.com/news/401760/transmedia-storytelling>
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture*. New York: NYU Press.
- Jenkins, H. (2007, March 22). Transmedia storytelling 101. (Web log comment). Retrieved from [http://henryjenkins.org/2007/03/transmedia\\_storytelling\\_101.html](http://henryjenkins.org/2007/03/transmedia_storytelling_101.html)
- Kittler, F. (2009). Towards an ontology of media. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(2-3), 23-31.
- Landström, H., & Johanisson, B. (2001). Theoretical foundation of Swedish entrepreneurship and small-business research. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 17, 225-248.
- Luhmann, N. (1990). The autopoiesis of social systems. In N. Luhmann. *Essays on self-reference* (pp. 1-20). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Meijer, I. C., & Kormelink, T. G. (2014). Checking, sharing, clicking and liking: Changing patterns of news use between 2004 and 2014. *Digital Journalism*, DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2014.937149
- Meikle, G., & Young, S. (2012). *Media convergence: Networked digital media in everyday life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Meyer, B. (2011). Mediation and immediacy: Sensational forms, semiotic ideologies and the question of the medium. *Social Anthropology*, 19(1), 23-39.
- Meyrowitz, J. (1998). Multiple media literacies. *Journal of Communication*, 48, 96-108.
- Miller, D. (Ed.), (2005). *Materiality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Miller, D. & Madianou, M. (2012). *Technologies of love*. London: Routledge.
- Mitchell, A. (2014). State of the news media 2014. *Pew Research Journalism Project*. Retrieved from <http://www.journalism.org/2014/03/26/state-of-the-news-media-2014-overview>
- Moloney, K. (2011). Transmedia journalism principles. (Web log comment). Retrieved from <http://transmediajournalism.org/contexts/transmedia-journalism-principles>
- Neff, G., Wissinger, E., & Zukin, S. (2005). Entrepreneurial labor among cultural producers: "Cool" jobs in "hot" industries. *Social Semiotics*, 15(3), 307-334.
- Norris, P. (1998). *Critical citizens: Global support for democratic governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford Dictionary Online. (2013). The Oxford Dictionaries Word of the Year

2013. Retrieved from <http://blog.oxforddictionaries.com/press-releases/oxford-dictionaries-word-of-the-year-2013>
- Papacharissi, Z. (2014). *Affective publics: Sentiment, technology, and politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Papper, R., Holmes, M., & Popovich, M. (2004). Middletown media studies. *The International Digital Media and Digital Arts Association Journal*, 1(1), 1-56.
- Platman, K. (2004). "Portfolio careers" and the search for flexibility in later life. *Work, Employment and Society*, 18(3), 573-599.
- Pogue, D. (2010, November 24). The lessons of 10 years of talking tech. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/25/technology/personaltech/25pogue.html>
- Putnam, R. (Ed.), (2000). *Democracies in flux: The evolution of social capital in contemporary society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quinn, S. (2005). *Convergence journalism*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Qvortrup, L. (2003). *The hypercomplex society*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. (2016). Digital News Report 2016. Retrieved from <http://www.digitalnewsreport.org>
- Rosen, J. (2006). The people formerly known as the audience. Retrieved from [http://archive.pressthink.org/2006/06/27/ppl\\_frmr.html](http://archive.pressthink.org/2006/06/27/ppl_frmr.html)
- Sennett, R. (2006). *The culture of the new capitalism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sloterdijk, P. (2004). *Sphären*. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2004.
- Storey, J., Salaman, G., & Platman, K. (2005). Living with enterprise in an enterprise economy: Freelance and contract workers in the media. *Human Relations*, 58(8), 1033-1054.
- Sundar, S. (2008). Self as source: Agency and customization in interactive media. In E. Konijn, S. Utz, M. Tanis, & S. Barnes, S. (Eds.), *Mediated interpersonal communication* (pp. 58-74). New York, NY: Routledge.
- The Business Journals*. (2015, March 23). Full coverage: Depression, entrepreneurs and startups. Retrieved from <http://www.bizjournals.com/bizjournals/news/2015/03/22/full-coverage-entrepreneurs-and-depression.html>
- Thompson, J. (1996). *The media and modernity: A social theory of the media*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Thompson, M. (2006, April 25). BBC creative future: Mark Thompson's speech in full. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/media/2006/apr/25/bbc.broadcasting>
- Wellman, B. (2002). Little boxes, glocalization and networked individualism. In M. Tanabe, P. Besselaar, & T. Ishida. *Digital cities II* (pp. 10-25). Berlin: Springer.