Journalism, Media Life, and the Entrepreneurial Society

Word count: 5286 (excluding notes and sources)

Introduction: Media as Water to Fish

We live in media. Media are to us as water is to fish. This is not a new situation or environment, nor is it uniquely attributable to social media such as Facebook, to devices such as smartphones, or to practices like selfies. In a quote often attributed to media theorist Marshall McLuhan, Albert Einstein wrote in 1936 a "Self-Portrait" (published in English in 1950):

"Of what is significant in one's own existence one is hardly aware, and it certainly should not bother the other fellow. What does a fish know about the water in which he swims all his life?"

Indeed, what can we know about media – especially as our lives have become suffused by media? Writing in 1985, media philosopher Friedrich Kittler foresaw our current media lives, suggesting that "the dominant information technologies of the day control all understanding and its illusions," and in the process "what remains of people is what media can store and communicate" (1999[1985]: xl). Perhaps Kittler's ontological observations of media go too far (dipping into the water of technological determinism), but his concerns are legitimate when it comes to the pervasive nature of media in everyday life and their corresponding disappearance from our active awareness of them as a direct function of this. As Joshua Meyrowitz remarks: "Ironically, then, the environment of a medium is most invisible when its influence is most pervasive" (1998: 106).

Looking at media and life as mutually implicated physical as well as emotional infrastructures – we do not just abundantly use media, we really love (and hate) our media too - 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. Leopoldina Fortunati combines this infrastructural approach with Kittler's (2009) appeal for an ontology of media to argue how media both amplify and sacrifice affect in human interaction as emotions "must submit themselves to the technological limits and languages of a machine" (2009: 13). Referring specifically to today's technologies - the mobile phone and internet - she works through the various ways in which media *give life* to the material and

immaterial structure of the global socio-technical system that is our communicative environment.

With this introduction I am not trying to say that our lives are completely determined by media; rather, I would like to argue that whether we like it or not, every aspect of our life plays out in media (one way or another). In the process, media come to be part of all our playing, learning, working, and loving. In this essay I aim to explore the consequences of media life, focusing specifically on the role of journalism and the currently emerging practices of journalists in the increasingly precarious context of newswork.

Martini Media, Polymedia, Media Life

Outlining the future of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) in May 2005, its 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."[1] Highfield was echoing Mark Thompson, who stepped in as Director-General of the BBC the year before with the prediction of a near-future of media and society 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."[2] Highfield and Thompson signaled to their co-workers that future media professionals should not just be getting comfortable with publishing and publicizing their work across many different media platforms – they should also recognize their audience and not exclusively an audience anymore, but people who participate and collaborate in finding, producing, sharing, curating and perhaps even remixing content.

This vision of media available anytime, anyplace, and anywhere included possibilities for users to create and share their own content on BBC websites, which company spokespeople claimed is a typical feature of today's Martini generation. The Martini concept refers to a series of 1970s television and radio commercials for Martini, a popular brand of Italian vermouth. The adverts featured a jingle that in 1977 became the hit song "Dancing Easy" by South African singer Danny Williams, featuring these memorable words: "capture a moment - that Martini moment - anytime, anyplace, anywhere - there is a wonderful place you can share - and the right one, the right one - that's Martini..." Beyond the attractive Martini metaphor, a comparable notion of seamlessly flowing content has been coined by advertising industry observers

as ‘liquid media’ referring to “content that can seamlessly be transferred from one format to another and from one platform to another” (Russell, 2009: 53), posing new creative challenges to media professionals.

Media industries and their observers know their stuff – market research consistently shows not only that people around the world each year spend more time with media than ever before, they often do so while concurrently exposed to multiple media at the same time (Papper, Holmes and Popovich, 2004). It is not just folks who love watching television on all their devices, nor is this typical for advertising trying to reach all of us wherever we may be – audiences for news similarly use media in ways that are anything but stable and seem to flow and spillover between and across media. Recent studies in The Netherlands show for example that 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” (Costera Meijer and Groot Kormelink, 2014: 3). Similarly, the annual online surveys in France, Germany, Denmark, Finland, Spain, Italy, Japan, Brazil, the UK and the US through the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism consistently show that people use multiple devices to access and share news, each year folding new devices – notably tablets and smartphones – and new platforms – specifically social media – into their omnivorous news routines.[3]

In the process of using news, multiple devices, interfaces and platforms get deployed and exchanged as people move throughout their day. This behavior is not completely random, but in fact has become quite patterned and does not change all that much when new ‘shiny new toys’ get introduced. The challenge for journalism is to become (and to stay) part of this routinized round of clicks (on computer mouse buttons, touchpads and touchscreens, remote controls, keyboards and, in few instances, the turning of printed pages).

Although this multi-device, multi-platform media culture may seem to consist of distinctly present-day practices, we should be reminded of German cultural anthropologist Hermann Bausinger, who in 1984 suggested that: “To make a meaningful study of the use of the media, it is necessary to take different media into consideration, the media ensemble which everyone deals with today … The recipient integrates the content of different media” (349). Media, in the eyes and experiences of users, have always been ensemblematic. 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 has

been echoed in the work of for example Nick Couldry, advocating an awaress of peope's 'media manifold' (2011: 220). Daniel Miller and Mirca Madianou take this one important step further, suggesting that we treat the media environment "as an integrated structure of affordances" (2012: 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" (ibid.: 5). This work in turn is informed by the recent convergence of mediation and mediatization studies, emphasizing the ways in which communications media transform social processes while being socially shaped themselves.

What all these approaches – media as ensemble, polymedia, mediatization – have in common, 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 media do not determine the way people live their lives. Media life can thus be seen as an iteration of what Katherine Hayles broadly conceives of as 'technogenesis': "digital media and contemporary technogenesis constitute a complex adaptive system, with the technologies constantly changing as well as bringing about change in those whose lives are enmeshed with them" (2012: 18). Here we have a conundrum, or so it seems: should we study media with distinctly non-media-centric approaches, deliberately 'decentering' media as our object of study? Or should the materiality of media be front and center in our sensemaking practices of everyday life? Sarah Pink and Kerstin Leder Mackley offer a way out of this false dichotomy, reporting on their ethnographic research of people's digital media use. As they find, people may not always be deliberate nor articulate about their media use, but still enter into all kinds of delicate negotations with their media throughout the day to make their homes (and offices and other living spaces) "feel right" (2013: 682). These interactions are embodied, sensory and emotional rather than necessarily linguistic. In other words: understanding media is as much about appreciating how media are felt and experienced, as it is about pinpointing how and why people use media the way they do.

Architect and urbanist Witold Rybczynski (1983) introduces additional historical perspective on the boundarycrossing properties of technology and the human condition that help us understand media life not just as an instance of using a lot of media devices and platforms, but also as a state of feeling. Referencing Sigmund Freuds' work on man as a 'prosthetic God' (1930: 39), Rybczynski sees technology as "really a set of artificial organs, extensions of our natural ones … the relationship between ourselves and our tools is often

blurred, and frequently intimate" (1983: 4). In a story reviewing a decade's worth of reporting covering new technologies for the *New York Times* (published on November 24, 2010), David Pogue 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."[4] Whether it is an innate aspect of the man-machine relationship, or something that is more or less particular to the digitally networked, mobile and screen-based devices so many of us carry around these days: the associations between humans and their media are above all deeply emotional and intimate.

Our media use is not just a series of individual activities or a set of distinct practices, I would therefore argue, but rather a social phenomenon particular of 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).

Selfies and Mass Self-Communication

As our media are anytime, anyplace and anywhere, we are too. In media, we witness crucially intimate occurences 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 lived experience 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 live (and die). A mundane media diet is anything but stable in terms of what it exposes us to, as we are navigating an ocean of stories that inform, shock and entertain, contributing our own selves as a narrative in the process (in the form of personal data we directly or indirectly share when using digital media services) to media that seem to multiply all the time. Life in media is an emotional rollercoaster, one most people try to tame 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 higlights the importance of our own selves 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 drivers' 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 me—"YOU"—its "Person of the Year" in 2006, featuring a front cover with a *YouTube* screen functioning as a mirror.[5] According to the editors of the American magazine, social media put people in control of the information age, effectively the Web into "a massive social experiment, and like any experiment worth trying, it could fail." This supposed control primarily manifests itself in individual self-expression and what some would call oversharing our private lives. It certainly seems that 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 in exuberant self-exhibition… As seven years later, in 2013, 'Selfie' became 'Word of the Year' by the Oxford Dictionary Online and a host of national associations around the world (including the Dutch national dictionary, Van Dale).[6] Rather than the selfie being the product of an increasingly narcisstic generation of youths, selfies have become the default operation in media life propagated by people as varied as President Barack Obama of the United States (during a remembrance ceremony for 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' to coincide with the 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi, Russia.

Rather than serving a strict self-documentation function, the selfie's core purpose is to be shared with others, in media. Manuel Castells terms this at once self-centered yet instantly connected social behavior in media as an emerging form of 'mass self-communication': "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 communicate with many*" (Castells, 2007: 248; emphasis in original).

As numerous observers (and critics of the selfie movement) 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. It certainly seems as Peter Sloterdijk remarks: “modern individuality [is] supported by a complex media environment that enables multiple and permanent auto-references” (2004: 235), enabling the individual to form a couple with himself. Indeed, the connection between self-formation and shared locale (Thompson, 1996: 207) has become comprehensively mediated. However, this does not necessarily mean that we are not in touch with each other and the world anymore. Barry Wellman articulates the link between the mediated self and social as co-constitutive rather than one-directional, suggesting that “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” (2002: 16; emphasis added).

What people do with Martini media is not only partake in increasingly complex and at times quite sophisticed 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. Reporting on social values studies in 43 countries, Ronald Inglehart (1997) observed a global shift of people in their roles as citizens away from nation-based politics and institutional elites, towards a distinctly skeptical, globally linked yet deeply personal type of self-centered civic engagement. This shift occurs in the context of a trend, particularly found among the populations of Western democratic countries, towards post-materialist values and ideals. This development – which started in the early 1970s – is indicated by a shift in emphasis on economic and physical security towards personal goals that emphasize self-expression and quality of life. Similarly, during the 1990s authors such as Robert Putnam (1999) and Pippa Norris (1998) detailed broad societal trends toward distinctly individualized and often outright anti-authoritarian attitudes, leading Ulrich Beck to conclude: “We are undoubtedly living in an anti-hierarchical age” (2000: 150). It is in this context that we should read both our proclivity to expect media exactly when and how we want it, as our tendency to prefer self-expression over passive consumption in those media, and quite possibly our waning trust in institutions such as government, the Church (as well as Synagogue and Mosque), and the press.

The Entrepreneurial Society

A question is, what happens to our lives in media – what are the consequences of media life? For *Wired* magazine co-founder Kevin Kelly the answer lies in figuring out what technology wants from us. First of all, Kelly argues, technology has been invisible, hidden, and nameless from us. Sure, people throughout history have evolved inseparably from using all kinds of technologies – consider Hayles' technogenesis - but technology was not named as such until well into the 20th century. As our definitions of life came to include not just material forms (such as DNA or the body) but also "the intangible organization of the energy and information contained in those material forms" (2010: 10), Kelly suggests that technology can best be seen on its own terms – an internal logic that is self-similar, self-organizing, and becoming autonomous. An example of the pervasive nature of what Kelly calls the 'Technium' is the rise of machine-to-machine (M2M) communication, which is the second-leading source of worldwide data traffic (after mobile data), according to a 2012 analysis by Cisco Systems.[7]

Nuancing Kelly's perhaps too technodeterminist view, philosophers of technology such as Don Ihde emphasize how the relations between media and the lifeworld must be seen as governed by a technological intentionality (1990: 141). Albeit not wholly determined by media, as Kittler would have it, Jos de Mul suggests that "every medium carries with it its own distinctive worldview or metaphysics" (2010: 89). For de Mul, the essential worldview we get from our contemporary media mix is based on their key characteristics of being multimedial, interactive and capable of virtualizing reality. Reality thus becomes something we can (or expect to be able to) interact with and intervene in – rather than something we get used to and adapt to. Douglas Rushkoff finds it should come as no surprise in this context that people increasingly see themselves not as consumers (or citizens), but rather as co-creators of society as "we begin to become aware of just how much of our reality is open source" (2003: 37).

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 is less than optimistic. Reports about continuing layoffs across all media industries—most notably, film and television entertainment, journalism, digital game development, and advertising—are paramount. 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—in terms of business models, effective regulatory practices (for example regarding copyrights and universal access provisions), and perhaps, most specifically, the organization of 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 mass self-communication, the ecosystem for media professions in general and, for the purposes of this essay, journalism in particular has been evolving towards what some call a 'post-industrial' model of news (Anderson, Bell and Shirky, 2013). In their report, Chris Anderson, Emily Bell and Clay Shirky suggest that in order for journalism to adapt to the new media environment (with its attendant social, economic and cultural implications), the profession needs new tactics, a new self-conception, and new organizational structures. What their report alludes to, is a trend benchmarked by the creative industries more generally: a gradual shift from centralized and hierarchical modes of industrial production to what Castells (2010) coins as a network enterprise form of production. The relationships of capital and labor in our at once global and local network society, argues Castells, are increasingly individualized. 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.

In the current digital and networked media ecosystem the roles played by different professional disciplines in the production of culture – media makers, financial executives, advertising creatives, communication managers, including marketing and sales prsctitioners are increasingly intertwined. This networked character 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 save costs and redistribute risks. In journalism this practice is called 'remote control journalism' as news organizations move certain divisions or departments to another part of the world.[8] The network enterprise is also at work closer to home, as the International Federation of Journalists and the International Labour Organization noted in a 2006 survey among journalism unions and associations in 38 countries from all continents. The report signaled the rapid rise of so-called 'atypical' work in the media, documenting that close to one-third of journalists worldwide work in anything but secure, permanent or otherwise

contracted conditions. Freelance journalism, independent news entrepreneurship, and casualization of labor were paramount, particularly among young reporters and newcomers in the field.

In recent years, all these trends have accelerated: in The Netherlands for example a national survey of journalists in 2010 showed 50% enjoying a contracted permanent position (versus 77% in 2000; see Hermans, Vergeer and Pleijter, 2011: 15). Less than a quarter of journalists younger than 35 years was '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 section 'independent' journalists with 2128 (out of a total 7400) members. In 2013, several organizations representing journalists in The Netherlands collaborated in a survey of their freelance or otherwise independently working members (totalling 7087 reporters, editors, videographers and photographers). Two-thirds of these independently working journalists preferred this kind of arrangement over a permanent, fulltime job in a newsroom. Key motivations mentioned for this choice were freedom, flexibility, passion and opportunity. Although most freelance journalists work on average with four different clients from home or within editorial collectives and news startups, many of these independent reporters in fact work within the newsrooms of legacy media, as these organizations increasingly depend on flexible, parttime, temporary or otherwise casualized labor arrangements to run their departments.

Even though we can find some optimism among the atypically employed, studies in Germany (Ertel et al., 2005), Australia (Gregg, 2011), the UK (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011), and the US (Neff, Wissinger and Zukin, 2005) consistently show adverse psychosocial effects, rising levels of stress, and overall poor subjective health among freelance media workers. The real or perceived freedom of entrepreneurship clearly comes at a cost to many, if not most media professionals. This picture of increasingly flexibilized and precarious working conditions for journalists and media workers corresponds with trends in the Dutch labor market as a whole, as data from the Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (from 2013) show a continuous growth of independent businesses and freelance entrepreneurship despite (or inspired by) the ongoing economic crisis. As this trend clearly is not unique to The Netherlands – nor is it particular to journalism but a feature of all media work (Deuze, 2007) and a structural condition of labor more generally - we 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 Hans Landström and Bengt Johannisson write, “entrepreneurship [is] a phenomenon that lies beyond individual attributes and abilities. Entrepreneurship encompasses, to our mind, the organising of resources and collaborators in new patterns according to perceived opportunities” (2001: 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. Whether it is figuring 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, 2005), or navigating the frothy water of our romantic life in a turbulent ‘post-dating’ world (Deuze, 2012: 212): it takes the constant gathering and organizing of information, the verfication and curation of resources, interacting with many (potential) collaborators, and finding our way anew every time systems, networks and people have changed to make things work.

Additionally, entrepreneurship as a social phenomenon cannot be separated from a pervasive and ubiquitous media environment, necessitating an advanced (and critical) multimedia literacy for all. As John Hartley suggests, “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” (2007: 137). A fundamental issue for developing some kind of consistent and functional literacy model for media life is our rapidly changing media environment. Asa Briggs and Peter Burke conclude, 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” (2009: 12), that the entire media system can best be understood as being in continuous flux. In other words: today’s media are really complex, 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 have neither time nor inclination to engage in.

However, as life plays out in media, we have no choice to engage with the media environment – no one is outside anymore. Society’s near-complete mediatization goes hand in hand with its increasingly complexity. I would argue that the entrepreneurial mindset and its corresponding skillset are not just

necessary but even required for anyone navigating our 'hypercomplex' (Qvortrup, 2003) society. Basing his approach on the work of Niklas Luhmann, Lars Qvortrup proposes that contemporary society cannot be considered to be a permanently unstable and highly distributed network (as Castells would have it). In order to account for society's "surprisingly stable" (2006: 347) state given the disruptive social, economical and technological developments of for example the first decade of the 21st century, it is perhaps better to see world society as a global social system that self-organizes through communication (Luhmann, 1990). The advantage of Luhmann's 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), which is particularly poignant to consider in the current context of media life. Seen from this perspective, people's 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.[9]

In this Luhmann-inspired conceptualization of society, no one person or institutional entity (or paradigm, such as capitalism, communism, or sharia) is effectively in control as society through communication adapts itself and self-organizes to answer increasing internal and external complexity. The 'complexity turn' (Urry, 2005) in connection with media life makes entrepreneurs of us all, as the organization of resources and collaborators in new patterns to address challenges and opportunities can be considered to be a way to manage complexity by complexity. The role of media in this context is "To manage social complexity by building systems of internal complexity in order to balance external complexity" (Qvortrup, 2006: 355).

Discussion and Conclusion: A Call to Compassion

Returning to the theme of precariously employed – if employed at all – journalists, the emergence of entrepreneurial journalism as a mode of instruction in journalism schools around the world, as a mode of production in the worldwide labor market for news professionals, and as a field of research within journalism studies on the one hand realistically addresses longterm trends in the industry, while at the same time all of this can seem to be disconnected from broader developments in media and society. The key to thinking about entrepreneurial journalism as an answer to (or the consequence of) precarity in media work is to recognize how is tied to broader trends in contemporary society – a society self-organizing through communication, where people live their lives in media, and where media professions both

contribute to the experience of complexity as well as providing the tools (devices and contents) to manage complexity. Entrepreneurship is not a set of skills and activities that are somehow exceptional or unique to a particular kind of individual, but rather a mundane aspect of everyday life, work and play. If entrepreneurship is at the heart of contemporary 'everydayness' (Lefebvre, 1987), perhaps we can be a bit more forgiving about our (and others') mass self-communicative behaviors, as well as about the less-than-traditional tactics and strategies journalists deploy to survive in order to do their work in ways that meet the highest expectations of ethics and accountability, and also – as Alain de Botton (2014) advocates about at times tuning out of the news because it can be, quite simply, be too much and makes us miserable. To be entrepreneurial in using media, in doing journalism, and to live your life deserves our compassion. Instead of focusing on unique individuals, specific success stories, and overarching normative notions about what journalism, citizenship and society should be, we should remind ourselves at all times about what it feels like to be a journalist, a citizen, and a human being. As Henri Lefevbre articulates in his call to the study of everydayness: "Given the colossal technical means at our disposal and the terrifying dangers which lie in wait for us, we would risk, in that case, abandoning humanism only to enter into 'superhumanism'" (ibid.: 11).

References

ANDERSON, C. W.; BELL, E.; SHIRKY, C. Post-industrial journalism: adapting to the present. New York: Columbia Journalism School, Tow Center for Digital Journalism, 2013.

BAINES, D., KENNEDY, C. An education for independence. Journalism Practice, v. 4, n. 1, 2010, p.1-17.

BAUSINGER, H. Media, technology and daily life. Media, Culture & Society 6, 1984, p. 343-351.

BECK, U. The brave new world of work. Cambridge: Polity, 2000.

BOTTON, A. The News: a user's manual. London: Hamish Hamilton, 2014.

BRIGGS, M. Entrepreneurial journalism. New York, CQ Press, 2011.

BRIGGS, A; BURKE, P. A social history of the media. Cambridge: Polity, 2009.

CASTELLS, M. Power and counter-power in the network society. International Journal of Communication 1, 2007, p. 238-266.

CASTELLS, M. The rise of the network society. Malden: Blackwell, 2010 [1996].

CLAUSSEN, D. 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, v.66, n. 3, 2011, p.3-6.

COULDRY, N. The necessary future of the audience... and how to research it. In: NIGHTINGALE, V. (Ed.). Handbook of media audiences. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, 2011, p. 213-229.

DE MUL, J. Cyberspace odyssey. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.

DEUZE, M. What is Multimedia Journalism? Journalism Studies, v. 5, n. 2, 2004, p.139-152.

DEUZE, M. Global Journalism Education: A Conceptual Approach. Journalism Studies, v. 7, n. 1, 2006a, p.19-34.

DEUZE, M. Participation, Remediation, Bricolage: Considering Principal Components of a Digital Culture. The Information Society, v. 22, n. 2, 2006b, p.63-75.`

DEUZE, M. Media Work. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

DEUZE, M. Media Life. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012.

DEUZE, M. Media life and the mediatization of the lifeworld. In: HEPP, A., KROTZ, F. (Eds.). Mediatized world: culture and society in a media age. Palgrave, New York, 2014, p. 207-220.

ERTEL, M. et al. Adverse psychosocial working conditions and subjective health in freelance media workers. Work & Stress: an international Journal of Work. V. 19, n. 3, 2005.

FREUD, S. Civilization and its discontents. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1930.

GREGG, M. Work's intimacy. Cambridge: Polity, 2011.

HARDT, M. NEGRI, A. Empire. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2000.

HARTLEY, J. There are other ways of being in the truth: the uses of multimedia literacy. International Journal of Cultural Studies. V. 10, n.1, 2007, p. 135-144.

HAYLES, N. K. How we think: digital media and contemporary technogenesis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

HEPP, A., KROTZ, F. (Eds.). Mediatized world: culture and society in a media age. Palgrave, New York, 2014.

HERMANS, L.; VERGEER, M.; PLEIJTER, A. Nederlandse journalisten in 2010. Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, 2011.

HESMONDHALGH, D.; BAKER, S. Creative labour: media work in three cultural industries. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2010.

IHDE, D. Technology an the lifeworld: from Garden to Earth. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990

INGLEHART, R. Consuming the romantic utopia: love and the cultural contradictions of capitalism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

KELLY, K. What technology wants. New York: Viking, 2010.

KITTLER, F. Gramophone, film, typewriter. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1999[1985].

KITTLER, F. Towards an ontology of media. Theory, Culture & Society. V. 26, n. 2-3, 2009, p. 23-31.

LANDSTRO¨M, H.; JOHANISSON, B. Theoretical foundation of Swedish entrepreneurship and small-business research. Scandinavian Journal of Management, vol. 17, 2001, p. 225- 248

LEFEBVRE, H. The everyday and everydayness. Yale French Studies 73, 1987, p. 7-11.

LUHMANN, N. The autopoiesis of social systems. In: LUHMANN, N. Essays on self-reference. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990, p. I-20.

MEIJER, I. C.; KORMELINK, T. G. Checking, sharing, clicking and liking: changing patterns of news use between 2004 and 2014. Digital Journalism. 2014.

MEYER, B. Mediation and immediacy: sensational forms, semiotic ideologies and the question of the medium. Social Anthropology, v. 19, n. 1, p.23-39.

MEYROWITZ, J. Multiple media literacies. Journal of Communication, v. 48, 1998, p. 96-108.

MILLER, D. (Ed.). Materiality. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.

MILLER, D.; MADIANOU, M. Technologies of love. London: Routledge, 2012.

MITCHELL, A. State of the news media 2014. PewResearch Journalism Project, March 26, 2014. Available: http://www.journalism.org/2014/03/26/state-of-the-news-media-2014-overview. Accessed: 21 October 2014.

NEFF, G.; WISSINGER, E.; ZUKIN, S. Entrepreneurial labor among cultural producers: “cool” jobs in “hot” industries. Social Semiotics. V. 15, n. 3, 2005, p. 307-334.

NORRIS, P. Critical citizens: global support for democratic governance. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

PANKSEPP, J. The Affective Brain and Core Consciousness. In: LEWIS, M., M. HAVILAND-JONES, J., FELDMAN BARRETT, L. (Eds.). Handbook of emotions. New York, The Guildford Press, p. 47-67.

PAPACHARISSI, Z. Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

PAPPER, R.; HOLMES, M.; POPOVICH, M. Middletown media studies. The International Digital Media and Digital Arts Association Journal. V. 1, n. 1, 2004, p. 1-56.

PINK, S. ; MACKLEY, K. L. Satured and situated: expanding the meaning of media in the routines of everyday life. Media, Culture & Society. V. 35, n. 6, 2013, p. 677-691.

PLATMAN, K. "Portfolio careers" and the search for flexibility in later life. Work, employment and society. V. 18, n.3, 2004, p. 573-599

PUTNAM, R. Democracies in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

QUINN, S. Convergence journalism. New York: Peter Lang, 2005.

QVORTRUP, L. The hypercomplex society. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.

RUSHKOFF, D. Open source democracy. London: Demos, 2003.

RUSSELL, M. A call for creativity in new metrics for liquid media. Journal of interactive advertising. V. 9, n. 2, 2009, p. 44-61.

RYBCZYNSKI, W. Taming the tiger: the struggle of control to control technology. New York: Viking Press, 1983.

SENNETT, R. The culture of the new capitalism. New Haven, Yale University Press, 2006.

SLOTERDIJK, P. Sphären. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2004.

STOREY, J., SALAMAN, G., PLATMAN, K. Living with enterprise in an enterprise economy: freelance and contract workers in the media. Human Relations, v. 58, n. 8, 2005, p.1033-1054.

SUNDAR, S. Self as source: agency and customization in interactive media. In: KONIJN, E. Mediated interpersonal communication. New York: Routledge, 2008.

THOMPSON, J. The media and modernity: a social theory of the media. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1996

URRY, J. The complexity turn. Theory, culture and society. V. 22, 2005, p. 1-14.

WELLMAN, B. Little boxes, glocalization and networked individualism. In: TANABE, M.; BESSELAAR, P.; ISHIDA, T. Digital Cities II. Berlin: Springer, 2002, p. 10-25.

Endnotes

---

[1] Source: http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2005/05_may/16/imp.shtml.
[2] Source: http://www.theguardian.com/media/2006/apr/25/bbc.broadcasting.
[3] Source: http://www.digitalnewsreport.org.
[4] Source: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/25/technology/personaltech/25pogue.html.
[5] Source: http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1570810,00.html.
[6] Source: http://www.vandale.nl/nl/woord-van-het-jaar/2013.
[7] Source: http://go.iu.edu/4BE.
[8] Examples: http://deuze.blogspot.com/2006/11/remote-control-journalism.html.
[9] A complexity theorist would of course state that this chaos just reflects another level of order.