Media Life and Work as a Challenge to Media Education

Mark Deuze

Keynote for ECREA TWG 2017 conference

"Trial and Error. Media Education in a Changing Media World"

Abstract

We 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 media (and media education) in it must start with an appreciation of the profound mediatization of everyday life and the lifeworld (the world we experience) (Deuze, 2014). As more aspects of our everyday life get played out in and across media, and media become foundational to our functioning as consumers, citizens, professionals, and *players* – as we hopefully become able to transform from a mere workers (homo faber) to players (homo ludens) with media and information (Flusser 1990: 399). Such a playful rendering of our digital competences needs to be considered in the context of profound global trends toward more complexity and precarity in everyday life. Our role in this deeply mediatized world (Couldry & Hepp 2016) is to find biographical solutions to systemic contradictions (Beck 1992: 137). The process toward a more complex, precarious and individualized media life (Deuze 2012) poses fascinating challenges for media education. In this paper, I outline key contextual trends and discuss possible approaches in teaching and pedagogy with a focus on teaching *for* media (next to *about* media), on teaching entrepreneurialism in terms of using media to challenge and change the taken-for-grantedness of the everyday, and on teaching (transmedia) storytelling as a particular form of read/write multimedia literacy (Hartley 2007).

Body

An integrated perspective on media in everyday life and work 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).

The invisibility of media, coupled with their connectivity and persistency, 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 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."[1] 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 re-emergence 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 paper I explore this 'media life' (Deuze, 2012) within the way media industries work.[2]

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."[3] 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, 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."[4]

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 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, information and entertainment 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).

In the process of using media, 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. 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, 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. This general sense and perception of reality co-creation can be seen as potentially unleashing human creativity and transforming a person from a mere worker (*homo faber*) to "an information processor, a player with information (*homo ludens*)" (Flusser 1990: 399; italics in original). However, the same trend – amplified through omnipresent tracking and surveillance systems intrinsic to our digital infrastructure - fuels a growing unease and suspicion regarding what counts as factual, as truth, and even as real in the people and places around us – particularly when it comes to those in positions of power (Mattelart 2010).

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 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 (Beckett and Deuze, 2016).

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 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 "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 turning 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. 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 and a host of national associations worldwide.[6] 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 scholarly 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 towards 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, towards 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. Social movements mixed with current events (such as police killings) become hashtags on Twitter, outrage online fuels the street demonstrations of 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, 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: their stories – e.g. news reports, television series, motion pictures, digital games, and advertising campaigns - fuel what gets shared online, their work flows across all media, where people use their work to co-create their own worlds inside personal information spaces.

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 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 has been evolving toward what some call a "post-industrial" news model (Anderson, Bell & Shirky, 2013). Anderson et al., (2013) suggest that for a media professional such as 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 as a whole: a gradual shift from centralized and hierarchical modes of industrial production to what Castells (2010) coins as 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 instititional). 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 nothing 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. The International Labour Organization found adverse effects of the network enterprise at work in the media in a 2006 survey conducted 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 media professionals worldwide work in anything but secure, permanent positions with contracts. It found freelancing, independent entrepreneurship, and uncontracted labor paramount, particularly among young workers and newcomers in the field.

In recent years, such work trends have continued. 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 U.K. (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2010), and the U.S. (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.[7]

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 media workers corresponds with trends in the labor market as a whole, as national reports across the developed world show a continuous growth of independent businesses and freelance entrepreneurship despite (or inspired by) the ongoing economic crisis. 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. 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, 2004), or navigating the frothy waters of our romantic life in a turbulent "post-dating" world (Deuze, 2012, p. 212), it takes the constant gathering and organizing of information, the verification and curation of resources, interacting with many (potential) collaborators, and finding one's way despite constantly changing systems, networks, and people.

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 people neither have the time nor the inclination to engage in this process. At the same time, people's 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 skillset 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 techologies), 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

Returning to the theme of precariously employed – if employed at all – media workers, the emergence of entrepreneurship as a mode of production in the worldwide labor market for media professionals and as a field of research within media studies realistically addresses long-term trends in the industry. At the same time, however, all of this can seem to be disconnected from broader developments in media and society. The key to thinking about media entrepreneurship 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 – a society self-organizing through communication, where people live their lives in media, and 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 rather is a mundane aspect of everyday life, work, and play.

The social, technological, and industrial trends outlined in this chapter all point towards 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 media have a specific role to play here, as they are predominantly populated by students looking for careers in the media. As future media workers, students have a specific role to play as they can be considered to be 'better' at living in media than most citizens. Teaching about the media should therefore include teaching for the media, based on the assumption that knowing how to *make, hack, edit, redact and remix* media contribute to both a critical and creative appreciation of media (Manovich, 2009).

Second, since media life and entrepreneurialism are integral parts of media work, they should be recognized in all program decisions. Entrepreneurialism has already become 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 people setting up their own enterprises in a precarious marketplace. As Storey, Salaman and Platman (2005) note (referring to Rose'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 – instead helping people to tinker, play with and change the taken-for-granted everyday practices of their culture (Spinosa, Flores & Dreyfus, 1997).

Finally, in terms of curriculum, media life and the Martini media context open up possibilities and opportunities for what Jenkins calls "transmedia" storytelling.[8] 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."[9] 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. Transmedia storytelling is particularly inspiring in its inclusion of the media ensemble, and 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* (also known as multimedia or

convergent) and *transmedia* storytelling should be the basis of future media schools and programs acknowledging media life.

In short, a teaching curriculum that embraces the implications of entrepreneurialism, super-citizens, media life, a Martini mode of thinking about media, and transmedia storytelling advocates:

- integration of coursework (for example combining case studies of the business side of the industry with insights from research on creativity and praxis from the arts);
- cross-sectional modules (for example integrating different media sequences in lab-type courses where teams collaborate combing disciplines such as design, coding/programming, writing, and producing);
- centralization of ethics and critical reflection on media and the role of individual media professionals in society as the benchmark for all coursework;
- a recognition of media work 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 practitioners tend to 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 media workers 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 co-creators of reality.

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.

Beck, U. (2000). *The brave new world of work*. Cambridge: Polity.

Beckett, C., Deuze, M. (2016) On the Role of Emotion in the Future of Journalism. *Social Media+Society* 2(3). Available: http://sms.sagepub.com/content/2/3/2056305116662395.long.

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. (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.

Flusser, Vilém (1990) On memory (electronic or otherwise). *Leonardo* 23(4), 397-399.

Gregg, M. (2011). *Work's intimacy*. Cambridge: Polity.

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. (2006). *Convergence culture*. New York: NYU Press.

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.

Manovich, Lev (2009). The Practice of Everyday (Media) Life: From Mass Consumption to Mass Cultural Production? *Critical Inquiry* 35, 319-331.

Mattelart, Armand (2010[2007]) *The globalization of surveillance*. Cambridge: Polity.

Meikle, G., Young, S. (2012). *Media convergence: networked digital media in everyday life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

Rosen, J. (2006). The people formerly known as the audience. Retrieved from 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.

Thompson, J. (1996). *The media and modernity: a social theory of the media*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Wellman, B. (2002). Little boxes, glocalization and networked individualism. In M. Tanabe, P. Besselaar & T. Ishida. *Digital cities II* (pp. 10-25). Berlin: Springer.

End notes

---

[1] Source: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/25/technology/personaltech/25pogue.html
[2] Previous versions of this paper have been published as: Deuze, M. (2017) On Media and Entrepreneurship as Ways of Being in the World: A Challenge to Journalism Education, in Goodman, Robyn (Ed.), *Global Journalism Education: Challenges and Innovations*, Austin: Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas; and Deuze, M. (2017) Media life and media work, in Serra, Paolo and Sónia Sá (Eds.), *Televisão e novos meios*, 17-37, Covilhã: Labcom.IFP/ Universidade da Beira Interior. The current paper has been revised for content and focus.
[3] Source: http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2005/05_may/16/imp.shtml
[4] Source: http://www.theguardian.com/media/2006/apr/25/bbc.broadcasting
[5] Source: http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1570810,00.html
[6] Source: http://blog.oxforddictionaries.com/press-releases/oxford-dictionaries-word-of-the-year-2013

[7] Source: http://www.bizjournals.com/bizjournals/news/2015/03/22/full-coverage-entrepreneurs-and-depression.html. See also the Twitter hashtag #startupdepression.

[8] Originally coined in a 2003 essay for *MIT Technology Review*. Retrieved from http://www.technologyreview.com/news/401760/transmedia-storytelling

[9] Source: http://henryjenkins.org/2007/03/transmedia_storytelling_101.html