



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

A History of Innovation and Entrepreneurialism in Journalism

Prenger, M.; Deuze, M.

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Remaking the News

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Prenger, M., & Deuze, M. (2017). A History of Innovation and Entrepreneurialism in Journalism. In P. Boczkowski, & C. W. Anderson (Eds.), *Remaking the News: Essays on the Future of Journalism in the Digital Age* (pp. 235-250). MIT-Press.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1pwt5kk.19>

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.

12 A History of Innovation and Entrepreneurialism in Journalism

Mirjam Prenger and Mark Deuze

Given the profoundly precarious condition of the news industry and the corresponding casualization of the journalism labor market, it should come as no surprise that a significant focus in the field of journalism studies is directed toward innovation and entrepreneurialism. In research as well as teaching, the “newness of the new” gets understandably overemphasized in an attempt to prepare students for precarity while supplying the industry with some much-needed perspective.

There are two issues with this approach. The first is that this focus runs the risk of ignoring the past, as innovation has been key to structural developments in journalism. Additionally, journalism has, in its innovative uses of technologies, pushed groundbreaking developments in other fields, such as telecommunications. Entrepreneurship is at the heart of breakthroughs in journalism, most notably when it comes to the introduction of new genres and news formats, investigative styles and techniques, and the development of an occupational ideology that can be both a flag behind which to rally in defense of tradition and routine, as well as providing fuel to release forces of change.

A second issue with the contemporary spotlight on entrepreneurialism and innovation is that it comes with a barely contained normative agenda, in that innovation and professionals becoming entrepreneurial tends to be seen as a good thing—marking a benevolent force. To this, one has to add some conceptual confusion: when exactly is something considered to be entrepreneurial or innovative, how does one “do” entrepreneurship, at what level of analysis does innovation lie (individual, organizational, product, or process)? Epistemological challenges further amplify these wide-ranging questions, as innovation is invariably a moving object, raising the issue of how to adequately study something so dynamic.

A general solution tends to be to treat entrepreneurialism and innovation in strictly managerial, economic, and business terms, as these fields

have arguably developed the most sophisticated discourse and conceptual toolkit around such issues. At the same time, the history of research on innovation in journalism studies tends to follow a neatly bounded institutional agenda, focusing on legacy news organizations and the content they produce. Although the worldwide media landscape is changing and working relationships are in a state of flux with the dominance of atypical media work, researchers still predominantly chart the professional cultures of news reporters working in an institutional editorial setting.

With these approaches, a whole dimension of research gets lost that is central to the object of journalism studies: professionalization, the development of a professional identity, of a news culture (particular to a country, a news organization, or division), and of an occupational ideology that works in different ways for a wide variety of practitioners professionally involved with gathering, selecting, editing, publishing, and publicizing news. Beyond the business and culture of legacy news organizations there is a wealth of questions waiting to be answered: what do ideological concepts (such as objectivity, autonomy, and being ethical) mean for particular journalists in specific circumstances in the context of entrepreneurial and transformative conditions; what do objectivity and other ideological values mean to those who either suppress or inspire innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship in their work; and what are the implications of entrepreneurialism and innovation for the way journalists both inside and outside of professional news organizations see themselves and their role in society?

Our chapter intends to map these questions using both a historical and a contemporary setting for the investigation of entrepreneurship and innovation in journalism. The emergence of a new journalistic genre on television in the 1950s and 1960s is compared with the emergence of the current startup culture in journalism. This comparison is used to highlight particular challenges and opportunities for doing journalism studies in a dynamic field.

A Historical Dimension: The Emergence of Current Affairs Television

One could consider the 1950s and 1960s of the twentieth century a significant period of transformative innovation and change in professional journalism, specifically as it grew and matured on the television screen (Conway 2009). In this period, journalism in various (yet similar) countries made significant strides, developing a new form, voice, and approach while maintaining and enhancing core professional ideals, making this period an

excellent benchmark for comparison with the turmoil of today's media landscape. A comparative analysis of the manner in which current affairs programs on television in the United States, Great Britain, and the Netherlands came of age and innovated in the 1950s and 1960s, shows that there are some very interesting parallels (Prenger 2014). These parallels help illuminate the factors which played a role in the innovation of journalism in the past, begging the question to what degree these factors still play a role today.

If we were to sketch the early history and subsequent coming-of-age of current affairs programming on television, we could draw a rather linear picture—something that has often been done by media historians (Bliss 1991; Smith 1998; Hilmes 2003). The temptation to do so is understandable: at a glance, the history of current affairs programming worldwide looks very straightforward.

The beginning can be pinpointed in the United States, with the start of the CBS program *See It Now* in November 1951. The program was the product of two ambitious men: the renowned radio journalist Edward R. Murrow and the creative and entrepreneurial television producer Fred Friendly. Inspired by the popular magazine *Life* and the radio (and movie theater) news series *The March of Time*, it was Friendly's ambition to create a news magazine on television that combined the possibilities of serious journalism, radio reporting, documentary film, and live television. The result was a weekly television program presented by Murrow that focused on current affairs, alternated with more lighthearted topics.

Acclaim for *See It Now* was immediate. Critics applauded the program because it demonstrated what television could achieve when imagination and journalistic ambition were combined. "Murrow and Friendly exploited to the full the drama and excitement inherent in the news," *Variety* wrote (Persico 1988, 305). The program focused on the gritty reality of life, and reporters and film crews were encouraged to follow news stories as they unrolled, instead of presenting them as prescribed reports. Among other innovations, Murrow and Friendly introduced the "cross-cut interview." By experimenting with the possibilities that television offered, the pair stumbled across the technique of counterpointing extracts from contrasting statements of people with different views, thereby achieving the essence of genuine controversy.

The real breakthrough came with the famous broadcast in May 1954 in which *See It Now* exposed the demagogic Senator Joseph McCarthy. Critics wrote, "no greater feat of journalistic enterprise has occurred in modern times" (Leab 1981, 20). Since that broadcast, a critical approach, a focus on

serious topics, and a point of view became distinctive features of the program, and thereby of current affairs programming.

The approach proved to be inspirational. In Great Britain, the BBC had been experimenting with different ways to present current affairs on television. In 1953 the broadcaster launched *Panorama*, introduced as a biweekly "magazine of informed comment." Lacking a clear identity and sense of purpose, the program floundered. This changed when the spirited television producer Grace Wyndham Goldie took over the helm in 1955. She appointed a young 25-year-old editor-in-chief, hired a slew of experienced and outspoken reporters with a background in politics, and asked a popular radio journalist to become the presenter. Both Wyndham Goldie and her editor-in-chief set *See It Now* as an example, and experimented with ways to make the filmed reports more dynamic and the live studio interviews more confrontational.

Although the format of *Panorama* was slightly different from *See It Now*, the approach was similar. The British news magazine presented itself as a weekly "window on the world," critically examining current affairs inside and outside of Great Britain. The relaunched *Panorama* was an immediate success and the program became the flagship of the BBC in the second half of the 1950s, a position it would hold for a long time. The reporters were presented as personalities, and encouraged to voice their judgments on the topics they were investigating. Current affairs thus had become a television genre explicitly licensed to deal in values and interpretation.

Panorama became the main source of inspiration for current affairs programs on television in the rest of Europe. In the Netherlands, two news magazines were initiated simultaneously in 1960 by competing broadcasters: *Achter het nieuws* (*Behind the News*) by the Socialist broadcasting organization VARA, and *Brandpunt* (*Focus*) by the Catholic broadcasting organization KRO. Initially the focus was on lighthearted, nonconfrontational topics. But this changed in 1962 when both programs appointed new editors-in-chief who set *Panorama* as an example. They changed the tone and content of the Dutch current affairs magazines, adopting a much more hard-hitting approach, confronting politicians and other authorities, covering topics which had previously been considered taboo, and investigating misdoings. The critics and the public applauded the new direction of the programs. Television journalism had come of age.

When presented in such a chronological fashion, the history of television journalism seems simple: an innovation which started in one part of the world was copied and rearticulated, slowly making its way to other

parts of the world. But this linear presentation glosses over interesting similarities across the national contexts.

For instance, when looking at the parallels between these different histories, it is noticeable that in each country the current affairs programs were introduced ten years after the start of television in that country. And it is striking that each of the programs—be it *See It Now*, *Panorama*, *Behind the News*, or *Focus*—needed about two years to find its feet and become critical and confrontational, even though inspirational examples were at hand. So it seems that factors other than just copycat behavior played a significant role in the coming of age of television journalism. Three factors stand out: public expectations, the competition between broadcasters, and the profile of the producers and editors-in-chief who helped bring about change.

Looking at public expectations, it is clear that they were not being met sufficiently at the time each current affairs program first hit the television screen. In the United States in the early 1950s there was much criticism concerning the quality of television programs in general. Television shows were deemed too commercial, violent, or immoral, and there was too much content that did not live up to public service standards. Television news programs were criticized for being superficial, concentrating on images instead of journalistic relevance. In reaction, most television broadcasters willingly adopted the Television Code, a set of ethical standards regulating the content of their programs, at the end of 1951. At the same time, *See It Now* was introduced. The enthusiastic reception of the program illustrated how much the public and the critics had been waiting for programs of substance that exploited the possibilities of the new medium. The confrontational *See It Now* broadcast concerning Joseph McCarthy in 1954 met even more critical acclaim. Television critics were full of praise, and 75,000 viewers wrote or called in, most of them voicing their approval of *See It Now* and its critical stance.

The same kind of reaction was noticeable in Great Britain. When *Panorama* started out in 1953, its lack of focus and relevance irritated many viewers. "*Panorama* is a perfect illustration of what is wrong with television," a television critic wrote (Wyndham Goldie 1977, 190). The new medium that had promised so much seemed to be stifled by old-fashioned BBC rules and routines. The *BBC News*, for example, consisted of a news bulletin read by an anonymous presenter and an image of the BBC logo on the television screen. When *Panorama* changed its format in 1955, the reactions were very positive. "If it keeps up last night's form it may become the most important live news magazine of the week," a critic wrote (Wyndham

Goldie 1977, 191). Millions of British viewers switched on their television sets each week to watch the new *Panorama*.

Impatience with the slow speed with which television journalism was evolving was tangible in the Netherlands as well. In 1961, television critics loudly complained that the Dutch current affairs programs were too immature, too dull, and not audacious enough. Where were the bold, critical, and entrepreneurial journalists who were willing to act as public watchdogs and prepared to make the programs much more dynamic and confrontational? Critics and public alike met the change in tone and approach of *Behind the News* and *Focus* in 1962 with open arms. *Focus* soon thereafter won the national prize for the best and most innovative television program.

Competition between broadcasters also played a major role in the coming of age and innovation of television journalism. As stated, all of the current affairs programs mentioned began at a similar moment: about ten years after the start of television in each country. This was also the moment that television began to break through nationally and surpassed radio as the most important medium.

In the United States, for instance, the sale of television sets exploded in 1951 and the major networks competed fiercely for a position in this new market. News and current affairs programs were considered to be strategically interesting genres with which the networks could attract new, higher-educated viewers. Hence the launch of *See It Now* by CBS in November 1951.

In Great Britain, 1953 was the breakthrough year, when the coronation of Queen Elizabeth attracted 20 million viewers, even though there were only 2 million television sets available. It made television an instant success, paving the way for the arrival of commercial television, ITV, in 1955. This caused great upheaval within the BBC, where it was feared that the corporation would lose out in the competition with ITV. Action was called for. It is significant that the newly restyled *Panorama* under guidance of Wyndham Goldie was relaunched just days before ITV began broadcasting.

The same pattern was visible in the Netherlands. Dutch television started growing in popularity in the early 1960s. The breakthrough moment came in the fall of 1962 with a marathon benefit show on television, watched by the majority of the Dutch public who donated money by the millions. It was a wake-up call for the public broadcasting organizations, making them realize how influential television had become. And it gave the politicians and other interest groups who were lobbying for the introduction of

commercial television new energy. Their lobby did not succeed, as the Netherlands retained a public broadcasting model. But the threat of commercial television clearly influenced the public broadcasting organizations, which started focusing more on serious television genres with which they could accentuate their public service mission.

These broadcasting organizations, representing different ideological movements, also competed among each other for public approval. In this light, it is significant that when one of the major broadcasters, VARA, started with its current affairs program *Behind the News* in 1960; the other major player, KRO, soon thereafter launched *Focus*. And when *Focus* changed its format and became much more hard-hitting in 1962, *Behind the News* quickly followed suit.

What is clear is that the broadcasting organizations and networks in each country strategically programmed the current affairs programs, using them as a means to an end in order to heighten the prestige of the broadcasting organizations. The aim was to gain public and even political approval, and to compete with other broadcasters. The organizations and networks appointed new producers and editors-in-chief and gave them a blank check to innovate, as long as it resulted in publicly acclaimed programs with a high profile.

It is interesting to note that the producers and editors-in-chief who set about changing and innovating television journalism all seemed to fit the same mold. They generally did not have a background in newspaper journalism (although there were exceptions) and they tended to treat the new medium on its own terms, rather than imposing those brought over from another medium. They also held outspoken views on the journalistic mission of their programs. And they all had rather imposing personalities, which they used to gain authority within their network or broadcasting organization, and among their editorial staff. "When he came in, it was like the Red Sea parting," a *See It Now* team member noted about Murrow (Persico 1988, 419). Similarly, the Dutch editor-in-chief of *Behind the News* was renowned for his curt and sometimes authoritarian style of communication. And working together with Wyndham Goldie at the BBC was both a nightmare and a pleasure, a member of *Panorama's* staff declared afterwards. She demanded total commitment. At the same time, Wyndham Goldie protected and defended her team. The British producer understood quite well how television worked, her assistant remembered: "that once you had the staff, the money, and the studio, you could tell other people to bugger off" (Lindley 2002, 37). This was important, since innovation and experiments

with new ways of practicing journalism provoked backlashes and criticism, however great the general appreciation of the results.

What is perhaps most striking is that all the producers and editors-in-chief concerned were not afraid to editorialize. They believed that journalism had a duty to investigate current issues and wrong doings, and presented the results with a sharp and critical point of view. This was a deviation from the dominant paradigm of neutral and nonconfrontational reporting. The producers and editors-in-chief also had a competitive mindset. Their ambition to produce the best current affairs program in the nation strongly motivated the rest of their editorial staff. The resulting editorial culture was one that fostered the pushing back of boundaries and the exploration of new territories.

In summary, it is clear that within different historical media contexts a similar combination of internal and external forces helped bring about change and resulted in the innovation of television journalism. The external forces, in the form of public dissatisfaction and threats to the position of the broadcasters, paved the way for ideologically driven producers and editors-in-chief who were given room to experiment and explore new paths. There was a profound emotional commitment to improve television journalism, freeing it from the formats which were derived from print and radio, exploiting the possibilities of the new medium, and making use of (and sometimes stretching) the technological means that were available. In that sense, innovation went hand in hand with a passionate view on what journalism could be if it lived up to its promises.

A Contemporary Dimension: Emergence of a Global Start-up Culture

The contemporary discussion on innovation and transformation in the news industry tends to be dominated by the role of technology, specifically the Internet. This technological determinism belies global trends in the profession, showing a continuous growth of independent businesses and freelance entrepreneurship despite (or inspired by) the ongoing economic crisis. In this crisis, news organizations have seen major budget cuts, redundancies, reorganizations, and considerable downsizing. Responding to technological disruptions and changing audience practices, production practices are undergoing rapid change. The emergence of the enterprising professional in journalism is a relatively recent phenomenon, starting with the rapid growth of freelancing since the early 1990s, culminating in today's celebration of "entrepreneurial" journalism.

Although professional innovation seems to be particularly challenging for those trying to make a living as journalists working without the benefits of steady employment, nothing is further from the truth. Faced with difficult and disruptive challenges on many fronts, the news business increasingly demands its workers to shoulder the responsibility of the company. Managers and employers increasingly stress the importance of “enterprise” as an individual rather than organizational or firm-based attribute (du Gay 1996; Witschge 2012). Trends such as the integration of the business and editorial sides of the news organization, the ongoing convergence of print, broadcasting, and online news divisions into digital journalism enterprises, and the introduction of projectized work styles show that such hybridized working practices are not particular to freelance journalists (Deuze 2007).

Shifting the notion of enterprise—with its connotations of efficiency, productivity, empowerment, and autonomy—from the level of the company to the individual, it becomes part of the professional identity of each and every worker, contingently employed or not. This shift reconstitutes “workers as more adaptable, flexible, and willing to move between activities and assignments and to take responsibility for their own actions and their successes and failures” (Storey, Salaman, and Platman 2005, 1036). At the same time, studies among professional journalists report increasingly stressful workplaces, rates of burnout rising, and people (especially younger journalists) leaving legacy news rooms (Deuze 2014). In this enterprising economy, entrepreneurial journalists increasingly start their own companies—somewhat similar to their colleagues elsewhere in the creative sector starting boutique advertising agencies or independent record labels—forming editorial or reportorial collectives as well as business start-ups. The emergence of a start-up culture is global: since the early years of the twenty-first century, new independent (generally small-scale and online-only) journalism companies have formed around the world.

As with the long history of innovation in journalism, the emerging start-up culture can be plotted along a relatively straightforward timeline: starting with freelancing as a career choice for senior reporters and a common practice for experts in broadcasting and correspondents in magazine publishing, moving to freelancing as a mainstreamed practice, and subsequently leading to reporters increasingly setting up shop with colleagues in editorial collectives and news startups. Start-ups are financed in different ways, generally influenced by factors particular to the national context—for example the dominant presence of private funding agencies and venture capitalists in Asia and the US, or state subsidies for innovation in

journalism in Europe. Or their start is attributable to distinct individuals—as many start-ups initially got off the ground with large financial injections of personal funds by their founders. More recently, crowdfunding and media-savvy marketing campaigns contributed to the rise of start-ups generally.

The literature generally celebrates this kind of entrepreneurialism, or treats it as a business case study (Naldi and Picard 2012; Bruno and Kleis Nielsen 2013). But beyond this deceptively straightforward timeline are interesting similarities across the various comparable national contexts—variables that stand out in explaining the choice for entrepreneurship, the role of the professionals involved, and the potential for success down the line. Comparing new online start-ups with the emergence of public affairs television as a distinct journalistic form in the mid-twentieth century, we find three key issues are at work: frustrated expectations of professional journalism among audiences and journalists alike, heightened competition between existing news industries, and a particular personality profile of the reporters and editors involved in new journalistic enterprises determining their visibility and (early) survival.

Much has been written about the waning of public trust in institutions generally, and in the press specifically—which can be seen as “suffering from a loss in public trust and confidence” (Witschge and Nygren 2009, 41). Global PR firm Edelman conducts annual surveys on trust and credibility among college-educated, middle-class, and media-savvy adults (the primary audience for professional journalism) in 18 countries. What the firm found over time is a gradual erosion of trust in governments, traditional institutions, and the media, in favor of nongovernmental organizations and peer people. Put in the context of what Ulrich Beck (2000, 150) has considered an increasingly antihierarchical age, in which traditional institutions (including the state, the Church, and the press) are “zombie containers” without meaning, people turn to each other rather than to established experts—parents, priests, professors, or presidents—for guidance. At the same time, the media landscape is fragmenting as people snack for news and entertainment from a digital smorgasbord rather than patiently consuming whatever a handful of mass media choose to dish up. In this context there is room for innovation for niche media, specialized and personalized media, and media that provide particular services to specific people. The fact that so many (online) start-ups got their start in such a short time in so many different markets worldwide is testament to this development.

It is not just public expectations that spur innovation across the industry—a shift toward independent work is also driven by frustration about the news industry among many journalists themselves. In the often overzealous conceptualization of journalism as a more or less consistent field (with a relatively homogeneous professional population), it becomes all too easy to forget that journalists, like their colleagues in other working environments in the creative industries, experience conflict and rivalry as intrinsic if not essential ingredients in the way they do their work. There is competition and conflict between employees and freelancers, among independent journalists, between reporters and editors, between television and print (online) divisions of the industry, and so on. Indeed, if anything, the conflicts within, between, and across media organizations can be better explained (and found) by looking at the contested relationships between creativity and creative control, rather than between creativity and the market (Lampel, Lant, and Shamsie 2000).

Competition at times fuels innovation, particularly in the context of a long-term process of disruptive and discontinuous change. Beyond this, it is noteworthy that the founding histories of many start-ups include narratives of frustrated newspaper editors striking out on their own, freelancers setting up their own shop with a critical eye toward the industry that used to employ them, and newcomers seeing more (creative and market) value in starting their own media platforms. Competition between legacy news organizations all experiencing aging and declining audiences in turn inspires innovation, either through the acquisition of external businesses or new managerial initiatives intended to create and shape a start-up culture in the newsroom. This can be seen as an extension of the need for all businesses to embrace a dual management process: to protect and enhance the existing way of doing things, as well as to experiment and explore new business models, new creative cycles or productivity routines, and so on. Under conditions of increasing competition both at home and abroad, online as well as offline, and the introduction of many new players in the media field (including journalist-hiring companies such as Google, Facebook, Apple, LinkedIn, Snapchat, and Twitter), entrepreneurial journalism gets expression both in new independent businesses as well as start-up units within existing industries.

The third variable of profound influence in the emergence and initial success of entrepreneurial ventures in journalism is that of the particular kind of people involved. The key professionals leading the movement, and giving entrepreneurship a voice, tend to be those enjoying a strong reputation in the field, having certain stand-out personality traits such as

extraversion, imagination, and an openness to experience, often coupled with a charismatic authority. Another noticeable element that is generally found among successful start-up founders is their deference to the basic values of the occupational ideology of journalism when proposing and defending their initiatives: truth and objectivity (or the antithesis: providing a subjective voice), ethics, public service, breaking news (or its opposite: producing slow news), and autonomy.

A strong peer reputation tends to be derived from a previous career as an editor (such as Rob Wijnberg at the Dutch *Correspondent*, Edwy Plenel at the French *Mediapart*, Andrew Jaspan at the Australian *Conversation*), or senior investigative reporter (including Guia Baggi at Italian *IRPI*, John F. Harris and Jim VandeHei at American *Politico*, Juanita León at Colombian *La Silla Vacía*). These journalists earned respect and admiration (and also resentment and criticism) from their competitor-colleagues even before they ventured into the world of news start-ups. Their respective clout is derived from having proven themselves in professional terms as mutually recognized by their peers.

Personality traits are a significant part in the makeup of those who start or choose to work at a news start-up. Founders often tend to be quite outspoken professionals, passionately voicing their enthusiasm for the new business and, correspondingly, an often-scathing critique of the existing news industry. It is striking to see that such critiques are generally grounded in the most traditional, old-school values of the profession. Legacy news operations are attacked for not doing any “real” journalism anymore—as they have to consider the market and advertisers, are limiting the ability of their reporters to do their work autonomously, are overcommitted to breaking (and short-form) news while curtailing efforts toward investigative reporting, or are too close to their political sources. Listening to start-up founders, one is struck by a fascinating paradox: they proclaim to embrace and produce a “new” kind of journalism while referencing “old” values as the source of their insights and practices.

What stands out in the “small” history of entrepreneurship and innovation at the start of the twenty-first century must be the recognition of the emotional relationship people have with news, and, more importantly, the relationship that journalists have with (doing) journalism. As we noted when looking at the emergence of current affairs television, transformative practices in journalism go hand in hand with a deeply affective interpretation of what journalism is (or should be). In this context it is important to note the fact that journalism as a distinct form of affective labor has received scant attention in the literature, even though scholars of media work signal

the pitfalls of emotional labor in other disciplines, such as the production of digital games and advertising. The benchmark study here is Andrew Ross's (2003) ethnography of the New York-based new media company Razorfish. The fact that the working environment looks and feels nothing like a typical office job contributes to people working incredibly long hours, invading and disrupting their nonwork lives. The strength of this account is that it foregrounds the participants' complex negotiations of how the meanings, values, and experiences of work and labor are changed and unsettled. Contemporary ethnographic work in newsrooms is rising, yet still pays little attention to the emotional and affective dimensions of newswork, and work on independent newswriters, editorial collectives, and news start-ups remains scarce.

Discussion and Conclusion

The literature on innovation and transformation in journalism generally focuses on the disruptive role of technology, specifically the Internet, highlights the culture of legacy news organization responding to (and resisting) change (exemplary cases include Ryfe 2012; Usher 2014), or discusses new forms of journalism largely in terms of business models and opportunities. Based on our historical and contemporary fieldwork, an additional model for theorizing and studying journalism innovation should include the factors of public and journalistic dissatisfaction and unrest, competition fueled by a sense of urgency, and personality traits and the affective dimension of newswork. Underlying all these factors is the mobilizing power of the values of the profession.

When focusing on the role of technology, one is at risk of exaggerating the influence technology has on (journalistic) innovation and disruption, and missing out on the impact that emerging journalistic practices have on the development of innovative technologies. Technology plays a role in facilitating change, but on the whole we do not find convincing evidence to conclude it induces change. The Internet and digital technologies, for instance, have been around for quite some time, but the blossoming of the start-up culture and the various innovations—and sometimes radical transformations—visible among legacy media is of a much more recent date. On a similar note, the innovation of television journalism in the past was not caused by technological innovation; rather technological innovation was accelerated because there was a need to transform television journalism.

True, technology can have a disruptive effect, but there is a tendency to exaggerate its influence, including the tendency of technomyopia (i.e., as people tend to overestimate the short-term impact of technology but underestimate the long-term impact) in both business and academia. As a disruptive force, the Internet changed the manner in which the public consume media, forcing media to adapt. However, the main disruption of the current media landscape has been caused by the steep decline of newspaper advertising revenue, combined with dwindling readership—both trends that started well before the World Wide Web was introduced.

Equally important is the realization that innovation and disruption are not new. This may have been stated many times before, but it is still worth underlining. There is nothing necessarily new about innovation and disruption in journalism. The transformation of journalism through succeeding media—print, radio, television, Internet, mobile—is an ongoing story. And what are now deemed to be “old” legacy media were once “new” media, disrupting the media landscape at some point in time. Therefore, it is a fallacy to make a distinction between old and new media, and to focus on their differences. It is much more fruitful to look at patterns that run across different media and across different phases in the development of journalism, and at the factors which play a role in inducing change at distinct moments or in particular settings.

As we have suggested, similar issues seem to be at work when considering innovation and entrepreneurialism as structural conditions of newswork over time. The frustrated expectations of professional journalism among audiences and journalists alike should be taken into consideration. To what degree does public dissatisfaction with the content, style, tone, and approach of (mainstream) media play a role in the need and urge to innovate? How is that dissatisfaction noticed and noticeable? And which kind of initiative receives public and critical acclaim, thereby highlighting what public and critics alike find lacking in the content that is generally on offer? What, in turn, produces what Pablo Boczkowski and Eugenia Mitchelstein (2013) call the news gap between the media and the public across seven countries? These are questions that are well worth taking into account, since the frustrated expectations act as a push factor, driving the audience away from the media that do not meet their (changing) demands, while at the same time pulling them toward media and start-ups that do provide the required journalistic content. For the media themselves, these changing demands clearly provide an impetus to innovate and change.

Dissatisfaction and unrest among journalists are equally worth investigating. Change comes about when professionals think they can improve

the way things are done, when they feel they can make a difference and have a stake in the process of transformation in professional journalism. In that sense, dissatisfaction with the current situation is a key prerequisite for innovation. Within an editorial setting this can be a productive energy, if there is room and a (strategic) need for change. But if there is insufficient autonomy to induce creative change within a medium, the drive to search for other, more independent ways to innovate journalism will increase. Therefore, dissatisfaction can also be seen as one of the motors for an entrepreneurial culture in which journalists strike out on their own.

Competition between existing news industries clearly is of importance when studying the innovation and transformation of journalism. Competition has always played a role in journalism, even in less competitive media landscapes with strong public broadcasting systems. In times of heightened competition, caused by economic factors or sometimes—in the case of public broadcasting organizations—by political change, there is an increased need for a strong journalistic profile in order to beat the competition and retain agency. Strategic choices tend to underlie the willingness to change and innovate. In that sense, innovation can be seen as a reaction to and the result of power struggles. It is crucial to take this broader media and power context into account when researching the transformation of journalism. Transformation within news industries does not happen by itself, but is always provoked by pressures both inside and outside of organizations. These factors influence the timing as well as the form of journalism innovation.

For innovation that takes place outside of the news industries, for instance within start-ups, competition is also a driving force. It is usually not competition on economic terms, since most startups have little economic clout. But there is a clear aim to compete in terms of being better at producing “real” journalism, and being more innovative and in tune with public needs than the major news industries and legacy media. In that sense, the competition is value based and affect driven.

The particular personality profile of the reporters and editors involved in innovating journalism, as well as starting new journalistic enterprises, is a third factor that is worth researching. Not only do they generally hold strong views on what “real” journalism should look like, referring to the basic values of the occupational ideology of journalism, they also tend to possess character traits which enable them to motivate and inspire the people around them. Their backgrounds can vary, but generally they have a strong peer reputation, which also helps inspire confidence among their

staff, as well as among (certain segments of) the public, that the innovations they strive for strengthen and enhance the journalistic values.

What is striking, is that for a profession that has often been criticized for not being a true profession (Anderson 2014), journalism has a surprisingly strong occupational value system, based on the cornerstones of truth, objectivity, ethics, public service, and autonomy. This occupational ideology seems to be a crucial driving force behind all factors concerned with innovation and entrepreneurialism. It is used as a critical benchmark (also by the public), as a justification, as a protection, and as a way to create cohesion within a group—whether that group is the staff of a large national newspaper or a small-scale editorial collective of collaborating freelancers. One could argue that this occupational value system allows journalists to function in environments and workplaces that can be far from ideal. The consensual occupational self-image can also lead to a reluctance of journalists to change and adapt to new work realities, when they feel these undermine their professional values. In all instances, the occupational ideology of journalism shows itself as an important and influential force of both resistance and transformation. Any research into innovation, transformation, and entrepreneurialism should take the profound role of the occupational ideology into account.

At the same time, one has to be wary of taking the values at face value or assuming that they are set in stone. The interpretation of the occupational values changes over time, and is influenced by specific national (as well as organization-specific) journalistic cultures. The challenge is to investigate what journalists and the public really mean with such catch-all terms as objectivity, autonomy, fourth estate, and public service. What is their function, how are they interpreted, and how does that change over time, as well as within specific situations? Getting a grip on how the occupational ideology works should remain one of the major demands of journalism studies. In this sense, just as journalism faces issues today that are anything but new, the field of journalism studies would be wise to recognize its own legacy, thus keeping alive its own grand narratives—while opening these approaches up to the disruptive, transformative, and precarious nature of the profession as it operates today.