City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Singer, J. & Broersma, M. (2020). Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Journalism Students' Interpretive Repertoires for a Changing Occupation. Journalism Practice, 14(3), pp. 319-338. doi: 10.1080/17512786.2019.1602478

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/21963/

Link to published version: https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2019.1602478

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to City Research Online policy.

City Research Online: http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/ publications@citystgeorges.ac.uk

Copyright information
The final and definitive version of this manuscript has been accepted for publication in: *Journalism Practice* © 2019; all rights reserved, Routledge.
DOI:10.1080/17512786.2019.1602478

Please cite as:
Singer, J. B., and Broersma, M. (forthcoming). "Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Journalism Students' Interpretive Repertoires for a Changing Occupation." *Journalism Practice*.

Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Journalism Students' Interpretive Repertoires for a Changing Occupation

Amid ongoing disruption, discourse about journalism increasingly emphasizes innovation within the newsroom and the rise of entrepreneurial initiatives outside it. This article uses the concept of interpretive repertoires to explore how students enrolled in journalism programmes in Britain and the Netherlands understand innovation and entrepreneurialism in relation to changing industry circumstances and long-standing conceptualizations of occupational norms and behaviours. We find shared repertoires that embrace technological change, but generally within an acceptance of traditional normative practice.

Keywords:
change; digital technology; entrepreneurial journalism; innovation; interpretive repertoires; journalism education

Amid fundamental disruption to traditional media business models and ongoing staff cuts at many legacy outlets, journalism students seeking to get a foot in the newsroom door face intensified challenges. Proficiency with digital tools and platforms may have provided an edge a decade ago, but newsrooms are now full of people with advanced technological skills. The people whom news managers seem to be seeking are those who can wield the tools in innovative journalistic ways – without costing the company a lot of money in the process (Pavlik 2013; Schlesinger and Doyle 2015). At the same time, news startups are popping up everywhere, offering an alternative, if challenging, route to success via entrepreneurial journalism (Briggs 2012; Bruno and Nielsen 2012; Marsden 2017).

This study focuses on perceptions among tomorrow's entry-level journalists related to journalistic innovation, a broad concept that encompasses many potential aspects of change, and to entrepreneurial journalism, a specific type of change directly linked to business opportunities and pressures. From the perspective of the occupational newcomer, where do the stabilities and instabilities lie, what does "change" look like rhetorically, and how appropriate is an entrepreneurial response to questions about the future of journalism?

To explore these issues, this study examines data collected in consecutive years from students in two leading journalism programmes, in Britain and the Netherlands. Our goal is to understand how people preparing to enter news work rhetorically construct journalistic innovation and entrepreneurialism in relation to changing industry circumstances and traditional ideas about norms and behaviours.

We ground our analysis in two bodies of literature. The first, outlining the theoretical and analytical concept of interpretive repertoires, provides a framework for exploring how journalism students make rhetorical sense of innovation and entrepreneurship. The second positions contemporary journalism as an increasingly entrepreneurial enterprise.

Making Sense of Change: Interpretive Repertoires

Scholars who study human discourse have long recognized that it is both variable and consistent. Individuals come up with different, and context-specific, discursive constructions to give meaning to the social world and to ground their everyday actions. But they do so within bounded language units that are broadly shared and internally coherent. These interpretive repertoires can be seen as the building blocks that speakers use to construct versions of an action, idea, or other phenomenon from a somewhat restricted range of terms (Wetherell and Potter 1988). The repertoires thus provide a lexicon or register of terms, tropes, and metaphors that help us characterize and evaluate the world in which we live (Potter and Wetherell 1987). Edley (2001, 198) describes them as "books on the shelves of a public library, permanently available for borrowing," a range of linguistic resources that enable mutual understanding in multi-faceted social situations and interactions.

The concept of interpretive repertoires originated in the field of social psychology, proposing a discursive approach to understanding human actions, emotions, orientations, and cognitive processes (Potter 2012). Scholars in this discipline have extensively explored its implications, including media use of linguistic constructions. Bruna Seu (2010), for instance, identifies three primary repertoires that explain why most people remain unmoved by news stories of human rights abuses. In his study of women who had left abusive relationships, Baly (2010) found that they drew on different discursive resources, including those offered by the media, than women who remained. Horton-Salway (2011) examined UK newspaper discourse about ADHD, identifying two interpretive repertoires, biological and psychosocial, that suggested quite different responses to hyperactive children and their parents.

For media scholars, these perspectives connect with the idea that what we know, and how we know it in the absence of direct experience (Adoni and Mane 1984), is a social construction expressed and enacted largely through language. "Everyday life is, above all, life with and by means of the language I share with my fellowmen," Berger and Luckmann wrote in their seminal treatise (1966, 34). "An understanding of language is thus essential for any understanding of the reality of everyday life." Despite its inherent challenge to the notion that journalism rests on objective compilation of verifiable facts, the concept has proved useful in understanding discourse both within the press and in response to it. Anderson's (1983) concept of the newspaper as constructing an "imagined community" draws on these ideas, as does Zelizer's (1993) consideration of journalists as forming their own interpretive community, "united by its shared discourse and collective interpretations of key public events" (219). Contemporary scholars have applied a constructive approach in understanding media discourse about topics from climate change (Carvalho 2007) to terrorism (Spencer 2012) to entrepreneurship, seen by Aldrich and Martinez (2010) as involving the social construction not just of organisations but also of populations and communities.

One important aspect of understanding interpretive repertoires is how people use them to enact and maintain membership in occupational groups (Traynor 2006); nurses, for instance, use them in reproducing stories of success, moral practice, and influential action, helping overcome institutional limits on professional autonomy (Traynor, Boland, and Buus 2010). McKinlay and Potter (1987) explored the way psychologists defend their own ideas and criticize those of others in the context of an academic convention. They found that along with neutral repertoires referencing methods or models, scientists also keep in reserve a "contingent" repertoire that introduces "distorting factors like bias, incompetence, and institutional pressures to account for why scientists have got it wrong" (457). And in a widely cited examination of how scientists discuss objective evidence and subjective belief, Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) found that although the two linguistic repertoires seem potentially incompatible, scientists in fact use both extensively in different social situations.

How Journalists Talk about Journalism (and Themselves)

To date, however, the concept of interpretive repertoires as linguistic building blocks of an occupational community has not been widely applied in journalism studies. One notable exception relevant to our research is a recent study of the discourse around journalism education and practice in Britain, in which Reardon (2016) identifies three interpretive repertoires. The first involves training and stresses the ability to learn to be a journalist; the second references journalism as a "vocation," implying a journalist is born rather than made. Both are prevalent in the discourse, but the third – critical engagement or thought – is not, leading her to conclude that "the value of intellectual debate plays a poor second fiddle to the importance and value of being trained in skills" (946).

A few other examples emerge from around the world. An examination of public relations practitioners seeking to book political clients onto TV news shows in the Netherlands found that they drew on interpretive repertoires related to play, positioning their interactions with journalists as a strategic balance between struggle and cooperation (Schohaus, Broersma, and Wijfjes 2017). Conversely, Francoeur (2016) found that Canadian journalists tap into multiple interpretive repertoires in articulating the ways in which they believe themselves to be different from public relations practitioners. Looking at the interpretive resources on which New Zealand journalists draw in writing about Maori people and issues, Matheson (2007, 93) identified a limited range, "repertoires of prejudice" difficult to overcome. In her study of European Union correspondents in Brussels, Siapera (2004) explored narrative repertoires of crisis, nationality, and "Europeanness," pointing toward a plurality of media images of Europe.

In contrast, a large body of work has examined how journalists talk about themselves, their work, and their social role without drawing explicitly on the notion of interpretive repertoires. Space limitations prevent an extensive accounting of this empirical work, which touches on everything from normative practice (Voltmer and Wasserman 2014) to work routines (Shapiro et al. 2013) to organizational and occupational change (Robinson 2011; Williams, Wardle, and Wahl-Jorgensen 2011) and the precarious nature of contemporary news work (Örnebring 2016). But to ground our findings about students' understanding of journalistic innovation and entrepreneurship, we highlight key findings from two massive, questionnaire-based research projects that have examined journalists across multiple nations: the "global journalist" and Worlds of Journalism studies.

Between them, *The Global Journalist* (Weaver 1998) and its update 14 years later (Weaver and Willnat 2012a) encompassed the views of tens of thousands of journalists from 35 countries, including Britain and the Netherlands. Findings suggest a typical journalist is young, college-educated, and representative of dominant cultural groups in his or her society. Journalists broadly agree on the importance of reporting accurately, getting information to the public quickly, and analyzing events and issues (Weaver and Willnat 2012b).

In Britain, despite concerns about economic pressures and deteriorating working conditions, most journalists expressed satisfaction with their jobs. However, role perceptions seem to be shifting, with journalism students ascribing less importance than older British journalists to adversarial or watchdog roles (Sanders and Hanna 2012). Similarly, Dutch journalists gave relatively low priority to investigating government claims, well behind such roles as making complex information accessible, providing interpretation and analysis, and signaling new trends. Although Dutch journalists said they consider audiences in doing their work, they also saw themselves as gatekeepers, determining what information citizens actually need (Pleijter, Hermans, and Vergeer 2012).

The Worlds of Journalism studies drew on questionnaires replicated in 67 countries between 2007 and 2016, enabling a comparison of views about their changing occupation held by journalists in different nations (Hanitzsch et al. 2019). More than 27,500 practitioners

participated in these studies, which explicitly posited that journalism is discursively created: As a social institution, it exists "because and as we talk about it," with norms, values, and practices embedded in a discourse that gives them meaning (Worlds of Journalism n.d.). The results form a mosaic of trans-national journalistic culture that incorporates not only practitioners' roles (in this construction, as populist disseminators, detached watchdogs, critical change agents, or opportunistic facilitators; Hanitzsch 2011) but also their ethical constructs, occupational influences, and perceived autonomy (Hanitzsch et al. 2019).

Several findings from the Netherlands and Britain are useful here. Dutch journalists saw their most important role by far as being "to report things as they are." Almost all felt they had considerable autonomy in writing and reporting the news, but many felt constrained by time pressures and a lack of resources. They highlighted a deterioration of working conditions, including longer working hours yet less time available to research stories. A majority reported an increase in market-related influences, including pressure to make a profit, advertising considerations, and an impetus toward sensational news (Hermans 2016).

British journalists also believed their most important role was to report things as they are, though they additionally gave high priority to educating the audience. They cited multiple influences on their work, including increased pressures from advertising and PR. More than two-thirds felt pressures to turn a profit had grown, and even more reported working longer hours than in the past (Thurman 2016; Thurman and Kunert 2016).

In summary, contemporary research shows that journalists in the Netherlands and the UK, as elsewhere, experience considerable pressure and see themselves as working in a changing occupation, but they also adhere to traditional views about their roles and normative practices. Before exploring students' perceptions, we look at how other scholars and practitioners have thought about one particular aspect of change of primary interest here, the rise of "entrepreneurial journalism."

Entrepreneurialism and Innovation in Journalism

Entrepreneurialism, long of interest in business and management studies, is seen as central to economic performance for companies, industry sectors, and even entire nations (Casson et al. 2008). But with a few notable exceptions, such as Hoag's (2008) application of entrepreneurship metrics to U.S. media industries, it was virtually ignored by journalism studies scholars through the 2000s (Hang and van Weezel 2007). In recent years, however, entrepreneurial journalism has been incorporated in media management texts and has attracted a growing amount of academic attention in its own right. Here, we highlight a few points primarily related to rhetorical constructions of the topic.

Much of that rhetoric has been positive, with entrepreneurialism positioned as a "benevolent force" for a struggling industry (Prenger and Deuze 2017). Compaine and Hoag (2012), for example, noted an environment hospitable to media start-ups, with relatively few barriers to entry and plentiful opportunities for technological innovation. An exploration of the manifestos offered by the start-ups themselves showed that they emphasized technological innovation, along with a simultaneous affirmation and critique of traditional journalistic practices (Carlson and Usher 2016).

A considerable amount of published work has proposed that universities should be preparing journalism students to be entrepreneurs. The premise is that students should learn business concepts and be able to identify opportunities for innovation, empowering them "with the knowledge and skill sets to create their own jobs" (Ferrier 2013, 229). In Australia, Quinn (2010) urged that journalism students be taught entrepreneurial skills and mind sets, from understanding audience research to effectively marketing themselves. British authors have proposed that an increasingly precarious work environment means journalism students should be equipped to become "entrepreneurial self-employed agents, who might compete

with, as well as service, other media organisations" (Baines and Kennedy 2010, 97).

But a more critical discourse also is visible. Some scholars contest the premise that entrepreneurialism is an appropriate response to industry crisis. Cohen (2015), for example, objects to addressing the precariousness of contemporary media work by telling individuals to become more enterprising and self-sufficient, while Compton and Benedetti (2010) caution that shifts in workforce structures and roles jeopardise the vital work of gathering information of public interest and turning it into a story. Similarly, Kreiss and Brennen (2016, 308) warn that entrepreneurialism entails embracing "a willingness to work under precarious conditions and a new mode of flexible work."

Other criticisms focus on normative issues. A key concern has been the perceived need for entrepreneurial journalists to embrace economic imperatives that compromise the "wall" separating editorial and commercial considerations (Coddington 2015) – for instance, by actively seeking crowd-funding for the journalism they produce, as documented by Porlezza and Splendore (2016) in a study that highlighted fundraising activities in Britain and the Netherlands. Such activities also can require inordinate amounts of time that otherwise might go to reporting and writing (Hunter 2016). More broadly, scholars note that journalists without practical business skills or experience typically struggle to make the sound fiscal and management decisions needed to sustain a news operation (Bruno and Nielsen 2012).

Some observers have taken pains to distinguish freelancers from entrepreneurial journalists because of the different degrees of independence and power they hold (Baines and Kennedy 2010). However, other scholars have closely linked the two (Edstrom and Ladendorf 2012; Elmore and Massey 2012), and as journalistic work becomes increasingly "uncertain, stressful and market-driven" (Deuze 2007, 142), researchers are more actively exploring the world of the freelance journalist. Gollmitzer (2014, 826) positions freelancers as "precariously employed watchdogs" typically also engaged in non-journalistic activities. On the other hand, Holton (2016) suggests that freelancers actually are gaining power in the newsroom; their skills in using social media to engage with and build audiences are central to a potential change from perennial outsiders to "intrapreneurial informants" (917). Freelancers in Flemish-speaking Belgium described their own experiences with such terms as freedom, mastery, and self-control (de Cock and de Smaele 2016) – but also said the work is uncertain and seemingly never completed, with considerable time and energy diverted to generating new business. Indeed, "the traditional divide between the values of journalism and those of business seem to blur, and disappear, in the world of entrepreneurial journalism" (263).

While "entrepreneurial journalism" comes with considerable conceptual baggage, the rhetoric around "innovation" has been far more celebratory (Vos and Singer 2016). Innovation is described as "key to the viability of news media in the digital age" (Pavlik 2013, 181). Innovative news organizations are juxtaposed against those mired in institutional stasis (Lowrey 2011), while even inherently traditional entities have been able to successfully redefine their own value by framing themselves as innovation champions (Lewis 2012).

That said, definitions of exactly what constitutes journalistic innovation have varied widely and referenced quite diverse concepts; García-Avilés and his colleagues (2018) group these into four broad areas involving products, production and distribution processes, organization, and marketing. Some scholars have focused on the innovation inherent in an increasingly participatory approach to defining and creating news (Ahva 2017; Lewis 2012; Raetzsch 2015). Others have looked at journalistic business models (Günzel and Holm 2013; Nel 2010), workforces and occupational networks (Hatcher and Thayer 2017; Hellmueller, Cheema and Zhang 2017), or emerging storytelling formats such as solutions journalism (McIntyre 2019) or constructive journalism (Mast, Coesemans and Temmerman 2018).

But by an overwhelming margin, the most widely applied innovation frame among journalism studies scholars has positioned technology as a driver of innovation and an

impetus for discussing and enacting change (Evans 2018). Countless studies over the past 20 years have explored the transformations in journalistic products and practices in connection with the emergence and evolution of a rapid succession of digital technologies, with "success" typically linked to the use of technological assets by journalists and news organisations (Steensen 2011). A few critical voices have been raised along the way, for instance questioning whether a "celebratory focus" on innovation marginalizes normative concerns about journalism's democratic purpose (Creech and Nadler 2018, 182). Overall, however, the tendency has been to emphasise, even exaggerate, the influence of technology as a change-maker for journalists and journalism (Prenger and Deuze 2017), and of technical experimentation as central to occupational innovation (Kreiss and Brennen 2016).

This exploratory study draws on work around entrepreneurial journalism and journalism innovation, along with the theoretical and analytical concept of interpretive repertoires in relation to journalists' understanding of themselves and their social roles, to address three research questions:

RQ1: How do journalism students understand the contemporary relevance of interpretive repertoires traditionally used to describe occupational norms and roles?

RQ2: What interpretive repertoires do journalism students draw on in relation to "journalism innovation"?

RQ3: What interpretive repertoires do they draw on in relation to "entrepreneurial journalism"?

Method

Cases, Population, and Sample

This study relies on questionnaire data from consecutive academic years, 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. All students enrolled in two leading journalism programmes – at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands and at City, University of London, in the United Kingdom – were surveyed. The two countries have featured in other cross-national explorations of journalistic products and cultures (Akkerman 2011; Bakker and Paterson 2011; Deuze 2002; Porlezza and Splendore 2016) and are especially informative for our purposes here. Both are high on the Global Entrepreneurship Index (2018), which ranks entrepreneurial ecosystems in 137 countries. Both also have a large proportion of self-employed media workers. In the Netherlands, roughly half of all journalists do freelance or other work that merges personal and professional spaces and times (Witschge n.d.); in the UK, 40% of people self-identifying as journalists work as freelancers (Ponsford 2017).

Although leaders in journalism education in their respective countries, the two programmes exhibit some structural differences. Journalism is taught at both the BA and MA levels in the UK, but at only the MA level in the Netherlands. This disparity is reflected in enrollment numbers and therefore in the size of the census drawn for this study. The Dutch cohort consisted of a total of 45 MA students in 2015-16 and 42 MA students in 2016-17. A total of 506 BA and MA journalism students were enrolled at the British institution in 2015-16 and 601 in 2016-17.

At Groningen, responses were received from 12 MA students enrolled in 2015-16 (26.7%) and from 20 enrolled in 2016-17 (47.6%). At City, responses were received from 78 students enrolled in 2015-16 (15.4%) and 91 of those enrolled in 2016-17 (15.1%). These figures are in line with previous findings that online surveys typically obtain a low rate of completion relative to paper ones in an educational environment (Nulty 2008). Among the second wave of UK respondents, only two undergraduate students indicated that they also had completed the survey the previous year.

All four sets of respondents had a nearly identical average age, between 23 and 24. Most of the MA students at both institutions had undergraduate degrees in other fields, with

only 27 students (13.4% of the total answering the question) holding a degree in journalism at the time of completing the survey. Most respondents were European – 87.5% of the students enrolled in the Dutch program, and 75.4% of those in the British one – but every continent was represented in the respondent pool. (Although not all were studying in their home country, students are identified below as "British" or "Dutch" for convenience.) The UK students were more likely than their Dutch counterparts to have had prior journalism work experience, especially in full-time roles.

Research Design

The questionnaires were created in SurveyMonkey and distributed to students early in the first term, ahead of any instruction on the topic of interest. Questionnaires were not associated with in-class activities. The questions were in English, in order to avoid potential translation issues, and were identical for both institutions. Confidentiality of all respondents was guaranteed, in accordance with both universities' human subjects research guidelines. The researchers did not know which students completed the questionnaire and which did not, to avoid any perception of repercussions in relation to programme expectations or assessments. It therefore was not possible to compare respondents with non-respondents.

The questionnaire contained a series of 5-point Likert-scale questions, asking respondents to agree or disagree with statements provided; for clarity in reporting here, "agree" and "strongly agree" responses have been combined. The 2015 questionnaire contained 12 such questions. In 2016, seven new questions were added in order to further explore issues suggested by the literature and by findings from the previous year. The concepts of, and context surrounding, both "innovation" and "entrepreneurship" are of course rapidly evolving; however, we structured our closed-ended questions to reflect concepts identified in the literature and the trade press discourse at the time of the study. Additional questions covered demographics, education, and previous journalism experience.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the quantitative data. Although necessarily limiting the scope of the analysis, descriptive statistics are appropriate given the use of a census or non-random respondent population; the different sizes of the two programmes and therefore of the potential respondent pool; and the relatively small number of completed surveys from each set of students. Results therefore are indicative but not generalizable.

In addition, in order to assess the interpretive repertoires used by future journalists in thinking about changes in the nature and practice of journalistic work, respondents were asked to list three words or phrases that they associate with the term "journalism innovation," and three that they associate with the term "entrepreneurial journalism." The responses to these open-ended questions were subjected to a textual analysis that identified discursive clusters and interpretive repertoires, with close attention to widespread use of particular terms and metaphors (Potter and Wetherell 1987). As the literature indicates, interpretive repertoires can be considered as both a conceptual and analytical tool, which proved helpful here. Taken together, the closed- and open-ended questionnaire items reflect the application of both inductive and deductive approaches to addressing our research questions.

Before turning to the findings, it is worth noting that the concept of interpretive repertoires has been most widely used within a discourse analysis framework, which considers discursive texts and conversational threads rather than isolated linguistic units. However, the authors found the idea also to be useful in seeking to understand the starting points for such discourse among journalism students: What terms do they use in constructing their consideration of evolving changes in their field?

Results

Closed-ended Questionnaire Responses

Not surprisingly, journalism students believed their occupation to be changing. Yet they also saw ongoing relevance for traditional norms and societal roles (see **Table 1**). More than 90 percent of respondents in both years agreed that "journalism today is different from journalism a decade ago," and aside from a slightly skeptical Dutch cohort in 2015, similarly overwhelming majorities agreed that journalism needs to continually change in order to remain relevant as society changes.

That said, there were indications that they connected such changes with digital technology, which they overwhelmingly agreed was important to contemporary practice, more than with any fundamental changes in the nature of the profession. At least 90% in both countries and in both years also saw traditional reporting, writing, and editing skills as essential, and large majorities believed that adherence to "traditional ethical principles" was crucial. Questions asked only in 2016, in an effort to tease out more nuanced perceptions about journalistic change, offered additional evidence about the degree to which students have incorporated long-standing interpretive repertoires in thinking about the occupation they are preparing to enter. Large majorities, particularly among the British cohort and somewhat at odds with some earlier findings (Sanders and Hanna 2012), agreed that "journalism should be about holding those with power to account," that "journalism should contribute to positive change in society," and that "storytelling should be central to journalism."

However, closed-ended survey responses also indicated accommodation for rhetoric that positions journalism as a business concerned with audiences, competitors, and economics. More than 95% of the UK respondents in both years, and at least 80% of the Dutch respondents, agreed that "journalists need to be knowledgeable about their audiences"; 82.4% of the British students and about two-thirds of those in the Netherlands also felt "journalism must find an audience in order to be valuable," a statement included only in 2016. British students also were more likely to agree with the need for journalists to know about their competitors, though sizable majorities of Dutch students agreed in both years. Respondents, particularly from the Netherlands, were more ambivalent about the need for journalists to understand basic business principles, though three of the four cohorts agreed this knowledge also was important. In response to a question asked only in 2016, more than two-thirds of students in both countries indicated they believed outside funding sources, such as crowd-funding or donations, would be increasingly important to journalism.

Several closed-ended questions asked for students' projections about their own career plans and paths. Here, some differences emerged between the two countries. While 60% of the Dutch students said they would rather work for a legacy news outlet than a digital one, fewer than half the UK students agreed. But most British students anticipated making journalism a lifelong career, compared with relatively few of their Dutch counterparts. Although the two countries have similarly high freelancing levels, responses to a question asked only in 2016 suggested Dutch students were far more likely to believe most of their journalistic work would be done on a freelance basis.

Open-ended Questionnaire Responses

Students were asked to provide three words or phrases that they associated with "journalism innovation" and three associated with "entrepreneurial journalism." They responded with 340 unique terms related to journalism innovation and 397 unique terms related to entrepreneurial journalism. **Table 2** shows terms used by more than 10 students.

Our findings suggest that journalism students' interpretive repertoires for these concepts are widely shared – and heavily dominated by associations with technological change. Five of the top seven categories encompassing the most frequently offered terms,

particularly for "innovation" but also for entrepreneurship, referenced the prominence of technology in students' perceptions. "Social media" and associated terms were offered a whopping 71 times by our 201 respondents, with "technology" not far behind at 64 references. "Digital," "online," and "Internet" had 35 or more mentions apiece; "multimedia" and "blogs" also were referenced repeatedly.

Among terms not directly associated with technology, the most common were phrases related to "business." Almost all were offered in reference to "entrepreneurial journalism": 41 mentions compared with just three for innovation. Students also conflated entrepreneurialism with freelancing; of the 29 mentions of freelance work, only five (all from UK students) were connected with "journalism innovation."

The related concepts of novelty and change also were clearly part of students' interpretive repertoires around both innovation and entrepreneurialism. Terms referencing something "new" or "novel" appeared 38 times in our data, and were one of only a handful that were well-represented in relation to both topics. "Change" also appeared on both lists, 16 times in all. And 23 students offered "innovation" in relation to entrepreneurial journalism … maybe because it was fresh in their minds, having just answered a separate question asking for terms associated with "journalism innovation"!

In addition to examining individual terms that suggested shared linguistic repertoires around these topics, the researchers also combed the open-ended data in search of discursive clusters – the register of terms and metaphors (Potter and Wetherell 1987) that our students used to characterize innovation and entrepreneurialism. We identified seven such clusters, as shown in **Tables 3 and 4**, along with three "catchall" clusters of generic terms with either a positive, negative, or neutral connotation.

The students' interpretive repertoire within the "audiences" cluster broadly connected both innovation and entrepreneurialism with opportunities for reaching and engaging new audiences, as well as for audiences to have greater input into news production. Students also seemed to differentiate between legacy "mass" media and more specialized and participatory offerings. The word "niche" appeared seven times in relation to entrepreneurial journalism, while such terms as "crowdsourcing," "participatory," and "citizen journalism" were used repeatedly in relation to journalism innovation.

As already indicated, the "business" cluster was far more widely used in relation to entrepreneurialism – not necessarily in a positive way. Students characterized journalistic start-ups as profit-driven and "lean," and their interpretive repertoires indicated realization of the necessity for diverse revenue streams: "advertising," "crowd-funding," "micropayments," "pay walls," and more. Several also associated entrepreneurship with industry survival, indicating a need for "new and sustainable business models" or "new ways to earn money."

Ethical concerns surrounded entrepreneurial journalism in particular. Students in both years and both countries offered discursive terms that indicated a sense of perceived dangers related to bias and the potential for journalists to be "compromised" – though "freedom" also was invoked four times, presumably expressing the idea that heading one's own enterprise enabled a degree of independence from supervisors and publishers.

A small linguistic cluster of terms related to globalization was invoked more often in relation to innovation than entrepreneurship. Students seemed to connect positive concepts about multiculturalism and trans-border networks with innovation, perhaps in view of the growing number of topical websites attracting audiences that cross national boundaries.

A fifth set of terms concerned the practices and characteristics of journalism. Here students seemed to express a traditional view of such fundamental tasks as reporting and writing, much in line with the literature cited above, as well as with responses to our own closed-ended questions. Their repertoire within this cluster was wide-ranging, but several groups of terms stand out. One is the concept of teamwork or collaboration, which students

evoked in connection with both innovation and entrepreneurship. Another, particularly prominent among the Dutch respondents, was the idea that entrepreneurial journalists needed to "brand" or market themselves, as well as to be multi-skilled multi-taskers. Students in both countries also associated entrepreneurialism with freelancing, as previously highlighted.

Their interpretive repertoire around novelty and change, another broad linguistic construct, has already been mentioned, as well. This was perhaps the most positively oriented of the rhetorical clusters, with virtually all respondents seeing change as offering opportunities for creative young people with ideas and technological proficiency. Indeed, a number of the terms in this category explicitly evoked the notion of progress, from "moving forward" and "staying ahead of the game," to "improvement" and "proactive."

This sense of opportunities benefitting the technically savvy was reflected in the prevalent linguistic association of various kinds of technology with the concept of "innovation," in particular. Virtually every imaginable tool and platform was rhetorically linked to innovation, entrepreneurship, or both; students liberally offered specific examples, such as YouTube, and broad concepts, such as "technology" itself. Although our data were collected before media discourse about "fake news" became widespread, students gave little indication of any concerns associated with social media.

Finally, their repertoires include more general sentiments, both positive and negative. Notably, while those who like entrepreneurialism see it vaguely as "fun" or "interesting," those who don't like the concept really, really don't like it. One British student used the three answer blocks to write: "Journalism is not entrepreneurial / journalism is about ethics / accuracy and accountability." Another offered these three terms: "Making cash" / "being a sleaze" / "advertising slave."

Discussion

Our first research question asked about the contemporary relevance of interpretive repertoires traditionally used to describe journalistic norms and roles, and our closed-ended data clearly indicated that students found such repertoires very durable. In particular, British students – most of whom, perhaps naively, anticipate staying in journalism throughout their working lives – appear to have adopted long-standing occupational discourse around practices (reporting, writing, editing, and general "storytelling") and normative roles (adhering to traditional ethical principles, holding those with power to account, and contributing to positive social change). The finding, which suggests a somewhat conservative approach to their career despite the fluidity of the occupation they are preparing to enter, is much in line with that of the Worlds of Journalism studies cited above.

This is not to suggest that they do not conceive of journalism as a changing enterprise. On the contrary, they overwhelmingly agree that journalism today is different from as little as a decade ago. They identify change most notably in connection with technology, with nearly universal agreement about the need for journalists to maintain relevance by mastering digital tools. They also volunteered a host of terms related to novelty in relation to the core concepts of interest here, innovation and entrepreneurialism. But taken as a whole, their responses suggest that these students view change at a relatively superficial level, without calling into question core understandings of what journalism does, is, or should be. The changes, in their view, are part of the evolution of traditional occupational constructs rather than involving, evoking, or indeed necessitating a revolution in journalistic culture.

Our second and third research questions concerned the interpretive repertoires around journalism innovation and entrepreneurial journalism, respectively. The findings section considered responses to the closed- and open-ended questions separately; here, we briefly revisit them in combination. In general, "innovation" seemed to enjoy positive discursive associations, much in line with the literature (Lewis 2012; Lowrey 2011; Pavlik 2013). A

majority of students, particularly among the British cohort, saw themselves as being innovators during their career, and terms related to digital platforms and technologies – which young people tend to see as their own generational bailiwick – were offered in relation to "journalism innovation" to an extent that is telling. Concepts around multiculturalism and globalization were also more likely to be included in interpretive repertoires related to innovation, a finding that merits follow-up investigation.

Interpretive repertoires surrounding entrepreneurial journalism seemed more nuanced as well as less uniform. The closed-ended responses indicated accommodation of entrepreneurial imperatives within students' discursive toolkit, including knowledge about audiences, competitors, and basic business principles; however, agreement with statements related to these ideas was generally weaker than with statements referencing journalistic norms or traditional practices. The open-ended responses suggested that students drew on interpretive repertoires associated with business in thinking about entrepreneurialism – and that they had some misgivings about that association.

Our data suggest, for instance, that while innovation was associated with citizen journalism, audience engagement, and participation, entrepreneurialism was more closely connected with reaching a "market." To take another example, the term "branding" was used in relation to entrepreneurial journalism but not to innovation. And the linguistic cluster around ethics, in particular, merits more extensive study in order to tease out intended meaning; for instance, when students evoke "independence," are they thinking about freedom to pursue the stories they choose or about insufficient independence from funders, as some scholars have cautioned (Coddington 2015; Porlezza and Splendore 2016)? A follow-up study incorporating interviews in the data set would enable discourse analysts to more fully understand interpretive repertoires that can only be hinted at through the isolated terms or phrases to which this study was confined.

Taken broadly, students studying journalism in the UK and in the Netherlands – who came to university from all over the world – seemed to reflect quite similar expectations of, and interpretive repertoires about, the profession they are entering. Our findings thus suggest widely shared acceptance of the modernist view of journalism practice, rooted in a discursive construct rather than in formal structures. That said, our respondents were enrolled at just two universities and of course cannot be taken as representative of international journalism students in general; this limitation is compounded by the relatively low response rates. Given the extent to which entrepreneurialism is becoming embedded in journalistic experience and journalism curricula around the world, as highlighted above, a greatly expanded data set undoubtedly would prove valuable.

Nonetheless, we believe our study extends understanding of how journalists at the start of their careers conceptualize the rapidly and dramatically changing industry they are preparing to enter, a matter of fundamental concern to those who teach and study journalism. Our findings suggest most are open to evolutionary change, but define it in relation to technology rather than the more challenging matters of journalistic practice, roles, or norms – much in line with Reardon's (2016) finding that training in concrete aspects of journalism, such as skills, dominates educational discourse. We see important implications here in the suggestion that journalism students may view themselves as innovators, but primarily if not exclusively within entrenched occupational boundaries. Also important is the indication, hinted at here but worthy of closer attention, that students continue to see the practice of journalism as unhampered by concerns about how to sustain it economically. As journalism educators, we tend to focus on preparing our students to get a job, virtually ignoring how or whether they might earn a living from the jobs they get. Given the dire state of local journalism, in particular, on both sides of the north Atlantic and the limited potential for government or non-profit entities to fill the funding gaps faced by many commercial news

outlets, we might work harder to encourage students to think creatively about economic sustainability of the news ecosystem.

For now, our study suggests, students seem to see both innovation and entrepreneurialism as telling journalistic stories with new tools. For the most part, their interpretive repertoires describe changes that are incremental rather than radical – much in line with how news organisations that will employ them are changing. They promise to fit in well as new newsroom employees. Whether more disruptive employees are needed to enable the industry to respond to the fundamental disruptions it faces remains an open question, one we believe merits ongoing and multi-faceted attempts to answer.

References

Adoni, Hanna, and Sherrill Mane. 1984. "Media and the Social Construction of Reality: Toward an Integration of Theory and Research." *Communication Research* 11 (3): 323-340.

Ahva, Laura. 2017. "Practice Theory for Journalism Studies: Operationalizing the Concept of Practice for the Study of Participation." *Journalism Studies* 18 (12): 1523-1541.

Akkerman, Tjitske. 2011. "Friend or Foe? Right-wing Populism and the Popular Press in Britain and the Netherlands." *Journalism* 12 (8): 931-945.

Aldrich, Howard E., and Martha Martinez. 2010. "Entrepreneurship as Social Construction: A Multilevel Evolutionary Approach." In *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, edited by Zoltan J. Acs and David B. Audretsch, 387-427. New York: Springer.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* New York: Knopf.

Baines, David, and Clara Kennedy. 2010. "An Education for Independence? Should Entrepreneurial Skills Be an Essential Part of the Journalist's Toolbox?" *Journalism Practice* 4 (1): 97-113.

Bakker, Tom, and Chris Paterson. 2011. "The New Frontiers of Journalism: Citizen Participation in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands." In *Political Communication in Postmodern Democracy: Challenging the Primacy of Politics*, edited by Kees Brants and Katrin Voltmer, 183-199. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baly, Andrew R. 2010. "Leaving Abusive Relationships: Constructions of Self and Situation by Abused Women." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 25 (12): 2297-2315.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.

Briggs, Mark. 2012. *Entrepreneurial Journalism: How To Build What's Next for News*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Bruna Seu, Irene. 2010. "'Doing Denial': Audience Reaction to Human Rights Appeals." *Discourse and Society* 21 (4): 438-457.

Bruno, Nicola, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. 2012. *Survival Is Success: Journalistic Online Start-ups in Western Europe*. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. http://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/publication/survival-success.

Carlson, Matt, and Nikki Usher. 2016. "News Startups as Agents of Innovation: For-profit Digital News Startup Manifestos as Metajournalistic Discourse." *Digital Journalism* 4 (5): 563-581.

Carvalho, Anabela. 2007. "Ideological Cultures and Media Discourses on Scientific Knowledge: Re-reading News on Climate Change." *Public Understanding of Science* 16 (2): 223-243.

Casson, Mark, Bernard Yeung, Anuradha Basu, and Nigel Wadeson. 2008. "Introduction." In *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, edited by Mark Casson, Bernard Yeung, Anuradha Basu, and Nigel Wadeson, 1-30. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coddington, Mark. 2015. “The Wall Becomes a Curtain: Revisiting Journalism’s News-business Boundary.” In *Boundaries of Journalism: Professionalism, Practices and Participation*, edited by Matt Carlson and Seth C. Lewis, 67-82. New York: Routledge.

Cohen, Nicole S. 2015. “Entrepreneurial Journalism and the Precarious State of Media Work.” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 114 (3): 513-533.

Compaine, Ben, and Anne Hoag. 2012. “Factors Supporting and Hindering New Entry in Media Markets: A Study of Media Entrepreneurs.” *International Journal on Media Management* 14 (1): 27-49.

Compton, James R., and Paul Benedetti. 2010. “Labour, New Media and the Institutional Restructuring of Journalism.” *Journalism Studies* 11 (4): 487-499.

Creech, Brian, and Anthony M. Nadler. 2018. “Post-industrial Fog: Reconsidering Innovation in Visions of Journalism’s Future." *Journalism* 19 (2): 182-199.

de Cock, Rozane, and Hedwig de Smaele. 2016. “Freelancing in Flemish News Media and Entrepreneurial Skills as Pivotal Elements in Job Satisfaction.” *Journalism Practice* 10 (2): 251-265.

Deuze, Mark. 2007. *Media Work*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.

Deuze, Mark. 2002. “National News Cultures: A Comparison of Dutch, German, British, Australian and U.S. Journalists.” *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 79 (1): 134-149.

Edstrom, Maria, and Martina Ladendorf. 2012. “Freelance Journalists as a Flexible Workforce in Media Industries.” *Journalism Practice* 6 (5/6): 711-721.

Edley, Nigel. 2001. “Analysing Masculinity: Interpretative Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions.” In *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, edited by Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J. Yates, 189-228. London: Sage and The Open University.

Elmore, Cindy, and Brian Massey. 2012. “Need for Instruction in Entrepreneurial Journalism: Perspective of Full-time Freelancers.” *Journal of Media Practice* 13 (2): 109-124.

Evans, Sandra. 2018. “Making Sense of Innovation: Process, Product, and Storytelling Innovation in Public Service Broadcasting Organizations.” *Journalism Studies* 19 (3): 4-24.

Ferrier, Michelle Barrett. 2013. “Media Entrepreneurship: Curriculum Development and Faculty Perceptions of What Students Should Know.” *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 68 (3): 222–241.

Francoeur, Chantal. 2016. “Maintaining the Boundaries: The Interpretative Repertoires Journalists Use To Differentiate Themselves from the Public Relations Industry.” *Brazilian Journalism Research* 12 (3): 56-73.

García-Avilés, José A., Miguel Carvajal-Prieto, Alicia De Lara-González, and Félix Arias-Robles, 2018. “Developing an Index of Media Innovation in a National Market: The Case of Spain.” *Journalism Studies* 19 (3): 25-42.

Gilbert, G. Nigel, and Michael Mulkay. 1984. *Opening Pandora’s Box: A Sociological Analysis of Scientists’ Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Global Entrepreneurship and Development Institute. 2018. “Global Entrepreneurship Index.” https://thegedi.org/global-entrepreneurship-and-development-index/

Gollmitzer, Mirjam. 2014. “Precariously Employed Watchdogs? Perceptions of Working Conditions among Freelancers and Interns.” *Journalism Practice* 8 (6): 826-841.

Günzel, Franziska, and Anna B. Holm. 2013. “One Size Does Not Fit All – Understanding the Front-End and Back-End of Business Model Innovation. *International Journal of Innovation Management* 17 (1): https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S1363919613400021

Hang, Min, and Aldo van Weezel. 2007. “Media and Entrepreneurship: What Do We Know and Where Should We Go?” *Journal of Media Business Studies* 4 (1): 51-70.

Hanitzsch, Thomas, Folker Hanusch, Jyotika Ramaprasad, and Arnold S. de Beer. 2019. *Worlds of Journalism: Journalistic Cultures around the Globe*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hanitzsch, Thomas. 2011. “Populist Disseminators, Detached Watchdogs, Critical Change Agents and Opportunist Facilitators: Professional Milieus, the Journalistic Field and Autonomy in 18 Countries.” *International Communication Gazette* 73 (6): 477-494.

Hatcher, John A., and Dana Thayer. 2017. “Assessing Collaboration in One Media Ecosystem. *Journalism Practice* 11 (10): 1283-1301.

Hellmueller, Lea, Sadia Ehsan Cheema and Xu Zhang. 2017. “The Networks of Global Journalism: Global News Construction through the Collaboration of Global News Startups with Freelancers.” *Journalism Studies* 18 (1): 45-64.

Hermans, Liesbeth. 2016. “Country Report: Journalists in the Netherlands.” Worlds of Journalism Study, November 8. https://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/30118/1/ Country_report_Netherlands.pdf

Hoag, Anne. 2008. “Measuring Media Entrepreneurship.” *International Journal on Media Management* 19 (2): 74-80.

Holton, Avery E. 2016. “Intrapreneurial Informants: An Emergent Role of Freelance Journalists.” *Journalism Practice* 10 (7): 917-927.

Horton-Salway, Mary. 2010. “Repertoires of ADHD in UK Newspaper Media.” *Health*: *An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine* 15 (5): 533-549.

Hunter, Andrea. 2016. “‘It’s Like Having a Second Full-time Job’”: Crowdfunding, Journalism and Labour.” *Journalism Practice* 10 (2): 217-232.

Kreiss, Daniel, and J. Scott Brennen. 2016. “Normative Models of Digital Journalism.” In *The Sage Handbook of Digital Journalism*, edited by Tamara Witschge, C. W. Anderson, David Domingo, and Alfred Hermida, 299-314. London: Sage.

Lewis, Seth C. 2012. “From Journalism to Information: The Transformation of the Knight Foundation and News Innovation.” *Mass Communication and Society* 15 (2): 309-334.

Lowrey, Wilson. 2011. “Institutionalism, News Organizations and Innovation.” *Journalism Studies* 12 (1): 64-79.

Marsden, Paul. 2017. *Entrepreneurial Journalism: How to Go It Alone and launch Your Dream Digital Project*. New York: Routledge.

Mast, Jelle, Roel Coesemans and Martina Temmerman. 2018. "Constructive Journalism: Concepts, Practices and Discourses." *Journalism*. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1464884918770885

Matheson, Donald. 2007. "The Interpretative Resources of Aotearoa New Zealand Journalists Reporting on Maori." *New Zealand Journal of Media Studies* 10 (2): 91-105.

McIntyre, Karen. 2019. "Solutions Journalism: The Effects of Including Solution Information in News Stories about Social Problems." *Journalism Practice* 13 (1): 16-34.

McKinlay, Andrew, and Jonathan Potter. 1987. "Model Discourse: Interpretative Repertoires in Scientists' Conference Talk." *Social Studies of Science* 17 (3): 443-463.

Nel, François, 2010. "Where Else Is the Money? A Study of Innovation in Online Business Models at Newspapers in Britain's 66 Cities." *Journalism Practice* 4 (3): 360-372.

Nulty, Duncan D. 2008. "The Adequacy of Response Rates to Online and Paper Surveys: What Can Be Done?" *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 33 (3): 301-314.

Örnebring, Henrik. 2016. *Newsworkers: A Comparative European Perspective*. London: Bloomsbury.

Pavlik, John V. 2013. "Innovation and the Future of Journalism." *Digital Journalism* 1 (2): 181-193.

Pleijter, Alexander, Liesbeth Hermans, and Maurice Vergeer. 2012. "Journalists and Journalism in the Netherlands." In *The Global Journalist in the 21st Century*, edited by David H. Weaver and Lars Willnat, 242-254. New York: Routledge.

Ponsford, Dominic. 2017. "One in Three Freelance Journalists in the UK Are on State Benefits." PressGazette.co.uk, February 15. http://www.pressgazette.co.uk/one-in-three-freelance-journalists-in-the-uk-are-on-state-benefits/

Porlezza, Colin, and Sergio Splendore. 2016. "Accountability and Transparency of Entrepreneurial Journalism: Unresolved Ethical Issues in Crowdfunded Journalism Projects." *Journalism Practice* 10 (2): 196-216.

Potter, Jonathan. 2012. "Re-reading Discourse and Social Psychology: Transforming Social Psychology." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 51 (3): 436-455.

Potter, Jonathan, and Margaret Wetherell. 1987. *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.

Prenger, Mirjam, and Mark Deuze. 2017. "A History of Innovation and Entrepreneurialism in Journalism." In *Remaking the News: Essays on the Future of Journalism Scholarsihp in the Digital Age*, edited by Pablo J. Boczkowski and C. W. Anderson, 235-250. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Quinn, Stephen. 2010. "Opportunities for Journalism Education in an Online Entrepreneurial World." *Asia Pacific Media Educator* 1 (20): 69–80.

Raetzsch, Christoph. 2015. "Innovation through Practice: Journalism as a Structure of Public Communication." *Journalism Practice* 9 (1): 65-77.

Reardon, Sally. 2016. “Mixed Messages: An Investigation into the Discursive Construction of Journalism as a Practice.” *Journalism Practice* 10 (7): 939-949.

Robinson, Sue. 2011. “Convergence Crises: News Work and News Space in the Digitally Transforming Newsroom.” *Journal of Communication* 61 (6): 1122-1141.

Sanders, Karen, and Mark Hanna. 2012. “British Journalists.” In *The Global Journalist in the 21st Century*, edited by David H. Weaver and Lars Willnat, 220-233. New York: Routledge.

Schlesinger, Phillip, and Gillian Doyle. 2015. “From Organizational Crisis to Multi-platform Salvation? Creative Destruction and the Recomposition of News Media.” *Journalism* 16 (3): 305-323.

Schohaus, Birte, Marcel Broersma, and Huub Wijfjes. 2017. “Negotiation Games: Play Metaphors in the Journalist-source Relationship between Political PR and Talk Shows.” *Journalism Practice* 11 (8): 925-941.

Shapiro, Ivor, Colette Brin, Isabelle Bédard-Brûlé, and Kasia Mychajlowycz. 2013. “Verification as a Strategic Ritual: How Journalists Retrospectively Describe Processes for Ensuring Accuracy.” *Journalism Practice* 7 (6): 657-673.

Siapera, Eugenia. 2004. “EU Correspondents in Brussels: Between Europe and the Nation-state.” In *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU*, edited by Marilynn Brewer, Thomas Risse, and Richard K. Herrmann, 129-157. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Spencer, Alexander. 2012. “The Social Construction of Terrorism: Media, Metaphors and Policy Implications.” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 15 (3): 393-419.

Steensen, Steen. 2011. “Online Journalism and the Promises of New Technology: A Critical Review and a Look Ahead.” *Journalism Studies* 12 (3): 311-327.

Thurman, Neil. 2016. “Journalism and Change.” In *Journalists in the UK*, edited by Neil Thurman, Alessio Cornia, and Jessica Kunert, 35-40. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

Thurman, Neil, and Jessica Kunert. 2016. “Country Report: Journalists in the United Kingdom.” Worlds of Journalism Study, July 1. https://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/30989/1/Country_report_UK.pdf

Traynor, Michael. 2006. “Discourse Analysis: Theoretical and Historical Overview and Review of Papers in the *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 1996-2004.” *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 54 (1): 62-72.

Traynor, Michael, Maggie Boland, and Niels Buus. 2010. “Professional Autonomy in 21st Century Healthcare: Nurses’ Accounts of Clinical Decision-Making.” *Social Science and Medicine* 71 (8): 1506-1512.

Voltmer, Katrin, and Herman Wasserman. 2014. “Journalistic Norms between Universality and Domestication: Journalists’ Interpretations of Press Freedom in Six New Democracies.” *Global Media and Communication* 10 (2): 177-192.

Vos, Tim P., and Jane B. Singer. 2016. “Media Discourse about Entrepreneurial Journalism: Implications for Journalistic Capital.” *Journalism Practice* 10 (2): 143-159

Weaver, David H. 1998. *The Global Journalist: News People around the World*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Weaver, David H., and Lars Willnat. 2012a. *The Global Journalist in the 21st Century*. New York: Routledge.

Weaver, David, and Lars Willnat. 2012b. "Journalists in the 21st Century: Conclusions." *The Global Journalist in the 21st Century*, edited by David H. Weaver and Lars Wilnat, 529-551. New York: Routledge.

Wetherell, Margaret, and Jonathan Potter. 1988. "Discourse Analysis and the Identification of Interpretative Repertoires." In *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*, edited by Charles E. Antaki, 168-183. London: Sage.

Williams, Andy, Claire Wardle, and Karin Wahl-Jorgensen. 2011. "'Have They Got News for Us?' Audience Revolution or Business as Usual at the BBC?" *Journalism Practice* 5 (1): 85-99.

Witschge, Tamara. (n.d.) "Entrepreneurship at Work: Analysing Practice, Labour, and Creativity in Journalism." University of Groningen. Accessed October 9 2018. http://www.rug.nl/staff/t.a.c.witschge/entrepreneurship_at_work_witschge.pdf

Worlds of Journalism. (n.d.). "Conceptual Framework." Accessed January 8 2019. http://www.worldsofjournalism.org/research/2012-2016-study/conceptual-framework/

Zelizer, Barbie. 1993. "Journalists as Interpretive Communities." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 10 (3): 219-237.

Table 1: Closed-ended data

Number and percentage of students agreeing (agree / strongly agree) with statement, listed in the sequence asked.

	British students 2016 (N=91)	Dutch students 2016 (N=20)	British students 2015 (N=78)	Dutch students 2015 (N=12)
Journalism today is different from journalism a decade ago.	85 (93.4%)	19 (95.0%)	76 (97.4%)	11 (91.7%)
Journalism needs to continually change in order to remain relevant as society changes.	84 (92.3%)	19 (95.0%)	74 (94.9%)	10 (83.3%)
I anticipate being a journalism innovator during my career.	54 (59.3%)	6 (30.0%)	50 (64.1%)	7 (58.3%)
I anticipate being a journalism entrepreneur during my career.	36 (39.6%)	8 (40.0%)	29 (37.2%)	5 (41.7%)
I anticipate remaining in journalism throughout my working life.	60 (65.9%)	5 (20.0%)	50 (64.1%)	4 (33.3%)
I anticipate that most of my journalistic work will be as a freelancer.	21 (23.1%)	13 (65.0%)	*(Not asked in 2015)*	*(Not asked in 2015)*
Journalism must find an audience in order to be valuable.	75 (82.4%)	13 (65.0%)	*(Not asked in 2015)*	*(Not asked in 2015)*
I would prefer working for a print or broadcast news organisation rather than a digital-only one.	44 (48.4%)	12 (60.0%)	*(Not asked in 2015)*	*(Not asked in 2015)*
Traditional reporting, writing and editing skills are essential for journalists today.	87 (95.6%)	18 (90.0%)	75 (96.2%)	11 (91.7%)
Adherence to traditional ethical principles is essential for journalists today.	78 (85.7%)	14 (70.0%)	74 (94.9%)	10 (83.3%)
Journalists should remain uninvolved with matters related to generating revenue.	36 (39.6%)	7 (35.0%)	29 (37.2%)	1 (8.3%)
Journalists need to be knowledgeable about their audiences.	87 (95.6%)	16 (80.0%)	76 (97.4%)	11 (91.7%)
Journalists need to be knowledgeable about their competitors.	80 (87.9%)	13 (65.0%)	74 (94.9%)	10 (83.3%)
Journalists need to know how to use digital technology.	85 (93.4%)	19 (95.0%)	78 (100%)	12 (100%)
Journalists need to understand basic business principles.	66 (72.5%)	9 (45.0%)	63 (80.8%)	8 (66.7%)
Outside funding sources (for example, crowd-funding or donations by foundations or individuals) will be increasingly important to journalism.	63 (69.2%)	15 (75.0%)	*(Not asked in 2015)*	*(Not asked in 2015)*
Storytelling should be central to journalism.	85 (93.4%)	14 (70.0%)	*(Not asked in 2015)*	*(Not asked in 2015)*
Journalism should be about holding those with power to account.	81 (89.0%)	12 (60.0%)	*(Not asked in 2015)*	*(Not asked in 2015)*
Journalism should contribute to positive change in society.	80 (87.9%)	14 (70.0%)	*(Not asked in 2015)*	*(Not asked in 2015)*

Table 2: Open-ended data: Terms used 10 times or more to describe "journalism innovation" and / or "entrepreneurial journalism"

Similar words ("freelance" / "freelancer" or "digital" / "digitization") are counted as one term. Words used in combination but expressing related concepts also are clustered together. For example, "business" includes the word by itself plus "build a new business," and "business plan," among similar terms.

The number of times the term appeared in our data set across both years is provided.

"N" and "UK" indicate whether the term was used by students from the Netherlands (total n = 32) and / or the United Kingdom (total n = 169), respectively.

	Used to describe journalism innovation	**Used to describe entrepreneurial journalism**	**Total unique times used**
Social / social media / social networks	65 (N, UK)	6 (UK)	71
Technology	50 (N, UK)	14 (UK)	64
Business	3 (UK)	41 (N, UK)	44
Digital	36 (N, UK)	8 (N, UK)	44
Online	32 (N, UK)	9 (N, UK)	41
New / novel	22 (N, UK)	16 (N, UK)	38
Internet	30 (N, UK)	5 (N, UK)	35
Freelance / freelancer / freelancing	5 (UK)	24 (N, UK)	29
Independent / independence	7 (UK)	18 (N, UK)	25
Start-up	3 (N, UK)	22 (N, UK)	25
Innovation / innovative	-	23 (N, UK)	23
Multimedia	21 (N, UK)	1 (UK)	22
Interactive / interactivity / interaction	17 (N, UK)	1 (UK)	18
Money	-	17 (N, UK)	17
Change	11 (UK)	5 (UK)	16
Creativity / creating / creator / creation	5 (UK)	8 (N, UK)	13
Adaptability / adaptation	7 (UK)	5 (N, UK)	12
Blogs / blogging	5 (N. UK)	7 (N, UK)	12
Citizen / citizen journalism	11 (N, UK)	-	11

Table 3: Discursive clusters related to "journalism innovation"

Total number of mentions per topic among each cohort shown, followed by example(s).

	British students 2016 (N=91)	**Dutch students 2016 (N=20)**	**British students 2015 (N=78)**	**Dutch students 2015 (N=12)**
Technology / tools / platforms ***Total mentions: 291***	**116 mentions** "Digitization" "Live blogging"	**32 mentions** "Multimedia" "Podcasts"	**121 mentions** "Data" "Mobile technology"	**22 mentions** "New platforms" "Social media"
Novelty / change / progress ***Total mentions:103***	**52 mentions** "Out of the box" "Revolutionary"	**6 mentions** "Different" "Young"	**45 mentions** "Fresh" "Future"	-
Audiences / engagement / participation ***Total mentions: 68***	**30 mentions** "Audience-focused" "Participatory"	**9 mentions** "Needs of society" "Personalized"	**27 mentions** "Accessible" "Engagement"	**2 mentions** "Citizen journalism" "Engagement"
Journalistic practices / traits ***Total mentions: 44***	**24 mentions** "Fact-checking" "Storytelling"	**4 mentions** "Multiskilling" "Relevance"	**13 mentions** "Freelance" "Jack of all trades"	**3 mentions** "Aggregation" "Professionalism"
Business / financial issues ***Total mentions: 18***	**12 mentions** "Competitive" "Profit"	**3 mentions** "Flexible subscriptions" "Survival"	**1 mention** "Quality journalism struggling"	**2 mentions** "Business" "Niche market"
Ethics / normative issues ***Total mentions: 16***	**6 mentions** "Independence" "Objectivity"	**2 mentions** "Blurred boundaries" "Hacking emails"	**6 mentions** "Balanced" "Principle of truth"	**2 mentions** "Core value" "Transparent"
Globalization ***Total mentions: 13***	**7 mentions** "Global village" "Internationalism"	**2 mentions** "Globalization"	**3 mentions** "Restructuring nat'l understandings" "Worldwide networks"	**1 mention** "Multicultural"
Generic: Positive ***Total: 6***	**1 mention** "Welcoming"	-	**5 mentions** "Important" "Insight"	-
Generic: Negative ***Total: 12***	**10 mentions** "Struggle" "Waste of time"	-	**2 mentions** "Growing superficiality" "Hard work"	-
Other (uncategorized) ***Total: 25***	**10 mentions** "Ideas" "Media"	**1 mention** "Attitude"	**10 mentions** "Information" "Politics"	**4 mentions** "Communication" "Reflection"

Table 4: Discursive clusters related to "entrepreneurial journalism"

Total number of mentions per topic among each cohort shown, followed by example(s).

	British students 2016 (N=91)	**Dutch students 2016 (N=20)**	**British students 2015 (N=78)**	**Dutch students 2015 (N=12)**
Business / financial issues ***Total mentions: 120***	**55 mentions** "Investment" "Monetisation"	**13 mentions** "CAPITALISM" (sic) "Profit-orientated"	**47 mentions** "Commercial" "Revenue"	**5 mentions** "Business model" "Paywall"
Novelty / change / progress ***Total mentions: 113***	**50 mentions** "Original" "Visionary"	**9 mentions** "Creative" "Modern"	**46 mentions** "Game changer" "Proactive"	**8 mentions** "Innovative" "Unique"
Journalistic practices / traits ***Total mentions: 103***	**41 mentions** "Teamwork" "Tenacity"	**14 mentions** "Multiskilled" "Networking"	**42 mentions** "Savvy" "Self-dependent"	**6 mentions** "Branding yourself" "Freelance"
Technology / tools / platforms ***Total mentions: 69***	**32 mentions** "Coding" "YouTube"	**2 mentions** "App" "Blogs with news"	**29 mentions** "Digital" "Multiplatform"	**6 mentions** "Online" "Twitter"
Ethics / normative issues ***Total mentions: 36***	**15 mentions** "Market ethos" "Transparency"	**4 mentions** "Freedom" "Objective"	**14 mentions** "Biased" "Jezebel"	**3 mentions** "Independence" "Subjective"
Audiences / engagement / participation ***Total mentions: 25***	**12 mentions** "Expanding readership" "Public journalism"	**2 mentions** "Audiences" "Niche"	**10 mentions** "Filling a need" "Gap in the market"	**1 mentions** "Niche"
Globalization ***Total mentions: 2***	-	**1 mention** "Globalization"	**1 mention** "World evolvement" (sic)	-
Generic: Positive ***Total: 17***	**8 mentions** "Fun" "Rewarding"	**5 mentions** "Hope" "Smart"	**4 mentions** "Humor" "Leadership"	-
Generic: Negative ***Total: 27***	**14 mentions** "Instability" "Risky"	**5 mentions** "Poverty" "Uncertainty"	**8 mentions** "Fad" "Greed"	-
Other (uncategorized) ***Total: 57***	**21 mentions** "Conceptual" "Magazine"	**3 mentions** "Eigen Bedrijf" (site) "Start-up"	**27 mentions** "Enterprises" "Product"	**6 mentions** "Relevance" "Strategy"