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Abstract: This chapter presents an account of the mediatization of education policy through a focus on the development and uptake of the knowledge economy discourse in national education policy and research settings. During the late 20th and early part of the 21st century, Australia, like other nation states around the globe, came to adopt the knowledge economy discourse as a kind of meta-policy that would help connect a variety of statistical indicators and provide direction for a number of policy areas, including education, science, and research funding. In Australia the adoption of a knowledge economy discourse was preceded by coverage from specialized sections of the quality print media, discussed broadly as a debate about the social contract that was afforded to fields charged with developing and producing national capacities for knowledge production. Such a debate mirrored similar claims by Michael Gibbons in the late 1990s, where he argued for a new social contract between science and society. Given the media coverage surrounding the uptake of the knowledge economy discourse and the promotion of the concept by the OECD, this chapter presents an account of the emergence of the knowledge economy discourse through a focus on the mediatization of the concept. The broad argument presented in this account is that what could be called “mediatization effects”, related to the promotion and adoption of policy concepts, are variable, and reach the broader public in inconsistent, time-bound, and sporadic patterns. In order to understand mediatization effects in respect of policy, the paper draws on a broad Bourdieuan informed conceptual framework to understand different kinds of fields, their logics of practice, and importantly here, cross-field effects. Specifically, the focus is on those cross-field effects related to the impact of practices within both national and global fields of journalism on national and global fields of education policy. While the case is an Australian one, the account explores general and more broadly applicable ways to understand links between the globalization and the mediatization of policy.
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1 Introduction

Mediatization is emerging as a concept with considerable promise for research in education. In its broadest sense, mediatization refers to processes of change involving media that entail struggles for social power. There are ongoing debates
about how to theorize and research mediatization. The understanding and research use of mediatization in education, as in other fields, is somewhat fractured as a result of divergent entry points to its study from different disciplines and national traditions, and their seeming disconnection from one another. However, we think there is more promise in mediatization than these divergent disciplinary starting points might suggest. We need, though, to conceptualize the objects or topics suitable for further research on mediatization of education.

On the face of it, the idea that media have profound ongoing impacts on education seems self-evident. Indeed, fundamental changes in education have resulted from the emergence of new communication technologies, and from the selection and promotion of technological platforms in schools, universities, and other places of learning (Friesen and Hug 2011). This is the first reference point for the media. The selection of particular technologies in classrooms, lecture theatres, and other sites of learning is a stake that normalizes future generations of technology users, and one that has cascading effects on the education of teachers and their students, including different dispositions required to be a part of an education system.

In English the media also implies a second referent point, in the sense of different fields of journalism, such as print journalism, online journalism, television and radio journalism (Bourdieu 1996/1998; Benson and Neveau 2005), and even today, citizen journalism. Journalism of different kinds has also had profound ongoing impact on education, and in particular through its influence on public debate, which increasingly frames the terms and parameters in which education policy emerges, and the patterns of communication that comprise public debate specifically about education policy (Blackmore and Thorpe 2003; Franklin 1999, 2004; Blackmore and Thomson 2004; Gewirtz, Dickson and Power 2004; Levin, Sohn and Maharaj 2013). This sense of media involvement with education highlights what representations of problems in education are newsworthy, the limits of arguments that can be publicly maintained about the education within nations and which representations of problems in education are capable of travelling between national contexts in different modes. The mediatization of education involves processes of educational change involving both of these two meanings of the media.

Both of these accounts of the mediatization of education – involving communication technology and journalism – also imply an increasing influence linked to globalization, implying the impact of changes in the media in some countries may have connected or flow on effects in geographically distant nations. We see the effects of globalization in the spread of technology leading to innovations in classrooms, such as the growth of the iPad, tablet computers, and smart boards, and in the borrowing of kinds of stories about education policy, such as the spread of coverage about school choice in education or test-based forms of educational accountability. This chapter assumes that mediatization refers to both of these
processes, but in ways that imply the growing dependence of education and education policy on the media (new technologies and journalism), and the reduced autonomy of education from changes in the media and from the impact of the logics of the field of journalism (Lingard and Rawolle 2004; Rawolle and Lingard 2010). In a later section of the chapter, we introduce an additional meaning of mediatization of education involving representations and images.

Hence, the solidity of meaning implied by the singular term mediatization collects together a plurality of overlapping processes, and suggests a complex interplay of media forces on and in education. The coherence of mediatization as a process and a concept lies in its scope for research, and as a way to connect and make meaning of seemingly disparate changes.

In this chapter we link our understanding of mediatization with a focus on the field of journalism and its effects on education policy, to the theories of practice and field of Bourdieu (Bourdieu 1990, 1993), a tradition that has been influential in one strand of research in communications studies (Benson and Nevue 2005; Couldry 2003, 2012)\(^1\) and research concerned with the role of the media in education (Blackmore and Thorpe 2003). Our own position is that the mediatization of education should be conceptualized as the combination of two sub-processes that are fundamentally concerned with the way changes in the media influence social power in other fields. The two sub-processes that we outline in this chapter are (1) the shaping and changing of education policy to meet the needs of different forms of journalism, and (2) the shaping and changing of education policy by the emergence of new forms of communication technologies. We are led to this representation of the process through our adoption of a Bourdieuan approach to research, in which processes need to be considered and represented in terms of social fields and practices (see Rawolle and Lingard 2013 here). As our own research focuses on the effects of journalism on education policy, our focus for the later sections of the chapter will be on mediatization as the first process. More specifically, the focus will be on the cross-field effects of the field of journalism on the field of education policy, nationally and globally (Lingard and Rawolle 2004; Rawolle and Lingard 2010).

In what follows, we first provide an overview of different kinds of mediatization in education research and of the possibilities that these different kinds hold for education research. We then expand on our own account (Rawolle and Lingard 2010) which engages with Bourdieu’s theories, and in particular his accounts of social fields and practice (Bourdieu 1990, 1993). We draw on one distinction implied by Bourdieu’s use of mediatization, in which the term implies the dual impact of specific fields of journalism and fields of media technology production on other fields, here specifically on the education policy field. This chapter takes as one example of this complexity, the impact of mediatization on a particular

---

\(^1\) See also Couldry’s chapter in this Handbook.
education policy, and represented in a particular discourse and practices associated with that policy, namely the Australian knowledge economic policy, *The Chance to Change* (2000). The broad argument that we develop is that for mediatization to be useful as a concept, some precision needs to be proffered about specific effects that can be attributed to the process, and that assumptions about the stages of mediatization (Strömbäck 2008) require some scrutiny for their application to different fields; that is, can different stages of mediatization be understood by the patterns of effects that are attributed to the concept? In order to develop an account of these mediatization effects, we will need to consider the different accounts offered of effects in education. The intent is that this discussion of mediatization effects and cross-field effects (Rawolle 2005) might be useful to the study of the process in other fields where the logics of practice of one field have effects in other fields, though we do not assume a complete homology with other fields. We also consider briefly the impact of globalization on the journalistic field and the field of education policy.

2 Kinds of mediatization of education

We can distinguish between three different kinds of the mediatization of education that have emerged in education research. While elsewhere we have discussed different applications of mediatization to education research (Rawolle 2010a, 2010b; Rawolle and Lingard 2010), here we talk briefly about these three different kinds to highlight the alternative ways that mediatization allows research to represent significant changes involving education in and across nations that are enabled through changes in the media and by the logics of practice of the fields of journalism. In education these kinds have parallel histories that have not always been interrelated, and research that has drawn on mediatization has adapted the concept to the central research problems and traditions within subfields of education. An important distinction that is elaborated in these debates lies in understanding the relationship and differences between mediation and mediatization (and allied terms: see Couldry 2008). Although later we will focus on one of these kinds of the mediatization of education, namely the impact of the field of journalism upon the education policy field, other kinds are important to note as they can lead to different reference points in subsequent discussions of the mediatization of education policy.

---

2 Couldry’s own position on these debates has shifted and he now advocates the use of mediatization in his own work. See Couldry (2012) and also his chapter in this Handbook, *Mediatization and the Future of Field Theory*. However, Couldry uses mediatization well beyond media studies; rather, he sees the saturation of the social by media of various kinds (including digital media) meaning that mediatization should contribute more broadly to social theory.
The first use of mediatization emerged from research into the development, use, and effects of computer technologies in education (ICT). This literature generated an initial, though somewhat disconnected, discussion about the expression “technical mediatization”, referring to changing modes in the transmission of information, in contrast with mediation (Linard 1995). The subsequent development of literature relating to ICTs lay in understanding the patterns of emergence, normalization and residualization of new forms of media in education. This branch of research involved critical engagements with the embedding of new media in everyday life, drawing on the original work of McLuhan and Postman (Friesen and Hug 2009). The possibilities of mediatization for education research from this literature relate to the exploration of the emergence, embedding, and effects of new technologies in education. These include discussions about new means of organizing teaching, and learning, and challenges to and effects on multiple practices in education, including pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment.

Broader questions that relate to this ongoing change involve a rethinking about the central beliefs and values of education, of what counts as teaching and learning, and of the necessary elements of education as a system. An allied concern that follows involves questions of provision of media technologies in education and educational systems. Given the global spread of policy and approaches to educational systems, there are different kinds of effects that relate to the scale and cycle of production and consumption of learning media, and the economics, distribution, and maintenance of these at various scales. As systems require standardization of technology, this scale consequently leads to schools, universities, students, teachers, and lecturers becoming important, lucrative, and competitive markets for businesses supplying new learning media technology, both to individual schools, systems of schools, universities, and to governments. Due to the increasing pressure on governments to ensure that education systems are competitive internationally, new computer technology in education provides both ongoing and new forms of pressure on education systems, politicians, and policymakers on how to fund, embed, resist, and regulate the use of new forms of media. The counterpart to this view of the way ICTs affect education is the social impact of these new forms of learning and teaching media, including their effects on equity in education and access of new technologies to schools in different circumstances; this is the debate about the “digital divide” and the information rich and information poor as a new manifestation of inequalities generally and also in and through education (see Rizvi and Lingard 2010: 153–156).

The second use of mediatization relates to the politics of education, and the effects of journalism on education, and its practices (e.g. Pina 2007; Goldstein and Chesky 2011; Thompson and Lasic 2011). In this sense, mediatization describes the ongoing changes and effects that can be attributed to the interactions between journalism and education and the struggle for social power. These interactions in turn link to practices within both journalism and education. The development and/
or promotion of league tables of performance and other instruments of comparison, by which individual schools, groups of schools, or even whole school systems are compared, has provided an ongoing source of content for journalists in multimedia outlets. Indeed, journalists and the media have played a strong and influential role here in demanding access to government held data and other accountability measures about system and school performance. In Australia, for example, the federal government under the rubrics of transparency and accountability has introduced the My School public website that lists and compares the performance of every school in Australia against averages and against statistically similar school performance on national literacy and numeracy tests taken at Years 3, 5, 7, and 9 by all students in all schools. Subsequent developments in Australia applied a similar rationale and logic to the development of a university comparison website (My University). Newspapers repackage these data as part of their sales pitch and circulation drives. The daily Murdoch paper in Queensland, the *Courier-Mail*, for example, advertises several times a year lift-outs on the “quality” of all Queensland schools, which utilizes publicly available data. This basically entails a repackaging of My School data and thus involves what we might see as the “privatization” of publicly funded data and analysis.

In relation to international comparative performance data such as on the OECD’s PISA, the OECD has a media strategy to release all the comparative national performance data at a single moment in various global cities. This might be seen as the mediatization of dissemination of policy data. The OECD packages these data in a media friendly fashion, which enables journalists and the media to construct league tables of performance along the dimensions of quality and equity (Wiseman 2013). The evidence would also suggest that it is this first media release of PISA results that gets most media coverage globally, rather than more detailed, comprehensive, and useful subsequent secondary analysis of PISA data (Wiseman 2013). Some argue that media coverage of these comparisons has impacted on the nature and kind of competition that schools, students, and teachers are located within, which has an effect of skewing or distorting the provision of education and the focus of teaching in schools (Lingard and Sellar 2013; Lingard, Sellar and Savage forthcoming). The media representations of these performance data have certainly had political and policy effects. For example, in the state of Queensland in Australia following the poor state performance on the national tests in 2008, the Premier instigated a review and subsequently implemented a range of policy changes, including moving Year 7 into secondary school, in response to the heavy and critical media coverage of the state’s performance (Lingard and Sellar 2013).

Another effect of journalism on education in some national contexts relates to the direct challenge to the technical and professional language and jargon used by teachers, teacher educators, and education departments, which ultimately challenges the autonomy of education to develop its own specialized language and
legitimacy as a discipline. Allied with the specific practices of journalists are the borrowing of familiar themes, framing, and stories about education across nation-states, either through wire publications, the direct lifting of stories related to one national or regional education system and inserted in news outlet in other nations and regions, or syndication. Sometimes it might be an issue that circulates in this mediatized fashion, for example, issues to do with the education of boys. The counterparts to practices of journalists in their reporting of education are the changes of practices of people in education that are based around counteracting or controlling the access journalists have to education institutions. Examples of this include the growing need for people in schools to market, be media savvy, and on message in public engagements in which journalists may be in attendance, and to restrict who can speak to journalists officially in relation to an education institution. When applied to policy and politics, the idea of managing journalists’ coverage of education is connected with spin by politicians about policy and the strategic release of media releases in line with 24-hour media cycles. Furthermore, as we will go on to show, policy releases now in education are often synonymous with media release. The “glossification” of policy texts reframes them as political, mediatized documents, aimed at the media and the general public, rather than as documents to be considered by professionals (here teachers and principals) for implementation or enactment in schools. In addition, media coverage of educational issues sometimes acts to represent and create social problems, which precipitates new policy developments, while in a policy vacuum in respect of such social problems such coverage can almost function as de facto policy for teachers. Furthermore, elements of the policy process in education are being impacted by new technologies and the visualization of policy (Koh 2009). Koh (2009) analyses, for example, the development of a documentary by the Ministry of Education in Singapore that was aired on television that took the public into classrooms and schools in an account of policy enactment. He locates this analysis within Fairclough’s (2000) argument about the mediatization of politics and government. In so doing, he also proffers a methodology for analysing the “visualization” of education policy. This example also overlaps with the third account of mediatization dealt with next.

A third account of mediatization focused on the impact of image and representations on the practices of education. Though there is direct overlap with the first two kinds of mediatization considered above, the focus on images and representations connects to a separate set of debates and theorizations in communications studies and other fields. For example, the increasing access to digital recording devices and means of sharing images and video online include their location within educational spaces, leading to the publishing of a variety of images, videos, and representations by and of young people with various degrees of oversight from adults. The products of these devices, the images and representations that they allow, place increased pressure on education for the protection of young people
with respect to institutions, online environments, other students, adults, and people outside schools. One consequence of this move is the push for more skills to be considered in the education of young people and people in education institutions more broadly, including new forms of literacy demands (for example technological literacy, digital literacies, and multi-literacy). Hence, there is also a push for the inclusion of skills in the education of teachers that relate to images and representations. The representation and images of young people impact in a variety of ways on the practices of teachers, principals and education policy. On-line bullying, for example, has become a major issue for many schools (Campbell 2005). Media representations of school shootings and other violent events are also a cause of concern for educators and policy makers (Kellner 2013).

In a separate sense, the managing of the public image of education has become an increasingly important stake in schools and universities, as this affects competition for desired students, teachers, academics, and leaders within educational markets. This is often linked to the marketing of the school in a new policy context of competition between schools and media representations of the outcomes of test-based accountabilities. As the images of students, academic staff, and leaders become attached to the brand of an institution, categories of desirable people that enhance educational image and brands also emerge. This includes categories of people who enhance school performance, such as high achieving and productive academics and students and cohorts of students that emphasize other qualities desired by institutions and demanded by policy, such as diversity, equity, and inclusion.

3 The mediatization of education policy as cross-field effects: a Bourdieuian account

There are a variety of research objects that have been connected to the mediatization of education, but little coherence in terms of methodological or theoretical approaches. Here we expand on one account that was originally developed to provide a methodological approach to the study of the mediatization of education policy (Rawolle 2007). We argue that this approach may provide a broad coherence to research involving the mediatization of education policy, focused in particular on developing an account that allows both an understanding of patterns of interactions and also broader cross-field effects of the process, specifically between the field of print journalism and the education policy field (Rawolle and Lingard 2010). The approach here involves an engagement with Bourdieu’s field theory and practice theory (Bourdieu 1990, 1993), with the addition of concepts to name, focus on, and explore the effects of one field (journalism) on other fields (education
policy. These additions are cross-field effects, temporary social fields, and incommensurate logics of practice. (The latter is a way of thinking about infidelity in policy implementation: basically the logics of policy text production inside the state are incommensurate with the logics of teacher classroom practices, with the former assuming a universalistic application and the latter being more contingent and specific). In this section, discussion is limited to cross-fields effects related to national fields, whereas in the next section the impact and emergence of cross-fields effects related to global fields are briefly considered.

There have been some problems and concerns raised in applying Bourdieu’s theories to research in communication studies that relate to mediatization. One of the most directly relevant is offered by Couldry (2003), and represents part of an ongoing and sustained engagement with the premises, theorization, and application of field theory. We note, though, that Couldry in his recent book (2012), *Media Society World*, and in his chapter in this Handbook, has expanded on his concerns about the usefulness of field theory to understand mediatization. In his 2003 paper, Couldry argued that there were inherent limits in the adoption of field theory for media research, and that the field specific forms of capital described for other fields seemed to miss something important about the engagement of people with the media, both those inside and beyond fields of journalism. In pursuing this argument, Couldry argued that a new kind of capital was needed to understand the effects of agents in the media on other fields, what he called “media meta-capital”. This argument provided an explanation for specific cross-field effects associated with particular agents’ practices in the media. Couldry’s insights align with our own arguments about policy fields, and the language necessary to understand policy effects in fields beyond the policy field. The conceptualization that we work with as the basis for research is that cross-field effects are connected to practices in one field, that are linked in chains to practices in fields beyond their original site of production (Rawolle 2010a, 2010b). Hence, education policy practices may impact on the reporting of results, formation of governing boards or councils or articles written in newspapers. In keeping with Bourdieu’s (1991) broad approach, these may be connected in the form of games, with a variety of strategies and tactics adopted by those inside and outside the field of journalism. Policy texts, and articles that cover these policies, provide an example of cross-field effects.

The basis of the account presented here, and the research problems that led to a Bourdieuan approach, was an empirical Australian case relating to education policy and the knowledge economy, in the form of a review of Australia’s science,

---

3 The concept “temporary social fields” is advanced here to cater specifically for fields that emerge around policy and whose parameters span political and policy fields and field/s of journalism and whose emergence is short term. Temporary social fields could be considered as a combination of different cross-field effects resulting in a relative autonomous space for debate around that policy. We also note here Champagne’s (1990) talk of a hybrid “journalistic-politics field”; by analogy we might talk of a “journalistic-education policy field”.

Shaun Rawolle and Bob Lingard

engineering, and technology capability, which involved close consideration of education and research (Batterham 2000). This review resulted in Australia’s acceptance of a knowledge economy policy as a way to orient funding and government involvement in research and education (Rawolle 2005). How this case relates to mediatization then lies in the wide ranging media-coverage of the review, and the role played by the Chief Scientist, Professor Robyn Batterham, who led the review, but also engaged journalists in the debate in what appeared to be a much more sustained manner than previous reviews of this kind. In short, this particular policy became something of a media event (Dayan and Katz 1992; Cottle 2006), which sustained coverage over its duration. The research interest in this media event lay in the patterns of interactions between journalists, policy makers, politicians, and experts, to understand the degree to which this interaction was dominated by agents in one field, such as journalists and editors, or another, such as policy makers or politicians. This raised an allied question of how sustained media events of this kind might be understood as an ongoing process of interaction and struggle for social power between education policy and the media, that is, as an example of mediatization of education policy. Notably, in this case the media was a site of social struggle for stakes and for people outside the field. We also note that the effects of the practices of journalists and policy makers may not be unidirectional, that is, cross-field effects can go in either direction. We also note that today education systems employ journalists as media advisors, but also in their media sections, both of which are manifestations of the mediatization of education and education policy.

Approaching this research problem using Bourdieu required a broad engagement with his theoretical framework, and in particular his account of social fields as a way of nominating and researching spheres of competition within which practice takes place, with each social field underpinned by a distinctive logic of practice (for more discussion see Rawolle and Lingard 2013). For Bourdieu, society (both national and postnational) is a social space, consisting of multiple social fields with their own logics and varying degrees of autonomy from the field of power, which overarches all fields. This is in recognition of the differentiation of contemporary societies and the way power is present in all aspects of societal practices. Each field is a contested space with a competition over goods or capitals, specific to that field and the competition takes the forms of distinctive practices. Within the field, which is a relational space, there are dominant and dominated agents. Given that Bourdieu’s account of fields is spatial and relational rather than geographical, we are able today to speak of global fields and fields operating at other scales.

Bourdieu’s broad approach to research requires that processes be represented in terms of changes involving one or more social fields. In this research, two major fields were considered important, in the form of the field of print journalism and the field of education policy. While Bourdieu emphasized underlying connections...
between fields, and fields that overlaid all others (including the field of power and field of gender relations) the research required a more direct way of identifying, naming, and grouping the connections between social fields. Hence, the focus of the research was on understanding practices in both fields and some of the products of these practices, in the form of policy texts and media texts. The analysis was on the patterns of production of these texts, and on tracing the flow of themes contained within these texts between policy texts and media texts. These flows of interaction were identified as one kind of cross-field effect, and led to some interesting findings about different kinds of cross-field effects (see Lingard and Rawolle 2004; Rawolle 2005, 2010a, 2010b; Rawolle and Lingard 2010).

Based on the study of Batterham’s review, we suggest that there may be a range of effects that relate to mediatization (mediatization effects), and that these relate to patterns of change within the field of print journalism, patterns of changes within the field of education policy, and effects related to the pattern of interactions between these two fields. The first two groups are within-field effects, while the third group are cross-field effects. Though interrelated, the differences are important as they highlight the point of comparison when researching mediatization effects. In keeping with Bourdieu’s theorization, these effects can be considered in relation to practice and habitus, or capital and field position.

In the field of print journalism, the patterns of publishing of articles related to Batterham’s review were analysed as a way of exploring different aspects of the investment of the field in this review. Within the field of print journalism, 249 separate articles and 147,000 words were written between May 1999 and January 2001 that directly covered the review, representing a wide variety of Australian newspapers. These articles were analysed in four ways: as a time-series in relation to the numbers of newspaper articles published within monthly time periods over the course of the review; in relation to the coverage of particular authors over the review; in relation to the overall contribution of different newspapers during the review; and in relation to overall publishing companies who own multiple newspapers. We also suggest that the impact of policy makers’ practices on the field of journalism in some ways is determined by the amount of “media capital” possessed by the policy maker (Champagne 1990). The within-field effects of mediatization of policy over the course of Batterham’s review relate principally to the strategies of specific newspapers, and key journalists, who invested in this review, and were dominant agents in the flow of the review. In particular, this review became a signature policy covered by one newspaper and a number of specialist journalists, but another journalist from a different newspaper contributed a large number of articles at the time of the beginning of the review, then did not contribute any further. Despite this large investment, the vast majority of individual articles did little more than restate media releases that were produced by the policy maker, with little extended coverage or investigation of the claims. In Bourdieu’s terms, these articles contributed to the “circular circulation” of ideas about Batter-
ham’s Review. This pattern of coverage of media releases illustrated the success of the tactic of “media release as policy release” (see below for details).

In the field of policy, four iterations of the policy texts published over the course of the review were analysed as a way of exploring changes in the representation and approach to the Policy Review. As discussed in more detail elsewhere (Lingard and Rawolle 2004), one of the changes in the representation of the text was the increasingly aphoristic representation of problems dealt with by the review (mediatization of the text), and glossification of the text, with media grabs of key quotes selected and emphasized in the margins of the policy text. In addition, the latter policy texts provided direct links to other allied policy developments.

In the broadest sense, the cross-field effects were first initiated through the production of a media release announcing Batterham as the new Chief Scientist, and foreshadowing a possible review of Australia’s science capability as one of his main goals. The vast majority of cross-field effects related to media coverage of these media releases, or of the four iterations of policy texts produced. In a variety of ways, media releases acted as a policy and political mechanism within the review, allowing the hijacking of other events that could have diverted attention from Batterham’s Review or key messages, and allowing quick publishing of copy in times when there were few other sources for stories for specialized journalists covering the Review. Though these media releases could be broadly considered a trigger for journalist practices, the uptake of these triggers did highlight patterns, related to the newsworthiness for specific kinds of journalists or their newspapers. We have defined elsewhere these effects that relate to homologies in structure – as “structural effects”, in which the specialization of journalists helps to understand the specific interest that they had in Batterham’s Review, such as different higher education and science reporters’ interest in the Review. Thus we define structural effects as a kind of cross-field effect as the patterns of publishing practices that result from links between specialist journalists and policy makers. Other cross-field effects relate to specific events that may have been hijacked by a media release, diverting journalists’ attention and articles to the connection between the event and Batterham’s Review (event effects). Event effects as a kind of cross-field effect refer to patterns of publishing practices that follow specific newsworthy events, with hijacking as one important sub-category of event effects. One final cross-field effect was the different patterns of coverage in different newspapers, highlighting that despite the strong coverage, it was quite limited in terms of the number of people who could possibly have read the coverage (knowledge effects). Knowledge effects refer to patterns of publishing practices that result from the different engagements of different newspapers with policy reviews and their different readership demographics.

We have argued in this section that using Bourdieu’s theories of fields and practice provides a useful basis for researching the mediatization of education policy, though the effects of mediatization require additional language to talk
about effects that cross fields. The adoption of a Bourdieuan framework entails thinking about the effects of mediatization on practices, habitus, capitals, and fields. In the analysis of the mediatization of education policy related to the knowledge economy, the focus led to an examination of both within field effects on practices in the field of print journalism and education policy, as well as cross-field effects that are related to the interactions between practices in each of these fields. The limits of this approach relate to the bounding of the case, which was necessary to the research, but potentially limited connected practices in other nations, and those related to the OECD.

4 Mediatization, rescaling, the topological turn, and global fields

This section briefly considers the rescaling (Brenner 2004) and respatialization (Allen 2011; Lury, Parisi and Terranova 2012; Ruppert 2012) of politics, economy, and culture that constitute, accompany, and are effects of globalization. We see both the fields of journalism and of education policy having been affected by globalization. For example, globalization in the era following the end of the Cold War has witnessed the emergence of a global economic field. As Bourdieu (2003) has argued, just as the creation of national economic fields resulted from a particular politics and strategies, so too did this more recent emergence of the global economic field in the post-Cold War era of neo-liberal, global capitalism. Here Peck and Tickell (2002) speak of “roll-back” and “roll-out” neo-liberal globalization that picks up on the agency involved in the creation of the global economy framed by neo-liberal precepts. This is not to say that the nation-state is no longer important, but rather to recognize that the globalization of the economy has seen a reconstitution of the political workings of the national political field, which now has to work strategically in relation to the global economy, underpinned by neo-liberal discourses. Here we might see the processes of globalization reconstituting the work of the nation and the nation in turn helping to constitute the global field. This account of globalization and its spatial effects has relevance to studies of mediatization. As Krotz (2009: 27) argues, “we, of course, must understand mediatization as a process that takes place under the condition that there are further meta-processes such as globalization, individualization and commercialization”.

In respect of media, Rantanen (2005) speaks of “global mediagraphies” to pick up on the concept of a global media field. A very interesting question here is: how do the global and national economic fields, global and national journalism fields and

---

4 Here Krotz’s account of mediatization is one that affects all of the social arrangement. This is somewhat akin to Couldry’s position as argued in his chapter in this Handbook.
also the global and national educational policy fields relate? It is here that we have extended the concept of cross-field effects (Lingard and Rawolle 2004; Rawolle and Lingard 2008), which is useful to think about flows from global to national fields. Such effects today work across global and national fields, including in policy and the media.

Brenner (2004) writes about these matters as the rescaling of politics with political authority being stretched and transformed across global, regional, and national fields, with enhanced political significance of international, regional, and supranational agencies. This might be seen as a new geography of state power and as a multi-site, hierarchical respatialization associated with globalization. In education policy, think of the enhanced global significance of the OECD (Sellar and Lingard 2013) or think of the EU as an emergent educational policy space (Lawn and Grek 2012). This is part of the rescaling of education policy.

There is another way, however, to think of the respatialization associated with the processes of globalization. Lury and colleagues (2012) have written about the “topological turn” or the “becoming topological” of contemporary cultural, political, and economic life. This topological turn is part of new spatializations associated with globalization and refers to a new post-Euclidian geometry of spatial relations, a single surface created across the globe, helping to constitute a new culture through metrics, models, measures, and comparisons. New data infrastructures and new technologies (new media if you like) are central here. Lury, Parisi and Terranova (2012: 4) speak of “a new order of spatio-temporal continuity for forms of economic, political and cultural life”. This is different from Brenner’s rescaling, which is a vertical set of processes that involves relationships between various sites (national, regional, and international organizations) and is also different from new network accounts that Brenner has also written about (Sassen 2007 too) to pick up on networks that stretch out across global space horizontally. New technologies and computer capacities are central to all these new spatial relationships. The topological, in contrast to Brenner’s new vertical scales of relationships, refers to new spaces as relational rather than territorial, topological rather than topographical, changing our conceptions of what is near and far, what is connected and disconnected. As Allen (2011: 284) suggests, with the topological “power relationships are not so much positioned in space or extended across it, as compose the spaces of which they are a part”. We would argue that international comparative performance testing such as PISA is topological in this way, creating new relational constructions of space as part of an emergent global educational policy field that is topological in character (Lingard and Rawolle 2011). This is also why we see Bourdieu’s concept of field as topological in character and constituted through relationships and thus useful for understanding this emergent global educational policy field (as well as for understanding the emergent global media field). Newspaper coverage of international performance data is a central element in the creation of this global educational policy field, as is the OECD’s own media
strategy for disseminating the first take on PISA data in each cycle. OECD media releases on PISA help create global league tables of PISA performance in relation to both quality and equity (Wiseman 2013).

Here we are using Bourdieu’s concept of field, which is also a relational rather than geographical or topographical space and can thus be seen to be topological in character. National testing in Australia, where schooling in the federal political structure remains the constitutional responsibility of the states and territories, also helps to constitute a topological or relational space and a national field of schooling (see Lingard 2010, 2011). This is achieved by constituting statistical neighbours of like schools across the nation, linking them topologically, and suggesting they are located in the same contexts. Likewise, with PISA and other international tests, we can see an emergent global educational policy field that is topological in character. The media’s policy role in respect of both national testing and international testing also contribute to the construction of national and global policy fields in education. We might also see rescaled relationships between the offices of multinational media corporations such as Murdoch’s and also their contribution to the emergence as well of a global field of journalism.

In respect of media and processes of mediatization, we thus would argue that rescaling and the topological turn need recognition of what we might analogously, or homologously in Bourdieu’s terms, see as an emergent global field of journalism. Multinational and cross-national control of media (e.g. the Murdoch Press ownership of a cross-section of media in the US, Australia, and Europe) fosters such a global journalistic field. Here we see the global circulation of stories and story stances across the field, what we might see as a globalized version of Bourdieu’s descriptor of one logic of practice of the journalistic field, namely “circular circulation” (Bourdieu 1996/1998), where stories and story lines circulate across the global media field. This is in addition to the circular circulation of stories across various arms of the media and within each of the print media, TV, and so on within nation journalistic fields and across the global one.

In terms of our empirical case of the mediatization of a policy and policy processes, our analysis needs to recognize the emergent global education policy field in respect of knowledge economy and human capital discourses, as well as the ways mediatization also has another level, notably the global. The global field of journalism helps to construct the emergent global education policy field through the coverage given to global comparative measures of performance of national schooling systems and in so doing connects different nationals in relational ways. From PISA 2009, for instance, Shanghai became an important comparator for many national schooling systems.

Bourdieu’s concept of field then needs to be stretched out, as it were, to take in the global and reject the notion that society or the social is simply or necessarily homologous with nation. Such a conceptual stretching is expedited by the recognition that Bourdieu’s concept of social fields refers to relations within deterritorial-
ized space with particular logics of practice – this is a topological account; such relations do not necessarily function within national or specific geographical places. Our last point in relation to the need to recognize rescaling is that such processes have been expedited by the new communication technologies, which in a hyperbolic sense can be seen to annihilate time and space.

5 Conclusion: implications of mediatization for research in education and about education policy

Given the previous discussion, mediatization then can be seen to present a range of implications for research involving education and education policy. As both globalization and mediatization are connected in a variety of ways with changes in education and education policy, there are important effects to consider in relation to national, global, and topological variations in the effect of mediatization. This implication reinforces Hallin and Mancini’s (2004) broad ranging study about differences in the links between journalism and politics in different nations. But it also raises questions about how to research questions about the purposes and roles played by the media, and whether the broad social contract played by the media is altered as a result of globalization, such as its claimed role as a fourth estate and allied press freedom to pursue this role (Schultz 1998). If, as a growing number of researchers have argued, there is a changing relationship between the media and government (Fairclough 2000; Kepplinger 2002), then scrutiny should be placed on the way that these changes impact on the role played by the media, for example, in relation to education. The media are assumed to play an important role in contributing to the public scrutiny of institutions such as education, and of subjecting public policies related to these fields to public debate and consideration. We have earlier, for example, given the example of media publication of league tables of school and national comparative performance and media pressure for the public availability of such data. The challenge to traditional forms of journalism raised by the growth of new media and on-line journalism also raises questions about whether these functions and roles can be realised.

For example in countries that that share what Hallin and Mancini (2004) outline as a normative “liberal model” of the role and function of the media, how is the “social contract” between the media and education negotiated, contested, and enacted? While there are individual studies of mediatization that relate to and connect with this role, very little research on the mediatization of education policy actively provides this kind of comparative work between nations. In Australia, providing an account of this comparison is important because the concentration of media ownership is unique. Indeed, Cunningham and Turner (2006) reported an estimate of 88% of the total print media in Australia was controlled by two
companies (Fairfax Media and Murdoch’s News Limited). They suggested that this is possibly the highest level of concentration of any comparable democratic nations – in other, comparable nations, laws preventing such concentration are in effect (Dwyer and Martin 2010; Pusey and McCutcheon 2010). Whether such concentration of media ownership is a problem for democratic politics and public debate depends on the effects of concentration, in symbolic, material, or practice forms. Yet the effects of this concentration on education have not been addressed in previous research.

Comparative research on mediatization of education is also important because the media and journalism are connected to broader changes in education globally, such as the increasingly global circulation of ideas about education in different media forms (Steiner-Khamsi 2004; Rizvi and Lingard 2010; Lingard and Rawolle 2011; Wiseman 2013), and of the media’s global influence on the selection and framing of education policy debates (Gopinathan 1996). These changes connect together the media’s role in the globalization of education policies and of the circulation of ideas about the role that education plays or should play in national concerns about education, such as promoting equitable and fair societies, improving international competitiveness, and increasing productivity. (See Wiseman [2013] for a review of different national responses to PISA results and the common “shock” response constituted by the media when nations have done badly.) As suggested earlier, this circulation of ideas about education can be linked to the emergence of a global field of journalism, in which competition between journalists, editors, and media companies increasingly revolves around global stakes and pickup of stories across different nations (Markham 2009; Rawolle and Lingard 2010). This global field in turn, is associated with multinational media companies.

In relation to the broader claims that mediatization of education and education policy represents a slow adaptation of education to the central logics of journalism, more needs to be done to systematically explore this claim over a long duration in different nations. Studies of changes in policy development and media coverage of different kinds over long durations are important to provide a base point of comparisons of individual media events involving policy. More also needs to be done to test other aspects of the effects of the mediatization of education policy, such as identifying whether dominance in fields like education policy is attached to specific practices involving the media, and as a result, if there is something like a mediatized habitus that accompanies these positions.

In conclusion, this chapter has provided an overview of the usefulness of mediatization for research in education and education policy, with a specific focus on its application to education policy. Mediatization of education policy is a broad process, but we have argued that it should also be examined in specific empirical cases. As one of the broad social processes affecting education as a field, there is scope to theorize its relationships to other processes. Here we have discussed its links to globalization, but more research and discussion are needed concerning
the links to other processes such as individualization, economization, and commercialization within education.
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