The mediatization of the knowledge based economy: An Australian field based account

SHAUN RAWOLLE and BOB LINGARD

E-Mail: shaun.rawolle@deakin.edu.au; r.lingard@uq.edu.au

Abstract

This paper presents an empirical account of mediatization from a Bourdieu-ian perspective, based on the development of a number of new concepts, such as cross-field effects and the rescaling of such effects as linked to processes of globalization. Built on an Australian empirical case relating to educational policy and the knowledge based economy, this paper argues that mediatization can be understood in relation to the cross-field effects of different fields of journalism on subsequent fields, which have their genesis in forms of practice that cross different social fields. Specifically, the case analysis details interactions between the field of print journalism and the field of policy over the course of an Australian science capability review, chaired by the then chief scientist, Dr Robin Batterham, which led to Australia adopting a national version of the knowledge economy. The empirical case also leads us to consider the impact of both global and national fields of journalism on fields of educational policy in relation to mediatization.

Keywords: field theory, mediatization of policy, globalization, cross-field effects, scalar effects

Introduction

From ongoing debates in communication studies, it is clear that mediatization, like globalization and other broad processes of social change, poses something of a challenge for scholars working with Bourdieu's ideas (see Couldry, 2007). These challenges relate not only to the specific arguments that Bourdieu made about the functioning of fields such as television and journalism (Bourdieu, 1995/2005, 1996/1998), but also to the limits of the language and concepts that he developed in support of his sociology of social fields (Lingard and Rawolle, 2004; Rawolle and Lingard, 2008).

Bourdieu's later work is characterized by the development of a coherent theory of internally meaningful social worlds, which he referred to as 'social fields'. In the majority of these studies, his research and concurrent conceptual development focused on single, individual fields and their logics of practice. This tended to downplay the development of concepts suited to describe and understand the effects of particular social fields on other fields. This is problematic for sociological studies concerned with the changes and effects of one field on another. For example, how can we name and identify the effects of the fields of journalism or fields of information and communication technology production on other fields?

This paper presents an empirical account of mediatization from a Bourdieuian perspective, based on the development of a number of new concepts, such as cross-field effects and scalar effects (Rawolle and Lingard, 2008). Built on an empirical Australian case relating to education policy and the knowledge based economy, the paper argues that mediatization can be understood in relation to the cross-field effects of different fields of journalism on other fields, but that such effects also occur on different scales, between global and national fields of policy and journalism. The genesis of different scales of cross-field effects, we argue, lies in forms of practice that cross different social fields. Our argument, based on this case, is that one starting point for studies of mediatization should be in terms of practices and the effects of practices (Rawolle, 2010; Couldry, 2004).

The empirical case that forms the basis of this paper details interactions between the field of print journalism and the field of policy over the course of an Australian science capability review, which led to Australia adopting a national version of the knowledge economy. Critical studies of the knowledge based economy have tended to focus on the claims inherent in policy documents based on the work of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 1996) (Peters and Besley, 2006; Kenway *et al.*, 2006). Scant attention has been directed towards understanding the way that national versions of the knowledge economy have emerged in response to specific political and policy pressures on governments. Even less attention has been focused on the way that the knowledge economy enters public discourse, and is subject to public debate and scrutiny in national journalistic fields. The empirical case highlights the time-based strategies and tactics that accompanied the emergence of the knowledge based economy in Australian policy, and the way that this debate impacted on the version of the knowledge based economy adopted in Australia.

Treating media interactions with policy makers over the course of a policy review as a case of mediatization raises some interesting research

questions such as what kinds of effects should be attributed to mediatization and how these effects might be accounted for and identified. As a starting point for our discussion, we utilize mediatization to refer to sets of practices by agents in specific fields, who contribute to media debate in order to maintain or improve standing within their own fields. The strategy is not merely to attain celebrity, but to provoke specific kinds of effects in other fields beyond the media field. In the empirical case detailed in this paper, the Chief Scientist and chair of the review, Dr. Robin Batterham, contributed to media debate as a way to pressure the Federal Government to intervene in the funding and linking between science, university research and schools.

Given this initial position, for the purposes of the research, an approach inspired by Bourdieu's work on social fields and practice was adopted. The paper places a distinct focus on mediatization, that is, how individuals or groups within specific fields produce practices involving the media as a strategic way of shaping or changing practices in fields beyond the media, such as politics and education policy. The analysis of this case is thus represented as an account of mediatization, defined as sets of practice involving an intermediary. The major premise of this account is that practices of mediatization act over time to change power relations between people situated in different fields. In this specific case, the intermediary considered is the field of print journalism, and the effects of mediatization are conceptualized as affecting power relations between people in the different fields of education and education policy. This account draws broadly on the conceptualization of mediatization developed within history (Godsey, 2001), critical sociology (Habermas, 1996), communication studies (Mazzoleni and Schulz, 1999), critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2000) and studies of post-modernism (Thrift, 2005). Rather than viewing mediatization as a process in which a singular logic of practice has subsumed the practices of all other field, this account points to the moves, strategies and tactics involved in practice games that develop when new concepts are introduced into policy, and the effects on national versions of policy concepts. The empirical case also leads us to consider the impact of both global fields of journalism and national fields of journalism on fields of educational policy. In order to understand the case, the paper discusses scales of cross-field effects, and more specifically global and national scales of effects associated with mediatization.

The remainder of this paper is structured in four sections. First, we consider different research approaches to the mediatization of policy and the application of Bourdieu's theories and concepts to empirical studies of mediatization. This account presents some resolutions to methodological problems that were required in order to develop an account of

the mediatization of the knowledge economy practice and discourse in Australian policy. These problems revolve around how to understand the role of globalization in the mediatization of the knowledge economy. Consequently, we briefly outline a Bourdieuian conceptualization of mediatization and globalization. Second, we present some data associated with the mediatization of Batterham's Review, in order to illustrate interactions between policy makers and journalists at different phases over the duration of the review. The third section discusses and reconsiders the methodological and theoretical problems confronting Bourdieuian approaches to mediatization in light of the empirical account. The paper concludes with some suggestions for future studies of mediatization based on the methodology developed.

Researching mediatization: a Bourdieuian approach

There are a variety of different uses of mediatization adopted by researchers. We introduce six accounts which have relevance to the empirical case explored here, before turning to a Bourdieuian inspired account. The concept 'mediatization' has been used to refer to processes in which:

- values of institutions beyond the media are eroded (which provides a contrast to the value-neutrality of the mass media offered by the term "mediation" [Couldry, 2008]);
- institutions (such as politics) are gradually forced to adapt to the needs of different mediating institutions (Habermas, 1996) through a variety of different mechanisms and feedback loops (Kepplinger, 2002);
- institutions are subject to an erosion of autonomy, which leads to increased dependence on the mass media for the core functions of the institution (Mazzoleni and Schulz, 1999);
- the increasing presence of visual media leads to new ways for social agents to engage with the world, but there is also an increasing focus on performance and performativity in everyday life (Thrift, 2005);
- four processes of social change (extension, substitution, amalgamation and accommodation) impact on functions of media communications (Schulz, 2004), which changes the character and processes of politics; and
- a new relationship or social contract is rewritten between government, politics and the media, resulting in a change in language use adopted by members of governments when engaging with various forms of the media with an aim of increasing the media impact of statements and public events involving politicians (Fairclough, 2000).

Given the variety of meanings, mediatization can be thought of as a *problematic concept* (Hacking, 1999), in that the concept has taken form and become useful to research in communication studies and other fields over a relatively short period of time. One of the key dilemmas around developing a distinguishable identity for mediatization lies in finding some agreement about what kinds of effects should be taken as relevant examples of the process (Hepp, 2009). Questions around what effects should be attributed to mediatization are important in that the concept has been adopted across a number of disciplines without a great deal of interaction between these fields. There is therefore some need for clarification as to how mediatization will be used in the argument that follows. As illustrated by the examples presented above, there are both positive and negative associations attached to mediatization, based largely on whether the process is taken to be either productive or limiting to agents' abilities to interact and engage with the world around them.

One of the concerns that accounts of mediatization raise is whether the concept has use value beyond critical accounts of the role of different forms of media. From an empirical perspective this is problematic, in that it implies a diagnosis of the function of different forms of the media either prior to data collection, or an implicitly evaluative concept used in critical analyses of data. In contrast, however, we argue that the concept of mediatization can be used in studies in which the practices of different agents in the media are intricately linked in struggles for social power in other social fields, such as politics and in our case, educational policy production. Such an account leaves room for evaluations of the effects of these struggles, either to the ultimate benefit of agents in the media, or to agents attempting to steer the media.

The emphasis here is on the application of Bourdieuian concepts to the study of mediatization. We argue that his overall sociological approach provides a consistency for researching the effects of mediatization, both within different journalistic fields and in other social fields. Our focus is to deal with concepts as they were utilized within the research described in this paper, and a number of methodological resolutions that were required in order to study the mediatization of the knowledge economy.

Problems around applying Bourdieu's concepts to what we describe as cross-field effects of journalism have been confronted in different ways within communication studies. Couldry (2003), for example, has written about the limits of field theory, and has argued that the capital that an agent has acquired in journalistic fields may provide a way to understand specific kinds of cross-field effects related to the practices of some agents. For Couldry the media allows some agents to gain what he describes as 'media meta-capital' that acts as a kind of symbolic capital.

The acquisition of this media meta-capital, Couldry argues, allows agents to produce effects in other social fields. We take Couldry's argument to imply that additional concepts are required in order to understand the specific effects of fields of journalism on agents in other fields.

In contrast with this approach, Hallin and Mancini (2004) argue that the fields of media and politics should be studied comparatively to reveal different historical models of their interrelationships, and the subsequent effects of these relationships on journalism and politics in different national traditions (Benson and Hallin, 2007). What we take from Hallin and Mancini's (2004) work is that to understand the relationships between the media and politics without considering different national traditions is to ignore important social and historical relationships that have developed over time. This remains the case despite the emergence of a global field of journalism, though the emergence of a global field of journalism does introduce effects related to different scales of fields of journalism.

The work of Couldry (2004) and Hallin and Mancini (2004) provides promising developments and applications for Bourdieuian inspired studies of the fields of journalism and to understanding mediatization as a process. Yet, these developments appear to sidestep a pressing question for empirical studies of mediatization, which is whether there is a way to talk about the effects of practices associated with different media forms on the practices of agents in other fields, whether these are national or global fields. We argue that there is still work to be done in order to apply Bourdieu's theory to empirical studies of mediatization, in particular in providing language and concepts suitable to the study of the processes and also in order to understand the mechanisms associated with them. For studies involving the media, and in particular those involving studies of interactions between the media and policy, an expansion of Bourdieu's general approach to fields is warranted in order to understand what we have described as 'cross-field effects', which identify different kinds of effects between fields (Lingard and Rawolle, 2004), and different scales of cross-field effects, which identify the effects between emergent global fields and national fields.

Bourdieu's conceptual triad: Practice, habitus and social fields

In order to understand the empirical case of mediatization that follows, we need to clarify briefly Bourdieu's conceptual triad that we have introduced in the preceding discussion, focusing on the concepts of practice, habitus and social fields. These three concepts were crucial aspects of Bourdieu's approach to sociology, from which other concepts were added to account for the variety of human activity and social inequality. Bour-

dieu's account of practice prioritizes the variety and complexity of social activity, such as writing an article for publication in a newspaper, chairing a policy review or implementing a policy. Additionally, practice refers to the social naming of an activity (nominalism). For Bourdieu, practice follows a game-like structure, and leads agents to adopt different moves, strategies and tactics within the flow of the game. In one respect, practice formed the main concern of Bourdieu's work, and he viewed all forms of communication as embedded within different practice forms. In order to understand how practice is possible, Bourdieu developed two additional major concepts: habitus and social field. Habitus was developed to provide an understanding of the relationships between agents and practice by talking about embodied dispositions that agents and groups of agents develop through their social history, which can be evoked in different circumstances. In connection with this account, social field, described the environment within which agents' habitus is expressed in practice. In Bourdieu's account, the social environment consists of a multiplicity of social fields in which agents produce practices, compete with one another and develop social capacities. For Bourdieu (1986), each social field provides a way of accumulating and distributing field specific forms of capital (which are composed of different weightings of social capital, cultural capital, symbolic capital) and mechanisms for the conversion of capital between fields.

Despite the broad applicability of Bourdieu's conceptual triad, the internal consistency between fields, practice and habitus leaves unresolved a number of problems about how to conceptualize the effects of one field on other fields. The study of mediatization requires an understanding of these kinds of effects. In order to name and identify these kinds of effects, we have elsewhere developed arguments about the need for a conceptualization of cross-field effects (Lingard and Rawolle, 2004; Rawolle and Lingard, 2008). One way to understand these effects is to discuss practices that have effects in fields beyond their initial production, which then lead to chains of practice links and games between fields (Rawolle, 2010). The production of policy texts, which provide the basis for articles produced in national newspapers, provides one kind of example of cross-field effects. Such effects can result from ongoing events (*event effects*), from structural relationships between specialist journalists and policy areas (*structural effects*), or from the naming, representing and acting upon agents in policy texts and newspaper articles (*looping effects*) (Rawolle and Lingard, 2008).

Rescaling and global fields

This section briefly considers the rescaling of politics, economy and culture that accompany and are effects of globalization. Globalization has

witnessed the emergence of a global economic field. As Bourdieu (2003) has argued, just as the creation of national economic field resulted from a particular politics and strategies, so too did the more recent emergence of the global economic field. 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. This account of globalization 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'. The interesting question is: how do the global and national economic fields and also the global and national policy fields relate? It is here that we have developed the concept of cross-field effects (Lingard and Rawolle, 2004; Rawolle and Lingard, 2008). 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 authority being stretched and transformed across global, regional and national fields, with enhanced political significance of international, regional and supranational agencies. In respect of media and processes of mediatization, we would argue that such rescaling needs recognition of what we might analogously 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 scalar level, notably the global.

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 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 deterritorialized space with particular logics of practice;

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 annihilate time and space.

Empirical case: Batterham's Review

During Batterham's Review, journalists and other contributors to print media coverage produced 147,000 words and 249 separate articles that were published in select Australian newspapers. In order to understand the mediatization of Batterham's Review, a way of piecing together the practice game that developed in the field of print journalism was necessary. To achieve this aim, Bourdieu's theory of fields was used as a way of dividing, grouping and understanding the practices of agents who participated in media discussions about the publication of policy texts associated with Batterham's Review. The methodological resolutions to data collection issues provided the basis for the account of moves, tactics and strategies that follows.

For analysis it was useful to think of practices as chains of production and consumption: practices may be viewed as both socially productive and socially consumptive. As the focal point was the interlinking between fields, there were some methodological issues that needed to be addressed in order to build an understanding of these links. The major issue that needed to be addressed related to the relevant practices that could be used to illustrate the links between the field of print journalism and the policy field.

Within the field of print journalism, practices revolve around the publication of articles. During Batterham's Review, journalists and contributors competed for space with one another, based on the value that was placed on the different kinds of reporting produced (investigative, opinion, political etc.) in different publications (Bourdieu, 1996/1998, 2001, 2005). The publication of articles by agents implied an awareness of the readership of the newspaper, and the editorial filters that limited the publication of content and themes. Bourdieuian influenced studies situate other practices that journalists produce relative to this key practice in the field of print journalism. In dealing with the practices of those involved with Batterham's Review, the decision taken was to focus on the way that different themes related to the Review were introduced into public debate. This included ways that these themes were discussed by journalists located in different segments of the field of print journalism. The term theme refers to the identification of subject matter or topics related to Batterham's Review in articles or policy texts.

The practices to be studied were the introduction of a theme or multiple themes in articles published in Australian newspapers. For analysis, themes associated with policy texts and media releases were designated *policy themes*, while themes associated with articles published in newspapers were categorized as *emerging themes*. The reasoning behind this choice was the hypothesis that, if the field of print journalism influenced the policy field, the fate of policy themes in public discussion would impact on the development of policy texts, about which both journalists and policy makers held an interest. Conversely, if the policy field influenced the field of print journalism, articles written by journalists would respond to policy themes. In other words, the flow of policy themes and emerging themes in sequences of articles would provide the basis for discussing the mediatization of policy.

The majority of public debate about Batterham's Review was carried in Australian newspapers, situated within the field of print journalism. The field of print journalism indicates the collection of newspaper publishing groups, newspapers, journalists and other authors that contributed to public debate over Batterham's Review. In order to develop a set of data that could be used to map the development of themes within this field, the time period over which articles were collected, using a systematic newspaper database search, was from the announcement of Batterham as Australia's Chief Scientist in May 1999 through to the announcement of the Federal Government's policy, *Backing Australia's Ability* at the end of January 2001. Articles were identified in daily and weekly newspapers in Australia that made reference to Batterham's Review. Some of the newspapers that covered the Review were national (including *The Australian* and *The Australian Financial Review*), some were city or state specific (including *The Age*, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Canberra Times*, the *Courier Mail* and *The Western Australian*), while some articles were used by multiple newspapers, and originated in print wire articles. Excel was used to compile gross monthly, yearly and overall totals of contributing publishers and authors in terms of words written and number of articles. Each of these articles was then entered as monthly text files into the program NVivo, which was used to code segments of text in articles into policy themes and emerging themes.

The sources for 'policy themes' and 'emerging themes' were identified according to their production within either the field of print media or field of policy. Policy texts associated with Batterham's Review carried policy themes, while emerging themes were identified in newspaper articles and wire publication articles. In order to make sense of the mediatization of policy over the course of the Review, the progression of policy themes and emerging themes was used to develop a narrative involving the different practices offered by agents in the field of print journalism

and the field of policy over the course of the Review, from which different moves, strategies and tactics were identified. For the purposes of analysis, newspapers articles that were chosen were over 500 words in length, unless they introduced an emerging theme.

In order to illustrate different aspects of the mediatization of Batterham's Review, we now turn to an account of different moves, tactics and strategies that were adopted in the introduction of policy themes and emerging themes in reporting over the duration of the Review. These examples are chosen to illustrate the cross-field effects and scalar effects associated with the mediatization of policy.

Mediatization moves and countermoves: Establishing the identity of the review

One of the most important aspects of the mediatization of Batterham's Review was the succession of moves and countermoves made by journalists, policy makers and politicians. The narrative that follows provides an illustration of such moves followed by a brief discussion about flows of practice described in the narrative. In order to understand the following narrative, Table 1 below summarizes the political position of key agents discussed over the course of Batterham's Review. The parentheses after the political responsibilities indicate the period each agent was in that specific role.

Table 1. *Names and political responsibilities.*

Name	Position(s)
John Howard	Member of the House of Representatives Prime Minister of Australia Leader of the Liberal-National Coalition Party (1996−2007)
Nick Minchin	Member of the Senate Minister for the Department of Industry, Science and Resources (1998−2001)
Kim Beazley	Member of the House of Representatives Leader of the Australian Labor Party and Leader of the Opposition (1996−2001)
Dr. Robin Batterham	Chief Scientist (1999−2005)

The mediatization of Batterham's Review and the knowledge economy can be (somewhat arbitrarily) traced to the announcement in 1999 of a new Chief Scientist in two press releases carried in two wire publications, M2 Presswire and AAP (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999a, 1999b). The announcement of Dr Robin Batterham as Chief Scientist was deliv-

ered in the form of media releases, which introduced Batterham and identified seven key policy themes that would be influential in policy discussions that followed. This exercise of employing media releases to introduce policy themes could be described as 'policy release as media release' (Lingard and Rawolle, 2004: 363). These two press releases provided the beginnings of a number of intervals in Batterham's Review, each signaled by policy releases that came to be important in framing patterns of policy themes and emerging themes in subsequent articles.

The larger of the two articles, 'Australian Government: New Chief Scientist to advise Government' (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999a), was important as the first major Government response to scrutiny by print journalists on issues related to science and innovation. The Minister of Science, Industry and Resources, Senator Nick Minchin, represented the knowledge economy as a desirable goal for Australia, which included a selection of areas included in the OECD's 1996 policy document, *The Knowledge-based Economy.* This selection excluded education in its different forms, learning or other forms of knowledge besides those associated with science, industry or government, marking a difference between the conceptualization of the knowledge economy in Australia from that developed in *The Knowledge-based Economy* (OECD, 1996). Minchin's quote suggested that in Australian policy terms, the knowledge economy was merely a new term used to describe science policy, but with an emphasis on input from industry and Government.

Follow up to Batterham's announcement as the new Chief Scientist was immediate. On the same day that Minchin's office published two media releases, a press release by the CSIRO, Australia's peak science research organization, was published supporting Batterham's appointment ("CSIRO welcomes Chief Scientist", 1999). What the article introduced was an emerging theme of public support for the Government's choice of Batterham from a section of the research industry, whose plight had become one of the foundations for public criticism of the Howard Government (Wood and Meek, 2002). Such a public gift exchange provided a symbolic alignment of one sector of the research field with the Government's response to criticism, illustrating the possibility of a narrowing of rifts between the scientific research fields and government fields.

The day following these three media releases, three major newspapers produced articles that to various degrees merely repeated the policy themes and emerging theme in these earlier media releases (Reece, 1999; Thom, 1999; "Briefs", 1999). The newspapers that first covered the Batterham media releases were a part of the Fairfax group (*The Age*, *The Herald-Sun* and *The Australian Financial Review*) − all with an educated demographic. Articles written were shorter than the original media releases. The first week of reporting of Batterham's appointment to the

position of Chief Scientist clearly illustrated the 'circular circulation' of themes within the print media. Initial reporting suggested that specialist journalists (those who specialized in particular areas of policy, such as higher education, science or business) in Australia's major newspapers did not view the announcement of Batterham as Australia's Chief Scientist as being of particular or immediate note. The policy releases created cross-field effects in the form of the circulation of policy themes, and introduced the knowledge economy into Australian media coverage, highlighting a scalar cross-field effect from a global field of policy.

The Importance of numbers: The stakes are global

After the 17th August 2000, all articles in August related to two policy themes: the release of Batterham's interim paper, *The Chance to Change: discussion paper* (TCTC) (Batterham, 2000); and secondly, the political manoeuvering around funding for the knowledge economy, of which TCTC (Batterham, 2000) became a centerpiece. Minchin's office released TCTC (Batterham, 2000), accompanied by a media release from Minchin (Commonwealth of Australia, 2000). Minchin's (Commonwealth of Australia, 2000) media release acknowledged Batterham's document, discussed the processes that would follow up this document and offered an attack on the opposition Labor Party's *Knowledge Nation* policy. Journalists now viewed TCTC (Batterham, 2000) as a potential election policy, and coverage tended to harmonize on issues.

When journalists reported on TCTC (Batterham, 2000)*,* for the remainder of August their comments represented the policy themes covered in the report. Some articles also highlighted the resolution offered in the discussion paper of earlier policy themes and emerging themes about the role of various policy areas in the knowledge economy. How journalists represented the main policy themes of Batterham's report illustrated knowledge effects, in the selection of policy themes considered relevant to the newspaper's readers and the depth of coverage provided for these readers. One of the policy themes of Batterham's Report was represented to be the need to harness, develop and utilize Australia's scientific resources, in the form of human capital. The problems represented in TCTC (Batterham, 2000) were not only about science, but also about systematic gaps in the institutions that supported and contributed to scientific research. TCTC (Batterham, 2000) identified teachers and students in schools in the areas of science and mathematics as deserving support.

But the problem was not only about lost potential due to Australia's internal policy failure, but it was represented to be about poor comparisons with other nations who were investing more in the knowledge econ-

omy (Illing, 2000). Even though Minchin had foreshadowed the three main areas into which TCTC (Batterham, 2000) would be divided (ideas, culture and commercialization), journalists covered specific quotes about problems, rather than the overarching framework that held the policy together. No journalist covered the seemingly key framing offered by TCTC (Batterham, 2000). The focus of articles was the level of funding needed to address the issues raised, and journalists highlighted the range of policy areas that could benefit from TCTC (Batterham, 2000) (Fannin, 2000). Reporting on TCTC (Batterham, 2000) also focused on some of the implications of Batterham's call for investment in so many policy areas. The Labor Party took the report as a damnation of the inaction of the Federal Government on multiple policy areas, and reporters employed this representation in describing Batterham's Discussion Paper ("Beazley signals science push", 2000a). The content and arguments of TCTC (Batterham, 2000) were represented in different ways to secure support for the policy direction of both Labor and Coalition parties. Beazley's contribution to this debate was another attempt to highjack an event, in this case TCTC (Batterham, 2000), as a means to promote the Labor Party's position on R and D.

While media releases focused media attention on relevant policy themes throughout Batterham's Review, media attention often quickly moved to other areas. This was evident in the remainder of media reporting in August related to TCTC (Batterham, 2000). Emerging themes developed around the falling Australian dollar, and the release of OECD figures that showed Australia's spending on R and D had dropped further relative to other OECD nations (Taylor, 2000). This announcement prompted a response by Minchin's office, in the form of a media release announcing that the Federal Government would investigate reasons for the slump ("Govt to investigate R and D slump", 2000).

Conclusion

In this paper we have outlined an empirical approach to the study of mediatization based on a Bourdieuian based account of cross-field and scalar effects. We have taken the brief narratives that were focused on as instances of mediatization in practice. The effects of mediatization revolved around a struggle for the progression of themes in the fields of print journalism and policy over Batterham's Review. While mediatization may be considered in terms of a struggle for social power best studied in the long duration, the case illustrates the importance of documenting and understanding specific instances of mediatization. That is, to extend the conceptualization of mediatization offered by Kepplinger (2002) requires relevant effects that can be associated with the practice

from which broader patterns and effects may then be discerned. In the case discussed in this paper, this has also led us to consider the interlinking between mediatization and globalization, and to point to the growing importance of global fields of journalism and policy, which reinforces the argument Krotz (2009) makes about the overlaying of different meta-processes alongside mediatization.

Theoretically, we have worked across two major strands of argumentation in Bourdieu's work. We have drawn on a practice based language to describe and understand mediatization, and also field theory, as a way of locating agents involved in the production of specific practices and practice effects. We have extended Bourdieu in terms of cross-field effects in relation to both national and global fields of journalism and policy and in relation to effects working across them. OECD comparative knowledge economy data were important in the mediatization case we have documented.

Our empirical case has illustrated cross-field effects between the fields of journalism and policy over the duration of Batterham's Review of Australia's science and technology capability. These effects were associated with practice chains that developed between the production of policy themes by Batterham and other policy agents and emerging themes in the print media. Some of these practice effects were associated with the naming, bounding and limits of the Review itself, and the kinds of fields that were to be connected through the concept of the knowledge economy. Furthermore, and as we have illustrated here and elsewhere, media logics became evident in the themes subsequently taken up in the Review and also in the reworking of the draft policy documents with the final version and its final title *Backing Australia's Ability* carrying the aphoristic character of media headlines (Lingard and Rawolle, 2004). Interestingly, Batterham's habitus as entrepreneur/scientist became the desired outcome from school and university science education. This habitus also seemingly allowed Batterham to work quite effortlessly across the fields of print journalism and policy.

The significance of the OECD's (1996) *The Knowledge-based Economy* to the version of the knowledge economy articulated in Batterham's Review also illustrated the cross-field effects at another scalar level across global and national policy fields. This OECD report and related OECD data on levels of investment in R and D by both industry and government formed an important reference document for the Review. These scalar effects were illustrated by the introduction of policy themes and emerging themes that reference a global policy field, yet lead to effects in national policy fields. These scalar effects included such emergences as the introduction of the knowledge based economy in policy themes at the beginning of Batterham's Review, indexing the work of the OECD

within Australian policy fields, and the referencing of comparisons between Australia's performance against other OECD nations in emerging themes later in the Review. The practices of the OECD thus became a part of practice based moves and strategies by some agents during this national review.

Bionotes

Shaun Rawolle is Senior Lecturer at the Deakin University, Geelong, Australia.

Bob Lingard is Professor at the University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

References

Batterham, R. (2000). *The Chance to Change: A Public Discussion Paper.* Retrieved 21 August 2003, http://www.dest.gov.au/chiefscientist/Reports/Chance_To_Change/Documents/ChanceToChange_17aug.pdf

Beazley signals science push (2000, August 22). *The Age.* Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Benson, R. & Hallin, D. C. (2007). How states, markets and globalization shape the news: the French and US national press, 1965−97. *European Journal of Communication*, *22*(1), 27−48.

Benson, R. & Neveu, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 29−47). Cambridge, UK; Malden, Mass. USA: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1995/2005). The political field, the social science field, and the journalistic field. In R. Benson and E. Neveu (Eds.) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 29−47). Cambridge, UK; Malden, Mass. USA: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1996/1998). *On Television and Journalism.* London: Pluto Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). Television. *European Review*, *9*(3), 245−256.

Brenner, N. (2004). *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Briefs (1999, May 21). *The Age.* Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Commonwealth of Australia (1999a, May 20). New Chief Scientist announced. *Australian Associated Press (AAP)*. Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Commonwealth of Australia (1999b, May 20). New Chief Scientist to advise government. *M2 Presswire.* Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Commonwealth of Australia (2000f, August 17). Minchin welcomes science discussion paper. *M2 Presswire*. Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Commonwealth of Australia (2001). *Backing Australia's Ability.* Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

Couldry, N. (2003). *Media, Symbolic Power and the Limits of Bourdieu's Field Theory.* London: MEDIA@ LSE Electronic Working Papers.

Couldry, N. (2004). Theorizing media as practice. *Social Semiotics, 14*(2), 115−32.

Couldry, N. (2007). Bourdieu and the media: the promise and limits of field theory (Review of Rodney Benson and Erik Neveu, Editors, *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005). *Theory and Society*, *36*(2), 209−213.

Couldry, N. (2008). Mediatization or mediation? Alternative understandings of the emergent space of digital storytelling. *New Media and Society*, *10*(3), 373−391.

CSIRO welcomes Chief Scientist appointment (1999, May 20). *AAP*. Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Desrosieres, A. (1998). *The Politics of Large Numbers: A History of Statistical Reasonin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.

Fannin, P. (2000a, August 18). Don't fall behind, top scientist urged. *The Age*. Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Godsey, W. D. (2001). Noble survival and transformation at the beginning of the late modern era. The Counts Coudenhove from Rhenish Cathedral Canons to Austrian priests, 1750−1850. *German History*, *19*, 499−524.

Govt to investigate R and D slump (2000, August 29). *AAP*. Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Habermas, J. (1996). Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hacking, I. (1999). *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge, Mass.; London, England: Harvard University Press.

Hallin, D. & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems: three models of media and politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hepp, A. (2009). Differentiation: Mediatization and Cultural Change. Chapter in K. Lundby (Ed.) *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences* (pp. 135−154). New York: Peter Lang.

Hovden, J. F. (2001). The Norwegian journalistic field: issues and problems in an ongoing research project. Paper presented at *15th Nordic Conference on Media and Communication Research*, Rejkjavik, Iceland 11−13 August 2001.

Kenway, J., Bullen, E., Fahey J., & Robb, S. (2006). *Haunting the Knowledge Economy*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kepplinger, H. M. (2002). Mediatization of politics: theory and data. *Journal of Communication, 52*(4), 972−986.

Krotz, F. (2009). Mediatization: a concept with which to grasp media and social change. In K. Lundby (Ed.) *Mediatization: Concept changes, consequences* (pp. 21−40). New York: Peter Lang.

Lingard, B. & Rawolle, S. (2004). Mediatizing educational policy: the journalistic field, science policy and cross field effects. *Journal of Education Policy, 19*(3), 361−380.

Marchetti, D. (2005). Subfields of specialised journalism. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 64−82). Cambridge, UK; Malden, Mass. USA: Polity Press.

Mazzoleni, G. & Schulz, W. (1999). 'Mediatization' of politics: a challenge for democracy? *Political Communication, 16*, 247−261.

Neveu, E. (2007). Pierre Bourdieu: Sociologist of media, or sociologist for media scholars? *Journalism Studies*, *8*(2), 335−347.

OECD (1996). *The Knowledge Based Economy*. Paris: OECD.

Peters, M. A. & Besley, A. C. (2006). *Building Knowledge Cultures: Education and Development in the Age of Knowledge Capitalism*. New York; Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Rawolle, S. (2005). Cross-field effects and temporary social fields: a case study of the mediatization of recent Australian knowledge economy policies. *Journal of Education Policy*, *20*(6), 705−724.

Rawolle, S. (2010). Understanding the mediatisation of educational policy as practice. *Critical Studies in Education*, *51*(1), 21−39.

Rawolle, S. & Lingard, B. (2008). The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu and researching education policy. *Journal of Education Policy, 23*(6), 729−741.

Reece, N. (1999, May 21). Chief Scientist Sets His Goal. *Australian Financial Review.* Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Schulz, W. (2004). Reconstructing mediatization as an analytic concept. *European Journal of Communication*, *19*, 87−101.

Taylor, L. (2000, August 18). Canberra to fund innovation. *The Australian Financial Review.* Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Thom, G. (1999, May 21). Researcher wins top science job. *Herald-Sun.* Retrieved 12 February 2005, from the Factiva database.

Thrift, N. (2005). *Knowing capitalism.* London: Sage.

Wood, F Q. & Meek, V. L. (2002). Over-reviewed and under-funded? The evolving policy context of Australian higher education research and development. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 24*, 7−25.