



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Thomas Schillemanns, Mediatization of Public Services

How Organizations Adapt to News Media, Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 2012

Dindler, Camilla

Published in:
MedieKultur

Publication date:
2013

Document Version
Tidlig version også kaldet pre-print

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Dindler, C. (2013). Thomas Schillemanns, Mediatization of Public Services: How Organizations Adapt to News Media, Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 2012. *MedieKultur*, 54(1-7), 185-188.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- ? Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- ? You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- ? You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Thomas Schillemanns:
*Mediatization of Public Services:
How Organizations Adapt to News Media.*
Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 2012.**

Camilla Dindler

MedieKultur 2013, 54, 185-188

Published by SMID | Society of Media researchers In Denmark | www.smid.dk

The online version of this text can be found open access at www.mediekultur.dk

Thomas Schillemans new book analyzes the mediatization of public organizations. His study is the first of its kind as previous related studies have more explicitly explored the mediatization of politics or other phenomena such as fashion, play, music, or religion. Organizations may be conceived of as phenomena as well, but they are also formal groups of actors that are, precisely, *organized* and therefore can be analysed as actors practicing organization.

When Thomas Schillemanns worked for a public organization in Holland, he found that the news was an ever-present companion for his colleagues and himself. At present, Schillemanns researches public administration at Utrecht University, and he has set out to study the mediatization of public services from a governance perspective. One good reason for doing so is that public and third sector service providers in Holland feature in a third of the daily news outputs. In the UK and Australia, the number is even higher (p. 15).

The book is among many recent empirical studies of mediatization that follow more theoretically informed works on mediatization by, for instance (and to mention just a few), Mazzoleni and Schulz (1999), Strömbäck (2008), Krotz (2009), and Hjarvard (2008). Schillemans does not place his study reflectively in relation to different definitions of mediatization, its elements, and causal explanations. However, Schillemans draws explicitly on Schulz' categories of social change related to the media, which will be further elaborated below.

Schillemans writes that his book:

[...] aims to shed light on the impact of the news media on public and third sector organizations providing public services. It basically seeks to describe and understand the way in which the news media have become an influential, external force that shapes, and possibly changes, public and third sector organizations providing public services" (p. 18)

His aim is also to transform the catch-all concept of mediatization into a "filtering concept that sifts and selects in order to thicken our insights and to improve the quality of the residue of knowledge" (p. 17). Finally, Schillemanns believes that a key question is whether media pressure and the resulting mediatization of the organization affects a "loss of core functions, goals and perspectives" (p. 123, see also p. 12).

The book's analyses are structured strictly by Schultz' (2004) three processes of mediatization: substitution, amalgamation, and accommodation (Schillemanns does not apply the process of extension that Schulz also mentions). Schillemanns draws on a very simplified model of organization in order to anchor the processes of mediatization as instances of organizational mediatization. According to this model, an organization consists of inputs, throughputs, and outputs (p. 52). The simplicity of the model is justified by the need to contain complexity and to facilitate comparisons between many otherwise-different public service providers.

Pursuing his aims, Schillemanns has used a mixed methodology in order to analyze and comprehend the complex reality of news media impact on public and third sector organizations in Holland and Australia. Content analysis has been conducted in order to measure the level of pressure on organizations by the news media as well as to measure the level of personalization and pack journalism/news waves, comparing these with the coverage of national politicians. Content analysis of organizational websites has also been conducted in order to analyse and assess the degree to which the sites cater for the news media in the form of contact details, presentation of facts and figures, etc.

Several respondents from public and third sector organizations have furthermore contributed to the study. Focus groups with a total number of 42 respondents from different kinds of public organizations were conducted. These respondents – as well as a few more – also filled in a questionnaire. Finally, 36 elite interviews were conducted. All questions were guided by a wish to explore the perceived media pressure on the organizations and the mediatization of their inputs, throughputs, and outputs.

Unsurprisingly, the overall conclusion of the book is that "public services are provided by public and third sector organizations that have all, to varying degrees, become mediatized" (p. 123). The book contains many interesting results grounded primarily in the qualitative material. I shall mention a few of the most interesting. In the analytical framework of "organizational inputs", Schillemanns lets his informants describe how the news media are monitored by organizations accommodated to this task and how the news media function as a signal system informing them of stakeholders' future steps rather than informing them of content. Organizational agents are thus much more aware of what is written between the lines of news items than of the events to which these news items refer. In the analytical

framework of “organizational throughputs”, news media pressure means increasing message control and the growing status of communication personnel within public and third sector organizations. This also affects policymaking, which is increasingly produced with due regard to anticipated media coverage.

In the analytical framework of “organizational outputs”, Schillemans’ informants show us how strategies for getting in and staying out of the news media dominate their daily routines. This should be understood from the perspective that public service organizations produce and have access to vast amounts of data that is of potentially high importance to the public and that news media may find this newsworthy too. Schillemans points out that the organizations perceive this data as important either because of their role as public servants or because of their interests in self legitimization *vis-à-vis* the public and the political system. However, precisely because of their role as public servants, the organizations are also subject to news media scrutiny. The news media are therefore a double-edged sword of which the organizations sometimes try to make use but just as often try to avoid. One respondent describes it – probably with unintentional humour – as an unavoidable evil: “The best way is being careful in providing details, not holding something back, but be careful how you explain. And just ensure that there’s nothing more to find. Then it usually goes away” (p. 107).

However, Schillemans underlines that “mediatization is not a direct effect of what journalists, editors and media corporations *do* – and might be blamed for doing – but is more properly understood as a structural development in complex systems of governance” (p. 9). One example of this may be the pattern through which the more dependent organizations perceive themselves to be of public goodwill or co-production, the more they are mediatized. An organization dealing with public health issues thus needs the public to actively engage in a perceived healthy life style, and a third sector organization working with public health would thus be the most liable to be mediatized in its outputs.

I have had to reread quite a few sections in the book because the practical use of Schulz’ concepts does not match how I would use them with the empirical material. For instance, according to Schulz, amalgamation is when human interaction is simultaneously mediated and non-mediated, as for example when students communicate on a mediated backchannel while attending a traditional lecture. The effect of amalgamation is that mediated and non-mediated definitions of reality in social interaction *merge* and *mingle* (Schulz, 2004, p. 89). However, Schillemans uses the concept to describe the mingling of unmediated media-related activities with essentially non-media activities (p. 51, 81) and thus modifies the concept into an actor-driven, practice-oriented concept. More theoretical clarification could have eased my understanding of the interplay between theory and empirical data in this study.

Generally, by using the concepts of effects, pressure, logics, and institution, Schillemans implies a certain approach to mediatization studies that is not, however, clarified in connection to current developments in mediatization theory (for example, see Hepp, 2012).

To a media researcher, the book is thus first and foremost an empirical contribution to the study of mediatization of public service organizations in general. To a researcher of public administration and governance, the distinction between different types of public organizations is also relevant as a more finely grained conceptualization of the conditions of these actors in a media-saturated society. From a media perspective, this could also have been interesting if contextualized within a macro study of mediatization where homogenization, globalization, localization, etc. are relevant analytical concepts.

To sum up, I believe that the book contains valuable empirical material and several interesting points and insights. I furthermore see the book as a major empirical contribution to the study of news sources although Schillemanns does not explicitly name this tradition himself. In my opinion, the book does not really answer the question as to whether media pressure and the resulting mediatization of organizations affect a “[...] loss of core functions, goals and perspectives” (p. 123, see also p. 12) and thus change the identities of public service organizations. The main reason is that we are never really introduced to a proposal of what constitutes the *primordial* public service organization.

References

- Hepp, A. (2012). Mediatization and the ‘molding force’ of the media. *Communications*, 37, 1-28.
- Hjarvard, S. (2008). The mediatization of society: a theory of the media as agents of social and cultural change. *Nordicom Review*, 29, 105-134.
- Mazzoleni, G. & Schulz, W. (1999). ‘Mediatization’ of politics: a challenge for democracy? *Political Communication*, 16(3), 247-261.
- Schulz, W. (2004). Reconstructing mediatization as an analytical concept. *European Journal of Communication*, 19, 87-101.
- Strömbäck, J. (2008). Four phases of mediatization: an analysis of the mediatization of politics. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13, 228-246.
- Krotz, F. (2009). Mediatization: A concept with which to grasp media and societal change. In K. Lundby (Ed.), *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences* (pp. 1938). New York: PeterLang.

Camilla Dindler
Assistant Professor, PhD
Department of Communication and Psychology
Aalborg University, Denmark
dindler@hum.aau.dk