Part II

Advancement of Developing Fields

4 Deep Mediatisation and the Datafication of Fashion

Agnès Rocamora

Mediatisation has established itself as a significant notion for understanding contemporary social processes. It is a "sensitizing concept" that helps researchers interrogate the intensification of the influence of media technologies and institutions on various social spheres (Jansson, 2015, pp. 14–15; Hepp, 2020, p. 9). A meta-process, it "points to the changed dynamics and dimensionality of the (whole) social world in a media age" whereby the media increasingly mould practices and experiences (Couldry, 2014a, p. 231; Krotz, 2007; Hepp, 2013).

However, contexts of mediatisation need to be fully qualified to account for its dimension as a differentiated and historically situated process that is "domain specific" (Hepp and Hasebrink, 2018, p. 23; Landerer, 2013; Strömbäck and Dimitrova, 2014). The Bourdieuian notion of field allows for this qualifying and contextualising. In this conceptual chapter, I focus on the field of fashion, also concentrating on digital media the better to interrogate the differentiated nature of mediatisation (sections I and II). In doing so, I bring Bourdieu's field theory in dialogue with mediatisation theory, contributing to the small body of work that has started drawing conceptual links between the two theories. I do so through the notion of logic, turning, in particular, towards the recent literature on deep mediatisation as a new stage of mediatisation (sections I and II).

At the core of deep mediatisation is datafication, the process whereby everyday practices and experiences are increasingly turned into data. Drawing on critical data studies scholarship, a body of research that generally fails to engage with mediatisation theory, I explore manifestations of the datafication of fashion, and discuss datafication as a key logic of the field of fashion (section III). In dialogue with Bourdieu's conceptual framework, I reflect on the role of data as capital and on that of algorithms as key players and gatekeepers of the field of fashion (section III).

I Mediatisation of the field of fashion

A mediatised society is a society submitted to "the media and their logic" (Hjarvard, 2009, p. 160). Here Hjavard is drawing on a concept, "media

DOI: 10.4324/9781003324591-7

logic", at the heart of mediatisation scholarship (see e.g., Barnard, 2018; Couldry, 2008; Couldry and Hepp, 2013; Deacon and Stanyer, 2014; Strömbäck, 2008). The term was developed by Altheide and Snow (1979, p. 240) in their eponymous book, to refer to "a form through which events and ideas are interpreted and acted upon". It is that which shapes individual and collective agents' everyday experiences and practices and is a taken-for granted "form of communication" (Altheide, 2013, p. 225).

However, various authors have objected to the universalising the term "media logic" in the singular implies, as if society was subject to a single, all-encompassing media logic, irrespective of media genres, affordances, and historical times. Couldry, for instance, acknowledges that the term is useful for conceptualising media logic as "a structuring force" (2014b, p. 65). But he also insists that one should talk about media logics to account for the role of both media types and media changes in logics across time in processes of mediatisation (see e.g., Couldry, 2008; see also Klinger and Svensson, 2018).

Thus, noting that "the concepts of 'media' and 'logic' are both underspecified", Asp (2014, p. 257) uses the notion "news media logic". Similarly, to conceptualise the rise and proliferation of digital and social media and their role in mediatisation, scholars have proposed various terms to capture their logics. Dahlgren (1996) discusses "cyberspace's media logic" to refer to the media logic of cyber-communication, such as cyberjournalism (p. 64); Klinger and Svensson (2018) refer to "network media logic"; and Van Dijck and Poell (2013) to "social media logic". Focusing on fashion blogs, Kristensen and Christensen (2017), for instance, have discussed the ways the logic of blogs, in contrast with that of print media, shapes fashion communication.

Being attentive to the specificity of the media involved in mediatisation allows for a differentiated account of this process, but so does attention to its articulation in specific social spaces. As Couldry observes: "mediatizaton research must be alive to multiple explanatory models of how the meta-process of mediatization is worked through in specific domains and fields" (2014a, p. 243).

It is with this aim in mind that, in previous work (Rocamora, 2017, 2018), I have started interrogating the way mediatisation is articulated in the field of fashion, also focusing on digital media in order better to attend to calls to approach mediatisation as a differentiated process. From designers and brands designing products so that they photograph well for social media, to consumers fashioning themselves for social media, I have discussed the ways, in the field fashion, "practices of production, consumption, distribution and diffusion – are articulated through the media, and, more crucially, are dependent on the media for their articulation" (Rocamora, 2017, p. 509). There are still too few studies of everyday, ordinary processes of mediatisation, and even less with regards to social and digital media. In being inherently embedded in everyday life and in both practices of production and consumption, the field of fashion lends itself to such studies.

Fashion shows, for instance, once the privilege of a small elite, and closed to the media, are now designed "with social media in mind" and always feature "made-for-instagram moments" (Business of Fashion, cited in Rocamora, 2017, p. 510; see also Halliday, 2022). Fashion e-commerce has become mediatised too, with the distinction between the editorial and the commercial increasingly fuzzy, and brands and e-tailers media content providers too (Rocamora, 2017). In April 2021 *Voguebusiness*, for instance, reported on brands from the field of fashion and beauty that are investing in in-house film studios to create online long-format videos (Chitrakorn, 2021).

II Field theory and mediatisation theory

In the above I refer to fashion in terms of "field", a notion I borrow from the work of Pierre Bourdieu. A field is a social space of positions, position taking and relations (see, for instance, Bourdieu, 2015a). It is a hierarchical space made up of established players and institutions, as well as new entrants, which all have the power to "produce effects" in the field (Bourdieu, 2015b, p. 240). Fields are also spaces of struggles for its transformation or preservation, for the definition of its boundaries, values and rules, and for the power to decide who belongs and who does not (Bourdieu, 2015a, pp. 483–487).

Four main genres of capital operate in all fields. They are economic (financial resources), symbolic (consecration and prestige), social (network and connections) and cultural capital (knowledge, possession of cultural goods and educational titles), and all are at once the "social energy" that fuels a field, a stake in it, and a product of it (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47; 2015a, pp. 519–520).

Fashion can be defined as a field, and indeed, Bourdieu, along with Yvette Delsaut, deployed field theory to discuss the 1970s French field of haute couture, looking at designers' position as dominant or dominated players, and the concurrent aesthetic values they upheld (Bourdieu and Delsaut,1975). Arguably, the field of fashion emerged in the nineteenth century with the "invention", in Paris, of the figure of the designer by Charles Frederick Worth. Worth set in place a series of rules and institutions that still exist to this day, though in altered guises, and have been crucial to shaping the practices and values currently at play in today's field of fashion (Rocamora, 2009; Steele, 2017).

All fields have agents of consecration and legitimation, which all participate in the definition of its boundaries, values and rules. Worth, for instance, was instrumental to the invention of the fashion show (Evans, 2013), an event central to the temporal and representational logic of fashion. He founded the Chambre Syndicale de la Confection et de la Couture pour Dames (now the Fédération de la Haute Couture et de la Mode), which regulates the fashion calendar, itself a tool of regulation of the temporal dynamic of fashion and its seasons. In the nineteenth century other instances of legitimation consolidated or emerged such as fashion magazines and

department stores, which all participated in the formation of the field of fashion, whose geographical centre became Paris (Rocamora, 2009; Steele, 2017). Agents of consecration also include educational institutions and regulatory bodies, such as, in the United Kingdom, the British Fashion Council. In arguing that the field of fashion is a mediatised field, what are the implications for field theory? If mediatisation encompasses all social spheres, this has ramifications for social theory, including, as Couldry (2012) notes, Bourdieuian field theory, and one should look at the ways mediatisation theory can be brought into dialogue with field theory.

To create a "bridge" between the two theories, Couldry (2014b, p. 59) builds on Bourdieu's notion of meta-capital. The state, following Bourdieu, is a space of power that exercises forces on all fields and influences the conversion rate between capitals within fields (Couldry 2012; 2014a; 2014b). Bourdieu captures this influence with the term "meta-capital", a form of capital, then, that works across fields and has power over the other forms of capital (ibid.; see Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). In a similar vein, and to capture the idea of mediatisation as a meta-process, Couldry (2014b) proposes the term "meta media-capital", also building both on Krotz's (2007) notion of meta-process and Champagne's (1990) notion of media-capital (but see also Bolin, 2016 for a discussion of the limits of the concept of meta media-capital; and Couldry, 2019 for a response to this).

Jansson (2015) too has made a conceptual link between field theory and mediatisation theory; through the Bourdieuian notion of doxa – the uncontested norms and beliefs at play in a field (see e.g., Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 73). Jansson (2015, p. 57) talks of "communicational doxa" to refer to that which "prescribes the ways in which social agents should communicate with one another, within and across fields, and with what media". This allows him to propose "a Bourdieusian understanding of mediatization", whereby mediatisation is a meta-process referring to the integration of media in a field's doxa (p. 58). Barnard (2018) also brings mediatisation theory into dialogue with Bourdieuian field theory to look at the mediatisation of the field of journalism, focusing on the ways Twitter shapes journalistic practices. He talks about "mediatized superstructure" to draw attention to the "new dynamics" that inform social spaces "in increasingly mediatized field contexts" (p. 49). Like Jansson, he mobilises the Bourdieuian notion of doxa to argue that Twitter has been incorporated into the orthodoxy of journalism.

To create another bridge between mediatisation theory and field theory, I turn to the notion of logic, for not only is it at the heart of mediatisation theory, as captured in the expression "media logic", but it is also a significant term in Bourdieu's writing. Couldry (2012, p. 137) evokes, but does not pursue this line of thought, a possible bridging of field theory and mediatisation theory via the notion of logic, when he notes: "mediatization as a term is perfectly compatible with field theory which insists upon paying attention to the 'logics' or working of specific field". Similarly, although

he does not elaborate on Bourdieu's notion of logic nor on that of media logic, Jansson's (2015, p. 18) writing draws attention to the possible conceptual linking between field logic and media logic when he writes: "the problem [of specification in mediatisation research] lies in the difficulties of unpacking the relationships between media and other social forces, which together mould the logic of practice with different social forces" (p. 14). To talk about the mediatisation of a field, then, is to say that media logic has become a significant logic at play in this field.

"Logic" is a recurring term in Bourdieu's writing. Not only does it form the basis of a book title, *The Logic of Practice*, but it is also a key notion in his articulation of field theory, such as when he writes, for instance, "Fields are spaces. Their logics have invariants but can be defined as much by their variations, their singularities, their specificities as by their invariants" (Bourdieu, 2015b, p. 32). Fields are informed by universal as well as field-specific logics, which are the mechanisms and principles that inform a field's dynamic and the practices at play there (see e.g., Bourdieu, 2015a, p. 474; 1991). In that respect, when thinking about fashion in terms of field we can talk about the logic of fashion.

The field of fashion is informed by logics that are shared across all fields of cultural production, such as the logic of struggle between players, the quest for the dominant definition of the field and attendant values, or the tensions between commerce and art. Yet, certain logics are more salient in, or even particular to, this field. The logic of commerce, for instance, is central to it: fashion goods are largely produced to be sold on a market.

The logic of distinction is another key logic of the field of fashion, as authors such as Simmel (1957), Veblen (1994), and indeed Bourdieu (1996a) have argued. Whilst Veblen and Bourdieu focused on class distinction, more recently, fashion studies scholars have also looked at the role of gender, race, or ethnicity in the articulation of distinct individual and group identities through dress (see e.g., Barnard, 2020).

Speed has become a significant logic of the field of fashion too. Fashion is the orchestrated renewal of style, increasingly so at an accelerated speed: witness the birth, in the 1970s, of the fast fashion system, as well as the multiplication of fashion seasons. Where the fashion calendar once featured only the Spring/Summer and Autumn/Winter collections only, it is now also rhythmed by Resort and Pre-Fall collections, with the temporal flow of fashion also punctuated by one-off "drops" which consumers have access to for a very short period of time. Digital fashion media have also played an important role in the acceleration of fashion time, by promoting, for instance, a "now" time informed by the values of speed and transience (Rocamora, 2013).

Both in the work of Bourdieu and in mediatisation theory, the notion of logic helps us grasp the idea of formative foundational forces and patterns at play in a social space. The media exercise such a "social force" (Altheide

and Snow, 1979, p. 9), as an interrogation of the mediatisation of the field of fashion indicates. To say that the field of fashion has become mediatised is to say that one of the key logics at play there is a media logic, and to investigate the mediatisation of the field of fashion involves identifying the media logics, and concurrent effects, that shape this field. As mentioned earlier, mediatisation has to be thought through as a differentiated process, which implies acknowledging that there is not a single overarching media logic but various media logics.

Recent developments in mediatisation theory are useful for interrogating a specific media logic at play in the field of fashion: datafication. In being digitised, media are not just means of communication but means of generating data too (Couldry and Hepp, 2018; Breiter and Hepp, 2018). With the deepening of our engagement with increasingly digitised media we have entered a new stage of mediatisation whereby our practices are being constructed through data (Couldry and Hepp, 2018; Hepp, 2020). Hepp calls this new stage "deep mediatization" (Hepp, 2016, p. 91). At this stage "all elements of our social world are intricately related to digital media and their underlying infrastructures"; data becomes entangled with our everyday experiences (Hepp, 2020, p. 5). Converted into digital information and computerised data sets, our practices have become datafied (Couldry and Yu, 2018, p. 4473). That is, deep mediatisation is a stage of "datafication"; a term Mayer-Schönberger and Cukier (2013, p. 78) coined to refer to the putting of a phenomenon into "a quantified format so it can be tabulated and analyzed". It is the process whereby large amounts of data are produced, collected, stored, and translated into quantifiable measures used to identify patterns and inform decisions and behaviours, thereby contributing to an increased quantification of the social (p. 78)

Outside of discussions of deep mediatisation, datafication is at the heart of much critical data studies, where, as with mediatisation theory, its sociocultural implications are problematised (see e.g., Beer, 2017; Gillespie, 2016; Kitchin, 2014; Lupton, 2016; Van Dijck et al., 2018). For Van Dijck and Poell (2013), who draw on Altheide and Snow, datafication is a defining logic of social media. They note that "in processing data, a platform does not merely 'measure' certain expressions or opinions, but also helps mould them" (p. 10). Although they do not refer to the term "mediatisation", their use of the word "mould" brings it to mind – Hepp (2013), for instance, regularly refers to the moulding power of the media in his writing on mediatisation – which points to the idea of datafication as a logic of deep mediatisation. Van Dijck and Poell restrict their analysis to social media but their linking of the notion of logic to that of datafication, together with their insistence on the moulding power of platforms through data, is useful for framing datafication more generally as a media logic at the stage of deep mediatisation. Andersen (2018, p. 1447) suggests as much, though without elaborating on it, when he writes:

> The changes brought about by deep mediatization are, besides social and cultural, also epistemological changes to the extent they make us act, understand, and get to know about things according to the "logic" of data and algorithmic processing, archiving, or ordering.

In other words, and using Bourdieuian terminology, deep mediatisation is a stage at which datafication has become a key field logic. In the next section, I discuss some of its manifestations in the particular field of fashion by bringing into dialogue field theory, theories of mediatisation, and theories of datafication. Except maybe for the work of Couldry and Hepp, mediatisation scholars have not fully engaged with critical data studies to look at digital mediatisation. Conversely critical data studies scholars have tended to ignore the literature on mediatisation. I am advocating for a more systematic encounter between mediatisation theory and critical data studies, and in the remainder of this chapter I show that the two can usefully be brought into dialogue with each other to look at processes of digital mediatisation.

III Deep mediatisation of the field of fashion

In *The Aisles Have Eyes*, Turow (2017) discusses the datafication of the retail sector, often referring to the fashion industry. He gives the example of fashion brick and mortar stores that, upon a customer's entrance to the premises, send buying recommendations to their mobile, thanks to data accumulated through visits to the store's website and past purchases (p. 10; see also Lupton, 2016, p. 30).

The tracking and tracing of customer purchases is not a new thing – it developed throughout the twentieth century – but with the invention of digital technologies, faster computerisation and new communication tools such as mobile phones, it has intensified in recent years (Turow, 2017, p. 10). "Quantifiying the world" is not new either and has existed for centuries (Mayer-Schönberger and Cukier, 2013, p. 79). However, in the past 50 years, and in particular since the beginning of the new millennium, it has significantly increased with the collection of large data sets (also known as Big Data) thanks to the wide reach of digital technologies and digitisation (Kitchin and Lauriault, 2018; Van Dijck et al., 2018).

In the field of fashion, in recent years algorithm-led fashion platforms have proliferated, which is part of a wider intensification of the datafication of fashion. Shopify, Farfetch, Depop, Lyst, Trouva, Stitch Fix, and Unmade are a few examples only. On such platforms data is collected to inform buying and selling decisions and recommendations, as well as the production of commodities that are predicted to be successful with customers. Fashion search platform Lyst (2020) put it thus: "[… we] track more than 10 million global searches a month, crunching queries, page views and sales

statistics every minute, and we use this data to tell the stories of what the world wants to wear".

Fashion shopping means browsing in brick-and-mortar stores, but it also means online searching, now a common way of engaging with fashion that draws attention to its deep mediatisation. For digital search is one of its key features, and "a significant part of our current system of media" enabled by the processing of large data sets by search engines (Andersen, 2018, p. 1142). Andersen talks about a "culture of search", whereby online search has become a normalised everyday cultural activity and searching "a form of communicative action" at the heart of deep mediatisation (p. 1141).

Through their online searching fashion consumers leave traces that companies can track to gather data that feeds back into their business strategy. Digital traces are the basis of datafication and of deep mediatisation (Breiter and Hepp, 2018, p. 387). Adidas, for instance, can track the clickstream data of consumers who have watched their ads on YouTube to collect information about them (Amoore and Piotukh, 2016, p. 9). Digital tracking is also used in the field of fashion media, such as to inform media content. *Vogue International*, for instance, can track the content readers engage with throughout the day to identify reading patterns. Also monitoring social engagement and keyword searches, this enables them "to act on those behaviors and reach record readership" (Barber, 2020). The trend mentioned in the first part of this chapter for fashion and beauty companies to invest in film studios, is also an opportunity for the sector to collect customer data (Chitrakorn, 2021).

Thus, data analyst positions are now regularly advertised in the field of fashion to support "data-inspired decision making", as Burberry (2021) put it in a job advertisement for a "Business Analyst – Analytics". Fashion business site FashionUnitedUK writes of the "fashion data analyst":

> The world of fashion has changed tremendously in the last decade, paving the way for new jobs in fashion. […] The responsibility of a data analyst working in fashion is to utilize all digital information collected to help retail and fashion companies become more profitable by predicting trends and consumer behaviour.
>
> (Yu, 2019)

2006 saw the creation of Launchmetrics, a marketing platform specialising in data analytics in the field of fashion, "that believes in the evolution of an industry where digital has changed the speed, expectations, and inspirations of the market", as they state on their website. Large data sets, thanks to the speed and power of digital technologies and computers, can be collected and analysed very quickly (Holmes, 2017). In the field of fashion, where speed is a key logic, being fast becomes an asset, which the fast collection of data is promoted as enabling.

Data has also become central to the discourse and practice of that new form of marketing born out of the rise of bloggers and Instagrammers: influencer marketing. Various start-ups have been created in recent years that place data at the heart of their services and self-representation. With titles such as influencer platform or influencer marketing data platform, companies such as Klear.com, Track, and socialbakers.com promote software and data as key players in the business of influence, now a significant global fashion business too. Klear.com, who, in their own words, "are data geeks", state: "Modern marketers need data-driven solutions to have a competitive edge and make the best decisions. Klear's sophisticated technology supports some of the world's largest organizations and empowers influencers around the world" (Klear, 2020). Such companies tap into what Van Dijck (2014, p. 198) calls dataism, that is, "the belief in Big Data", in quantification and in the tracking of human behaviour through online media technologies.

The term "belief" brings to mind the work of Bourdieu, for whom central to the functioning of a field is a belief in the values that inform it. Belief is a universal field logic; "an inherent part of belonging to a field" which exerts its forces on it (Bourdieu, 1997, p. 67). With deep mediatisation the belief in quantified data has become a dominant belief of social fields. As Mau (2019, p. 13) notes, "All numbers deployed in public discourse require a leap of faith – they have to be accepted as correct in order to exert their cold charisma. Numbers that no-one believes in have no value in social communication."

In the field of fashion, the belief in quantified data intensified during the Covid-19 pandemic, with the further digitisation of this field. Showrooms and trade shows, for instance, moved online, and a host of fashion brands adopted new digital features to support their e-commerce, "including live streams, 360-degree imagery, more data science and virtual reality" (McDowell, 2021, n.p.). In-person fashion shows were replaced by online events, further contributing to the mediatisation of fashion and its embrace of a logic of entertainment (see Rocamora, 2017), whilst the fashion retail sector moved further away from the high street and towards e-commerce (Collins, 2021). Fashion brands, already active on Instagram, started engaging with TikTok, a move indicative of a wider platformisation of fashion whereby brands are increasingly turning into content creators and media platforms (Rocamora, 2018).

This intensified digitisation of fashion has been celebrated and called for by many business advocates. At the core of their discourse is the idea that data is an answer to the current crisis. A McKinsey (2020) report puts it thus: "Some apparel, fashion, and luxury companies won't survive the current crisis; others will emerge better positioned for the future. Much will depend on their digital and analytics capabilities." "Digital and analytics", the report also claims, "will play a critical role in helping companies emerge stronger from the crisis".

The statements draw attention to the "trust in numbers" (Porter, 1995) that underpins the logic of datafication, but it also brings to light its commercial dimension. Indeed, datafication is a process deeply intertwined with commodification (Couldry, 2018; Morozov, 2015), a logic at the heart of the field of fashion too. Launchmetrics make this clear when they state that: "Data and technology bring a sharp focus to profitability, accountability, and efficiency while enabling the type of quick decision making required for agility." That is, data are to be capitalised on. In Bourdieuian terms, it is a form of capital. Thus Mau (2019, p. 8) draws on Bourdieu to propose the notion of "digital status data", a type of data that by virtue of being a sign of distinction and reputation "is a form of symbolic capital which can be used to one's own advantage and converted to other social currencies" (see also Sadowski (2019) on "data capital"). As Christin (2020, p. 4) has shown of journalists, for instance, metrics are "symbolic resources" they can mobilise in various institutional contexts.

Metrics are key resources for fashion influencers too (see also Rocamora 2022). Their number of social media "likes" and "followers", and the correlated engagement rate, are elements of their symbolic capital. Likes and followers metrics allow influencers to distinguish themselves by signalling their reputation and capitalising on it. Collected and stored, not only are they informed by the logic of datafication, but they are a currency influencers trade against money when selling their service in the "economy of 'likes' " (Lindell, 2017, p. 3; Hearn, 2010). Influencers are also an instance of what Hepp (2016) calls "media-related pioneer communities", and whose activities are central to deep mediatisation. By mediating fashion across digital platforms and attracting large audiences they have participated in further anchoring the field of fashion to the digital and datafication.

Deep mediatisation also means the transformation into digital media of objects not normally seen as media (Hepp and Hasebrink, 2018). An example is dress, as the case of wearables illustrates. Wearables are digitally connected devices worn on the body. Throughout the 1990s various designers started experimenting with the technology, developing jewellery and other accessories such as glasses. Wearables can be used to track users' emotions and bodily sensations. They are also "technologies of the self": wearers can use the data they provide to monitor themselves and shape their everyday activities, as the quantified-self movement indicates (see Lupton, 2016, after Foucault). The datafied self of wearables is a mediatised self.

At the heart of datafication are algorithms, a procedure for the rapid automatic processing of data based on pre-determined calculations and resulting in the creation of new informational outputs (Amoore and Piotukh, 2016; Bucher, 2018; Gillespie, 2014). Fashionunited, for instance, informs potential fashion data analysts that "using math skills and formulas, a data analyst will help create algorithms to optimize the brand's performance, sales and engagement online" (Yu 2019). In a context in which computational tools have become a pervasive medium of expression,

algorithms are now "a key logic governing the flows of information on which we depend", the meaningfulness attributed to it, and the way it is perceived (Gillespie, 2014, p. 167). The power given algorithms is premised on a new "knowledge logic" whereby they are given a role once attributed to "credential experts, the scientific method, common sense, or the word of God" only (p. 168).

Algorithms, however, are not just technological, they are cultural and social too (Beer, 2017; Bucher, 2018; Cotter, 2018). They have a veneer of objectivity, but they are human made entities, and do not exist outside of the social (Gillespie, 2014; 2016). As Hepp (2020, p. 75) notes, noting the role of algorithms in the process of deep mediatisation:

> in specifying the possible molding power of algorithms it is important to keep in mind that the organizations – companies, state agencies, administrations – that commission the coding of software have certain purposes and interests as well as explicit and implicit models of the social which become inscribed in the algorithms they produce.

In their ability to filter, search, prioritise, and recommend, algorithms have the power to exclude, and are therefore tools "in the deployment or expression of power"; they can "create, maintain or cement norms" as well as "decide what matters" (Beer, 2017, pp. 3, 6). Hepp talks about the "moulding power of algorithms", insisting on their roles in the process of deep mediatisation. Looking at this process then entails looking at the role of algorithms and the way they select, include or exclude information in particular fields.

In the field of fashion algorithms have become key players. The headline of a 2018 *Racked* article, for instance, reads "Style is an algorithm". It reports on Amazon and eBay's Echo Look application which, upon the user's uploading a selfie, selects a range of articles and tells them "which set of clothes looks better, processed by style-analyzing algorithms and some assistance from humans". Algorithms have taken on a central role in the circulation of fashion images too. Intrinsic to the working of Instagram, for instance, which is now a key space of "fashion media discourse" (Rocamora, 2009), algorithms have become significant players in the field of fashion media. By regulating the blending of posts edited by fashion influencers with those of brands and private individuals into a continuous flow of images on a user's feed, they have taken over human editors by becoming a sort of meta-editor, as in the metrics journalism that Christin (2020) discusses (see also Cardon, 2016). There, the algorithmic has become "a competing logic" to the editorial (Gillespie, 2014, p. 192). Algorithms operate "regimes of visibility" whereby decisions are made as to what content gets shown to whom, what information is included or excluded, who is seen and heard and who is not (Bucher, 2018, p. 82). At a time when being visible is often a path to success, algorithms grant the capital of visibility – a symbolic capital – necessary for success in a field (Lundahl, 2020). This is why they must be

seen as a "powerful gatekeeper" (Bucher, 2018, p. 7); "the new 'gatekeepers' of public digital space", as Cardon (2016, p. 95) also puts it.

Bourdieu has insisted on the importance of gatekeeping in regulating membership of a field (see e.g., Bourdieu, 1996b). In the field of fashion, gatekeepers include established journalists, for instance, but they now also include algorithms. In this field, where the logic of visibility is central to one's membership (Entwistle and Rocamora, 2006) algorithms's power to decide who is seen and who is not is also a power to decide who belongs and who does not. This begs the question, what is the visual fashion media landscape as shaped by algorithms? This is an issue I addressed when looking at the role of search engines and Instagram in representation of "*la parisienne*", a trope of the discourse on fashionable style. A normative vision of fashionable Parisian femininity is promoted on Google and Instagram that privileges white, thin, young, non-disabled bodies at the expense of diversity and inclusion (Rocamora, 2019). Further studies are needed, in the field of mediatisation studies, to understand the role of algorithms in the moulding of discourses and representations at play in a particular field.

In representing information in particular ways, algorithms, Wade Morris (2015, p. 452) argues, are "like intermediaries" that exercise power over the way knowledge is constructed. He builds on Bourdieu's (1996a) notion of cultural intermediaries – taste makers situated between producers and consumers – to conceptualise algorithms' role in intermediation mechanisms, and their status as entities able to collect and process data to make taste recommendations. Like cultural intermediaries, algorithms shape the representation of culture. To capture this idea Wade Morris (2015, p. 459) defines algorithms as "infomediaries", also arguing that they deserve as much attention as other cultural intermediaries in studies of the mediation of culture or, following the terminology used in mediatisation theory, the deep mediatisation of culture.

Like Wade Morris, critical data theorists Gillespie (2014) and Bucher (2018) do not use the concept of mediatisation, but their writing often brings it to mind in drawing attention to the power algorithms have in moulding the social. Gillespie (2014, p. 187), for instance, notes that "the working logics of these algorithms not only shape user practices, but also lead users to internalize their norms and priorities". Likewise, Bucher (2018) writes that at the heart of her book is "the basic question of how software is shaping the conditions of everyday life", and she argues that moments of sociality "are mediated, augmented, produced, and governed by networked systems powered by software and algorithms" (p. 2). Woven into people's everyday life, algorithms have an "agential force" that has the power to produce new practices, experiences, and realities (p. 50). They "do something" to various social domains (p. 50).

This doing is instrumental to processes of deep mediatisation, such as in the field of culture. As Nieborg and Poell (2018, p. 6) note, "algorithmic logic" has become central to cultural production, since the creation and

circulation of cultural goods is increasingly shaped by the recommendations and rankings of algorithms. Cultural production, they argue, has become contingent in two ways: contingent in that it is dependent on a group of powerful platforms, namely, in the West: Google, Amazon, Facebook, Apple, and Microsoft; and contingent in that media products and services by being informed by data (such as datafied user feedback) are constantly open to revision and recirculation (Nieborg and Poell, 2019; 2018, p. 6). This results in what they call the "contingent commodity"; it has a "modular design" and is "continuously reworked and repackaged, informed by datafied user feedback" (Nieborg and Poell, 2018, p. 1). Similarly, Bucher (2018, p. 2) invites us to think about the ways dependence on data and algorithms "might funnel cultural production in particular directions". This raises the question: What is the contingent fashion commodity? More generally: How do algorithms and data shape the production, consumption, and representation of fashion? That is, what are the implications of deep mediatisation on practices, commodities, and players in the field of fashion?

Should be 'Meta'

In this chapter, I have started addressing those questions. Fully answering them is beyond its scope and necessitates empirical investigation. However, the ideas presented here will hopefully form a springboard researchers can appropriate to empirically research the deep mediatisation of fashion. In focusing on this field, I am not making any claims as to the extent and manifestation of mediatisation across all fields. Rather, by focusing on one particular field, in a particular historical time, the present chapter calls for, and supports, discussions of the differentiated nature and manifestations of mediatisation, and the idea that mediatisation varies across time and space. Furthermore, empirical research of processes of mediatisation, and in particular deep mediatisation are still too rare. Empirically grounded field-specific analyses should be conducted to fully interrogate the ways individual and institutional agents' practices and experiences are moulded by the media, as well as by data. Finally, whilst there is a growing body of empirical studies of the ways datafication shapes practices, most significantly perhaps in discussions of the quantified self (Lupton, 2016), those are too often split from discussions of mediatisation, a concept which precisely helps approach the idea of the structuring force of digital data in everyday life. By bringing mediatisation theory more systematically into dialogue with critical data studies, the complexities and interrelatedness of both processes – mediatisation and datafication – can be better understood.

Conclusion

The chapter offers a reflection on Bourdieuian field theory in light of theories of mediatisation, and in particular deep mediatisation. It answers Couldry's call for more attention to be given to the way mediatisation theory can contribute to social theory, including Bourdieuian theory. Focusing on the notions of logic and datafication, it has discussed the ways deep mediatisation

is articulated in the field of fashion, also bringing into dialogue the wider scholarship on datafication with that on mediatisation. In doing so, the chapter also shows the relevance of Bourdieuian field theory and attendant concepts for understanding social and digital media. Finally, it provides a conceptual framework with which to investigate contemporary changes in the field of fashion. The chapter also offers scholars of mediatisation a possible point of comparison from which to assess the extent to which mediatisation may be context-dependent and a process differentiated across social spaces and media types. Further field-specific studies, and dialogue between studies of different fields, it is hoped, will allow one to grasp the complex and heterogeneous nature of mediatisation.

References

Altheide, D.L. (2004). Media Logic and Political Communication. *Political Communication*, 21 (3), 293–296.

Altheide, D.L. (2013). Media Logic, Social Control, and Fear. *Communication Theory* 23, 223–238.

Altheide, D.L. (2014). *Media Edge*. New York: Peter Lang.

Altheide, D.L. and Snow, P. (1979). *Media Logic*. London: Sage.

Amoore, L. and Piotukh, V. (2016). Introduction. In L. Amoore and V. Piotukh (eds) *Algorithmic life* (pp 1–18). London: Routledge.

Andersen, Jack (2018). Archiving, Ordering, and Searching. *Media, Culture and Society*, 40 (8), 1135–1150.

Asp, K. (2014). News Media Logic in a New Institutional Perspective. *Journalism Studies*, 15 (3), 256–270.

Barber, K. (2020). How Vogue's International approach to audience data helped it reach record readers. Digiday. https://digiday.com/media/how-vogues-internatio nal-approach-to-audience-data-helped-it-reach-record-readers/.

Barnard, S.R. (2018). Tweeting #Ferguson. *New Media and Society*, 20 (7), 2252–2271.

Barnard, M. (ed.) (2020). *Fashion Theory: A Reader*. London: Routledge.

Beer, D. (2017). The Social Power of Algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20 (1), 1–13.

Bolin, G. (2016). *Value and the Media*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J.E. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–58). Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). Le champ littéraire. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 89, September, 3–46.

Bourdieu, P. (1996a). *Distinction*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1996b). *The Rules of Art*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bourdieu, P. (2015a). *Sociologie Générale I*. Paris: Seuil.

Bourdieu, P. (2015b). *Sociologie Générale II*. Paris: Seuil.

Bourdieu, P. and Delsaut, Y. (1975). Le couturier et sa griffe. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 1, 7–36.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity.

Breiter, A. and Hepp, A. (2018). The Complexity of Datafication. In A. Hepp, A. Breiter and U. Hasebrik (eds) *Communicative Figurations* (pp 387–404). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Bucher, T. (2018). *If…Then*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burberry (2021). Burberry. https://burberrycareers.com/job/London-Senior-Business-Analyst-Not/715461200/?jobPipeline=Indeed

Cardon, D. (2016). Deconstructing the Algorithm. In R. Seyfert and J. Roberge (eds) *Algorithmic Cultures* (pp. 95–110). London: Routledge.

Champagne, P. (1990). *Faire l'opinion*. Paris: Minuit.

Chitrakorn, K. (2021). Entertaiment Studios. *Vogue Business*. https://www.voguebusiness.com/beauty/entertainment-studios-should-beauty-brands-invest?utm_source=Vogue+Business&utm_campaign=37560931dd-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2021_04_21_05_39&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_5d1e7914df-37560931dd-58931108

Christin, A. (2020). *Metrics at Work*. Princeton University Press.

Collins, S. (2021). The Landscape of Fashion Is Changing but It's Still All about the Brand. The Fashion Law. https://www.thefashionlaw.com/the-landscape-of-fashion-retail-is-changing-but-its-still-all-about-the-brand/

Cotter, K. (2018). Playing the Visibility Game. *New Media & Society*, 21, 1–19.

Couldry, N. (2008). Mediatization of Mediation? *New Media & Society*, 10, 373–391.

Couldry, N. (2012). *Media Society World*. Cambridge: Polity.

Couldry, N. (2014a). Mediatization and the Future of Field Theory. In K. Lundby (ed.) *Mediatization of Communication* (pp. 227–248). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Couldry, N. (2014b). When Mediatization Hits the Ground (pp. 54–71). In A. Hepp and F. Krotz (eds) *Mediatized Worlds: Culture and Society in a Media Age*. New York: Macmillan.

Couldry, N. (2018). Tracing Capitalism's Turn to Data. *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 701–705.

Couldry, N. (2019) Is the "Field of Power" Really a Field? In F. Till and G. Bolin (eds) *Fritt Fran Fältet*, Södertörns Högskola.

Couldry, N. and Hepp, A. (2013). Conceptualizing Mediatization. *Communication Theory*, 23, 191–202.

Couldry, N. and Hepp, A. (2018). The Continuing Lure of Mediated Centre in Time of Deep Mediatization. *Media, Culture & Society*, 40 (1), 114–117.

Couldry N. and Yu, J. (2018). Deconstructing Datafication's Brave New World. *New Media & Society*, 20 (12), 4473–4491.

Dahlgren, P. (1996). Media Logic in Cyberspace. *Javnost – The Public*, 3 (3), 59–72.

Deacon, D. and Stanyer, J. (2014). Mediatization: Key Concept of Conceptual Bandwagon. *Media, Culture and Society*, 36 (7), 1–13. DOI: 10.1177/0163443714542218

Entwistle, J. and Rocamora, A. (2006). The Field of Fashion Materialized. *Sociology*, 40 (4), 735–751.

Evans, C. (2013). *The Mechanical Smile*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gillespie, T. (2014). The Relevance of Algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P.J. Boczkowski and K.A. Foot (eds) (pp. 167–193). *Media Technologies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gillespie, T. (2016). Algorithms. In Peters, B. (ed.) *Key Words: a vocabulary of information society and culture*.

Halliday, R. (2022). *The Fashion Show Goes Live*. London: Bloomsbury.

Hearn, A. (2010). Structuring Feeling. *Ephemera*, 10 (3/4), 421–438.
Hepp, A. (2013/2011). *Cultures of Mediatization*. Cambridge: Polity.
Hepp, A. (2016). Pioneer Communities. *Media, Culture and Society*, 38 (6), 918–933.
Hepp, A. (2020). *Deep Mediatization*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Hepp, A. and Hasebrink, U. (2018). Researching Transforming Communications in Times of Deep Mediatization. In A. Hepp, A. Breiter and U. Hasebrink (eds) *Communicative Figurations* (pp. 387–404). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Hjarvard, S. (2009). Soft Individualism. In K. Lundby (ed.) *Mediatization*. New York: Peter Lang, 159–177.
Holmes, D.E. (2017). *Big Data*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Jansson, A. (2015). Using Bourdieu in Critical Mediazation Research. *MedieKultur*, 58, 13–29.
Kitchin, R. (2014). *The Data Revolution*. Sage.
Kitchin, R. and Lauriault, T.P (2018). Toward Critical Data Studies. In J. Thatcher, A. Shears and J. Eckert (eds) *Thinking Big Data in Geography* (pp. 3–20). University of Nebraska Press.
Klear (2020). The Klear Influence Score. https://klear.com/what-is-influence
Klinger, U. and Svensson, J. (2018). The End of Media Logics? *New Media and Society*, 20 (12), 4653–4670.
Kristensen, Nete N. and Christensen, Christa L. (2017). The Mediatization of Fashion. In O. Driessens, G. Bolin, A. Hepp and S. Hjarvards (eds) *Dynamics of Mediatization* (pp. 225–245). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Krotz, F. (2007). The Meta-Process of "Mediatization" as a Conceptual Frame. *Global Media and Communication*, 3 (3), 256–260.
Landerer, N. (2013). Rethinking the Logics. *Communication Theory*, 23, 239–258.
Lindell, J. (2017). Bringing Field Theory to Social Media. *Social Media + Society*, Oct.–Dec., 1–11.
Lundahl, O. (2020). Algorithmic Meta-Capital, *Information, Communication and Society*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1864006
Lupton, D. (2016). *The Quantified Self*. Cambridge: Polity.
Lyst (2020). About. https://www.lyst.co.uk/about/
Mau, S. (2019/2017). *The Metric Society*. Cambridge: Polity.
Mayer-Schönberger, V. and Cukier, K. (2013). *Big Data*. London: John Murray.
McDowell, M. (2021). Digital Wholesaling Invites New Perks, New Complications. https://www.voguebusiness.com/technology/digital-wholesaling-invites-new-perks-new-complications (accessed 24-02-21).
McKinsey (2020). https://www.mckinsey.com/~/media/mckinsey/business%20functions/organization/our%20insights/to%20emerge%20stronger%20from%20the%20covid%2019%20crisis%20companies%20should%20start%20reskilling%20their%20workforces%20now/to-emerge-stronger-from-the-covid-19-crisis.pdf
Morozov (2015). Digital Technologies and the Future of Data Capitalism. Socialeurope. https://www.socialeurope.eu/digital-technologies-and-the-future-of-data-capitalism
Nieborg, D.B. and Poell, T. (2018). The Platformization of Cultural Production. *New Media & Society*, 20 (11), 1–18.
Nieborg, D.B. and Poell, T. (2019). The Platformization of Making Media. In M. Deuze and M. Pringer (eds) *Making Media* (pp. 85–96). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Porter, T.M. (1995). *Trust in Numbers*. Princeton University Press.
Rocamora, A. (2009). *Fashioning the City*. London: I.B. Tauris.
Rocamora, A. (2013). New Fashion Times. In S. Black, A. de la Haye, J. Entwistle, A. Rocamora, R. Root and H. Thomas (eds) *The Handbook of Fashion Studies* (pp. 61–77). Oxford: Berg.
Rocamora, A. (2017). Mediatization and Digitization in the Field of Fashion. *Fashion Theory*, 21 (5), 505–522.
Rocamora, A. (2018). Mediatization and Digital Retail. In A. Geczy and V. Karaminas (eds) *The End of Fashion* (pp. 99–112). London: Bloomsbury.
Rocamora, A. (2019). #parisienne. In V. Steele (ed.) *Paris, Capital of Fashion* (pp. 164–181). London: Bloomsbury.
Rocamora, A. (2022). Datafication and the Quantification of Fashion: The Case of Fashion Influencers. *Fashion Theory*. https://doi.org/10.1080/1362704X.2022.2048527
Sadowski, J. (2019). When Data Is Capital. *Big Data and Society*, 19 (Jan.–June), 1–12.
Simmel, G. (1957). Fashion. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 62 (6), 541–558.
Steele, V. (2017). *Paris Fashion*. London: Bloomsbury.
Strömbäck, J. (2008). Four Phases of Mediatization. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13 (3), 228–46.
Strömbäck, J. and Dimitrova, D. (2014). Mediatization and Media Interventionism. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 16 (1), 30–49.
Turow, J. (2017). *The Aisles Have Eyes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Van Dijck, J. (2014). Datafication, Dataism and Dataveillance. *Surveillance & Society* 12 (2), 197–208.
Van Dijck, J. and Poell, T. (2013). Understanding Social Media Logic. *Media and Communication*, 1 (1), 2–14.
Van Dijck, J., Poell, T. and de Waal, M. (2018). *The Platform Society*. Oxford University Press.
Veblen, T. (1994/1899). *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Dover.
Wade Morris, J. (2015). Curation by Code. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 18 (4–5), 446–463.
Yu, A. (2019). Fashion Careers: What Does a Fashion Data Analyst Do? https://fashionunited.uk/news/fashion/fashion-careers-what-does-a-fashion-data-analyst-do/2019041942753