



Fashion Theory

The Journal of Dress, Body and Culture

ISSN: 1362-704X (Print) 1751-7419 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rfft20>

Mediatization and Digital Media in the Field of Fashion

Agnès Rocamora

To cite this article: Agnès Rocamora (2017) Mediatization and Digital Media in the Field of Fashion, *Fashion Theory*, 21:5, 505-522, DOI: [10.1080/1362704X.2016.1173349](https://doi.org/10.1080/1362704X.2016.1173349)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1362704X.2016.1173349>



Published online: 27 Apr 2016.



Submit your article to this journal 



Article views: 2640



View related articles 



View Crossmark data 



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles 

Mediatization and Digital Media in the Field of Fashion

Agnès Rocamora

Dr. Agnès Rocamora is a Reader in Social and Cultural Studies at the London College of Fashion, University of the Arts London. She is the author of *Fashioning the City: Paris, Fashion and the Media*. Her writing on the field of fashion and on the fashion media has appeared in various journals, including *Fashion Theory*, *Journalism Practice*, *Sociology*, *Sociétés* and the *Journal of Consumer Culture*. She is a

Abstract

This article shows the relevance of the concept of “mediatization” for understanding the contemporary field of fashion and its relation to digital media. It first gives an overview of definitions of mediatization. It then shows that the production of fashion, such as the staging of catwalk shows and the design of collections, is being molded by and for the media, as is its retailing. Finally, the article discusses the relation between the wearing of cosmetics and the use of digital cameras in the fashioning of the self to argue that the mediatization of fashion reaches out to ordinary practices of the self, a mediatized self.

co-editor of *Thinking Through Fashion: A Guide to Key Theorists*, of *The Handbook of Fashion Studies* and of *Fashion Media: Past and Present*. She is also a co-founder and co-editor of the *International Journal of Fashion Studies*.
a.rocamora@fashion.arts.ac.uk

KEYWORDS: mediatization, digital media, fashion shows, makeup, selfies

Introduction

“Social media have ‘flattened fashion’”: thus reads the headline of a September 2015 article devoted to French designer Alber Elbaz, then artistic director at Lanvin. Arguing that screens and social media have “flattened fashion a bit” Elbaz observes that:

On social media you only see the front (of an outfit) [...] When I am at a fitting with women, not just celebrities, before they even look at or touch the dress and move with it, they take a picture of themselves to see how it photographs! (Fashionmag.com 2015)

In this quote Elbaz draws attention to the relation between fashion design and social media, suggesting that with the latter the photogenic dimension of a dress has become more important than its tactile, material quality. In doing so he also hints at the possible transformations of fashion practices related to the proliferation of social media: the transformation of design practices (only the front of an outfit seems to matter), as well as that of buying fashion (today clothes need to photograph well to sell well).

In stating that social media and digital screens have flattened fashion Elbaz is embracing a technological determinism that fails to capture the complexities of the relationship between the technological and the social. However, his words usefully point to the significance of digital media in today’s field of fashion and to the changes that have been taking place with the field’s adoption of those media. In the present article I unpack this significance by applying the notion of mediatization to the field of fashion—that is, I discuss the ways various practices of fashion have become shaped by and for digital media.

I first give an overview of definitions of mediatization. I then turn to instances of mediatization in the field of fashion in relation to digital media. I first look at the example of fashion shows, then move on to the topic of fashion retail, and finally turn to that of the interaction between makeup and digital cameras. I show that not only is the production of fashion, such as the staging of catwalk shows and the design of collections, being “moulded by” (Hepp 2013b) and for the media but so is its retailing and its everyday consumption, as evidenced by the relation between the wearing of cosmetics and the use of digital cameras. The mediatization of fashion reaches out to a variety of spheres including everyday life, pointing to the significance of this process in practices of the self, a mediatized self.

In this article, then, I show the relevance of “mediatization” for understanding the contemporary field of fashion and its relation to digital media. Conversely, I draw attention to the usefulness of fashion as a field through

which to further understand processes of mediatization. A situated bodily practice (Entwistle 2000) as well as the product of both material and symbolic production (Bourdieu 1993) fashion lends itself particularly well to an analysis of contemporary instances of mediatization both in terms of practices of production—that of catwalk producers, designers and brands, for instance, as I discuss below—as well as in terms of ordinary practices of consumption such as the fashioning of the self through the use of camera-ready makeup.

Mediatization and Digital Media

Although mediatization is not a new term—indeed some scholars have traced it back to the nineteenth century (Couldry and Hepp 2013, 195; Strömbäck and Dimitrova 2011, after Livingstone 2009b)—in recent years, it has been given a new lease of life in the fields of communication and the sociology of the media, and, in the process, it has been redefined. In the 1980s and 1990s, German and Northern European academics in particular started developing a strong body of work around this notion. It has since been appropriated by researchers from other countries, though it is still predominantly on the research agenda of mostly Northern European and British scholars (see Ampuja, Koivisto, and Väliverronen 2014; Couldry and Hepp 2013; Kaun and Fast 2014; but see also Strömbäck and Dimitrova 2011 for a comprehensive account of the rise of studies of “mediatization”).

Underpinning studies of mediatization is the idea that the media have become increasingly central to the shaping and doing of institutions and agents, to their practices and experiences. Various definitions have emerged from the literature, often pertaining to one of two approaches: the institutionalist and the constructionist (see also Deacon and Stanyer 2014; Hepp 2013a; Jensen 2013). With the former the media are conceived as an institution in its own right guided by independent rules and a “media logic,” a term I return to later, that is said to be shaping other fields and institutions; with the latter, focus is placed on the role of the media in the construction of social reality (see also Couldry and Hepp 2013; Finnemann 2011 for an overview of definitions of mediatization). However, what brings all mediatization scholars together is the notion that, “saturated with media” (Couldry 2012, 133), society cannot be thought of outside of its intertwining with them. The media, as Couldry puts it, have become “an irreducible dimension of all social processes” (137).

Thus, a distinction between mediation and mediatization is often drawn. Where mediation refers to the media as conveyors of meaning, to their role in the transmission and circulation of messages, mediatization refers to their *transformative* power (Cottle 2006; Hepp, Hjarvard, and Lundby 2015; Livingstone, 2009a; Lunt and Livingstone 2015; Strömbäck and Dimitrova 2011). For Cottle, for instance, mediatization means that “the

media have infiltrated into the rhythms and practices of everyday life as well as systems of governance and the conduct of societies more generally” (2006, loc 201). The media are “performative and constitutive” (201); Cottle talks about “media doing” (207).

For Hjarvard (2009, 160) mediatization is “the process whereby society to an increasing degree is submitted to, or becomes dependent on, the media and their logic.” Here Hjarvard is invoking a recurring concept in studies of mediatization: “media logic” (see, for instance, Rothenbuhler 2009; Schrott 2009; Strömbäck and Esser 2009), a term associated with the work of Altheide and Snow (1979) and their eponymous book. Media logic, they write, “consists of a form of communication; the process through which media present and transmit information” (10). This includes a medium’s “distinctive feature” and format—that is, the ways material is organized, selected and presented (Altheide 2013: 226). Altheide and Snow also insist on the idea that “media are the dominant force to which other institutions conform” (1979, 15).

Writing in the 1970s, the media the two scholars were discussing are what is often referred to now as traditional mass media—e.g. TV, radio, newspapers—in contrast with the new media of digital culture, and indeed much work on mediatization has tended to focus on traditional media, at the expense of investigating this process as taking place in relation to digital media (see also Finnemann 2011; Jensen 2013, 216). Strömbäck (2008, 243) acknowledges this when, noting that he has “focused on the traditional news media,” he also asks, in reference to the field of politics, “But what about the Internet? What are the implications of the Internet in terms of the mediatization of politics?” Thus some authors have argued that digitization and the proliferation of digital media mark a significant stage, or “wave,” following Hepp (2013a), in processes of mediatization (see also Adolf 2011). Yet apart from a few studies (see Couldry 2008; Finnemann 2011; Schulz 2004; Skjulstad 2009; Sumiali and Hakala 2010), mediatization as taking place in relation to digital media remains relatively neglected.

Focusing on mediatization as articulated through digital media means approaching mediatization as a differentiated process as opposed to a unified one, an idea the title of this article also captures: “*Mediatization and Digital Media in the Field of Fashion*.” This title aims for the precision that Deacon and Stanyer argue is often lacking in what they say is “the mediatization of ‘this-and-that’ scholarship that has developed, too often uncritically, and with a lack of precision in the definition of the term” (2014, 8; see also Deacon and Stanyer, 2015).

Looking at the mediatization of fashion in relation to digital media also means looking at contemporary processes of mediatization, therefore leaving open the possibility that forms of mediatization might vary depending on historical media genres, such as print, as opposed to digital, media. Only by conducting historical studies of mediatization will the historical reach and intensity of mediatization be ascertained. As Rothenbuhler puts

it: “How else could we know that something has been altered, is being done differently in interaction with the media, than through historical study” (2009, 281). In that respect a comprehensive study of the mediatization of the field of fashion would have to investigate this process as having been taking place since the birth of one of the first fashion media—often acknowledged as *Le Mercure Galant* in 1672—and especially with the proliferation of fashion media in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This is beyond the scope of this article. Here the contemporary time of digital fashion media is privileged.

Looking at mediatization in the field of fashion means looking at the ways practices of fashion—practices of production, consumption, distribution and diffusion—are articulated through the media, and, more crucially, are dependent on the media for their articulation. The interest is not on the idea of communicating fashion through the media but on *doing* fashion through the media (after Hjarvard 2013, 51, on politics). Investigating the mediatization of fashion, then, means looking at the ways fashion practices have adapted to, and been transformed by, the media. It does not mean focusing on the media themselves, but on the ways people and institutions in the field of fashion have changed their practices for and with the media. As Kaun and Fast put it, citing Asp, “the media *per se* are of secondary interest for mediatization research: ‘The theory of mediatization does not really focus on the media—the important thing is how people and different institutions adjust to the media’” (2014, 10–11). In the remainder of the article I focus on new practices in the staging of fashion shows, in the designing of collections, as well as in retail and in the use of cosmetics.

The Mediatization of Fashion Shows

When the first fashion shows started taking place in the late nineteenth century, they were the preserve of a social and financial elite (see Evans 2013). Throughout the twentieth century, and with the consolidation of fashion as a field with institutions of consecration and professionals such as designers, journalists, stylists and photographers (see Rocamora 2009), fashion shows, now also known as fashion week or the collections, became predominantly a trade event aimed at fashion insiders—the established players of the field of fashion—and organized around a strict calendar of presentations. In recent years, however, and correlated with the proliferation of digital media platforms, the shows have turned into media events—a public spectacle and entertainment addressed to a worldwide audience. The fashion industry has embraced digital media to the point that they are now intrinsic to and formative of many practices taking place in the industry and amongst fashion consumers, as I argue below starting with the example of fashion shows.

A key moment in the encounter between the collections and social media includes the presence of fashion bloggers on the front row of Dolce and

Gabbana's September 2009 collection and the live streaming, in September 2013, of Burberry's collection across 11 social networks, on the digital screens of its flagship store as well as on outdoor screens in places such as New York's Times Square and Hong Kong's World-Wide House (Strugatz 2013). A photo of the show's finale was retweeted 1200 times, whilst a video of it yielded 18,000 likes within a few hours on Instagram (Strugatz 2013). Since then, social media have become a staple of the shows, events increasingly geared at bringing the public in. For their summer 2015 Unique London collection Topshop created what they call a "Social catwalk" in collaboration with Facebook and Instagram. Some looks appeared simultaneously on the catwalk and on Facebook, and could be bought immediately. In September 2015 Givenchy opened their show to the public: 25,000 people registered (2000 of them within the first 2 seconds) for a chance to get access to one of the 850 tickets; 150 tickets were given to people from the local West Side area; and large screens projected the show live across the city (Ellison 2015). It is estimated that 6000 people saw the show (Ellison 2015). On 21 January 2016, Givenchy had 4.5 m Instagram followers, ahead of Asos' 3.8 m followers, and not far behind Burberry's 5.7 m followers, but with the likes of Louis Vuitton (9 m followers) and Nike (33.3 m followers) in the lead.

Thus digital platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat (Burberry previewed their Spring-Summer 2016 collection there), and the more recent Periscope (a live video streaming extension of Twitter) have become legitimate spaces of diffusion of the collections. In this context the shows are increasingly designed with social media in mind; they have become mediatized events—that is, events produced and staged with a view to being consumed online, on a digital screen. In July 2013, for instance, fashion show producer Alexandre de Bétak explained that the internet "has totally changed how we frame what we show, not just visually but also in time. [...] even the way I direct the models is affected by where some of the cameras for the webcast are placed" (cited in Anaya 2013). Shows are full of "made-for-instagram moments," as the *Business of Fashion* put it, end of the show "tableaus" having become common ready-to-be-instagrammed stagings (Amed 2013). Designer Tom Ford puts it thus:

Having a runway show has become so much about the creation of imagery for online and social media [...]. I wanted to think about how to present a collection in a cinematic way that was designed from its inception to be presented online. (Cited in Amed 2015)

Strömbäck and Esser (2009, 211) argue that "creation" is a dimension of mediatization in the sense that "the media makes other social actors *create* events with the main or sole purpose of being covered by the media." By being staged with a view to circulating online, fashion shows are increasingly becoming an instantiation of mediatization as creation, and so of the transformative power of digital media over fashion practices. Chanel's 2014 decision to design a catwalk in the shape of a supermarket, for

instance, with all the goods on display bearing the Chanel logo, cannot but be seen in the light of this mediatization of collections; nor can the hiring as models of popular Instagram figures such as Cara Delevingne, Kendall Jenner and Gigi Hadid (respectively 25.3 m, 46.2 m, 11.6 m followers on 11 January 2016). Before they rose to fame as models the latter two were already media celebrities through their association with reality TV shows, *Keeping Up with the Kardashians* for Jenner, and *The Real Housewives of Beverly Hills* for Hadid.

The mediatization of fashion is also concurrent with the mediatization of fashion design. Some designers, for instance, have discussed how their collection was conceived taking into account social media. This is the case of Alexander Wang, who says this of catwalk shows: “We try to think of the pictures that are going to come out online”—something he says he also takes into consideration when developing a collection (cited in Schneier 2014). He notes: “I have to admit, as a designer, you get into this trap of thinking about clothes for a picture rather than what’s going to go into the market or showroom” (cited in Schneier 2014.).

Similarly, discussing the September 2015 Paris collection, the *Business of Fashion* argues that “Alber Elbaz overtly created his collection with Instagram and image-making in mind” (Amed 2015), whilst the *Washington Post* notes of Olivier Rousteing’s Spring–Summer 2016 collection for Balmain:

these clothes look better in photographs than they do in reality. Which in these digital times is all too often the point. [...] Rousteing’s runway show is not about clothes or concepts. It is orchestrated to attract a million social media hits. It doesn’t matter whether the clothes are judged attractive or profoundly ugly by the professionals—the gatekeepers—in the room. The ultimate audience is those people [...] whose understanding of designer fashion, luxury and style has been shaped not by seeing couture craftsmanship up close but by the images of celebrities on the red carpet, the postings of celebrities on Instagram, the website advertising of luxury brands, the hyper-reality of the Kardashians [...] These clothes are not meant to be subtle because subtlety isn’t a strong suit of Twitter. Balmain has 193,000 followers on Twitter, 2.3 million on Instagram. (Givhan 2015)

Thus, drawing attention to the limitations of seeing clothes online rather than in the flesh, the *New York Times* hints at the problems associated with their being designed without consideration of social media:

Though several designers mentioned the ability of Instagrammers to capture a garment at more angles than before, intricacies of cut and construction can vanish when reduced to two dimensions. Shows that may be gripping live may be done little justice on-screen. Junya Watanabe’s fall collection, all in black (notoriously hard to photograph), was composed of pieces of many fabrics sewn together to

create a patchwork. On-screen, the nuances often failed to come through. (Schneier 2014)

In an interview with *Purple MAGAZINE*, fashion photographer Stephen Shore also draws attention to the impact digital screens and social media can have on a photographer's practices. Asked to comment on the ways appearance on the screen of a digital device affects a photograph's relationship to its object, he explains that "the most successful Instagram pictures are visually fairly simple. [...] they [photographers] are taking photos with the understanding that the picture will be seen in a relatively small size (the size of an image on a phone or iPad)." Commenting on what he says are "the new challenges" of Instagram, he mentions the fact that on this platform pictures are square, adding:

If you post a square picture, it comes out larger on the screen of the phone than if you post an oblong picture. It's as though Instagram is asking me to do a square picture, and I had not shot squares in 40 years! So, this is a challenge. [...] I'm figuring out how to use the square, and I'm figuring out what kind of picture works in this small size, and often I'm pushing it and seeing how complex a picture I can post, how detailed a picture will still work in such a small size. (Shore, cited in Dahan 2015)

In a similar vein in 2013, Christopher Bailey, then Chief Creative Officer of Burberry, discussed changes in the practices of selling clothes concurrent with the showing of the collections online, thereby hinting at the mediatised retail practices:

you can't just start live-streaming a show and then carry on doing everything else exactly the same as you were doing before. So we started doing this thing of "runway to reality", where you can click to buy as you're watching the shows. Shows traditionally were presented to the fashion buyers' industry, but if you're inviting the public, you can't suddenly tell them that they have to work in the way that the industry works and you have to wait another six months before they can get their hands on the clothes. (Cited in Johnston 2013)

Not only have fashion shows become mediatised then, but so has fashion retail, as I now elaborate on looking at the examples of Burberry's flagship store in London, and of the use of digital mirrors in retail spaces.

The Mediatisation of Fashion Retail

Burberry's London flagship store was opened in 2012, after the website; "after" both in the sense that the latter predates the former, but in the sense

too that the website informed the store's architecture. Journalist Robert Johnston (2013) puts it thus:

The store itself is designed to echo how visitors navigate the website so, for example, when you walk into the building, the first thing you discover is a space containing the whole collection, much like landing on the home page online, and as you move through, the offer becomes increasingly more specific as you "click through" the world of Burberry.

Trench coats, for instance, are in a single section, as they are online. As Angela Ahrendts, CEO of Burberry at the time of the Regent Street opening, stated in the store's press release:

Burberry Regent Street brings our digital world to life in a physical space for the first time, where customers can experience every facet of the brand through immersive multimedia content exactly *as they do online*. Walking through the doors is just like walking into our website. It is Burberry World Live. (Ahrendts 2012, emphasis added)

Burberry's take on physical space draws attention to the importance of online platforms in the conception of bricks-and-mortar environments, and to the possible redefinition of one's practice of physical spaces under the influence of digital media. In the context of the transnational reach of websites it is likely that many consumers will have encountered a brand or retailer online before they experience the physical shop; their expectations and visions of the latter will have been informed by their online experience, and their entry into the physical space partly shaped, therefore, by their use of the website.

In the Burberry store online and offline worlds also meet by way of the many digital screens that can be found throughout the shop floor. They display lavish images of the products and promotional films that narrate, and produce, the Burberry brand. Sales assistants walk the floor armed with iPads allowing them to check a product's availability. This meeting of online and offline stores is a growing strategy of retailers. At Burberry, for instance, 20% of digital sales are "collect-in-store" and 25% are bought on iPads (Drum 2015). Various retailers and brands offer the possibility to order an item directly from a touchscreen made available to consumers in their bricks-and-mortar stores. Digital screens have turned into shop windows accessible from home, on the move as well as at physical points of sale, as is also the case, for instance, at the Rebecca Minkoff stores in San Francisco and New York (Holmes 2014). In the former, *Wired* magazine also reports,

the mirrors come alive. Walk into the fitting room with, say, a blouse and a jacket, and the dark glass lights up with a suggested handbag

to match. You can browse the racks at the upscale fashion boutique or swipe through “looks” on massive touchscreens. If you see something you like, you tap in your phone number, and you’ll get a text when it’s ready to try on. (Wohlsen 2014)

Jansson (2013, 280) draws attention to “the close relationship between mediatization and sociospatial transformations,” which includes what he calls “mediated/mediatized mobility” to refer to the blurring of “the distinctions between texts and contexts; between symbolic and material spaces, and makes the settings of media use (production and consumption) increasingly fluid.” The coming together of online and offline practices of shopping participates in such mediatized mobility. In that respect, not only has shopping become mediatized but so has space. One’s movement through retail spaces has become tightly linked to one’s practice of digital screens, screens which can also orient one’s trajectory through urban space. This is the case, for instance, of a smart phone app introduced by the Crown Estate in London in 2014 to promote commerce on the Regent Street. The app uses Beacon technology to alert passers-by through their mobile phones of product discounts and other promotions (Chmielewski 2014). The visitors’ phone guides them through the street, inviting them to engage with goods they will have first encountered on a screen. The iTunes app descriptors reads: “The exciting new Regent Street app is your key to exploring the very best of London shopping and dining; planning visits; and receiving introductions to great brands, restaurants, and events that align with your personal interests.” One’s wandering through urban space has become shaped by one’s use of media tools turning *flânerie* into a mediatized experience.

Digital screens, then, are becoming a recurrent feature of the practice of shopping, the images they display adding an aesthetic layer to the goods consumers engage with. In the Burberry flagship store an electronic chip has been inserted in various items to trigger a screen that will display enticing images of the goods in question. Handbags, for instance, can be placed on a digitized table located next to a large screen, which immediately features aestheticized visuals of the bag. Customers are left to engage with its representation rather than with the bag itself. Trench coats in fitting rooms trigger a digital mirror that shows images of the coat as worn on the catwalk. Similarly, in the fitting room of Rebecca Minkoff’s flagship store in New York:

the technology—powered by eBay—again overlays the mirror [...] RFID tags recognize each item brought in, and shoppers can pull up product screens that show the item styled with different looks, as well as other available sizes and colors, *much like you would find when shopping online.* (Milnes 2015, emphasis added)

One is invited to shop in physical space as one would “when shopping online,” the screen being ever present, grafting a flow of visuals onto the

materiality of the objects engaged with, thereby emphasizing their symbolic dimension and further turning the consumption of things into the consumption of images. A few years ago Wilson (1985, 157) wrote that “increasingly it has been the image as well as the artefact that the individual has purchased.” In the context of the mediatization of retail this dematerialization of fashion seems to be truer than ever. As Jansson also notes of the mediatization of consumption, an instance of which can be found in the mediatization of retail: “Due to the mediatization process, which is integral to reflexive accumulation, most kinds of consumer goods have become increasingly image-loaded, taking on meanings in relation to media texts, other commodity-signs, entire lifestyles, and so on” (2002, 6).

Still in the early stages of their development, technologies such as digital mirrors, also known as magic mirrors and interactive mirrors, are also a means for retailers to generate media noise; they grant attention in stores as well as away from them, in the media. In that respect too, retailers’ redesigning of the shop floor and merchandising of goods can be seen as an illustration of the mediatization of retail: retail practices are being “moulded by” (Hepp 2013b) and for the media.

When connected to social media, digital mirrors can also become spaces of communication. Neiman Marcus, Adidas and Diesel, for instance, have all experimented with the technology. In Spain the latter have equipped their stores with “Diesel Cam,” which enables shoppers to photograph themselves with the clothes they are trying on and immediately post the photo on their Facebook page (O’Neill 2010). Fashioning oneself in a shop becomes a practice further intertwined with the media, a mediatized practice of sharing and connecting with others through digital screens turned digital mirrors. Indeed, such screens draw attention to the role of new technologies in practices of the self, a self fashioned for and enacted through the media, a mediatized self, as I now discuss looking at the connection between digital cameras and makeup.

The Mediatization of the (Fashionable) Self

Thanks to webcams or the front-facing cameras of their computers, beauty bloggers and vloggers regularly use digital screens as mirrors onto which they monitor and project themselves whilst projecting their image to their audience, as I elaborate on elsewhere (Rocamora 2011). There, discussing the ways technologies of the screens turn digital surfaces into reflective surfaces—mirrors—I draw on the work of Foucault (1988) to argue that computer screens, like traditional glass mirrors, are “technologies of the self.” Similarly, magic mirrors can be seen as new technologies of the self, a “networked self” (Papacharissi 2011)—that is, a self envisaged, constructed and practiced as an image that is intended for a connected audience of Facebook friends and other social network relations. It is a self to be

shared and circulated online, a mediatized self, as the other contemporary ubiquitous practice of the screen, and of the self—the selfie—also shows.

In her study of selfies Warfield draws attention to the multimodality of smartphones in their capacity as “*camera, stage, and mirror*” (2015, 1). In a selfie, she writes, one is both a model and “a self-reflecting embodied subject with a mirror (the #realme)” (4). It is a subject that “is negotiated, performed and mediated” (5), or rather mediatized, in that it is a self that is practiced to appear online, as an image to be shared and circulated on a digital screen, and so needs to be fashioned accordingly. Indeed, social media users can draw on a variety of techniques to style themselves for an audience. Clothes are one possibility, as personal style blogs illustrate (see Rocamora 2011); so is makeup.

A 2011 advertisement for Make Up For Ever’s “HD foundation” shows actor Blake Lively reclining on an armchair, her arm stretched out holding a camera phone at which she stares, a position typical of selfies. In drawing attention to the use of makeup to style oneself for, and as, an image, the advertisement points to the idea of the mediatization of the self, its enactment for the media, but also to the idea of the mediatization of commodities, here makeup. The advertisement is for a type of foundation that is supposed to enhance one’s appearance in the context not of a face-to-face interaction, but as an image on a digital screen.

There is now a wide variety of “camera ready,” “high-definition” or “photo-ready” cosmetics, as they are often called, which are meant to improve one’s appearance on a digital screen by being suited to the demands of digital cameras and their high resolution. Indeed, such cameras pick up details and pigments in ways that analogue cameras do not (Musburger and Kindem 2009), often emphasizing and making visible on-screen shades and textures that are invisible off-screen. Thus makeup brand CoverGirl have started designing and testing their foundation in various modes of lighting, including for selfies, so as to ensure it will translate well on the screen of a mobile phone (Rubin 2015). Sarah Vickery, CoverGirl’s principal scientist, tells the story of the making of Outlast Stay Luminous Foundation. She explains that because such long-wear foundations can look “dead” on a picture, mica particles were added to the formula to create more luminosity. However an iPhone test showed that they appeared glittery on the screen, and so the company reworked the product to find a good balance between shine and longevity, ensuring that the foundation would translate well on-screen. Vickery states: “We’ve got one type of consumer who is constantly taking pictures, and what really matters to her and her social group is how she looks in a selfie” (cited in Rubin 2015).

Similarly, David Factor, founder of Smashbox makeup company observes: “We’re responding to the growing demands of the selfie generation by offering new light-reflecting properties in our formulas which offer that instant filter quality” (cited in Peter 2015, 49). The article lists makeup products that can “filter imperfections,” “blur and smooth your skin,” “airbrush your lips,” “change your hue,” whilst “beauty specialist”

Victoria Buchanan is quoted saying: “We’re now equipped with the tools to create a more ‘perfect’ version of ourselves on screen” (in Peter 2015, 49.). Thus fashion magazines now regularly invoke social media when describing products on their pages. *Grazia UK*, for instance, talks about “Brows with Selfie Appeal” (25 May 2015, 97) and “#InstantCheekbones” in reference to a sculpting stick, also adding “Instagram is where this hero really comes into its own” (100). In another issue the magazine describes a new blusher as “extremely Instagrammable” (27 July 2015, 96).

Couldry (2012, 49) insists on the importance of “showing” as a social practice related to new media, also arguing that the “multiple forms of ‘showing’ illustrate how social and public space is being rekeyed via mediated-related practices.” In a context in which meeting peers off the screen, at a party for instance, is tightly linked to the practice of showing in that it will probably result in one’s picture appearing on social media thanks to the likely presence of camera phones at the point of encounter, it makes sense to think that, for some women, being “camera-ready” by way of the “right” use of makeup may have become built into one’s ritual when getting ready to go out. The sheer abundance of blogs and vlogs devoting space to “camera ready makeup tutorials” and tips aimed at instructing users how to make up their face for the screen suggests this practice is widely shared. One blogger, Celina (*bycelina.com*), for instance, advises her readers:

If your skin is very dry you can use a foundation, but I recommend using a powder as the finish will look better on camera. [...] To finish off I applied my favourite fake eye lashes. The lashes are far too long in real life, but they always look amazing on camera. (Celina 2012)

In response to a comment by a reader on cameras picking up Sun Protection Factors (SPFs) in a product, another reader notes: “Armani LS is indeed a very photogenic foundation! I have also heard from others that Vitalumiere doesn’t cause flashback despite the SPF ... I will definitely try it eventually!”

Drawing on Bourdieu’s notion of doxa—the tacit agreement on the legitimacy of the stakes, issues and concepts fought over in a field (see, for instance, Bourdieu 1997)—Jansson identifies “texture” as one of the ways through which media “become part of communicational doxa” (2015, 21), thereby supporting the mediatization of everyday life and “ritual dependence” on media technologies. Camera phones have become part of the “texture” of everyday life and point to the normalizing of “certain expectations of positionality and regularity with regards to media practices” (Jansson 2015, 21), and, one can add, to attendant practices of the self, such as beauty rituals.

The use of makeup to fashion oneself for the screen, and the related practice of selfies, draw attention to the idea of mediatization as an ordinary phenomenon and micro-process, both dimensions which, as some

scholars have observed, have been neglected in the literature on mediatization (see also Kaun and Fast 2014). Knoblauch (2013, 310), for instance, insists on the importance of looking at mediatization at the micro-level of social interaction, whilst Jansson (2015, 27) notes that it is only by looking into routinized mundane practices of communication “that we will be able to see how mediatization is socially realized and shaped through embodied practice.” The use of cosmetics is one such embodied, routinized practice. So is one’s wearing of a dress, during a fitting, for instance, as in the example mentioned by Elbaz in the introduction, or in a changing room equipped with magic mirrors, and so is one’s strolling through a store or a street, all practices which point to the mediatization of everyday life.

Conclusion

The examples I have discussed in this article show that the adoption of digital media by fashion producers and consumers is concurrent with the adoption of new ways of producing and consuming fashion, from the production of fashion shows and garments to the retailing of clothes and the fashioning of the self; from the exclusive world of the fashion producer to ordinary practices of the self. In the present article, then, I hope to have shown that “mediatization” constitutes a useful analytical tool for thinking through some of the changes that are currently taking place in the field of fashion in relation to digital media. Conversely, thinking mediatization through the field of fashion and digital media allows for an understanding of processes of mediatization as anchored to the particularities of historical time. Understanding contemporary fashion practices also means understanding practices of digital media. “Mediatization” is the tool that sheds light on the ways such practices meet.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

Adolf, M. 2011. “Clarifying Mediatization: Sorting through a Current Debate.” *Empedocles* 3 (2): 153–175.

Ahrends. 2012. “Burberry World Love Arrives in London”. http://www.burberryplc.com/media_centre/press_releases/2012/burberry-world-live-arrives-in-london.

Altheide, D. 2013. “Media Logic, Social Control, and Fear.” *Communication Theory* 23: 223–238.

Altheide, D., and R. P. Snow. 1979. *Media Logic*. London: Sage.

Amed, I. 2013. "Fashion's Made-For-Instagram Moments". <http://www.businessoffashion.com/2013/07/fashions-made-for-instagram-moments.html>.

Amed, I. 2015. "Why Stage Fashion Shows?" <http://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/week-in-review/why-stage-fashion-shows>.

Ampuja, M., J. Koivisto, and E. Väliverronen. 2014. "Strong and Weak Forms of Mediatization Theory: A Critical Review." *Nordicom Review* 35: 111–123.

Anaya, S. 2013. "The Creative Class: Alexandre de Bétak, Fashion Show and Event Producer". <http://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/creative-class/the-creative-class-alexandre-de-betak-fashion-show-and-event-producer>.

Bourdieu, P. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge: Polity.

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

'Celina'. 2012. "How to get photoshoot ready." Accessed June 11 2015. <http://bycelina.com/beauty-2/makeup-tutorials/makeup-tutorial-how-to-get-photoshoot-ready/>.

Chmielewski, D. 2014. "Iconic London Shopping Street Gets Latest Accessory: Beacons". <http://recode.net/2014/06/02/iconic-london-shopping-street-gets-latest-accessory-beacons/>.

Cottle, S. 2006. *Mediatized Conflict*. Kindle for Ipad edition: Maidenhead Open University Press.

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

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

Couldry, N., and A. Hepp. 2013. "Conceptualizing Mediatization: Contexts, Traditions, Arguments." *Communication Theory* 23: 191–202..

Coulter. 2015. "Fashionable Magazine". <https://contently.com/strategist/2015/04/27/fashionable-content-how-asos-built-a-brand-mag-with-over-500000-monthly-readers/>.

Dahan, A. 2015. "Stephen Shore: On Photography vs Instagram". <http://purple.fr/article/stephen-shore/>.

Deacon, D., and J. Stanyer. 2014. "Mediatization: key concept or conceptual bandwagon?" *Media, Culture & Society*: 1–13.

Deacon, D. and Stanyer, J. 2015. "Mediatization and' or 'Mediatization of? A response to Hepp et al". *Media, Culture & Society* 37 (4): 655–657

Drum (The). 2015. "Burberry's Snapchat and Periscope campaigns deliver a record 100 m impressions". <http://www.thedrum.com/news/2015/07/16/burberry-s-snapchat-and-periscope-campaigns-deliver-record-100-m-impressions>.

Ellison, J. 2015. "We'll take Manhattan". <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/2/127bf2f6-558d-11e5-a28b-50226830d644.html>.

Entwistle, J. 2000. *The Fashioned Body*. Cambridge: Polity.

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

Fashionmag.com 2015. “Alber Elbaz: les réseaux sociaux ont ‘aplati la mode’”. Accessed September 10 2015. http://m.fr.fashionmag.com/news/Alber-Elbaz-les-reseaux-sociaux-...lati-la-mode,568513.htm#utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email.

Finnemann, N. O. 2011. “Mediatization theory and digital media.” *Communications* 36: 67–89.

Foucault, M. 1988. *Technologies of the Self: Seminar with Michel Foucault*. London: Tavistock.

Givhan, R. 2015. “At Balmain those aren’t clothes on the runway, they’re a social media moment”. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/arts-and-entertainment/wp/2015/10/02/at-balmain-those-arent-clothes-on-the-runway-theyre-a-social-media-moment/>.

Hepp, A. 2013a. “The Communicative Figurations of Mediatized Worlds”. *Communicative Figurations*: 1.

Hepp, A. 2013b [2011]. *Cultures of Mediatization*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hepp, A., S. Hjarvard, and K. Lundby. 2015. “Mediatization: theorizing the interplay between media, culture and society.” *Media, Culture & Society* 37 (2): 1–11.

Hjarvard, S. 2009. “Soft Individualism: Media and the Changing Social Character.” In *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*, edited by K. Lundby, 159–177. New York: Peter Lang.

Hjarvard, J. 2013. *The Mediatization of Culture and Society*. Oxon: Routledge.

Holmes, E. 2014. “Designer Rebecca Minkoff’s New Stores have Touch Screens for an Online Shopping Experience”. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/designer-rebeccaminkoffs-new-stores-have-touch-screens-for-an-online-shopping-experience-1415748733>.

Jansson, A. 2002. “The Mediatization of Consumption: Towards an analytical framework of image culture.” *Journal of Consumer Culture* 2 (5): 5–31.

Jansson, A. 2013. “Mediatization and Social Space: Reconstructing Mediatization for the Transmedia Age.” *Communication Theory* 23: 279–296.

Jansson, A. 2015. “Using Bourdieu in Critical Mediatization Research.” *MedieKultur* 58: 13–29.

Jensen, K. B. 2013. “Definitive and Sensitizing Conceptualizations of Mediatization.” *Communication Theory* 23: 203–222.

Johnston, R. 2013. “Leading Lights”. <http://www.gq-magazine.co.uk/style/articles/2013-03/05/christopher-bailey-burberry-designer-interview>.

Kaun, A., and Fast, K. 2014. *Mediatization of Culture and Everyday Life*. Mediastudier vid Södertörns högskola: 1. Karlstad University Studies.

Knoblauch, H. 2013. “Communicative Constructivism and Mediatization.” *Communication Theory* 23: 297–315.

Livingstone, S. 2009a. “Foreword: coming to terms with ‘mediatization’.” In *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*, edited by K. Lundby, ix–xi. New York: Peter Lang.

Livingstone, S. 2009b. "On the mediation of everything: ICA."

Lunt, P., and S., Livingstone 2015. "Is 'Mediatization' the next Paradigm for our field? A Commentary on Deacon and Stanyer (2014, 2015) and Hepp, Hjarvard and Lundby (2015)". <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/63409/>.

Milnes, H. 2015. "How tech in Rebecca Minkoff's fitting rooms tripled expected clothing sales". http://digiday.com/brands/rebecca-minkoff-digital-store/?utm_content=e8a&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=buffer.

Musburger, R. B., and G. Kindem. 2009. *Introduction to Media Production*. Oxford: Elsevier.

O'Neill, M. 2010. "Diesel Cam Brings Facebook to the Fitting Room". <http://www.adweek.com/socialtimes/diesel-cam-brings-facebook-to-the-fitting-room/317460>.

Papacharissi, Z., ed. 2011. *A Neworked Self*. London: Routledge.

Peter, S. (2015). "#No Filter Make-Up". *Stylist*, May 27: 271.

Rocamora, A. 2009. *Fashioning the City: Paris, Fashion and the Media*. London: IB Tauris.

Rocamora, A. 2011. "Personal Fashion Blogs: Screens and Mirrors in Digital Self-portraits." *Fashion Theory* 15 (4): 407–424.

Rothenbuhler. 2009. "Continuities: Communicative Form and Institution-alization." In *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*, edited by K. Lundby, 277–292. New York: Peter Lang.

Rubin, C. 2015. "Makeup for the Selfie Generation." http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/24/fashion/selfie-new-test-makeup...c=edit_li_20150924&nl=nytliving&nlid=71339939&ref=headline&_r=1.

Schneier, M. 2014. "Fashion in the Age of Instagram." http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/10/fashion/fashion-in-the-age-of-instagram.html?_r=0.

Schrott, A. 2009. "Dimensions: Catch-All Label or Technical Term." In *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*, edited by K. Lundby, 41–61. New York: Peter Lang.

Schulz, W. 2004. "Reconstructing Mediatization as an Analytical Concept." *European Journal of Communication* 19: 86–101.

Sherman, L. 2015. "Inside Fashion Instagram Wars." <http://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/intelligence/fashion-instagram-brands-social-media-proenza-schouler-calvin-klein>.

Skjulstad, S. 2009. "Dressing up: The Mediatization of Fashion Online." In *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*, edited by K. Lundby, 179–202. New York: Peter Lang.

Strömbäck, J. 2008. "Four Phases of Mediatization." *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 13 (3): 228–246.

Strömbäck, J., and D. V. Dimitrova. 2011. "Mediatization and Media Interventionism: A Comparative Analysis of Sweden and the United States." *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 16 (1): 30–49.

Strömbäck, J., and F. Esser. 2009. "Shaping Politics: Mediatization and Media Interventionism." In *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*, edited by K. Lundby, 205–223. New York: Peter Lang.

Strugatz, R. 2013. "Burberry's Spring Show Goes Global." <http://www.wwd.com/media-news/digital/burberrys-spring-show-goes-global-7160355/print-preview/>.

Sumiala, J., and Hakala, S. 2010. "Crisis: Mediatization of Disaster in the Nordic Media Sphere." In *The Nordic Countries and the World. Perspectives from Research on Media and Communication*, edited by Teok-sessa Broddason, \xE9orbjörn; Kivikuru, Ullamaija; Tufte, Birgitte; Weibull, Lennart & \x88stbye, Helge (toim), 361–378. G\xf6teborg: Nordicom.

Warfield, K. 2015. "Digital Subjectivities and Selfies." *The International Journal of the Image* 6 (2): 1–16.

Wilson, E. 1985. *Adorned in Dreams*. London: I. B. Tauris.

Wohlsen, M. 2014. "eBay's magic mirrors will give shoppers fashion advice". <http://www.wired.co.uk/news/archive/2014-11/28/ebay-magic-mirrors>.