Guest Editorial
The Success and Failure of Media Education

David Buckingham, Loughborough University

Editors' Comment: The stories we tell ourselves about media education have been a recurring theme in MERJ – see previous issues for our provocation on the deficiency of pedagogic research in the field; our retrospective analysis of the 'Media 2.0' debate; our re-publishing of Dan Laughey's Back to Basics polemic and our recent attempt to 'take stock' of ourselves in the light of Leverson. And yet we make no apology for returning once again to 'the state we're in' here, as Professor David Buckingham, to say the least a notable and influential academic and practitioner in the field, provides this guest editorial, following his keynote on the same theme at the 2013 Media Education Summit. RB & JMcD

For a variety of reasons, media educators in the UK are currently on the defensive. Although media education might appear to be quite well established, both in schools and in higher education, we continue to find ourselves under attack – or at least ridiculed and derided – and we increasingly have to fight our corner. Of course, it is vital that we proclaim the importance and necessity of what we do; but perhaps there are also some grounds for self-reflection, and even self-criticism.

Some months ago, Professor James Curran of Goldsmiths gave a very articulate defence of Media Studies at the MeCCSA conference.[1] Although I would not dissent from much of what he said, I want to give a bit more space here to the failures as well as the successes of media education. It is worth noting that Curran was defending Media Studies – the academic discipline, primarily as it exists in universities – whereas my concern is with media *education* – that is, with *teaching and learning* about media, at all levels. I do not believe we can or should separate questions of teaching and learning from questions about knowledge; and I am particularly interested in adding schools to this picture – which is something James Curran didn't even mention. In the process, I want to raise a few critical questions about this defence of Media Studies or media education. Why are we (still) defending ourselves? What are we defending? Are we all defending the same thing? And is it all defensible?

A success story

Most readers of this journal could probably rehearse the defence of media education in their sleep. Most of us will have encountered attacks on the field, or at least some sharp questioning, both in the wider media debate and perhaps from some of our colleagues. And many of us have probably produced our own defences for different audiences.[2] We all know the arguments about the importance of the media, to society, to politics, to the economy and to everyday life. The implication that we would not or should not study something as self-evidently important as media – which is the view of some of our critics – seems not just profoundly reactionary, but utterly bizarre.

There is a great deal of evidence of the success of Media Studies as a subject. When they have the choice, students clearly want to study it, not because they are wasters or fantasists or just badly informed or misled (again, as the critics patronisingly imply) but because, like us, they know that the media are central to social life in the modern world.

Media Studies in universities has expanded dramatically over the past twenty years, although the evidence here is somewhat mixed. A recent report from the Higher Education Policy Institute (Ramsden, 2012) found that the number of universities offering Media Studies courses had tripled between 1996 and 2009, and that the number of applications for such courses had doubled (well outstripping general expansion in the sector as a whole). On the other hand, a 2011 report by Universities UK found that student numbers in 'mass communications and documentation' had grown by just under nineteen percent since 2003 – not much more than the average across the sector, and significantly less than in STM subjects. Within that category, numbers for Media Studies and Journalism had grown faster than other areas; but even so, the proportion of the overall undergraduate student cohort has actually remained constant, at just over three percent (Universities UK, 2011).

Equally, the expansion in schools has been quite phenomenal, at least until the last couple of years. Numbers of students taking AS and A2 examinations grew four-fold under the last government, albeit from a very low base.[3] More recently, examination board statistics showed an increase of fifteen percent between 2007 and 2010 – although again this was less marked than in some other subjects, and there has been a drop-off in the last few years (to be discussed below).

One can also argue that Media Studies (or Cultural Studies) has been very successful as an academic discipline. It has had a profound and lasting influence on other disciplines such as sociology, art history, geography and literature; and as Curran points out, British work in this field has been influential on a global scale, which is reflected in the numbers of international students who want to come here to study. We can say the same about British approaches to media education at a school level: the British 'model' of media

education – the 'key concepts' approach developed in the 80s and 90s – has informed approaches to media education worldwide.

The discourse of derision

Yet despite its apparent success, the criticisms of Media Studies do not go away. Indeed, if anything, the more successful it is, the more virulent the criticism becomes. Within the wider public debate, Media Studies is a very easy target – a byword for triviality, for the dumbing down of education, for the degenerate, celebrity-obsessed, loser-take-all culture that modern Britain has (apparently) now become. From this perspective, it would seem there is no way that Media Studies can possibly be a serious subject: its content is deemed to be trivial, and so the subject itself is trivial. Media Studies is a soft option, 'a Mickey Mouse subject'; and it definitely won't get you a job in the media. It is simultaneously condemned for being insufficiently academic, and for being insufficiently vocational.

These arguments have a long history. In the late 1990s, Martin Barker conducted a systematic analysis of media coverage of Media Studies, and found that this 'discourse of derision' was very widespread (Barker, 2001). Almost twenty years ago, in opening our book *Cultural Studies Goes To School*, Julian Sefton-Green and I had no difficulty in finding similar examples referring to media education in schools (Buckingham and Sefton-Green, 1994). More recently, James Curran (in his MeCCSA presentation) and Dan Laughey (in a presentation at the Media Literacy conference in London in 2010) have provided many more examples from journalists and politicians right across the political spectrum (Laughey, 2010).

As Curran quite rightly says, these criticisms are essentially based on ignorance. They misrepresent what Media Studies involves: they are not based on any information or knowledge, but simply on prejudice. The people who make them have not done any research on the issue, or talked to anyone who knows about it: they have no idea about what we do. As Curran argues, studying media is intellectually demanding: despite the criticisms, it is not about sitting around watching telly or playing computer games. Media Studies is a cross-disciplinary field, drawing on bodies of knowledge and theory from sociology, psychology, history, aesthetics, linguistics, economics, political science and beyond. Media students also appear to be quite employable – although the evidence on that is rather mixed.

And yet it seems that we are still having to defend ourselves against these kinds of criticisms. For someone of my advanced years – my first experiences of teaching Media Studies in school date back to the late 1970s – it is quite disconcerting that we are *still* having this argument after all this time. Why do we seem to have made so little headway in

establishing the public legitimacy of what we do?

According to James Curran, this is because the criticisms are actually a reflection of the insecurities of journalists – a response to the fact that their own jobs, and their own status and legitimacy, are increasingly insecure. Lashing out at Media Studies makes them feel better. Personally, I am not so sure: this argument rather overstates our own importance (which is perhaps an endemic problem in the field). Most of our critics – who are by no means only journalists – do not see Media Studies as a threat to their own power, but merely as an irrelevance. For them, Media Studies is a joke; and they are confident that in referring to it, most of their readers will instantly be able to share that joke.

Tiresome as it may be, we do need to defend ourselves against this kind of criticism. However, this should not preclude a degree of *self*-criticism. This is particularly the case when we approach the issue from an *educational* perspective – when we think about media *education* rather than just Media *Studies*. There is a strange line in James Curran's article where he says that he has always avoided responding to these kinds of criticisms, on the grounds that 'discussion about education is best left to those in Education Departments'. This almost seems to imply that academics are not actually educators at all – as though we can somehow separate the content from the pedagogy. This is a position that I am afraid is rather typical in higher education.

Reasons to be miserable
Having painted a brief picture of success, we also need to acknowledge the potential – or indeed the reality – of failure. In my view, we can no longer afford to be quite so confident about the continuing expansion of the field. There are several reasons for this, which would include the following:

- Student numbers for GCSE Media Studies hit a plateau some time ago, and are now in decline. Although the government's plan for the EBACC (the so-called English Baccalaureate) has been abandoned, there is now a clear institutionalised hierarchy of subjects at this level, in which Media Studies has predictably very low status. Student numbers at A2 have been falling for the past three years, while AS is about to disappear. We may be seeing a temporary leveling off here, but significant further expansion appears unlikely.
- There are moves to downgrade the value of Media Studies and other so-called 'soft' subjects in terms of university entry. Some elite universities (including those that actually teach and research media, like the LSE and Oxford) refuse to recognise it as a valid subject in the first place. Both at GCSE and A-level, there is a renewed emphasis

on the terminal exam and an attempt to remove coursework, which is likely to make subjects like Media Studies more difficult to teach and less attractive to students.

- Meanwhile, there was the fiasco of the Creative and Media Diploma, an enormously expensive new course that was effectively abandoned after two years. While the reasons for this go beyond media education, they partly reflect the awkward positioning and low status of the area (see Buckingham, 2103).

- In universities, it also seemed that undergraduate numbers in Media Studies last year were starting to drop. While that may have been a temporary 'blip', students paying £9000 fees are almost bound to be affected by claims about the vocational value (or lack of it) of particular subjects. Higher education funding is also massively and dangerously dependent on postgraduate students, who are predominantly international; and while this is still a growing market, it seems increasingly uncertain.

- Looking beyond Media Studies as a specialist subject, the place of media education within English looks weaker than it has done for a long time. The government's recent consultation document for GCSE English predictably says nothing at all about media, and includes the astonishing stipulation 'digital texts will not be permitted'. In primary schools, we have had for some time a literacy curriculum that focuses exclusively on print literacy – and we now have a Secretary of State for education whose hostility to media education is very well known.

- Some years ago, we might have looked to communications policy for some kind of recognition, but 'media literacy' (which was part of Ofcom's remit) has now largely been abandoned as a policy imperative, or at least reduced to a functional concern with online safety and access that has very little to do with a broader notion of media literacy or media education (Wallis and Buckingham, 2013 – and Wallis, 2014, in this issue).

- Meanwhile, the British Film Institute (BFI), the key organisation in the field over the past fifty years, seems to have franchised out much of its education work to an industry-led organisation called Film Nation. There is growing concern, not only that this reduces media education to *film* education, but also that its approach seems to be premised primarily on screening films and getting children to make them, rather than developing the critical approach that is central to media education.

The outcome of many of these developments remains to be seen, but it is quite possible that we are seeing a turn in the tide here. It is implausible that people will *not* be studying media in the years to come; but it is unlikely that media education will become the basic core curriculum entitlement that some of us imagined it would and should

become. On the contrary, it may well remain a low-status, marginal specialism on the fringes of the education system.

History lessons

In seeking to understand what might be happening here, it is useful to look both historically, at the evolution of curriculum subjects, and comparatively, at other subjects. Where do subjects (or disciplines) come from? How are they established, and how do they achieve legitimacy? Why do they take the form they do? And how does that trajectory of development determine what a subject becomes? Looked at in this way, it quickly becomes clear that the process of subject formation is contingent, uneven and provisional. What media education is – what it has become, and might in future become – has been shaped not only by its practitioners, or by the internal development of field, but also by external forces – by the politics of education, and the wider political and cultural context.

Terry Bolas's book *Screen Education: From Film Appreciation to Media Studies* (Bolas, 2009) offers some interesting food for thought in this respect. The book is not so much a history of media education, but rather of a key organisation in the field, the Society for Education in Film and Television (SEFT). SEFT began life in 1950 as the Society of Film Teachers and was eventually wound up in the late 1980s – paradoxically, just as media education was starting to expand. SEFT was funded at arm's length by the BFI, and Bolas's book provides a detailed account of the political in-fighting that took place between these two organisations. In my view, the book rather evades some of the more critical questions that might be raised about the role of state-funded cultural institutions; and it is ultimately rather nostalgic about the radical self-image of Media Studies as some kind of dissident, subversive political movement (a view that, I would admit, most of us shared at the time).

However, what is especially interesting about Bolas's book is that he locates the origin of this work in schools: 'film appreciation' began in schools in the 1930s, in the absence of any teacher training, well before it began to gain credibility in the academy. SEFT was run by a small group of teacher-pioneers – some of whom were driven by a rather self-righteous desire to protect children from harmful media influences, although others had a broader commitment to the importance and value of film (and subsequently television) as a medium. The academic study of these media began somewhat later, at least as a distinct subject discipline rather than merely a minor element of psychology or sociology. It was not until the late 1960s that the BFI began to feel that media education needed to have a more coherent theoretical basis; and this contributed to a shift in the focus of attention (and the allocation of resources) away from schools to higher education. This was very much a *disciplinary* project – about establishing the legitimacy of the subject through the

academy – and SEFT played a key role in pursuing it.

Bolas's history stops with the demise of SEFT in 1989, although many of the problems that appear in his account are still with us. The most crucial one, in my view, is the problematic relationship between media education in schools and in higher education. Despite its name, SEFT (the Society for *Education* in Film and Television) was effectively dominated by a cadre of avant-garde, radical intellectuals. These people would have refused the term 'academics', although most of them eventually became university staff. The most dominant individuals were people with a complete lack of interest in schools, and in education: education was not only (in the language of the time) part of the 'ideological state apparatus', it was also hopelessly unglamorous. And of course scholars were not really involved in the grubby business of education in any case.

Thus, most of the organisation's resources went into the publication of the academic journal Screen, a publication notorious for its impenetrable prose – and indeed, there was a self-conscious resistance to clarity in writing, as though making oneself understood was tantamount to bourgeois empiricism. There was a sense that this kind of work amounted to a form of revolutionary cultural activism in itself – a kind of political posturing that seems absurd in retrospect, but was quite terrorising at the time. The struggle to get SEFT to address *education* – in which I was involved at the time – was effectively lost; and this in part accounts for the organisation's ultimate demise.

This, I hasten to add, is my retrospective analysis, rather than Terry Bolas's. One can look back with the condescension of hindsight – or indeed with nostalgia, or with regret at all that wasted effort. However, my key point is that media education has not entirely outlived all this: some of the problems that arose in the formation of the subject – and particularly the disconnection between schools and higher education – are still very much around.

The making of subjects

In addition to this historical dimension, it is also instructive to look comparatively at the formation of Media Studies by contrast with the formation of other academic subjects. There is a useful body of sociological research on the development of subject disciplines, mostly dating back to the 1980s (e.g. Goodson, 1983; Goodson & Marsh, 1996). This work explores how subjects work as social systems, and how they emerge and change, by looking at textbooks, syllabuses, the work of subject associations, teacher training and so on.

While the 'new' sociology of education of the 1970s had tended to present subjects in a rather monolithic way, the sociologists of the 1980s began to recognise that – both within schools and in the academy – subjects (or disciplines) are often fragmented and divided

rather than coherent and consensual. There are competing paradigms and sub-groupings, each with somewhat different social worlds and social structures. When we look at school subjects in particular, a wide range of different interest groups are involved – teachers and academics, but also managers, policy-makers, examination boards (awarding bodies), industry groups, etc. What a school subject becomes – not least in terms of status – is also tied up with the issue of teachers' careers, and the allocation of resources in schools. The whole process of defining what counts as knowledge in a given subject – what is legitimate, what carries status – is thus very contingent and contested.

For example, Ivor Goodson (1981) looks at how Geography gradually evolved over more than fifty years from being a low-status school subject to one that was established in the university. The subject association, the Geographical Association, was crucial in this drive for legitimacy – for example in lobbying for teachers to receive proper training, and for the subject to be recognised in the examination system. Goodson also describes the ongoing struggle between the emerging academic definition of Geography and the one that came out of schools, which was more focused on how students might use geographical knowledge in their everyday lives - a struggle that was particularly played out over the so-called 'new Geography' in the 1960s.

There are other studies of this kind – for example, Barry Cooper's (1983) account of the arrival of 'modern Maths' in the 1960s – but the most relevant here is probably Stephen Ball's work on the early history of English (e.g. Ball, 1982). Ball explores the power-struggles that were entailed in establishing the legitimacy of English – in competition with Classics – and then between different 'versions' of English. Here again, there was an interesting partnership between schools and universities – with F.R. Leavis as a central figure – and a key role for the subject association, the English Association. This was very much about alliances between elites: private school teachers played a dominant role, along with various representatives of the great and the good, including numerous authors (although interestingly not publishers).

If we were to do this kind of work now, we would find an even more complex picture. The role of universities is obviously significantly weaker, although it also takes a different form: for instance, the Russell Group of elite universities recently published a guide on what it called 'informed choices' of A-level subjects, although it is still fighting shy of formalising different weightings for different subjects for the purpose of university entry. On the one hand, schools have become much more subject to direct political intervention. Yet on the other, we have a marketised education system, with privatised examining bodies, commercial publishers and media companies all involved, often working in concert – as well as a whole cadre of entrepreneurs, advisers and consultants of various kinds, most

of them effectively private commercial concerns.

One of the particular issues affecting media education is the relationship between media and technology. Of course, this is not new: Terry Bolas shows how, right from the start, the argument for media education was caught up with (and often confused with) the argument for educational media. Through the mid-20th century, there was a growing movement promoting the educational uses of film and television as 'audio-visual aids'. This represented an opportunity for those seeking to promote media education; but they also had to distance themselves from the functional, instrumental use of media tools. In many respects, we are now in a similar place with digital media. ICT in education has massively overtaken media education – partly because it has been so energetically promoted by commercial companies – and once again we have been wrong-footed by this. Technological developments are undoubtedly offering much more space for creative media production (although again, this is very far from new); but there is often very little opportunity here for critical understanding or reflection on media or technology.

Of course, there is more to be said here; but the key point is that the establishment, and hence the defence, of a subject is always a complex and contested matter. There are different versions of a subject (or an academic discipline), promoted by different interest groups, with different imperatives, and located in different social structures or social worlds. So while we can all agree to defend Media Studies or media education, it is not necessarily the case that we are defending the same thing.

As James Curran argues, Media Studies is well established as an academic discipline: scholars have been conducting serious research about the media for seventy or eighty years, even if the title 'Media Studies' is a more recent invention. However, if we want to defend media *education*, we need to do more than just emphasise its academic, disciplinary credentials – its status as Really Difficult Knowledge. We have to defend it as an educational, pedagogic practice – not least because it is against that pedagogic practice that so much of the criticism seems to be directed. This means asking pedagogical questions – questions about teaching and learning. Yet particularly in higher education, these kinds of questions have largely been neglected, perhaps on the basis that they are 'best left to people in education departments'. And it is here that teachers in schools – who inevitably think much more about these issues – might have something to offer to academics in higher education.

Asking educational questions

I would like to conclude, then, by briefly pointing to some of the educational questions that I believe media academics should be addressing. I will look in turn at 'theory' and 'practice',

and then at the relationships between them.

As media technologies evolve, it seems important to be clear about what we are trying to *teach* when we teach 'practice'. Are we teaching (and indeed assessing) technological skills, or the more conceptual processes that transfer across media (such as editing or narrative construction)? Are we teaching 'creativity' – whatever that is, and however we think it can be taught? As the technologies and devices that are involved in media production become much more affordable and accessible, we might well ask why it is necessary to *teach* practice at all. When in-depth and up-to-date information about production skills can be found on YouTube tutorials, what do students need to be taught? What can they do at the end of a media practice course that they couldn't do before, or couldn't have done anyway? How do we know that they have learnt it, and how do we assess it?

Likewise, what do we teach when we teach 'theory', and why are we teaching it? Are we aiming to provide tools for students to think with, to enable them to theorise, to think critically or theoretically? Or are we merely giving them access to a body of legitimated discourses, a canon of approved theorists (so we don't teach *Citizen Kane* [1941] or *The Searchers* [1956] or Hitchcock any more, but we do teach Foucault and Bourdieu and Anthony Giddens)? How do students learn 'theory'? In schools, but also in universities, students generally have little direct encounter with theory – what they use are textbooks in all but name, second- or third-hand potted summaries of 'key theorists', as parodied but also promoted in David Gauntlett's 'theory trading cards'.[4] What kinds of writing and argument are we teaching and promoting here?

One of the strange things about James Curran's defence of Media Studies is that he ignores the political economy of the academic curriculum. Media Studies may be doing well, but it is doing so at a time when universities have been comprehensively marketised: academics are embroiled in a cut-throat competition to pile in students, to publish or perish, and to achieve 'excellence'. The Research Excellence Framework effectively requires academics to write for their peers, rather than for students, let alone for a more general readership. Media Studies' attempts to establish its own legitimacy as a serious academic subject have had adverse consequences in terms of the accessibility (or lack of it) of academic writing, and the primacy that is afforded to certain versions of 'theory' (a tendency which goes back to *Screen*). One reason why Media Studies is so reviled by the media is not because they see it as a dangerous political threat, but because media academics tend to talk and write in such pompous and pretentious ways.

Following from this, there is the question of how theoretical and practical learning are related. Media education at university level is characterised by a separation – even

a divorce – between 'theory' and 'practice'. There are 'theory' courses that teach media analysis and there are 'practice' courses that teach media making; and even in courses that purport to combine them, the theory and the practice are often taught in very different ways by very different people. The picture is more complex in schools, but even here there is a continuing problem with how the two relate to each other: often it seems as though the theory stops when the practice starts, and vice-versa.

We would all pay lip-service to the idea that there should be a dynamic relationship between theory and practice, but how does that relationship work out pedagogically? The lack of integration at the level of teaching means that students are effectively left to work out this relationship for themselves. But do they actually do this – and if so, how? We might claim to be aiming for 'critical practice', but what is critical practice, and how would we know it if we saw it?

In my view, we need some better answers to these kinds of questions, but we also need to avoid reducing them to a vocational logic. There was a newspaper report in the *Independent* recently which trashed Media Studies on the grounds that only one in nine media graduates actually got jobs in the media industries – and it compared Media Studies in this respect with Medicine, where 96 or 98 percent get jobs in their field.[5] Of course, the more interesting and relevant comparison might be with English or History – yet nobody asks how many English Literature students become poets or novelists, or how many History students become historians, or work in jobs where their knowledge of history is remotely relevant.

Even so, we are in a complicated and changing situation here. One could argue that in a marketised system, the old model of liberal education in the humanities is well past its sell-by date. The current generation of £9000-a-year students have been told they will have to pay for higher education because it will help them to land a better-paid job and increase their lifetime earnings. As such, the vocational question is bound to be on the agenda; and like it or not, it is also part of the rationale for media education. We might view Media Studies in terms of an all-round liberal education, but most of our students are choosing it at least partly in the expectation that it will lead to jobs in the media.

Even those of us who teach on largely 'academic' courses (as I currently do, in a Social Sciences department) are increasingly being urged to emphasise *employability*. In fact, even in this context, much of what students learn can be of value in the workplace: they may not know one end of a camera from the other (although most of them undoubtedly do anyway, since they all have cameras in their pockets), but they are learning to write, to undertake research, to present information and arguments in different forms, and so on. Yet the vocational relevance of this is rarely explained.

Bridging the gaps

To some extent, defending Media *Studies* is a fairly straightforward matter – even if nobody seems very inclined to believe us. Defending media *education* is more complex, and in many ways more urgent. Of course, the media are important, and there is a lot of complicated academic research about the media. But if we are going to defend *teaching and learning* about media, we need to have much better educational arguments: we need to understand what and how students *learn* about media, at whatever level, and we need to argue that what they learn has a much broader relevance and applicability.

This means overcoming some of the separations and divisions that characterise the field – which can to some extent be traced back to its early formation. We suffer from a lack of connection between schools and universities; between the academic and the vocational; between theory and practice; and between the academic study of media and the wider public debate. There are some dialogues that need to take place here, in a spirit of constructive self-criticism – and perhaps *MERJ* is one of the few places where that might happen.

Editors' Comment: This article is based on a keynote presentation at the Media Education Summit, September 2013, which is available, alongside keynotes from Susan Orr, Natalie Fenton and Barry Ryan at http://www.cemp.ac.uk/about/keynotespeakers.php

As David suggests, MERJ is a forum for research and discussion across these themes and boundaries. In this issue, we publish other work first disseminated at the Summit: from Richard Wallis, whose report on his research, partly in collaboration with David Buckingham, as cited above, provides an assessment of media literacy policy and rhetoric during the New Labour era; John Twycross, who shares the findings from a pedagogic research intervention whereby gaming conventions were aligned with learning to embrace the 'just-in-time workflow' of the creative industries; Peter Westman who assesses the use of a digital ethnographic pedagogy as opposed to more 'traditional' forms of teaching; while Ross Adamson reports on a case study about the 'domestic ethnographic' mode of filmmaking.

In addition, we publish Melanie Chan's practitioner enquiry into media students' critical thinking about the relationships between the technology they use, the social and cultural contexts surrounding these consumption practices and the overlapping of digital technology and physical environments. Finally, Michael Dezuanni and Mark David Ryan's article examines the mandatory media education curriculum taking shape in Australian schools, and how shifts occurring in domestic film and television sectors are identifying

the new types of knowledge students are having to engage with.

Among our regular crop of book reviews, this issue we re-appraise Stuart Hall's *Representation* for 'Laughey's Canon' and continue our attempts to innovate with the review format by asking two *Doctor Who* scholars to review each others' recent publications.

The next issue of *MERJ* (volume 5 issue 1) is a Digital Media Arts themed issue, with DaRE researchers Andrew Burn, John Potter and Mark Reid as guest editors. DARE (www.darecollaborative.net) stands for Digital Arts Research Education, and is an open collaborative network committed to enabling 'better conversations' about the relationship between the arts, education and the digital environment. We're delighted to be working with DARE in this way. See the call for papers in this issue for more information.
RB & JMcD

References

Ball, S. (1982). Competition and conflict in the teaching of English: a socio-historical analysis. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 14(1): 1-28.

Barker, M. (2001). On the problems of being a 'trendy travesty'. In M. Barker and J. Petley (eds.). *Ill Effects: The Media/Violence Debate*, 2nd edition, pp. 202-224. London: Routledge.

Bolas, T. (2009). *Screen Education: From Film Appreciation to Media Studies*. Bristol: Intellect.

Buckingham, D. (2013). Teaching the creative class? Media education and the media industries in the age of 'participatory culture'. *Journal of Media Practice* 14(1): 25-41.

Buckingham, D. and Sefton-Green, J. (1994). *Cultural Studies Goes To School*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Cooper, B. (1983). On explaining change in school subjects. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 4(3): 207-222.

Goodson, I. (1981). Becoming an academic subject: patterns of explanation and evolution. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 2(2): 163-180.

Goodson, I. (ed.) (1983). *School Subjects and Curriculum Change*. London: Croom Helm.

Goodson, I. and Marsh, C. (1996). *Studying School Subjects*. London: Routledge.

Laughey, D. (2010). The case for and against Media Studies in the UK press. Paper presented at 'Media Literacy 2010' conference. London, June 2010.

Ramsden, B. (2012). *Institutional Diversity in UK Higher Education*. Oxford: Higher Education Policy Institute.

Universities UK (2011). *Patterns and Trends in UK Higher Education 2011*. London: Universities UK.

Wallis, R. and Buckingham, D. (2013). Arming the citizen-consumer: the invention of
    'media literacy' within UK communications policy. *European Journal of Communication*
    28(5): 527-540.

Footnotes

1.   Online at http://cmr.ulster.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Defending-Media-
      Studies.pdf.
2.   I wrote a piece along these lines for *The Guardian* 'Comment is Free' site a few years
      ago: http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2009/aug/22/media-studies.
3.   Response to a parliamentary question, reported in *Daily Telegraph* 15th August 2009.
4.   See http://www.theory.org.uk/david/theorycards.htm - although, it would seem, no
      longer available from Amazon.
5.   Extracted in *The Week* 6th September 2013.