Year: 2011

Orientations of entertainment media workers

von Rimscha, M Bjørn ; Siegert, Gabriele

Abstract: Although entertaining media content is considered to be highly influential on values and norms shared by the recipients, little is known about the orientation and self-perceptions of entertainment media workers conveying these values and norms. This article offers an overview of existing research on TV entertainment workers and concludes that the common stereotype of a primarily commercial orientation cannot be sustained across the board. To underpin this argument results from two exploratory studies with producers and commissioners in five European countries are presented. Besides a market orientation we can also identify a creative, a common welfare and a professional orientation. Combined with information on the work environment and the demographics of the respondents, the orientations are used to develop a typology of producers and commissioners. It turns out that the common stereotype of a solely commercial mindset only applies for the self-perception of non-fiction producers at commercial broadcasters and program buyers, while all other types seem to have a corrective in other orientations.

Orientations of entertainment media workers

Entertainment media workers - disrespect and neglect

Entertainment shapes our conception of the world. It might not have the same impact as news on our short-term knowledge as well-informed citizens and thus it might be less influential when it comes to our voting decisions; however, entertainment influences our long-term values, the norms we obey in everyday life, and stereotypes we hold about other people or certain social spheres. Recent research demonstrating this includes a study by Boyle and Magor (2008) on the depiction of business life in Britain and a study by Costera Meijer and de Bruin (2003) on the integration potential of Dutch soap operas.

Entertainment television is a part of popular culture that provides orientation and allows inclusion in (imagined) communities of like-minded viewers. In contrast to elite culture, it is welcoming and offers belonging. Viewers can use entertainment television to fantasize about the ideals, hopes, and concerns that they have for society (Hermes, 2006: 37). Furthermore, entertainment television is inclusive, linking the domains of the public and the private for the broadest range of age, gender, and ethnicity. According to Hermes (2006: 38), "In that sense it is the most inclusive and democratic of domains in our society." He believes that, despite commercial or governmental influences in its production, entertainment offers room for implicit and explicit social criticism.

However, entertainment has a weak standing in public debate. Entertainment is depicted as an irrelevant pastime and its recipients are looked down on. Coleman (2003), for example, finds a deep divide between political junkies and the followers of the television show *Big Brother*. The latter consider politics as relevant, although they do not follow it. Political junkies, though, show no interest in understanding the motives of *Big Brother* followers and paternalistically state that they should adjust their viewing habits and relevance scheme.

The same pattern can be seen when comparing producers of informative content with producers of entertaining media content. The sociology of work has found that the prestige of an occupation correlates with the consonance of its function with societal values. Entertainment production lacks a high social prestige even if it is socially influential (Weischenberg, 1995: 126). In some sense, this prestige deficit also translates into a research deficit. Although there is good reason to analyze TV entertainment with the same scrutiny used for news media, the field receives much less attention. It seems as if there is no obvious framework for this kind of analysis. Mass communication scholars have long studied journalists, yet have no traditional claim on popular culture, entertainment, and its respective producers. Van Zoonen (2005) suggests that popular culture "belongs" to history, sociology, and cultural studies, while entertainment is "owned" by various strands of

psychology. However, a lot of research exists about how entertainment affects recipients, as well as a considerable body of literature that discusses issues of entertainment and popular culture on a macro level of society. Both macro-level investigations in popular culture and micro-level investigations into media effects suggest entertainment has an impact on the public sphere, on the cultural citizenship, and on (political) norms and values held by media users. However, the stereotype remains that entertainment producers only have two objectives: to entertain and to maximize profit (Altmeppen, 2008). Certainly, an entrepreneurial spirit is necessary to some extent, especially if we consider that the salaried in-house producer has all but disappeared, making way for producers with duties more inclined to general management (Tunstall, 1993).

Cultural studies only recently have started to analyze the production process of TV entertainment and those involved (Grindstaff, 2002; Caldwell, 2008; Mayer et al., 2009; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011). These studies take an ethnographic approach and provide great insights using case studies of specific texts and their production process. Empirical studies most often deal with extremely popular shows such as *Lost* (Mann, 2009), or with a notorious genre such as the daytime talk show (Grindstaff, 2002). To some extent, this hampers the generalizability of the findings. If we learn, for example, that producers of a certain talk show have few scruples and encourage stage conflict to drive up ratings and profitability, it does not mean all entertainment producers work that way. While these studies provide a great number of possible indicators for the self-perception and orientation of entertainment media workers, they do not tell us how different orientations are distributed among entertainment media workers as a whole. Therefore, we need to complement the cultural studies approach with a quantitative analysis of the orientation of entertainment producers to derive a more complete picture of who entertains us.

Research on entertainment media workers

Most research on entertainment production is interested solely in business aspects (Caves, 2003; Vogel, 2004), is a macro-level reflection on culture (Hermes, 2006), or is focused on political implications (van Zoonen, 2005). With the exception of the mentioned works by cultural studies proponents, little work has been done investigating the actual producers and commissioners of entertainment content. This might be explained by the fact that scholars generally regard entertainment as less relevant than news, but it could also be due to the intentional isolation of the industry from academia. Entertainment production is a people business relying on personal ties and the protection of intangible assets such as ideas and knowledge. Researchers often are regarded as irrelevant and potentially disreputable outsiders (Espinosa, 1982: 77f; von Rimscha, 2010: 183; Harrington & Bielby, 2005: 906). For this reason, an ethnographic cultural studies approach with participant observations has

proven to be quite successful because researchers actually become part of the field and spend ample time building trust with the analyzed individuals.

Research on orientation and entertainment media can be grouped into two strands. On the one hand, orientation is interpreted as a result of entertainment. Here we find numerous studies in the context of media effects on the individual, as well as studies that focus on the aggregated level of society. On the other hand, we find fewer studies that interpret entertainment as a result of the orientation of producers and commissioners. We will start with a brief review of the literature on entertainment TV as a contribution to societal orientation since that can be regarded as a potential reason for the orientation of media workers, which will be discussed afterward.

Several studies prove the ability of an entertainment program to create awareness of social issues and promote socially desirable values and behaviors, especially in development communications (Brown, 1990) and health communications (Whittier et al., 2005). Despite that fact, the notion of entertainment as In every market that where commercial television was introduced academic research eventually arrived at the assumption that "Newcomers - subscription or advertising-funded - strive to acquire popular programming at lowest cost, adding little to creative refreshment" (Ibbotson, 2008: 70). On a general level, McQuail (1998) states that there is a strong connection between commercialization and a larger share of entertainment programming. From this perspective, entertainment is predominantly driven by and oriented toward the commercial objectives that it also reinforces. Thus, entertainment is said to cultivate a consumer culture (Bennett, 1998; Keum et al., 2004). Entertainment programming is regarded as an especially suitable environment for advertising breaks since the more entertaining, enjoyable, and involving a program is perceived to be, the more favorably viewers rate advertisements (Norris et al., 2003). In many countries, advertising regulation is stricter for news or factual content than for entertainment programming.[i]

Entertainment often is depicted as the cash cow of a broadcast company; the money spent on news has to be earned by entertainment. Subsequently, entertainment commissioners would need to be clearly oriented toward the consumer rather than the recipient, and regard the audience as an advertising target group rather than as citizens. Given the power structure of the industry where producers by far outnumber commissioners, the former would need to adapt to the demand. However, several studies negate a dichotomy between organizational modes in TV production and commissioning. Network organization with broadcast companies and producers as essential nodes would lead to mutual dependency reinforced by each cooperation between the two. The longevity of producer-commissioner relations would force both sides to compromise rather than hold onto a singular orientation toward creativity or market demand (Windeler & Sydow, 2001; Deakin & Pratten, 2000; Altmeppen et al., 2007).

In 1982, Espinosa claimed that there was a lack of research regarding producers' producers' concerns about social issues and perceptions of the audience (Espinosa, 1982: 77). Almost three decades later, little has changed (Harrington & Bielby, 2005: 906). Media scholars have a fine grasp on the effects of media content on the audience, and an ever-growing knowledge about the influences on the orientations of journalists, yet little is known about entertainment producers or commissioners. The most quoted studies are rather outdated: Cantor's classical study of Hollywood TV producers (1971) and Tunstall's qualitative survey of television production in Britain (1993).

In 80 interviews, Cantor identifies three types of producers (1971: 74ff). A group she dubs "film makers" is self-centered and oriented toward art and personal ideas. The second group, the "writer-producers," is concerned about producing meaningful content and thus oriented toward the public. The third type, so-called "old-line producers," may be creative individuals in private, but their orientation chiefly focuses on maintaining financial success. Generally, Cantor identifies profit orientation among executives at the TV networks rather than among producers. She predicts more pronounced conflicts between profit-oriented executives and creative producers as the latter become more professionalized. At the same time, she notices that the power remains with executives who exercise influence over the hiring process or the decision of who to commission. the individual producer might be self-centered or try to convey social messages, the industry calls for commercialism.

Tunstall is interested in the organizational structures of the industry rather than in the individual orientations and self-perceptions of producers. However, certain quotes or marginal notes in his study offer conclusions in that regard as well. When a show producer is quoted as saying "my task is to win the time slot" (Tunstall, 1993: 138), we may assume an orientation toward the audience, or more precisely toward the ratings. On the other hand, for producers in drama/fiction own experiences in acting, writing, and directing would lead to "predominantly artistic orientations" which at times are more addressed at peers than at the audience (Tunstall, 1993: 121). This corresponds with newer findings by Costera Meijer (2010: 192): Almost half of the 59 producers of quality programs that she interviewed exhibited a patronizing attitude toward the public.

Nevertheless, studies exist that suggest creative and social orientation is not a matter of individual self-affirmation but also aimed at the common good, which is generally expected from journalists (Hanitzsch et al., 2010). In their ethnographic study of creative work, Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) find that many individuals working in creative industries are not only concerned about the aesthetic quality of what they produce, but also about ethical implications, social and cultural impact, and contribution to the common good. Similar to what we know about the gratifications a journalist can derive from work, these people consider elements that are satisfying and rewarding to include "innovation that has an impact on

society and on the industry, work that is ground-breaking, or that reveals injustice in the world" (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011: 190). In a previous study of a British talent show produced for the BBC, Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2008) also addressed the issue of how such light entertainment can fit with the public service ethos of the commissioning broadcaster. The commissioning editor mentioned the intention to offer a huge variety of programming to better compete with commercial broadcasters. Supporting and developing talent in a responsible manner is viewed as a public service, which is a rationale commonly put forward by public service broadcasters (Amgarten, 2008).

Grindstaff (2002: 82) suggests that even in a TV genre as mundane as US daytime talk shows, producers would draw from the codes and conventions of journalism when coping with the difficult process of putting ordinary people on television. They claim to be creative and original, although that does not necessarily refer to unearthing new material but to how they recombine information into familiar patterns that adhere to media conventions. From her participant observation at two talk shows, Grindstaff reports of rare occasions when producers persuaded a potential guest not to participate in the show (2002: 107). Although it would have been in the show's best interest from a market perspective, the producers' personal ethics lead to the perception that an appearance was not in the would-be guest's best interest. In general, producers distance themselves emotionally from the guest and the show to deny personal accountability (Grindstaff, 2002: 141). However, we can assume that producers are not solely oriented toward high ratings and increasing profitability, at least in extreme cases.

For commissioners in the UK, a Research Centre report suggests that they are not only market oriented, but "have an undisputed commitment to quality and innovation" (Preston, 2003: 1). However, the broadcast companies would expect them to develop "a much more commercial, or corporate, mindset" (2003: 3). As a result, there seems to be a mismatch between individual and organizational orientation.

Finally, we find some studies that provide insight in terms of specific themes or historical circumstances. In the context of health communication, evaluations of campaigns that try to include health messages in entertainment content provide some insight about how willing producers are to address objectives other than profit maximization. Glik et al. conclude: "Many in Hollywood are interested in health and social welfare issues" (1998: 279). Spigel analyzes the reaction of entertainment TV to the attacks on New York City's World Trade Center and finds that many shows did alter their program. For instance, executive producer Aaron Sorkin quickly drafted an episode of *The West Wing* in an attempt to inform the audience about the situation in the Middle East and thus "use television as a form of political and historical pedagogy" (Spigel, 2004: 242).

To sum up the existing literature, the orientations of entertainment media workers matter because their product is used to orient the audience. Structural constraints in the industry suggest that entertainment producers, and even more so entertainment commissioners, need to cater first and foremost to the commercial viability of their work. Altmeppen (2008) compares and differentiates between journalists and entertainment media workers according to the actor setup in production and structural constraints or, with reference to Schimank (2000: 27), according to their "orientation horizon." While journalists would be oriented toward society and topical incident, entertainment media workers would be oriented toward the market and planned result. However, convincing his argument might be, Altmeppen provides no empirical evidence. The limited empirical evidence available indicates that entertainment media workers are not solely commercially oriented. The remainder of this paper will add to the empirical investigation of the field and analyze whether different types of entertainment media workers have different orientations.

Applying research on journalists to entertainment production

Although most journalists work at for-profit companies, empirical evidence shows that they did not choose the profession solely for the money. As our literature review has shown, the same can be said for entertainment media workers. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to adapt research on journalists (Weaver & Wilhoit, 1986; Weaver et al., 2007; Marr et al., 2001; Weischenberg et al., 2006) to investigate the self-perception of entertainment producers and commissioners. A producer's self-perception shows not only the influence of the industry on the job but also the influence of culture. Media workers in entertainment are not autonomous artists, but oriented at internalized norms and conventions resulting from the media culture (Negus, 2006: 203). Common stereotypes about entertainment production will be put to test in a survey of entertainment media workers that includes questions about self-perception, field of work, and demographics. The question guiding our work is as follows: What orientations can be drawn from entertainment workers' self-perceptions? We will use factor analysis of ascertained self-perceptions to identify the unobservable underlying orientations. Building from there, we present a typology of entertainment media workers that combines orientation with workplace traits and demographics.

In the following section, we present results from two separate studies using largely the same research instrument. The first study covers entertainment producers while the second surveys commissioners, that is individuals within broadcast companies who commission or acquire entertainment content. The two groups adopt different positions in the process and value chain and thus might face different constraints due to their respective frameworks. While the first group works as freelancers or in small businesses with direct contact to creative talent, the latter are usually salaried personnel at TV broadcasters working as only

one contributor of a complex product bundle. Analyzing these two groups separately allows for a more detailed and diverse investigation of the self-perceptions and orientations of media workers in TV entertainment.

Compared with journalists, the job description of producers and commissioners is much more vague and diverse (Tunstall, 1993; Lee, 2000; Iljine & Keil, 2000). There is no professional guild or association as is common for journalists and any existing associations consist of production companies rather than individuals.[ii] A majority of producers is not employed by a production company but hired on a project basis. Even some TV commissioners work as freelancers rather than permanent employees. Thus, we cannot define the population and draw a sample, but have to produce a sample of accessible individuals and asses the generalizability.

We used different approaches in the two studies. The producer study covered Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. Contact addresses were generated using three sources: individuals with e-mail addresses listed in the online industry register MediaBiz; individual members of relevant guilds (such as BVP, FAF, or GARP); and corporate members of associations who provided us with a list of their producer employees or contractors. Altogether 803 contacts could be generated.[iii] The producers were surveyed using a standardized online questionnaire and the field phase was from October to November 2008. Recourse was at 19% resulting in a sample of 153 complete returned questionnaires.

Few of the producers work exclusively for just one segment of the market. Similar to the respective share of the programming, producers working in fiction were more prominent in the sample (90%) than those working for non-fiction productions (53%). Seventy-one percent of the respondents worked for productions that aired on public service channels, 50% for productions that aired on commercial channels, and 68% for cinema productions. Altogether, this distribution seems to be skewed toward fiction on public service channels or in cinemas, which echoes the status hierarchy of different entertainment genres described by Tunstall (1993: 104). We suspect that a large number of producers who claim to work for cinema productions do so only occasionally and may be diluting differences between the groups.

The study with commissioners combined the survey with a qualitative interview study focusing on issues of TV quality that shall not be reported here. The sample was much smaller, and, again, we were unable to define the population from which to draw it. The study covered the most important TV channels both public and commercial from Switzerland, Germany, Austria, France, and Italy. For each channel, we interviewed a program buyer, a fiction commissioner, and a non-fiction commissioner with each representing a characteristic and popular program of their channel. We ended up with 30 respondents. Since there is only one commercial broadcaster in Switzerland but a strong public service organization with several channels, the sample is skewed toward public service broadcasters. Commissioners

working for public service broadcasters financed by a license fee should not feel obliged to churn out cheap programming that maximizes advertising revenue. The guaranteed funding should allow for programming decisions to be made purely on editorial grounds for a public value or for pure creative or artistic goals. So, given the structure of our sample, the results might underestimate market orientations.

Self-perceptions of producers and commissioners

Since it is assumed that self-perception determines performance to some extent, studies of self-perception are popular within journalism research. To allow for comparisons, we decided to adopt the item set and analyzing strategy introduced by Marr et al. (2001) who surveyed Swiss journalists.[iv] They integrated numerous studies that attempt to capture the influence of economic factors on journalism since and depict journalism as being between the conflicting priorities of public mandate and commercial pressure. Thus, they introduced market orientations and common welfare orientation as basic dimensions. The former can be divided into consumer orientation and advertising market orientation, while the latter can be divided into a passive and an active variation of common welfare orientation. For each dimension, they formulated three role descriptions that were judged according to their importance by the respondents. A confirmative factor analysis validated the underlying orientations.

For our two studies, by and large we adopted these items to allow for comparisons with journalists. The results from our literature review suggest that these role descriptions are relevant for our sample too. However, we dropped the dimension of consumer orientation since producers are clearly in a business-to-business situation and the broadcasters in the sample gained revenue only from advertising or license fees. We also dropped the role of the commentator since the time frame of entertainment production does not allow for current cementation as we find it in a daily newspaper. Furthermore, we introduced a new dimension capturing the creative orientation, again with three corresponding roles. Table 1 provides an overview of the surveyed dimensions and the formulation of the items.

Table 1: Operationalization of orientations as role self-perception

Dimension	Role self-perception	My goal is to...
Active common welfare orientation	Advocate	work as advocate for the socially weak and disadvantaged.
	Critic	criticize undesired developments and grievances in society.
	Commentator	contribute to the formation of public opinion as a commentator.
Passive common welfare orientation	Intermediator	act as a mediator providing a forum for different social groups.
	Analyst	carefully verify and precisely analyze complex situations.
	Neutral reporter	neutrally report reality as it is.
Advertising market orientation	Cost-conscious entrepreneur	be a cost-conscious entrepreneur getting the best quality out of given funds.
	Marketer	sell a product in demand efficiently and profitable.
	Vendor of target groups	create a favorable advertising environment to sell target groups.
Creative orientation	Creative	realize myself and my ideas as a creative.
	Artist	create a cultural asset that outlasts the test of time.
	Original	show new trends and convey new ideas.

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of job role self-perceptions and how much they believed they would live up to these goals. Since the answers to these corresponding questions were very similar, we only report the data on the perceived importance. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the claimed importance of the eleven job roles for the surveyed producers and commissioners.

Table 2: Mean importance of job role in self-perception (rank in brackets)

Job role	Producer N=153	Commissioner N=30	Journalists N<1950
Cost-conscious entrepreneur	4.48 (1)	3.90 (2)	2.30 (6)
Creative	3.75 (2)	3.48 (4)	n.a.
Analyst	3.40 (3)	3.55 (3)	4.0 (2)
Artist	3.40 (4)	3.14 (5)	n.a.
Original	3.39 (5)	4.07 (1)	n.a.
Marketer	3.07 (6)	2.84 (7)	1.85 (7)
Intermediator	2.64 (7)	2.62 (10)	3.33 (4)
Critic	2.56 (8)	2.83 (8)	3.85 (3)
Neutral reporter	2.51 (9)	2.93 (6)	4.36 (1)
Vendor of target groups	2.34 (10)	2.27 (11)	1.56 (8)
Advocate	2.29 (11)	2.82 (9)	3.24 (5)

Scale: 1 - "not important at all" to 5 - "very important"
Journalist data reprocessed from (Marr et al., 2001: 123–30)

A surface impression of the figures seems to support the stereotype that journalists are oriented toward common welfare while entertainment producers are oriented toward economic aspects. Consonant with the assumption of Altmeppen (2007), producers rate the cost-conscious entrepreneur as their most important role model: commissioners who are usually salaried personnel still rate this role as second most important. However, neither

producers nor commissioners consider the roles of the marketer or the vendor of target groups especially important.

The advocate, critic, and neutral reporter are rated below the center scale. In contrast, the role of the analyst is rated third most important for both occupations. The three additional roles of the creative, artist, and original all score relatively high, which might indicate a necessary extension of the dimensions of self-perception.

In a second step of the analysis, we identified the underlying dimensions of the role of self-perception using a factor analysis.[v] For the producers, we needed to drop the job role of the original since it has loadings on several factors. The result of the analysis is presented in Table 3. We find four dimensions that together explain 72.5% of the variance. The orientations toward the common welfare represent expected items such as advocate, neutral reporter, and intermediator. Together the artist and the creative form the dimension of creativity orientation. Evidently, creativity is something also relevant in marketing because the role of the creative also loads on the market orientation. According to our analysis, economic orientation can be split into two distinct parts with the first being a market orientation focused on demand and the second being an entrepreneurial orientation focused on production. The latter also includes the job role of the analyst, which we derived from the study on journalists by Marr et al. and expected to have a factor loading on common welfare orientation. Apparently, our respondents interpreted the item differently by referring to business processes rather than social aspects.

Table 3: Dimensions of producer self-perception

	Orientation toward			
	Common welfare	Market	Creativity	Entrepreneurship
Advocate	.87			
Neutral reporter	.78			
Critic	.79		.32	
Intermediator	.79			
Vendor of target groups		.89		
Marketer		.80		
Artist			.86	
Creative		.35	.77	
Cost-conscious entrepreneur				.82
Analyst				.71
Explained variance	27.8%	16.6%	15.8%	12.3%

The same factor analysis was carried out for the commissioner sample. Here we had to drop the job roles of the original, cost-conscious entrepreneur, and artist since they loaded on more than one factor. We derive only three dimensions of the commissioners' self-perceptions that explain 63.5% of the variance (see Table 4). Again, we find a factor representing the common welfare orientation; however, it consists of only three job roles. The distinction between two different aspects of economic orientation is not replicated. The

analyst role is combined with other more demand-oriented job roles. We do not find a clear factor of creative orientation but rather an initially odd combination of the roles of the creative and neutral reporter. Again, we believe the respondents have reinterpreted an item intended to grasp common welfare orientation. Commissioners might want to point out that they neutrally handle content they are pitched or commission. Consequently, we call the last factor professional orientation. The job requires creativity, but commissioners neutrally assess a project's merits rather than actually create it.

Table 4: Dimensions of commissioner self-perception

	Orientation toward		
	Common welfare	**Market**	**Profession**
Critic	.86		
Advocate	.81		
Intermediator	.65		
Vendor of target groups		.78	
Analyst		.78	
Marketer		.70	
Creative			.78
Neutral reporter			.78
Explained variance	25.4%	21.7%	16.4%

Even though economic orientations are important for producers and commissioners alike, they cannot be the sole explicator. For producers, an entrepreneurial orientation is necessary since they are most often self-employed or working on a project basis, although they also have an orientation toward creativity and common welfare. For commissioners, the economic orientation is less pronounced since they most often work on permanent contracts. Additionally, they have both a professional and common welfare orientation. Thus, we cannot reproduce the finding of Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2008: 106) whereby commissioners would be more market oriented and interested in power rather than programs.

Our sample tries to include different aspects of the respective fields of work. However, the factor analysis is run on the whole sample. Given the small sample size, we cannot run factor analysis on different subsamples so peculiarities of different fields are leveled out. To counter that drawback, we used hierarchical clustering (Ward, 1963) to identify different types of producers or commissioners. The Ward method is adequate for small samples when the number of clusters is not known. For both the producer and commissioner samples, we calculated solutions of two to five clusters. In both cases the solution with three clusters turned out to be most interpretable.

The producer clusters were built based on the dimensions of self-perception previously described, as well as the share of certain work activities, the genre produced, a potential public mandate of the commissioning TV channel, and demographic variables including work

experience, rank, workload, and gender. Since the variables were collected using different scales, all variables were z-standardized. The best solution produced three clusters, which we label creatives (26%), marketers (32%), and veterans (42%).

Creativity seems to be an exclusive activity since *Creatives* concentrate on it while seldom engaging in other activities. They are excluded especially from activities concerning budgeting or organizing. Creativity as an orientation proves to be a rather singular trait as creatives are below average for all other orientations. The unity of creativity and management as demanded by Bilton (2007) does not seem to be implemented with producers. Creatives tend to work for cinema productions or commercial TV and only to a lesser extent for public service broadcasters. They produce fiction entertainment rather than non-fiction. On average, they have only begun their careers, so they tend to be at a low hierarchical level. Creatives have fewer working hours but juggle more projects than others. Women are overrepresented in this cluster.

Marketers show a wide range of activities. They do engage in creative thinking, but take on a striking number of budget-related activities and sales responsibilities. This is also reflected in orientations where the market orientation clearly dominates all others. Marketers work for commercial broadcasters in particular, and above average on non-fiction productions. Their work experience is below average, but they have already achieved above average hierarchical levels. Although they tend to organize a relatively large number of projects simultaneously, their working hours are slightly below average. Women are slightly overrepresented.

Veterans also have a wide range of activities, but their profile displays two lows: creative thinking and marketing as activities and the respective orientations toward creativity and market play a smaller role than in the other clusters. In contrast, the orientation toward common welfare is more pronounced. Veterans predominantly work at public service broadcasters or on movie productions with an above average share on non-fiction productions. They show the highest level of professional experience and reach the relatively highest hierarchical levels. Veterans have a heavy workload, but focus on fewer projects. Men are overrepresented in this cluster.

Three types of commissioners were identified using a cluster analysis based on the dimensions of self-perception as previously described , as well as the share of certain work activities, the genre produced, a potential public mandate of the TV channel, and gender. Again, all variables were z-standardized. The resulting three clusters can be denominated as follows: program buyer (42%), show-manager (32%), and editor-producer (25%).

Program buyers are found predominantly in program acquisition departments of commercial broadcasters. Their professional and common wealth orientation is below average while

market orientation is above average. This economic orientation corresponds with the activity profile, and with the exception of planning and controlling the budget, all activities have a below average share of working time. Men are overrepresented in this cluster.

Show-managers work predominantly in the non-fiction editorial department predominantly at commercial broadcasters. All three orientations are above average but the professional orientation stands out the most. Show-managers do not engage a lot in administrative activities, in controlling, or budget planning. Their activity profile shows above average shares of coordinating, organizing and leading teams, and the marketing and technical aspects of the job. Gender distribution equals that of the whole sample.

Editor-producers work in the fiction editorial department of public service broadcasters. They rank below average with professional orientation and especially market orientation. On the contrary, common wealth orientation is more important than it is for the other two clusters. Their activity profile shows a quite diverse job with above average engagement in financial controlling, leadership, and in administrative tasks. However, their above average share of creative thinking truly stands out. Women are overrepresented in this cluster.

If we combine the results of the two samples, then two clusters make a good match. Producer veterans correspond with editor-producers, while marketers correspond with show-managers. Program buyers have no obvious counterpart on the production side since most of the programming they buy is produced by producers that were not included in the sample (predominantly Americans). What is striking, though, is that creative producers lack a clear counterpart among commissioners. It might be that commissioned TV productions do not allow for the same level of creativity as cinema productions.

Discussion

Allegations that media workers producing, acquiring, or commissioning entertainment content are first and foremost oriented toward the market do not correspond with the self-depictions captured in our study. One could even argue that given a setting where TV channels act as , television commissioners are not market oriented enough: They have a self-perception that rates creativity higher than market orientation. It seems as if commissioners are pretty insulated from the marketing of a TV channel and its impact on programming decisions.

The cluster analysis highlights the heterogeneity of the producers' and commissioners' work, respectively. The judgmental dichotomy between journalists and media workers in entertainment, as formulated by Altmeppen (2008), can be maintained only for one of the identified producer types and, with some deductions, for one type of commissioner. Producers of non-fiction entertainment for commercial broadcasters, as well as program

buyers, seem to be strongly market oriented. All other types of producers and commissioners identified in the two studies each state a corrective to a sole market orientation.

Creative producers subordinate the needs of the market to their self-perception as creative content producers. They tend to neglect the more business related aspect of the job, so it can be assumed that they work in a setting where others take care of this part of production.

The veterans who produce for public service broadcasters claim an orientation toward the common welfare. The public mandate of the commissioning channel translates to a corrective where the producers align their own work to non-market aspects. Of course, our method allows for a reversed reasoning: Veterans who feel obliged to the common welfare can sell their product only to public service broadcasters because they will value it and pay a price the market would not.

Similarly, editor-producers depict themselves as creative "co-producers." They work within a public service broadcaster and thus subscribe to a common wealth orientation. However, they depict themselves not only as commissioners but also as creatives in their own right. They reinforce the stereotype that public service commissioners are not market oriented. Critics might say this proves that public service neglects the interests of the audience and advertisers. However, partisans of public service would argue that this proves the value of public service broadcasters because they produce content where the market fails.

Show-managers at commercial broadcasters also seem to have a corrective against a sole market orientation. They do engage in marketing, but they are not involved in planning and controlling the budget. This correlates with their professional orientation; they want to do a "good" job rather than maximize revenue or profit.

The identified types of producers and commissioners reflect the framework set by structural aspects of the production industry, industry conventions, and individual reactions on the perceived culture of media production. Clear differences emerge when we focus on the contrast between public service and commercial broadcasting. Producers working for public service broadcasters and fiction commissioners within those organizations have internalized a common welfare orientation. In this aspect, they are not different from public service employees in other industries. They generally are more likely to place a higher value on the intrinsic reward of important work that provides a feeling of accomplishment. Individuals employed by public organizations value different motives than those employed by private organizations (Houston, 2000). However, the organizational structure of public service channels seems to be only partly suited to stimulate creativity and artistic ambition. This is not true of the commercial broadcasters acting as commissioners where a market orientation is clearly rewarded and promoted. Nevertheless, even producers working for those organizations cannot be described as unreflected executors of market logic. In this context, producers point out the relevance of a creative (not artistic) orientation which indicates the

significance of cultural influences. Likewise, editors of the show-manager type possess a professional orientation that qualifies the market imperative. Entertainment production seems to have developed its own professional ethos with creativity at the center.

Tunstall (1993: 104) described a hierarchy between genres immanent in "a fog of moral values." Single domestic TV movies rank higher than series, which in turn rank higher than imported fare or light entertainment such as quiz shows. Our results seem to reflect these findings since market orientation is most obvious among non-fiction producers. Drama producers working for public service channels, on the other hand, claim to be oriented more toward common welfare or creativity. This might result in higher quality, which in turn would justify the hierarchy observed by Tunstall.

In conclusion, we find little empirical evidence for the stereotypical qualifications of entertainment producers and commissioners as purely market driven. If at all, the allegation of a market orientation is to be addressed by commissioning editors rather than producers. Just as journalism research has become differentiated along divergent functions and areas of work, research on entertainment media workers must take into account the different segments of entertainment production. Dichotomous comparisons of journalists and entertainment producers do not do justice to either group and simultaneously suppress cultural factors beyond the conditions of production.

Limitations and further research

The biggest limitation is, of course, the explorative character of both studies presented. The sample size is rather small and only a limited set of TV markets is included. Some findings might not be generalizable due to peculiarities of the countries. For instance, there is a strong public service broadcaster in all surveyed countries. The objective to entertain in a responsible manner is not only in the mission statements of European public broadcasters, but often also in a legislative mandate. This might directly bias the results for commissioners and also the answers of producers serving those commissioners. To verify the presented findings, the studies would need to be replicated in other markets, especially for commissioners with a larger number of participants. Results from markets with a weaker presence of public service channels would be particularly telling.

Furthermore, the question arises whether producers and editors can be surveyed with the same item set. Tunstall (1993: 3) describes strong differences between genres: "Each genre has its own internal system of status and prestige, its own values and its own world-view." Although we confirm this assumption, we believe different genres should be surveyed with the same item set in order to measure the differences, which would still allow accounting for different contexts.

More generally, the items describing job roles might be reviewed and further adjusted to the field of TV entertainment production. We left out aspects that might indicate a service orientation, and even neglected the title "entertainer" since we assumed everyone would rate it as very important. Possibly a limited interview study with producers and commissioners answering open questions about their orientations might improve the fit of the surveyed items. However, one should realize that a custom-tailored item set limits the possibility to compare the results with those of existing surveys of journalists.

In terms of validity, every study working with self-reported answers is suspected to measure ideological self-deception (Prott, 1976) rather than the actual individual orientation because of a supposed social desirability (Phillips & Clancy, 1972). Generally, we need to point out that only the self-depictions the respondents were willing to provide was measured, and we cannot tell if this can be regarded as fact or staged image. However, compared with studies of journalists, we believe that the issue of social desirability is less of a problem in the context of entertainment production. From other studies that include interviews with entertainment media workers, we got the impression that being market oriented is not regarded as condemnable or problematic. Furthermore, the perceived need to provide socially desirable answers should be lower in an anonymous survey than in-depth interviews. However, we must mention that we did not include the relevance of orientation as a dimension of the self-depiction for the actual work of the producers and commissioners. Chances are that the institutional framework does not allow them to live up to their self-perceptions. Further research should try to include the implications of the orientation for the media workers' actions. A survey interrelated with content analysis of the output of surveyed individuals will allow for more generalizability.

Notes

[i] In Germany, for instance, news may not be sponsored and news anchors are not allowed to appear in commercial messages §7(8) and §8(6) RStV.

[ii] The situation is different in the US with the Producers Guild of America that represents individuals.

[iii] We cannot tell what share of the producers we have covered since the absolute number is unavailable. Seufert (2002: 64) estimates the total number of employees in the film industry in Germany in the year 2000 at 10,900. However, he now provides a breakdown according to occupations and no new estimate has become available since.

[iv] The Worlds of Journalism project by Hanitzsch et al. (2010) might have offered a more standardized measurement of journalistic self-conceptions since their items have been used in 18 countries. However, their focus is on political journalists only, which means their items do not translate well into an entertainment context.

[v] For both samples we used principal component analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization.

References

Altmeppen K.-D. (2007) 'Differenzierung und Distinktion: Journalismus, unterhaltender Journalismus, Unterhaltungsproduktion,' pp. 133–156 in A. Scholl, R. Renger, & B. Blöbaum (eds), *Journalismus und Unterhaltung. Theoretische Ansätze und empirische Befunde*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Altmeppen, K.-D. (2008) 'Wer macht was? Organisationale Handlungsfelder in der TV-Contentproduktion', pp. 30–53 in G. Siegert and M.B. von Rimscha (eds), *Zur Ökonomie der Unterhaltungsproduktion*. Köln: Herbert von Halem.

Altmeppen, K.-D., K. Lantzsch and A. Will (2007) 'Flowing Networks in the Entertainment Business: Organizing International TV Format Trade', *The International Journal on Media Management* 9(3): 94–104.

Amgarten, G. (2008) 'Praxisperspektive. Unterhaltungsproduktion im Service public', pp. 116–122 in G. Siegert and M.B. von Rimscha (eds), *Zur Ökonomie der Unterhaltungsproduktion*. Köln: Herbert von Halem.

Bennett, W.L. (1998) 'The UnCivic Culture: Communication, Identity, and the Rise of Lifestyle Politics', *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31(4): 741–761.

Bilton, C. (2007) *Management and Creativity: From Creative Industries to Creative Management*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Boyle, R. and M. Magor (2008) 'A Nation of Entrepreneurs? Television, Social Change and the Rise of the Entrepreneur', *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics* 4(2): 125–144.

Brown, W.J. (1990) 'Prosocial Effects of Entertainment Television in India', *Asian Journal of Communication* 1(1): 113–135.

Caldwell, J.T. (2008) *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Cantor, M.G. (1971) *The Hollywood TV Producer: His Work and His Audience*. New York: Basic Books.

Caves, R.E. (2003) 'Contracts Between Art and Commerce', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17(2): 73–84.

Coase, R.H. (1961) 'Why Not Use the Price System in the Broadcasting Industry?' *The Freeman* 11(July): 52–57.

Coleman, S. (2003) *A Tale of Two Houses: The House of Commons, the Big Brother House and the People at Home*. London: Hansard Society.

Costera Meijer, I. (2010) 'Quality Taste or Tasting Quality? Excellence in Public Service Media from an Audience Perspective', pp. 189–211 in G.F. Lowe (ed), *The public in public service media. RIPE@2009*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.

Costera Meijer, I. and J. de Bruin (2003) 'The Value of Entertainment for Multicultural Society: A Comparative Approach Towards 'White' and 'Black' Soap Opera Talk', *Media Culture & Society* 25(5): 695–703.

Deakin, S. and S. Pratten (2000) 'Quasi Markets, Transaction Costs, and Trust. The Uncertain Effects of Market Reforms in British Television Production', *Television & New Media* 1(3): 321–354.

Espinosa, P. (1982) 'The Audience in the Text: Ethnographic Observations of a Hollywood Story Conference', *Media Culture & Society* 4(1): 77–86.

Glik, D., E. Berkanovic, K. Stone, L. Ibarra, M.C. Jones, B. Rosen, M. Schreibman, L. Gordon, L. Minassian and D. Richardes (1998) 'Health Education Goes Hollywood: Working with Prime-Time and Daytime Entertainment Television for Immunization Promotion', *Journal of Health Communication: International Perspectives* 3(3): 263–282.

Grindstaff, L. (2002) *The Money Shot: Trash, Class, and the Making of TV Talk Shows*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hanitzsch, T., F. Hanusch, C. Mellado, M. Anikina, R. Berganza, I. Cangoz, M. Coman, B. Hamada, M. Elena Hernández, C.D. Karadjov, S. Virginia Moreira, P.G. Mwesige, P.L. Plaisance, Z. Reich, J. Seethaler, E.A. Skewes, D. Vardiansyah Noor and E. Kee Wang Yuen (2010) ,Mapping Journalism Cultures Across Nations: A Comparative Study of 18 Countries', *Journalism Studies*. Online first.

Harrington, L.C. and D.D. Bielby (2005) 'Global Television Distribution: Implications of TV 'Traveling' for Viewers, Fans, and Texts', *American Behavioral Scientist* 48(7): 902–920.

Hermes, J. (2006) 'Hidden Debates: Rethinking the Relationship Between Popular Culture and the Public Sphere', *Javnost - The Public* 13(4): 27-44.

Hesmondhalgh, D. and S. Baker (2008) 'Creative Work and Emotional Labour in the Television Industry', *Theory, Culture & Society* 25(7-8): 97–118.

Hesmondhalgh, D. and S. Baker (2011) *Creative Labour: Media Work in Three Cultural Industries*. London: Routledge.

Houston, D.J. (2000) 'Public-Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(4): 713–728.

Ibbotson, P. (2008) 'The Remaining Incentives for Commercial Public Service Broadcasting', pp. 69–72 in T. Gardam and D.A.L. Levy (eds) *The Price of Plurality: Choice, Diversity and Broadcasting Institutions in the Digital Age*. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

Iljine, D. and K. Keil (2000) *Der Produzent. Das Berufsbild des Film- und Fernsehproduzenten in Deutschland. Versuch einer Definition*. München: TR-Verlagsunion.

Keum, H., N. Devanathan, S. Deshpande, M.R. Nelson and D.V. Shah (2004) 'The Citizen-Consumer: Media Effects at the Intersection of Consumer and Civic Culture', *Political Communication* 21(3): 369–391.

Lee, J.J. (2000) *The Producer's Business Handbook*. Burlington, MA: Focal Press.

Mann, D. (2009) 'It's Not TV, It's Brand Management TV: The Collective Author(s) of the Lost Franchise', pp. 99–114 in V. Mayer, M.J. Banks and J.T. Caldwell (eds), *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries*. New York: Routledge.

Marr, M., V. Wyss, R. Blum and H. Bonfadelli (2001) *Journalisten in der Schweiz. Eigenschaften, Einstellungen, Einflüsse*. Konstanz: UVK.

Mayer, V., M.J. Banks and J.T. Caldwell (eds) (2009) *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries*. New York: Routledge.

McQuail, D. (1998) 'Commercialization and Beyond', pp. 107–127 in D. McQuail and K. Siune (eds), *Media Policy: Convergence, Concentration and Commerce*. London: Sage.

Negus, K. (2006) 'Rethinking Creative Production Away from the Cultural Industries', pp. 197–208 in J. Curran & D. Morley (eds), *Media and Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge.

Norris, C.E., A.M. Colman and P.A. Aleixo (2003) 'Selective Exposure to Television Programmes and Advertising Effectiveness', *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 17(5): 593–606.

Phillips, D.L. and K.J. Clancy (1972) 'Some Effects of 'Social Desirability' in Survey Studies', *The American Journal of Sociology* 77(5): 921–940.

Preston, A. (2003) *Inside the Commissioners: The Culture and Practice of Commissioning at UK Broadcasters*. Glasgow: The Research Center for Television and Interactivity.

Prott, J. (1976) *Bewusstsein von Journalisten. Standesdenken oder gewerkschaftliche Solidarisierung?* Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt.

Rundfunkstaatsvertrag RStV vom 31.08.1991, in der Fassung von Artikel 1 des Zwölften Staatsvertrages zur Änderung rundfunkrechtlicher Staatsverträge vom 18.12.2008 (vgl. GBl. S.130, 2009), in Kraft getreten am 01.06.2009

Schimank, U. (2000) *Theorien gesellschaftlicher Differenzierung.* Opladen: Leske+Budrich.

Seufert, W. (2002) *Film- und Fernsehwirtschaft in Deutschland 2000/2001: Beschäftigte, wirtschaftliche Lage und Struktur der Produktionsunternehmen.* Berlin: Vistas.

Spigel, L. (2004) 'Entertainment Wars: Television Culture After 9/11', *American Quarterly* 56(2): 235–270.

Tunstall, J. (1993) *Television Producers: Communications and Society.* London: Routledge.

van Zoonen, L. (2005) *Entertaining the Citizen: When Politics and Popular Culture Converge.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Vogel, H.L. (2004) *Entertainment Industry Economics: A Guide for Financial Analysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

von Rimscha, M.B. (2010) *Risikomanagement in der Entwicklung und Produktion von Spielfilmen: Wie Produzenten vor Drehbeginn Projektrisiken steuern.* Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Ward, J.H. (1963) 'Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 58(301): 236–244.

Weaver, D.H. and G.C. Wilhoit (1986) *The American Journalist: A Portrait of US News People and Their Work. Bloomington*, IN: Indiana University Press.

Weaver, D.H., R.A. Beam, B.J. Brownlee, P.S. Voakes and G.C. Wilhoit (2007) *The American Journalist in the 21st Century: US News People at the Dawn of a New Millennium.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Weischenberg, S. (1995) *Journalistik. Theorie und Praxis aktueller Medienkommunikation. Band 2: Medientechnik, Medienfunktionen, Medienakteure.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Weischenberg, S., M. Malik and A. Scholl (2006) *Die Souffleure der Mediengesellschaft. Report über die Journalisten in Deutschland.* Konstanz: UVK.

Whittier, D.K., M.G. Kennedy, J.S. St. Lawrence, S. Seeley and V. Beck (2005) 'Embedding Health Messages into Entertainment Television: Effect on Gay Men's Response to a Syphilis Outbreak', *Journal of Health Communication: International Perspectives* 10(3): 251–259.

Windeler, A. and J. Sydow (2001) 'Project Networks and Changing Industry Practices Collaborative Content Production in the German Television Industry', *Organization Studies* 22(6): 1035–1060.