Class, gender and cultural work in British documentary film production: Experiences, subjectivities and policy discourses

Ekaterina Tarnovskaya

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology

University of Essex

December 2020

Abstract

This thesis explores class, gender and cultural work in British documentary film production. It investigates documentary filmmaking as creative labour by using interview, ethnographic observation, and discourse analysis. The methods allow analysing experiences of class and gender and modes of articulating them. Thus, the thesis means to contribute to the collection and analysis of data about cultural labour. Much academic work on cultural industries has considered increasing social inequality. However, sociological studies of cultural production have little attended to documentary films. My research findings indicate that socially marginalised workers are more likely than their privileged peers to encounter obstacles when working in documentary filmmaking. My interviews reveal that filmmakers in marginalised positions are likely to be aware of structural inequalities, whereas privileged filmmakers are likely to reproduce discourses of meritocracy and postfeminism. A central aim of the thesis is to identify within independent film enterprises the workings of class and gender. The thesis argues that entrepreneurial work practices sustain, rather than depart from, discriminatory working conditions. The thesis considers also how to address social inequalities within filmmaking work by exploring cultural policy discourses that operate within the British film industry. The thesis takes a 'bottom-up' approach to cultural policymaking in the hope that it might encourage more socially-disadvantaged workers into film production.

Contents

Acknowledgements

First and indeed foremost, I thank each of my interviewees for their participation in this study. They were generous with their time and knowledge.

I thank both of my supervisors, Dr Michael Bailey and Dr Stevphen Shukaitis, for their constant support and guidance. I was enormously fortunate to have had their academic supervision and personal support. They have inspired me and developed me intellectually. This research would have been impossible without them.

I am most grateful to Professor Colin Samson, who monitored my doctoral progress and offered advice and support throughout.

I thank the academic staff of the Department of Sociology, University of Essex for their time and their ideas. I have found many wonderful colleagues and friends there, who, I hope, will stay with me in the future.

I would like to thank Dr Nicholas Joll for proofreading this thesis.

Thanks to all my dearest friends. They have supported me through this process.

My warmest thanks go to my mother and father for their encouragement and kindness. Most of all, I would like to thank Iain for his loving support and for his patience with me during this journey.

Analytical contents

Introduction

A documentary film is historically known as a medium that aims to capture social reality and itself to play a social role by giving voice to marginalised communities. There has been a strong sense of film thus serving society within British film culture. It is characterised by enthusiasm for documentary as a tool for education, social improvement, and construction of citizenship (Hill, 2004: 33). For example, the British documentary film movement of the 1930s used documentaries to address social injustice. In the 1960 through to the 1980s, radical film groups – such as the London Women's Film Group, the Berwick Street Collective, Amber Films and so on – advocated socialism, feminism and anti-racism. The Independent Filmmakers Association (IFA), established in 1974, argued for the cultural and political independence of filmmaking. The early history of Channel 4 involved putting marginalised voices on and indeed, so to speak, behind the screen. Documentaries are somewhat continuing to play their social role nowadays by capturing poverty, violence and discrimination. Films shape our understanding of societies that we live in and affect how we imagine social change. As Arendt (1998) argues, storytelling is a political action that provides access to public space and allows to build participative society. The political implication of documentaries is one of the motivations for undertaking this study.

The research seeks to explore who is allowed to speak within the medium of British documentary film. It examines the documentary filmmaking profession within the structures of class and gender relations. Although there is a strong sense of documentaries playing a social role, the large majority of filmmakers do not belong to communities that are portrayed in films. Documentarians form a homogeneous

professional group that predominantly comprises upper and middle-class men. Recent studies have shown that there is an increase of social inequalities within cultural industries that should be examined systematically (Brook et al, 2018; O'Brien & Oakley, 2015; Warwick Commission, 2015). Informal and insecure employment characterises cultural work and worsens inequality within it. Gaining and accumulating knowledge about contemporary employment is an essential step to addressing issues of injustice in cultural industries, so analysing filmmaking as creative work is necessary and timely.

The study discusses class and gender inequalities in filmmaking work by examining the discourses of documentarians. The main questions, which the thesis asks, are as follows. How are class and gender constructed in discourses of filmmakers? How do their discourses contribute to or else resist the exclusion? In order to answer these questions, I undertook empirical research into documentary filmmaking work in Britain. I collected thirty-three interviews with documentary filmmakers and did ethnographic observations of film industry events. The data demonstrates lived experiences of inequalities and different ways of describing them. The thesis explores how class and gender operate in independent film enterprises that are a prevailing form of film production. It expands on how to address class and gender marginalisation at work by examining cultural policy discourses. The study has a political motive of bringing social justice in the professional community. It is engaged with a question of how to give voices to marginalised individuals and derives from a political idea of changing labour relations that would result in building a better social world.

The class and gender inequalities are investigated in this study because there is an interesting imbalance between them in British film production. British documentaries are characterised by the highest number of women among crew members (Sleeman, 2017).[1] There are more women directors and women producers in documentaries than in other film genres. Additionally, a large and growing body of literature has investigated gender inequality in cultural work and presented quantitative and qualitative data on this issue.[2] Several policy initiatives aim to tackle gender inequality in cultural industries. Yet, recent studies have paid little attention to class. There is less available data on the social class composition of the film industry workforce. Social class is hidden in the official diversity policy agenda and anti-discrimination laws. The fact that the law does not require the collection of data on social class results in being less data, or at least less robust data, about that matter (O'Brien & Oakley, 2015: 14). The thesis attempts to examine class and gender together, rather than separately. I argue that the exclusionary effects of class and gender reinforce each other.

The research fits within two areas of academic literature such as Foucauldian studies and sociological research on cultural labour. The project is relevant in the context of Foucauldian studies because it provides an attempt to apply Foucault's ideas to the empirical study of the filmmaking profession. The project draws on the

---

[1]   Since the 1990s, 31% of documentary film crew members have been women, according to data released by the BFI (Sleeman, 2017).

[2]   See, for example, Adkins (1999), Allen (2013), Banks (2017), Banks & Milestone (2011), Conor et al (2015), Gill (2002), Gill (2008), Gill (2011), Gill & Scharff (2011), Gill et al (2017), Hesmondhalgh & Baker (2015), Kelan (2009), McRobbie (2010), McRobbie (2016), McRobbie (2009), Proctor-Thompson (2013), Scharff (2015), Scharff (2018), Taylor (2015), Wing-Fai et al (2015), Wreyford (2015).

theoretical legacy of Foucauldian analytics of power, discourse analysis and neoliberalism. Classism and sexism are examined as constantly modified and even constantly reinvented practices and discourses. The discourses are examined as constitutive elements of social reality. I explore how documentarians shape their conduct at work by employing the theory of governmentality. Foucault's account of neoliberalism provides a theoretical framework that I use to discuss entrepreneurial subjectivities of filmmakers. Foucault's works are inspirational for numerous sociological studies of culture and media that employ his theoretical considerations on governmentality and neoliberalism.

The thesis aims to contribute to the sociological literature on cultural production. There is an increasing amount of research that explores culture within the structure of social relations. (To name but a few such studies: Banks, 2017; Gill, 2008; Hesmondhalgh, 2013; McRobbie, 2016; Oakley & O'Brien, 2016; Scharff, 2018; Shukaitis & Figiel, 2015.) The studies are engaged with the question of who makes culture in the neoliberal context. Cultural industries are critically discussed as capitalist modes of production characterised by specific dynamics of social relations, power and capitals. The issues of inequalities are central for academic debates on cultural industries. Recent studies treat inequalities of gender, class, race, disability, age, sexuality and more within various cultural industries. Various manifestations of social inequalities are examined – for instance, income, status, and discriminatory practices. Recently the quantity of publicly available data on cultural labour has increased (O'Brien & Oakley, 2015).[3] However, there are no robust data that would

---

[3]   See, for instance, data released by the United Kingdom's Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.

provide a consistent picture of labour relation changes over the past decades (*ibid.*). My study aims to contribute to collecting and exploring cultural labour data on one of the least researched area – the documentary film sector. Sociological research on cultural production contains only a few studies of the British documentary film industry. (Examples of such studies are: Presence et al, 2020; Zoellner, 2010.) That neglect has to do with the position of film within the disciplinary division of universities. Usually, films are treated as 'texts' within humanities departments, rather than as practices by social science departments. Film is considered by the social science disciplines an entertainment industry that does not fit in more 'serious' social science research objects such as migration, poverty, surveillance and so on.

This thesis begins with a review of relevant literature. Chapter one treats Foucault's so-called analytics of power, his discourse analysis and his account of neoliberalism. His ideas on power relations are useful for examining the dynamic of inequality in the documentary filmmaking profession. Foucault's notion of neoliberalism is insightful for understanding the nature of the entrepreneurial activity in documentary film production. I move on to reviewing sociological studies of cultural work. I discuss the main characteristics of the contemporary work regime that obtains within cultural industries and I summarise the findings of existing research into class and gender inequalities within cultural labour.

Chapter two presents and tries to warrant the methods that I have used for my empirical work. I discuss the main research questions of my study and provide an overview of my data collection. The methods of interview and ethnographic observation are employed to examine the lived experiences of class and of gender inequalities in the documentary filmmaking profession. I discuss data analysis and

methodological concerns of applying a Foucauldian framework to this empirical research. Moreover, the chapter explores challenges and limitations of my position as a doctoral researcher.

Chapter three provides the historical context to the research. It does that by analysing policy regulation and industrial relations in the British film and television industries, from the 1980s onwards. The chapter summarises the main social and political changes relevant to understanding the current ecology of British documentary film production. I discuss the film policy of the Thatcherite decade, the launch of Channel 4 and the emergence of the independent film production sector. The chapter expands on film and broadcasting policies of the Major Government, the New Labour Government and the Coalition Government. The remaining three chapters form the empirical part of the thesis by presenting discourses of interviewees.

Chapter four explores how documentarians construct discursively class and gender in filmmaking work. It investigates their subjective experiences of inequalities and modes of describing them. The interviewees produced a number of consensual and conflicting discourses. Although they agreed upon the nature of existing social exclusions and upon the existence of disadvantageous working conditions in the sector, there were different interpretations of how it affects film workers.

Chapter five discusses ethos and practices of governing the self among documentarians. The chapter investigates entrepreneurial discourse, which dominates in the film industry, and resisting discourse, which escapes and questions the enterprising subjectivity. Filmmakers launched their enterprises in the hope of becoming autonomous producers who could create a new and auspicious environment

within which to work. Thus, to engage in entrepreneurial activity is not only to change one's employment status but also to change subjectivity and self-governance. The chapter explores the entrepreneurial ethos characterised by innovation, self-reliance, independence, individuality and resilience. I proceed to analyse entrepreneurial discourses about class and gender produced by interviewees and entrepreneurial work practices that contribute to social exclusions. The chapter discusses resisting discourses of documentary filmmakers. Some research participants articulated discourses in ways that escape entrepreneurial subjectivity. Those documentarians criticised the ideas of meritocracy and market competition and expressed themselves through non-entrepreneurial themes. The chapter draws on themes of social justice, radical aesthetics, friendship and solidarity.

Chapter six investigates policy discourses about class and gender. To that end, it surveys policy initiatives undertaken by governmental and non-governmental actors and then expands upon accounts of documentarians concerning what could be done for building a better working environment. I use a 'bottom-up' approach to cultural policymaking to create a list of policy recommendations provided by the film practitioners. It aims to understand how to transform the documentary filmmaking profession into a democratic public space.

The Conclusion ends the thesis with an outline of the main findings of this study. It summarises the research findings in relation to research questions and provides recommendations for further research.

1   Review of the literature

1.1   Introduction

There is no shortage of existing work that describes the role of cultural industries within contemporary societies and that focuses upon creative work defined as 'jobs, centred on the activity of symbol-making' (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011: 9). Cultural production is divided into different genres that function as social institutions characterised by distinctive values and behaviours. For example, documentary film workers understand their work in a different way from creators working in fiction or animation film. The present empirical study of inequalities in documentary filmmaking work develops the theoretical framework by employing recent sociological research on cultural work. Much of the sociological literature on cultural work draws on the theoretical legacy of Foucault's works. In the literature review chapter that follows, I consider Foucauldian 'analytics of power'. I do so because that analytics provides an epistemic tool for examining the dynamic of inequalities in the filmmaking profession.[1] The chapter focuses on Foucault's contributions to the historical understanding of the neoliberal subject, and his account of neoliberalism is highly influential in studies on entrepreneurialism. The chapter provides an overview of the sociological studies on cultural work that are relevant for this empirical research of inequalities in the filmmaking profession.

---

[1]   My second chapter tries to support my choice of Foucault's work as the theoretical framework for my empirical research.

1.2   Analytics of power in the works of Foucault

In his lecture *The Government of Self and Others*, Foucault summarises his studies as 'history of thought' or history of 'focal points of experience' (Foucault, 2010: 3). His interests include examining forms of knowledge, normative forms of behaviour and modes of what he calls 'subjectification'. In these areas – forms of knowledge, behaviour, 'subjectification' – Foucault undertakes analytical shifts or displacements, which could be defined in three main points such as 'veridiction', 'governmentality' and 'subjectification' (Foucault, 2010: 5). For instance, the displacement in examining forms of knowledge relates to exploring discursive practices, rather than the content and development of knowledge. Foucault discusses subjectification in terms of their forms and technologies of the self, rather than the theory of the subject. The normativity of behaviour is explored as techniques and procedures of 'conduct of conduct' or 'governmentality', rather than the functioning of power institutions. The displacement made by Foucault in the analysis of power is discussed below.

Foucault's analytics of power concerns how power relations operate in a society (Foucault, 1983; Foucault, 1978; Foucault, 1995; Foucault, 2007). Foucault defines power relations as relations that modify others, or as he puts also it, 'conduct of conduct' or 'an action upon an action'. Foucault writes about power:

> It is a total structure of actions brought to bear upon possible actions; it incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult; in the extreme it constrains or forbids absolutely; it is nevertheless always a way of acting upon an acting subject or acting subjects by virtue of their

acting or being capable of action. A set of actions upon other actions.

(Foucault, 1983: 220)

According to Foucault, power is not someone's privilege or property; power is rather a social relation based on a complex set of positions, strategies and tactics. Power is force relation intrinsic to some particular area, and to processes of their transformations, and strategies of their operation.[2] Foucault talks of the 'omnipresence' of power and immanence of power in social relationships. Power originates from multiple sources, and investigating social relations involves power relations inevitably. Foucault uses the term 'government' to show that power operates through various social modes rather than just through the management of states. Government aims to modify the conduct of people by means of other people who do not necessarily represent states – for instance, government of criminals, the sick, and of children. Following Foucault's research perspective, Dean (1999) suggests the term 'analytics of government' to indicate the wideness of spheres of governing, which is applicable in any social relations. Foucault suggests that power relations operate through practices engaged in daily by individuals, so he explores 'concrete practices' instead of institutions, ideologies, systems or 'universals' (Foucault, 2010: 3). Foucault calls them 'grids of practices' (Foucault, 2010) or 'regimes of practices' (Foucault, 1997d).

Foucault provides the following definition of power in the chapter called 'Method' in his *The History of Sexuality. Volume I.*

---

[2] In the empirical part of this thesis, I consider social inequalities as inequalities of power. Class and gender struggles in the documentary filmmaking profession are a local point of power exercise.

> [P]ower must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of
> force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which
> constitute their own organisation; as the process which, through
> ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or
> reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one
> another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the
> disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another;
> and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general
> design or institutional crystallisation is embodied in the state apparatus,
> in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies. Power's
> condition of possibility, or in any case the viewpoint which permits one
> to understand its exercise, even in its more 'peripheral' effects, and
> which also makes it possible to use its mechanisms as a grid of
> intelligibility of the social order, must not be sought in the primary
> existence of a central point, in a unique source of sovereignty from
> which secondary and descendent forms would emanate; it is the moving
> substrate of force relations which, by virtue of their inequality,
> constantly engender states of power, but the latter are always local and
> unstable. (Foucault, 1978: 92–93)

In my study of British documentary film production, Foucault's concept of power allows to investigate the industry at a micro-political level. The documentary film sector produces a particular configuration of power and knowledge, which benefits hugely white middle-class men. Documentarians who fall outside of this social group struggle for survival in the filmmaking world. Power, however, is not limited to domination of this social group; power relations involve all social groupings, regardless their positions in the social hierarchy. Foucault's ideas of

'omnipresence' of power and immanence of power relations in any social sites allow me to explore documentarians and documentary institutions as 'local centres of power-knowledge' (Foucault, 1978: 98).

My study uses Foucault's understanding of power as originating from multiple sources. Power relations are not limited to official political forms but include social actors, which do not belong to political institutions. Foucault's idea of power originating from below leads me to discuss documentarians as actors of power. Their actions and discourses regulate work relations in the sector. My study explores discourses produced by filmmakers, and I consider their discourses as a part of the operation of government.

Power relations are actions that modify others, or as Foucault puts it, 'a mode of action upon actions' (1983: 222). My study explores how documentary filmmakers govern actions of others. Class and gender privileges permit some filmmakers to act upon actions of others. These filmmakers – usually upper/middle-class and men – pursue own interests in securing their privileges. Their objectives are to maintain their funding, positions and statuses. The privileged documentarians exercise power over others by means of economic differences and means of patriarchal control. Documentarians' discourses about workplace inequalities involve the notions of directing the conduct of individuals and social groups who lack class and gender privileges. For example, documentarians discuss in interviews why women and working-class filmmakers are underrepresented in the documentary making profession and what they could do to improve their chances (government of women and government of working class).

According to Foucault, power is unequal relations between social actors; and this idea speaks to my study of workplace inequalities in filmmaking work. Social inequalities lead to investigating how power operates in the documentary filmmaking. My study aims to explore micro practices of power in filmmaking work, or in other words, power in its everyday performance. The study asks the question of how or by what means power is exercised in the filmmaking sector. Some documentarians exert power over others by using their class and gender privileges, thus reproducing inequalities at work. Documentarians also subvert inequalities in their work practices and resist the dominant forms of government. Confrontations and consensus, which documentarians produce in their actions and discourses, transform the system, within which they work. Thus, my investigation treats power as a process of changing relations within the documentary sector.

Foucault claims that power is complex relationships that could be explored by looking at the forms of resistance (1983: 211). My study of inequalities within filmmaking work analyses struggles and confrontations: it considers resistance to the power of middle-class/men over working class/women. I investigate various discourses produced by documentarians about class and gender and explore how documentarians subvert inequalities in their policy suggestions. Documentarians aim at defeating the power effects that prevent them from participating in filmmaking as equals. I consider also discourses that run counter to entrepreneurial discourse, which dominates in the film sector. Resisting discourse links documentarians with their communities and allows filmmakers to be different from the dominant norms.

Foucault uses the term 'governmentality' that he defines as a set of institutions and regulations within a historically specific form of power (Foucault, 1997c: 219-

220). Institutions and regulations govern population by using the political economy as a source of knowledge about governed population and apparatuses of security (*ibid.*: 219-220). Foucault defines governmentality as a historical shift from one period to another and as a process of transformation of states (Foucault, 1997c: 220). He analyses the changes of governing modes throughout the history of Western societies and looks at the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as a period of profound social and political change. He discusses historical shifts in forms of power, and these forms changed from 'sovereignty' to 'discipline' and then to 'government' (Foucault, 1997c). The 'governmentalisation' of the state has produced the state of government existing today. It replaced the old forms of the state that are the administrative state appeared in the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries and the state of justice that existed in the feudal age. The main difference between them is the way in which societies are governed, namely by discipline at the period of the administrative state and by law at the period of the state of justice. The administrative state was replaced by the state of government in the eighteenth century. At the time of emergence of the governmental state, the 'modern' power replaced the 'juridico-discursive' power. Foucault distinguishes between the juridico-discursive power that is a repressive and preventing force and the modern type of power that is a creative force (May, 2015). The latter makes something happen within a society rather than trying to prevent it. Foucault (1995) argues that modern power creates a modern soul, which is to say, it creates a certain kind of human being.

Foucault provides the following threefold definition of the term 'governmentality'.

By this word [governmentality] I mean three things:

1. The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security.

2. The tendency which, over a long period and throughout the West, has steadily led towards the pre-eminence over all other forms (sovereignty, discipline, etc.) of this type of power which may be termed government, resulting, on the one hand, in the formation of a whole series of specific governmental apparatuses, and, on the other, in the development of a whole complex of *savoirs*.

3. The process, or rather the result of the process, through which the state of justice of the Middle Ages, transformed into the administrative state during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, gradually becomes 'governmentalized'. (Foucault, 1991b: 102–103)

The modern type of power creates individuals through their daily practices, which involve different kinds of knowledge. Knowledge and power are closely intertwined, and according to Foucault, 'power produces knowledge' (Foucault, 1995: 27). He uses the terms 'power-knowledge' or 'dispositif' for exploring their interrelationships (Foucault, 1995; Foucault, 2010). Examining Foucault's research, Dean (1999) explains the term governmentality by referring to mentality or collective thinking about governing. The mentality is regulated by commonly accepted knowledge. In contemporary societies, knowledge is produced by human sciences such as psychology, medicine, political economy and so on. Political economy, for instance, is the essential knowledge for the government because it shows the ways of

reaching prosperity of the population and the enrichment of the state (Foucault, 2010). The population has become the main target of the state of government from eighteenth century onwards. The population is not merely a set of people grouped together and, thus, requires a different approach to control it. Statistics and political economy suggest the approach that understands the population as a set of demographic data such as birth rates, death rates, and life expectancy (Foucault, 1978: 25). Another example is the development of criminal knowledge that is necessary for the penal system operating in the governmental state (Foucault, 1995). The 'scientifico-juridical complex' provides answers about the nature and circumstances of the criminal activity. In the administrative state, the executioner is the only one who is in charge of punishments; in the state of government, by contrast, 'there swarms a whole series of subsidiary authorities' such as warders, educationalists, and doctors (Foucault, 1995: 21). These specialists have different spheres of expertise aimed at controlling life and body. Psycho-disciplines produce knowledge about individuals and contribute to creating the modern soul.

The aforementioned definition of governmentality is the first, historic, meaning of the concept. There is a second meaning of the concept: governmentality is rationality of government, i.e. the way of thinking and reasoning about government (Dean, 2010). The rationality of government functions within practices of governing and self-governing. The concept of governmentality is relevant for my study because it allows to investigate documentarians' thoughts about governing and self-governing. In interviews, filmmakers demonstrated different truths and knowledge about filmmaking work. Documentarians narrated their ideas about social inequalities and how to govern them. They share their thoughts about filmmaking success and what they need to do to achieve their aims. The modern state promotes individualization

and produces individual subjects. Foucault argues that the state's power is 'both an individualizing and a totalizing form of power' (1983: 213). My study explores enterprising documentarians who encourage individuality and connect themselves to their own identities. The concept of governmentality allows to understand the modes of resistance too. According to Foucault, nowadays, the prevalent type of struggles is the struggle 'against that [forms of subjection] which ties the individual to himself and submits him to others in this way (struggles against subjection, against forms of subjectivity and submission)' (1983: 212). My study explores resistance to individualisation by radical filmmakers who questioned entrepreneurial subjectivity.

1.3   Foucault's notion of governing the self

Foucault is interested not only in how external forces regulate the actions of subjects but also in how those subjects govern themselves (Foucault, 1997a).[3] Foucault provides the following definition of 'subject'. 'There are two meanings of the word subject: subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge' (Foucault, 1983: 212). His idea of a subject refers to the terms 'governmentality' and 'dispositif'. Subjects are controlled 'inside and outside' by the technologies of power and the technologies of the self, and the connection between them is called 'governmentality' (Foucault, 1997a: 225). Foucault gives the following definitions of the technologies of power and the technologies of the self.

---

[3]   Chapter five will explore how entrepreneurial filmmakers interviewed for this empirical study 'govern' themselves. I will discuss the entrepreneurial activity of filmmakers as the technologies of the self.

[Technologies of power] determine the conduct of individuals and

submit them to certain ends or domination, an objectivizing of the

subject. (Foucault, 1997a: 225)

[Technologies of the self] permit individuals to effect by their own

means, or with the help of others, a certain number of operations on

their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as

to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness,

purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality. (Foucault, 1997a: 225)

Foucault is interested in thoughts, feelings, attitudes and skills of individuals who govern themselves. The analysis of governing oneself includes four elements in its structure (Dean, 1999). The first element relates to the governed substance that is an aim of the technologies of the self – for instance, the soul in ancient Greece. The second element is the governing work that explains how government operates, such as meditation practices in Greek culture. The third element in Foucault's analysis of self-governance is the governable subject. An example of a governable subject is a male citizen in ancient Greece. And the fourth component is the telos of governing practices – for instance, in ancient Greece, the achievement of truth. Applying this scheme, Foucault explores the history of the development of the technologies of the self by considering hermeneutics of the self in Greco-Roman and Christian texts (Foucault, 1997a; Foucault, 2005). He outlines the differences between historical periods with regard to the relations between subject and truth. In Greco-Roman philosophy – according to Foucault – the main principle is 'the care of the self', and spirituality regulates the relation between subject and truth (Foucault, 2005). In the Christian culture, 'knowledge of the self' replaces the care of the self, and knowledge defines the relations between subject and truth (Foucault, 2005).

The care of the self is a 'general cultural phenomenon' and 'an event in thought' in Greek society (Foucault, 2005). The principle of the care of the self is important for understanding the modern subject, and Foucault investigates that care via ancient philosophy. He refers to Plato's text *Alcibiades*, in which Socrates helps others to care for themselves (Foucault, 2005). Socrates aims to awaken Athens' citizens and change their attitudes towards themselves. Foucault comments on this principle, as follows.

> The care of oneself is a sort of thorn which must be stuck in men's flesh, driven into their existence, and which is a principle of restlessness and movement, of continuous concern throughout life. (Foucault, 2005: 8)

The care of the self is a mode of conduct and a particular relation to oneself and indeed to other persons. That multiform relation involves the technologies of the self, which is to say, practices and exercises all of which transform oneself so that one can achieve the truth. In a word, the techniques at issue – those through which the Greek pursued care of the self – are the practices of spirituality (Foucault, 2005: 15). 'Spirituality' is an important term for understanding the relations between subject and truth in the ancient world, according to Foucault. A subject cannot achieve the truth without changing itself and becoming someone else. As Foucault suggests, 'The subject is not capable of truth' (Foucault, 2005: 15). There are two main ways of achieving the truth, namely love and work. Work on oneself relates to the concerns about the soul. Foucault outlines the classification of practices that are used to access the truth and change oneself in Greek culture (Foucault, 2005: 47-48). For instance, ancient people purify and concentrate their souls to prepare themselves for truth; they withdraw themselves from the world and society and by that grow their stamina and

strength. The care of oneself includes various practices such as reading, writing, learning, meditating, memorising, preparing for political life and so on. Foucault provides examples of extensive practices of self-reflexivity and self-examination in personal diaries and letters, which were common for Greek and Roman cultures (Foucault, 1997a: 233). Another example is that of the rituals used to purify and prepare souls for dreams – rituals including listening to music and reading (Foucault, 2005: 48). The process of remembering is another practice of the care of the self: someone memorises the truth taught by masters and then implement it into their conduct. According to Foucault, the figure of a master is always present in the practices of the care of the self (Foucault, 2005: 58). He writes:

> The master is the person who cares about the subject's care for himself, and who finds in his love for his disciple the possibility of caring for the disciple's care for himself. (Foucault, 2005: 59).

Foucault shows the relationships between the master and disciple by providing the example of Socrates and Alcibiades. Socrates cares about Alcibiades' soul and prepares him for governing the city. Foucault links the care of oneself to economic and political privileges of those who can care for themselves (Foucault, 2005: 31). Foucault says: 'We entrust our lands to our helots so that we can take care of ourselves' (Foucault, 2005: 36).

The important point for the modern history of truth is the 'Cartesian moment' that indicates the shift from the care of the self towards knowledge of the self (Foucault, 2005: 14). There is a deep change in the relations that persons bear to the truth because the subject achieves the truth through knowledge rather than spirituality. According to Foucault, 'subject is capable of truth' (Foucault, 2005: 19).

Achieving the truth does not require changing the subject into someone else. Another cause of the shift to knowledge of the self is a further phenomenon affecting the modern history of truth, namely the Christian religion. Self-knowledge could be obtained by disclosure and reaching purity of the soul. Disclosure takes different forms in the Christian tradition, and all of them relates to the rejecting of own self. In the early Christian period, the disclosure of oneself relates to publicly declaring oneself as a Christian penitent sinner. Later on, it is replaced by a practice of disclosure oneself through the speaking of thoughts at confession and, by means of that speech, obedience to the master. Unlike the ancient culture, the Christian tradition considers the thoughts, but not the activity of oneself. The Christian subject seeks in her thoughts hidden ones that do not lead to God and then confesses them to the master. Foucault argues that confession has a great impact on societies and that it continues to operate within the production of discourse of truth today (Foucault, 1978). For, institutions of confession have developed and changed over time and need not take place in a church or even involve God. They can be found in, for instance, relationships between parents and children, and between experts and criminals (Foucault, 1978: 63).

Foucault's idea of governing the self is relevant for my study, which investigates how documentarians regulate their own behaviour at work. I am interested in finding regularities and patterns in professional conduct of filmmakers. My study explores practices of self-government, or in other words, what happen when documentarians govern themselves. The study of self-governing includes analysis of technologies of government, forms of knowledge and identities (Dean, 2010: 42-43). Documentarians govern themselves according to a set of norms and pursuing certain objectives. Research interviewees revealed in interviews how to

govern themselves better, i.e. what abilities and characteristics documentary workers are expected to have. My interviewees knew what is an appropriate conduct in filmmaking work: for example, they need to be highly committed to filmmaking, take financial risks of the profession, attend networking events and so on. Documentarians aim to obtain these attributes, and thereby improving their conduct at work.

Foucault argues that governing the self operates in the sphere of ethics (1985). My study analyses entrepreneurial ethos of documentarians who established independent enterprises. My study treats the entrepreneurial activity as not simply a career change but a form of self-regulation. The objective of their practices of government is creating an enterprise culture. According to their accounts, the entrepreneurial world of filmmaking is a new auspicious work environment that gives autonomy and agency to its workers. Documentarians govern their conduct at work by using the means of self-management. Their practices of self-government constitute entrepreneurial subjectivity. The regime of government encourages documentarians to have entrepreneurial attributes: for example, innovation, self-reliance, independence, individuality and resilience.

According to Foucault, the sphere of ethics is autonomous from the sphere of politics (Dean, 2010: 21). This autonomy, therefore, implies that government of the self could become a tool for resistance to the dominant forms of power (*ibid.*). Documentary filmmakers resist the dominant forms of government though governing the self. My study acknowledges that some documentarians think and act differently, or in other words, investigates 'counter-conduct' of documentarians (Foucault, 2007: 196). Foucault argues that 'revolts of conduct' are different from resistance against sovereignty or economic exploitation (*ibid.*: 196). 'Resistance of conduct' pursues

different goals and takes different forms (*ibid.*: 196). Documentarians' counter-conduct criticises and aims to defeat domination of middle-class men in the documentary sector. Their resistance of conduct is linked to the broader conflicts of class and gender. Documentarians aim to escape domination of this social group and develop a new mode of conducting the self and others. Their counter-conduct pursues the aim of creating inclusivity and diversity in the filmmaking sector. A new egalitarian work regime would give voice to filmmakers from marginalised backgrounds. My study explores the rationality of resistance and practices of resistance. Some documentarians do filmmaking work differently: they undertook proactive steps to creating equity at work. For example, they involved marginalised individuals in their documentary film production, thus prioritising diversity over profit and productivity. Consequences of documentarians' resistance are increasing autonomy of documentarians from market needs and developing capacities for self-determination.

1.4   Foucauldian discourse analysis

Foucault develops a way of studying discourse that remains highly influential in social science and the humanities. Foucault argues that discourse is constitutive in that it structures social and cultural reality. There is, however, a difference between his views on discourse in his earlier, so-called 'archaeological' works (such as *The Archaeology of Knowledge* itself) and later so-called 'genealogical' works (such as *History of Sexuality* and *Discipline and Punish*). His archaeological works treat 'discursive formations' and areas of knowledge, while his genealogical works investigate the connection between power relations and discourse (Fairclough, 1992: 39). This section of the chapter will consider this shift in Foucault's understanding of

discourse and will discuss the later genealogical works because they are more relevant than the earlier works to the study of inequalities in filmmaking work.

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) examines various types of discourse to be found in the human sciences. He argues that discourse constructs social reality, namely its subjects, social relations and knowledge. The archaeological discourse analysis explores 'verbal performances' or 'statements' existing in the social and cultural context (Fairclough, 1992: 40). Here then Foucault is interested in language use, though he does not limit himself to that. The term 'discursive formations' is defined as a set of rules for statements' operation in a society (Fairclough, 1992: 40). The rules are formed by social relationships between 'institutions, economic and social processes, behavioural patterns, systems of norms, techniques, types of classification, modes of characterization' (Foucault, 1972: 45, quoted in Fairclough, 1992: 42). Foucault develops tools for examining discursive formations such as rules for the formation of objects, enunciative modalities, subject positions, concepts, and strategies (Fairclough, 1992: 41-49). The 'objects' are understood as the objects of knowledge within particular disciplines. The 'enunciative modalities' are various discursive activities of subjects. The formation of subjects proceeds through constituting of self in discursive practices (Fairclough, 1992: 44). According to the archaeological works, discourse constructs subjects and their social identity.[4]

---

[4]   The structuralist point in Foucault's archaeological works is criticised by Fairclough (1992). Fairclough argues that a subject is an effect of discursive formation, and that state of affairs does not allow a subject to exercise social agency or perform resistance (Fairclough, 1992: 45). According to Fairclough, Foucault neglects questions about political struggles and about resistance to power.

Foucault's ideas of intradiscursivity / interdiscursivity / extradiscursivity (Foucault, 1972) provide an insight into how discourses interact and depend on each other. There are different relations between texts within discursive formations (and these are the 'intradiscursive relations'). The rules of discursive formations are affected also by various discursive formations within orders of discourse ('interdiscursive relations'). 'Extradiscursive' dependencies function between discursive formations and changes outside discourses – for instance, economic and political transformations. All statements, therefore, exist in complex relations with each other, and intradiscursive, interdiscursive and extradiscursive contexts shape and structure statements.

In the later genealogical works *The History of Sexuality* (1978) and *Discipline and Punish* (1995), Foucault starts to explore the relations between power and discourse. He is interested in how power relations allow the production of specific types of discourse, and on the other hand, how discourses sustain power relations (1978: 97, 102). Discourses are located within various points of power relations. For example, they are distributed between the positions of being an instrument of power and being a source of resistance against it. Foucault examines discourses as 'tactical elements' within various strategies of power relations; thus, they have a fluid character that allows them to change a strategy or produce a contradiction within a strategy (1978: 101). Foucault argues that discourse is not 'the surface of projection' of power relations, but rather 'it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together' (Foucault, 1978: 100). 'Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it' (Foucault, 1978: 101).

In the chapter on method in *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault establishes a '[r]ule of the tactical polyvalence of discourses' (1978: 100). The chapter construes discourse as 'a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable' (1978: 100). There is 'a multiplicity of discursive elements' the distribution of which Foucault examines and reconstructs. Foucault argues that one should investigate the distribution of various discourses, rather than only the dominant and dominated ones (1978: 100). He writes:

> It is this distribution that we must reconstruct, with the things said and those concealed, the enunciations required and those forbidden, that it comprises; with the variants and different effects – according to who is speaking, his position of power, the institutional context in which he happens to be situated – that it implies; and with the shifts and reutilizations of identical formulas for contrary objectives that it also includes. (Foucault, 1978: 100).

In his study of sexuality (1978), Foucault examines what is said and what is silenced, who is allowed to speak and who is not, what are the contexts and relations producing discourse about sexuality. He argues that since the eighteenth century there have been many ways of talking about sexuality – as Foucault puts it, 'multiplicity' of discourses about sexuality (1978: 18). Sexuality is not excluded or forbidden to speak about, but different mechanisms of regulations are imposed to produce the 'true' discourse (1978: 69). Those mechanisms aim to control sexual conduct of population and to keep discourse under strict control – as Foucault puts it, to make it 'an object of secrecy' (1978: 34). Discourses about sexuality operate within a *scientia sexualis*, which develops a scientific mode of regulation (1978: 51-73). For instance, there are clinical inducements to speak about sexuality – clinical observations, examinations,

and interpretations (Foucault, 1978: 65-67). As a result of the regulation, discourses produce 'economically useful and politically conservative' sexuality (Foucault, 1978: 37).

In Foucault's genealogical works, he examines discourse as a constitutive force of social reality. Power relations operate through discursive practices in the modern period (Fairclough, 1992: 50). Of various 'discursive practices' that exist today, the most powerful of those that correspond to discipline (/examination) and confession are interviewing and counselling (Fairclough, 1992: 50-54). In *Discipline and Punish* (1995), Foucault argues that modern disciplinary power operates through constructing and controlling human bodies. Disciplinary power constitutes individuals by producing knowledge about them through examination procedures. The objectification of individuals is made in documented records about the conduct of individuals in prisons, hospitals, and schools. The knowledge that they produce allows controlling individuals (Fairclough, 1992: 53). By contrast, confession aims at the subjectification of individuals (Fairclough, 1992: 53). It allows individuals to speak about themselves in the contemporary confession institutions that extend beyond the religious ones – for instance, therapeutic counselling.

In his lecture 'The Order of Discourse', given at the College de France in 1970, Foucault sets out principles for the analysis of discourse (1981: 67-69). Discourse is understood here as a series of discontinuous and regular practices that operate in certain external conditions. Foucault writes:

> We must conceive discourse as a violence which we do to things, or in
> any case as a practice which we impose on them; and it is in this

practice that the events of discourse find the principle of their regularity. (1981: 67).

Discursive practices function by separating, intersecting, opposing or rejecting each other, or as Foucault puts it, 'discontinuity' of discourses (1981: 67). This variety of practices are to be explored by looking at the 'external conditions of possibility' of that variety, rather than by seeking some 'hidden nucleus' (1981: 67). Foucault points out the main regulating principle of his analysis of discourse in the following sequence: 'the [discursive] event, the series, the regularity, the condition of possibility' (1981: 67). He argues for the examination of discourses as a regular series of events in their materiality and discontinuity (1981: 69). Foucault's suggestions signal a break (or 'displacement') with a more traditional history of ideas. For, that tradition examines, instead, the 'creation', 'unity', 'originality', and 'signification' of ideas, or so Foucault claims (1981: 67).

According to Foucault, discourse is a sphere in which power operates, possible danger and violence against things. '[D]iscourse is not simply that which translates struggles or systems of domination, but is the thing for which and by which there is struggle, discourse is the power which is to be seized' (1981: 52-53). Discourse is, therefore, usually controlled in every society (1981: 67). He argues that there are subjection and rarefaction of discourse and provides a detailed classification of the procedures of controlling discourse. Foucault writes:

> [I]n every society the production of discourse is at once controlled,
> selected, organized and redistributed by a certain number of procedures
> whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mystery over

its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality. (1981:

52).

The first procedure is prohibition: the exclusion of certain topics, speakers and circumstances of speech (1981: 52). Discourse is controlled and limited because individuals are not allowed to speak about everything in any situations. So, there are taboos and what Foucault calls 'unsayable objects'. Examples of such taboos are sexuality and politics (Foucault, 1981). Another mechanism of exclusion is division and rejection – for instance, the division between madness and reason (1981: 53). Foucault argues that the madman's discourse is always perceived as alien. The mad speech is not listened to and even barely exists – it is 'mere noise' (Foucault, 1981: 53). The third system of exclusion relates to the will to truth, namely the division between true and false in its historical specificity (1981: 54-55).

The second system of controlling discourse concerns internal procedures of classification and ordering (1981: 56). For instance, Foucault understands commentary as a secondary discourse in relations to the primary source, and this division produces a hierarchy among discourses. Discourses are grouped according to the principle of author – for instance, ones belonging to a speaking subject and ones circulating anonymously (1981: 58-59). The last principle discussed by Foucault relates to disciplinary divisions of discourses (1981: 59-61). Scientific disciplines control the production of discourses by identifying true and false statements.

The third system controlling discourse relates to managing individuals 'holding' discourse, or as Foucault puts it, 'rarefaction of the speaking subjects' (1981: 61). Discourse is not directly accessible to everyone. Nor can everyone gain access. The speaking subject is obliged to follow certain rules and to meet requirements of the

order of discourse (1981: 62). Foucault provides an example of the 'societies of discourse' that limit the distribution of discourse to 'a closed space' operating according to strict rules (1981: 62-63). The societies of discourse limit the number of speaking subjects and do not allow members of societies to replace each other. The societies of discourse are characterised by the circulation of secrets or knowledges that are divulged to those ones who enter the society. Foucault provides an example of the society of discourse by referring to writing as a professional practice (1981: 63). He argues that the opposition between creativity and other forms of written word highlighted by writers is a way of establishing limitations to access in the society of discourse. The opposition is supported and encouraged by publishing institutions.

Foucauldian discourse analysis is applied within research on media and cultural work (Conor, 2014; Gill, 2000a; Gill, 2018; Nixon, 1996). Gill uses Foucault's work to analyse women's participation in the workforce in the radio industry (Gill, 2000a; 2018). She examines interviews with radio managers as discourse, namely constructive social practices that are discussed critically. According to Gill, discourse analysis seeks 'the patterning, organisation and action orientation of the discourse' (Gill, 2018: 27). Now, Gill wishes to find out why radio managers employ mainly men rather than women. She distinguishes various repertoires of reasons provided by her interviewees. For instance, they cite a lack of job applications from women, a lack of the requisite skills among those women that do apply, audiences preferring, and the irrelevance of female voices. The discursive patterns explain how the exclusion of women is justified by radio workers who seek to avoid being explicitly sexist, simultaneously. Gill argues that discourse analysis reveals 'the subtlety and the detail of the way that discrimination was practiced' and was normalised (Gill, 2018: 27). She writes:

> [T]he force of the [discourse] analysis as a critique of sexist ideology or
> practice lay not in comparing the accounts with a taken-for-granted
> reality (e.g., the assertion that women do apply), but in looking at how
> the accounts worked together to justify the lack of women at the radio
> stations in question. (Gill, 2018: 27)

In her research into the work of screenwriters, Conor (2014) argues that professional discourses construct social inequalities at work. She distinguishes different types of screenwriting subjects ('maverick', 'egotist', 'geek' and others) and argues that screenwriting subjects are gendered. The subject positions and the practices, however, are not perceived by screenwriters as gendered or unequal. She writes:

> They are taken for granted and hegemonic expressions of self-oriented
> creative drive, of homophilic and heteronormative networking and
> relationship building, and they are implicitly gendered understandings
> of heroic, individual creativity. These kinds of 'common-sense'
> professional discourses and subjects then continue to mask exclusions
> and hierarchies. (Conor, 2014: 120-121).

Nixon (1996) undertakes a genealogical study of masculinity. He explores discourses transmitted through press journalism, advertising, fashion design and magazines. He wishes to know how new masculinities are produced at various sites. Popular culture produces a 'new man' – a new representation of masculinity that is aestheticized and commercially-oriented, simultaneously. Nixon argues that discourse analysis of various modes of commercial cultural production reveals 'the interdependence of economic and cultural practices' (Nixon, 1996: 199).

My study explores interviews with documentarians as discourses. Research participants shared their career stories and expressed their opinions about workplace inequalities. Foucault's theoretical framework helps to analyse their discourses: how their testimonies are intertwined with power relations. For example, my thesis distinguishes between entrepreneurial discourse and resisting discourse produced by documentarians. The entrepreneurial discourse is dominating in the film sector, thereby operating as an instrument of power. This discourse maintains power of middle-class men in the documentary sector. The enterprising filmmakers seek to increase profit and disregard the issues of inclusivity and diversity. For example, documentarians argued that the enterprise sector empowers marginalised individuals and helps to defeat workplace inequalities. According to their accounts, social vulnerability does not exist in the enterprise culture, and anyone could succeed in the profession. Hence, entrepreneurial discourse hides inequalities and reproduces their social effects. Entrepreneurialism sustains social and cultural elitism of the documentary filmmaking profession. Counter-discourse of documentarians, on the other hand, challenges power relations in the film sector. Discourse of resistance aims to involve marginalised individuals and to defeat the domination of upper-/middle-class men. Documentarians argued that the mainstream film sector ignores experience of marginalised individuals; they aimed at transforming representations and bringing filmmakers from marginalised backgrounds into documentary production. Counter-discourse resists the dominant mode of government and introduces alternative ways of governing and self-governing.

My study argues that documentarians' discourses construct social relations. Their use of language is not neutral but produces sociality. What documentarians say about inequalities produces social effects, which sustain or change work relations in

the sector. I am interested in how interviewees make their versions of inequalities persuasive and what discursive means they use when talking about class and gender in documentary work. For example, enterprising documentarians aimed at achieving high productivity and excellence in their companies. Interviewees said that they hired people from their social circle or people who already achieved professional results. Documentarians' discourses present hiring strong talents as essential for their companies' prosperity. Interviewees made excuses for disregarding questions of inclusivity: they are left with no choice but to make their enterprises financially stable. Therefore, their discourses about hiring within their social circle produce effects of social exclusion. Foucault's idea about discourse as social practice is relevant here: documentarians use discourse in order 'to *do* things' (Gill, 2000b: 175).

1.5   Foucault and Foucauldians on neoliberal subjectivity

In the lectures published as *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault contributes to the historical understanding of neoliberalism as the main rationality of the contemporary states (Foucault, 2008). Foucault applies his ideas of power relations to neoliberalism that is examined as an art of government and a form of governmentality. He regards neoliberalism as not merely a theory and an ideology but comprises practices of governing in which the forms of enterprise have spread to all social relations.[5] He explores neoliberalism as a concrete historical form of governing and specific

---

[5]   Gill et al (2017: 231) summarise the notion of neoliberalism as follows. '[N]eoliberalism is traditionally understood as a political and economic rationality characterized by privatization, deregulation and a rolling back and withdrawal of the state, it has also been conceptualized as a novel form of governance (Harvey, 2005) that is "reconfiguring relationships between governing and governed, power and knowledge, sovereignty and territoriality" (Ong, 2006, p. 3).'

doctrines developed by the groups of scholars. For instance, he distinguishes between German Ordoliberalism, which locates the legitimacy of the state in the market, and American neoliberalism, which locates the market as a rationality of the state (Foucault, 2008). Neoliberal governmentality is a 'method of thought', and Foucault provides an account of neoliberal subjectivity (Foucault, 2008: 218).

Foucault argues that the neoliberal subject is *homo oeconomicus* that appeared in the eighteenth century (Foucault, 2008). *Homo oeconomicus* is not only someone who participates in economic exchange; she is also an entrepreneur of herself. The entrepreneur is a producer who owns her means of production, and she is a source of her own capital, which allows her to acquire income. Foucault examines the position of the entrepreneur as a consumer. The consuming entrepreneur is a producer of own satisfaction. As a producer and consumer, the neoliberal subject follows her individualistic interests and choices.

Foucault argues that *homo oeconomicus* is 'the basic element of the new governmental reason' (Foucault, 2008: 271). He argues further that *homo oeconomicus* is not reducible to the subject of right with regard to exercising of sovereign power, as her sovereignty does not cover the sphere of the market. He writes: 'these economic subjects require either the sovereign's abstention, or the subordination of his rationality, his art of governing, to a scientific and speculative rationality' (Foucault, 2008: 294). Thus, the economic subject is not governable within the juridical regime that refers to the subject of right. Foucault points out that *homo oeconomicus* is the basis for the fundamental changes of government reason (Foucault, 2008: 294). There is a need for a new governmental technology that can manage a civil society inhabited by *homo oeconomicus*. '[T]he technology of liberal

governmentality' (Foucault, 2008: 296) makes the entrepreneurial subject 'eminently governable' through governing herself (Foucault, 2008: 270). Foucault defines *homo oeconomicus* as

> [T]he person who accepts reality or who responds systematically to modifications in the variables of the environment, appears precisely as someone manageable, someone who responds systematically to systematic modifications artificially introduced into the environment.
> (Foucault, 2008: 270)

These systematic responses lie at the core of Foucault's analysis of economics. He examines neoliberal subjectivity by looking at the theory of human capital introduced by neoliberal thinkers – for instance, Schultz and Becker (Foucault, 2008: 227-230). The theory of human capital is a source of economic explanations of non-economic spheres. For example, labour turns into the object of economic analysis. The theory of human capital regards a worker as an economic subject whose positions and views should be analysed so as to produce knowledge about the worker's conduct, values, and rationality. Foucault argues that the worker is a 'machine' and 'enterprise-unit', and that demonstrates the process of turning the human capital into earnings. The human capital includes innate and acquired elements, which do not relate to work necessarily. For instance, these elements are genetic hereditary, skills and experiences acquired through education, family, and mobility (Foucault, 2008: 227-230). Foucault provides an example of the formation of human capital in family. The time parents spent with a child contributes to her human capital, and this quality allows her to be a successful entrepreneur in the future.

Within Foucauldian studies, there is an acknowledgement of contribution made by Foucault into research on the production of neoliberal subjectivity (Bröckling, 2016; Dean, 2018; du Gay, 1996; McNay, 2009; Rose, 1999). Rose (1999) and Bröckling (2016) investigate the genealogy of subjectification. To give a genealogy of subjectification is to examine historical variations in the modes of problematising the subject and related knowledge and techniques. Rose (1999) argues that human sciences – for instance, psychology – shape the neoliberal subject. Dean (2018) points out that human science knowledge produces entrepreneurial subjectivity. According to Rose, human science disciplines contribute to constructing 'governable subjects' (1999: vii). The resulting knowledge allows the subjects to be governed according to the political principles of liberalism and democracy (Rose, 1999: vii), i.e. making them 'the subjects of regulation' (1999: viii). The expertise 'fabricate[s] subjects – human men, women and children – capable of bearing the burdens of liberty' (Rose, 1999: viii). Liberty relates to the values of freedom, autonomy and self-realisation that characterise various aspects of the subject's life – for instance, work life. Work is an essential part of neoliberal subjectivity: it allows the subject to have autonomy and self-fulfilment. Rose argues that the contemporary subject is 'obliged to be free' regardless of the amount of encountered constraints (1999: viii). He writes:

> [H]owever apparently external and implacable may be the constraints, obstacles and limitations that are encountered, each individual must render his or her life meaningful as if it were the outcome of individual choices made in furtherance of a biographical project of self-realization. (Rose, 1996: ix)

Following Foucault's account of entrepreneurial subjectivity, social science scholars apply his framework to analysing contemporary work in media and culture.[6] According to recent research, entrepreneurialism is an essential feature of contemporary work in cultural industries.[7] McRobbie (2016; 2002) regards entrepreneurialism as a new form of governmentality that manages cultural industries. Taylor (2015) explores the convergence of the discourses of entrepreneurialism and creative work and argues (2018) that the entrepreneur is a model, which includes new working requirements and rewards. Banks (2007) and Oakley (2009) argue that entrepreneurial discourse is implemented in the policies of cultural industries. Workers in the cultural industries are governed 'not by force or coercion but by subjectivizing discourses of enterprise' (Banks, 2007: 64). He writes:

> In the context of cultural work, techniques of governmentality have been doubly evidenced, first, in the construction of cultural policy (and other supporting) enterprise discourses and second, in the situated practice of constructing the entrepreneurial, creative self. (Banks, 2007: 64)

The discourse of entrepreneurial self is a normative discourse constituting a new type of worker – an 'entreployee' (Brockling, 2016). An entreployee is required

---

[6] See, among other works: Banks (2007); Banks (2017); Coulson (2012); Gill (2008); Gill (2010); Gill & Pratt (2008); Ikonen (2018); Lesage (2018); McRobbie (1998); McRobbie (2016); Morgan & Nelligan (2015); Neff et al (2005); Oakley (2009); Ouellette & Hay (2008); Ross (2009); Scharff (2015); Scharff (2016); Scharff (2018); Storey et al (2005); Taylor (2015); Taylor (2018); Ursell (2000).

[7] Entrepreneurialism maters greatly for this thesis because a small independent enterprise is a prevailing form of documentary film production. Chapter five discusses the entrepreneurial subjectivity of documentary filmmakers.

to work on herself in order to transform herself and to take an entrepreneurial personhood, which fit the contemporary working conditions. Entrepreneurialism treats the self as the political project of enterprising that requires her to acquire various qualities such as being rational, ambitious, and flexible. The entrepreneur is a worker with high initiative who makes a significant contribution to work and taking its various risks. The entrepreneurial herself is fully responsible for her life and work that are regulated as an enterprise. As an autonomous individual, the entrepreneur aims to make both her life and her work as good as possible by intensive self-monitoring and reflexivity. These qualities are essential for the entrepreneur who exists in the conditions of precarious work regime. Contemporary work involves an accelerated pace and the holding of multiple jobs. However, the entrepreneur believes that her work is the main means of her self-fulfilment. McRobbie describes the entrepreneurial subject in the following passage.

> The cheerful, upbeat, passionate, entrepreneurial person who is constantly vigilant in regard to opportunities for projects or contracts must display a persona that mobilises the need to be at all times one's own press and publicity agent. This accounts for a flattening and homogenisation of personhood or, as Sennett would put it, a 'corrosion of character' (Sennett 1995). (McRobbie, 2016: 74)

McRobbie (2016) examines the individualisation processes that characterise contemporary work. She argues that cultural workers 'substitute' social structures. For instance, contemporary employees are no longer guaranteed their workers' rights protection and therefore are forced to take on full management of the precarity of their working life. They become their 'own micro-structures' that are characterised by self-regulation and the high level of reflexivity (McRobbie, 2016). Forkert (2013)

demonstrates that self-reliance is an essential part of creativity in art worlds. He argues that the neoliberal conditions of work facilitate the independence of artists from the state and its welfare benefits.

Following Foucault's ideas, Ursell (2000) explores the entrepreneurial ethos developed by cultural workers in the British broadcasting sector. She argues that the prevailing discourses in television production are those of entrepreneurialism, market rationality and economic competition. The discursive transformations are caused by changes in the regime of labour in British television. According to her findings, cultural workers become entrepreneurs as a response to contemporary working conditions that include high competition, precarity and informal organisation of television labour market. Entrepreneurialism is a widespread reaction to employers reducing pay and removing permanent jobs. Being an entrepreneur involves self-exploitation, self-commodification and taking high risks of employment. Ursell regards entrepreneurialism as an essential part of contemporary governmentality. She claims that entrepreneurialism relates to 'governance through self-government' (Ursell, 2000: 746).

McRobbie (2016) explores the new creative workforce that exists in the deregulated and privatised labour market of the UK. She analyses artists' career development, distinguishing different career types (McRobbie, 2016: 80-86). The 'socially engaged artist' demonstrates an intention for collaboration and cooperation with other cultural workers rather than compete with them (McRobbie, 2016: 81). This type of artist is motivated to do socially valuable jobs rather than commercially-oriented ones. This artist type criticises the exclusionary mechanisms of work in cultural industries. The 'global artist' type demonstrates the 'neoliberal mode of

subjectification' (McRobbie, 2016: 82). This artist type is an entrepreneurial subject engaging in self-promotion activity. She has heroic and charismatic features and has acquired international recognition as an artist. The 'artist-precariat' is another type of artists' career (McRobbie, 2016: 84). The origin of this type of career is bound up with the protest movements of the 2000s. Nevertheless, a feeling of disappointment with leftist politics characterises this artist type. She is reflective about political and social processes and argues against neoliberal tendencies in work relations.

Although many studies discuss the entrepreneurial nature of cultural work, the experience of cultural entrepreneurs is relatively understudied. Some research explores how cultural workers negotiate entrepreneurialism and entrepreneurial subjectivity (Coulson, 2012; Scharff, 2016; Scharff, 2018; Storey et al, 2005; Taylor, 2015; Taylor & Littleton, 2008). Taylor's study of self-employment practices (2015) examines the entrepreneurial discourse of creative workers. An increasing number of creative workers are moving from conventional employment to fulfilling self-employment. Taylor's interviews show workers considering the 'humanisation' of self-employed work in that it provides autonomy, self-realisation, and a possibility to stay closer to family. Also, self-employment involves negative aspects such as insecurity, under-earning, and isolation. According to research by Storey et al (2005), freelance media workers identify similar positive and negative features of entrepreneurial work. Media freelancers talk about their work as a highly personal experience, and their enterprises' success and failures influence significantly entrepreneurs' respective identities. As a response to this, media workers attribute any career failures to their enterprises or other circumstances, rather than to themselves. As Storey et al put it, freelancers employ 'the language of enterprise and business to

create an insulation between the individual *qua* individual and the individual as a micro-business' (2005: 1052).

In her research into the entrepreneurial subjectivity of classical musicians, Scharff (2016) claims to identify ten distinctive features of discourse produced by the neoliberal subject about herself. The entrepreneur regards herself as a business and places all spheres of her life into constant optimisation. She embraces employment risks and considers failures as positive learning experiences. Social difficulties are considered by the entrepreneur as if they were her personal struggles that are possible to overcome. For instance, there is a widespread rule among musicians to hide any health injuries received at work. As Scharff puts it, the positive attitude to social difficulties is the 'survivor discourse'. It is an essential characteristic of the entrepreneurial subject who is capable to manage her entire life. According to the entrepreneurs, success is achievable through 'appropriate self-management' (Scharff, 2016: 115). Encountering social constraints, the entrepreneur rarely considers social and economic forces; she rather doubts herself and blames herself. Scharff argues that inequalities among the entrepreneurial musicians are 'unspeakable', in that to avow them would destroy entrepreneurial mythologies. She writes that 'exclusionary processes lie at the heart of the constitution of entrepreneurial subjectivities' (Scharff, 2016: 107). The building of boundaries and the rejection of others are essential features of entrepreneurial subjectivity. For instance, the entrepreneurial musicians distinguish between hard-working self and lazy others. Scharff writes:

> the exclusionary dynamics of entrepreneurial subjectivity do not only
> extend to the positionalities required to become an entrepreneurial
> subject, but also to the kinds of subjects that are othered in this process
> of becoming. (Scharff, 2016: 119)

The entrepreneurial discourse produced by musicians intersects with other discourses, which do not support the former. The entrepreneurial musicians show feelings of anxiety about the precariousness of their employment and vulnerability concerning audience perception of their work. Their discourse refuses competition with co-workers and, instead, aim to support them. Coulson's study of networking by musicians (2012) is relevant here. Coulson argues that musicians refuse to discuss networking in terms of competition and individualisation; they rather develop a sense of community and cooperation. Coulson points out that musicians do not follow the entrepreneurial model of networking – a model in which social contacts are regarded strategically, as a means to work and thereby money. Moreover, musicians value friendship and support in their networking (Coulson, 2012).

Developing entrepreneurial subjectivity is examined by the researchers as a response to profound changes in the nature of cultural work in cultural industries. Understanding the contemporary regime of work illuminates neoliberal subjectivity. Hence my next section considers how, within cultural industries, work has been transformed and inequality is increasing. It provides a few observations upon a substantial body of studies in the sociology of cultural work, and these studies present a consistent picture of cultural labour.

1.6 Sociological studies of the transformation of cultural work and of the increasing inequality within such work

There is a sufficient number of studies examining work transformations in media and culture.[8] In the post-industrial economy, cultural work is characterised by refusal of traditional forms of industrial relations with fixed hours, welfare protection, and permanent contracts. Cultural work is precarious in that it is project-based, casual, free from welfare protection and standard working hours (Banks & Hesmondhalgh, 2009; Blair, 2003; Blair et al, 2001; Forkert, 2013; Gill, 2002; Hesmondhalgh, 2008; Menger, 1999; McRobbie, 2016; Standing, 2011; Wing-Fai et al, 2015). Previous studies show that the precariousness of cultural work indicates infiltration of employment patterns of a low-end job sector (Menger, 1999; Ross, 2009). Often cultural work pays little and thus requires those who do it to have a second career or some other source of a second income (Forkert, 2013; Abbing, 2002; Banks, 2017; Lingo & Tepper, 2013). And having multiple jobs can create exploitation and even self-exploitation (McRobbie, 2016). Also, cultural work involves non-conventional forms of career development. For instance, there is no straightforward connection between age and career growth, and that is explained by unforeseeable success in cultural industries (Forkert, 2013). Unlike conventional careers, cultural ones are characterised by their brevity (Forkert, 2013). There are prevalence and rise of self-employed and freelance work that is different from the conventional working patterns (Banks & Hesmondhalgh, 2009; Menger, 1999;

---

[8] See, again among other works: Abbing (2002); Banks (2017); Blair (2003); Caldwell (2008); Deuze (2007); Forkert (2013); Gill (2002); Gill (2010); Gill & Pratt (2008); Hesmondhalgh (2013); Hesmondhalgh & Baker (2011); Leadbeter & Oakley (1999); McRobbie (2016); Ross (2009); Shukaitis (2019); Shukaitis & Figiel (2015); Taylor (2018); Ursell (2000); Wing-Fai et al (2015).

Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). The new organisation of cultural work demands transforming professional relations into informal and flexible ones (Gill, 2002; Wreyford, 2015). According to McRobbie (2016), the creative sector encompasses the components of the youth culture. She argues that the club and rave culture of 1980-1990s produced 'club sociality' that affected 'network sociality' in contemporary cultural industries.

After cultural work became a conventional occupational option in the 1990s, there is the continuing growth of cultural industries and its workers (Banks, 2017; McRobbie, 2016). The period of growth is characterised by changing the social composition of cultural workers' pool. In his comprehensive historical account of social changes in cultural industries, Banks argues that cultural work has become popular and legitimate from the mid-1950s in the UK (2017: 89-121). It has involved a considerable number of new workers from diverse social groups including the working-class and the lower middle class. Although there was an expansion in employment for new social groups, there was no redistribution of power and statuses within the cultural industries (Banks, 2017: 98). Also, the increase in the numbers going into cultural work meant that supply exceeded demand. The cultural industries, therefore, have become very competitive, and competition facilitates social inequalities within work. Although cultural work is predominantly hard and low-paid (Abbing, 2002; Banks, 2017), there is a small number of privileged workers who have high salaries and certain symbolic resources (Hesmondhalgh, 2013: 31). The vast majority of cultural workers are invisible and marginalised (Forkert, 2013). McRobbie (2016) provides a historical account of 'middle-classification' and 'de-proletarianization' processes in the cultural industries. The period from the mid-1990s onwards is defined by McRobbie by processes of extending education in arts and

humanities and involving many young people into the enterprise culture in the UK. McRobbie regards the middle-classification processes as ideological phenomena because young people from working-class families acquire a sense of belonging to the middle class caused by their employment in the cultural industries (McRobbie, 2016: 11). McRobbie argues that a new social group has emerged, or as she puts it, a 'middle-class faction'. Such a faction is 'a cohort of relatively young people, often, though not always, educated to degree level, with qualifications across the range of social sciences and arts and humanities subjects, for whom career expectations can be characterised by this high level of uncertainty, and for whom jobs and projects seem to be "permanently transitional"'. 'These young men and women', McRobbie continues, 'are typically living in cities that have a wide range of institutions, organisations and corporations devoted to arts, media, culture and creative economy' (McRobbie, 2016: 37).

The post-industrial economy facilitates different forms of marginalisation at work and in particular increasing social inequalities in cultural production.[9] Treating cultural industries as a space of 'elite occupations', Friedman and Laurison argue that, 'In contemporary Britain it quite literally pays to be privileged' (2019: 209). Conor et al (2015) point out that cultural industries are characterised by 'stark, persistent and in many cases worsening inequalities' (2015: 1). Banks argues that cultural work is 'foundationally unequal' (2017: 109). Although the cultural industries

---

[9] Relevant works include: Allen (2013); Banks (2017); Banks & Oakley (2015); Brook et al (2020); Bull (2019); Conor (2014); Conor et al (2015); Eikhof & Warhurst (2013); Forkert (2013); Friedman & Laurison (2019); Gill (2002); Gill (2008); Gill (2010); Gill & Pratt (2008); Grugulis & Stoyanova (2012); Hesmondlalgh (2008); Hesmondhalgh (2013); McRobbie (2016); Nwonka (2015); O'Brien et al (2016); O'Brien & Oakley (2015); Saha (2018); Scharff (2015).

provide opportunities for social diversity *de jure*, there are other mechanisms of reproducing inequalities that are 'cumulative and cross-compounding' (Banks, 2017: 109). The mechanisms facilitating social injustice include precarity, informality, and flexibility – in other words, the main features of the contemporary employment in the post-industrial economy (Banks, 2017; Conor et al, 2015). The previous studies point out that social inequalities have increased significantly within neoliberal regimes; and that is so even though cultural industries represent themselves as egalitarian, meritocratic and inclusive (Banks, 2017; Conor, 2014; Conor et al, 2015; Friedman & Laurison, 2019; Gill, 2002; Hesmondlalgh, 2008; McRobbie, 2016; Taylor & O'Brien, 2017).

Academic research into cultural work tends to be about the 'big three' issues of inequalities in cultural production – gender, class and ethnicity (O'Brien & Oakley, 2015: 12).[10] The issue of social class in cultural work is relatively understudied (Banks, 2017; Randle et al, 2014), whereas previous studies claim that gender inequalities are 'widespread and established' (Banks, 2017: 111). According to studies that take an intersectional approach, mechanisms of oppression echo each other in different types of social inequalities. Friedman and Laurison (2019: 190) argue that 'drivers of the class ceiling – homophily, sponsorship, self-elimination, microaggressions' resemble the mechanisms of oppressions explored in gender- and race studies. The claim in all these words is that different dimensions of inequality, so to speak, intersect with and exacerbate each other.

---

[10]   Chapter four will investigate class and gender inequalities within the documentary filmmaking sector.

Existing studies use quantitative data about cultural labour released by the regulator and by public agencies (O'Brien & Oakley, 2015). The official statistics present the dominating governing rationality as connected to the current policies in the cultural sector, but also as something that could be used as 'a key legitimating tool to make inequalities visible and speakable' (Jones & Pringle, 2015: 39). The DCMS is one of the main sources of labour market statistics. It has published reports about cultural industries in the UK since 2010. The Creative Skillset releases useful data on gender; Nesta publishes data on spatial inequalities in cultural industries. Yet, little quantitative data is available about social class in cultural industries (O'Brien et al, 2016; O'Brien & Oakley, 2015). For instance, there is no large-scale data on the class backgrounds of cultural workers in creative industries (O'Brien & Oakley, 2015; O'Brien et al, 2016). O'Brien and Oakley (2015: 14) link neglecting of class dimension in data collection to the 2010 Equality Act that does not include social class into 'protected characteristics'. Thus, public agencies are not required to gather information about social class. Similarly, Conor et al (2015: 6) point out that there is no available national statistics about gender pay gaps in cultural industries that are connected to the prevalence of postfeminist values. The efforts of various bodies and agencies, though, do contribute to the production of statistical information on this matter. For example, these bodies include the BFI, Directors UK, and the Fawcett Society in the UK.

Social exclusion cannot be fully examined with statistical tools. Several studies do explore the experience of social inequalities in cultural work. (Those studies are: Blair, 2003; Brook et al, 2020; Gill, 2008; Friedman & Laurison, 2019; O'Brien, 2020; Ross, 2009; Saha, 2018; Scharff, 2018.) Qualitative inquiry captures a great variety of experiences. For instance, some of the experience at issue have to do with

intersection between different types of inequality. Moving beyond statistics allows one to explore the specificity of career trajectories, and the qualitative inquiry reveals mechanisms of the continuing dominance of privileged groups (O'Brien, 2020). Social inequalities are intertwined with its neoliberal context, and as Scharff puts it, 'exclusionary processes lie at the heart of neoliberalism' (Scharff, 2016: 119). Labouring subjectivities contribute to the persistence of neoliberalism by reproducing their neoliberal modes, and therefore they require research attention (Chandler & Reid, 2016; Scharff, 2018). Studies of media and culture are predominantly textual ones that explore media representations. There is significantly less research into cultural economy that explore experiences of inequality (Banks, 2017; Hesmondhalgh, 2013; Nwonka, 2015; Saha, 2018; Scharff, 2018). The remaining sections of this chapter provide some observations about the relevant research on social class and gender inequalities in cultural work.

1.6.1 Class inequalities in cultural work

Social class and occupation are the phenomena closely intertwined with each other. Historically, professions produce ideas about a 'right' type of worker suitable to do the jobs that 'have become embedded, even institutionalised, over time' (Friedman & Laurison, 2019: 125). Often, the characteristics at issue have nothing to do with the ability to do the job but have to do instead with class (Ashcraft, 2013). Some academics use the notion of occupational position as a proxy for social class stratification. Indeed, occupational class becomes a standard approach in research

into social mobility and public policy.[11] The UK Government develops the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NS-SEC) that distinguishes eight class categories based on occupational differences. The British Labour Force Survey investigates social backgrounds of respondents by identifying their parents' occupations. NS-SEC is employed in the studies of the social composition of the cultural workforce.

A few studies explore social backgrounds of cultural workers via the data in the British Labour Force Survey (Brook et al, 2018; Carey & Florisson, 2020; Friedman & Laurison, 2019; O'Brien et al, 2016). The study by O'Brien et al (2016: 120) is one such account. It distinguishes four social class groups of cultural workers. The first group comprises cultural workers whose parents have higher professional and managerial occupations (or NS-SEC 1). The second group comprises workers with parents having lower professional and managerial occupations (or NS-SEC 2). The third social group consists of those whose parents have intermediate occupations or are self-employed (or NS-SEC 3–5). And the fourth category comprises workers whose parents have semi-routine or routine occupations or are unemployed (or NS-SEC 6–8). Other research that uses the same survey data includes that by Friedman and Laurison (2019). Friedman and Laurison divide cultural workers into three

---

[11]   Friedman and Laurison provide a valid criticism of the notion of occupational classes. They argue that there are enormous variations within classes with regards to workers' income, employment and backgrounds. They suggest that therefore one should take into account 'multiple indicators of social position and resources' (Friedman & Laurison 2019: 222).

categories (2019: xiv; 30).[12] The first comprises 'upper middle-class' workers from 'privileged' backgrounds whose parents have professional and managerial occupations. The examples of such occupations include CEO, professor, engineer, doctor, journalist, IT consultant, store manager and others (or NS-SEC 1–2) (2019: 30). The second group comprises workers from 'intermediate' or 'lower-middle-class' family backgrounds. For instance, these backgrounds are secretary, teaching assistant, carpenter, hairdresser, taxi driver, electrician and others (or NS-SEC 3–5) (2019: 30). The third social class group relates to workers having 'working-class' backgrounds – for instance, sales assistant, care worker, waiter, cleaner, bus driver and others (or NS-SEC 6–8) (2019: 30). Friedman and Laurison consider film and television industries as a space of elite occupations matching NS-SEC 1 category. Employees with privileged origins dominate the film and television sector. According to Labour Force Survey data, 50% of the workers have professional or managerial backgrounds, 38% are of intermediate origins and 12% are working-class (2019: 33). In addition to the limited participation of workers from working-class origins, numerous obstacles for the progression of their cultural careers are explored in academic research.

Cultural work is characterised by barriers and constraints that are faced by individuals from non-privileged class backgrounds.[13] The studies explore the, so to

---

[12] Following the approach to class analysis suggested by Friedman and Laurison (2019), my empirical work categorises documentary filmmakers into three groups – see my second chapter.

[13] See, for example: Allen et al (2013); Banks (2017); Brook et al (2018); Brook et al (2020); Bull & Scharff (2017); Carey & Florisson (2020); Friedman & Laurison (2019); Friedman et al (2017); Hesmondhalgh & Baker (2011); Koppman (2015); McRobbie (2016); Millward et al (2017); Nwonka (2015); O'Brien (2020); O'Brien et al (2016); Oakley & O'Brien (2016); Oakley et al (2017); Percival & Hesmondhalgh (2014); Wright (2005).

speak, vertical and horizontal segregation of cultural labour by class (Carey & Florisson, 2020). Workers from working-class backgrounds are less likely than their middle-class peers to be employed in creative roles and to have supervisory responsibilities (Carey & Florisson, 2020). There are studies too that show that those with working-class backgrounds have restricted access to resources and opportunities. Barriers to gaining employment in the cultural sector include school tuition fees, the prevalence of unpaid internships and a class pay gap (Brook et al, 2018; Carey & Florisson, 2020; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011; Friedman & Laurison, 2019; Oakley & O'Brien, 2016). Unequal access to professional institutions is caused also by the prevalence of network sociality and informal recruitment practices (McRobbie, 2016). Network sociality reproduces class homogeneity within cultural workforce. Homophily – or 'gravitating' towards workers with similar social and cultural backgrounds – reproduces the current social structures and thereby excludes working-class people in cultural industries (Friedman & Laurison, 2019; Millward et al, 2017).

Friedman and Laurison (2019: 186) use Bourdieu's notions of field, habitus, capital and practice in order to investigate the class mobility (or lack of it) in workers in several elite occupations that include the film and television industries.[14] Bourdieu's ideas about capital allow them to understand how social background affects workers' mobility trajectories. Hence, his ideas help to move towards 'a more

---

[14] A 'field', according to Bourdieu (1999: 46), is 'a socially structured space, a force – there are those who dominate and those who are dominated, there are constant and permanent relations of inequality that operate within this space – that is also a field of struggle to transform or conserve this forcefield. Every actor within this universe engages other actors in competition by wielding his relative strength, a strength that defines his position within the field and, consequently, also his strategies' (quoted in Friedman & Laurison, 2019: 308-309).

multidimensional measurement of both class origins and destinations' (Friedman & Laurison, 2019: 186). They argue that embodied cultural capital allows workers from privileged social backgrounds to gain considerable advantages in the elite occupations (2019: 187). For one thing, behavioural and cultural codes are essential for entering and for getting promoted within elite occupations (2019: 25). Specific tastes and modes of self-representation inherited through a privileged upbringing contribute to workplace homogeneity. As they put it, there is a kind of 'fitting in' filter. The same study claims that cultural capital has great significance in 'channels of sponsorship' (2019: 25). Often, career mobility is based upon 'sponsorship' that relates to establishing informal relationships between senior and junior workers. Almost always these relationships are based 'on cultural affinity, on sharing humour, interests and tastes', and therefore, 'these homophilic bonds tend to advantage the already-privileged' (2019: 25). Banks (2017) argues similarly that cultural capital affects promotion within cultural industries. Cultural industries favour 'inheritors' rather than 'wonderboys' and wondergirls because the socialisation of the former gives them desirable skills and capital (Banks, 2017). Nwonka (2015) points out that the UK film industry requires workers to behave and talk in certain ways – to demonstrate embodied cultural capital – if they are to progress within it. Nwonka argues that the informality of workplace relationships helps to reproduce the predominantly middle-class class structures of the film industry. He writes:

> Individuals will require a certain demeanour, language, vernacular and decorum, and be fluent in specific cultural behavioural modes and customs of the particular cultural space. […] Thus, economic position and cultural capital are symbiotic in cultivating a particular 'creative class' (See Florida 2012) as an observable phenomenon that can

maximise a particular cultural code to restrict the entry of other social

groups. By definition, those cultural spaces cannot be fully accessible to

economically disadvantaged social groups – this would represent a

fundamental threat to the hegemonic behavioural code of the cultural

space. (Nwonka, 2015: 85).

Higher education institutions comprise a space within which class inequalities

in cultural work are reproduced (Allen et al, 2013; Banks, 2017; Friedman &

Laurison, 2019; McRobbie, 2016; Oakley & O'Brien, 2016; Oakley et al, 2017).

Cultural workers from working-class origins are less likely to attend private schools

and receive degrees in top universities (Friedman & Laurison, 2019: 21; 38).

McRobbie (2016) argues that, as one would expect, in the most prestigious

universities students gain social connections, which reproduce existing social

structures, since networking is a crucial aspect of cultural work. When working-class

people receive degrees from top universities, they are less likely to find jobs in elite

sectors, and likely to earn less, than their more privileged counterparts (Friedman &

Laurison, 2019: 20-22; 39). Banks too (2017) shows how higher education system

reproduces the inequalities existed in society 'at large'. In the UK art schools, the

talent of the privileged is more likely to be recognised than that of the unprivileged

because the privileged demonstrate specific social appearance and cultural

dispositions that originate from advantaged social and economic positions (2017: 82).

Oakley and O'Brien (2016) explore how the education system contributes to class

inequalities within cultural industries. The education programmes demand that

prospective cultural workers have qualities such as flexibility and adaptability, and

those qualities are more likely to be possessed by middle-class students than by

working-class students (Oakley & O'Brien, 2016). The cultural sector esteems those

who, whilst in education, had a lot of extracurricular activity. The working-class students tend not to participate in those activities (Oakley & O'Brien, 2016).

Unpaid work experience is another way in which cultural industries sustain class inequality (Ashton, 2015; Brook et al, 2018; Conor, 2014; Friedman & Laurison, 2019; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011; Nwonka, 2015; Oakley & O'Brien, 2016; Brook et al, 2017; Percival & Hesmondhalgh, 2014).[15] The unpaid work is a common and widespread practice across cultural industries. The unpaid work at issue is usually low-status work – 'dogsbody' positions include doing mundane tasks such as making coffee, copying papers and delivering tapes. (Ashton, 2015). In exchange for performing low-responsibility tasks, young aspirants receive work experience, professional contacts and knowledge of the industry (Ashton, 2015; Oakley & O'Brien, 2016). Unpaid placements contribute to social class inequality because they are affordable only by prosperous workers. Those people rely on the financial support of 'the Bank of Mum and Dad' gaining them 'profound occupational advantages' (Friedman & Laurison, 2019: 24). They are, for instance, protected from precarity of professions and able to focus on their careers and networking. Friedman and Laurison write the following about the aforementioned 'bank'.

> This kind of financial patronage, we argue, is pivotal in propelling
> careers forward, particularly in precarious elite labour markets such as
> the cultural industries. Here money acts as an important early-career
> lubricant, allowing the privileged to manoeuvre into more promising
> career tracks, to focus on developing valuable networks, resist

---

[15] Chapter four discusses further the unpaid work of documentary filmmakers.

exploitative employment and take risky opportunities – all of which

increases their chances of long-term success. (2019: 210)

In their study of higher education programmes for prospective cultural workers,

Oakley and O'Brien (2016) argue similarly that middle-class students are more likely

to participate in unpaid internships than their working-class counterparts. This kind of

exploitative practices is widespread in cultural industries, and, for instance, some

companies would not be able to survive without employing unpaid work (Oakley &

O'Brien, 2016). 'Runner' positions are an inescapable first step for young aspirants in

the UK film and television industries (Ashton, 2015). Percival and Hesmondhalgh

(2014) critically discuss various factors that affect attitudes to unpaid work among

cultural workers in the television and film industries. These factors include: which

industry or part of the industry is at issue; type of funding; and quantity of work

experience (Percival & Hesmondhalgh, 2014). Film workers are more likely to accept

unpaid work than television workers. The less the project at issue has funding, the

more workers accept unpaid work; the less cultural workers have work experience,

the more they accept unpaid work (Percival & Hesmondhalgh, 2014).

1.6.2 Positions and subjectivity of women in cultural work

Feminist scholarship discusses positions and subjectivity of women at cultural

work at the neoliberal period.[16] McRobbie (2016; 2010) argues that there is a

significant inflow of women employed in cultural industries. Adkins (1999)

---

[16]   See, for example: Adkins (1999); Allen (2013); Banks (2017); Banks & Milestone
       (2011); Conor et al (2015); Gill (2002); Gill (2008); Gill (2011); Gill & Scharff (2011);
       Gill et al (2017); Hesmondhalgh & Baker (2015); Kelan (2009); McRobbie (2010);
       McRobbie (2016); McRobbie (2009); Proctor-Thompson (2013); Scharff (2015); Scharff
       (2018); Taylor (2015); Wing-Fai et al (2015); Wreyford (2015).

investigates the feminisation of the labour market in cultural industries and beyond.[17]
The post-Fordist shift from manufacturing/industrial work to service/communication
work has promoted various forms of sociality – informality, reciprocity, networking –
that are connected historically to femininity (Banks & Milestone, 2011; Adkins,
1999). McRobbie (2016) claims that independence and autonomy of creative work
are particularly attractive to women and other oppressed social groups experiencing
obstacles at work. She argues that having an interesting and creative job becomes an
important part of a female status today (McRobbie, 2016; 2009). Employment,
however, does not suffice for the full liberation of women because contemporary
work contributes to new forms of gender inequality and discrimination (Gill et al,
2017). There is significant gender inequality in cultural work in that such work is
more likely to be done by men.

The previous studies investigate various modalities of gender inequalities such
as underrepresentation in employment, pay gaps, lower-status positions and
demonstrate thereby that 'women as a group are consistently faring worse than men'
in cultural industries (Conor et al, 2015: 6). Vertical segregation by gender combines
with a gendered division of labour or horizontal segregation (Hesmondhalgh &
Baker, 2015; Smith et al, 2017). The earlier studies argue that the informality and
flexibility of cultural work further disadvantage women (Jones & Pringle, 2015;
Wreyford, 2015; Wing-Fai et al, 2015). Networking and informal recruitment
practices replicate social homogeneity and gender inequalities in cultural work
(Wreyford, 2015; Wing-Fai et al, 2015). Gendered stereotypisation hinders female

---

[17]   My empirical work discusses gender inequality in the filmmaking profession by
        exploring discourses and experiences of women employed in the sector. See chapter
        four.

career development. For instance, a stereotypical view on female workers as 'caring' and orienting to others contribute to sexism at workplaces (Alacovska, 2015; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2015; Jones & Pringle, 2015; Scharff, 2012; Taylor & Littleton, 2012). Several studies argue that most family responsibilities fall upon women, and that makes precarious employment harder to sustain (Taylor & Littleton, 2012; Wing-Fai et al, 2015). As a result, female cultural workers are less likely to have children than male cultural workers (Conor et al, 2015: 7).

Cultural work produces a gender 're-traditionalisation' that relates to regressively traditional models of gender inequality (Adkins, 1999; Banks & Milestone, 2011; Conor et al, 2015; Gill, 2002; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2015; McRobbie, 2010; McRobbie, 2016; Taylor, 2015). Detraditionalisation of gender relations is a result of women moving into the labour market in late modernity. However, Adkins (1999) introduces the term 're-traditionalisation' to describe backtracking to traditional forms of gender relations in contemporary work. She argues that most domestic and child-caring labour is done by women and that that makes it harder for women to enter the creative workforce. The current division of labour creates additional opportunities for men to be flexible and mobile at cultural work. Adkins (1999), Banks and Milestone (2011) maintain that, often, female cultural workers perform the traditional female roles of caring and supporting not only at home but also at work. For example, they hold administrative or organisational positions or provide emotional support to colleagues. Adkins (1999) examines the tourism industry that is populated by family businesses with the male part of male–female couples playing managing roles and the women performing caring/administrative responsibilities. Similarly, there is a tendency in the film industry for women to have producing and organisational roles and for the men to

have directing and creative positions (Smith et al, 2017; Conor et al, 2015).

Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2015) argue that women dominate in coordinating,

marketing and public relations roles, while men occupy more prestigious creative and

technical roles in the cultural industries. Banks and Milestone (2011) explore the

reproducing of family relations at work by investigating an empirical case of a female

worker employed for an administrative position in a media/marketing sector. Usually

she performs informal support for her male co-workers, thus becoming an 'unofficial

mother' at the workplace (Banks & Milestone, 2011). Taylor (2015) is critical of

increasing self-employed forms of work as a way in which women get taken out of

work and put back into the home. She argues that this tendency subverts the feminist

movement achievements concerning an increased female presence in educational and

professional institutions (Taylor, 2015). Taylor provides an account of the

entrepreneur as a feminised and financially marginalised figure and criticises the

conventional view of the entrepreneur as heroic and masculine.

Postfeminism is dominating discourse and subjectivity in the cultural industries

today (Allen, 2013; Conor et al, 2015; Gill, 2002; Gill, 2011; Gill, 2017; Gill et al,

2017; Jones & Pringle, 2015; McRobbie, 2016; McRobbie, 2009; Scharff, 2012;

Taylor, 2011). Gill et al examine postfeminism as a 'sensibility', 'discursive

formation' or 'cultural dispositif', thus aiming 'to describe the empirical regularities

observable in contemporary beliefs about gender' (2017: 230).[18] In her study of media workers, Gill (2002) examines the widespread view that female experiences at workplaces 'have nothing to do with gender' and, consequently, that there is 'no language to make sense of this' (2002: 85-86). Feminist ideas are refused by post-feminists who argue that empowerment and emancipation are fully achieved by women as a result of their inclusion in the labour market and by entrepreneurial activity. Gill argues that 'postfeminist sexism' or 'new sexism' treats feminism as 'taken into account' and 'repudiated' (McRobbie, 2004: 255 quoted in Gill, 2011: 63).

Postfeminism is connected to the broader neoliberal context (Allen, 2013; Gill, 2002; Gill, 2011; Gill, 2017; Gill et al, 2017). Gill (2017) argues that postfeminism becomes hegemonic in contemporary work and operates as 'gendered neoliberalism'. Gill et al argue that the discourses of individualism, particularly narratives of 'choice' and 'agency', contribute to the construction of a postfeminist subject (2017: 227). Postfeminist individualism replaces ideas of social and political structures affecting cultural workers.

> A watchword of the [postfeminist] sensibility is 'choice', constructed
> around a view of the female subject as autonomous and unconstrained
> by any lasting power differences or inequalities. (Gill et al, 2017: 231).

---

[18] Gill et al (2017) provide an account of postfeminism as a sensibility, but they acknowledge other meanings of the term 'postfeminism'. They write: 'It is possible to identify four broad ways in which the notion of postfeminism is used: [1] to mark out an "epistemological break" within feminism, signalling the emergence of a new perspective influenced by poststructuralism, postmodernism and postcolonial thinking; [2] to posit an historical shift and a generational 'moving on' within feminism—sometimes allied to the third wave; [3] to signify a backlash against feminism; or [4] to capture a distinctive sensibility' (Gill et al, 2017: 228, my interpolations). See further Brooks (1997).

The narratives of empowerment and self-discipline are regarded as modalities of 'postfeminist sexism' (Gill, 2011: 64). Scharff (2012: 4) argues that women have 'self-identification as empowered subjects of social change' in the postfeminist regime. The postfeminist subject is also characterised by aspirations for 'make-over' and transformations of self, thus, demonstrating 'a strong resemblance' with the neoliberal subject (Gill et al, 2017: 231). Gill et al call for examining 'the psychic life of neoliberalism and postfeminism' that reveals 'the ways in which neoliberalism and postfeminism are registered, negotiated and lived out on a subjective level' (2017: 231).

Allen (2013) examines the female subjective experience of gender inequality at male-dominated workplaces such as technical teams in film or advertising industries. She criticises female workers for producing the post-feminist discourse. Her interviewees argue that there are gender hierarchies at work in creative industries. According to their accounts, creativity is commonly identified with male employees rather than female ones. They express feelings of not being good enough for their work, or of being 'fish out of water', in the male-dominated community (Allen, 2013: 241). Thus, their narratives show marks of social exclusion embodied in the everyday talk about work. Although female interviewees notice gender hierarchies at work, they do not regard them as discriminatory and problematic. The 'post-feminist sensibilities' place systemic gender inequality within a space of individual struggles and failures (Allen, 2013). Their accounts of gender are connected to the neo-liberal discourse of individual choices and freedom, and, particularly, to the widely shared perception of cultural industries as egalitarian and inclusive. The latter makes the language of inequality and injustice unacceptable, and moreover, it reinforces oppression. Allen concludes:

> Post-feminist discourses of female empowerment not only foreclose the
>
> possibility of collective political action but also actively reinforce
>
> gender hierarchies and oppressions. (Allen, 2013: 245).

Similarly, Gill et al (2017) argue that gender inequality is 'unspeakable' and 'unintelligible' at workplaces in cultural industries in the post-feminist regime (2017: 226). Unspeakable inequalities remain unaddressed by the majority of cultural workers who replace their effects by a narrative of individual failures (Gill, 2011). Gill argues that '[t]he potency of sexism lies in its very unspeakability' (2011: 63). Gill et al (2017) explore different workplaces in cultural industries in which there is 'a postfeminist repudiation of gender inequality' that includes four main modes of its discursive operation (2017: 227). The first postfeminist discourse places inequalities in the past, rather than in the present moment ('the historical view') (2017: 235). The second narrative considers inequalities existing in other places, but not 'here' ('the spatial view') (2017: 237). The third discursive construction relates to an idea of women being in advantageous positions in comparison to men ('the female advantage') (2017: 238). And the fourth type of discourse normalises gender inequalities and requires women to perform better at work ('accepting the status quo') (2017: 239). Scharff (2012: 5) adds to this classification another discursive modality – that of 'the man-hating, unfeminine, lesbian feminist' that describes a common discursive trope of postfeminist sensibilities. Postfeminism makes gender inequalities not only invisible but also 'unmanageable' (Jones & Pringle, 2015; Gill, 2011). Sexism takes new forms that operate outside the official programmes that tackle injustice – programmes such as anti-discrimination laws and diversity policies (Gill, 2011: 62).

McRobbie (2004; 2009; 2016) argues that women are empowered to a certain degree and that feminist ideas are 'taken on board' (2004: 257) in cultural industries. Such acknowledgement of feminism aims to forestall more radical feminism and more radical political change (McRobbie, 2004: 258). There is, McRobbie maintains, a 'post-feminist masquerade' that produces a 'working girl' who matches the requirements of 'the fashion-beauty complex' (McRobbie, 2009: 59-83). She writes:

> The masquerade functions to re-assure male structures of power by defusing the presence and the aggressive and competitive actions of women as they come to inhabit positions of authority. It re-stabilises gender relations and the heterosexual matrix as defined by Butler by interpellating women repeatedly and ritualistically into the knowing and self-reflexive terms of highly-stylised femininity. […] It operates with a double movement, its voluntaristic structure works to conceal that patriarchy is still in place, while the requirements of the fashion and beauty system ensure that women are in fact still fearful subjects, driven by the need for 'complete perfection' (Riviere 1929/1986: 42).
> (McRobbie, 2009: 68-69)

The postfeminist sensibility is explored as discourse and subjectivity having a dynamic character (Gill et al, 2017). Postfeminism is examined as practices of power which fluctuate and mutate. Its discourses and relations are not stable, but rather constantly changing. This understanding of postfeminism involves Foucault's ideas about power as 'the moving substrate of force relations' (Foucault, 1978: 93).

1.7   Conclusion

The review presents the theoretical framework for the study of social inequalities in cultural work in British documentary film production. Foucault argues that there is the dynamics of power that operates as a fluid set of relations and practices; their substance transforms and mutates, rather than stands still. His ideas on power relations provide an insight into examining the dynamics of power and inequality in the filmmaking profession. Classism and sexism are a set of practices and discourses that are modified and invented constantly. Foucault's theory of governmentality is applied to the analysis of subjective experiences of class and gender inequalities in documentary work. The present thesis explores how filmmakers shape and guide their conduct at work that is characterised by numerous social constraints and barriers. Adopting Foucault's approach to discourse analysis allows me to understand discursive regularities concerning oppression. The filmmakers' subjectivities are examined as a mode of governing the self. Foucault's study of neoliberalism and the neoliberal subject is suitable for understanding social inequalities as 'exclusionary processes lie at the heart of neoliberalism' (Scharff, 2016: 119). Foucauldian scholarship explores neoliberalism as a form of rationality and a form of discourse through which subjectivity is constructed in economic terms. They pose the question of who has sufficient resources to become a cultural entrepreneur (McRobbie, 2016) and the question of how the cultural entrepreneur contributes to the processes of 'Othering' in relation to classed, gendered and raced subjects (Scharff, 2016; Tyler, 2013). My study of inequalities in filmmaking work aims at investigating how filmmakers negotiate neoliberal and postfeminist subjectification that remains relatively understudied (Scharff, 2016; Scharff, 2018; Storey et al, 2005). The issues of applying Foucault's ideas will be discussed in

greater detail in the next chapter. That chapter will treat the methodological aspects of the empirical study of the filmmaking profession.

2   Research methodology

2.1   Introduction

This research considers documentary filmmaking as a form of creative labour in the post-industrial economy. The thesis investigates class inequality and gender inequality in filmmaking work and does so via the lens of discourses produced by filmmakers. Their lived experiences of class and gender disadvantages reveal structural barriers to access to filmmaking work. The narratives on workplace inequalities also contribute to reproducing and/or resisting oppression. This chapter will discuss the research questions and the processes of data collection and data analysis. It will outline the methodological concerns of applying Foucauldian theoretical framework to the empirical study of filmmaking work.

2.2   Research questions

The project aims to analyse class and gender inequalities in work in British documentary film production. It examines inequalities experienced at workplaces by filmmakers who are involved in producing creative contents. My research interest relates to understanding how filmmakers construct discursively their experiences and the experiences of marginalised filmmakers. The documentarians' reflexivity about social disadvantages is the primary research focus. The study explores filmmakers' entrepreneurial subjectivities as constructing social exclusions. Understanding labouring subjectivities allows me to explain how social inequalities are reproduced by documentarians. The research project investigates policy recommendations articulated by filmmakers who want social changes in the profession.

The research seeks to answer the following questions.

- How do documentary filmmakers experience and articulate class and gender inequalities in work in British documentary film production?[1]

- What are the ethos and practices of governing the self among documentary filmmakers?[2]

- How do documentary filmmakers discursively construct policy recommendations concerning class and gender inequalities in work?[3]

2.3 Data collection

2.3.1 Interviews and observations

Interviewing is a standard research tool in qualitative research practice. Interviews provide data about experiences and understandings produced by individuals whose thoughts and opinions are captured in interviews (Arksey & Knight, 1999; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Kvale, 2007; Seale, 1998; Strangleman & Warren, 2008). Respondents are observers who produce ideas about the world she or he lives in (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007: 98). Their testimonies are analysed by social science researchers as information about social phenomena and/or 'evidence about the perspectives' that are deconstructed by a researcher (*ibid.*: 97). Hammersley and Atkinson argue that examining interviews' materials as '*both resource and topic*' would allow understanding respondents and their cultures (*ibid.*: 99). They write:

---

[1]　I will explore this research question in chapter four.

[2]　I pursue this research question in chapter five.

[3]　See chapter six.

The accounts produced by the people under study must neither be

treated as 'valid in their own terms', and thus as beyond assessment and

explanation, nor simply dismissed as epiphenomena or ideological

distortions. They can be used both as a source of information about

events, and as revealing the perspectives and discursive practices of

those who produced them. […] [A]ll accounts must be examined as

social phenomena occurring in, and shaped by, particular contexts.

(*ibid.*: 120)

Interviewing is often combined with other research methods, at the aim of

triangulation across data (Atkinson & Coffey, 2001; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007).

For instance, ethnographic observation is a research method that helps one to

understand interview data; it brings to light how to hear and interpret interviews

(Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007: 102). As Atkinson and Coffey (2001) argue, the

talks captured in interviews and the actions captured in observations do not oppose,

but rather complement each other. They write:

Actions, we argue, are understandable because they can be talked about.

Equally, accounts including those derived from interviewing are

actions. Social life is performed and narrated, and we need to recognise

the performative qualities of social life and talk. (*ibid.*: 801)

Thus, the observation method does not intend to approve or disapprove information

gathered by interviews. What is being said and what is being done form a too

simplistic dichotomy (Atkinson & Coffey, 2001). Interviewing and observations are

techniques generating different types of data on different social actions (Atkinson &

Coffey, 2001).

Methods of interview and observation are commonly employed in the studies examining work and cultural industries. (To cite but a few such studies: Caldwell, 2008; Conor, 2014; Gill, 1991; McRobbie, 2016; Rose, 1999; Ross, 2004; Scharff, 2018.) Caldwell (2008) examines the reflexivity of cultural workers in film production in Los Angeles by interviewing them and doing ethnographic observations. He is interested in how 'practitioners theorise in practice', or, in other words, in the subjective interpretation of practices held by cultural workers themselves (*ibid.*: 18). Caldwell aims to understand the social organisation of Hollywood through the 'industrial reflexivity' captured by qualitative research methods. Conor (2014), in her research on screenwriting labour, employs the qualitative methods to examine the elitist profession in the new cultural economies of the UK and USA. She examines the subjective experiences of gender by investigating professional discourses. These discourses construct inequalities in screenwriting work and demonstrate 'gendered understandings of heroic, individual creativity' (*ibid.*: 120-121). In her empirical study of small-scale fashion businesses in Berlin and London, McRobbie (2016) investigates cultural work by employing qualitative research methods. She argues that the idea of 'romance at work' or 'passionate work' demonstrated in cultural workers' testimonies is a new form of governmentality. Despite the high level of exploitation, precariousness and low payments in the fashion industry, cultural workers share a 'passion' about their creative jobs. The passion for work is one of the reasons why welfare protection and other labour movement achievements were refused by cultural industries. Fairclough argues that social changes at a workplace are foremost the changes in discourse (1992: 7). Work relations are strongly affected by neoliberal transformations related to marketisation

and commodification. These changes are engineered through discourse practices, thus making suitable employing discourse analysis to the research of work (*ibid*.).

The interview and observation methods suit the study of documentary filmmaking work because my study aims to understand how filmmakers make sense of work and social disadvantages. The experiences of workplace inequalities can be understood in open and informal conversations with the respondents. Interviewing provides a useful research tool for capturing reflexivity about filmmaking work. Ethnographic observation helps examine the normativity of the professional community providing a tool for interpreting interview data. Both methods facilitate discovering the context and new perspectives of the research problem. The following sections discuss the collection of interviews and the making of ethnographic observations for the study of inequalities in documentary filmmaking work.

2.3.2 Sampling and gaining access

I collected thirty-three interviews with documentary filmmakers between June 2017 and September 2018.[4] I conducted the interviews in person in order to increase interviewee engagement with the research questions. The interviews took place at various locations such as workplaces (interviewees' offices/homes), coffee shops and

---

[4] The majority of documentary filmmakers interviewed for this study produce a particular type of films, namely ones that show 'a continuing strand of commitment to political exploration and critique' (as Corner, 2011: 187 puts it). Corner defines this type of documentary production 'as a range of forms for, among other things, political investigation and political portrayal, forms which generate a variety of ways of knowing and feeling' (*ibid*.: 187). He expands upon this type of film production as follows. 'Quite a lot of this work, rather than engage primarily with formal politics, politics as established within core institutions and through officially legitimated processes, connects most strongly with the "politics of everyday life", examining domestic and occupational contexts in which an "official politics" is merely implicit' (*ibid*.: 187).

cinema theatres. Most of the interviews were conducted in London, which is where most of the documentary film productions are located. I used a telephone or Skype when interviewing in person was impossible. Interview length varied. Some interviews were as short as thirty minutes. Some were as long as two hours. Most of the interviews fall upon the shorter end of that range. I obtained permission to record from all interviewees.[5]

    I chose my research participants purposively.[6] The selected documentary filmmakers were able and willing to disclose their relevant experiences. The study aimed to find research participants who were involved in 'professional' film production – in other words, producers who earned or aimed to earn their livelihood from filmmaking.[7] Often, the interviewees had a second career or job. The selected participants had various degrees of professional recognition from being an

---

[5]   I required that each interviewee sign a consent form before interview. Also, I gave them a sheet containing information about the research. For details see my third and fourth appendixes.

[6]   This type of sample is a non-random one. In a non-random sample, the chances of population units to be chosen are never known; rather the research goals set which units are selected. Understanding filmmakers' reflexivity is a main focus of the study. Therefore, the selection of research participants need not be randomised for this purpose. An informal social grouping cannot be investigated with the random sample because it requires to have a list of population as a basis for sample building. A community based upon informal network sociality, such as the filmmaking community, does not have the list of its population. See Deacon et al (2007) for further discussion of the non-random sampling that is commonly used in qualitative research.

[7]   O'Brien and Oakley (2015: 12) find the idea of professional cultural production problematic. For, the cultural industries rely upon unpaid work. However, O'Brien and Oakley argue that professional cultural production has a greater influence on culture and its representations (*ibid.*: 12).

anonymous producer to a 'star' producer.[8] They were able to reflect on their work and inequalities regardless of how recognised they were among peers.[9] I construed professional recognition in a broader sense of being *seen* as a filmmaker by others. Another selection criterion for the interviewees was their concern and willingness to discuss inequalities in the filmmaking profession.[10] The research sample is not limited to marginalised filmmakers, but it includes different perspectives on the problem of marginalisation.[11] Class and gender dynamics affect everyone in the film sector and not only those marginalised because of class and/or gender. Thus, sociological questions of class and gender are relevant to the privileged as well as to marginalised workers.[12] The study aims to include research participants who are able to contribute to already existing theoretical knowledge by developing or disproving the

---

[8] Existing sociological studies of art and culture show that the work of symbolic production becomes significant if and only if others recognise it (Becker, 2008; Bourdieu, 1984; Abbing, 2002). As Becker puts it: 'Someone must respond to the [art] work once it is done, have an emotional or intellectual reaction to it, "see something in it", appreciate it. The old conundrum – if a tree falls in the forest and no one hears it, did it make a sound? – can be solved here by simple definition: we are interested in the event which consists of a work being made and appreciated; for that to happen, the activity of response and appreciation must occur' (Becker, 2008: 4, my interpolation).

[9] Caldwell (2008) takes a similar approach to the researching of film cultures. His study investigates the industrial reflexivity of film workers who occupy various positions and roles within the professional hierarchy.

[10] Hammersley and Atkinson (2007: 106) argue that ethnographic research aims 'to target [as subjects] the people who have the knowledge desired and who may be willing to divulge it to the ethnographer' (my interpolation).

[11] I consider marginalised filmmakers in terms of their positions in class and gender structures.

[12] That said, the filmmakers often suggested that I recruit interviewees from marginalised backgrounds.

assumptions about research questions.[13] Therefore, the interviewees had various jobs and employment status. Thus, I interviewed, for instance, a director, a producer, a director of photography, an editor, a sound mixer. And some interviewees were employees and others were self-employed. The majority of the people I interviewed were self-employed professionals running their own film production companies. These companies usually are 'micro' ones consisting of a single filmmaker.

Table 1 Information on research interviewees

Name	Occupation	Employment type	Gender	Social class, by birth[14]
Albert	Director	Freelancer	Man	Unknown
Alex	Producer, director	Freelancer	Man	Middle
Alice	Director, producer, camerawoman, editor	Self-employed	Woman	Working
Anna	Director	Self-employed	Woman	Middle
Ben	Producer	Self-employed	Man	Working
Dana	Director	Freelancer	Woman	Upper middle
Daniel	Director, producer	Self-employed	Man	Middle

---

[13]   This type of sampling is called 'theoretical sampling'; see Deacon et al (2007), Glaser and Strauss (1967).

[14]   I determine social class origin by employing the schemes of previous studies of cultural work (O'Brien et al 2016; Friedman & Laurison 2019). They use the UK government's National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NS-SEC) to distinguish different social groups of cultural workers. Following the approach to class analysis suggested by Friedman and Laurison (2019: xiv), my empirical research identifies three social classes. The 'upper middle-class' or 'privileged' backgrounds are used for the filmmakers whose parents have professional and managerial occupations (NS-SEC 1-2). The 'middle-class' or 'privileged' backgrounds relate to the interviewees whose parents are employed in 'intermediate' occupations such as clerical, technical, lower supervisory, self-employed jobs (NS-SEC 3–5). The 'working-class' backgrounds are employed for those ones whose parents are occupied in routine, semi-routine jobs or being unemployed (NS-SEC 6–8).

Dylan	Sound designer, sound mixer	Freelancer	Man	Middle
Emily	Director	Self-employed	Woman	Middle
Finn	Producer	Employee	Man	Working
Freddie	Director	Freelancer	Man	Middle
George	Producer	Self-employed	Man	Upper middle
Greta	Director, camerawoman	Freelancer	Woman	Middle
Isabella	Director, producer	Freelancer	Woman	Unknown
Isla	Cinematographer	Freelancer	Woman	Middle class
Jack	Producer	Self-employed	Man	Middle
Jasper	Editor	Freelancer	Man	Middle
Juliet	Producer	Self-employed	Woman	Working
Leo	Director, producer	Self-employed	Man	Middle
Lily	Sound mixer	Freelancer	Woman	Middle
Luke	Producer	Employee	Man	Middle
Marc	Director, producer	Self-employed	Man	Unknown
Matthew	Director, cameraman	Freelancer	Man	Upper middle
Max	Director, producer	Employee	Man	Middle
Nick	Director	Freelancer	Man	Working
Olivia	Producer, location manager	Self-employed	Woman	Middle
Oscar	Editor	Freelancer	Man	Middle
Robin	Editor	Freelancer	Man	Middle
Sam	Director, cameraman	Self-employed	Man	Middle
Sean	Director, producer, cameraman	Self-employed	Man	Middle
Susanne	Producer, director, cameraman	Self-employed	Woman	Upper middle
Thomas	Director, producer	Freelancer	Man	Working
William	Director, producer	Freelancer	Man	Working

Gaining access to the film sector was difficult and took a long time. I knew some documentary filmmakers; they became my first interviewees.[15] I was a volunteer at the international documentary film festival Sheffield Doc/Fest in June 2017; that role allowed me to establish contacts that proved useful for continuing the fieldwork. Moreover, I explored the programmes of various other film festivals that took place at approximately the same time, namely the Open City Documentary Festival, Raindance Film Festival, and the BFI London Film Festival. Film festivals are vital to the industry.[16] Their number and significance have increased in recent decades (Rosenthal, 2005; McLane, 2012). They bring filmmakers together and mark filmmakers' professional recognition. The producers whose works are selected for festivals are likely to have considerable work experience and well-informed opinions on workplace disadvantages. I gathered additional information about potential interviewees and examined available online sources such as the IMDb (Internet Movie Database), websites and social media. I wrote emails to potential interviewees who were chosen during the preliminary gathering of information. In the email, I introduced myself as a doctoral researcher who was investigating social inequalities in British documentary film production. I described my research aims that related to understanding their experiences of social disadvantages. I asked for a short interview that would be audio-recorded. The email stated that interview materials would be used confidentially and anonymously. I received a reply from approximately every tenth email. Each reply expressed an interest in the interview topic and indeed agreed

---

[15]   My doctoral supervisors were kind enough to provide these contacts.

[16]   O'Reilly (2005: 42-43) explores such 'key events' as a starting point of a research fieldwork.

to arrange a meeting or a telephone call.[17] Usually, it took weeks elapsed between arranging an interview and conducting the interview. During the fieldwork, I used the so-called snowballing technique. That is, I asked interviewees to suggest other interviewees.[18] In this way, I gained research subjects. The snowballing technique was a useful tool for exploring filmmaking community because I received more responses from potential candidates found by the word of mouth than by contacting them directly. It is the most authentic way of approaching a social grouping that is based on informal network sociality. With the snowballing sampling, its size is specified by achieving the saturation, rather than being strictly determined. The saturation relates to the point when the participants' accounts repeat other responses and do not provide any new information. Thus, I finished my data collection when the filmmakers' testimonies became repetitive and their suggestions of potential interviewees related to already interviewed filmmakers.

2.3.3 Interviewing

My interviews aimed to cover a list of topics and problems, rather than precisely worded questions.[19] Hence the interviews varied in their length and in their sequence of topics. Also, my questions changed as my knowledge of filmmaking developed. The list of topics[20] for the interviews included the filmmakers' work

---

[17]   An exception was a filmmaker who said that he had nothing to say about inequalities and, thus, that he would not participate.

[18]   There is more on self-selection for interviews in Hammersley and Atkinson (2007: 104).

[19]   As Hammersley and Atkinson (2007: 117) suggest, one might call this approach to interviewing 'non-directive questioning'. Non-directive interviews resemble conversations, but in fact they are never '*simply* conversations' (2007: 117).

[20]   Appendix Two has details.

experiences, experience of inequalities, and recommendations regarding possible

social changes.[21] Usually, the interviews started with a question about the family

background (parents' occupations).[22] The following question was about educational

background and that question was concerned particularly with school and higher

education experiences.[23] Subsequent questions addressed their filmmaking

experiences and career development.[24] The questions about concrete experiences of

situations/events worked better than the abstract questions. For instance, 'Tell me

how you started making films' tended to generate a fuller response than, 'Tell me

about your filmmaking career.' Usually, the interviewees enjoyed talking about their

work and careers. They regarded the interview situations as an opportunity 'to explain

---

[21]   According to Rubin and Rubin's (2005) 'responsive' approach to interviewing, there are 'main' questions that are asked to respondents who generate further discussion around the topics relevant to their experiences.

[22]   Earlier academic studies distinguish social groups via the UK Government's National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NS-SEC) (O'Brien et al, 2016; Friedman & Laurison, 2019). Following the approach to class analysis suggested by Friedman and Laurison (2019: xiv), my empirical research divides filmmakers into three social classes. The 'upper middle-class' or 'privileged' backgrounds are used for those filmmakers whose parents have professional and/or managerial occupations (cf. NS-SEC 1-2). The 'middle-class' or 'privileged' backgrounds describe the interviewees whose parents are employed in 'intermediate' occupations such as clerical, technical, lower supervisory, self-employed jobs (NS-SEC 3–5). The 'working-class' backgrounds are employed for those ones whose parents are occupied in routine, semi-routine jobs or being unemployed (NS-SEC 6–8). My first appendix has further details.

[23]   Friedman and Laurison write: 'Education is indeed an essential way that class advantages and disadvantages are reproduced' (2019: 37). They show that people from privileged backgrounds are more likely than their less privileged counterparts to receive private education and attend prestigious universities such as Oxbridge and Russel Group universities (*ibid.*: 64).

[24]   These questions about career paths helped me to understand the positions of interviewees in the film sector.

themselves'; as Bourdieu argues, respondents demonstrate a 'joy of expression' moving their personal experiences to a public space (1996: 24). Some interviews with filmmakers included long monologues about career development, its crucial moments, achievements and struggles. The interviewees provided compelling narratives about films they have made – for instance, film plots and characters. I never interrupted my participants when they were telling their work lives because the study goal was to understand their reflexivity about filmmaking jobs. I asked a series of 'follow-up' questions about work biographies.[25] The next interview question related to their experiences of class and gender inequalities. It was formulated broadly: 'Have you ever experienced workplace disadvantages or inequalities?' Usually, the interviewees provided enthusiastic responses that they illustrated with examples of their experiences or experiences of others.[26] Their replies considered constraints and obstacles owing to class and gender. The interviewees demonstrated an ability to employ easily these social science terms in their everyday speech. For instance, some interviewees' replies started with: 'As a white middle-class man, I am…' or 'As a black woman, I am…'. In most instances, the interviewees identified and criticised what they took to be an injustice. However, the severity of their criticism varied significantly. Usually, the interviewees continued to share their ideas on what could be done to change disadvantageous working conditions. Otherwise, I

---

[25]   'Probes' and 'follow-up' questions aim to explore new areas and contexts of the research problem (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

[26]   The reason that interviewees discussed workplace problems so keenly might be that, after all, these were people who had responded positively to my initial email about that very topic.

asked the final questions: 'What could be done to address these problems?' and, 'What could you as a professional do about these problems?'

Interviewees hesitated to discuss some aspects of their experience.[27] They presented their filmmaking careers as a series of achievements rather than as a series of events that included ones that went badly. Failures are not a common way of presenting themselves in the filmmaking world because its network sociality demands that one build up an impeccable reputation with filmmakers. Presenting themselves as documentarians who might fail a job is a fatal mistake with regard to their professional future. An interview excerpt below is an example of this resistance.

> I don't know whether I would call them failures. […] We kind of have this system where there are a lot of gatekeepers and these gatekeepers have a lot of power. […] You almost kind of have to wait to get picked [by them]. So, I have not waited to get picked. […] I'd rather stay away from that box and build an alternative way. So, I would not call it a failure, it might be slower than most of my peers who kind of say: 'Yes, yes, yes', and did whatever they were told. But now most of them are miserable because they just say yes to everything and never actually found a path that worked for them. Whereas I feel like I'm slower than them, but I've beginning to create a business that is sustainable and is able to give me the freedom that I need to make stuff. (Susanne, 2017)

---

[27] Chapter one discussed the neo-liberal discourse of individual choice and of freedom. That discourse is connected to the widely shared perception of cultural industries as egalitarian and inclusive; and that perception makes the language of inequality unspeakable. On 'unspeakability' of inequalities, see, for example, Allen (2013) and Gill et al (2017).

While presenting their careers as successful stories the interviewees recognised obstacles and barriers in the film sector, nevertheless.[28] The documentarians turned the constraints to their advantages, thereby demonstrating how they surmounted difficulties. They spoke only rarely of how disadvantages hindered them. Thus, the respondents present their life and work as if they were the results of individual free choices, rather than the outcomes of the structural forces.

The interviewees resisted talking about themselves being involved in marginalisation. They were reluctant to see themselves as a part of oppressive structures; on the contrary, they expressed their willingness to work with marginalised filmmakers such as women and people from working-class backgrounds. The responses to questions about beliefs, attitudes and conduct were affected by social expectations of desirable conduct (Deacon et al, 2007). The diversity discourse is a common mode of addressing social disadvantages in the film sector.[29] Accordingly, the filmmakers had internalised social expectations and, thus, demonstrated their commitment to being socially inclusive. For instance, the socially inappropriate attitude was accepting a view that the film sector was a social milieu that was designed for a privileged group of middle-class men educated in Oxbridge. The interviewees criticised this statement, thus avoiding repercussions of demonstrating unethical conduct.

I adopted the approach that is called either 'responsive interviewing' (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) or 'non-directive interviewing' (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). The

---

[28]   Chapter four discusses filmmakers' experience of workplace disadvantages.

[29]   Chapter six discusses diversity initiatives within the film sector.

approach describes the specific type of interaction between the researcher and participants: the researcher responds to information provided by interviewees, rather than relying only on a questionnaire. The research design is flexible and adaptive to the interview discussion, and the researcher might change questions during the fieldwork. I listened to my research interviewees carefully and followed their ideas about the discussion topics.[30] The approach facilitates arising new themes for conversation and receiving socially rich findings. It puts a demand on the researcher who is supposed to facilitate the discussion. For, as Hammersley and Atkinson (2007: 118) claim, when using this approach, the researcher 'must be an active listener'. The open format of the interview allows the greater intervening of the researcher into fieldwork than within more standardised research procedures.

Bourdieu argues that interview relationships involve 'active and methodical listening' (1996: 19). There is an asymmetry between a researcher and a respondent: the latter usually follows the rules established by the former. These relationships, as Bourdieu argues, include symbolic violence against respondents, and reducing violent forms of communication makes a good research practice. Bourdieu explains 'active and methodical listening' in the following passage.

> In effect, it combines the display of total attention to the person
> questioned, submission to the singularity of her own life history –
> which may lead, by a kind of more or less controlled imitation, to
> adopting her language and espousing her views, feelings and thoughts –

---

[30] Rubin and Rubin (2005) term respondents 'conversational partners' in order to demonstrate their active role in a discussion (2005: 14).

with methodical construction, founded on the knowledge of objective

conditions common to an entire social category. (1996: 19)

Bourdieu points out that an interviewer aims at achieving 'true comprehension' (*ibid.*: 23) of a respondent by 'attempting to situate oneself in the place the interviewee occupies in the social space' (*ibid.*: 22). Situating oneself in the place of other relates to paying close attention to what is being said in an interview (*ibid.*: 23). Familiarity (and social proximity, which implies familiarity too) is one of the two important modes of maintaining 'non-violent communication' in research interviews (*ibid.*: 20).

Haraway (1988) criticises the division between object and knowing subject. Haraway argues that a researcher should 'learn how to see' the points of view of others; she calls seeing those perspectives as 'feminist versions of objectivity' (*ibid.*: 583). The latter is juxtaposed by Haraway to 'doctrine of objectivity' produced by white male supremacy and aimed at disconnecting subject and object (*ibid.*: 581). Haraway questions the transcendence of 'objective' vision, which is rooted in attempting to secure the power.[31] Instead, she argues for 'partial, locatable, critical knowledges' (*ibid.*: 584). She provides a useful analogy of photography to illustrate the feminist idea of learning how to see from other perspectives. Contemporary photography presents different pictures of the world from an insect to a satellite; that is an example of a great variety of different perspectives and '*ways* of seeing'. Haraway writes:

---

[31] Similarly, and in conversation with Deleuze, Foucault (1977: 207-208) argues for a need to develop a non-totalising theory that would be opposing to the dominant power structures. Deleuze summarises Foucault's view as follows: 'It is in the nature of power to totalise and it is your position, and one I fully agree with, that theory is by nature opposed to power.' (1977: 208).

The 'eyes' made available in modern technological sciences shatter any
idea of passive vision; these prosthetic devices show us that all eyes,
including our own organic ones, are active perceptual systems, building
on translations and specific *ways* of seeing, that is, ways of life. There is
no unmediated photograph or passive camera obscura in scientific
accounts of bodies and machines; there are only highly specific visual
possibilities, each with a wonderfully detailed, active, partial way of
organising worlds. (*ibid.*: 583).

2.3.4 Ethnographic observations

Interviewing was not my only technique. Over the summer and autumn of 2017, I performed ethnographic observation of talks, workshops, screenings at the film festivals such as Sheffield Doc/Fest, Open City Documentary Festival, Raindance Film Festival, BFI London Film Festival, Colchester Film Festival, TriForce Short Film Festival. In the summer of 2018, I attended a short course called the Open City Docs Summer Documentary Filmmaking School. The UCL Anthropology Department organised the course. My observations took a non-participatory overt form: filmmakers were aware that I was undertaking research. These ethnographic observations allowed to immerse me into the filmmaking community and, thereby, to capture and understand the meaning systems translated by filmmakers. Observing their life provided information on how different work-related issues were interpreted in real practice and about how some aspects of work came to be hidden.[32] Participating in the film summer school provided me with an opportunity to communicate with my tutors who were experienced documentary filmmakers. They

---

[32]   On ethnographic studies see further O'Reilly (2005), Strangleman and Warren (2008).

discussed various aspects of their work and their relationships with co-workers, all in an informal manner; and these materials proved useful for my research project. Most importantly, the observations gave me a chance to expand my knowledge about the film sector. They helped me to become familiar with the specific language used by documentarians.[33] I stored the relevant information yielded at the events in my observational and theoretical notes. The observational notes included information about industry events such as key speakers and discussed topics. The theoretical notes included my analytical ideas produced during observations.[34]

2.3.5 Self-reflection

This section of the chapter discusses my position as a doctoral researcher who was investigating filmmaking work as an outsider: a non-filmmaker, a young woman, and a migrant.[35] Following an argument from Haraway (1988) about 'situated knowledges', the section discusses 'the particularity and embodiment' of my vision (*ibid*.: 582). As she puts it, 'only partial perspective promises objective vision' (*ibid*.: 583).

As a non-filmmaker and a migrant, I found my research fieldwork both an exciting and challenging. It was compelling to discover an unknown world of British documentary filmmaking. At the beginning of the fieldwork, I knew no-one in the

---

[33]   On how ethnographic observation can assimilate the participants' language into the familiar one, see O'Reilly (2005: 92-95).

[34]   The theoretical notes are called an 'intellectual diary' because they seek to collect reflections and thoughts of an observer (O'Reilly, 2005: 99).

[35]   The insider/outsider dyad is widely discussed in social science. See, for example, Simmel (1950), Merton (1972), Latour (1981), Becker (1973).

film sector. Over the course of my ethnographic observations, I learnt a specific professional language and a style of communication used by filmmakers. For instance, communication in the filmmaking world is less formal than academia. My observations provided me with an opportunity to learn how to present myself to filmmakers. Yet, I encountered various difficulties related to managing my position as a professional. I was expected to present myself as a knowledgeable researcher, but it was not always so. While interviewing filmmakers, I was not always familiar with the facts and the problems at issue in discussions. Being a non-native English speaker, I found it hard to understand unfamiliar accents, expressions and words. Also, having not been raised in Britain I lacked some cultural reference points. Only rarely did I confess such things to my research participants; I did not want to look unprepared or incompetent. This outsider position affected my conduct as an interviewer. For instance, I never challenged the interviewees but rather followed their narratives. I did not ask questions to speakers when I was observing the industry events such as question-and-answer sessions, workshops and talks. I struggled with establishing social connections with filmmakers over my fieldwork observations. My outsider position affected the conduct of the interviewees as well. A few research participants explained to me the social context of the filmmaking. I presume that they would not do that with an 'insider'. For instance, one interviewee discussed changes to the British education system over recent decades when he was answering the question about his parents' professional backgrounds. Another filmmaker told me about the social context of the launch and operation of Channel 4.

I was born as, and identify as, a woman, but I was researching gender inequality in a sector dominated by men. Although I did not experience overt discrimination from male interviewees in most of the interview situations, I was

reading communication with them through a feminist lens.[36] In a few interviews, the subtlety of the gender oppression related to the fact that I was not being taken seriously as a credible researcher by male interviewees. They regarded me as a 'young woman' and student, and as I assume, would rather take seriously a male researcher of older age. My gender affected communication with the interviewees in ways that contribute to either a social uniting or distancing. Unlike the social distance with the male filmmakers, gender united me with the female interviewees. Social proximity with female interviewees owes to sharing similar experiences of disadvantages and leads to a better understanding of their perspectives. The affinity for women allowed me to express solidarity with female filmmakers who experience workplace disadvantages. Similarly, Bourdieu argues for a need for:

> the relations of the research in which it is possible to partially surmount
> such social distance thanks to the relations of familiarity which unite
> her with the respondent and to the sense of social ease, favourable to
> plain speaking, provided by the numerous links of secondary solidarity
> which offer indisputable guarantees of sympathetic comprehension.
> (1996: 21-22).

The filmmakers could not easily identify my social class. Both my parents were academics in a small city in Russia. Both of them were first-generation graduates;

---

[36] There were two instances of discrimination. A male interviewee produced a statement that his experience of racism was with women: 'Most of my experience [of racism] is with white female[s], not with white male[s]. They would deny your experience [of racism], they would deny. And someone who denies your life experience, it's very insulting, it's very hurting' (William, 2018). Another male filmmaker regarded the interview as an opportunity to discuss his romantic relationships. Also, he reacted aggressively to my questions about his background and work experience.

their parents had traditional working-class occupations. Juggling multiple science lecturer's jobs to earn their livelihood, my parents did not accumulate economic or cultural capital that I would be able to inherit. The contradiction of my social background is explained by the discrepant social and professional structures of Russian society. My social background was not recognised by my interviewees, but it affected my communication with them, nevertheless. I had a strong affinity for filmmakers from working-class backgrounds, rather than for middle-class filmmakers. I was able to empathise with the financial struggles accompanying the filmmaking profession. That resulted in my expressing solidarity with workers from less affluent backgrounds.

As a precarious worker, I was able to share an understanding of struggles with professional uncertainty articulated by the interviewees. A lack of job security and the prevalence instead of fixed-term short contracts is something that the filmmaking profession and today's academia have in common. It positions me in close social proximity to the respondents. Moreover, it may have been that a few interviewees had agreed to be interviewed because, having a second job in academia, they felt somewhat pastoral towards me, a student.

My sociology background politicised me and that politicisation affected my research fieldwork. This thesis aims to make social exclusions visible and speakable and to apply a bottom-up approach to cultural policymaking. The research interest was affected by my political assumption that marginalised workers should be given voices. Following feminist ideas, I positioned myself on the side of the oppressed and regarded the research project as providing an emancipatory potential to marginalised Others. Haraway (1988) stands for the subjugated points of view, which are the

closest to 'critical knowledges'. She writes: "[s]ubjugated' standpoints are preferred because they seem to promise more adequate, sustained, objective, transforming accounts of the world' (1988: 584). The subjugated are used to being oppressed and denied; thus, they are unlikely to deny critical knowledges. Haraway points out accurately that subjugated positioning are 'ways of being nowhere while claiming to see comprehensively' (1988: 584). In her view, the solidarity with 'preferred positioning' contributes to the creation of a feminist version of objectivity in opposition to relativism and totalising objectivity disavowing the partiality of perspectives (Haraway, 1988: 584).

2.4   Data analysis

I discuss now how I recorded, organised and analysed data. Cataloguing collected information into transcripts and fieldnotes is an important research procedure that prepares data for subsequent analysis. I discuss my approach to data analysis, namely the relevance of Foucauldian analytical framework for the empirical study of the filmmaking profession.

2.4.1 Data organising

I made audio recordings of the interviews with a digital voice recorder and (at other times) a smartphone. I transcribed the recordings using the software called NVivo. In the transcription, I omitted unimportant features of speech such as pauses and interruptions because a full format of transcription was not necessary for my research purposes. For a few interviews, I did not make transcriptions at all but instead summarised the relevant information provided by interviewees. This flexible approach saved me time.

In archiving the data, I anonymised the interviewees, since the research fieldwork generated personal information about filmmakers' careers.[37] I used the pseudonyms for the research participants in the interview transcriptions. I created a separate document in which to encrypt identifiable information; it connected the pseudonyms with the identifiable information such as real names and the contacts of the interviewees.[38] Other information such as gender, class background, education, occupation, employment status was not changed or coded because it was useful for answering the research questions.

Throughout the fieldwork, I took extensive notes, both on (and during) interviews and on (and during) the industry events that I was observing. The focus of such fieldnotes changed over the fieldwork. At the beginning of the research fieldwork, I was writing almost everything that I was observing, but my later fieldnotes had more detailed information relating to the research problem. I was producing the analytic notes related to my ideas and thoughts about the fieldwork. The analytic notes were helpful for the subsequent data analysis.

2.4.2 The analysis of data

For this study, the data analysis was done by using NVivo software. The data analysis involves producing analytic categories and subsuming data within those categories (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007: 161). Data coding reorganises the interview transcripts and fieldnotes into themes, thus providing a means to examine

---

[37] My research project meets the ethics requirements of confidentiality in the data collecting and anonymity in the research findings presenting.

[38] I alone had access to the version of the document that contained identifiable information.

testimonies and a way of seeking and receiving information.[39] While reading the transcripts and fieldnotes, I identified topics discussed by the interviewees. For instance, those topics were social background, unpaid work experience, gender division of labour and so on. The coding system changed over the course of my data analysis because I was adding new codes and/or regrouping already existing ones. The main trend of the development of the categories was from the specific to the abstract. Some interviews were coded to a greater extent than the others because the collected interviews varied significantly with regard to their relevance, quality and length. The coding was undertaken with a view to the theoretical framework with which subsequently I would further process the data. However, the data analysis was not straightforward, but rather an iterative process of moving back and forth between data and the theoretical framework. (On that movement, see Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007: 159).[40]

I used a Foucauldian methodology[41] to understand the experiences of workplace inequalities in the filmmaking profession.[42] Foucault argues that investigating 'experiences lived in contemporary societies' results in engaging with the question of

---

[39]   On data coding see further Hammersley and Atkinson (2007), Rivas (1998).

[40]   Hammersley and Atkinson call this approach to data analysis 'grounded theorising'. They write (2007: 159): 'The central injunction of grounded theorising is that there should be constant interplay between data and ideas throughout the research process' (2007: 159). That approach is the opposite to the 'hypothesis-testing' approach that seeks to test data against the previous research results.

[41]   A Foucauldian approach to methodology treats epistemological issues, rather than a method in a narrow sense of a technique of research practice.

[42]   Chapter four treats experience of class and of gender inequalities in the filmmaking profession.

power (Foucault, 1991c: 148-149). This thesis examines 'the multiplicity of force relations' (Foucault, 1978: 92) immanent in the film sector. It investigates how filmmakers and film institutions could transform power relations in the sector by contributing to discussions on working conditions and its inequalities. Following Foucault's argument against 'binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled' in his investigation of power (Foucault, 1978: 94), the thesis explores testimonies of filmmakers as well as discourses produced by the regulators in the film sector.[43] The idea of the immanence of power relations in a particular sphere led me to consider filmmakers' accounts as 'local centres of power-knowledge' (Foucault, 1978: 98). Filmmakers contribute to transformations of power-knowledge relations by producing discourses of workplace inequalities and social changes. This thesis aims to reconstruct 'a multiplicity of discursive elements' (Foucault, 1978: 100) and the positions of filmmakers producing these elements. Following Foucault, the project asks the twofold question: 'How did they [power relations] make possible these kinds of discourses, and conversely, how were these discourses used to support power relations?' (Foucault, 1978: 97).

My method of analysis is discourse analysis developed by Foucault and echoed by Foucauldian studies of media and culture.[44] According to it, discourse reflects social reality. Foucault argues for 'localising problems' by listening to individuals and

---

[43] My chapters three and six consider the policy regulation of the film sector.

[44] Discourse analysis has been an influential approach to research since the 1980s (Deacon et al, 2007). There are many – somewhat overlapping – definitions of it. Moreover, it takes different forms. According to Fairclough (1992), there are two main approaches to discourse analysis that are developed by linguistics (for instance, Fowler, Pecheux, Sinclair, Coulthard, and Labov) and by social theory (for instance, Foucault, Gramsci, Althusser, Habermas, and Giddens).

their particular experiences (Foucault, 1991c: 152). Localising problems reveals general problems in society. My thesis aims to find the connection between subjective experiences and structural problems in the film sector. The study explores how social inequalities shape filmmakers' experiences of work. The thesis treats social inequalities as a structural phenomenon that provides social resources and limitations for actions. Also, discourse contributes to structuring social relations: filmmakers generate different discursive responses, thereby reproducing or challenging social structures.

Following Foucault's notion of governmentality, the study explores labouring subjectivities of filmmakers as a mode of governing the self.[45] Subjectivities are regarded as a constitutive element of power relations, rather than a question of a private matter. Subjectivities are continuously governed 'inside and outside' (Foucault, 1997a: 225). Filmmakers' subjectivities are affected by the broader neoliberal tendencies towards commodification and marketisation in the sphere of art and culture.[46] This thesis examines entrepreneurial subjectivity of filmmakers reproducing oppressive structures.[47] The chapter on subjectivities compares and contrasts documentarians' discourses of marginalisation in the film sector.

---

[45] I will consider the labouring subjectivities of filmmakers in chapter five.

[46] Chapter three tries to show how policy regulation within the film sector demonstrates these trends.

[47] Chapter five has more on the entrepreneurial subjectivity of filmmakers.

2.5 Conclusion

In his conversation with Deleuze, Foucault (1977) discusses the relations between intellectuals and power in their historical context. He argues that 'the masses' are able to produce and articulate knowledge better than the intellectual (1977: 207). The power structures, however, deny their discourses and transform the intellectual into its own tool. In this mode, the intellectual is placed above to teach the truth to the masses. Foucault argues for a need to resist this version and to make the intellectual a part of 'a struggle against power' (1977: 208). Resisting the power, the intellectual transforms the relations between theory and practice. Foucault writes:

> In this sense theory does not express, translate, or serve to apply
> practice: it is practice. But it is local and regional, as you said, and not
> totalising. This is a struggle against power, a struggle aimed at revealing
> and undermining power where it is most invisible and insidious. […] A
> 'theory' is the regional system of this struggle. (1977: 208)

The idea of examining local and partial knowledges that do not totalise and are opposed to the power structures is illuminating for the empirical study of filmmaking work and the inequalities therein. The project aims to understand the complaints and demands of the film workers whose everyday work practice is the origin of their concerns. Their testimonies concerning work and its injustice are examined as the only source for social change in the film sector.[48] The film workers produce, as Foucault puts it, 'an individual theory' of inequalities, and '[i]t is this form of

---

[48] I will discuss the policy recommendations that my filmmakers made with regard to social inequalities in chapter six. It will employ a 'bottom-up' approach to cultural policymaking by exploring the complaints and demands of film practitioners.

discourse which ultimately matters' (*ibid*.: 209). The analysis of filmmakers'

discourses of social inequalities is preceded by an overview of the contemporary

history of British film production.[49] The next chapter provides a social and political

context for the empirical study of cultural work in the contemporary documentary

film sector.

---

[49]   Chapter four discusses the filmmakers' discourses about social inequalities.

3   Contemporary history of British film production: policy regulations and labour relations

3.1   Introduction

This chapter contextualises the thesis. It does so via the recent history of British film production. Specifically, I will review central tendencies, from the 1980s onwards, in policy regulation and in industrial relations in the film and television sectors. I chose that time period because labour relations within the culture section underwent great change, that change owing to deregulation and marketisation. My review does not seek to be comprehensive. Rather I outline the main changes in policy regulation and in funding provision within the period, or rather such of them as are the most relevant to explaining the current ecology of British documentary film production. The chapter discusses both the film and television sectors because, historically, the two interrelate.

3.2   Film policy in the Thatcherite decade

The Thatcherite decade of the 1980s was one of economic restructuring that sought to free market by reducing public control and ownership. Those policies transformed the British economy – by, for instance, decreasing the manufacturing sector and growing service and leisure sectors. A 'transformative sector' of the British economy – or construction, utilities, and manufacturing – decreased from 46.7% in 1970 to 27.3% in 1990 (Castells, 1996: 292-293 quoted in Hesmondhalgh, 2019: 118). A 'producer services' sector – or banking, insurance, and engineering – increased from 5% in 1970 to 12% in 1990 (*ibid.*: 118). A 'social services' sector – or hospital, education, and welfare – increased from 17.7% in 1970 to 27.2% in 1990

(*ibid.*: 118). These changes affected the labour market, in that both self-employment and unemployment increased (Corner & Harvey, 1991a: 3). Work became casual and subcontracted. The reduction in labour regulation created insecurity and inequality. The Conservatives' polies caused the creation of 'less confident, less demanding, more fearful workforce' (Corner & Harvey, 1991a: 9).

The culture sector was not immune to all this.[1] The government aimed – in this sector too – at minimising public provision and control, and there was a significant reduction of funding for public institutions of culture. The Arts Council grant-in-aid income was reduced by £12 million for the year 1980/1981 in England (Parliament. House of Commons, 2016: 24). The cultural institutions were left to operate independently and were to transform themselves into efficient, profitable and self-reliant enterprises. To that end, the government began programmes such as the Enterprise Allowance Scheme that was introduced in 1983. That particular programme allowed unemployed people to establish their businesses and promoted an entrepreneurial ethos of independence and individualism. The amount spent by the Enterprise Allowance Scheme increased from £23.2 million in 1983 to £200 million in 1987 (Corner & Harvey, 1991b: 61). The programme had the significant ideological effect of transforming job values into entrepreneurial ones (*ibid.*: 61).[2] Corner and Harvey summarise the situation accurately.

---

[1]   There is also a broader globalised context of neoliberalisation of cultural industries. Chapter one discussed those neoliberal tendencies.

[2]   The entrepreneurial ethos is a dominant discourse in cultural industries today. Chapter five will discuss the entrepreneurial subjectivity of documentary filmmakers.

['The enterprising spirit'] favours the aggressive and marginalises the weak, advances self-interest and selfishness, encourages increased differentials of wealth and poverty and the continuing exploitation of labour, replaces planning with anarchy, ignores the tendency to monopoly and hides the concentrations of power and ownership in capitalist societies. (Corner & Harvey, 1991b: 60).

The Conservative policy of deregulation and free market influenced the film sector significantly (Corner & Harvey, 1991a, 1991b; Crisell, 1997; Dickinson, 1999; Higson, 2011; Hill, 2016; Hill, 2004; Hill, 1993). The government believed that the film industry along with other industries had to become financially independent and self-reliant. The government aimed at minimising public expenditure, facilitating private investments, and privatising public properties in the film industry (Hill, 1993). Under the Conservatives, investments in the film sector decreased significantly – from £270 million in 1986 to £50 million in 1989 (Hill, 1993: 209). This decrease in investment brought British film production to 'a historically low ebb' by the end of the Conservatives' decade (Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015b: 105).

Several Conservative initiatives demonstrated that the government was reluctant to support film production (Hill, 1993). In 1983, the quota for British film distribution, which had been in force since the 1927 Cinematograph Films Act, was abolished (*ibid.*). The quota had obliged distributors to exhibit a certain number of British films in cinemas.[3] The government suspended the 'Eady levy' too. That levy – suspended by the 1985 Films Act – had existed since 1957 and was a tax, on box office revenue, used to support British film production (*ibid.*). Moreover, the

---

[3] The percentage of films distributed in British cinemas has changed over the years.

Conservatives changed how the National Film Finance Corporation (NFFC) operated (*ibid.*). The NFFC was created in 1948 in order to provide loans to British film producers and distributers. Thatcher's government privatised the NFFC and changed its name. It was replaced by a British Screen Finance Consortium (British Screen), which was obliged to become a self-funding institution.[4] The government suggested decreasing the financial support provided by the British Screen to film production (*ibid.*: 209). Thus, in various ways, the government withdrew funding from the film industry. The result was that the aforementioned British Screen became the main source of film production funding, thus acquiring a significant position within the industry.[5]

Despite the government actions towards facilitating the market, the film industry was hardly able to operate in these conditions (Hill, 1993). British film production was rarely profitable.[6] Production companies were unstable enterprises, which could collapse at any moment. A decline of the domestic theatrical market exacerbated those issues. For instance, cinema admissions decreased from 1635 million in 1946 to 58 million in 1984 (*ibid.*: 216). There was a lack of funding from the state or from within the industry, and that resulted in reliance of British production upon funding from abroad, particularly from the US. Indeed, during the 1980s the US was the main financer of British film. The US films prevailed in British

---

[4] Although, the British Screen Finance Consortium was financially supported by the UK Government, Channel 4 and a few television companies during the first years after its launching.

[5] The British Screen was the second main source of film production funding after television.

[6] The nonfiction industry was even less profitable than the rest of the film industry.

cinemas too. For instance, American films contributed to 78%–88% of the British box-office revenues in the period 1985–89 (*ibid.*: 216). British film production depended financially upon such investment from overseas but also upon the support provided by British television. As Hill puts it, British television was 'the most stable and significant source of British production finance', without which the film industry was not able to survive (*ibid.*: 212). The next section of the chapter will describe changes occurred in British broadcasting and its impact upon film production.

3.3   The launch of Channel 4

This section reviews the early history of Channel 4 because the channel produced a significant impact on the film sector. One of the avowed principles of Channel 4 was to 'reflect' the interests of minorities, and the channel did indeed contribute significantly to diversity both on and behind the screen. The new fourth channel contributed also to the funding of films and helped to create an independent film production sector.[7]

The emergence of Channel 4 in 1982 was a result of long debates about a need for independent broadcasting and film production (Harvey, 1994; Brown, 2007). In 1971, the TV4 Campaign was established. It was an organisation comprised of film and television workers. It opposed the launch of ITV2 as an alternative to existing duopoly of the BBC and ITV (Harvey, 1994). The TV4 Campaign argued for launching the fourth television channel instead. The fourth channel would abolish the duopoly and facilitate the development of the independent film production sector.

---

[7]   The next section of the chapter will discuss the development of the independent film production sector.

Another initiative was made by the BFI Director Anthony Smith who proposed the idea of a National Television Foundation (*ibid*.). He argued that the National Television Foundation would be a separate organisation that would commission programmes to independent companies and would be an alternative to existing broadcasters. He argued that the fourth channel would consider a variety of interests, including a minority audience. These two initiatives influenced a 1977 report – the Annan Report – that itself requires some discussion.

The 1977 Annan Report comprised the main principles of Channel 4 (Hobson, 2008; Born, 2003). These principles included 'accountability through Parliament to a public which is given more chance to make its voice heard', 'diversity of services', 'flexibility of structure' and 'editorial independence' (Annan, 1977: 474 quoted in Harvey, 1994: 111). The Annan Report considered the diversity of programming, which would reflect the interests of different minorities. The report argued for regional production and for regional workshops. Also, the report proposed a scheme for the distribution of programme production sources. For instance, independent producers were to be responsible for some 15% to 35% of programmes, ITV was to produce some 35% to 50% of programmes, and ITN was to supplement them (Crisell, 1997: 197). The debates about the fourth channel continued. For example, the Channel 4 Group was established. The Channel 4 Group included oppositional filmmakers from the Independent Filmmakers Association (IFA). They contributed to the discussion significantly and argued for the cultural independence of the fourth channel. The 1980 Broadcasting Act was the final policy document that established the main principles of Channel 4. It implemented the key recommendations of the Annan Report. The main principles of the new channel included experimentation and

being appealing to a variety of tastes and interests (Harvey, 1994; Broadcasting Act, 1980).

Channel 4 was independent from advertising (Sparks, 1994). It was owned by the Independent Broadcasting Authority (IBA). The IBA was a public body and regulated the interaction between the channel and commercial companies. The income of Channel 4 was ascertained beforehand and did not depend upon audience preferences, although the channel was funded by advertising revenues. The channel's income was increasing in the first decade of its operating because commercial television companies sponsored it generously due to an advertising boom of the 1980s. Channel 4 income increased from £129 million in 1986 to £168 million in 1990 (Sparks, 1994: 138).

Channel 4 was a public service broadcaster that, as said, was duty-bound to serve a variety of audiences or interests (Harvey, 1994; Freedman & Goblot, 2018; Blanchard & Morley, 1982; Brown, 2007). Two thirds of its programming intended to serve 'special interests and concerns for which television has until now lacked adequate time' and the remaining third catered to broader tastes (McDonnell, 1991: 71 quoted in Crisell, 1997: 198). Channel 4 divided the special and minorities' interests into three main categories: 1) cultural interests, including art-film, documentaries and serious talk; 2) special interests such as sport and hobbies; 3) ethnic minorities, mostly Indian and Asian (Crisell, 1997). Hence, Channel 4 influenced the television industry significantly because it extended a variety of possible subjects for broadcasting.

Channel 4 reflected social and cultural changes by representing a variety of opinions on different subjects (Harvey, 1994; Born, 2003). It functioned as a

'multicultural public sphere' which programmes treated highly politicised questions (Malik, 2013: 232). The channel's programmes differed radically from other media content. For instance, filmmakers from a range of backgrounds were allowed to explore working-class life, female experience, black life and so on (Harvey, 1994: 118-120). Channel 4 showed 'a greater variety of ideas and lifestyles, sharper extremes of wealth and poverty, more ferocious political and ideological disagreements, together with a general lessening of public interest in official politics' than the television of two preceding decades (Harvey, 1994: 118). Harvey further characterises the channel as follows.

> It was probably the only television channel in the world to combine a legislative requirement to *experiment*, to *innovate* and to *complement* the service offered by the existing commercial television channel, and all of this on an income guaranteed in advance by its parliamentary god-parents, under the direction of a Conservative government. (Harvey, 1994: 102)

Lengthy planning of the fourth channel resulted in its emergence during Thatcher's time in government. Channel 4's planning took over twenty years, and those who took part in it considered the process as a long delay. The Labour government, which preceded the Thatcher's administration, postponed their decision regarding Annan Committee recommendations. On the other hand, William Whitelaw, the new Conservatives' Home Secretary, showed a strong interest in the fourth channel (Harvey, 1994: 114-115). In his talk on the Royal Television Society Convention in 1979, Whitelaw argued that Thatcher's administration will give 'new opportunities to creative people' and 'new ways of finding minority and specialist audiences' (Lambert, 1982: 93 cited in Harvey, 1994: 115).

The political controversy between the Old Right and the New Right, which Conservatives tried to resolve in 1980s, influenced the principles of Channel 4 (Harvey, 1994: 103-104). The Old Right propagated cultural tradition and heritage, while the New Right stood for enterprise and business development (Corner and Harvey, 1991). Channel 4 incorporated ideas from both sides of the debate between heritage and enterprise. Channel 4's aspirations for programme innovation and serving various audiences corresponded the Old Right's idea of public service broadcasting, which was a cultural tradition and heritage since the Victorian time (Harvey, 1994: 103). The New Right's ambition to develop enterprise culture matched Channel 4's production model, which involved independent companies. Channel 4 did not produce programmes in-house but commissioned the independent sector to produce programmes. The Conservatives saw the development of the new independent sector as promising in terms of economic innovation and enterprise development.

The Channel 4 Group, which included left-wing filmmakers, journalists, trade-unionists, considered the Conservatives' initiative to encourage enterprise culture a good opportunity to persuade the government that the Channel 4 should be established (Brown, 2007). Such rebranding allowed them to win the lobbying battle for the new channel. In his interview with Brown, Anthony Smith commented on this: 'It is the only dialectical force in history that has taken a group of left-wing intellectuals and turned them into businessmen' (Brown, 2007: 27).

Conservatives hoped to reduce the power of the unions and considered Channel 4 and its new model of independent production of a significant help for undermining trade unions' positions (Brown, 2007: 27). The Association of Cinematograph,

Television and Allied Technicians (ACTT) organised a 'disastrous' strike in autumn

1979, and this strike convinced further the Conservatives against unions (Brown,

2007: 27). Employees and senior executives of the television industry took part in

industrial action and picketing. Underpayment of television workers was the main

issue of the dispute. ITV, for example, stopped their broadcasting for three months

(The Guardian, 1999). It was 'the last hurrah of union power in the television

industry' (*ibid.*). Barry Cox, a union activist and then a deputy chairman of Channel

4, commented on the strike actions:

> I suppose the key thing was that we knew we were in an industry that
>
> was rapidly growing and that we were negotiating from a position of
>
> strength as there would be a growing market for our skills. It was totally
>
> different for people who were not just fighting for jobs, but for the
>
> survival of an industry. But clearly, since the Thatcherite laws on
>
> industrial action came in and technical changes have taken place in the
>
> UK TV industry, this kind of strike could never happen now. (*ibid.*)

Channel 4 'need[s] to be seen within the terms of the tensions caused by this

combination of 'strong' governmental direction and crosscurrents of cultural and

political dissent' (Lee and Corner, 2017: 449). The years of Thatcher's administration

were marked by the 'remarkable record on civil disturbances' (Benyon and Solomos,

1988: 402). The large part of the British population disliked the Thatcher's

government (Lee and Corner, 2017; Benyon and Solomos, 1988). The main causes of

unrest included unemployment, socio-economic deprivation, racial injustice, political

exclusion, police violence (Benyon and Solomos, 1988). Urban protests happened

every year of Conservative government: for example, in Bristol, London, Liverpool

and other cities. Channel 4 reflected the political atmosphere of 1980s in their

programme making: the channel challenged the status quo and promoted political and aesthetic innovation (Born, 2003; Lee and Corner, 2017).

Channel 4's effect on the film sector was not limited to diversifying television programmes. For, also, it helped to create an independent film production sector. Also, Channel 4 contributed to film production funding. It did so by establishing the 'Film on Four' schemes. I elaborate now upon the development of the independent production sector and its funding.

3.4   The emergence of the independent film production sector

Channel 4 contributed to an emergence of a new organisational form of film production – the independent production sector (Dickinson, 1999; Harvey, 1994; Sparks, 1994; Crisell, 1997; Freedman, 2016). The channel did not make programmes but commissioned them from independent film production companies. The new production model was the opposite of the one used by the BBC and by ITV. Those older broadcasters produced their programmes in-house and hence had full control over production (Sparks, 1994: 137). Channel 4's adoption of the commissioning model would later have an effect upon the BBC and ITV. The 1990 Broadcasting Act contributed to production changes at the BBC and ITV by obliging them to commission 25% of their programmes from independent production companies.

In the 1980s, Channel 4 facilitated significant growth of independent film production (Dickinson, 1999: 68-79; Harvey, 1994; Sparks, 1994; Freedman, 2016). The number of broadcasting hours was increasing, and therefore, it increased demand for independent production. Nearly half of Channel 4's programmes were made by the independent production sector by 1991 (Harvey, 1994: 125, 130). Channel 4 made

a considerable contribution to the funding of the production companies. The channel
was funded generously by advertising in the first decade of its operating, and that
funding allowed the channel to be generous in turn in its sponsorship of the
independents. The number of independent companies funded by Channel 4 increased
from 281 in 1984 to 668 in 1991 (Sparks, 1994: 145). The majority of these
companies received commissions under £100 000 per year, although a few of them
received approximately £1 million per year (Harvey, 1994: 125).

The independent production sector grew quickly and changed the industry
(Harvey, 1994: 104; Sparks, 1994: 139). Previously, a few large institutions such as
the BBC and ITV dominated the industry and provided stable employment. The
growth of the independent production created small companies that had precarious,
because short-term and subcontracted, work arrangements (Sparks, 1994: 137). The
income of independents was unstable and unpredictable. They reduced the benefits
that they offered employees – pensions, childcare, sick pay, paid holidays – in order
to decrease production costs (Harvey, 1994: 104, 125).

One interviewee discussed the profound changes that were brought by the
growth of the independent production sector in the 1980s.

> I was a beneficiary of a change that, probably, a lot of other people
> suffered from – people who had secure jobs at the BFI, the BBC and
> ITV, who might have lost their jobs when those institutions began
> shrinking. I came in the moment when that was sort of happening with
> the rise of the independent sector and had benefits upon that for twenty
> years. (Luke, 2017)

Channel 4 broadened access to the film and television sector: it allowed the participation of filmmakers who would not otherwise have been able to work in production. The aim was to stop class, gender, race, sexuality, age and so on from being barriers. A few interviewees argued that often newcomers lacked work experience or social connections in the sector. Channel 4 'opened the door' to a sector wherein '99% were men with these degrees from Oxford' (Dana, 2018). Of this issue, another interviewee said the following.

> A whole new generation of people was working on television for the first time. Some people who'd worked for the BBC left to make programmes for Channel 4. Some people who'd been working for ITV left to make programmes for Channel 4. But quite a lot of people like me, some of them [were] academics, some of them [were] just journalists, whatever, film enthusiasts, just happened to be lucky. At that moment, it was about being at the right place at the right time. (Luke, 2017)

Another interviewee said how easy it was for him as a journalist to receive a Channel 4 commission for a documentary series. 'I took an idea to Channel 4 as a journalist, and as a result of that amazingly I've got commissioned to be part of a team to make a documentary series' (Leo, 2018).

Channel 4 helped to develop the independent sector by investing in film production (Hill, 1993; Harvey, 1994). Channel 4 created Film on Four in order to support the film industry with money from television. The annual budget of Film on Four increased from £6 million to £36 million during the first decade of Channel 4 (Harvey, 1994: 130). The amount of funding was equal to 6%–7% of Channel 4's overall budget (Hill, 1993: 214). The increased funding paid for 136 feature films in

1991 (Harvey, 1994: 123-124). Channel 4 did not have commercial interests in any of its filmmaking, and as Hill puts it, the channel demonstrated 'its insulation from purely commercial considerations' (1993: 214). It sponsored films without demanding financial return and allocated funding to films according to its view of their cultural worth rather than audience ratings (Hill, 1993: 214). In 1991, documentaries were the fourth largest portion of the channel's expenditure and that portion was £19 million (Harvey, 1994: 130). Channel 4 provided opportunities to non-mainstream filmmaking and had a significant impact on documentary film production. Furthermore, Channel 4 became a 'role model' for other television channels with regard to film funding provision (Hill, 1993). Television channels likewise started to invest in film production. As a result, the proportion of British film production funded by television increased from 4% in 1982 to 49% in 1989 (Lewis, 1990 quoted in Hill, 1993: 14).

3.5   Further development towards commercialisation and marketisation

Several government actions contributed to further commercialisation and marketisation of the film and television sector. Of those actions, I shall discuss the Peacock Report and the 1990 Broadcasting Act. Then I will give an overview of the changes that occurred within the broadcasting and independent production sectors.

The Peacock Committee was appointed by the government in 1985 to make recommendations about public service broadcasting. *The Report of the Committee on Financing the BBC* – the 'Peacock report' – appeared in 1986 and contributed to the creation of a hostile environment for the broadcasters (Collins, 2004; Crisell, 1997; O'Malley & Jones, 2009). The recommendations in the committee's report sought to create an economically efficient and independent broadcasting sector, or as the report

put it, 'a sophisticated market system based on consumer sovereignty' (Peacock, 1986 quoted in Collins, 2004: 154). It suggested replacing the BBC license fee with subscription payments. The subscription television would transform broadcasting into an entrepreneurial organisation that operates in the market. The report recommended that 40% of the BBC programmes were commissioned from the independent production sector, and that BBC Radio 1 and BBC Radio 2 be privatised. But of course, the report's recommendations were not fully implemented.

The 1990 Broadcasting Act discussed moves towards deregulation and marketisation of the sector (Crisell, 1997; Sparks, 1994; Harvey, 2006b). The Act changed the financial provision of channels and considered broadcasting as a profit-making business (Harvey, 2006b). Broadcasting licenses were to be allocated to the highest bidders rather than awarded to broadcasters according to their merits. The changes increased the financial pressure upon the commercial companies that sold advertising time. Those companies operated in conditions of high competition for advertising revenues with each other. Because of increased market pressure, the BBC diversified its income sources by adding the subscriptions and coproduction (Sparks, 1994: 139). The Broadcasting Act obliged the BBC and other channels to commission 25% of their programmes from independent companies. That change worsened working conditions: it decreased employment, wages and benefits (Sparks, 1994: 140-141). For instance, the BBC dismissed 7000 staff between 1986 and 1990 (Crisell, 1997: 234). Also, the Act altered the regulation body: the Independent Broadcasting Authority (IBA) was split into the Independent Television Commission (ITC) and the Radio Authority. The ITC was a 'light touch regulator': it had less control over broadcasters than the IBA had had.

In 1993, Channel 4 started to compete for advertising revenues. The legal requirement to sell advertising increased the financial pressure on the channel. Funding was declining already because of recession and the end of an advertising 'boom'. The annual growth of television advertising expenditures decreased from 14% in 1983 to below zero (-8%) in 1991 (Sparks, 1994: 146). The increased market pressure changed the channel's innovative character. The channel aimed to minimise production costs and maximise audience, rather than to address a variety of voices and cultural characteristics of programmes and films. There was strong criticism of Channel 4 programmes that became populist since then (Crisell, 1997: 228).

The labour relations within the film and broadcasting changed substantially by the early 1990s. The large institutions that provided stable employment were replaced by small companies that provided casual and freelance employment. After its first few years of growth, the independent sector faced funding reductions and a death of commissions. The independent sector became highly competitive, insecure and 'casualised'.[8] The increased quantity of casual workers in the film sector was – and indeed is – 'the industrial equivalent of small peasants who work themselves and their families to death in order to hold onto the tiny family plot of land' (Sparks, 1994: 151). Sparks (1994: 143-146) argues that independent production companies found several ways to deal with the new conditions. Specialisation allowed certainty and stability to companies and also allowed them to get regular contracts and to hire full-time staff. The independent companies reduced wages and benefits. They aimed to use resources efficiently and to develop towards greater commercialisation. Another

---

[8]   Chapter four explores filmmakers' experiences of precarious work.

response to uncertainty was to try to widen their market, namely to find new audiences for their production.

3.6 Film and broadcasting policies of the Major government and New Labour government

Conservative film policy changed with the Major Government (1990–1997) (Dickinson & Harvey, 2005a; Higson, 2011; Hill, 2004; Hill, 2012). Major's government renounced the free market policy; the government introduced tax reliefs and provided National Lottery funds for film production. The tax relief was for films with large budgets (budgets over £15 million) and was introduced in 1992. This tax relief remains in force today.[9] The tax relief, and lottery funding, meant that in the 1990s the number of films produced increased (Higson, 2011: 15). For, the tax relief attracted inward investment, and as Newsinger and Presence put it, 'helped boost employment and developed the UK's state-of-the-art facilities and world-leading talent and crews' (2018: 447). The tax relief system, however, was a part of a 'corporate welfare system' with 'commercial subsidy as a cornerstone' of film policy (*ibid*.: 448). The main beneficiaries of subsidies were multinational corporations and Hollywood studios which dominated in the film industry. The government was eager to subsidise the commercial culture where large corporations prevailed. Thus, the tax relief system took a step away from Conservative free market ideals.

The Major government introduced further initiatives in order to attract inward investments into the film industry. The British Film Commission and London Film

---

[9]   The next section of the chapter will discuss the current funding system of film production.

Commission, established in 1991 and 1995 respectively, aimed at increasing inward investments. The agencies connected government with industry in order the better to support and promote feature films and high-end television production. They helped film producers with production and funding. Additionally, the National Lottery funds became available to film production in 1994. Regional Arts Councils were responsible for allocating these funds to film producers. The lottery funds were distributed via franchises; they facilitated vertical integration of film production (Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015b). Furthermore, the Major Government moved the regulation of film to the Department of National Heritage.

The cultural policy of the so-called New Labour Government (1997–2010) was a complex mix of social democratic and neoliberal ideas wherein neoliberal incentives to commercialisation prevailed (Böhm & Land, 2009; Harvey, 2006b; Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015a; Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015b; Hewison, 2015; Newsinger & Presence, 2018). Unlike the Conservatives, New Labour increased funding for the culture sector (Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015a). The government's grant-in-aid to Arts Council England increased from £187 million in 1997 to £453 million in 2010 (*ibid*.: 100). New Labour increased the Lottery funds too. For instance, over the period of 1997–2010, it gave some £3 billion of lottery money to the art and heritage sector (*ibid.*: 101). However, the funding increases owed more to economic growth (between 1995 and 2006) than to a policy change (*ibid*.: 104). Hesmondhalgh et al (2015a) argue that New Labour continued to be subject to neoliberal incentives: they regard continuity between the preceding Conservatives and New Labour. New Labour conduced to the public sector decline and private sector development (*ibid.*). It implemented 'new public management' mechanisms that included 'unbundling public sector into corporatised units organised by product' and 'more contract-based

competitive provision' among others (*ibid*.: 104). The government imposed upon the sector various forms of external assessment and planning, thereby reducing the sector's autonomy.

New Labour policy contributed to the commercialisation and marketisation of the culture sector by implementing 'creative industries' policies (Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015a; Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015b; Ross, 2009; McRobbie, 2016; Newsinger, 2015). The government considered culture a driving force for modern economies. Creative industries were regarded as institutions operating according to a business model. The Department for Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS) released the *Creative Industries Mapping Document* in 2001.[10] That document promoted an idea of economic development based on creative work. This New Labour approach to creative industries took the film industry as one of its main targets (Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015b: 106).

New Labour's film policy showed certain continuity and shifts with the preceding Conservatives. It extended the tax relief to low-budget film production, intending thereby to support independent film production. The government increased the available lottery money. However, these changes gave more money to corporations because the available state subsidies were allocated mostly to large corporations, which had already privileged positions (Newsinger & Presence, 2018). In 1998, the government established the Film Policy Review Group in order to examine the film industry and propose film policy initiatives. The group's members included people from the government and people from the film industry. In 1998, the

---

[10]   The Department of National Heritage became the Department for Culture, Media and Sports in 1997.

group released its report *A Bigger Picture*, which made recommendations to the Treasury. It proposed an extension of the tax relief and new tax incentives, both in order to attract inward investments. The economic goals were combined with cultural incentives, with the report proposing that films had to be 'culturally British' in order to be eligible for the tax relief (Hill, 2016: 712-715). In 2007, the 'Cultural Test' was introduced in order to examine whether films qualify as 'British' (Higson, 2011; Hill, 2016). The Cultural Test awarded 16 out of 31 available points to 'culturally British' films. The points were distributed among different categories that were 'content', 'practitioners', 'contribution' and 'hubs'.[11] The Cultural Test failed to achieve its main aim of providing tax relief for domestic production. Non-domestic films were able to pass the test easily due to a lack of clarity of the test (Hill, 2016: 712-715).

New Labour changed the regulation of film and broadcasting. It established the Film Council, a non-departmental public body, in 2000. It was delegated the majority of the regulatory responsibilities held previously by the DCMS. Moreover, the Film Council replaced the Arts Council of England, the British Screen and the British Film Commission. It took over from the Arts Council by taking on the distribution of lottery money.[12] It took over from the British Film Commission and from British Screen by taking on the investment into film production. The Film Council supported a Premiere Production Fund, a Film Development Fund, a Regional Investment Fund,

---

[11]   The 'content' section was used to check that the films contained British characters and English language (16 points). The 'practitioners' section checked whether film producers had British nationality (8 points). The 'contribution' section checked whether film representations had to do with British culture (4 points). The 'hubs' section checked whether film production had occurred in the British region (3 points) (Hill, 2016).

[12]   Between 1994 to 2000 the Arts Council of England distributed National Lottery funds.

a New Cinema Fund and a British Film Institute. The Film Council financed Nine Regional Screen Agencies that were launched to fund regional film production.

The Film Council was intended to be 'a conduit between government and the British film industry' (Magor & Shlesinger, 2009: 15). It was funded by the DCMS and included members appointed by the government. Its members included senior executives from the film and television sectors. The Film Council, therefore, represented the interests of the mainstream film industry. As Dickinson and Harvey put it, the Film Council had 'little sympathy for the sort of film culture that might make a wider variety of types of films available to actual and potential audiences throughout the UK' (2005b: 426). The Film Council was a result of processes of 'rationalisation in the interests of putting business and economic aspects of film well above its cultural dimensions' (Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015b: 106-107).

The Film Council declared that it aimed 'to stimulate a competitive, successful and vibrant UK film industry and culture, and to promote the widest possible enjoyment and understanding of cinema throughout the nations and regions of the UK' (UK Film Council, 2004 quoted in Hill, 2004: 34). In other words, the new regulatory body attempted to facilitate commercially successful film production while supporting the 'film culture' and widening access to it. The avowed aims were inconsistent with each other because market considerations were opposite to concerns for developing the film culture and film education.

The Film Council's primary goal was to facilitate a sustainable film industry (Dickinson & Harvey, 2005b: 426; Hesmondhalgh et al, 2015b: 107; Higson, 2011: 41; Hill, 2004). It launched the Premiere Production Fund and the Film Development Fund; both of them sponsored expensive commercial productions that attracted large

audiences. This distribution of funding intended to marginalise smaller film production that did not make much profit. The Film Council financed the Regional Screen Agencies that aimed to create 'a sustainable UK film industry by developing the pool of creative skills and talent; developing entrepreneurial acumen and business clusters; and developing an industrial infrastructure' (Holden, 2006: 37 quoted in Newsinger, 2012: 138). The Agencies contributed to the entrepreneurial ethos by facilitating competitiveness and commerce in the film sector.[13]

The Film Council regard the making of films as a powerful way of constructing citizenship and national well-being, and that was, as Hill puts it, 'a longstanding feature of government policy towards film' (2004: 35). The agenda of the Film Council included concerns about diversity and social inclusivity within the film industry. The Film Council published *Film in the UK 2002: Statistical Yearbook* (UK Film Council, 2003). According to those statistic, 32.6% of those working in film production in 2002 were women and 1.6% were from one or other ethnic minority. The Film Council aimed to change the social composition of the film workforce (Hill, 2004). It aimed to change the fact that most film production (67.5% in 2002) was done in London. The Film Council articulated a need for production of a greater variety of films in the UK. The Film Council developed a 'specialised cinema' that included non-mainstream films. For instance, the Film Council funded the BFI that aimed to contribute to the non-mainstream production. It established a Specialised Distribution and Exhibition Strategy to give extra funding to non-mainstream films (Hill, 2004).

---

[13]   Chapter five will discuss the entrepreneurial ethos of documentary filmmakers.

The New Labour government changed broadcasting regulation. The Office of Communications (Ofcom) was established by the 2003 Communication Act. That establishment reintegrated broadcasting's regulatory bodies.[14] All public service broadcasters were accountable to Ofcom – except for the BBC. Moreover, the 2003 Communication Act was in line with a long policy tradition in promoting citizenship interests in broadcasting (Livingstone et al, 2007). The Act required public broadcasters to ensure that 'cultural activity in the United Kingdom, and its diversity, are reflected, supported and stimulated' (Communications Act, 2003 quoted in Harvey, 2006b: 93-94). The content of television programmes was required to be based on the principles of high quality, impartiality and editorial integrity; the broadcasters were obliged to include news and current affairs programmes, for instance (Harvey, 2006b: 96). Harvey argues that Ofcom construed high-quality programming in terms of the neoliberal ethos of market competition (*ibid*.). Ofcom sought to promote the supposed interests of citizens by enhancing competition. As Harvey puts it, Ofcom was 'torn between civic and market principles'; it was 'the product of an uneasy mix of earlier traditions along with newer commitments to neoliberal and deregulatory principles and values' (*ibid*.: 94-95).

The film and broadcasting policy of New Labour put great emphasis on economic goals. New Labour regarded the sector as a creative industry that was a source of economic growth. The government wanted to create a sustainable and successful industry that could compete with Hollywood. There was an increase in film funding; however, the economic measures were concerned with the well-being of

---

14   The previously existing broadcasting regulatory agencies included the Independent Television Commission, Office of Telecommunications, the Broadcasting Standards Commission, the Radio Authority, and the Radio Communications Agency.

large productions. There was a little concern for independent filmmaking or for film, and television, as culture. Harvey's article, which was written in 2006, described the main processes that occurred in the British television in the mid-2000s thusly: 'marketisation of the medium grows apace, as competition intensifies in a multi-channel universe, as ratings drop, profits dip, audiences fragment and costs are cut' (2006b: 91).

3.7   Film policy and public funding in the 2010s

There were 'fundamental continuities in film policy' between the new Coalition government and the previous New Labour administration (Hill, 2012: 335). In 2011, the new government created a Film Policy Review Group in order to evaluate film production and establish policy principles. Its report, *A Future for British Film*, recommended 'connect[ing] the widest possible range of audiences throughout the UK with the broadest range of British films and films from around the world' (Film Policy Review Panel, 2012: 91 quoted in Hill, 2012: 341). Also, or as part of that, the report promoted policy ideas that aim to develop commercial filmmaking (Hill, 2016).

The Coalition reduced the funding to the film sector still further (Hill, 2012). In 2010, it dismantled the UK Film Council and Regional Screen Agencies, and the UK Film Council responsibilities were transferred to the BFI and Creative England (*ibid.*). The BFI budget was reduced by 15% in 2010 (HM Treasury, 2010). The DCMS – a film industry regulator – had its budget reduced by 24% in 2010 (HM Treasury, 2010) and by an additional 7% in 2013 (Newsinger, 2015: 306). Newsinger (*ibid.*) argues that these funding reductions greatly affected non-commercial cultural organisations and small cultural organisations (2015: 307). On the other hand, the

government changed the film taxes that supported commercial filmmaking (for instance, Hollywood production) (Hill, 2016: 716). In 2013, tax relief upon the first £20 million of film production spending was increased from 20% to 25%. The minimum amount of production spending in the UK was decreased from 25% to 10% (Hill, 2016: 716). Additionally, the new Cultural Test was introduced in 2014. The Test qualified 'culturally British' films eligible for the tax relief, and it decreased the number of specific cultural points awarded to films (Hill, 2016: 716).[15] The government policy of tax relief and public funding cuts contributed to further polarisation and fragmentation of the film production sector.

The majority of production companies are small independent ones that produce relatively cheap films. Only a few large companies produced bigger-budget films (Newsinger & Presence, 2018). In 2017, 59% of feature films produced in the UK had low budgets of under £500,000, whereas 6% of feature films had high budgets of over £5 million (BFI, 2018c: 166). The type of public funding available to a company is determined usually by the size of a production house (Newsinger & Presence, 2018). Nearly half of the workers are employed in companies that are small in that they have ten or fewer workers. These companies account for 97% of all workplaces in the sector in 2017 (BFI, 2018c: 203). The other half of the workers are self-employed.[16] The significant growth of film production in the last decade affected the polarisation and fragmentation of the sector. There was a 49% increase in the number of film production companies from 2013 to 2017 (BFI, 2018c: 220). The film and

---

[15] For instance, the points awarded for British 'hubs' were raised from three to five, and it was made the case that using the English language provided two additional points.

[16] The majority of my interviewees were self-employed filmmakers too.

video production workforce grew from 24,000 in 2008 to 64,000 in 2017 (BFI, 2018c: 198).

The UK film sector had access to £582 million of public funding in 2016/2017 (BFI, 2018c: 177).[17] The largest source of public spending is the tax relief, which is worth £415 million or, equivalently 71% of the total in 2016/2017 (BFI, 2018c: 177). The tax relief is a cash rebate of 25% of qualifying film production spend that is provided by the HMRC. The main beneficiary of the tax relief system is the small number of large production companies that make big-budget feature films. They are well-positioned in the international market through their connections with Hollywood and with other multinational corporations (Newsinger & Presence, 2018: 451; Hill, 2016: 718). The tax relief system applies more often to those privileged companies and indeed for those companies the 25% rebate amounts to a larger amount of money than it does or would for companies that are spending less. The tax relief system subsidies the minority of companies that make a small number of commercial big-budget films (Newsinger & Presence, 2018).

The funding that remains to the smaller companies is 29% of the total funding and was worth £167 million in 2016/2017 (BFI, 2018c). These are, arguably, 'inadequately low levels of public subsidy' (Newsinger & Presence, 2018: 452). Now of the total funding that was available in 2016/2017, the National Lottery provided £60 million: some 10% (BFI, 2018c: 178). The DCMS supplied grant-in-aid worth £29 million or 5% of the total in 2016/2017, and this amount was distributed to the BFI and the NFTS (*ibid.*: 178). In the same period, the public service broadcasters

---

[17]   The UK film sector includes production, distribution, education, and administration.

provided funding of £36 million or 6% of the total (*ibid.*: 178).[18] Film 4 offered £26 million, and the BBC Films grant was £10 million (*ibid.*: 178). £13 million or 2% of the total were supplied by the Arts Council England in 2016/2017 (*ibid.*: 178).

The current system of public funding contributes to some genres of the film industry being much better funded than others. The whole budget for the UK documentary production was £118 million or 1% of the total film production budget over the period 2015-2017 (BFI, 2018c: 163). In contrast, the highest spending genre is action which accounted for £3,847 million or 37% of the overall UK expenditure over the same three-year period (*ibid.*: 163). The documentary genre is one of the lowest spending genres. Indeed it is also the lowest earning genre, taking 0.3% of the box office gross income in 2017 (*ibid.*: 39). Documentary is categorised by the BFI as a 'specialised film' genre along with foreign language films and re-released archive and classic films (*ibid.*). Still: despite its unprofitability and its insufficient funding, documentary was the most released type of British film (at 25% of the total releases) and the most released type of British independent film (at 28%), in 2017 (*ibid.*: 38). In the same year, documentaries comprised 12% of all theatrical British releases (*ibid.*: 32). In the last decade, the number of feature documentaries increased from 49 films in 2008 to 89 films in 2017, by way of a peak of 117 films in 2015 (*ibid.*).

I end this section with a summary. The literature criticises the current system of public funding in several ways. The introduction of the tax relief system in 1992 transformed the film industry into a highly competitive and polarised environment (Newsinger & Presence, 2018; Hill, 2016). The available funds are distributed

---

[18]   Channel 4 and the BBC.

disproportionately among various film companies. The current system benefits large well-positioned companies that produce commercial big-budget feature films. By contrast, the majority of film production companies – that are smaller – have access to insufficient public funds. The independent film sector is the most disadvantaged within the current funding system (Hill, 2016; Steele, 2015). The system requires producers to seek funding from multiple sources: UK film production is characterised by 'patchwork or jigsaw financing model' that involves a large number of stakeholders (Newsinger & Presence, 2018: 455). The public funders have been widely criticised for applying a commercial logic to funding distribution. Film 4, the BBC and the Film Council sponsor 'substantially profitable films with high production values' (James, 2009: 24). James (2009) argues that these funding bodies aim at granting commercial films that attract large audiences and raise box office profit. Newsinger and Presence (2018) argue that the current system of public funding 'maintains the systemic barriers to equality that characterise the industry' (2018: 455). The insufficiency of available public funding places the risks of film production on workers who are able to take these risks only when they belong to privileged social groups.[19]

3.8 Social and economic context of documentary filmmaking in Britain

The documentary film sector is a distinctive sector within the British film and television industry. The sector has specific institutional and historical characteristics that distinguish it from the independent fiction film sector and the television industry (Presence et al, 2020). Based on rather scarce studies of the documentary film

---

[19]   As will be discussed in more detail in chapter four.

industry, this chapter section outlines the main features of the socio-economic context of British documentary film production.

3.8.1 The emergence of the documentary film sector in the 1990s

The documentary film sector appeared by separating from the television industry in the 1990s; the 1990 Broadcasting Act played a significant role in this process (Presence et al, 2020: 11). The 1990 Broadcasting Act decreased the programmes' budget and obliged broadcasters to commission a quarter of their programmes from independents. The Act increased competition between broadcasters and transformed them into commercial institutions. Responding to these changes, broadcasters altered their programmes and schedules in order to fit in a new environment. The 'new commercial imperatives' implemented by the legislator forced broadcasters to reduce significantly documentary funding and opportunities for documentarians (Kilborn, 1996: 143). For example, Channel 4's Independent Film and Video department, which supported documentaries, was shut down in 2004; the BBC's *Modern Times* was closed in 2000 (Presence et al, 2020: 11). The decline in broadcasting budgets 'has hit documentary films and factual programming hardest' (Sørensen, 2012: 731).

The 1990 Broadcasting Act and the 2003 Communications Act lessened the public service broadcasting (PSB) duties of broadcasters. The 1990 Act did not oblige broadcasters to exhibit documentaries, which were included previously in PSB content (Kilborn, 1996: 144). In the context of enforced competition and reduction of funding, broadcasters transformed their documentary programmes: they decreased the number of serious documentaries and increased the number of popular documentaries with the strong entertainment component (Corner, 1996: 181; Kilborn, 1996: 144).

Broadcasters demanded from documentaries to have a significant audience in order to be included in the channels' timetables; they excluded serious investigative documentaries from their schedules because this type of documentaries was less likely to attract mass audiences. The new legislative requirement brought into being 'the softer modes of documentary, high on human interest (especially if it involves royalty or show-business personalities) but low on controversy or any form of risk taking' (Kilborn, 1996: 145). Also, new hybrid genres emerged at that time: for example, docudrama combines documentary conventions and dramatization (Bignell, 2010). Docusoaps was a middlebrow genre that was easy to make and that was able to attract a sufficient audience (*ibid.*).

In the context of declining broadcasters' support, the documentary sector appeared and developed its independent institutions (Presence et al, 2020). These new institutions created a 'patchwork' model of documentary financing, which had multiple and disperse sources (*ibid.*). The new finance model requires documentarians to look for co-production finance: one funder did not any longer sponsor documentary films, but multiple organisations finance documentary projects. Foundations and private sponsors became the main sources of financial support for documentaries. Multiple independent documentary institutions were established (*ibid.*: 12-13). For example, Sheffield Doc/Fest, the major international documentary film festival, was created in 1994. BRITDOC (later Doc Society), a non-profit organisation sponsored by Bertha Foundation, Ford Foundation and other bodies, has been supporting documentary production since 2005. BRITDOC had the BRITDOC Film Festival with a documentary pitching platform. Dogwoof, a major documentary film distributor, was established in 2006. Open City Documentary Festival was

launched in 2010. BFI created pitching sessions for their funds at Sheffield Doc/Fest and in London in 2013.

3.8.2 Funding for documentary filmmaking

The reduction of broadcasting funding for documentaries results in appearing of a new finance model (Presence et al, 2020; Sørensen, 2012). The new model includes multiple funding organisations running in the documentary film sector. Usually, a documentary film project has multiple funders, and each of them sponsors the project partially. This model is opposite to the one existing before when broadcasters supplied full sponsorship to documentary films. Most documentaries rely fully on the financial support of multiple organisations and do not make money in distribution (Presence et al, 2020).

The documentary sector lacks sufficient funding support (Presence et al, 2020; Sørensen, 2012). The majority of documentarians make films with no budget or a very low budget. There are 40% of documentary filmmakers who have a documentary feature film budget of £0-99,999 in 2019, according to the UK Feature Docs survey conducted by researchers from the University of the West of England in partnership with Doc Society (Presence et al, 2020: 37). The Whickers, a documentary film funding body, has been conducting surveys among documentarians since 2016; and according to their latest results, 59% of documentarians (including feature and non-feature makers) have a budget of less than £100,000 (Whickers, 2020: 23). The lack of sufficient funding results in filmmakers are not able to make their living from documentary work. Thus, only 21% of respondents of the Whickers survey claimed that they were able to pay themselves a wage while working on documentary film projects (Whickers, 2020: 17-18).

Personal funds are the most popular origin of documentary film production finance. The UK Feature Docs study reports that 43% of respondents contribute their personal funds to making documentary feature films in 2019 (Presence et al, 2020: 5). The Whickers study of the non-fiction sector has similar results: 56% of respondents get money from working on non-documentary projects, 38% of respondents use their personal savings, and 21% of respondents have financial support from friends and family (Whickers, 2020: 17). The second large part of documentary financing comes from private sponsors and foundations: 27% of UK Feature Docs survey respondents reported that they received money from these sources (Presence et al, 2020: 39). Documentary filmmakers apply for funding at various organisations: for example, Sundance Documentary Film Programme, Tribeca Film Institute Doc Fund, Doc Society, Guardian Docs, Open Society Foundation, Scottish Documentary Institute, One World Media Production Fund, International Documentary Association, IDFA BERTHA Fund (Whickers, 2020: 25; Presence et al, 2020).

There is scarce public money available for documentary filmmakers: the most common sources are the film tax relief and broadcasters' funds. According to the UK Feature Docs survey, 22% of respondents received tax relief money in 2019 (Presence et al, 2020: 39). Many filmmakers acknowledged that application for film tax relief is challenging and is not conducive to the specificity of documentary filmmaking (Presence et al, 2020: 41). The British broadcasters supply funding for documentaries, but their commissions are in decline (Sørensen, 2012: 727). For example, BBC *Storyville* is not funded sufficiently, and Channel 4 is 'largely absent' (Presence et al, 2020: 5). Only 14.5% of respondents of the UK Feature Docs survey received money for their feature documentaries from the BBC; and only 4.5% of

respondents received documentary funds from Channel 4 or Film 4 (Presence et al, 2020: 39).

In the context of limited funding, documentary filmmakers look for alternative finance sources: for example, online funding sources (Sørensen, 2012; Nash and Corner, 2016). According to the Whickers study, 21% of respondents used crowdfunding sources in 2020 (Whickers, 2020: 30). Crowdfunding is a less common source for feature documentaries: thus, only 7% of respondents of the UK Feature Docs survey reported that they received crowdfunding money (Presence et al, 2020: 39). Documentarians can find online funding for their films on crowdfunding and crowdsourcing websites. Online funding sources give documentarians creative freedom and the ability to keep rights for films. However, crowdfunding and crowd investment opportunities are more accessible for recognised documentarians and high-profile projects than for the majority of filmmakers (Sørensen, 2012).

3.8.3 Documentary companies and filmmakers

The documentary sector has been growing drastically over the past twenty years. The number of documentaries released in British cinemas increased from four films in 2001 to one hundred and twelve films in 2018 (O'Sullivan, 2017: 135; BFI, 2019d: 34). Documentary films made 14.2% of all theatrical releases in 2018 and earned £9.3 million (or 0.7% of total box office) in 2018 (BFI, 2019d: 34).

The documentary film sector is polarised and fragmented. There are, on the one hand, big high-profile documentary film institutions, which have commercially oriented productions and big budgets, and, on the other hand, small indie production companies, which produce no budget documentaries or low budget documentaries (Presence et al, 2020; Sørensen, 2012). A few big documentary organisations

dominate the small ones because the former receive most of the production funding and commissions. Well-positioned documentary companies have 'star' directors/producers who are more likely than most filmmakers to receive financial support and to have theatrical success (O'Sullivan, 2016). For example, the most successful UK documentaries were Asif Kapadia's documentary films *Senna* (2010) and *Amy* (2015): *Amy* earned £3.8 million in cinematic release, and *Senna* earned £3.2 million (BFI, 2019d: 47). Kevin MacDonald's documentary *Touching the Void* (2003) earned £2.6 (*ibid.*: 47).

The geography affects inequalities between documentary companies. Most documentary film institutions (65% of UK Feature Docs survey respondents) are located in London and South East (Presence et al, 2020: 26). Well-positioned companies and filmmakers are concentrated in the capital city and stay close to funding organisations. Regional documentary production companies do not have direct access to funding and commissions, which are based in London. The South West and North East regions have the most scarce resources (Presence et al, 2020: 28).

The lack of available funding worsens workforce inequalities in the documentary sector. Documentary filmmakers from upper- and middle-class backgrounds are more likely than their working-class counterparts to afford to make films. According to the UK Feature Docs survey, 91% of respondents have a middle-class background in 2019 (Presence et al, 2020: 15). Documentarians from middle-class background earn more than their counterparts from working-class background: upper- and middle-class filmmakers have 38% of income earned at documentary projects, whereas working-class respondents earn only 12.5% of their income at those

projects (Presence et al, 2020: 35). Women documentarians are more likely than men to be producers; and men are more likely than women to become documentary directors (*ibid.*: 20-21). Women earn less than men on their documentary film projects and are more likely than men to make no money at all (*ibid.*: 20-21). For example, according to the UK Feature Docs survey, women documentarians have a mean annual income of £33,488 and men have an income of £36,261 (*ibid.*: 21). Women have shorter careers than men and make fewer documentaries than men (*ibid.*: 21).

Most British documentary filmmakers have a higher education degree: 74% of UK Feature Docs survey respondents have a degree (Presence et al, 2020: 32). Usually, their degrees are not specific for documentary filmmaking because there is a shortage of educational institutions providing specific training (Presence et al, 2020). There are 24% of documentarians who graduated with undergraduate degrees in documentary filmmaking and 27% of those who graduated with postgraduate degrees in documentary (Whickers, 2020: 12-13). Documentarians acquire creative and craft skills 'on the job': according to the Whickers survey, 51% of respondents learn how to make documentaries in this manner (Whickers, 2020: 12). Thus, higher education institutions do not fully meet the needs of the documentary film sector. Indeed, many documentary filmmakers called for developing training opportunities in the creative process, business and marketing (Presence et al, 2020: 42).

The socio-economic conditions of work have been worsening for documentarians in the last decades. Declining broadcasters' support for documentary films contributed to growing casualisation, precarity and competition. Overwork, uncertainty, low/zero remuneration characterise the nature of freelance work, which prevails in the documentary film sector: there are 76% of freelancers among feature

documentary makers (Presence et al, 2020: 30). Most filmmakers struggle to receive documentary commissions and funding. Only 21% of documentarians have a wage from their documentary film work in 2020 (Whickers, 2020: 2). 56% of respondents in the Whickers survey are involved in other projects in order to sponsor their documentary films (*ibid.*). Documentarians tend to do multiple roles in their films, and that illustrates the lack of available funding support for documentaries. Thus, 55% of UK Feature Docs survey respondents perform two or three roles on their feature doc projects in 2019 (Presence et al, 2020: 30).

3.9   Conclusion

The chapter provides context for the empirical study of inequalities in the filmmaking profession. The chapter discussed policy regulation in the film and broadcasting sector from the historical perspective. Starting from the Conservative decade of the 1980s, the chapter moved on to exploring the film policies implemented by the Major Government, New Labour Government and the Coalition Government. The policies of the last decades affected labour relations, the organisation of production and funding. Those policies created precarity and made labour relations entrepreneurial. The next chapter will present the empirical materials collected for this study. It will examine the subjective experiences of class and gender inequalities articulated by the documentary filmmakers in the interviews.

4 Experiences of class and gender inequalities in filmmaking work in British documentary production

4.1 Introduction

The chapter seeks to examine how class and gender inequalities are constructed discursively by documentary filmmakers. It explores the interviews with the filmmakers who reflect on their experiences of workplace disadvantage. I examine discourses by employing the version of discourse analysis that Foucault articulated – and practiced – in his late, so-called 'genealogical', works (Foucault, 1978; 1995; 1981).[1] In these late works, Foucault understands discourse as a series of discontinuous and regular practices that operate in certain external conditions (Foucault, 1981). There is 'a multiplicity of discursive elements' (Foucault, 1978: 100) that is reconstructed in this study. The documentarians interviewed for the research project produced a number of discourses. There was an agreement among them about social exclusion and disadvantageous working conditions in the sector.[2] However, the interviewees gave various accounts of how class and gender inequalities affected the workers in the industry.[3] In his genealogical works (1978; 1995), Foucault explores the relations between power and discourse. Discourses are distributed between the subjects operating as instruments of power and as sources of resistance against it. As Foucault puts it, 'it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together' (1978: 100). Following the Foucauldian approach, I attribute the

---

[1] Chapter one discussed Foucault's discourse analysis.

[2] §§4.2–4.4 explore those discourses.

[3] §§4.5–6 examine those conflicting discourses.

differences in discursive interpretations of class and gender inequalities produced by the interviewees to the social positions and interests of the interlocutors.

4.2 'Film people are alarmingly similar!'[4]

The documentary filmmakers that I interviewed agreed upon existing social inequalities in filmmaking work. They articulated social inequalities primarily in relation to 'big three' types of inequality – gender, class, and race (O'Brien & Oakley, 2015). Other responses related to disadvantages that owe to characteristics such as geography, age, and disability. Often the interviewees were not able to distinguish among inequalities because those inequalities operate as 'the vehicle for one another' (Butler, 1993: 116). This chapter section will discuss the discourses about the underrepresentation and misrecognition of marginalised filmmakers in labour relations.[5]

The filmmaking occupation systematically excludes women and working-class people and reproduces an elitist perspective of (upper) middle-class men. The interviewees agreed upon existing social exclusions in labour relations. Brook et al (2019) describe so-called 'inequality talk' among cultural workers when those workers discuss their employment. The filmmakers interviewed for this study provided accounts of their experiences of workplace disadvantage. For instance, the

---

[4]   Alex (2018) Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya. 8 October 2018, London.

[5]   I understand the marginalisation of filmmakers in terms of their positions in social class and gender structures. Marginalised filmmakers are working-class / lower middle-class workers and female workers. Privileged filmmakers are middle-class / upper middle-class workers and male workers. It is worth noting that the categories of marginalisation and privilege are dynamic and not stationary. For example, one could be marginalised and privileged at the same time.

female interviewees said that they did not have any female co-workers on film sets in the following interview excerpts.

> Very often I find that I am the only woman. On the shoot, earlier this year, I had a male DoP [Director of Photography]… and there was me and then everybody else were white men. (Dana, 2018)

> I am a female and Chinese, and I never see someone like me in the film industry. (Lily, 2018)

In these interview excerpts, the participants constructed the self through distancing from the industry. They constituted themselves as belonging to outside. They had outside voices because their presence in the industry is a deviation from the norm. The first interviewee used expression that showed limitation ('I am the only woman'); the second interviewee used clause with sentential negation ('I never see'). Hence, these interviewees articulated their outsider positions in the sector. The participants argued that women and ethnic minorities were underrepresented in the industry and that the sector is characterised by social homogeneity.

The privileged filmmakers – who, because of their privilege, did not suffer class and gender inequalities – tended to discuss their observations of the social exclusion suffered by others. The white middle-class male documentarians expressed their worries about workplace social homogeneity as follows.

> And when I came to production companies now, it feels like the 1970s again: it's white guys! (Luke, 2017)

I clearly come from a middle-class educated elite, and that's where

people working in film come from. It's very much reproductive in terms

of class. (Dylan, 2018)

These interviewees constructed themselves as belonging to the industry. They

belonged to the privileged social group of middle-class men. The first interviewee

showed that he had been working in the industry since 1970s. He noticed that social

composition of the sector workforce did not change since then. The second research

participant classified himself as 'elite'. He argued that the film industry replicates

social homogeneity.

There is available quantitative data on gender and class underrepresentation in

the workforce released by film sector institutions and the government. In 2019,

women comprised 27% of documentary film production crew (BFI, 2019c).

However, the gender differential varies considerably across documentary film

departments and roles. For instance, and still in 2019, 38% of producers were women,

25% of directors were women, and 13% of directors of photography were women

(*ibid.*). Less data is available about class inequality in documentary filmmaking work.

According to the DCMS report (2016), in 2015, among those employed in film,

television, video, radio and photography, 12% were from socio-economically

disadvantaged groups. In the same year, and in creative occupations within the same

sectors, 27% had either no educational qualifications or only secondary education

certificates (*ibid.*). Over the last 25 years, among BAFTA winners of best actress,

actor and director awards, 42% attended independent schools, 33% attended grammar

schools, and 25% attended comprehensive schools (Kirby, 2016: 39-40).

Most interviewees maintained that, in addition to underrepresentation, there was misrecognition of working-class and women filmmakers in the film sector institutions.[6] They claimed that the diverse social backgrounds were high risks that the film industry did not will to take. The marginalised filmmakers were forced to 'justify' their ability to do filmmaking jobs (Susanne, 2017). 'A subtle feeling of not feeling comfortable' was a strong mechanism of exclusion; subtle, partly because it was hard to document (Lily, 2018). The socially privileged interviewees maintained, also, that there was misrecognition of marginalised filmmakers.

> In the film industry… if you are a female, you are positioned as a special position, as not standard. You will be treated differently than everyone else. It is discriminative. You are either treated as a little beautiful person or you are being excluded from some stuff. (Dylan, 2018)

In this interview excerpt, the participant used passive verbs to describe the position of women in the film industry. For example, passive verbs are 'are positioned', 'will be

---

[6]   I construe misrecognition as a mode of injustice. Fraser argues that misrecognition is one of two modes of injustice. She writes: '[T]he most general meaning of justice is parity of participation. According to this radical-democratic interpretation of the principle of equal moral worth, justice requires social arrangements that permit all to participate as peers in social life. Overcoming injustice means dismantling institutionalized obstacles that prevent some people from participating on a par with others, as full partners in social interaction. Previously, I have analysed two distinct kinds of obstacles to participatory parity, which correspond to two distinct species of injustice. [...] On the one hand, people can be impeded from full participation by economic structures that deny them the resources they need in order to interact with others as peers; in that case they suffer from distributive injustice or maldistribution. On the other hand, people can also be prevented from interacting on terms of parity by institutionalized hierarchies of cultural value that deny them the requisite standing; in that case they suffer from status inequality or misrecognition' (Fraser, 2007: 20).

treated', 'are being excluded'. Passive verbs omit agency: people who discriminate women are absent from this interview excerpt.

> The weird thing is… once you are a film editor, I think you are middle class… I don't see many working-class film editors. Do I know any of them? I do know one or two. But you could get into lifestyle… and become middle-class. (Jasper, 2018)

The interviewee argued that working-class filmmakers are not recognised as working class. He claimed that, in the film sector, working class is absent and middle class is a norm. Working-class filmmakers could make efforts to not be recognised rather than claim recognition. They refused to represent their social class positioning, and this denial is a part of their subjectivity. Skeggs called it 'disidentifications of class': 'social and cultural positioning generates denial, disidentification and dissimulation rather than adjustment', thus replicating social inequalities (1997: 75).

There is, however, a little evidence of overt discrimination against workers with regard to their class and gender positions. The interviewees maintained that usually film workers did not give accounts that would be considered as discriminatory. The film industry has a 'fairly liberal' character that disguises the subtlety of social exclusions (Dana, 2018). Commenting on that, the interviewees said:

> It's not that people are sitting there and saying: 'I don't want to work with black people'. Nobody is saying that. (Dana, 2018)

> I don't fit the stereotypical image [of a filmmaker]. Maybe that's why people don't feel that I am the correct choice. They wouldn't show that:

> they will meet you and be very friendly, but then they never call you.
>
> (Lily, 2018)

These interview excerpts have 'discourse representation' (Fairclough, 1992: 118). The interviewees represented discourses of other filmmakers: they informed about what filmmakers say or feel about marginalised individuals. The excerpts have indirect discourse representation, e.g. the research participants did not provide the exact words of the represented discourse. The first quote suggests what filmmakers never say, and the second quote shows what filmmakers might think. The interviewees chose the representing verbs accordingly: 'say' and 'feel'. The research participants argued that the attitude and tone of filmmakers are 'friendly' and welcoming everyone. They claimed that there was no evidence of discrimination in circumstances of communication between privileged and marginalised filmmakers. However, filmmakers' thoughts differed from their communicative behaviour: they did not choose to work with individuals from marginalised backgrounds. There is the same function of the represented discourse in both interview excerpts: the representing discourse expose and unmask the represented discourse.

The interviewees did not show as much reflection about themselves and their production companies as they did about the film sector. Typically, the research participants did not consider themselves as perpetuating the above-mentioned inequities. Moreover, they tended to deny that there was any injustice within their independent companies or within their freelance collaborations. They were reluctant to discuss disadvantages that their filmmaking work might cause to marginalised filmmakers. For example, one interviewee said:

I've run for the last… what is it… thirty years, I've run companies on

my own. So, obviously, I'm going to be quite defensive of any

accusations of injustice within the companies that I've run. […] I

think… what I would say… I don't think that I have ever witnessed

discrimination against people on the grounds of their gender, or their

race, or their sexuality. (Jack, 2018)

The interviewees drew a line between the film sector and their own work by arguing

that all injustice was located in the film industry at large rather than in their

filmmaking. Likewise, Friedman and Laurison (2019) and Brook et al (2019) argue

that their research interviewees do not consider themselves as a part of the power

dynamic and distance discursively themselves from cultural industries.

The accounts of the documentarians are affected by ongoing industry debates

about on- and off-screen diversity. The film industry has programmes and schemes

that aim to develop workforce diversity.[7] For instance, Channel 4 launched the 360°

Diversity Charter in 2015. The programme aims at increasing participation of people

from diverse backgrounds in film production. It considers race, gender, and disability

inequalities. The channel provides £5 million of investment to various activities

facilitating diversity in the filmmaking and commissioning (Channel 4, 2015). The

BBC published *Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2016-2020.* It aims to have 50% of

female workers, 15% of workers from ethnic minority groups, 8% of disabled

workers, and 8% of LGBT workers at the BBC by 2020 (BBC, 2016a). The major

British film festivals organise various events that concern the current discussion on

---

[7] Chapter six will discuss diversity programmes that have been implemented within the film sector.

diversity in film production. For instance, Sheffield Doc/Fest 2017 organised an event called 'The New Leaders: Developing an Equal and Inclusive Industry'. The festival talk considered the problem of exclusion and some solutions to it. The speakers pointed out an overall failure to create diversity in the film workforce, despite a few steps towards it. The BFI Film Festival 2017 organised a seminar called 'Who Is In Your Crew?' that brought together representatives of institutions that aimed at inclusion of marginalised individuals. Several organisations within the industry work to include people from underrepresented social groups. These organisations include BFI Film Academy, Four Corners Film, Mama Youth Project, The Film Crew, Iconic Steps, and Triforce Creative Network. They provide training, mentorship and paid placements in order to include marginalised individuals.

There is a discussion about social inequalities in the British cultural industries. Brook et al (2019) argue that senior male managers in the British cultural industries engage in a certain kind of 'inequality talk'. Those managers acknowledge the existence of marginalisation and underrepresentation within their sector. However, they admit that they are unable to contribute to structural changes. They employ 'gentlemanly tropes' in presenting themselves as being lucky rather than privileged (*ibid.*). Brook et al (2019) argue that the inequality talk legitimises exclusions in a similar vein as postfeminist and post-racial discourses. The inequality talk replaced a widely circulated rhetoric of egalitarianism and meritocracy in the culture sector. Some studies argue that the repudiation and unspeakability of inequalities are key parts of labouring subjectivities in the cultural industries (Gill, 2010; Allen, 2013; Scharff, 2016). Gill (2010) indicates that unspeakable sexism contributes to producing postfeminist ideas and legitimising gender inequalities. Forkert (2013) explores the myth of egalitarianism circulated in the cultural sector. That myth

consists in the false perception of the cultural industries as being inclusive and welcoming to everyone.

4.3 'The thing with directing is that your life goes down in a bloody rabbit hole!'[8]

The interviewees produced a discourse about disadvantageous working conditions – conditions that cause an underrepresentation and marginalisation of working-class and women filmmakers. The documentarians claimed that the film profession is a 'hard' (Jasper, 2018) and even 'sacrificial' job; people 'pay a big price for' the job (Anna, 2018). Filmmaking is a precarious occupation that gives no socio-economic guarantees to its workers. The freelance filmmakers that account for nearly half of the film workforce (BFI, 2018c: 203) are in short-term, casual and intermittent employment that does not give employees the various benefits of permanent positions. The other half of the filmmakers are (self-) employed in small independent film companies that have similar working conditions.[9]

Precarious employment has a 'bulimic' regime of work (Gill & Pratt, 2008; Pratt, 2000) that causes burn-out among filmmakers. The bulimic working patterns are a prevailing job dynamic in the film sector wherein periods of non-work are replaced unpredictably by the high intensity of work. Short-term employment requires filmmakers to look constantly for a job opportunity. The interviewees reported being overwhelmed with work. They must work far from home and that

---

[8]   Dana (2018) Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya. 23 June 2018, London.

[9]   Usually small independent film companies have between one and ten workers (BFI, 2018c: 203).

contributes to the accelerated pace of work. The interviewees claimed that this dynamic is a reason that many leave the sector, particularly women and those from the working class. For example, one interviewee discussed her experience of working on a documentary programme:

> When I was doing this TV series – just now I'm editing at the moment –
> [I] get picked up at 7 am in the morning and then we work until 6.30
> pm or 7 pm and then I go to the cutting room to look at the assembles
> for another two hours and get home… Having left the house at 7 am
> and until 8.30 pm [at work] and then I have to prepare for the next day
> for two hours. (Dana, 2018)

This interview excerpt demonstrates how the interviewee is constituted as a subject of her actions. Dana described relations with oneself at work: she worked long hours and was overwhelmed with her work duties. She did not have time for anything else. Documentary directing involves multiple responsibilities that Dana had to fulfil. She had to shape her conduct at work accordingly.

The interviewed filmmakers tended to be working multiple jobs within the sector or at least multiple roles. Many interviewees used a term 'self-shooting director/producer' to describe their jobs. For instance, the interviewees commented:

> I'm a producer, director, cameraman, editor, sound recordist. I normally
> end up making everything myself. (Sam, 2018)

> When [the genre of] documentary first started, you have a full team,
> you have a cameraman, you have a producer, [an] assistant producer, [a]
> director and a sound man. But at the time when I got to the film school,

the budget you can afford stretches the amount of time that takes to

make a proper documentary. So, you have to do everything. So, now

I'm a director, but I also do my own sound, my own camera work, and

I'm producing. You are doing a lot of the work yourself. (Freddie, 2018)

The filmmakers performed multiple roles because of the financial constraints.[10]

Sufficient funding is unavailable for small independent companies to hire

specialists.[11] The freelance filmmakers accepted any job opportunity to get income.

The big broadcasters cut programme budgets and force their employees to perform

multiple job roles. A former television producer commented:

For the last three years of my television career, I went from producing

ten to twelve programmes a year to two. You can't live on two

programmes a year, unless you direct, shoot, edit, present, do

everything on a programme. A part of trying to make budget stretch and

careers stretch is people doing all jobs on production. (Luke, 2017)

In aforementioned interview excerpts, the research participants showed how they

governed themselves in the conditions of limited funding. The documentarians argued

that certain professional conduct is expected of them: they must develop the capacity

to perform multiple roles and multiple tasks. Indeed, they performed multiple roles on

their documentary film projects, e.g. directing, producing, shooting, recording, and

editing. The interviewees described how they transformed the self. These person

transformations are the result of practices of governing. Decreasing budgets for film

---

[10] The next section of the chapter will explore the financial constraints experienced by the interviewees.

[11] Chapter three discussed the funding system of the film sector.

production enforces those capacities of documentarians. Thus, the contemporary regime of government facilitates filmmakers' abilities to perform multiple roles and work on various projects. The 'work of government' produces those identities for the reason of reducing funding (Dean, 2010: 44).

Interviewees described the film industry as 'depressing' (Susanne, 2017) and as 'not [being a] fair, competitive business' (Anna, 2018). Filmmaking is an attractive career choice for many individuals, but there are not enough jobs and funding for all of them. One interviewee used the – apt – metaphor of a 'lottery space' (Nick, 2018) to describe the high degree of uncertainty. Class and gender privileges are a significant advantage in developing a career in a highly competitive industry. The interviewees maintained that the working conditions in the film sector favoured a young enthusiastic worker from privileged backgrounds without care responsibilities. An interviewee said: 'I am always questioning whether I want to work in this industry when I am 40-50 years old. If I start a family, would I always have money to support them? That worries me!' (Thomas, 2018)

The interviewees' accounts of the disadvantageous working conditions in the film sector contribute to the literature on the sociology of cultural work.[12] According to this earlier research, the cultural sector was an early adopter of post-Fordist forms of industrial relation. The sector is very precarious and very competitive and yet it is a popular career choice. The cultural industries have grown steadily and continue to

---

[12] Sociological studies of cultural work include Abbing (2002), Banks (2017), Banks & Hesmondhalgh (2009), Blair (2003), Christopherson (2008), Gill (2010), Gill & Pratt (2008), Hesmondhalgh & Baker (2008), McRobbie (2016), Menger (1999) Neilson & Rossiter (2008), and Ross (2008).

do so and there is an oversupply of workers. Thus, cultural workers are forced to weather uncertain working conditions, with little help.

4.4 'If you don't have money these days, then how the hell do you get your start and how do you keep going?'[13]

The interviewees considered the financial struggles of filmmaking careers. Those in the profession suffer from not having enough money.[14] The interviewees maintained that it is individuals who take the financial risks rather than the institutions. The filmmakers from privileged social backgrounds are more likely than their less privileged peers to overcome the financial obstacles. This section discusses various mechanisms that reproduce elitism within the profession – low remuneration and unpaid work.

The interviewees thought that low remuneration and unpaid internships put aspirants from non-privileged backgrounds off the industry.[15] The newcomers seek for receiving work experience and building social connections. As one interviewee put it, the newcomers 'have rubbish wages while working the way up in the industry' (Finn, 2017). Unpaid internships are widespread in the film sector, and according to a survey by Percival and Hesmondhalgh (2014), 94% of workers within the industry undertook unpaid work experience in it. Fast et al (2016) provide the useful metaphor of a 'prospector' in order to examine this type of unpaid labour. The prospector takes high risks in a competitive environment in the hope of future rewards. However, the

---

[13] Juliet (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 18 July 2017, Colchester.

[14] Chapter three discussed the funding system of the film sector.

[15] Chapter one discussed unpaid internships too.

industry does not guarantee anything to the prospectors. Moreover, the high competition among the newcomers facilitates the system of unpaid internships. Another interviewee commented on this issue as follows.

> Independent production companies are taking people but not paying them, essentially, giving them absolute pocket money! They might not even pay them for transport to get to the office. They say: 'You should be so honoured to have us helping you!' I just think that it's so exploitative! (Leo, 2018)

This excerpt constructed how documentary production companies operate. Leo claimed that they do not provide sufficient remuneration: as he put it, 'absolute pocket money'. The interviewee reported directly the voice of those employers by using the quote. Intertextuality demonstrates difference in positions and opinions of people involved in this discourse (Fairclough, 2003: 41). In the last sentence of the excerpt, Leo gave his explicit evaluation: 'I just think that it's so exploitative!' He articulated explicitly his point of view on the events that he represented.

The interviewees attributed low remuneration and unpaid work to reproducing elitism within the profession. They maintained that entry into and advancement in the industry rely to a large extent upon social and financial capital held by individuals. For instance, one interviewee said the following.

> I think personally if I was looking for going to the drama school, to university, or film school now… and it's coming out very precarious profession when you're going be a filmmaker or an actor or any other freelance job within the industry… I don't know whether I have to get

> to do it [now]. Because you're going to come out of that with quite a lot
>
> of debt. That's one thing when you're going to be a lawyer or in
>
> accounting and you know that you're going to pay it back, but if you're
>
> going to the arts… I think we are going to see... there is a danger that
>
> we could stand up with just one kind of person being able to do that,
>
> and it will very elitist profession. (Juliet, 2017)

In this interview excerpt, Juliet presented her critical vision of the documentary film sector. She claimed that filmmaking is 'very elitist profession'. The interviewee compared working in arts with other sectors – law and accounting – which provide better working conditions. The documentarian agreed that the filmmaking profession excludes individuals from working-class backgrounds and instead provides easier admittance to those who have financial support. The ideas about homogeneity of film production workforce can be attributed to the critical discourse. Another interviewee said:

> People are expected to become unpaid interns in the one of the most
>
> expensive places to live in the world. So, what does that mean? It means
>
> either you're incredibly confident and you're willing to get a huge debt,
>
> or you've got to have wealthy friends or parents or whatever who are
>
> gonna support you while you spend six months, a year, six weeks,
>
> however long it is, getting no money. (Luke, 2017)

This interview excerpt, again, presents the critical discourse of documentarians. The interviewee argued that the concentration of film production in London contributes further to marginalisation by class. The aspirants seeking a filmmaking career are required to live in London where the cost of accommodation is very high.

Individuals from privileged and individuals from marginalised social
backgrounds have different social chances to become filmmakers. This difference
becomes apparent when comparing the career progression of interviewees from
different backgrounds. Freddie (2018) and Greta (2018) were 'self-shooting directors'
who had each produced documentary programmes for over a decade. They were
freelancers who received broadcasting funding from the BBC and Channel 4. Both
were well-established filmmakers who had a broad professional network and broad
recognition and had won awards. The two of them held similar professional positions
in the sector but they were dissimilar in the amount of time and labour they put into
creating their careers. Those difference were caused by their social backgrounds and
their respective economic resources.

Freddie had a privileged middle-class background. He was privately educated
and a graduate of an art school and of the National Film and Television School. His
family was able to financially support him at the beginning of his filmmaking career.
He had free accommodation in London where he undertook unpaid work experience.
He made his first feature documentary film for the BBC three years later. He had the
time and financial resources for developing his filmmaking ideas, skills and
cinematography style. He was able to pitch his projects to various funders and
broadcasters. These opportunities were available to him because he was financially
supported by his family. He did not have any other jobs outside of filmmaking work.
His class privilege secured him time for improving professional skills and knowledge.
Freddie described his career in the following excerpt.

> I was very lucky. And when I lived in London, I was able to live there
> for free because it was a real thing that give me the ability to pick and

choose a kind of jobs that I wanted to do. I got into the industry because

I went to the film school and then I did a lot of work. (Freddie, 2018)

Unlike Freddie, Greta had a lower-middle-class background and had fewer financial resources. She had a history and social science degree from Birmingham University. She did not go to a film school because she could not afford the fees. She could not afford to work for free in London. So, she moved to Manchester where she worked for a few film production companies. At the beginning of her filmmaking career, Greta had unpaid/low-paid runner positions in the production companies. She did various minimum wage jobs outside the film sector. She became a freelance documentary director seven years later. She finished her first feature documentary film a few years later. She did not have the 'Bank of Mum and Dad' (Friedman & Laurison, 2019). Therefore, she contributed more time and labour having to do unrelated paid work than Freddie. Greta described her experience of financial struggles as follows.

When I finished my degree, I knew that I wanted to make documentaries. I need to have work experience and I need to work for free. But also I didn't have any money to live in London to pay rent and to work for free. I didn't have a parent who would pay for me to do that. So, I moved to Manchester where I had friends who were studying to be doctors and they had a spare room because they were doing placements. And I found a work experience – the job on television – there. It was a runner position for six weeks and I had a place to stay for free, job, placement... After that, I got paid job as a researcher. […] I did a couple of series in that job as a researcher. And I was doing part-time work as well as a secretary, and I was working in bars at the same time to keep

between jobs. Because you didn't get jobs back to back, you have to wait. And I moved out into a place in Manchester, and I have to pay rent, so that's why I had other jobs. Then I realised that I have to move to London because there were not enough jobs in Manchester. So, when I went to London, I have to start again a little bit and start working for free. I was earning £200 per week working in a really good company I want to be in, in a documentary company. But I was not earning enough to pay my rent. (Greta, 2018)

This interview excerpt is a narrative story of Greta's career. She presented a series of events that took place in the beginning of her filmmaking career. The interviewee did not organise chronologically the sequence of these events but presented them in a different manner. Greta's story is focused on her consistent efforts of making a career in the documentary sector. It's a story of succeeding through difficulties: 'to the stars, through hardship'. The interviewee constructed discursively her career story and made sense of events by explaining them from the particular point of view.

Similarly to the previously examined examples of the freelancers, independent production companies face a high financial pressure. The interviewees claimed that there was not enough funding available for their small film companies. They did lots of unpaid work in and outside of the filmmaking in order to launch and develop their production houses. For example, Ben (2017) claimed that his small company faced various financial difficulties in its development. He and his business partner launched the company straight after graduating with a degree in film production from the National Film and Television School. They did not receive special funding for company development. They supported their business – or themselves, whilst running

the business – via various other jobs. For instance, they taught, made television programmes and worked for other production companies. Ben reported that their production company became financially sustainable a few years later. Another interviewee, Finn (2017), had a similar experience. He and partners created a film production company after he had graduating with a degree in film and television production from the Sheffield Hallam University. They ran their economically unsustainable company for a few years after its launching. They did various external jobs on weekends to financially support their business. For example, Finn worked as a technician and as a camera operator for other production companies. Interviewee Anna (2018), on the other hand, launched her company at the point when she was a recognised documentarian. She became a self-employed filmmaker after working for broadcasters and production companies for over twenty years. Her independent company encountered similar financial obstacles, but she had – by that stage – the professional resources to overcome them.

Hardship at the start of their careers is far from being the only financial barrier faced by filmmaking aspirants. Some have to put their own money, and unpaid labour, into their filmmaking. The interviewees discussed various scenarios of taking financial risks of the high costly occupation. For example, they were employed in other jobs, took bank loans, and used personal funds. The majority of the interviewees produced self-funded documentaries. The self-funded films were made with various financial resources gained outside the filmmaking. Also, the filmmakers relied on own non-paid labour and favours made by their colleagues.[16]

---

[16]   Chapter five will discuss the favour-based economy of small filmmaking enterprises.

The interviewees discussed how they contributed income from other employment, and personal funds, to their filmmaking. Susanne (2017) worked as a full-time solicitor, and she was a documentary director-cum-producer at the weekends and on leaves. Her corporate job allowed her financially to sustain her documentary filmmaking career. A few years later, she resigned from her full-time job and used her savings to create an independent film production company. Sam (2018) was a self-employed documentary filmmaker who struggled to get his programmes commissioned. He worked as a freelance director of photography for various external projects that allowed him to fund his filmmaking. Matthew (2018) was a freelance documentary director making television programmes and corporate films. His freelance employment provided sufficient income to fund his documentaries. Emily (2018) was a self-employed documentary director who made documentaries with income earned at jobs in advertising and by selling filmmaking equipment.

The interviewees presented their experiences of taking bank loans and using mortgage loans to do the self-funded films. Matthew (2018) was a freelance documentary director employed in television. In the early stages of his career, he funded his films by borrowing from a bank. Using credit cards brought him to massive debt because the distribution of his films was not successful. Leo (2018) said that colleagues used mortgage loans to fund their filmmaking. The filmmaking profession put workers into debts that could not be covered by income from the filmmaking. He said: 'It's really a huge risky gamble business! I wouldn't recommend it to anyone! It's not gonna lead you to wealth, that's for sure. If you want to get rich, don't make documentaries!' (Leo, 2018).

The interviewees maintained that parts of directing and producing are unpaid – for instance, the film development and the postproduction stages. 'Film development' is preparatory research – for example, the development of ideas, the establishing of professional connections, and finding film characters. At this point, the filmmakers 'have to get access to a story that is incredible and captures imagination' (Freddie, 2018). As the interviewees claimed, there was no funding available; usually film ideas were pitched for funding only after the research phase was completed. Thus, Anna (2018), a well-recognised documentary director, received broadcasting funding for her filmmaking but not for the development research. Also, the film directors and producers contributed their labour to the postproduction stage without being paid. Other professionals were responsible for postproduction – for instance, editors, sound mixers and colourists. The film directors and producers, however, needed to participate in this phase to complete a film project. Two interviewees commented as follows.

> Sometimes it's going really stressful because you are doing a hell of a lot of work, and you are not going to be paid for it. Hours and hours of work that just have no pay! (Alice, 2017)

> The people who are cinematographers, or sound, music – they can always find jobs. Whereas producing and directing require a much longer period to get to develop projects. You've got to raise the money for it, you've got to film it, you've got to be there for the whole postproduction. And unlike other jobs, the cameraperson for the shoots, the music people at postproduction etc, you are there the whole time. […] But the money is not always right! […] There has been always a mentality that a producer does not need to get… it's the last person who

> needs to get paid. Or maybe you can cut your fees? […] There is always
> an issue about producers particularly in development just do not have
> enough money to survive. A lot of producers tend to do other jobs. They
> might produce commercials or other different jobs to get money to
> survive. (Ben, 2017)

In the second interview excerpt, the research participant generated a classification of occupations in the documentary film sector. He distinguished between two groups: the first group included directors and producers, and the second group consisted of cinematographers and sound recordists/mixers. This interviewee constructed this system of classification based on the division of access to funding between occupations. This division of the sector created a particular vision of the filmmaking profession; this vision has 'the performative power' to 'remake the world' (Fairclough, 2003: 130). Indeed, the interviewee opposed the underpayment to directors and producers and criticised the current distribution of funding.

To conclude this section: the financial barriers of the filmmaking profession contribute to the social exclusion of working-class filmmakers. As one interviewee put it, 'the main thing that divides [the industry is] whether you can afford to make film or not' (Ben, 2017). The financial constraints faced by the aspirants and professionals exacerbate class inequalities. The filmmakers from privileged backgrounds can contribute their time and labour to the profession. The marginalised workers do not have economic privileges to easily navigate through financially insecure employment, and that forced them to find other jobs and/or leave the sector. There was a consensus among the interviewees that financial constraints and precarious working conditions, each and together, excluded the unprivileged. The

interviewees, however, disagreed about how social disadvantage operates. I turn now to that area of contention.

4.5 Discourses about class inequalities

The interviewees provided different interpretations of how class disadvantages operate and affect workers. A first discourse communicated the maldistribution of resources in the film sector. The filmmakers claimed that power was misused by an institute of gatekeepers that was a main mechanism for the reproduction of class inequalities. A second narrative was about misrecognition of classed Others, and that misrecognition was embedded in labour relations. Some interviewees maintained that class marginalisation was reproduced through network sociality, division of creative labour and cultural capital. The third discourse articulated by the interviewees was on a meritocracy ideal. These interviewees pointed to changes in recent labour relations. They claimed that filmmakers could succeed in their careers due to talent and hard work. The above-mentioned discourses do not operate in isolation from each other. The interviewees' accounts, taken as a whole, might combine different perspectives on how social inequalities function within the sector. 'Rule of the tactical polyvalence of discourses' suggested by Foucault (1978: 100) explains a lack of coherence in the interviewees' accounts. Discourses function as numerous tactics within the strategies of power relations that are 'neither uniform nor stable' (*ibid*.: 100). Their fluidity allows them to create contradictions within power strategies (*ibid*.: 101). I investigate the production of the discourses about class inequalities by exploring the social positions of the filmmakers who articulated the discourses. My next three sections discuss the different interpretations of class inequality in filmmaking work.

4.5.1 A 'self-selecting club of people'[17]

Some interviewees stated that the exclusion of working-class filmmakers was a result of maldistribution of power by an institute of gatekeepers. They characterised the film industry as a 'closed shop' (Finn, 2017) that was controlled by a powerful group of workers who made main decisions about the filmmaking. Commissioning editors at broadcasters, and the CEOs at large film production companies, determine the distribution of financial resources and positions within the industry. The workers or audience, on the other hand, are not allowed to contribute to these decisions. This section presents interview data that describe the institute of the gatekeepers and nepotism that reproduce the class structures of the film sector.

Some filmmakers argued that the gatekeepers belonged to a particular social group – a 'small social stratum' (Leo, 2018), a 'media class' (Sam, 2018), a 'controlling family' (Finn, 2017). They adverted to the social homogeneity of the gatekeepers who had similar middle or upper middle-class backgrounds. The gatekeepers graduated from a single set of schools and universities, at which they formed useful contacts.[18] They hold powerful positions within the sector that allowed them to decide how funding and jobs were distributed. The social and cultural spaces shared by the gatekeepers contributed to keeping their community closed. Their lifestyles resembled each other, and additionally, they socialised with each other on regular events in London. The closed space allowed establishing comfortable conditions for working with socially similar people. Foucault's idea of a 'society of

---

[17]   Alex (2018) Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya. 8 October 2018, London.

[18]   See research literature on low levels of social mobility in the UK: Verkaik (2018); Kirby (2016); Watters (2016).

discourse' (Foucault, 1981: 62-63) is useful for exploring a 'closed shop' (Finn, 2017) of the gatekeepers.[19] Foucault argues that societies of discourse restrict access to certain speaking subjects. This closed space operates according to strict rules to which the speaking subjects must confirm. In the filmmaking profession, the rules at issue are about class. Consider the following interview excerpts.

> I realised, once I started working, that all these people in powerful positions, all went to universities together. So, it's not like there is some plot where they go: 'I only want my friends I went to Oxford with to have jobs'. People are set friends, people that they are comfortable with, people that they know. (Dana, 2018)

> I think it's a very small circle of friends with a similar background, mainly in London. They are people who are meeting in coffee bars and restaurants in London, and there is a whole social media around it. Quite often they are people who run larger independent production companies and then they end up becoming commissioning editors at broadcasters like [the] BBC or Channel 4. And therefore, their previous friends and colleagues in those independent companies have a fast track approach to getting commissions, basically, pick up the phone and speak to them as formal colleagues and friends. (Sam, 2018)

These interview excerpts construct the phenomenon of gatekeeping by generalising repeated events (Fairclough, 2003: 138). Those representations include forms of activity, persons, social relations, means, objects, language, times and places (Fairclough, 2003: 135-136). The forms of activities are the most prominent in those

---

[19] Chapter one discussed Foucauldian discourse analysis.

excerpts: gatekeepers are involved in various activities such as going to universities, having friends, networking, meeting people, speaking to colleagues. Those excerpts say that, in effect, those gatekeeping activities perpetuates class privilege. The gatekeepers allow the workers from privileged backgrounds access to film production. Their hiring practices do not involve unprivileged outsiders. According to the interviewees, there are no meritocratic principles in the distribution of funding and positions. One interviewee said: 'It's a new class that has a monopoly over the system that prevents other people to get into' (Sam, 2018). Another said: 'They do not look outside their own world for people' (Alex, 2018).

The same gatekeeping gives a few organisations a monopoly in creating films and getting films funded. The mainstream documentary film sector is 'rigid' and 'established' (Susanne, 2017), and that contributes to a strong hierarchical structure of film productions. Small film companies located in regional Britain are not able to get access to film funding. The gatekeepers prevent the development of regional production. One interviewee described the disappearing of independent film production companies in the north of England.

> When I first set up [<company>] [in the 1980s], we had an office in [<city>]. There were maybe about ten other independent companies doing independent production based here. And now I think there are only two. Because people who were able to move to London moved to London, and they didn't have to tie to the region. (Sam, 2018)

He described his financial struggles related to communicating with the gatekeepers who were based in London:

I might have an idea for a programme, and commissioning editor that I had in the past said: 'Oh that's quite a good idea, let's pop up for a chat?' For me, to pop up for a chat in London costs me maybe £250 because I have to get a train to London, and I would normally have to stay overnight in London in a hotel because to meet for early morning meeting, and then I have to get a train back. And that's £250. And that's discrimination because no way they will prepare to pay that to me to go down. So, if I don't have that £250 in the bank or I don't feel that I can risk it, I can't go and have that meeting with the commissioning editor. And no one will ever come up to see me haha! (Sam, 2018)

In aforementioned interview excerpts, the interviewee shared his experience of filmmaking outside of London. His narrative is based on comparison between regions and the capital. Regions do not have film production companies, funding sources and job opportunities; and London is the centre of documentary film production. Two interview excerpts consist of stories that present a series of events. Those events show the relationship between the region and the capital – the relationship between scarcity and prosperity. The first excerpt argues that London absorbed almost all regional companies, and the second one shows that London does not give any money back to the region. The interviewee evaluated explicitly those stories: he claimed that stories demonstrate discrimination and unfairness.

The interviewees claimed that nepotism was widespread in the mainstream film industry. A few participants discussed their involvement in providing unfair advantages in recruitment for friends or family members. For instance, Anna used her parents' connections to get a job in television. Alex helped his children to find jobs in television by introducing them to the gatekeepers in the industry.

> All my children work on television. When they left the university, they
>
> said: 'We need some help, we can't find a job'. I said: 'Okay, I'm going
>
> to introduce you to six people I know'. I explained what they had to do,
>
> how to do it, how to talk to them, how to offer things for not very much
>
> money. So, I would say to someone who works in that production
>
> company: 'This is my daughter. Would you mind having a meeting with
>
> her?' And she said: 'No, of course, I would be happy to!' It has been
>
> like choosing a school for your child. (Alex, 2018)

In this interview excerpt, the research participant talked about his involvement in nepotistic practices. Alex shared his story by representing voices of his children and an employer. The speech of other people is reported directly: Alex quoted actual words used in conversations. Intertextuality allows to demonstrate difference in opinions and positions of people involved in nepotistic practices (Fairclough, 2003: 41). The last sentence of the excerpt is an example of moral legitimation (*ibid.*: 98). Alex said: 'It has been like choosing a school for your child.' The interviewee made his nepotistic actions reasonable by referring to values. Alex believed that supporting children in their careers made him a good parent.

This section has reviewed the discourse produced by some interviewees who argued that social class exclusion was caused by a particular power source – the gatekeepers. They admitted that there was maldistribution of power that might be eliminated by simply redistribution of resources. The discourse was produced predominantly by middle-class filmmakers who had dispositions to work in mainstream documentary film production. Their privileged backgrounds, however, did not prevent them from experiencing some disadvantages at their work. These interviewees encountered financial constraints caused by limited access to public

funding and job opportunities. They attributed the problem to misuse of power by the gatekeepers in the film industry. The filmmakers sought other career paths to solve the issues – for instance, via launching film production enterprises.[20] The section that follows considers another discourse of class marginalisation that was articulated by the filmmakers in the interviews.

4.5.2 'Those unprivileged people [. .] clash with institutions!'[21]

The quotation in my section title is a metonym for a whole discourse. That discourse considers class marginalisation to be an embedded dimension of labour relations in documentary film production. Some interviewees cited the complexity of the dynamic of class relations in the filmmaking profession. They argued that class inequality was reproduced through various mechanisms – for instance, a network sociality, cultural capital, and division of creative labour. I shall now analyse what some interviewees said about mechanisms of reproducing social class structures.

The interviewees adduced a division of creative labour in documentary film production. There was a division between creative and non-creative roles, and this division was underpinned by class differences within the profession. The creative roles – the directing and producing – were the most prestigious. The filmmakers from privileged backgrounds were more likely than less privileged peers to succeed within the profession. Other non-creative roles – for instance, technical roles – were predominantly occupied by workers from working-class backgrounds. Research supports the view presented by the interviews. Workers from privileged backgrounds

---

[20]   Chapter five will discuss entrepreneurial careers of the filmmakers.

[21]   Dylan (2018) Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya. 4 April 2018, London.

dominate the creative roles in film, television and photography (Carey & Florisson 2020). For instance, 54% of workers from privileged backgrounds have positions of officers, directors and producers (*ibid*.). As one interviewee put it:

> So, almost all the people who are directors and DoPs [directors of photography]… almost all… I'm not saying, obviously, I have not got statistics, but I have a lot of experience: I've been working for thirty years now [in the sector]… will be from the middle-class background. And then you have some people, like the electricians, will tend to be from working-class backgrounds, but they also will tend to come from… they fathers also worked in the industry. So, it's very much stratified in terms of class. (Dana, 2018)

This interview excerpt showed two types of social class inequality: vertical segregation by class and horizontal segregation by class. The interviewee accentuated a homogeneity of social backgrounds in the film sector: most filmmakers are from middle-class backgrounds. Moreover, Dana argued that, within the sector, there is classed division of labour: non-creative workers might have working-class backgrounds. The research participant remarked that her opinion is based on her experience of filmmaking work and that her 30-year experience in the sector is significant enough to inform social science study.

The interviewees indicated that the division of creative labour was encouraged by education institutions. Matthew (2018) and Susanne (2017) were film directors who had professional backgrounds in business and in management. They were marginalised in film schools: they were seen as inexperienced and pushed into producing courses. Producing roles have slightly lower status than directing positions

because the former involves organising things and dealing with communications. Director's positions are the most prestigious because they make creative decisions. According to the interviewees, film schools expected students on directing courses to have art and media backgrounds, whereas other backgrounds were considered appropriate for producing courses.

'Network sociality' (McRobbie, 2016) is a main mechanism of employment in documentary film production. Informal networking has a great affect upon job opportunities, and indeed there are no formal hiring practices in the industry.[22] The interviewees talked of the importance of investing a lot of resources into networking. One interviewee said:

> I think that the main thing about any part of the film industry, documentary, or feature films, or whatever is that – I have to remind myself even now that – you just keep on meeting people all the time. You have your network at film school and then you go to somebody's party, or screening, or an event, and then you meet somebody else through them. You are always expanding your network, all the time. And it's the most important thing that you should do really! (Ben, 2017)

This interview excerpt reveals documentarian's thoughts about practices of governing and self-governing. The concept of governmentality is relevant here because it allows to explore rationality of government (Foucault, 1991b). Ben argued that filmmakers

---

[22] Some sociological studies argue that professional relations changed towards informality and networking in cultural industries. See Banks (2017), Banks & Hesmondhalgh (2009), Blair (2001), Friedman & Laurison (2019), Gandini (2016), Gandini et al (2017), Grugulis & Stoyanova (2012), McRobbie (2016), Menger (1999), Leadbeater & Oakley (1999), Wreyford (2015).

should do networking, or as he put it, 'it's the most important thing that you should do really'. This interviewee narrated his truth about filmmaking work. Networking is an essential part of professional conduct of filmmakers who are supposed to be engaged in it on everyday basis. Filmmakers should expand constantly their network in order to achieve success in the profession. Thus, this excerpt shows how the modern type of power creates individuals through their daily practices.

The interviewees reported that their choices of co-workers often depended upon with whom they could feel comfortable collaborating. They cited social and cultural similarities as the important factor in their decisions. Some specifics of documentary film productions contribute to that practice. For instance, usually documentary film productions have very small crews that encourage its members to work closely together. This interviewee's comment illustrates:

> I'm trying to work with the people that I really know well, and I trust, and I worked with them before. The last film I've made was filmed by a friend of mine who I worked with about six films, edited by a woman I know really well – the editor who is [a] fantastic editor, and she worked on two of my films. (Leo, 2018)

The interviewees admitted that network sociality was a mechanism for marginalisation by class. It was such because being limited in the social connections that one could form was a career disadvantage. One interviewee said:

> If you're not a part of that network or you don't have easy access to that network, then it is extremely difficult, much harder to get on it… The most valuable thing that you can offer to someone is an easy entry to a network. (Jack, 2018)

And the interviewees argued that the working-class filmmakers were less likely than the more privileged to know, already, people within the industry. For instance, Ben took a producing course at the National Film and Television School and there he met his film production company partner to-be. They started their independent production company soon after graduating from the course. Ben referred explicitly to the similarity of their cultural tastes:

> I met [<partner>] at film school, we were at producing course together. And we are, obviously – when you are there for two years – very close, you get to know people very well. And we had similar tastes and very complementary skills. And she had work in consultancy and I was an agent, but we both went to the film school to specifically not work for anybody. So we decided to – which was quite scary – to set up our own company and do our own thing. (Ben, 2017)

Unlike Ben or his work partner, interviewee Dana did not attend a film school. She had a middle-class background but, also, lived in near-poverty for nearly a decade. She lacked social connections with film professionals. She said that she could begin upon a filmmaking career only after she had established professional connections. She said: 'I was not doing anything for a long time because I just didn't know anybody. I didn't have a set of peers from film school who could support each other' (Dana, 2018).

The network sociality requires the filmmakers to satisfy middle-class norms. The interviewees stated that the filmmakers were expected to have a certain accent, a certain way of speaking, use particular body language, and more. Dylan (2018) referred to a 'bourgeois code' and said that that working-class people do not fit it. He

felt that these demands were 'discriminatory', 'brutal' and 'violent' (Dylan, 2018). He said:

> In terms of discrimination, I find [film school] education brutal and violent. The institutions where I work in are unable to accommodate people who come from the seriously lower social background. It's reciprocal because students can't accommodate to codes, bourgeois codes. I constantly see this in schools. Those unprivileged people and how they grew up clash with institutions. They do not behave as it is expected of them. In a workplace – it is the same. (Dylan, 2018).

The interview excerpt shows micro practices of power in filmmaking work. This interviewee explored government of working-class people in film institutions. Dylan argued that institutionalised documentarians exert power over marginalised others by using their class privileges, or as he put it, by inciting 'bourgeois codes' of behaviour. Working-class people do not demonstrate specific conduct, which is appropriate in the film sector, and therefore, they are excluded from the industry. The filmmakers were expected to have various character traits: confidence; sociability; general niceness. They were expected, in a word, to have what the British elite call 'polish'. The demeanour of working-class individuals, however, did not meet these requirements. Here is a former Head of Documentaries at a television channel.

> When you are sitting across the table from someone who is going to invest money in your project, in television project or film project, they are looking at you as the individual, they are looking to see whether they trust you, whether you are capable of doing it, whether you know clearly what it is you are trying to do, and is this a good idea. But I'm convinced it's not just whether it's a good idea or not, it's that person

sitting opposite you is the right person to be doing this. And if you don't

look right or you don't sound right, that's a disadvantage in the current

system. Yes, exactly, how you look, how you talk, the accent you have,

your experience, how much education you've had… All those things

count, unconsciously, they are unconscious bias. (Alex, 2018)

In this excerpt, the interviewee shared his experience of making decisions about

funding distribution. Alex's class and gender privileges permit him to act upon

actions of others (Foucault, 1983). His narrative is an example of governing practices

in filmmaking work. The interviewee shared his thoughts on how filmmakers should

behave in order to become successful candidates for funding. Those filmmakers

should look and sound 'right'. Commissioning editors make decisions about

providing funding to projects that conform to middle-class norms. As Alex put it,

'how you look, how you talk, the accent you have, your experience, how much

education you've had… All those things count'.

The interviewees from working-class backgrounds claimed that the filmmaking

profession considered working-class cultures as abject spaces and practices. They

shared how they did not exhibit the expected demeanour of the filmmaking

profession. For instance, Alice (2017) maintained, in effect, that social class was a

performative phenomenon consisting in a particular mode of speaking and holding

oneself.[23] She indicated that there was a significant class difference in how people

communicated. The middle-class workers recognise each other quickly and

collaborate easily. Middle-class norms required Alice to be nice and sociable, but she

opposed the idea that in order to get work she must be friendly. Nick (2018) claimed

---

[23]   See the work of Bernstein (1971) on elaborated and restricted linguistic codes.

that working-class people are 'easy-going and honest', unlike middle-class people who 'do not know what they want'. He had a strong scepticism about socialising with the middle-class filmmakers: 'They speak with confidence, but mostly they speak b − − t' (*ibid*.). Lily (2018) said that she was not comfortable with a culture of socialising, and that became a significant disadvantage for her career development. She commented: 'I don't like drinking with them, and that stopped my career' (*ibid*.).

The interviewees argued that the working-class people were less likely to see filmmaking as a possible career option than the middle-class people. According to the interviews, working-class individuals did not share senses of 'belonging to' (Greta, 2018), 'being [at] home' (Jasper, 2018), 'being comfortable' (Alice, 2017) with the filmmaking profession. They described filmmaking work as 'completely alien' (Juliet, 2017) to people from unprivileged class backgrounds. The interviewees suggested that those feelings originated in family upbringing and education. Not being able to imagine themselves in the filmmaking jobs prevented working-class people from choosing the profession. Several comments illustrate the point.

> The fact that I might have exhibition or artwork or get into film… it just really seems that it is something that is so remote, that it was not even a possibility. (Dana, 2018)

> I wasn't allowed to pursue it, so I didn't think I, a working-class black guy, could be a filmmaker. (William, 2018)

These interview excerpts show self-governing practices of working-class people. They do not consider themselves as belonging to the film sector: for example, they said that filmmaking is 'so remote' and 'not even a possibility'. They claimed that they were not 'allowed to pursue it'. The research participants revealed in interviews

that working-class individuals are not expected to become filmmakers. This presupposition about abilities and characteristics of working-class individuals is an example of governing working-class people. The regime of government attributes this capacity to middle-class individuals. A former commissioning editor at a television channel (Alex, 2018) gave another example of a working-class person who was invited by him to pitch film ideas. This person did not accept Alex's invitation because she believed that she did not belong to the profession. Alex commented on this story:

> I don't think it's just to do with money, it's to do with outlook: the way
> you see the world and the assumptions you make about the world. I
> don't think it necessarily has anything to do with money… It has lots of
> with money, but money is the only thing: it's an attitude of mind, I
> think. (Alex, 2018)

The working-class filmmakers did not feel comfortable or confident in the profession. The interviewees from non-privileged backgrounds reported their inability to show confidence and determination and to demonstrate specific cultural capital. For instance, Alice (2017) described her experience of studying on a film course as 'shocking'. She claimed that everyone but her was from comfortable middle-class backgrounds. Her classmates were supported financially by their families, whereas she lived on benefit support within a social housing estate. She and her classmates had different lifestyles and modes of communication.

> [I]t was so different world to me, it was still very very middle class.
> There were people there whose parents were paying their rent. They
> could afford to live in London because their parents were paying their

> rent. I was in a council house, and I was getting benefits that kind of
> help with my rent… It's amazing! I met people in their 30s whose
> parents were paying their rent for them! It was like whoa! It was a
> massive shock to me! Also, people who knew that I lived in Peckham,
> they would just: 'Wow! Oh my god! It's such a rough area! Oh my god!
> How awful!' And now everyone wants to live in Peckham because it
> became really gentrified. So, yeah, having such close contact with very
> middle-class people was a real shock for me. (Alice, 2017)

In this interview excerpt, the research participant described the middle-class norms of interaction within the filmmaking profession. She interpreted these norms from the working-class perspective and negotiated the difference between herself and others. She claimed that middle class had financial resources but working class did not. Those resources determined the lifestyle of filmmakers: film students from middle class background lived on rented accommodation paid by their parents and working-class students lived in social housing estates. In her discourse, the interviewee accentuated the difference between classes. For example, in sequencing sentences, Alice repeated three times the same notion about middle-class parents paying the rent for their children. She used repeatedly strong vocabulary expressing her response to the difference: for instance, 'a massive shock' and 'a real shock'. Alice represented the discourse of middle-class filmmakers and this representation accentuated further the social class difference ('Wow! Oh my god! It's such a rough area! Oh my god! How awful!'). Talking about a lack of confidence among working-class filmmakers, interviewees said such things as the following.

> People from private education are just so confident in terms of how to
> approach people or networking. And I've never been taught about that

in school. I think there is a lack of confidence generally. (Thomas, 2018)

I feel that unless you're from a certain background, you're not going to Creative England or BFI because you think it's not for you. There is an issue of under-confidence. If you see people who've been at public schools or been at really good universities, their level of confidence, because they believe in themselves, they've been talked to believe in themselves throughout that education. And people who do not have these advantages, they have lacked confidence. (Juliet, 2017)

The interviewees articulated the lack of confidence among working-class filmmakers by using 'attributed intertextuality' (Fairclough, 2003: 47-56). Attributed intertextuality is incorporating other texts in the text and attributing those other texts to somebody. The voices of 'confident' people are incorporated in these interview excerpts. The confident people are filmmakers from middle-class background. The interviewees represented what middle-class filmmakers do: for example, they have private education / prestigious university degrees, have broad social network, receive funding from the BFI and Creative England. The interviewees reported how middle-class filmmakers talked without reporting the content of their speech. For example, Juliet said that voices of middle-class filmmakers were confident: 'they believe in themselves'. 'Them' are opposed to 'I' in the first interview excerpt and to 'you' in the second excerpt. Thus, the research participants presented two different perspectives that are in conflict and in polemic.

Matthew (2018) discussed his experience of social exclusion at the National Film and Television School. He argued that the majority of students at the film school were from privileged backgrounds and that that allowed them to have a certain level

of cultural capital. Their skills and knowledge gave them advantageous positions within the course. Matthew argued, in effect, that he did not have the same level of cultural capital; and he felt excluded from the course.

> I hadn't got a relevant media degree, I hadn't worked in TV. I just got in [the film school] based purely on the ability of film I sent in and a film that I did when I was within. I had a lot of catching up to do when I was there. There were some brilliant people who had been using a camera since they were eight-year-old, who worked in TV for years. (Matthew, 2018)

This interview excerpt demonstrates how technologies of the self function in the documentary film sector (Foucault, 1997a). Technologies of the self are modifications of conduct that individuals undertake in order to become 'brilliant' filmmakers. Documentarians are supposed to acquire and use virtuously filmmaking skills. The interviewee provided examples: 'There were some brilliant people who had been using a camera since they were eight-year-old, who worked in TV for years.' However, Matthew did conform to this middle-class norm of conduct. He did not have previous experience of filmmaking and 'had a lot of catching up to do'. The interviewee transformed himself in order 'to attain a certain state of [. .] perfection' (Foucault, 1997a: 225).

This section has attempted to examine the discourse of social class marginalisation in the filmmaking profession. The interlocutors of the discourse argued that social class exclusion was embedded in labour relations. The working-class filmmakers are disadvantageous Others who do not fit into the middle-class profession. Networking is a 'reproduction machine' (Dylan, 2018) of the class

structure in the film industry. In order to get work, documentarians must show themselves culturally and socially similar to those who have jobs already.

4.5.3 'The film business is more egalitarian than most other businesses'[24]

Some interviewees produced the discourse of meritocracy that is encapsulated in the interview excerpt in the title of the section. They maintained that recently the film sector had undergone considerable changes in its labour relations, changes that had made class inequality a problem of the past. The discourse considered an increasing number of filmmakers from diverse social backgrounds. According to this view, those filmmakers that succeeded did so because of talent and hard work.

The filmmakers referred to changes in labour relations that brought social justice in the film sector. They presented the film sector as a place that provided a lot of opportunities to filmmakers. They claimed that film workers were allowed to choose freely among various career paths. Social positions of the filmmakers did not matter for their career development. One interviewee described her idea of meritocracy in filmmaking work as follows.

> People are breaking through, people can see role models, which is really good. So, they know that maybe people are trying to get into film who might not even have tried before. And it's more accessible [because] everyone can film something on an iPhone. If you have a really good idea or story, you can make it happen. (Emily, 2018)

The interviewees attributed the democratisation of film production to technological development. Easy access to the film equipment had liberated the film sector, they

---

[24] George (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 24 September 2018, London.

said. 'If you have a camera, you can just get up and keep your idea and it's more…
You can just create your own allies and your own work, so it just makes it a lot easier
for anybody' (Ben, 2017).

Those interviewees argued that talent, hard work and determination were the
main factors in developing a successful career in the film industry. The talented
filmmakers found their ways to succeed in the industry notwithstanding any
difficulties. As one interviewee put it:

> I think, probably, in the end, [the current system is] healthier for
> filmmaking because individuals can find a way through the system
> according to their talent, rather than according to any structure that they
> have happened to have gone through. (George, 2018)

The interviewees agreed that the film sector had disadvantageous working conditions,
numerous financial constraints and high competition. These conditions, however,
were no barriers for the true talents. The filmmakers needed 'to sacrifice quite a lot'
(Freddie, 2018), but they could succeed despite any disadvantages. The best film
ideas would be embraced, if filmmakers demonstrate persistence and commitment.
An interviewee remarked as follows about what he called the 'democratic' nature of
film production.

> There are opportunities for people, they just have to be persistent and
> get into production companies or go and make their own films. That's
> what makes documentary so democratic is you can go and get your own
> camera and film something, get access to something, and then you can
> turn it into television or good films… You have to be really passionate

and you have to sacrifice quite a lot, you know, your time and your

energy to do it. But it's possible. (Freddie, 2018)

This interview excerpt demonstrates practices of self-governing in the documentary

film sector. The interviewee argued that filmmakers have to acquire certain qualities

and to modify their professional conduct. According to the interviewee, those

characteristics include: being 'persistent', 'passionate' and willing to 'sacrifice quite a

lot'. Filmmakers should acquire these attitudes in order to succeed in the profession.

Another interviewee argued similarly. He maintained that the 'democratisation' of

film production 'embraced' the working-class filmmakers.

There is a kind of democratisation in documentaries where people get

valued for the ideas and skills that they bring. And if somebody who is

working class has good ideas, I think they would be embraced. (Jasper,

2018)

In this excerpt, the interviewee represented the documentary film sector from

the meritocratic perspective. He talked about 'democratisation' process that

resulted in emergence of fair and inclusive environment. The regime of

government, however, facilitates documentarians to have certain attributes.

Working-class filmmakers should acquire certain characteristics – as the

interviewee put it, 'ideas and skills' – in order to be accepted in the

profession.

Littler criticises the idea of talent that is 'an essentialised conception of intellect

and aptitude' (2013: 54). It conceives intelligence and skills as entities that are

received by birth or by chance. The idea of talent does not involve any multiple

conceptions of aptitudes. The talk of talent contributes also to hierarchical structures

because the realisation of some talents entails that other talents are left unrealised (Littler, 2013: 54). The documentary filmmakers created hierarchical structures too. For example, Alex (2018) argued that there was a shortage of film works of a good quality. He said:

> In the documentary world, there are not that many companies who are really good. It's a very hard thing to do well. There are maybe twenty companies who you know and actually deliver really well. (Alex, 2018)

The interviewees agreed that there was an underrepresentation of working-class individuals within filmmaking. However, the situation was changing rapidly (they thought): 'things are getting better all the time' (Everingham et al, 2007). The interviewee's comment below illustrates the idea of the changes that they thought had taken place:

> Class has always been a problem in the past because I think if you look at television you find that there is that what used to be expression about 'old boys network'. People – it's almost human make-up – people tend to give an opportunity to people they know or sons and daughters of the people they know, and they move into the system and so on. And I think that has very much dominated television in the past. Again, I think it is in the process of changes at that moment. […] I think it is just generally changing, I think people's attitudes are changing a lot. I think it will continue to do so in the right direction. (George, 2018)

In this excerpt, interviewee presented his vision of the documentary film sector. He claimed that the sector is changing and becoming more egalitarian. His discourse represents social process in an abstract way: for instance, he attributed the cause of

social changes to 'human make-up' and 'people's attitudes'. Commenting on social class disadvantages, the interlocutor within this discourse of meritocracy suggested that the main need was to achieve a sufficient number of underrepresented workers. Thereby the interviewee overlooked discrimination – discrimination in the form, for instance, structural barriers relating to freelance work and informal recruitment.

Those documentary filmmakers who believed their industry meritocratic tend to be the ones who hold the most privileged positions within the sector. They did not regard themselves as existing within structure of power and of inequality. Rather they explained their privileges by considering their contributions and commitment to the profession. Taylor and O'Brien (2017) argue that meritocratic ideas are produced predominantly by cultural workers holding the most privileged positions. Friedman and Laurison point out that meritocratic explanations can be used to legitimise individual careers, especially those ones that have higher positions in elite occupations (2019: 61). Talk of meritocracy – at least in circumstances where meritocracy is limited – is 'an ideological myth to obscure economic and social inequalities'; it contributes to legitimising privilege and power (Littler, 2013: 55).

We have seen the interviewees argued that talent, hard work and determination were the main things needed if one was to succeed. The interviewees accepted that there were disadvantageous working conditions, financial constraints and high competition. They agreed with each other that these conditions affected film workers in a similar vein. Social background was little barrier to a successful career. The 'democratisation' of film production was attributed to the recent technological development that brought change in the social composition of the film workforce.

4.6   Discourses about gender inequalities

The interviewees produced conflicting discourses about gender inequalities within filmmaking work. They provided different interpretations of how gender inequalities operated and affected workers. A first discourse considered the underrepresentation and misrecognition of women in the film sector. The filmmakers argued that women experienced numerous disadvantages. For instance, women were less promoted and less funded than their male counterparts; and often women filmmakers got pushed into non-creative jobs within projects. A second discourse had to do with a social change and increased number of women across the industry. The interlocutors of this postfeminist discourse argued that gender inequality was a problem of the past. The following two sections will discuss these discourses of gender inequalities.

4.6.1 'If you don't want to be around and organising for boys, you are difficult'[25]

Some interviewees produced the discourse of gender inequality in documentary filmmaking work. They considered the underrepresentation of women and various barriers encountered by them in the film sector. The women filmmakers had fewer job opportunities and less funding than their male counterparts. They less often received a promotion in the film institutions. There was a division of creative labour within the sector, and women were pushed into non-creative roles. Women faced different modes of misrecognition – for instance, stereotypisation and scepticism about their abilities to do filmmaking jobs. The interviewees reported that the filmmaking profession was characterised by hegemonic masculine norms. The

---

[25]   Susanne (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 23 October 2017, London.

various scenarios of gender oppression were discussed by predominantly female interviewees. They shared detailed stories from their experiences of being marginalised. The male interviewees considered the underrepresentation and misrecognition of women by providing rather broader ideas about this issue. The testimonies provided by the interviewees are explored in this section of the chapter.

Several interviewees argued that there was the underrepresentation of women across all professions in documentary film productions. There were significantly fewer women than men among documentary directors, producers, editors, directors of photography. Similarly, the film sector releases data on the underrepresentation of women. According to the BFI, in the 2010s, 38% of producers were women, 24% of directors were women, 20% of editors were women, 13% of directors of photography were women, 6% of sound leads were women in documentary (BFI, 2019c). In addition to underrepresentation, women encounter various barriers throughout the profession. As one interviewee put it: 'All the way through your life and your career, you will meet iniquities and of course [gender] discrimination, all the way through!' (Anna, 2018)

The interviewees argued that there were less available job opportunities and funding for women filmmakers. There was maldistribution of resources within the sector, and men had easier access to positions and funds. Women were required to spend more time and labour for finding opportunities. The progress of their careers was constrained by numerous difficulties. The interviewee's comment below illustrates an issue of job unavailability.

> There are lots of women in the industry, but for these women it's very
> very tough [to have a career]. As a female director, I… I think if I was a

male director, I would get more work. I think it's genuinely true. (Greta,

2018)

This interviewee constructed a critical view on the documentary film sector. Greta

claimed that women documentarians are underrepresented and encounter various

obstacles in the film sector. The interviewee used discourse to present herself in a

certain way: she has a more disadvantageous position than her male counterparts. In

this excerpt, Greta blamed nobody but talked about women's experience of

filmmaking work. Another interviewee, Anna, discussed the unequal distribution of

funding. She shared her experience of getting less funding from broadcasters than her

male counterparts in the following interview excerpt.

I'm sure the budget that I got is much much less than other people get.

Because I didn't know how much they got... Women are still getting

much less... I only discovered what some of the budgets were because I

was sitting in one of these panels judging things. And I saw what the

budget was sometimes. And I said to the BBC: 'I never do a film for

less than that ever again because you are giving your own people

double what I'm getting. And it's not fair!' (Anna, 2018)

This interview excerpt represents how funding distribution operates in the

documentary film sector. The interviewee argued that women documentarians receive

less funding than their male counterparts. The excerpt from the interview showed

who is responsible for women discrimination – broadcasters' commissioning editors

who make decisions about funding distribution. Anna made her vision of the sector

persuasive by relying on her 'insider' knowledge obtained during her work with the

BBC. This insider knowledge allowed her to understand how funding is distributed

among men and women. Anna's discourse claimed power back to women: as she put

it, 'I never do a film for less than that ever again because you are giving your own people double what I'm getting. And it's not fair!' Her discourse 'undermines and exposes' power relations in the sector where male documentarians dominate (Foucault, 1978: 101).

The female interviewees reported that they received fewer chances of getting a promotion within the film institutions than their male counterparts. They argued that women 'are just kept in the background' (Emily, 2018) of film productions. One interviewee discussed her experience of being discriminated:

> I've been working for different TV companies. And every time I saw a man get promoted who came with less experience and less kind of passion, and then any time I went with ideas or tried to put myself forward, I just get dismissed. (Emily, 2018)

This interview excerpt represents how film workers are promoted in television companies. The interviewee shared her experience of discrimination. She did not receive promotion despite her ideas and experience; her male counterparts, on the other hand, got promotion in those companies. Emily used passive constructions to describe her experience of discrimination: for example, 'a man get promoted' and 'I just get dismissed'. Passive verbs omit agency, thus hiding who is responsible for discrimination against women.

The filmmakers interviewed for this study reported on the gender division of labour in documentary filmmaking work. They claimed that the division of creative / non-creative work correlated to gender of film workers. The producing positions were likely to be held by female workers, and the directing roles were predominantly

occupied by their male counterparts.[26] The directing roles had a higher status and more funding than other positions. The comments below illustrate the gender division of labour:

> I think you will find more female producers than female directors. Somehow women are pushed into the role of [a] producer not [a] director because I think women are not taken seriously as directors. […] I've got an opportunity to direct, so I was able to keep on directing. But that's quite unusual [for women]. (Greta, 2018)

> The woman who is in control [of the film production as a director], the woman who is the leader [in production] is the evil. The one who is just: 'Let me do my job and just be at home with my boyfriend' – that's the hero. So, for women, it's quite tough [to be a film director]. (Susanne, 2017)

Those interviewees shared own experience of being documentary directors to represent women's positions in the film sector. The interviewees' narratives constitute outsider position of women: 'women are not taken seriously as directors', directing is 'quite unusual [for women]', 'the woman who is the leader [in production] is the evil', 'for women, it's quite tough [to be a film director]'. Those utterances position women as discriminated social subjects. The social effect of these discourses is criticising male dominance in documentaries and thus transforming power relations

---

[26] Smith et al (2017) argue that, in the film industry, typically women are allocated producing and organisational roles, while men hold directing and creative positions. Adkins (1999), Banks and Milestone (2011) argue that female cultural workers often perform traditional female roles of caring and supporting by holding administrative and organisational positions.

within the sector. Interviewee Greta said further that there was also a gender division between filmmaking and television work. The filmmaking was considered as a more prestigious occupation than the television programme-making. Therefore, there were more women in television than in the filmmaking. The interviewee's comment illustrates this issue: 'I think it's harder to get into films [for women]. It's considered to be more prestigious, it's more exclusive, it's more elitist, therefore there are more [male] members' (Greta, 2018).

The interviewees claimed that women filmmakers were misrecognised by the film sector. There was widespread scepticism about women's ability to do filmmaking jobs. Their aptitudes were questioned throughout their careers despite their professional achievements. One interviewee discussed her experience of not being taken seriously:

> I think [gender discrimination] happens all the time. Even when I
> employ people on set, I was standing next to them, and they were
> [saying] like: 'Where is the director then?' And I will be [saying] like:
> 'No, that's me. I've employed you.' And they were [saying] like: 'Ah, I
> thought you were a runner'. And it's just because being a woman
> making a film! (Emily, 2018)

Another documentary director, Alice, shared her experience of being dismissed by others when working collaboratively. She was placed in a secondary position, while her male colleague was addressed in the first instance. She said:

> Because [<male colleague>] and I do a lot of work together, so – haha –
> whenever we have email on stage, it's probably very unconscious,
> but… we signed up emails as [<male colleague>] and Alice, and people

always reply to [<male colleague>]. It's lots of, lots of people reply to [<male colleague>]. And like the other day, we applied to do the residency at the [<place>], and [there were] very middle-class people, there was a very middle-class woman, and she addressed herself to [<male colleague>] the whole of the time… And it was like 'Oh my god!' And I am never quite sure… when it's face to face… because [<male colleague>] is a professor and he is from the relatively middle-class background… and I'm never quite sure whether that's a kind of mix of class and gender, or whether it's about gender and class. (Alice, 2017)

These interview excerpts constitute outsider positions of women in the sector. The utterances constructed work relations where women are unheard and unseen by their colleagues. For example, Emily did not look like a documentary director to her employees; Alice did not sound like a documentary director in her correspondence. The interviewee constituted positions of women as secondary to men. Thus, the discourses criticise the power relations in the sector and, through criticism, transform those relations.

The documentarians discussed (though not in these terms) hegemonic masculine norms circulating in the film sector. Women were marginalised workers who did not fit in the filmmaking. One interviewee commented about her experience of not matching a familiar image of a male worker: 'There is a stereotypical image of a sound person that you expect to see a male geek. I don't fit that image. Maybe that's why people don't feel that I am the correct choice' (Lily, 2018). Another interviewee explicitly referred to masculine norms dominating the profession:

It's not a fair business. It doesn't mean that you shouldn't complain

about it, but you are gonna have to fight quite a lot! I probably turned

into... It's terrible! I've become a man in a way that I just attack

everything. (Anna, 2018)

There was strong stereotypisation of abilities and personhood of women

filmmakers. Stereotypes reduce the complexity of social reality to familiar features

that contribute to the marginalisation of women. One interviewee discussed this issue

in the following excerpt.

Even if the script is done by women, this script is for a male boss. And

for a female script you will be telling bizarre things like: 'Your

characters [are] not like they should be'. [This is] because she is female,

she is single, she does not have children, and she has a job. And that's

not likeable in films! Because the film industry has been programmed to

see women [in a particular way]. Most female characters you see in the

films… if they are not a secretary or a wife… they ensure you that their

journey is… to be happy, to have children, and that is more likeable.

(Susanne, 2017)

The filmmakers claimed that the marginalisation of women affected their

confidence about work. The interviewees admitted that there was a general lack of

confidence among women filmmakers. They pointed out that confidence was an

essential quality in freelance and network-based filmmaking. The documentarians'

comments below illustrate.

> I think if someone championed me a lot earlier, I would just have
>
> started making my own stuff a lot earlier, and I would be a lot more
>
> confident about it. (Emily, 2018)

> I am not very confident in terms of selling myself, and probably men
>
> are more confident. I noticed that men are much better at being
>
> confident and feeling good about themselves than women. Men can say
>
> that they can do a job, even if they never did it before, while women go
>
> to a job and think that if they did not do it, they could not do it. (Lily,
>
> 2018)

In these interview excerpts, the interviewees constructed themselves as 'moral subject[s] of [. .] own actions' (Rabinow, 1984: 352). They talked about their lack of confidence at work that does not permit them to participate actively in filmmaking. The interviewees connected their lack of confidence to gender relations. Those patriarchal relations impose certain rules of ethical conduct on women; and according to those rules, filmmaking is not an appropriate conduct for women. Another interviewee elaborated further:

> Women also have a lack of this confidence in the ability to do their own
>
> work. So, they won't apply for those big funds, they won't apply to
>
> make features, they won't apply for the shorts, they won't go to the BFI,
>
> they won't go to the Film Four, because they think they will not give
>
> money to me. They count themselves out straight away. (Juliet, 2017)

This section explored the discourse about gender inequality in filmmaking. The interviewees referred to underrepresentation and misrecognition of women in the sector. The women filmmakers had less available job opportunities, funding and

promotion than their male counterparts. Women faced different modes of misrecognition – for instance, scepticism about their abilities to be filmmakers. The interviewees discussed hegemonic masculine norms circulated in the sector that contributed further to the marginalisation of women.

4.6.2 'I can number as many successful women filmmakers as I can number men'[27]

Some interviewees produced another discourse of gender – the postfeminist discourse – that is encapsulated in the interview excerpt.[28] They said that there was a significant increase in the number of women in the film sector; and that left gender inequalities in the past. They claimed that women did not face disadvantages in the film sector. The women filmmakers had access to various job opportunities and funding, if they demonstrated persistence and commitment to the profession. The postfeminist ideas were produced by female and male filmmakers. The women filmmakers holding privileged positions within the sector were more likely than marginalised women filmmakers to contribute to the rhetoric of postfeminism. This section discusses the postfeminist discourse articulated in the interviews.

The filmmakers asserted that there was a significant increase in the number of women workers. It was a result of recent social changes that brought them into the labour market. The interviewees pointed out that the majority of their colleagues were

---

[27] George (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 24 September 2018, London.

[28] The postfeminist discourse is a prevailing sensibility in the cultural industries today. Postfeminism refuses feminist ideas by considering women's empowerment and presence in the labour market. See, for example, Allen (2013), McRobbie (2016), and Gill (2008). See also my first chapter.

female workers. According to their experiences, the senior managing positions were occupied predominantly by female workers. The comments below illustrate this issue.

> In the world that I've worked in, which is cutting documentaries for directors, probably, I would think between 70% and 80% of my work is made for women [directors]. (Jasper 2018)

> I've always worked with quite a variety of people. I worked a lot with women directors… Probably, I think, of all of the heads of departments and directors, probably, equally split into males and females, almost fifty-fifty, I should think. (Ben, 2017)

These interview excerpts illustrate Foucault's idea of political character of discourse. Power relations function through discourse. These male interviewees claimed that women are represented well in the documentary sector. They made their version of work relations persuasive by sharing their experience of filmmaking. Jasper, a documentary film editor, and Ben, a documentary film producer, worked for women directors mainly. These interviewees provided numbers of women workers in order to substantiate their vision. According to their accounts, a high number of women illustrate an idea that gender discrimination is a problem of the past. The political aim of these discourses is to hide disadvantageous experience of women documentarians and sustain male domination in the sector.

The interlocutors here agreed with the statement that there were disadvantageous working conditions that might cause problems for women filmmakers. However, they were reluctant to understand those conditions as discrimination. They maintained that the disadvantages encountered by women were not caused by social relations. According to them, there were various individual

reasons why women underperformed in the filmmaking profession. For instance, one of the explanations concerned a lack of agency among women. The interviewees suggested that there were equal chances to get positions and funds for women and men. One interviewee commented as follows.

> I'm quite confident that it wouldn't be that somebody says: 'Ah that young guy, let's promote him over a girl.' I'm sure that young guy went and said: 'I want to be a researcher and I have an idea.' And that's how he gets it. And she was waiting for somebody to kind of discover her. So, I think there is still kind of ingrained things that we have these women that somehow do not push themselves… I'm not doing the blaming the victim thing, but I think in order to change, we also have to change that way that we think. (Dana, 2018)

This interview excerpt constitutes relations between women and filmmaking. The interviewee claimed that women lack agency and persistency. Dana suggested that women acquire those qualities in order to succeed in the profession. Thus, this discourse incorporates microtechniques of power, which produce and shape subjects (women) in order to make them fitting in the sector (Foucault, 1978). Another explanation for the underperformance of women related to the poor quality of their filmmaking works. The interviewees claimed that high-quality filmmaking brought equal opportunities to everyone. The filmmakers referred to a need to provide tangible evidence of discrimination of women. As one interviewee put it: 'If I'm clearly better than men, then I will get a job' (Lily, 2018).

Some interviewees had stereotypical ideas about women's personhood and presented those ideas as explanatory for women underperformance in filmmaking. The women filmmakers were perceived by them as not good enough for doing jobs in

comparison to their male counterparts. For example, one interviewee reported that his female colleague was dismissed from her job for not being 'strong enough'.

> I've been offered work that basically another female director has been working on for a long time. She directed, and then a commissioner at a channel said: 'We don't want her to do it, we want you to do it'. Then I don't know if that because… I don't think it's because she is just female. I suppose they think she is not going to be strong enough to make that film. (Freddie, 2018)

This interview excerpt shows how power relations operate in the documentary sector. Power relations are actions that modify others, or as Foucault puts it, 'a mode of action upon actions' (1983: 222). The interviewee governed actions of others – women – because his gender privileges permit him to act upon actions of others. Freddie pursued own interests in securing his privileges: his objective is to maintain his positions and status. The interviewee's discourse controls the conduct of women. For example, he said that women are not 'strong enough' to do filmmaking jobs, and therefore, suggested that women acquire this quality.

Some interviewees attributed the disadvantages of female careers to the care responsibilities borne by women. The interviewees argued that the main cause of their career difficulties was leaving the industry to have families. There were no maternity leaves available for freelance filmmakers. The interviewees added that many women did not return to the filmmaking profession after having children. The comments below illustrate this issue.

> A lot of my [female] producers are having families and they are taking… would they come back I don't know… because, obviously, it's

> not an industry where you can go and take… because if you are a
> freelancer, you are not gonna be paid if you take – what is it called
> when you are off for the baby – maternity leave! (Freddie, 2018)

> Women are dominating in a lot of professions, I think, up until a certain
> point. And that certain point is once you want to have children. Most of
> them don't have staff jobs, very few of them have staff jobs, so they
> can't take maternity leave. […] It's not very family-friendly. It's bad for
> the girls, for the women. (Anna, 2018)

The disadvantageous working conditions were barriers for those women who wished to continue their careers after having children. Filmmakers were required to work long hours and often to do so away from home, and that was not conducive to any care responsibilities. The interviewees maintained that only a few women filmmakers could combine their careers and childcare. According to Skillset statistics (2009: 35), within media industries, more men have children than women (32% to 21%). This comment by an interviewee's illustrates the situation:

> Female directors who want to have children, probably, won't work as
> female directors after they have children. The way you have to work is
> more conducive to somebody who does not have children, and so that's
> why to men. That's why women tend to take a producer's role… There
> would be fewer jobs that I would be able to do because of childcare
> demands. Some female directors still do it, it's just not so many. (Greta,
> 2018)

Another interviewee suggested possible scenarios for women filmmakers having children:

> You often find that women who are directing either like me had children
>
> very young, which means… I was still in my early 30s when my son is
>
> now a teenager, which meant that I could start a career later. Or they
>
> don't have children, or they are very wealthy, and they don't mind not
>
> to see their children very much. (Dana, 2018)

The postfeminist discourse of the filmmakers contributes to gender re-traditionalization. It relates to regressively traditional models of gender inequality that understand women as child and family carers. Attributing female careers to mothering is highly questionable because it reproduces an essentialised notion of family as women's primary responsibility (Gill, 2014). It reinforces an idea that most of the childcaring and domestic labour is done by women. Women's family responsibilities create obstacles for women to be fully represented in filmmaking work, and, on the other hand, allow men to be flexible and mobile at their work.

This section has explored the postfeminist discourse produced by the interviewees. They claimed that there was an increasing number of women employed in the sector and that offered equal access to job opportunities and funds to everyone. Those interviewees experienced or observed disadvantageous working conditions that might cause difficulties for women's careers. However, they did not understand those difficulties as discriminatory practices. The interviewees provided various explanations of why women underperformed in filmmaking jobs – for example, the lack of agency and family responsibilities. These findings suggest that the postfeminist discourse contributes to marginalising female workers and empowering privileged male ones.

4.7   Conclusion

I have tried to analyse the discourses about class and gender inequalities that were provided by the filmmakers in the interviews. Following Foucault's genealogical works (1978; 1995), discourse was examined as a constitutive force of social reality. Discourses are normative constraints that produce and regulate the work of the filmmakers. Discourses are 'ritualised repetition of norms' that construct gender and class (Butler, 1993: ix). The analysis of the interviews identified several consensual and conflicting discourses. Filmmakers agreed about existing social exclusions and about disadvantageous working conditions in the film industry. However, they created different interpretations of how class and gender inequalities operated and affected workers. Following Foucault's approach, the differences in discourses are discussed by considering social positions and interests of the interlocutors. The filmmakers who are marginalised (through class and/or through gender) provided critical and accurate accounts of the labour relations in the film sector. Their subjugated positions allow them 'to see comprehensively' (Haraway, 1988: 584). Haraway argues similarly for the 'preferred positioning' of the subjugated whose points of view are the closest to 'critical knowledges'. Those filmmakers with privileged positions within the sector, on the other hand, were likely to talk of meritocracy and in postfeminist terms, thus, contributing to class and gender marginalisation. The next chapter will discuss an entrepreneurial subjectivity of documentarians who launch their own companies in response to their experiences of social inequalities.

5 Ethos and practices of governing the self among documentary filmmakers

5.1 Introduction

This chapter explores ethos and practices of governing the self among documentarians. I will investigate entrepreneurial discourses, which are dominant in the film industry, and resisting discourses, which escape and question the enterprising subjectivity. Some of my interviewees became entrepreneurs because they experienced class and/or gender inequality within the film industry. They criticised the film sector for its disadvantageous working conditions and exclusion of working-class workers and women. Launching an independent business provided them with an opportunity to become autonomous producers who created a new, more auspicious work environment. They sought autonomy and agency in their entrepreneurial work. Their entrepreneurial activity was not just a career change to self-employed status, but rather a self-governing programme and subjectification (Foucault, 2008). The filmmakers were the entrepreneurs of their life that was reshaped by them permanently with regard to entrepreneurial goals. The transformation of self was the main aim of entrepreneurs who could achieve it through following specific rules in their everyday practices (Bröckling, 2016; Brown, 2003; Foucault, 2008; Rose, 1992; Scharff, 2016). As Bröckling puts it, an entrepreneur is 'only ever an entrepreneur *à venir*[1], only ever in a state of becoming one, never of being one' (2016: viii). Entrepreneurialism is 'a field of force' that regulates the conduct of subjects via social technologies and technologies of the self (*ibid*.: viii-xi). The entrepreneurial self is a

---

[1] Forthcoming (fr.).

normative model for conduct and a form of knowledge providing truth about subjects (*ibid*.: 21). According to Bröckling, the entrepreneurial self is a prevailing 'micropolitical rationale or logic' in contemporary labour relations and an 'entreployee' replaced a mass worker of the Fordist time (*ibid*.: 21). Additionally, some recent studies assert that cultural workers are 'entrepreneurial subjects *par excellence*' and 'paradigms of entrepreneurial selfhood' (Scharff, 2016: 110). The rhetoric of entrepreneurship prevails within the British film sector. In this chapter I examine that rhetoric, by way of the discourse produced by the filmmakers that I interviewed and observed for this study. I examine: 1) the entrepreneurial ethos exhibited by many of the interviewed filmmakers; 2) the operations of class and gender within film production enterprises; 3) working practices within film production enterprises. Finally, the chapter discusses resisting discourses of documentary filmmakers. Some research participants articulated discourses in ways that escape entrepreneurial subjectivity. These interviewees think and act differently, thus demonstrating 'counter-conduct' (Foucault, 2007: 196). Documentary filmmakers criticised the ideas of meritocracy and market competition and expressed themselves through non-entrepreneurial themes. The chapter draws on themes of social justice, radical aesthetics, friendship and solidarity.

5.2   The entrepreneurial ethos

This section argues that some interviewees demonstrated entrepreneurial subjectivity. They were self-employed documentarians who launched their independent film production companies and aimed to escape disadvantages of the film industry. However, setting up a film company did not lead to having the entrepreneurial ethos necessarily. Some interviewees created film companies but did

not become entrepreneurial subjects. Many of the filmmakers within my sample who were best rewarded by the film sector contributed to the entrepreneurial ethos too. They did not suffer from social inequalities, but they contributed to producing the entrepreneurial discourse, nevertheless. The subsections that follow discuss the entrepreneurial innovation, self-reliance, independence, individuality and resilience. Those features were demonstrated by the entrepreneurial filmmakers who were interviewed or observed for this study.

5.2.1 'Disrupting the system' of the film industry[2]

The entrepreneurial filmmakers contrasted their enterprises with the film industry that, in their view, was characterised by disadvantageous working conditions and by social exclusion.[3] Indeed the reason that the entrepreneurial filmmakers gave for leaving the 'conservative' and 'established' film industry (Susanne, 2017) was that they had experienced inequalities of gender or class. According to their accounts, establishing their own, independent businesses solved the problems. They created their enterprises in order to circumnavigate sexism or classism of the film industry. The entrepreneurs ascribed the meanings of autonomy and independence to their businesses. The cases below illustrate the innovative character of entrepreneurial activity.

Emily (2018) started her production company in order to circumvent sexism. She maintained that she had not been treated seriously as a film director and that colleagues had doubts about her work. At one point, on a production set, she was

---

[2]   Emily (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 21 March 2018, Colchester.

[3]   Chapter four discussed the interviewees' experiences of inequalities.

mistaken for a runner. She argued, further, that industry gatekeepers hindered her professional development. She created own production company that provided autonomy and independence for her. She discussed the empowering potential of her film enterprise in the following interview excerpt.

> I was a woman trying to make it in the film industry, which was really against me... And then having your own company is easier, as you have got a lot more power. […] I couldn't get a job at the BBC, I couldn't get a job and work for other companies. I've written hundreds of CVs, hundreds of emails to people. And it's still really closed off. It still feels like the only way I could do it is to make my own things and projects happen. It's still very closed off. (Emily, 2018)

This interview excerpt shows Emily's experience of getting into the film industry. She argued that women struggled to become involved in film production. Establishing own enterprise, however, helped to overcome the difficulties. Emily contrasted discursively the enterprise sector with the rest of the film industry. The industry is 'closed off' and 'against' women, thus preventing women to get opportunities at broadcasters and companies. The enterprise sector gives 'a lot more power' to women and allows them to make own film projects.

Susanne (2017) was director with experience within the film industry of sexism and racism. Her efforts to becoming a writer-director were dismissed by a film school. Although the school pushed her into the role of a film producer, she became a director of documentary films. Throughout her career, co-workers doubted her artistic autonomy as a director. Her films violated stereotypes about films produced by a woman director from an ethnic minority group. It was her that characterised the

British film industry as a 'rigid' and 'established' sector that was out of step with the international filmmaking world. She held that the filmmakers were controlled by 'powerful gatekeepers' who made decisions on film production and distribution. There were nepotistic recruitment practices that reproduced the social composition of the film workforce. By creating her independent filmmaking enterprise, she was able not only to avoid discrimination and be more autonomous but also have greater access to the international film industry. Susanne said:

> What I decided at that time was that I never ever want to work in the industry where I have to ask people [the industry gatekeepers] for permission to do [film] stuff… I thought I'm not going to go and have to deal with these people who are gatekeepers because they are going to put me in the box of where I should be. (Susanne, 2017)

This interview excerpt shows the reason why Susanne launched her filmmaking company: she wanted to avoid discrimination created by gatekeepers. The interviewee claimed that the enterprise sector allowed documentarians to be independent from gatekeepers. The interview excerpt consists of denials which indicate assumptions about the film industry. The gatekeepers control access to the film industry, thus creating a discriminatory work environment.

Ben (2017) was a film producer from a working-class background. He argued that the film industry did not provide sufficient remuneration to film directors and producers. Responding to this disadvantage, he started his own company in order to be in a position to command greater pay. His entrepreneurialism resolved the problem

of low remuneration that was a serious barrier for the careers of marginalised filmmakers.[4] Ben commented:

> Money is not always right. I had always… not forced but… insisted that I get paid for everything I've done, I try to get paid for it. It's important, it's a professional job and if you do it well, it's very important to production. […] There has been always a mentality that a producer does not need to get paid, it's the last person who needs to get paid. 'Or maybe you can cut your fee?' It's not always valued, that producer's job. I don't need people to love me or anything like that. But you want to be respected, you want to be paid properly. (Ben, 2017)

The filmmakers who became entrepreneurs considered themselves as thereby 'disrupting the system' of the film industry (Emily, 2018). They argued that entrepreneurialism did not locate them on the margin of the filmmaking but within commercial production. According to their accounts, their enterprises allowed them 'to make good money' (Emily, 2018). The interviewee characterised the entrepreneurial activity in the following interview excerpt.

> It's a very good thing that people are doing YouTube, blogging and all that stuff. Because some people are able to make a complete name for themselves just from their bedrooms making videos. And that's exciting because that disrupts the system. And those people make good money. (Emily, 2018)

---

[4] For a more detailed analysis of bad pay or lack of pay in the film sector, see chapter four.

Juliet (2017) drew a similar distinction between entrepreneurial and non-entrepreneurial modes of resisting the film industry. Her film distribution enterprise, she said, allowed marginalised filmmakers access to mainstream productions. She said:

> It's not about doing the next exciting kind of east-end film festival. We want people to make films for [the] mainstream, so they are not sort of ghettoised into a different kind of working-class filmmaking. (Juliet, 2017)

In these interview excerpts, the research participants construed film enterprises as 'disrupting' of the existing production forms. They claimed that those enterprises are different from the rest of the film industry because they give lots of opportunities to filmmakers. Filmmakers are successful entrepreneurs when they are not 'ghettoised' but rather 'make good money'. Bröckling points out that entrepreneurs are 'innovative, creative destroyers of existing means of production and distribution' whose motto is 'further beyond' (2016: xvi, 71). The entrepreneur 'disturbs the even flow of production and of the market by creating new ways of doing things and new things to do' (Kirzner, 1973: 79 quoted in Bröckling, 2016: 70). He writes:

> The spirit of enterprise is supposed to overcome economic stagnation and promote general prosperity, shaving away the bureaucratic crust and bursting political narrow-mindedness, pacifying society through the spirit of market exchange and leading all to final success and happiness. (Bröckling, 2016: 76)

Christiaens argues that '[t]he entrepreneur is not the individual conforming to statistical norms like everyone else, but is rather the exceptional outlier' (2019: 2).

Dean and Ford (2016) argue that the main aim of entrepreneurs is making changes for their staff, communities, and clients. They seek to interact with, collaborate with, and support other entrepreneurs (*ibid*.: 14). Dean and Ford argue that entrepreneurs aim 'to expand their entrepreneurial leadership beyond the boundaries of the self as entrepreneurial and individual leader to reach to other people too' (*ibid*.: 20).

5.2.2 'A lot of brilliant filmmakers fall down because they are not really good at a business'[5]

The interview excerpt in the title encapsulates the idea of filmmaking as a business – an idea that was promoted by entrepreneurial filmmakers. The interviewees wanted to create self-sustaining enterprises that operated without public funding support. They regarded filmmaking as an instrument for making profit like any other commercial initiatives. This section discusses the view that my interviewees presented of their entrepreneurial self-reliance and of a business model of the filmmaking.

The entrepreneurial filmmakers made economies in order to try to ensure that what they had was 'a self-sustaining film company' (Jack, 2018) that needed no public funding. They argued for taking full financial responsibilities for their enterprise functioning. The entrepreneurial discourse of self-reliance exhibited here correlates with government policy that applies to the film sector. That policy reduces public funding and encourages entrepreneurship.[6] One interviewee said:

---

[5] Anna (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 03 April 2018, Colchester.

[6] For a more detailed analysis of the austerity measures and policy initiatives developing entrepreneurial culture in the film production, see chapter three.

I've beginning to create a [film] business that is sustainable and is able

to give me the freedom that I need to make [film] stuff. But it's meant

that I have to take six years off [work], making films and working on

the business model that makes it possible. (Susanne, 2017)

This interviewee talked about her filmmaking career, particularly about starting her film production company. The film industry incited Susanne to become an entrepreneur. The research participant acquired new skills and attitudes in order to modify her conduct at work. Those modifications, or 'technologies of the self', involved developing a new business idea and creating a company (Foucault, 1997a: 225). The interviewee used economic vocabulary to represent her documentary filmmaking: for example, 'business', 'business model', and 'sustainable'. Thus, her discourse represents documentary filmmaking in entrepreneurial terms. Entrepreneurial themes generate the interviewee's vision of the documentary profession.

A self-sustaining film company has to produce material that audiences like. According to the interviewees, a good story for a documentary was a story that could engage audiences. The audiences' satisfaction was an ultimate goal for the film entrepreneurs. To achieve this aim, the filmmakers had to develop entrepreneurial abilities for self-promotion and calculative rationality. The filmmakers' comments below illustrate the importance of satisfying the audience.

If the project can grab the audience attention, that's the project that is

likely to fly.[7]

---

[7]   Research observations: film festival talk 'From Festivals to Awards', at the Raindance Film Festival 2017.

> You as a filmmaker have got to build your audience. There are a lot of
> filmmakers and it's almost getting less and less audience. It's your
> responsibility to get on social media, to build your followings and to
> connect with your audience. There are a lot of people making films, so
> you have to make sure that you're standing out, that you're doing
> something different. I think that the industry is looking for a
> writer-director who isn't just going: 'I want to be just a curator'. And
> actually no, I have a business mind, I'm gonna build my audience, I'm
> gonna engage my fans.[8]

These excerpts argue that filmmakers should modify their conduct at work. These narratives of festival speakers present technologies of the self that change professional conduct of filmmakers (Foucault, 1997a: 225). Documentarians are required to obtain new skills and attitudes. The speakers advised documentarians to work closely with their audiences. Filmmakers are required to learn how to work with audiences, e.g. self-promotion on social media. They are advised to have 'a business mind', or in other words, to change their attitude to self-promotion. The aim of attracting audiences is to make filmmaking profitable and self-sustaining. On the other hand, as one interviewee maintained, the film industry produced and promoted 'not actually the best' films (Susanne, 2017): *those* films struggled to find an audience or to make a profit. Her comment below illustrates the entrepreneurial critique of the film industry.

> The people who actually get these opportunities [the film industry
> funding and distribution] are not actually the best. They are just the

---

people who the system has decided to let make a film. And so, when

making a film with all the government support and the influence that

the government institutions have, they give them a lot of visibility at all

these prestigious festivals. But when the government doesn't hold their

hand, nobody actually let them speak up, because their films don't make

money, don't reach audiences. (Susanne, 2017)

The interviewee regarded filmmaking as an instrument for making profit like any

other business activities. She considered filmmaking as a tool for raising funding,

rather than an end in itself. The economic model of their enterprises required

providing financial returns to investors.[9] And the financial returns were possible, if

films were successfully distributed.

The discourse of self-sustaining filmmaking business resonates with neoliberal

governmentality that aims to eliminate social reciprocity and instead to promote

'responsibilisation' of subjects (Brown, 2003; Foucault, 2008; Gill, 2008; Lemke,

2001; McNay, 2009). The discourse suggests creating and developing enterprises that

are independent of public funding.[10] The apparatus of neoliberal transformations is

limited to creating conditions for entrepreneurial self-governing, rather than the

government itself (Binkley, 2014: 21; Brown, 2003: 43-44; Chandler & Reid, 2016:

11; Dean, 2010; Foucault, 2008; Lemke, 2001; McNay, 2009; Miller & Rose, 1990;

Rose & Miller, 1992). There is 'self-limitation of a [neoliberal] government that

---

[9]   Research observations: film festival talk 'From Festivals to Awards', at the Raindance
      Film Festival 2017.

[10] However, independent film enterprises remain dependent upon established gatekeepers
      who control public funding distribution. Their narratives demonstrate rather an aim to
      become independent from the public purse.

operates only indirectly and at considerable distance from its intended objects' (Binkley, 2014: 21). Neoliberal government is a 'productive power' (*ibid*.: 22) that produces subjects who transform their conduct according to the entrepreneurial ethos. It involves developing features of independence, commitment, determination, risk-bearing and adaptability. The following sections will discuss those entrepreneurial aptitudes.

5.2.3 'My company is me; it is purely the vehicle for me to make my own films'[11]

The foregoing excerpt exhibits an idea of the self as being, itself, an enterprise (The relevant literature is: Christiaens, 2019; Bröckling, 2016; Brown, 2015; Foucault, 2008; Lazzarato, 2009; McNay, 2009; Moisander et al, 2018; Read, 2009; Scharff, 2016). The filmmakers regarded their enterprises as personal projects. Each entrepreneurial filmmaker is 'a sort of permanent and multiple enterprise' (Foucault, 2008: 241) – a, 'Me Inc' (Bröckling, 2016: 31-36). Self-as-an-enterprise is characterised by depoliticised 'individual autonomy' and 'active self-regulation' (McNay, 2009: 62-63). Bröckling argues that the entrepreneurial self is an autonomous party that is responsible for self-optimisation and self-development. Me Inc is a commodifying mechanism that transforms the subject into 'unification of product and producer, boss and subordinate […] buyer and seller' (Bröckling, 2016: 32). McNay suggests that 'the marketisation of social relations' (2009: 56) affects the shaping of the human subject that is at issue.

---

[11]   Anna (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 03 April 2018, Colchester.

> Individuals would be encouraged to view their lives and identities as a type of enterprise, understood as a relation to the self based ultimately on a notion of incontestable economic interest. (McNay, 2009: 56)

The film entrepreneurs considered themselves as independent producers fully responsible for their works. They said in the interviews that taking responsibility for their work gave them power to determine their work environment. They argued that their businesses gave them independence from the film industry's gatekeepers and nepotism.[12] Their enterprises increased their freedom in that it gave them the ability to act independently of the sector. However, the main reason that they sought such independence was to further own self-interest.

> We both went to film school to specifically not work for anybody. So, we decided to – which was quite scary – to set up our own company and do our own thing. (Ben, 2017)

> I didn't just stand in the queue and wait for them [the gatekeepers] to give me permission [to make films]… I do films that I want to make about the world that I know. So, now I just don't bother, I just don't apply for anything, don't talk to anybody, I just do it! (Susanne, 2017)

In these interview excerpts, the documentarians demonstrated how they governed themselves. Independence is an essential attribute for working in the enterprise sector, and practices of government facilitate this capacity. The first interviewee said that his aim was 'to do [. .] own thing'; the second interviewee summed up the capacity as 'just do it'. The second excerpt

---

[12]   Chapter four discussed the institution of the gatekeepers in the film industry.

showed a repeated pattern of organising the speech: the research participant alternated a negative clause with a positive clause. Susanne said that she 'didn't just stand in the queue', did not wait for permission, did not 'apply for anything' and did not 'talk to anybody'. These negative clauses include assumptions about how the film industry operates. The negations imply that the film industry has queues of people waiting for permissions of gatekeepers to make films. Susanne added positive clauses that showed what opportunities the enterprise sector provides: 'I do films that I want to make about the world that I know'; 'I just do it!' Thus, according to the interviewee, obstacles created by gatekeepers fostered entrepreneurial conduct of documentary filmmakers. Documentarians must transform themselves if they want to have a career in the film sector.

The entrepreneurial filmmakers are autonomous units that manage themselves in the market. They are simultaneously the 'customer' of their own selves and the 'provider' of their own selves, and 'the management of life ceases only with death' (Bröckling, 2016: 32). The entrepreneurs promote themselves constantly because they must be constantly active within the job market. Unlike Fordist workers, 'entreployees' are fully responsible for organising their own work (*ibid*.: 26). Self-promotion is an important part of entrepreneurial careers in filmmaking. The interviewees argued that their professional skills were their main means of success within the profession. They discussed their professional achievements as a result of individual efforts. Here are two of the interviewees.

> Really great for me personally was that I had this sort of special skill of using a camera, no one else really has, and I was able to use it [i.e., use that skill]. (Freddie, 2018)

> I discovered when I left the BBC [and started my own company], I was
> actually very good at coming out with the ideas for films that people
> quite enjoyed and liked seeing… Then, I never wanted to work for
> anyone else, I was just quite like working for myself. […] I have a
> particular style of filmmaking... I chose subjects that I think other
> people will find interesting. I specifically go and choose something that
> I think has a universal appeal. What I'm quite good at is getting people
> to talk to me very honestly. (Anna, 2018)

These interview excerpts demonstrate how the research participants govern themselves. The documentarians worked on themselves in order to transform themselves and to take entrepreneurial personhood. The interviewees promoted themselves as successful documentarians. For example, they said: 'I had this sort of special skill of using a camera, no one else really has, and I was able to use it'; 'I was actually very good at coming out with the ideas for films that people quite enjoyed and liked seeing.' Entrepreneurialism treats the self as the political project of enterprising that requires filmmakers to acquire various qualities, including self-promotion. In these excerpts, the interviewees demonstrated 'a persona that mobilises the need to be at all times one's own press and publicity agent' (McRobbie, 2016: 74).

The entrepreneurial filmmakers promoted individualism. They articulated a need to be different, even unique in their filmmaking, because it contributed to their professional success. The entrepreneurs sought to find their 'authentic voices' that would have a universal appeal among audiences. Their authentic voices would allow them to succeed in their businesses. Their individualism involves an idea of transforming life and work (Bröckling, 2016). The entrepreneurs believe that they can

be successful, so long as they govern themselves in a particular way (*ibid*.: 33). The filmmakers discussed their duty to be 'authentically self' in the following excerpts.[13]

> One of the greatest things about making the first film whether it's a short or a feature is that you get to be authentic, you get to be authentically yourself. You get to express your voice.[14]

> Everyone has a different journey, and part of the journey is figuring out your way of doing it, what works for you, who are you and what is the best route for you. Be open to going down different routes to reach your goal.[15]

The film industry equipped filmmakers with a range of self-management techniques that lead them to professional success. The industry taught them how to shape their conduct into one that would generate funding for their companies. For instance, one of the talks at the Raindance Film Festival 2017 focused on self-promoting techniques that were useful for receiving funding.[16] Filmmakers were advised by a speaker to attain meetings with sponsors. They even required filmmakers to make a short presentation about their filmmaking ideas and to do so confidently and passionately. 'Do not please be boring!'[17] – said the festival speaker.

---

[13] Research observations: film festival talk 'Short Films', at the Raindance Film Festival 2017.

[14] *Ibid*.

[15] *Ibid*.

[16] Research observations: film festival talk 'Pitch Training with Elliot Grove', at the Raindance Film Festival 2017.

[17] Research observations: film festival talk 'Live Ammunition (pitch)', at the Raindance Film Festival 2017.

Filmmakers were regarded as salesmen of their own selves who did not want 'to over-sale or to under-sale themselves'[18]. Therefore, a pitching of a film relates to a certain way of performing and a way of presenting oneself, rather than presenting ideas. Filmmakers were advised to promote themselves by all available means.[19]

> You are more than just a filmmaker, you are your social media expert, you are your publicist, you are the person who is going to push your work out there. More than anybody else![20]
>
> Everything I'm trying to do as a producer, I'm just trying to add to the profile of my project. It makes people more likely to see it, it makes people more likely to invest in it. It adds to your credibility.[21]

Such self-management techniques aim at the optimisation and rationalisation of entrepreneurial life. Filmmakers were advised to demonstrate enthusiasm but also a

---

[18]   Research observations: film festival talk 'Pitch Training with Elliot Grove', at the Raindance Film Festival 2017.

[19]   Research observations: film festival talk 'Short Films', at the Raindance Film Festival 2017.

[20]   *Ibid*.

[21]   Research observations: film festival talk 'From Festivals to Awards', at the Raindance Film Festival 2017.

self-discipline: those virtues would lead them to professional achievements.[22] Hence, transformation of self is a central goal of entrepreneurial careers.

5.2.4 'I'm where I am because I'm a fighter'[23]

The entrepreneurial filmmakers showed strong commitment to their profession. They remained dedicated to their work in the face of all difficulties.[24] They presented their careers as a kind of permanent battle against restrictions relating to disadvantageous working conditions in the film industry.

> I just attack everything. You fight, you have to fight to survive! It's tough, tough, competitive business! (Anna, 2018)

> You are fighting, and you are trying to get your career on, and you are trying to make better stuff all the time. (Matthew, 2018)

In these interview excerpts, the research participants used the metaphor of battle for representing the enterprise sector (Lakoff and Johnsen, 1980). This metaphor differentiates the entrepreneurial discourse: the notion of fighting was repeated in many interview texts. The interviewees understood and talked about the enterprise sector in terms of battle. Film entrepreneurs fight with each other in order to win in the competition; other filmmakers are opponents

---

[22] Bröckling argues that 'self-help' psychology books examine antagonistic strategies such as 'rational' and 'charismatic form of self-control' (2016: 34). He writes: 'On the one hand, the entrepreneurial self should be a calculating administrator of its own life, on the other hand a source of motivational energy, untiringly striving for new achievements, and a firework spitting out innovative ideas. There is an obvious contradiction in this demand to optimise self-discipline and enthusiasm all at once' (2016: 34).

[23] Anna (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 03 April 2018, Colchester.

[24] For a more detailed analysis of filmmakers' experiences of inequalities, see chapter four.

who are attacked by them. The discourse shows how the interviewees conceive the sector and how they act according to their conceiving (*ibid.*: 5). The metaphorical expression structures entrepreneurial activity of filmmakers. They should acquire the qualities of strength, tenacity, and resilience in order to fight for their place in the sector.

Some interviewees argued that they had to make sacrifices in their careers. Their professional success was exchangeable for a series of withdrawals from their life. For instance, Anna (2018) argued that there is 'a big big price to pay' for an opportunity to do filmmaking. She recounted how relationships with her family had collapsed because she 'gave so much of her life to her work'. She argued that documentary work required her to spend a lot of time away from home and that work could not be combined with family commitments. Matthew (2018) told how he sold his business, and changed where he lived, in order to start a filmmaking career in London. He said:

> I sold my businesses and I moved to London. I was in Birmingham at that time. And I just threw myself into the documentary world. So, I went to every documentary screening, every documentary class and just to start teaching myself documentary and how to make it. (Matthew, 2018)

This interview excerpt shows that commitment and initiativeness are the qualities of appropriate conduct at filmmaking work. Matthew wanted to realize himself in documentary filmmaking and therefore committed himself utterly to this activity. The documentarian modified his conduct to achieve perfection: he did everything he could to acquire knowledge and skills needed for documentary filmmaking. He finished his

previous career by selling his businesses and moving to London. Thus, the interview excerpt demonstrates how a subject govern themselves: they are fully committed workers intensifying their efforts 'to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality' (Foucault, 1997a: 225).

The filmmakers discussed adaptive capacity as a main component of successful filmmaking careers. Freddie (2018) argued that there were many job opportunities for filmmakers who could accommodate themselves to uncertainty.

> There are a lot of [opportunities] out there, you just have to not stop filming on yourself and you not stop putting your work out… I sort of feel like it's all there… but you have to grab it. You can't just block up and expect that it will be given to you. You have to chase it. You have to be really really passionate and you have to sacrifice quite a lot, you know, your time and your energy to do it. But it's possible. (Freddie, 2018)

The interviewee made assumptions that there are many job opportunities in the industry and that those opportunities are available for those who wish to have them strongly. Freddie made assumptions about what exists and what is possible. He stated implicitly that being 'passionate' and being able to 'sacrifice quite a lot' are desirable and valuable qualities for film workers. Thus, this interview excerpt plays an ideological role in assuming that a lot of opportunities exist and in making certain personal qualities valuable. His assumptions create a certain version of a 'common ground' (Fairclough, 2003: 56). This common ground relates to an idea that entrepreneurial filmmaking is a fair world where everyone are given their due based on their contributions.

A film-festival speaker discussed resilience and adaptability as crucial virtues for documentarians in the following excerpt:

> You kind of make yourself available to all sorts of things. And the beauty of documentary is that it gives you lots and lots of different skills. I'm a producer of documentary television, and also fiction, and also, I'm a director and producer in documentary advertisements... We've got to be flexible and adaptable.[25]

In this passage, the filmmaker demonstrated the form of resilience that consists in an ability to adapt to the disadvantageous environment and changes (Chandler, 2016). The entrepreneurial filmmaker perceived changes as 'a necessary facilitator of self-knowledge, self-growth, and self-transformation' (*ibid*.: 14). Resilience, as it is at issue here, is the capacity to accept the uncertainty of the work environment and to transform that uncertainty into own good. Such resilience, together with a certain flexibility, are 'sustainable responses to threats and dangers posed by its environment' (Chandler & Reid, 2016: 1). Scharff presents the surviving of difficulties as a central part of the formation of the entrepreneurial, self-managing subject (2016: 113-114). Sennett argues that 'pursuit of flexibility has produced new structures of power and control', namely 'the concentration of power without centralisation of power' (1998: 47, 55). He discusses 'flexible specialisation' of contemporary economic production that aims at continuous changing in response to customers' demands. Workers are required to be flexible in their conduct in order to fit this form of production, and that results in 'discontinuous reinvention of institutions' (*ibid*.: 47).

---

[25]   Research observations: film festival talk 'Using Your Skills to Pay the Bills', at the Open City Documentary Festival 2017.

The interviewees maintained that the main reason for resilience and tenacity related to 'pleasure in work' (Donzelot, 1991) or 'passionate work' (McRobbie, 2016). The filmmakers were passionate about their creative, enjoyable work. Anna (2018) contrasted her filmmaking to 'working in a bloody bank'. She commented in the interview:

> I think it's just a tough, demanding industry. And the reason we all go into it is we are creative, we really enjoy working in it, it's much more exciting than working in a bloody bank! (Anna, 2018)

Matthew (2018) told a story of making a film that he was passionate about but for which he was not paid properly:

> I did a film about [<some subject>]. The budget for that was £10,000. And I spent months doing it. So, if I worked and got paid per day for that, it was probably less than minimum wage. But it's something that I believe in and passionate about. And because I'm doing TV, it freezes me up to do these things, where there is not a lot of money, but you have a lot more artistic freedom to make something than when you are doing TV. (Matthew, 2018)

Existing research holds that entrepreneurs assign a crucial significance to their commitment to their work (Dean & Ford, 2016). Entrepreneurs do not aim purely at economic growth but aim also to follow their passions (*ibid*.: 12). Entrepreneurial activity in the creative sector acquires a double meaning in terms of commitment because creative work is endowed with passionate qualities too (McRobbie, 2016). Eikhof and Haunschild argue that 'bohemian entrepreneurs' in the theatre sector combine an idea of 'art for art's sake' with an entrepreneurial notion of self-discipline

(2006: 236). They point out that there is 'amalgamation' of the conflicting discourses of, respectively, art and business (*ibid*.: 235). McRobbie (2016) examines small fashion businesses that are characterised by shared ideas of commitment and 'romance of work' (*ibid*.: 42). She argues that 'passionate work' results in refusal from labour movement achievements. Creative entrepreneurs are genuinely committed to their jobs and reject stable employment and welfare protection. McRobbie considers 'passionate work' as a success of neoliberal forms of governmentality. Chandler and Reid argue that the resilient subject enslaves herself/himself to the world (2016: 2). The neoliberal subject is 'a resilient, humble, and disempowered being that lives a life of permanent ignorance and insecurity' (*ibid*.: 3). Chandler and Reid criticise their willingness to adapt to uncertainty and to the 'unknowability' of the world by being resilient (*ibid*.: 3). By adapting to insecurity, the neoliberal subject transforms and disciplines herself. She/he accepts the world without changing it. Chandler and Reid write:

> The psychic or inner life of the subject, and the social milieus through which it is seen to be constructed and influenced, become the sphere of transformation in order to develop the faculties of resilience and adaptive efficiency held to be necessary to respond to external environments more securely. (*ibid*.: 5)

5.2.5 'It's a bit alarming not knowing that I have a salary coming every month'[26]

The interviewees acknowledged the uncertainty of their independent entrepreneurial activity and referred to their capacity to bear high risks. They argued

---

[26]   Susanne (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 23 October 2017, London.

that the uncertainty was caused by a shortage of available funds for independent companies.[27] The filmmakers discussed the financial struggles of their enterprise functioning. The interviewee's comment below illustrate this issue.

> [In large film companies and broadcasters], people are sort of taking care of, in terms of you have food, safe place to work, you are paid properly. Whereas if you are doing a documentary [in a small enterprise], you might be spending hours and hours researching or filming, and you have limited funds. It's hard work, you have to do all kind of arranging... I found it's really difficult. (Emily, 2018)

The entrepreneurial filmmakers took a proactive stand on their companies' financial prosperity by being ingenious and showing initiative. They found various resources to subsidise their enterprises. Those resources included income from further jobs (in commercial filmmaking, education, hospitality, advertising, law and in other area). They took all financial and social risks of their independent entrepreneurial activity and demonstrated a capacity to deal with its contingencies. There were no limits that they would not be able to overcome in achieving their entrepreneurial goals.

Emily (2018) was an entrepreneurial filmmaker who struggled to find sponsorship for her filmmaking. She was determined to make self-funded documentaries, despite the financial difficulties. She accepted the risks and sought solutions to the consequent problems. That is, she took jobs in the media and hospitality sectors in order to sponsor her filmmaking. Moreover, she started a further

---

[27]   For a more detailed analysis of available film funding, see chapter three.

company, which sold sound and visual equipment, and invested its surplus into her film company. She said:

> When I started doing filmmaking business, my original plan was to sale cameras and to use the revenues from selling cameras to then make video content. Because I didn't have any financial backing, and I didn't have also access to any rich kind of family backing. So, I did it all by myself. So, the first year I sell cameras and then used some of that money. And I also worked in advertising, so I used my own wages to kind of make it up… I did social media, reception work. I was also performing; I was in the Secret cinema. I was still acting and dancing. Working in bars, I was waitressing. I just worked all the time. I made some corporate films for people as well. I did self-shooting, made some videos for people. (Emily, 2018)

This interview excerpt shows how the research participant managed risks of the profession. Emily developed a capacity for multitasking and hard work: she worked in various cultural industries in order to keep on filmmaking. The interviewee transformed herself through those actions in order to be a successful filmmaker (Foucault, 1997a: 225). The interview excerpt demonstrated that time should be arranged into 'labour time' and 'individuals must be subjugated to the production cycle' (Lemke, 2012: 83). The participant revealed in the interview how to govern herself better. Emily acquired those attributes – being committed and taking risks – and thereby improved her conduct at work.

Ben (2017) was an entrepreneurial filmmaker who discussed his experience of bearing risks in his independent film business. He worked on multiple jobs to get funding for his company. He said:

My [business] partner got a job at a film company, in development, it
was a special paid internship, for like three months and writing scripts
and things like that. I was doing all kinds of things like teaching, film
stuff or doing anything to get extra money. It takes two or three years to
make the company financially successful. It was a combination of us
doing other jobs to support ourselves. And then we would do small
things like tiny documentary commissions for Channel 4, like three
minutes long and they would pay you £12,000 or £16,000 – I can't
remember now – to make four films that they would run on Channel 4,
Monday to Thursday after the news, three minutes films. So, we had a
few of those, and they paid you very well. But we had some of those
music videos. We made promotional films for film school. All kinds of
things just to bring some money in while developing some bigger ideas.
(Ben, 2017)

This interview excerpt demonstrates how the modern forms of government operate.
Government facilitates individual responsibility of workers who take all economic
and social risks. The interviewee showed how he started his filmmaking enterprise:
he took various jobs in order to make his company financially sustainable. He showed
a lot of initiative to achieve his goal. His initiatives involved various risks – financial,
professional, and social – that were taken enthusiastically by the interviewee. Thus,
this excerpt demonstrates how modern forms of government encourages 'privatized
risk-management' (Lemke, 2012: 84).

Susanne (2017) was an entrepreneurial director/producer who invested her
savings into her film business. She had a well-paid corporate job that subsidised her
filmmaking.

> I kept my full-time job and I continued to make films on the side.
>
> Because I had a good job, I could afford to go to the film festivals, I
>
> could take annual leaves, and I could rent a camera and do stuff. So, I
>
> made short films. And one of them got a Scotland nomination. And all
>
> of these things were literally funded by myself. It also meant that I
>
> didn't go through all of these schemes that people normally go through
>
> when they come out of film school. (Susanne, 2017)

This interview excerpt demonstrates that the research participant commits herself completely to the filmmaking profession. The interviewee talked about her experience of filming on weekends and annual leaves while keeping a job in the law industry. This corporate job allowed Susanne to take risks of documentary filmmaking. The interview excerpt shows how neoliberal forms of government manufacture the entrepreneurial subject. She is an active subject who is dedicated completely to her work. Her enthusiasm and inventiveness permit herself to take high risks of the documentary filmmaking profession.

According to recent studies, entrepreneurial activity involves taking high risks and bearing uncertainty (Bröckling, 2016: 72). Entrepreneurs are required to be able to deal with any possible contingencies of life and work (*ibid*.: 71-73). There are uncertainties that can be predicted and 'pure uncertainties' that cannot (*ibid*.: 72). The latter type of uncertainty results in 'leading finally to the speciation of the entrepreneur' (*ibid*.: 72). The entrepreneur takes responsibility for bearing all uncertainties by following 'the logic of *pushing back limits* and *outdoing*' (*ibid*.: 77). Dean regards risk-taking technology as 'the new prudentialism' that endows individuals with 'multiple responsibilisation' (2010: 194-196). He distinguishes between 'active citizens' who take full responsibility for taking risks and the 'targeted

population' who are marginalised individuals 'at risk' (*ibid*.: 195). McRobbie argues that 'the high-risk career pathways […] are also normalised across the new cultural industries' (McRobbie, 2016: 76 quoted in Christiaens, 2019: 4). Scharff's study of entrepreneurial musicians indicates that embracing risks is a part of a neoliberal presentation of the self as a business (2016: 113). She points out that risk-bearing is consistent with a 'positive thinking' tendency integrated into neoliberal governmentality (*ibid*.: 113). Sennett argues that the flexibility of contemporary production demands that workers place the risks of their work upon themselves (1998: 76-97). He claims that risk is 'normal and ordinary' in many workplaces (*ibid*.: 81). He writes: 'Risk is to become a daily necessity shouldered by the masses' (*ibid*.: 80).

5.3   Class and gender in film production enterprises

The interviewees with entrepreneurial persona produced different discourses about class and gender in film production enterprises. The interviewed filmmakers created their enterprises in response to being – as they saw matters, at least – marginalised within the industry.[28] They are 'innovative, creative destroyers' of the existing film industry (Bröckling, 2016: xvi). They sought to create a new, more auspicious work environment in their independent enterprises. In what follows, I focus upon the aforementioned interpretations of how class and gender operate in independent enterprises. The first discourse considers an empowering potential of enterprises for marginalised filmmakers (both in terms of class and gender). That

---

[28]   This chapter focuses upon interviewees who become entrepreneurs in response to marginalisation. There are other scenarios of becoming entrepreneurs – for example, opportunism. See more in Wiener (2004).

discourse presents independent film enterprises as meritocratic and inclusive initiatives. The interviewees argued that everyone has the capacity to become entrepreneurs regardless of their social positions. The second discourse instrumentalises marginalised experiences for enterprise purposes. My interlocutors argued that marginalised filmmakers mattered to enterprise development, as long as they were able to attract new audiences and to generate profit. The third discourse considers marginalised filmmakers as a threat to business interests. The marginalised experiences were discussed by the interviewees as limitations for the financial prosperity of film enterprises. The following three sections discuss the discourses produced by the entrepreneurial filmmakers interviewed for this study.

5.3.1 'It doesn't matter if you are a man or a woman, a gay or a straight, whatever. Let's do the deal!'[29]

The discourse regards entrepreneurial filmmaking activity as empowering for marginalised individuals (both in terms of class and gender). The entrepreneurial filmmakers argued, in effect, that their enterprises created an egalitarian working environment that was accessible for marginalised filmmakers. Unlike the film industry, the independent enterprise sector was socially inclusive: it accepted anyone who was willing to be independent, creative and committed. The entrepreneurial work did not have any limitations because it aimed at the purely economic exchange. One interviewee said, of being an entrepreneur, that:

> It's definitely easier, if you are in control of it [the business]. In terms of
> any kind of deals you have to negotiate with people. I don't think

---

[29] Emily (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 21 March 2018, Colchester.

people actually mind if you come to the table and you really make something. For them, it's like a job is a job. (Emily, 2018)

This interview excerpt comprises an assumption about filmmakers' professional conduct. This assumption is 'triggered' by the verb 'think' (Fairclough, 2003: 56). Emily formulated the assumption as follows: 'I don't think people actually mind if you come to the table and you really make something. For them, it's like a job is a job.' Emily's utterance reveals that everyone can succeed in the profession: she assumed that filmmakers support works of others. The excerpt presents the ideas of fairness and transparency within the enterprise sector as 'taken as given' (Fairclough, 2003: 55). The idea of 'a job is a job' was supported by other considerations related to the increasing accessibility of filmmaking technologies. Nowadays, filmmakers did not have to belong to, or be connected with, socially privileged groups. Their filmmaking ideas were what matter in the independent enterprise sector.

Ben (2017) had similar ideas. He argued that the independent enterprise sector was egalitarian. He remarked that his professional network included many marginalised filmmakers. He himself had a working-class background. According to his account, his entrepreneurial career brought him opportunities that were not available in well-established film institutions. He said:

I've never worked with a kind of comfortable middle-class person in a senior position on a film. I've always worked with quite a variety of people. I worked a lot with women directors. [<name>] who I worked with in documentaries, I supposed he is a working-class [filmmaker]. I met him at [the] film school, he is from the north [of England]. The documentary film [<title>] had three directors, two women and a man. And then [<name>] who is a black British. So, I've worked with a

variety of people… I think I haven't worked on the BBC or even

Channel 4. I think Channel 4 is obviously more representative than the

BBC, but still, there is a certain type of person that gets works at

broadcasters or institutions. I haven't formed the network from being at

one of those places. […] I haven't really been in that world particularly.

I've always been independent, I suppose, and I've always been over the

places. So, you just meet more genuinely independent… you just meet a

wider variety of people [in the enterprise sector]. (Ben, 2017)

This interviewee shared his personal experience of working in the enterprise

sector. He argued that, in the enterprise sector, he worked with the colleagues

from diverse social backgrounds and provided examples of his documentary

film crews. Ben contrasted discursively the enterprise sector with the film

industry and positioned himself in the former. The excerpt shows a repeated

pattern in the discourse: the interviewee did not work for broadcasters but did

work for independent sector. In the last sentence of the excerpt, the

interviewee universalized his personal experience and made a conclusion

about the enterprise sector as a whole: 'you just meet more genuinely

independent… you just meet a wider variety of people [in the enterprise

sector]'. Thus, universalization of personal experience disregards the issues of

inclusivity and diversity: the entrepreneurial discourse hides inequalities and

reproduces their social effects. Universalization of particular experiences

aims at 'achieving and maintaining dominance' (Fairclough, 2003: 58). This

discursive pattern strengthens existing power relations in the documentary

film sector.

Emily (2018) too shared her ideas on the social diversity of the entrepreneurial

world. She argued that she was unable to make a career within the established film

industry. She lacked social connections and experienced sexism. These are the reasons she started her own company. She commented as follows on the world of independent filmmaking.

> It's great for women, or transgender people, or people slightly on the margin, who were not able to tell their stories. Also, Black and ethnic minority filmmakers. These funding and things are coming through. I think it is changing. (Emily, 2018)

In this interview excerpt, Emily, again, made an assumption about the enterprise sector. She claimed that the enterprise sector is diverse and inclusive. As she put it, documentarians 'on the margin' – from ethnic minorities, women documentarians and documentarians identified as transgender – received funding and opportunities in the enterprise sector. The interviewee presented this idea as 'taken as given' (Fairclough, 2003: 55). She created a 'common ground' by assuming the diversity and inclusivity of the enterprise world (*ibid.*: 55). The interviewee used implicitness to make persuasive her vision of the enterprise sector and inclusivity.

My interviewees considered social diversity as not a limitation for entrepreneurial activity, but rather as an essential component for developing film enterprises. They held that being from a minority was an advantage in the independent enterprise sector because it helped the person to show resilience and determination. For instance, Anna (2018) argued that marginalised filmmakers were positioned twice as 'fighters'. Their social disadvantages required them to be adaptive and committed. They became better entrepreneurs than their socially privileged counterparts. She said:

> But the ones that come from much poorer backgrounds... One of the people that I mentored, and he is now really successful, he was living in a port for about six months. It doesn't sound good. He couldn't afford to live... Another girl was sleeping on the floor of the office to get themselves going. With that level of dedication, you know those kids are going to be good. Because they really really want. So, we really really have to help them. And not because that is right: because they are fighting to get in. I love them! […] I really like them because they have to fight so hard and they are really tenacious. And I think the only way you are going to survive and do well in telly is if you've got a combination of talent and tenacity. Those are the people I tend to pull and help, I like them better. (Anna, 2018)

In this interview excerpt, the research participant represented what filmmakers from marginalised background do. Those filmmakers were homeless because their filmmaking jobs did not supply enough income. However, those filmmakers showed strong commitment to the profession and did not leave it for seeking better opportunities. The interview excerpt includes explicit evaluation of the qualities of tenacity and dedication. Anna showed that those qualities are valuable and desirable; she said: 'I love them!', 'I really like them', 'I like them better'. Moreover, the interviewee made an 'existential assumption' that those qualities are essential for working in in the film sector (Fairclough, 2003: 56). She said: 'I think the only way you are going to survive and do well in telly is if you've got a combination of talent and tenacity'. Thus, Anna universalized the particular qualities of workers. The assumption translates meanings that are taken for granted: those meaning are not questionable. The assumption plays an ideological role because it sustains power relations (Fairclough, 2003: 58).

In his study of neoliberal government, Dean (2010) discusses a shift in contemporary governmentality. That shift is epitomised by the famous claim by Margaret Thatcher that, 'There is no such thing as society' (*ibid*.: 177).[30] The statement presents a neoliberal rationality according to which there is no social reciprocity nor accountability, but rather there are individual freedoms and responsibilities (*ibid*.: 179). The neoliberal rationality insists on enhancing autonomous entities who are free to exercise their agency. Dean argues that facilitating agency is a technology of neoliberal government (*ibid*.: 196-197). 'The technologies of agency' are often actualised on disadvantaged subjects or 'targeted populations, i.e. populations that manifest high risk' (*ibid*.: 196). Dean writes:

> Victims of crime, smokers, abused children, gay men, intravenous drug users, the unemployed, indigenous people and so on are all subject to these technologies of agency, the object being to transform their status, to make them active citizens capable, as individuals and communities, of managing their own risk. (Dean, 2010: 196-197 quoted in Chandler & Reid, 2016: 11).

Dean discusses the development of professional services that equip 'the targeted populations' with instruments of transforming them into 'active citizens' (2010: 198-199). Chandler argues that discourses of empowerment and emancipation are the neoliberal rhetoric that induces vulnerable subjects and is produced by them (2016: 15-16). It suggests that each person is responsible for their own independence and

---

[30] Let me quote Thatcher more fully: 'They are casting their problems at society. And, you know, there's no such thing as society. There are individual men and women and there are families. And no government can do anything except through people, and people must look after themselves first. It is our duty to look after ourselves and then, also, to look after our neighbours' (Keay, 1987).

creativity or lack of those things, in both work and life. This neoliberal logic is characterised by a lack of consistent reflexivity on social structures (*ibid.*: 16). Scharff argues that non-entrepreneurial subjectivities are seen as abject ones because the subjects must become entrepreneurs regardless of whether that is feasible for them (2016: 108). Scharff's study of classical musicians indicates that there is a 'repudiations of vulnerability under neoliberalism' (*ibid.*: 114). For instance, musicians are required to conceal any work-related injuries. The musicians say that they fear they would be deemed unreliable and hence would fail to obtain employment, were they to display any injury. '[T]he entrepreneurial self only has itself to blame if something goes wrong' (*ibid.*: 115). On the other hand, 'appropriate self-management' spells success with the classical music profession (*ibid.*: 115). McNay argues that 'irresponsible self-management' results in experiencing social disadvantages, and the entrepreneurial subject does not regard those disadvantages as structural problems (2009: 64). McNay writes: 'the poor are stigmatised as the "other" of the responsible, autonomous citizen' (*ibid.*: 64). Brown writes on the same matter, as follows (2003: 42–3).

> [T]he rationally calculating individual bears full responsibility for the consequences of his or her action no matter how severe the constraints on this action—for example, lack of skills, education, and child care in a period of high unemployment and limited welfare benefits. Correspondingly, a 'mismanaged life', the neoliberal appellation for failure to navigate impediments to prosperity, becomes a new mode of depoliticising social and economic powers and at the same time reduces political citizenship to an unprecedented degree of passivity and political complacency. (Brown, 2003: 42-43).

5.3.2 'Why don't I package a project based around the underrepresented groups within the film industry [. .] to attract finance?'[31]

The sentence that I use to entitle this section encapsulates a further discourse about class and about gender: this discourse instrumentalises marginalised filmmakers for entrepreneurial purposes. Diverse voices matter for enterprise development because those voices are engaged with new stories and new audiences. The interviewees presented the commercial rationale of including diverse stories into filmmaking. Their utilitarian view regarded perspectives brought by marginalised people as valuable only if they aimed at maximising enterprises' happiness, or in other words, increasing profit. The commercial rationale for bringing diverse voices to filmmaking aligns with the utility maximisation and economisation of life that characterise neoliberal governmentality.

Entrepreneurs aim to optimise and maximise the benefits of their activity. They are governed by calculative self-interest: they seek to increase their productivity and to achieve valuable results. In pursuing that aim, they employ all available resources, including marginalised filmmakers. The entrepreneurs regarded the marginalised filmmakers as a business asset rather than a business risk. The marginalised workers could contribute to enterprise functioning by engaging new audiences. The following excerpt illustrates the commercial rationale behind bringing working-class people to filmmaking.

> The film industry is so overwhelming with people with these expensive
> media degrees, so the fact that you're a reconstruction worker put you

---

[31] Research observations: film festival talk 'From Festivals to Awards', at the Raindance Film Festival 2017.

in a very rare category and makes people more interested: how the

reconstruction worker could possibly make a film?[32]

One interviewee attributed the working-class background to characteristics of novelty

and wonderment. He argued that working-class filmmakers have high economic value

for film production businesses. He said:

> I think people are seeing the value of that [working-class] kind of
>
> background and the value of someone like him [a working-class
>
> filmmaker] and realising that that could bring something to your
>
> company, that will help the company and not to be a risk for the
>
> company. (Alex, 2018)

This interviewee represented working-class filmmakers from a particular perspective.

Alex talked about working-class documentarians in economic terms, terms that assess

economic value and economic risks. This excerpt represents working-class

backgrounds as a valuable commodity that 'bring[s] something' to filmmaking

enterprises. Working-class documentarians are resources that are useful for achieving

entrepreneurial goals. Alex argued further that it is important to consider the interests

of audiences and prevent their boredom:

> I recognised that the audience wanted different kinds of voices in
>
> making programmes. And if you don't do that, you just keep [having]
>
> the same kinds of programmes, and the audience gets bored quickly.
>
> (Alex, 2018)

---

[32] Research observations: film festival talk 'Pitch Training with Elliot Grove', at the
Raindance Film Festival 2017.

In this interview excerpt, the research participant made an assumption about the audience. The assumption is 'triggered' by the verb 'recognise' (Fairclough, 2003: 56). Alex assumed that 'the audience wanted different kinds of voices' and 'gets bored quickly'. The interviewee articulated ideas about audiences and aimed to make those meanings widely shared and common. Alex had significant resources to transform those meanings into a 'common ground' (*ibid.*: 55). For example, he had class and gender privileges that allowed him to receive funding and opportunities in the sector. Another interviewee said that marginalised filmmakers brought 'important perspectives' to film production businesses. He commented:

> I made a film for Channel 4 and the commissioning editor was Asian,
> and he was one of very very few people – you can say – was not
> standard white Caucasian on Channel 4. So, he got a job at the BBC.
> And from talking to him, I realised his job is very very difficult
> because, it's inevitable, he is in a very small minority of people. So, he
> tended to have a different perspective but a very important perspective,
> which was not given the way it should have been. (Leo, 2018)

Matthew (2018) pointed out that a marginalised filmmaker was 'able to make a better film' than others. According to him, it was valuable for the enterprise development. He said:

> In documentary, you naturally go and find your world. You know the
> first documentary I made was about this music, it happened in the
> 1980s because I was involved in that. So, you get people to go out and
> reflect their experience. You don't want to be just full of middle-class
> white guys. You need to go and find other people who can then go and
> reflect on their experience. And, also, if you are going to make a film

about certain areas and certain people and you come from that area, you

should be able to make a better film. (Matthew, 2018)

In this interview excerpt, the research participant made an argument. Argument structure includes a claim, grounds, and warrants (Fairclough, 2003: 81). The claim of Matthew can be formulated as follows: filmmakers from marginalised backgrounds make better films than others. Matthew's grounds are his first experience of making a documentary about music: his experience provides evidence that supports his claim. Warrants are assumptions that justify the connection between the claim and grounds. Matthew articulated the warrants explicitly: documentary films cover a variety of topics and this variety brings individuals from the variety of backgrounds into documentary film production.

5.3.3 'The audience doesn't care who made it: they see the programme'[33]

Some entrepreneurial filmmakers produced discourse that regards marginalised experiences as limitations for film production enterprises. According to some interviewees, marginalised filmmakers were restrictions for financial prosperity of businesses because they did not expand audiences or increase profit. According to their views, marginalised filmmakers produced films of a low quality. On the other hand, film entrepreneurs were very keen to improve the quality of their filmmaking and to involve new audiences. According to those filmmakers, audiences were demanding about the quality of films. The film enterprises were obliged to meet their high demands. As one interviewee put it, 'the level of filming is so high, the quality

---

[33]   Alex (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 8 October 2018, London.

that people want is just going mad' (Freddie, 2018). Although the film entrepreneurs

lamented underrepresentation, they put profit first.

Alex (2018) had a view about prioritising quality over justice in filmmaking.

He argued that few film companies produced high-quality content. He referred to the

importance to produce only 'successful programmes' among audiences. He said:

> If you are commissioning editor, you want to be commissioning
>
> successful programmes that really well made. And in the documentary
>
> world, there are not that many companies who are really good. It's very
>
> hard thing to do well. Possibly there are maybe twenty companies who
>
> you know and actually deliver really well. (Alex, 2018)

In this excerpt, the interviewee made an excuse for disregarding questions of

inclusivity. He argued that filmmakers have to make their companies successful and

financially stable. The interviewee held that hiring strong talents is essential for

enterprise's prosperity. Also, Alex made an assumption that the majority of companies

and filmmakers do not make good documentaries: 'It's very hard thing to do well.'

Alex furthered that work by marginalised filmmakers would tend to be received

poorly by audiences. His argument was based on making a misguided assumption that

marginalised filmmakers produced low-quality filmmaking.

> It's very hard for a commissioning editor just to take a programme,
>
> which is not very good, and just say: 'Well, at least, it was not someone
>
> who we normally worked with [in terms of workforce diversity].' The
>
> audience doesn't care who made it: they see the programme. (Alex,
>
> 2018)

In this excerpt, the interviewee repeated his assumption that filmmakers from diverse backgrounds do films of a poor quality. He articulated explicitly this idea by representing the voice of a commissioning editor. Alex made a second assumption about the audience: 'the audience doesn't care who made it'. These ideas guided his decisions as a commissioning editor and a film enterprise director. He said that he was wary of making decisions that were 'bad for the business'.

> When you are running a company, you have to balance… the pressure on you do not make mistakes and lose money because it's bad for the business. You are never feeling confident, so you are constantly being quite conservative in your judgements and your decisions. And so, it was hard to make a decision [to include marginalised filmmakers] that you thought could damage the company simply because it was the right thing to do. (Alex, 2018)

In this excerpt, Alex repeated his excuse for neglecting diversity. The interviewee claimed that appealing to inclusivity is a 'mistake', which would 'damage the company' and 'lose money'. Thus, Alex's discourse – characterised by repeated patterns of making excuses and assumptions – produces effects of social exclusion. Foucault's idea about discourse as social practice is relevant here: the documentarian used discourse in order 'to *do* things' (Gill, 2000b: 175).

Another interviewee, George (2018), distinguished between 'the right thing to do' and 'the best thing to do'. He argued that doing the right thing, in the form of diversifying a company's workforce, would damage the company's interests and thus was not the 'the best thing to do'. The entrepreneurial decisions were based on

commercial considerations that were 'the best' for film businesses. In a highly competitive market, good-quality filmmaking determined the survival of film enterprises. And – like Alex – George held that marginalised filmmakers produced films that were of a low quality and hence commercially unviable. He described the decision-making process at his company as follows.

> We [the people within the film enterprise] tend to be very project focused. So, the project is on the table, and we are all discussing [it]. We don't automatically say that we must have somebody that fits all other criteria [of the workforce diversity]. We just look at who is available and say: 'Okay, that's the best person for this particular thing'. And at the end, somebody says: 'Hey, perhaps, we should look a little deeper into that and ensure somebody… is socially aware or from a different kind of background'. I think it's a quite tricky area to pressurize, when your survival depends on the programming. To be socially conscious is one thing, but to be forcing that consciousness on your peers because that's what you feel is the right thing to do, rather than the best thing to do… it's difficult there. (George, 2018)

He gave an example of making a hiring decision that was based on considerations about the quality of filmmaking, rather than the workforce diversity. It involved hiring a filmmaker from the University of Oxford in order to make a documentary about New Guinea.

> We don't have that policy to say we must have somebody who [meets criteria of the diversity of the workforce]. When I was doing some anthropological thing in New Guinea, I would not look to necessarily for somebody who is from New Guinea, but I'd look for somebody who

> has knowledge about this part of the world. If that person happens to go
>
> to Oxford, I would not ignore them because I'm trying to balance class.
>
> I would look at the qualities as the individual. (George, 2018)

In these excerpts, the interviewee presented his views on inclusivity and diversity. He said that his filmmaking company did not consider diversity in their hiring decisions. As he put it, 'We don't automatically say that we must have somebody that fits all other criteria [of the workforce diversity]'. In the first interview excerpt, the research participant used a simulated dialogue to represent how hiring decisions were made in his company. They chose 'available' employees who were 'the best [. .] for this particular thing'. George represented directly the critical voice of some people advocating for diversity. George used the quotation that he attributed vaguely to 'somebody'. He continued saying that diversity 'pressurize' filmmaking enterprises. Thus, he made an excuse for neglecting diversity by referring to economic conditions of enterprise functioning. The interviewee made an assumption that documentary filmmakers from diverse backgrounds would not help for the 'survival' of the enterprise. In his discourse, the interviewee construed documentarians from diverse backgrounds as economically inefficient workers. Hence, his discourse contributed to exclusion and discrimination of filmmakers from diverse backgrounds.

The quality management is a nature of the entrepreneurial activity (Bröckling, 2016: 147-169). The entrepreneurs improve permanently the quality of their enterprises' goods to succeed in a competitive market. They rely on customers' views on desired quality. Therefore, the quality is voluntary defined and redefined by particular situations (*ibid.*: 148). Investigating 'the quality imperative', Bröckling examines techniques of governing and self-governing embodied in various literature on quality control and feedback (*ibid.*: 148-166). The literature suggests that business

success is achievable by transforming its employees into entrepreneurs who, as such, seek always to improve the quality of their work (*ibid*.: 148). The 'quality specialists' regard satisfying customers as a main goal of their work; and that affects their subjectivities and discourses (*ibid*.: 149). Bröckling argues that entrepreneurs must internalise market mechanism, else they will not survive (*ibid*.: 150). He claims further that the typology of provider and customer is imported into relations within companies: 'within the company everyone is everyone else's customer' (*ibid*.: 152). He (*ibid*.: 159-166) provides a useful comparison of permanent evaluation of the quality of works of employees by other employees with panopticon examined by Foucault (1995). Work relations based upon so-called 'all-round evaluation' have that premise that all employees are comparable with one another regardless of their social characteristics. Bröckling argues that '[q]uality as value bestows privilege' (*ibid*.: 147). The feedback system applies the same requirements to everyone. These requirements align with the commercial interests of enterprises that make employees 'useful' to companies (*ibid*.: 162). The entrepreneurial regime requires employees to develop into an 'ideal model' of a fully responsible and competitive worker who satisfies customers' demands and increases profit (*ibid*.: 164-165).

5.4 The replication of social inequalities within the work practices of film production enterprises

The sections that follow treat interviewee accounts of the working practices within film enterprises. I argue that the film entrepreneurs replicate, rather than depart from, the discriminatory working conditions of the wider or more established film industry. The entrepreneurs uphold exploitative working conditions in various ways: by offering short, fixed-term contracts and by relying upon unpaid work.

Entrepreneurial concern for excellence and perfection contribute to reproducing competition and inequalities. Thus, film entrepreneurs create a socially homogenous working environment in their enterprises. They do not transcend the limitations of the film industry, thereby replicating social exclusions. The next three sections present my findings about the employment characteristics in independent film production enterprises – for instance, precarity, overwork, competition, and unpaid work.

5.4.1 Employment in film production enterprises

The independent film enterprises that I studied were micro or small-sized companies that provided short fixed-term employment to their employees.[34] The film entrepreneurs worked on their own and hired freelancers on short, fixed-term contracts. Lack of available funding was the reason for those contracts.[35] The entrepreneurial filmmakers had limited project-oriented funds that did not cover all necessities for their filmmaking. Their production houses did not provide permanent positions to anyone including entrepreneurs. For instance, Emily (2018) affords an example of the financial constraints at issue. She closed her business while she took up her parental responsibilities because maintaining her film enterprise was a net cost that, when parenting, she could not afford. She would reopen her film enterprise when she returned from her maternity leave. She said:

> I've just closed that [<company>] down now because when you have a
> film company, if you are not making content, it is no point [to run the
> business]: you just keep paying out money for sort of tax and stuff. So,

---

[34] 'Micro-sized' enterprises are defined as those that employ up to ten people. 'Small-sized' enterprises have up to fifty employees.

[35] Chapter three gives details about the funding of films.

there is no point for me to keep it down. And I will restart it when I

finish maternity and my girl will get older. (Emily, 2018)

The film entrepreneurs gave freelance workers intermittent work. For instance, Anna (2018) worked with an assistant producer on a short film project. She hired a camera person for a few weeks too. The project-based funding of her enterprise did not cover other roles that were essential for the making of the film. Preproduction research was done by Anna without remuneration. Her comment below illustrates how things work.

Once I've got a commission, then I bring an assistant producer. And

then it's just me and AP [the assistant producer] would research the

whole film up and get ready to go. And then, only for the short period

time, I can afford a cameraman and a soundman. We go and shoot it.

And then I return to edit, just with the editor: I don't keep anyone else

on the board usually. So that's how it works. (Anna, 2018)

This interview excerpt demonstrates how the research participant managed herself and her enterprise. Anna talked about the ways that she organised her filmmaking business and administered her hiring decisions. The interviewee construed her work life as it was a result of her individual choices, 'choices made in furtherance of a biographical project of self-realization' (Rose, 1999: ix). However, her filmmaking enterprise encountered financial constraints that prevented her from employing new staff. The scarcity of funding required the interviewee to work with a handful of colleagues who joined her for a short period of time.

The form of employment on offer did not afford any employee benefits such as sick leave, paternity leave, retirement, vacation, and life insurance. The film

entrepreneurs argued that they were financially unable to provide these benefits. The entrepreneurial main concerns were rationalising and economising of their businesses. They aimed to optimise the allocation of resources in their production enterprises. Any consideration of employees' interests was irrational in terms of their businesses' goals. The following from Anna illustrates.

> If you break the rules and regulations [that aim at optimizing resources], it would harm the small companies. And the small companies are not earning enough from making television programmes – I can tell you that – [are not earning enough to] to be able to provide maternity leaves [and other employee benefits]. To all the young girls we are saying: 'We don't get maternity leaves for you to be able to have a family and work in telly'. And they are not going to have paid... very few of them will have paid maternity leaves. (Anna, 2018)

In this excerpt, the interviewee used language to make an excuse for disregarding employee benefits. Anna claimed that her small enterprise did not have enough funding and therefore could not afford to pay for employee benefits. She said that those benefits would 'harm small companies'. To make her representation persuasive, Anna universalized her experience and made a conclusion about the enterprise sector as a whole: as she put it, 'the small companies are not earning enough from making television programmes – I can tell you that'. The interviewee used repeatedly same clauses that construct unavailability of employee benefits in small filmmaking enterprises.

The financial restrictions of small independent production enterprises contribute to the precarity of employment that dominates the film industry.[36] The film entrepreneurs replicate the working conditions that they sought to escape. Employment in the independent enterprises is insecure, casual and lacks benefits. Therefore, film enterprises contribute to reproducing exploitative working conditions.

5.4.2 (Self-) exploitation in film production enterprises

Exploitation is 'a critical conception [. .] centred on systemic unjust advantage and suffering' (Hesmondhalgh, 2015: 80). According to Hesmondhalgh, sociological enquiry into the phenomenon of exploitation can brings new understandings to the Marxist concept (Cohen, 2009). Hesmondhalgh argues for developing an 'inclusive' conception of exploitation that comprises empirical meanings. He suggests that exploitative working conditions hinder the 'flourishing' of workers (*ibid*.). He examines exploitative features of cultural work that he summarises as 'overwork and associated emotions of anxiety and powerlessness, and high levels of risk and uncertainty' (*ibid*.: 84).

The interviewed film entrepreneurs recognised their work as exploitative and even as self-exploitative. They deemed overwork necessary if their company was to survive. And they worked long hours and they reported that they were exhausted from professional responsibilities that included research, socialising, and self-promotion. Their professional life required them to work 'as much as they can' (Matthew, 2018). And accordingly, the entrepreneurs demanded long working hours from their employees. The interviewees argued that if aspirants worked long hours for their

---

[36] For a more detailed analysis of precarious employment in the film industry, see chapter four.

businesses, they would succeed in the filmmaking profession. According to them, hard work and professional success were closely intertwined. One interviewee commented on this matter: 'It's very intense working with me… working just one-to-one with me is not everybody's ideal heaven' (Anna, 2018).

Unpaid work is common in the entrepreneurial world of filmmaking, and likewise in the conventional film industry.[37] My film entrepreneurs discussed their experiences of working for free – of, for instance, doing entire film projects without funding. They argued that their enterprises relied upon the exchange of unpaid favours with other filmmakers. For instance, Susanne (2017) commented on her filmmaking project as follows. 'I'm doing the documentary at the moment where have not got anybody who has funded' (Susanne, 2017). She asked her colleagues to do unpaid work for her and said that such work was common for the enterprise world.

> The last film I made was a short film. It was not film that I planned. I was on the recce [a preproduction visit to a film location] and I jumbled across the story and I had a camera with me, and I just built a guerrilla-style. I did it with a friend of mine who I went to film school with. There were two of us and then we came back… and it was a friend of mine and then I came back and I called another friend of mine who was a sound designer and he did [the] sound design. And I called another friend of mine who was an actor to do my voice. So really, I just use my network. The film that I'm doing now – same. He is a friend of mine who lives in the country that I'm looking for filming and we know some of the people who are contributors. So, we just did filming in

---

[37] For a more detailed analysis of the unpaid work done by filmmakers, see chapter four.

> [<the city>] and I just called somebody from film and TV who moved
>
> to [<the city>, and asked]: 'Can you film for me?' So, if you don't have
>
> the luxury of having a budget when you can just go and hire the people,
>
> you're kind of stuck in your network. Which also happens in film a lot,
>
> which is why again there is a lot of inequality. Because when you're not
>
> a part of this network, nobody means to call you. (Susanne, 2017)

The film entrepreneurs acknowledged the unfairness of a favour-based economy of their enterprises and their inability to change it. For example, Susanne said: 'One day I get to the stage when I have a budget, when I can recruit properly, while now it's easier to work with who you know because you rely on a lot of favours' (2017).

The film entrepreneurs exploited their employees by hiring them for 'dogsbody' positions (Ashton, 2015). These jobs involved doing low-responsibility work that serves film enterprises. The duties of these employees did not include creative activities, but rather involved driving, couriering, waitressing. The aspirant workers sought work experience and professional contacts, and their career aspirations were used as instruments for developing film enterprises. Anna (2018) commented on her film enterprise functioning as follows.

> My company is me; it is purely the vehicle for me to make my own
>
> films. And there you really make films for someone else. What
>
> sometimes I did... if I have a very good young assistant producer...
>
> they've come to work with me as very unexperienced APs. And there
>
> are just two of us. So, they learn everything about making films from
>
> making the coffee, driving the car, making the budget thing. They learn
>
> everything because it's just the two of us doing everything. Obviously,
>
> people who are quite ambitious come to work with me, and they are

quite happy to work in that wheel because they know they are going to learn a lot. So, quite a lot of them have to go along to do very well. But the problem is that they don't want to stay because they are ambitious and that's why I like them. So, few of them stayed for one, or two, or three films, some of them stayed for quite a long time, and then they are away directing, producing or whatever. (Anna, 2018)

This interview excerpt shows how power relations operate in the filmmaking enterprise. Anna has the power to speak the truth about documentary filmmaking to her employees. She organised the way her company worked, and her employees were 'quite happy to work in that wheel'. She described what tasks her employees undertook for her – 'making the coffee, driving the car, making the budget thing' – and claimed that the employees 'learnt a lot' from her about the profession. Thus, she construed her company as it was an excellent training opportunity for future talents. The entrepreneur argued that doing dogsbody jobs at their film companies would lead their employees to a prosperous future. Anna described her employees as 'ambitious' and 'super talented' aspirant workers who learnt from working in her enterprise and then succeeded in the profession. She shared a success story of her employee who was 'a fantastic collaborator' for her.

And then as a result of that [working for the film enterprise], he then was hunted by all the top companies to go and shoot their films. So now he's just on the shortlist for the best director of photography. So, it worked! And he also worked on [<title>] which is the best series. (Anna, 2018)

This interview excerpt demonstrates how Anna used language to describe and classify her employees. She claimed that some employees were 'fantastic' and 'super

talented'. As she put it, 'It was the most wonderful experience because I had a collaborator who was with me the whole way through the process!' She construed their further filmmaking careers as exceedingly successful: they 'learnt a lot' from working in her enterprise and could use this knowledge to be build their filmmaking future. Thus, the interviewee used her discourse to promote her enterprise. The interviewee claimed that other employees were good but not 'as brilliant'. Good employees were less useful for her company's success and had less chances for successful career in the film industry.

The newcomers' aspirations for auspicious career future are 'unrealistic hopes [. .] created to the unjust advantage of the powerful and privileged' (Hesmondhalgh, 2015: 86). Hesmondhalgh argues that aspirants seeking professional recognition in media industries are exploited based on (im)possible prospects that are promised to them. These prospects are examined by Hesmondhalgh in relation to unavoidable disadvantageous working conditions, rather than broader positive cultural values of media work (*ibid*.: 86). The study conducted by Ashton (2015) explores the interpretations that are given by early-career workers to their runner positions in the UK film and television sectors. Although they consider runner experience a necessary initiation, aspirant workers hope to receive positions with more responsibilities that their degrees can ensure. They thought that runners' jobs are a necessary ritual to pass through that would lead to professional careers.

5.4.3 Perfectionism and competitiveness in film production enterprises

The entrepreneurial filmmakers aimed to achieve significant professional results. They regarded their film enterprises as a personal matter; that resulted in a willingness to produce excellent filmmaking work. Moreover, their films must be

excellent if they are to compete in market. As Brown points out, 'citizenship is reduced to success in this entrepreneurship' (2003: 43-44). Christiaens notices that, to the people involved, '[t]he future appears as a hazy mist of uncertainty, but the young creatives are confident that, if they diligently cultivate their virtuosity, they are destined for extraordinary achievements' (2019: 4). Entrepreneurial aspirations for excellence affected work practices in film production enterprises.

The entrepreneurs aimed to collaborate with successful filmmakers and with those who could help them. They were interested in working with colleagues who could make significant contributions to their enterprises. For instance, Anna said: 'I've always brought an award-winning cameraman to shoot it because my films always looked really good' (Anna, 2018). The interviewees regarded hiring employees from a perspective of enterprise rationalisation. They considered their employees' capacities to bring maximum economic value to their enterprises. Here again is Anna.

> The best one [the best employee] that I had – he came to me because he was very good, but he wanted to get experience, he needed content experience, he needed to find out more about storytelling. So, he wanted to come and work with me, even though he was ready to direct themselves. He was very good AP, he was a fantastic collaborator for me to work with for the research and meeting other people. […] And it was the most wonderful experience because I had a collaborator who was with me the whole way through the process. […] For the next film I did, he couldn't do it because he was already doing something else. So, I've got someone else. And that one didn't work so well haha. The next one was good but was not as brilliant collaboration. (Anna, 2018)

The employees were required to have a variety of experience and skills to be able to make a valuable contribution to businesses. For instance, one interviewee discussed his expectations from his employees as follows.

> You want to work with people who are obviously gifted in the craft industries, but also are good in my world, in documentary, and they are bright, and intelligent, and they've got journalistic instincts, and they know how to handle people well. (Alex, 2018)

This interview excerpt shows how the enterprise sector operates at a micro-political level. The excerpt illustrates Foucault's ideas of 'omnipresence' of power and immanence of power relations in any social sites (1978). Alex's discourse is a 'local centre of power-knowledge' (*ibid.*: 98). This interviewee showed how he regulated the conduct of other filmmakers. Those documentarians should demonstrate particular qualities such as being 'gifted in the craft industries', 'bright', 'intelligent'; they should be sociable and have 'journalistic instincts'. Alex's class and gender privileges allowed him to act upon actions of others. His discourse directed the conduct of individuals who lack class and gender privileges. Thus, this excerpt illustrates Foucault's ideas of power: power is unequal relations between social actors and operates through everyday practices of individuals. Another interviewee pointed out the necessary characteristics of employees:

> They [employees] had to just be very quick, I mean, fast-thinking and anticipating. The best one for me is the one who is actually very experienced for doing research, for looking for a particular type of people. They know the best way to do that. […] And they know how to go and find people because that's the key to my films. (Anna, 2018)

In this excerpt, the interviewee showed how she modified the conduct of other filmmakers, or as Foucault puts it, 'a mode of action upon actions' (1983: 222). Anna required a particular way of thinking and conducting from her employees: they should be 'quick', 'fast thinking', 'anticipating', 'very experienced'. This interviewee is an actor of power: her actions and discourses regulate work relations in her company. Her class privilege and established position in the sector permit her to govern actions of others. I consider her discourse as a part of the operation of government. As noted in the previous chapter, experienced and recognised filmmakers tend to be from socially privileged backgrounds.[38] In this way, understandable hiring practices – trying to hire the experienced, the recognised, the capable – contributes to replicating social exclusion within the film industry.

The entrepreneurial filmmakers restricted creative expression of their employees. They articulated a necessity for a particular type of worker who could serve entrepreneurs. The accounts given by the entrepreneurs evince the view that there was only room for one creative person within their company. For example, Anna commented as follows.

> I try to avoid people from film schools. I hate it. Because they've got ideas on their own about how they want to direct. I don't need another director. I want someone who services me. They have to be people who are willing to learn from the way I make films. And they have to watch my back and work with me. But I have a way of working, and it doesn't appeal to everybody. (Anna, 2018)

---

[38]   For a more detailed analysis of the experiences of social inequalities, see chapter four.

In this interview excerpt, again, Anna exercised power over others: she governed actions of her employees. Her discourse involved the notions of how to direct the conduct of other filmmakers who lack financial privileges and look for employment in her company. As Anna put it, those filmmakers should 'serve me', 'watch my back', 'learn from the way I make films'. This interviewee pursued own interested in securing her privileges. Her objective was to maintain her position and status. Thus, this interview excerpt demonstrates how micro practices of power operate in the documentary film enterprise.

Entrepreneurial attitudes to work include competitiveness. The film entrepreneurs aimed to achieve significant results by employing workers who could make a valuable contribution to their companies. The entrepreneurial filmmakers compared and contrasted their employees' abilities to bring maximum economic values, thereby creating a highly competitive environment in the independent film sector. Moreover, the way in which they described their careers created a rhetoric of success that itself contributed to competitiveness. For instance, Susanne said:

> I see the progress that I'm making and I see lots of people around who don't make progress. I feel that I'm doing something right. The film that I'm working on will be done, and hopefully, it will be received well. And then it makes it less difficult to get finance for the next one. That's the way that I'm looking at it. (Susanne, 2017)

The entrepreneurs are successful only in comparison to others who are less successful, dedicated, and adaptable. Success is a temporary feature for the entrepreneurial self, because entrepreneurs aim at transformations of themselves and

others (Bröckling, 2016: 77). According to previous studies, competitiveness is an essential feature of entrepreneurial subjectivity that involves comparing individuals as human capital (Berardi, 2009; Lazzarato, 2009; McNay, 2009; Scharff, 2016). Bröckling writes:

> You only act enterprisingly when you are more innovative, alert, daring, self-responsible and more of a leader than all the others. […] The fact that entrepreneurial qualities can only become manifest in comparison with others endows the practice with the character of sporting competition. It is a contest no one is excused from, but not everyone plays in the same league. No matter how unequal the chances of climbing the ladder really are, every player can, in theory, improve her position, as long as she is more alert, innovative, self-reliant and assertive than the others. (2016: 77).

5.5 Resisting discourse

This chapter section discusses resisting discourse of documentarians who questioned and escaped entrepreneurial subjectivity. Some documentarians thought and acted differently, and therefore, their professional conduct can be called 'counter-conduct' (Foucault, 2007: 196). These documentarians belong to a radical documentary film culture which is rooted in opposing injustice in the filmmaking profession and societies. Documentarians challenged power relations in the film industry and brought marginalised voices to film production. The section explores rationality of resistance and practices of resistance demonstrated by documentarians.

5.5.1 Rebuilding the world

Some documentarians aimed to make social and political transformations in the filmmaking profession. They criticised domination of middle-class men in the industry: their domination does not allow people from marginalised backgrounds to have access to and to be fully represented in the documentary industry. Interviewees said that structural reasons caused workplace inequalities, and these reasons were rooted in political organisation of societies. Power relationship caused marginalisation of filmmakers. According to their accounts, the film industry reflected neoliberal societies and their injustice. Interview excerpts below are examples of this notion.

> It's money, it's capitalism… If you are born with certain advantages, you've got such a great start [in film production]. And I don't know how you can make up for that. (Nick, 2018)

> I think it's always more interesting, and for me I would just love it if there were also some people from different ethnic background [in film production]. That's very very rare. […] Yes, it reflects society. (Dana, 2018)

These interview excerpts demonstrate that research participants linked workplace inequalities with injustice of capitalism and of neoliberalism. They considered the film industry a part of a broader environment, which is characterised by discrimination and oppression. These interviewees explored structural reasons of inequalities. They understood disadvantages as systemic problems, rather than an area of individual responsibilities of film production workers.

Radical documentarians wanted to create inclusivity and diversity in film production. They argued that structural changes are needed in order to involve filmmakers from marginalised backgrounds. Research participants wanted to see more working-class filmmakers and women filmmakers in film production. Filmmakers from marginalised backgrounds should be given more job opportunities and more training opportunities; they should take more decision-making roles. My research participants said:

> Unless you structurally changed things and you positively gave opportunity to people and training opportunities and so on, nothing would change! (Dana, 2018)

> We need people who are working class [to be] in the commissioning seats, people who are working class [to be] making the films. Not just these schemes that bring a working-class young person in for a week. We need to start making proactive changes. That's actually really exciting. We shouldn't see it as quotas, or something that we've got to do. We should see it as something that is actually vital and progressive for the future. And I think it's the responsibility of everyone. If you are not working class and working in the media, you should be trying to reach out and make sure that your office has more representation of all society, and not just reflection of yourself. And then we will start to see changes on screen as well.[39]

---

[39] Research observations: the film festival talk at the Sheffield Doc/Fest 2018.

In these interview excerpts, research participants used the rhetoric of assertion. The assertive discourse criticizes the social reality in order to achieve social and political transformations. The documentarians argued that the film industry needs significant changes. The research participants demanded collective actions in order to build a better working environment. Collective efforts of filmmakers could make possible social changes that would bring filmmakers from diverse backgrounds in film production. Filmmakers claimed that everyone is responsible for making the industry more inclusive.

Radical documentarians involved marginalised people into their film productions, thus contributing to social changes within the film profession. They agitated for creating new film collectives which would be inclusive and diverse. My research participants demonstrated examples of creating new filmmaking practices in their filmmaking careers. Their practices of resisting included mentoring aspirants from underrepresented backgrounds and working with communities that were less likely to be involved in cultural production. For example, Dana made hybrid films which included the elements of documentary and drama. She invited first-time actors and actresses to work in her films about poverty, welfare system and street crime. People who tell their own stories inspired Dana's films. She said:

> On this [title] project she [assistant] has been doing street casting. So,
> it's where you find actors in schools, on the streets, boxing clubs and so
> on, rather than going through agencies. And that's really important to
> me aesthetically and also kind of ethically to do that. (Dana, 2018)

Dana developed a new way for governing the self and others: she implemented new practices in her filmmaking and involved marginalised communities into cultural

production. She acknowledged cultural and political reasons for broadening access to production. Dana aimed at political and social transformation of film production and at creating new, more truthful representations. Also, Dana supported and mentored aspirants from diverse social backgrounds. She argued that mentoring is vital for changing the industry and its workforce composition. Dana said:

> I sort of set up things… and I had one Pakistani heritage and one Caribbean heritage, young men who were former students of mine, and I said I want them to be with me [on a film set]. Because unless you set… you have to positively say: 'This is what I'm going to do in order to change anything.' Because otherwise everything stays the same. And everybody is going [to say]: 'Oh dear, that's terrible!' Haha, saying 'Oh dear' is pointless! You have to do something. (Dana, 2018)

In this interview excerpt, Dana called for actions that bring social transformations. She claimed that there was a collective responsibility to act and change the industry. Her resisting practices aimed at emancipation of marginalised groups and liberation of their agency.

Alice demonstrated another example of resisting practices. She worked in a prison where she taught a filmmaking course to serving prisoners. Alice invited academics and practitioners to teach film theory and filmmaking practice. Prisoners comprised production groups and made own films. Alice used film as an instrument for educating and empowering marginalised communities which the majority of prisoners belong to. She said:

> If to come back to the question about [why did I work in] prison, I just… I suppose I wanted to be with working class people. I wanted to

feel like I was giving something back. That was really really important

to me. (Alice, 2017)

This interview excerpt demonstrates an intention to transform social class relations. Alice had a working-class origin and a strong sense of working-class belonging. She acknowledged working-class struggles, which she intended to change by 'giving something back'. Alice wanted to provide access to cultural production and education to marginalised community of prisoners. She wanted to empower them and developing their capacities for self-determination. Similarly, William, a working-class filmmaker, argued that he had 'a responsibility to send the elevator back down' (2018). He wanted to create a network of black working-class people within film production. He acknowledged his responsibility to contribute to social and political transformations.

Marc showed another example of counter-conduct. He made a film about marginalised urban communities who resisted austerity and deindustrialization. His aim was to 'amplify unheard voices' of marginalised people (Marc, 2018). Marc argued that the majority of filmmakers tell stories for marginalised people; his resisting practice aimed to tell stories with underrepresented communities. He wanted to collaborate with marginalised groups in his filmmaking. For example, he negotiated representations with his film protagonists: before shooting his documentary, he sent a script of the film to protagonists to check whether the film represented them well. Also, Marc created a platform that involves mentoring and supporting marginalised filmmakers. Marc was a documentary film tutor for a filmmaking charity.

Some interviewees argued that resisting filmmaking practices involved experimenting and risking. The resisting filmmakers concerned with diverse and direct experience of the world. Documentary films should capture diverse experiences of people, and familiar and recognizable practices of filmmaking do not allow to achieve it. Radical filmmakers did not consider their filmmaking as business and were not interested in making their filmmaking commercially successful. As one interviewee put it, 'It's a shame to call it business' (Dana, 2018). These interviewees valued diverse experiences of filmmakers rather than their technical skills and achievements. They wanted to involve into film production untrained people who had diverse backgrounds. One interviewee said:

> Nothing is going to change by talking about it [diversity in the film industry]. It has been so much talking and zero actions. […] People need to take risks. If you are going to change things, you have to give opportunities to people and you have to let people fail. And everybody is too afraid to do that. (Dana, 2018)

In this excerpt, the interviewee linked diversity of experiences to taking risks. Diverse filmmakers with little professional experience would change the industry by bringing new perspectives and new representations. Underrepresented filmmakers might fail to bring commercial success to filmmaking companies. Dana argued that the majority of filmmakers working in the industry did not give opportunities to underrepresented individuals out of fear of failing their businesses. The majority of film producers avoided taking risks that were irrational and harmful for filmmaking enterprises. This interviewee adamantly opposed commercial considerations of the industry and proposed new way of governing the self and others.

Radical documentarians aimed to bring justice through filmmaking. They argued that creating new representations would transform social imagination. New films would present true stories of people and this knowledge would change collective thinking about marginalised groups. Hence, filmmaking could contribute to broader socio-political changes that would defeat capitalism, patriarchy, classism, racism, colonialism. Some interviewees aimed to change the life of their film protagonists. For example, Dana made a documentary film about street gang communities. Her film affected protagonists, and, at the end of her film shooting, they decided to stop street war between bands. Her film characters made a peace agreement and created a social enterprise which works with young people and prevents street violence. Some protagonists became professional actors and performers after participating in Dana's films. Alice taught a filmmaking course to serving prisoners and involved them in film production. She argued that the majority of prisoners had a working-class origin, and their incarceration was a result of systemic social problems. Working-class people are not represented truthfully in media because middle-class filmmakers speak on their behalf. Alice aimed to involve working-class prisoners in cultural production and to allow them to tell their stories via films. As a result, serving prisoners made a series of short films and some of them did a film degree after leaving prison.

5.5.2 Radical aesthetics and cultural impact

Some documentarians created radical aesthetics and produced politically motivated films. They made documentaries on the subjects of social and political problems, e.g. homelessness, poverty, racism, xenophobia, violence. The themes demonstrate that the interviewees are politically engaged citizens. In their films, radical documentaries aimed to change the world. The interviewees created a new

way of filmmaking that promotes social justice. They were interested in socio-political topics and paid less attention to changing conventions in shooting and editing. Those documentarians could be called 'committed' documentarians: 'committed documentary' makes 'a declaration of solidarity with the goal of radical sociopolitical transformation' (Waugh, 2011: 8 quoted in Perry, 2016: 44).

Radical documentarians declared that their films gave voices to unheard and underrepresented groups. They argued that the mainstream film sector ignored experiences of Others: the privileged groups had the power to represent marginalised communities. The mainstream film representations speak on behalf of marginalised individuals and do not let them to tell their own stories. As one interviewee put it, 'They study working-class people like they are insects under microscope' (Alice, 2017). This interview excerpt demonstrates the relationship of power in the film industry: middle-class people examine working-class individuals like objects. Examination is the main technology of disciplinary power that aims to create 'docile bodies', which adapt easily to changes in economic production (Foucault, 1995). Radical filmmakers transformed the mainstream production and created new representations. These documentarians made films in collaboration with people engaged in 'political struggles' (Waugh, 2011: 6). One interviewee said:

> Also, really really crucially is they [serving prisoners who made films] are representing themselves. And that is what a lot of working-class people, or whatever their race, or religion, or gender, don't get to do. They get spoken about or spoken to. But they actually don't get to do. When I did some research on food banks, only 20% of newspaper reports on food bank actually talk to food bank users. They talk to

> volunteers, or church leaders, or politicians. They don't talk to people
>
> who use food bank. (Alice, 2017)

In this interview excerpt, Alice criticised the mainstream representations of working-class people. She claimed that marginalised groups were voiceless and provided findings from her research. The interviewee used the rhetoric of analysis of social phenomena. Radical documentary filmmaking investigates social problems in the historical contexts. Interviewee argued that socio-political problems have structural nature and are not limited to individual cases. In her own film practice, Alice created truthful representations and invited individuals with direct experience of political struggles to create own representations. Another research participant commented about the mainstream representations of working-class people:

> The way I wanted to portray my [homeless] mom as someone who was
>
> loving, and had dignity, and used to fold up clothes, and do normal
>
> stuff, we all do. But we don't see these representations in the media.
>
> People want to show you have a mess on your floor and not wash and
>
> fold them on the side if you got time. [40]

The interview excerpt shows criticism of the mainstream representations that portray homeless people in an undignifying way. New representations would reinvent experiences of marginalised communities and decrease their disadvantages. Radical documentarians had direct access to stories of marginalised groups because they had diverse social backgrounds and experienced social struggles. Their stories were

---

[40] Research observations: the film festival talk at the Sheffield Doc/Fest 2018.

different from the mainstream ones because they shared understanding and knowledge with marginalised groups.

Radical documentarians used the rhetoric of commitment. They claimed that they created a new way of filmmaking which was committed and non-impartial. Some interviewees argued that they had political responsibility to produce accurate representations of marginalised individuals, and ethical considerations played an important role in their work. As one interviewee put it, documentary filmmaking was 'a moral quagmire' (Dana, 2018). She said:

> In documentary, you really have people's lives in your hand. And that's the part of it that is so burdensome… The burden of representing people and responsibility of that. For me, I have to really love people and I have to be really interested in them. And if I'm not, if I find somebody boring or I don't want to be in the same room with them, I just don't [film]. It's kind of simple, it's people I fall in love with, and they have to fall in love with me. In a way, you have a kind of little creative affair when you are in a journey together. It's about trust really. (Dana, 2018)

Dana called her political and ethical responsibility to create truthful representations a 'burden': this interview excerpt shows that Dana made films not simply about people but with them and among them. She collaborated with people who she made film about, or as she put it, they have a 'little creative affair'. This expression shows equity of a filmmaker and protagonists: they created a documentary together.

Some documentarians adopted discourse of persuasion: they aimed to convince viewers to support political struggles with capitalism, poverty, classism and so on. Marc's documentary showed that poverty and homelessness are the result of austerity

policies. Housing crises increased homelessness and facilitated destitution. He portrayed stories of people who experienced social deprivation; his films provided political context to these stories. Angela made a film about her experience of being homeless. She criticised the mainstream representations of homelessness: the film industry showed that homeless people did 'something wrong'[41]. She argued that anyone might become homeless regardless their actions or positions at a job market. Her documentary presented the story of her family losing their house and moving to homeless hostel. She said:

> I think it was for me about showing the lived realities of what it feels like to go through [homelessness], the lived realities of those policies that make such a massive impact on our lives. We never really get honest portrayal of the impact of the policy. Even speaking to local councils, they see us as figures and numbers in a system. And for me, it was really about humanizing that. Often in society we blame an individual rather than actually turning it on and questioning the system and why is that happening.[42]

In this excerpt, the research participant claimed that her film showed the reality of socio-political struggle. The mainstream representations hid this reality. Angela aimed to raise awareness of viewers and activate their compassion in regard to the problem of homelessness. She regarded her audience as an active one and wanted to persuade viewers to participate in political struggles. Audience could relate to 'the lived

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] *Ibid.*

realities' and consequently to show support and solidarity with homeless communities.

5.5.3 Solidarity and friendship

Some documentarians created allies and friends with other filmmakers. Radical documentarians transformed their professional relationships into friendship. Their friendship is a form of attachment characterised by trust, affection and solidarity. Documentary filmmaking engenders informal social ties which are based on mutual interests, cultural preferences and political ideals. Some filmmakers shared same values and goals, namely achieving socio-political transformations in film production and broader society. They had similar ideas about what is social justice and what is the role of filmmaking in achieving it. One interviewee said:

> People contacted me and I formed friendships through bumping into people. So, Sean, the guy I'm working with, contacted me and said: 'Can I help you for free?' And I said: 'Yes.' And then eventually he was good, so I started to paying him. The guy edited my last film, he started editing it for free, because he was bored and depressed in television, and he wanted to just get involved in [something different]. And I said: 'Okay.' […] I wouldn't ever gone to search out the top editor. I'd much rather to find somebody that I'm… the graduate from the school, or a friend of a friend.' (Nick, 2018)

In this excerpt, the interviewee argued that his professional network is a network of friends. His friends shared similar ideas about documentary filmmaking work: their cultural preferences allowed to collaborate easily. Nick argued that they shared political beliefs and confronted same social disadvantages.

Another interviewee argued that having allies is crucial for her career because it allowed her to bring 'independent sensibility' into film production. She shared cultural and political values with her allies. This collaboration helps her to make films. This interviewee said:

> I often will work with the same people if I can, but it's not a full-time thing. So, I did a documentary about homeless people, and I worked with an editor on that, and then he and I did four or five films [together]. But obviously he worked with other directors as well. And now I'm working with a different editor, because it's kind of Channel 4 drama. So, the Director of Photography, the editors, they tend to change from project to project. Although, I always like to, if I can, if I get on well with somebody, I always try to work with them again, because you have a shorthand way of communicating. […] For me it was important that Director of Photography was somebody that I could… that I share cultural references with. So, I chose people who like me came from independent film background, so we could have some fun and bringing independent sensibility into the prime-time TV show. And it's very close relationships, so sharing kind of vision is really important. Otherwise, I feel like a stranger on my own shoot, that I've been a one freak who is not part of the mainstream haha. So, you have to have your allies, you know. (Dana, 2018)

The interview excerpt demonstrates an importance of bonds of friendship for documentary filmmaking work. Allies share beliefs and values and their collaboration is a crucial element of independent filmmaking. Dana talked about horizontal relations between allies who together contribute to creating cultural meanings. The excerpt also shows the divide between the independent documentary filmmaking and

the mainstream film industry. The quote suggests that documentary filmmaking work could be considered as a form of a social club. The independent documentary sector has its norms of behavior: filmmakers should demonstrate certain cultural and political preferences in order to be in this circle of allies. They should follow certain conventions of communication and that preserves the boundaries of the social group.

Limited production budgets and precarious working conditions require documentarians to cooperate and to become friends. Having friends who are able to help with filmmaking is crucial for surviving in the industry. My interviewees argued that they cooperated with others and their cooperation was beneficial for their filmmaking work. Collaborations helped documentarians to make movies. They cared for each other and provided their help if needed:

> I know with this film that we just made someone contacted us from [organisation] which is in Bristol, he said… he's seen something [about the documentary film] on Facebook or Twitter and said: 'I really really like what you are doing! If you need any kind of postproduction work, I'll do it for you for free.' Ah that's great! And he did some lovely animation work for the film, and he didn't charge us. And the same with the music. We've got some original music: one [track] is from the band, one [track] of the woman [who] was in [the film], and the other one [is] from Manchester band who donated music. So, you are never truly independent. You [are] kind of dependent on people who [are] believing in what you are doing. (Alice, 2017)

This interviewee imagined the documentary filmmaking community as a network of friends. Alice showed that radical documentary making is done with the help of allies. This network makes filmmakers co-dependent: providing support and care to each

other is vital for surviving of this documentary filmmaking community. Caring for themselves is 'self-preservation' for documentarians who have to organise their own support and solidarity system (Lorde, 1988). Drawing from Foucault's works, my study explores documentarians' care as a way of governing the self and others. Care is an ethical principle and a relationship to the self and to others. In Foucault's works, the care of the self is a framework for exploring autonomy and self-making of subjects. The care of the self takes place through daily practices of individuals. Caring for other filmmakers is the principle that constitutes the radical documentary film community. Caring practices are the resisting conduct of radical documentarians: they opposed the neoliberal subject who refrains from dependency and accepts market principles.

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the entrepreneurial subjectivity of documentary filmmakers who contribute to replicating social inequalities in the independent enterprise sector. The entrepreneurial filmmakers disciplined themselves according to the entrepreneurial ethos of independence, commitment, flexibility, tenacity, and resilience. They adapted to the uncertainty and contingency of filmmaking work and changed themselves to achieve entrepreneurial goals. Entrepreneurial subjectivity contributes to the legitimation of neoliberal governmentality. Adaptation to the world, as against changing it, is an essential feature of the neoliberal subject (Chandler & Reid, 2016). Initially negotiated as a solution to inequalities, entrepreneurialism reinforces the dominant models of work relations and, therefore, sustains elitism and marginalisation. The film entrepreneurs regarded failure and social vulnerability as things the workers had to take care of themselves, through hard work and tenacity.

Their failures and vulnerabilities are a matter of personal responsibilities of workers. Their film enterprises admitted only committed workers who could contribute significantly to the success of the enterprise. Thereby the entrepreneurs reinforced the social and cultural elitism of the filmmaking profession.

The chapter has explored the rationality of resistance and practices of resistance demonstrated by documentary makers. Some documentary filmmakers criticised domination of middle-class men in the filmmaking profession and developed new way for governing the self and others. Radical documentarians reinvented working environment and created inclusivity and diversity in the filmmaking profession. Their practices of resistance comprised: bringing marginalised groups and individuals into the documentary profession; making new representations; creating networks of support and solidarity. Their resistance resulted in increased autonomy of filmmakers from the market, emancipation of marginalised groups and liberation of their agency.

6   Cultural policy discourses about social inequalities within filmmaking work

6.1   Introduction

In this final chapter I discuss cultural policy discourses about social inequalities within filmmaking work. The first part of the chapter examines various initiatives, governmental and non-governmental, that aimed to promote diversity and hence equality within the film workforce. The prevailing 'cultural diversity' agenda is criticised widely by researchers for its failure to address the problems.[1] The second part of the chapter discusses the policy changes proposed in the interviews by the documentary filmmakers. A 'bottom-up' approach (O'Regan, 1992; McGuigan, 1996) to cultural policymaking is adopted for my analysis of the interviews because the experiences of practitioners provide an understanding of how social justice might be imagined and achieved.

As anticipated in chapter one, I take a Foucauldian approach to power relations and employ the idea of a discursive production of truth (Foucault, 1978; Foucault, 1981; Foucault, 1991a).[2] Power comprises social relations that owe to multiple sources and take different forms when different parties confront each other (Foucault, 1978). There is no one source of sovereignty. Power relations disperse over and

---

[1]   See, for instance, Ahmed (2012), CAMEo (2018), Freedman (2016), Freedman & Goblot (2018), Gray (2013), Malik (2013), Malik (2018), McGuigan (2004), Moody (2017), Nwonka (2015), Nwonka & Malik (2018), Newsinger & Eikhof (2020), Saha (2012), Saha (2018).

[2]   As already discussed in chapter one, Foucault's ideas on power relations inspired many scholarships of media and culture.

fluctuate within various sphere. According to Foucault, power is immanent within

social reality. Discourses are positioned within power relations and operate as

instruments of coercion or resistance. 'Discourse transmits and produces power'

(Foucault, 1978: 101); therefore, an examination of discourse can reveal power

relations. As Young (1981: 48) maintains, discursive practices are embedded tightly

within social life, making it 'virtually impossible to think outside of them'. Foucault's

ideas about power and discourse are useful for the analysis of cultural policy

discourses in the film and broadcasting sector. His framework illuminates various

sources of power relations; in my research, those sources are the government, film

institutions, trades unions, broadcasters and film practitioners. All these actors

constitute 'the moving substrate of force relation' (Foucault, 1978: 93) that support,

transform or resist the current organisation of forces. Different subjects contribute to

the discursive production of truth about what is justice and injustice in the film sector.

The discourses about social change affect each other and are affected by the

interdiscursive relations between different discursive formations.

Another theoretical source is a debate on a cultural policy turn within cultural

studies.[3] I will examine the 'cultural policy studies' that have been inspired by

Foucault's work (Bennett, 1992; Cunningham, 1993; Hunter, 1993; O'Regan, 1992)

---

[3]   See Barker (2005), Bennett (1989), Bennett (1992), Bennett (1998), Cunningham
(1989), Cunningham (1993), Garnham (1990), Golding & Murdock (1986), Hunter
(1993), McGuigan (1996), McGuigan (2004), O'Regan (1992).

and give some consideration to the political economy perspective.[4] Bennett (1992) argues that cultural studies should be involved in the formation and implementation of cultural policies. As he puts it, we 'need to include policy considerations in the definition of culture in viewing it as a particular field of government' (*ibid*.: 23). He suggests that we break with the Gramscian tradition of examining power relations via the notion of hegemony and use instead the Foucauldian notion of governmentality. Bennett defines culture as follows. Culture is

> a historically specific set of institutionally embedded relations of government in which the forms of thought and conduct of extended populations are targeted for transformation—in part via the extension through the social body of the forms, techniques, and regimens of aesthetic and intellectual culture. (*ibid*.: 26)

Bennett adds that, as a 'surface of social regulation', culture is accompanied by specific cultural technologies and forms of conduct (*ibid*.: 27). Moreover, Bennett understands truth, in Foucauldian fashion, as a set of beliefs of social actors involved in institutional practices (McGuigan, 1996: 18).

O'Regan's (1992) response to Bennett's (1992) thesis proposes an alternative reading of Foucault's view of policy. Unlike Bennett who examines policy as comprising various technologies, O'Regan regards policy as 'a technique of information' (1992: 416). According to O'Regan, the analysis of cultural policy

---

[4] An academic controversy between political economists and structuralists was an important discussion in 1970-80s. On that, see Curran's historical account of the distinction between 'the materialist low road' of the Westminster School and 'the idealist high road' of Birmingham School (Curran, 2004: 16). That controversy is a part of an intellectual history and presents rather artificial distinction nowadays.

should examine what he calls 'rhetorical' practices, rather than technologies of government. By 'rhetorical practices', O'Regan means an assemblage of texts, ideas and actors (*ibid*.: 417). As he points out:

> Policy is a particular kind of informational practice with its own limitations, potentialities and linkages to other kinds of public discourse, including cultural criticism and journalism, over which it holds no necessary pre-eminence. (*ibid.*: 416).

Thus, cultural policy discourse is to be examined beside other discourses produced by critics, journalists and cultural producers (*ibid*.: 417). O'Regan's example illustrating this point suggests that cultural criticism of 1950-60s affected implementing public funds for film production in Australia (O'Regan, 1983; O'Regan, 1992). He argues that cultural criticism affects equality policies by discussing the issues of oppression and inequalities (1992: 418). As a 'Left' Foucauldian, O'Regan argues that cultural studies include a variety of discussions and that cultural policy debate is not a prevailing one. In addition, he points out that cultural studies take a 'bottom-up' approach to cultural policies, in that they take up the points of views of the disadvantaged and excluded (*ibid*.: 410). He argues that cultural policy studies are engaged with a variety of purposes such as state, reformist, antagonistic and diagnostic purposes (*ibid*.: 418). A state and reformist purposes of cultural policy studies relate to supporting official regulation, while an antagonistic purpose criticises these actions.

In his overview of the cultural policy debate, McGuigan (1996; 2004) distinguishes between three varieties of Foucauldian: Left; Centrist; and Right. Bennett and Hunter are Right Foucauldians, in that they advocate only minor changes

to the status quo (McGuigan, 2004: 16). Left Foucauldians, such as O'Regan, aim at resisting power structures; and Foucault himself is placed on the left side of the political spectrum (*ibid*.: 16). O'Regan criticises Bennett, particularly Bennett's engagement with 'administrative usefulness' for cultural studies (McGuigan, 1996: 18-19). McGuigan agrees with O'Regan's criticism of Bennett's 'instrumentalist agenda for policing the horizons of cultural studies' (*ibid*.: 19). McGuigan suggests his 'inclusive' perspective on cultural policy. As he puts it, 'cultural policy is about the politics of culture in the most general sense: it is about the clash of ideas, institutional struggles and power relations in the production and circulation of symbolic meanings' (*ibid*.: 1).

6.2   Diversity policies in the film and broadcasting industry

In the UK, there is long-standing agreement that public service media should serve the idea of diversity (Freedman, 2016).[5] The 1960 Pilkington report asserts that broadcasters should acknowledge the interests of all citizens including those of minorities (*ibid*.: 103). The 1977 Annan report contributes to the idea of broadcasters serving diverse interests of audiences (*ibid*.: 103). According to the report, society and culture are

> multi-racial and pluralist: that is to say, people adhere to different views
> of the nature and purpose of life and expect their own views to be
> exposed in some form or other. The structure of broadcasting must
> reflect this variety. (Annan, 1977: 30 quoted in Freedman, 2016: 103).

---

[5]   Chapter three discussed some policy regulations in the film and television sectors.

Launching the UK Film Council in 2000, the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport indicates that it aims to 'support and encourage cultural diversity and social inclusiveness' (UK Film Council, 2000: 9 quoted in Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020). The UK Film Council adopted the 'cultural diversity' agenda and appointed its first Head of Diversity in 2002 (Moody, 2017; Hill, 2004).

Recent statistics released by the UK government demonstrates concern about social inequality within creative industries. According to 2018 estimates of employment published by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, 14% of jobs in film, television, video, radio and photography belong to people from 'less advantaged' socio-economic backgrounds (DCMS, 2019). That compare to the 32% of jobs in the whole of UK employment held by those from such backgrounds (DCMS, 2019: 10). In 2018, 37% of the jobs in film and television (*et cetera*) were held by women (DCMS, 2019).

Moreover, recently several policies, governmental and non-governmental, have been created with the aim of reducing inequality both on and behind the screen.[6] This chapter treats those recent policies, namely: government legislation against discrimination; the diversity programme of the Office of Communication; the British Film Institute's diversity standards; trades unions' campaigns; and diversity initiatives

---

[6]   My primary research concerns with policy suggestions of the filmmakers who argue for a need for social changes. I will explore their discourses later on in this chapter: it is preceded by my analysis of diversity initiatives implemented in the sector.

undertaken by British broadcasters. Moreover, I provide an overview of the academic literature that criticises those initiatives.[7]

6.2.1 Workforce diversity initiatives of the UK government

The government implemented the anti-discrimination law in the UK. At issue here are: the Sex Discrimination Act of 1975; the Race Relations Act of 1976; and Disability Discrimination Act of 1995. The Equality Act 2010 substitutes them. It identifies various types of discrimination – including direct discrimination, indirect discrimination, harassment and victimisation – and forbids those forms of discrimination within workplaces (Gov.uk, 2020). Workplace discrimination is identified in relation to 'dismissal, employment terms and conditions, pay and benefits, promotion and transfer opportunities, training, recruitment, redundancy' (Gov.uk, 2020). The Equality Act treats different social inequalities or so-called 'protected characteristics' that include: 'age; disability; gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation' (Equality Act 2010, p. 2, c. 1). The Act defines gender discrimination as the 'less favourable treatment of a woman' (p. 2, c. 2). A workplace is 'gender equal' if jobs are 'rated as equivalent' and 'of equal value' (Equality Act 2010, p.2, c.3). 'An equal value' refers to 'the demands made on a worker' and 'the evaluation not made on a sex-specific system' (*ibid*., p. 2, c. 3). The Act requires that an employer pay men and women equally and requires that employers publish details that demonstrate this parity of pay (*ibid*., p. 2, c. 3). The Act recognises class

---

[7]   See Ahmed (2012), CAMEo (2018), Freedman (2016), Freedman & Goblot (2018), Gray (2013), Malik (2013), Malik (2018), Moody (2017), Nwonka (2015), Nwonka & Malik (2018), Newsinger & Eikhof (2020), Saha (2012), Saha (2018).

inequality that, however, is not included in the 'protected characteristics' (*ibid.*, p. 1). The Act asserts a commitment on the part of the law 'to reduce the inequalities of outcome which result from socio-economic disadvantage' (*ibid.*, p. 1). The anti-discrimination legislation prescribes to undertake 'positive actions' to rectify discrimination against those workers with protected characteristics (Gov.uk, 2020). The positive discrimination at issue is not mandatory, but it is allowed in relation to workers with protected characteristics who 'at a disadvantage', 'have particular needs', and 'underrepresented in an activity or type of work' (*ibid.*). In order to encourage employers to practice positive discrimination, the government published *Equality Act 2020: What Do I Need to Know? A Quick Start Guide to Using Positive Action in Recruitment and Promotion* (Government Equalities Office, 2011).

The government published the report, *A Future for British Film: It Begins with the Audience...* (DCMS, 2012) that provides an overview of film policy. The industry experts comprising the Film Policy Review Panel wrote the report.[8] The report has it that, 'British film is going through something of a golden period' (*ibid.*: 2). Indeed: the industry 'is one of the sectors which plays a full role in driving growth, creating jobs and stimulating inward investment and exports' (*ibid.*: 6). Although most of the report's recommendations concern film distribution and audience development, some are about funding. The government urges the British Film Institute (BFI), a central government's agency in the film sector, to ensure that a 'diversity of projects [is] supported' in their funding distribution (*ibid.*: 37). The report warns the BFI against

---

[8]   The Rt Hon Lord Smith of Finsbury, a former Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, chaired the Panel. Its other members were: Will Clarke; Lord Julian Fellowes; Matthew Justice; Michael Lynton; Tim Richards; Tessa Ross; Libby Savill; and Iain Smith.

'the dangers of a single gatekeeper's taste becoming predominant (or even the perception that this is happening) and believes it is important for the BFI to reflect a genuine plurality of decision-making in the interests of audiences' (*ibid*.: 38). The panel recognised that the film industry faces a 'diversity challenge' with its workforce (*ibid*.: 69). For, the report acknowledges the problem of underrepresentation in the film production workforce. For instance, women directors constituted only 13% of the workforce in 2010 (*ibid*.: 69). The report recommends that, to tackle that problem, the BFI and other institutions provide suitable job placements and appropriate training (*ibid*.: 70). In that way, the institutions at issue are urged 'to create a strategy to ensure diverse talent is found, supported and nurtured' (*ibid*.: 72). As another means to that end, the report suggests that the BFI collaborate with Skillset in developing and delivering training (*ibid*.: 71).[9] Moreover, the panel suggests allocating special training bursaries and apprenticeship bursaries for people from marginalised backgrounds. The lottery funding is recommended to be distributed to projects that have diverse and inclusive workforces (*ibid*.: 73).

The Office of Communication (Ofcom), a broadcasting and telecommunication regulator that the 2003 Communication Act created, produced in 2018 the *Ofcom's Diversity and Inclusion Programme 2018–2022* (Ofcom, 2018a).[10] As an employer and communication services regulator, Ofcom aims at achieving diversity and inclusion. The document states: 'Putting diversity and inclusion right at the heart of

---

[9] Skillset is the Sector Skills Council for cultural industries, including film and television. This organisation aims to know the 'skills needs' in the cultural sector.

[10] Chapter three discussed the 2003 Communication Act and, more generally, New Labour's film and broadcasting policy.

everything we do is crucial to us achieving our goal to make communications work for everyone' (*ibid*.: 5).

As an employer, Ofcom postulates developing a diverse workforce that reflects the diversity of consumers, thereby strengthening the commercial rationale for its diversity initiatives. According to the aforementioned *Programme*,

> Having a mix of diverse backgrounds and life experiences increases and widens our thinking, ideas and viewpoints to shape the policies and decisions that we make for the benefit of consumers and businesses who use services in our sectors. (*ibid*.: 7).

The Equality Act 2010 is embedded within Ofcom's *Programme*. It acknowledges the problems of discrimination, harassment and victimisation concerning gender, ethnicity and other 'protected characteristics' (*ibid*.: 3). For instance, by 2020, Ofcom aims at having 40% of women in senior positions and 50% of women in its workforce (*ibid*.: 7). It intends to provide equal pay and career opportunities and to support its diversity networks (*ibid*.: 9).

As a regulator, Ofcom aims to be inclusive of 'consumers in vulnerable circumstances' (*ibid*.: 10). Those circumstances are defined via income, age and disability (Ofcom, 2019a: 3). Ofcom acknowledges that, 'People who are financially vulnerable are less likely to have each of the main communication services' – for instance, television and the Internet (*ibid*.: 4). The *Programme* distinguishes various financially vulnerable groups. It does so by considering employment, property ownership, and household size (*ibid*.: 26-27). The programme avows a responsibility to diversify the broadcasting sector:

> We will work with television and radio broadcasters to improve the
>
> diversity of people working on and off screen and air, to better represent
>
> and portray modern life across the UK. (Ofcom, 2018a: 11).

Ofcom's diversity initiatives include monitoring and publishing information on diversity and inclusion in the broadcasting sector (*ibid*.: 21-22). For instance, Ofcom monitors broadcasters' employees and encourages the broadcasters to collect workforce data relating to gender, class and other social characteristics of employees. Ofcom publishes annual reports on broadcasters' workforce composition. Periodically, Ofcom assesses how well public service broadcasts 'reflect the diversity of the UK, its cultural identity' and 'represent alternative points of view' (*ibid.*: 22). Ofcom encourages the broadcasters to promote diversity and helps to change those of them that have 'inadequate arrangements'. Ofcom is allowed to 'take enforcement actions' against the latter (*ibid*.: 21).

As a part of the *Diversity and Inclusion Programme*, Ofcom published its *Diversity and Equal Opportunities in Television* report (Ofcom, 2019b), which states that 'progress on improving representation has stalled' (*ibid*.: 2). Ofcom argues for facilitating diversity and inclusion and does so partly on the ground that thereby broadcasters who operate in a highly competitive field will accrue 'significant creative, cultural and commercial benefits' (*ibid*.: 4). Ofcom asserts that publicly available diversity information is 'pivotal' move towards increasing inclusion in the broadcasting sector (*ibid*.: 7). The report is made with the assistance of the Diversity Advisory Panel, which includes six experts from the broadcasting industry; the

diversity information used in the report is gathered by the broadcasters.[11] The report

analyses the diversity information provided by the main five British broadcasters,

namely the BBC, Channel 4, ITV, Sky and Viacom – broadcasters that together

comprise 72% of the UK television industry (*ibid*.: 9).[12] The report discusses class

inequalities in the television sector. According to the report, those in broadcasting are

more likely than not to have attended private schools and to have professional social

backgrounds. 60% of workers in the television industry have a professional

background, whereas the figure is 33% for the UK working population as a whole

(*ibid*.: 4, 30). According to the document, 26% of employees in British broadcasting

have a working-class background, whereas the figure is 38% for the UK working

population as a whole (*ibid*.: 4). The report finds that 45% of those who work in

broadcasting are women, with women occupying 42% of the senior positions (*ibid*.:

5-6). Women are underrepresented in technology and engineering positions (they

occupy 27% of them) and in creative roles (43%) (*ibid*.: 20). Ofcom's report

discusses the broadcasters' initiatives relating to inequalities of the workforce. For

instance, the BBC and ITV set targets of achieving 50% of women in senior

positions; Sky launched a Women into Leadership programme; the 'RISE' initiative at

Channel 4 aims at increasing the number of women across senior positions (*ibid*.: 21-

22). The report discusses also various broadcasters' initiatives that aimed tackling

class inequalities. Examples are: Channel 4's 'Pop Ups' programme; ITV's Social

Mobility Business Partnership; Sky's News Diversity Work Experience Programme;

and Sky's Production Services Early Careers Programme. (See *ibid*.: 32.) In the

---

[11]   The Diversity Advisory Panel members included, among others, Adrian Lester, Ellen E.
        Jones, and David Proud.

[12]   The company Viacom acquired Channel 5 in 2014.

report, Ofcom provides recommendations for further work towards diversity and inclusion. For instance, Ofcom suggests that the broadcasters contribute to workforce data collection, adopt various inclusion programmes and initiatives, review their own equality arrangements, and to use positive discrimination in their recruitment and promotion (*ibid*.: 35-36).

The film sector institutions responded (Ofcom, 2018b; Ofcom, 2018c) to the Ofcom's Diversity and Inclusion Programme. Broadcasting, Entertainment, Communications and Theatre Union (BECTU) evaluates positively Ofcom's initiative but claims a need to include the perspective of freelancers into Ofcom's monitoring programmes (Ofcom, 2018b). Freelancers account for 50% of the workforce in the film and broadcasting sector but are not monitored by Ofcom (*ibid*.).[13] BECTU advocates for a need to establish compliance rules for the broadcasters. According to its recommendations, Ofcom should ensure that the broadcasters demand the independent producers to establish diversity standards of recruitment and employment (*ibid*.). The BFI's response to Ofcom*'s* Diversity and Inclusion Programme highlights similarities with BFI's actions to achieving diversity and inclusion (Ofcom, 2018c). BFI suggests working together with Ofcom and other parties towards this aim.

6.2.2 Diversity initiatives by the BFI and by trades unions

The BFI released a five-year plan that warns that there is 'a growing urgency to address barriers in the film industry around inclusion and opportunity that are limiting

---

[13]   The majority of my research interviewees are freelancers and/or self-employed workers.

the industry's creative potential and cultural relevance' (BFI, 2017a: 19).[14] BFI2022 highlights the commercial rationale of increasing diversity of the film workforce: 'Diversity is good for creativity, supports economic growth, taps into under-served audiences and makes good business sense' (*ibid*.: 5). It promises to 'devise and support interventions that increase the diversity of the workforce' that would help them to 'drive and lead changes' (*ibid*.: 18). BFI2022 demonstrates an intention to support documentaries 'with a strong cultural or progressive impact' that acknowledge 'the quality of difference in perspective, talent and recruitment' and take 'risks in form and content' (*ibid*.: 19-20). Also, they aim to encourage early career documentarians and documentarians from the UK regions.

There are several programmes launched in support of the aims of BFI2022 with a proposed five-year budget of £488,8 million (*ibid*.: 28). The BFI's Future Film Skills Programme is a main part of BFI2022. It aims to diversify workforce by launching, across the UK, various training opportunities, career services and apprenticeships. The combined budget for skills development is £28,5 million (*ibid*.: 28). Creative Skillset is a body that delivers the programme and works together with the film sector organisations such as: the National Film and Television School (NFTS); the British Academy of Film and Television Arts (BAFTA); the Broadcasting, Entertainment, Communications and Theatre Union (BECTU); and broadcasters. As part of the Future Film Skills Programme, the Work Foundation conducted research for the BFI (Carey et al, 2017) that examines a shortage of skills in the film sector. Based on the Work Foundation's research, the BFI released the *Future Film Skills 10 Point Action Plan* (2017b) that had to do with, among other

---

[14]   Henceforth I shall call this plan 'BFI Plan 2017-2022' or 'BFI2022'.

things, diversity (or rather lack thereof) in the workforce. The *Action Plan* argues that there is a 'great challenge of inclusion' of diverse voices in the film work (*ibid*.: 18). According to the document, in 2015, 40% of the workers were women and 12% from working-class backgrounds (*ibid*.: 18). Also, it highlights the disadvantages faced by small independent producers and by producers based outside of London (*ibid*.: 13). The *Action Plan* identifies contradictory principles at work in attempts to promote diversity, namely competition on the one hand and fairness on the other. It argues that '[t]ackling this lack of inclusion will be vital to addressing skills shortages, ensuring future competitiveness and supporting a fairer society' (*ibid*.: 19).

The BFI2022 has other initiatives that aim at diversifying the film workforce. The Into Film initiative involves 5-19 year-old children from different social backgrounds in watching and making films. As part of this initiative, approximately 10,000 film clubs were created across the country (BFI, 2017a: 16). The BFI provides £24 million of National Lottery money to Into Film over five years (BFI, 2020b; BFI, 2017a: 28). The BFI's Film Academy provides training opportunities to 16-19 year-olds and has a £7.5 million budget (BFI, 2017a). The BFI aims to promote regional production (i.e. production outside London) by redistributing 25% of its Production Fund, which is worth £79.5 million, to film centres outside London (*ibid.*: 8, 28). Those centres provide additional support to the regional BFI Network. The BFI established an Enterprise Fund, worth £10 million, in order to support small film production companies (*ibid*.: 8). The BFI allocate additional funds for supporting low-budget and 'debut' filmmaking (*ibid*.: 8).

In 2016, the BFI launched its Diversity Standards initiative (see BFI, 2019a; BFI, 2019b). That initiative promotes diversity of representation both on and, as the

BFI likes to say, behind the screen. A film must meet at least two of four so-called

Diversity Standards in order to qualify for BFI funding, or BBC funding, or Film4

funding. Since 2019, a film must meet those criteria to be eligible for BAFTA Film

Awards and for the BIFAs (the British Independent Film Awards). The Standards

document discusses exclusions in relation to the 'protected characteristics' of the UK

Equality Act 2010[15] and three additional characteristics such as 'regional

participation', 'socioeconomic background', and 'caring responsibilities' (BFI,

2019a: 2). Two of the four Standards pertain to the diversity of the workforce behind

the screen. So-called Standard B has to do with central roles in film sets, and

Standard C is about training and job opportunities (BFI, 2020a: 7). Standard A relates

to on-screen representation, whereas Standard D deals with audience diversity (*ibid*.:

7). Achieving Standard B, which is entitled 'Creative leadership and project team', is

conditional on matching with at least two of the four points that include having

underrepresented filmmakers at Department heads' roles, other key roles, other staff,

and offering regional employment (BFI, 2019a: 4). Criterion B3, which is entitled

'Other project staff', aims at having 50% of women and 'significant amount of

crew/staff from a lower socioeconomic background' (*ibid*.: 4). Standard C, 'Industry

access and opportunities', has to do with offering, to underrepresented filmmakers,

such things as paid jobs, training, promotion and mentoring (*ibid*.: 5).

The BFI encourages British film productions to adopt the Diversity Standards

(BFI, 2017a) by providing help and guidance for meeting the standards. One way in

which the BFI provides such support is by giving a list of resources and organisations

---

[15]   The protected characteristics include age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage
       status and civil partnership status, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex
       and sexual orientation.

(BFI, 2020c). For instance: Cinemamas is a platform for filmmakers with caring responsibilities; Primetime is a database of women filmmakers; and Reel Angels is an agency encouraging women's representation in film workforce. Several organisations specialise in 'industry access and training opportunities' (the provenance of Diversity Standard C). They include: the BFI Film Academy; the MAMA Youth Project; and TriForce Creative Network. Also, the BFI encourages film producers to change their working cultures by preventing bullying and harassment practices. The BFI co-wrote, with BAFTA, *A set of principles to tackle and prevent bullying and harassment in the screen industries* (BFI, 2018a) and *A practical workplace guide for the prevention of bullying and harassment in the screen industries* (BFI, 2018b). These principles are incorporated within the Diversity Standards.

The trades unions have played a role in increasing diversity and inclusion in the sector. The Broadcasting, Entertainment, Communications and Theatre Union (BECTU) launched a *Say No to TV Exploitation* campaign that intended to change working conditions in the television sector (Campbell, 2013). Moreover, the BECTU conducted a survey among independent producers about their working conditions. The union commented as follows upon the results of the survey.

> Asked what top three changes they'd like to see to improve their lot,
> there were recurring themes, amongst them: shorter working hours,
> better pay, set rates, better budgets, more realistic schedules taking
> account of demands on location and in post-production, pay for hours
> worked, better training, more staff, better management, use of more
> experienced staff, proper breaks, higher meal allowances, rest days,
> respect at work, a shift in the balance of power between commissioners

and indies and a call for the sector to be regulated. (The News Line,

2014)

The BECTU published a *Factual TV Code of Practice* that suggests restricting a

working day to eleven hours and a week to five working days (Campbell, 2013). It

proposes that workers have regular breaks, paid days off, and meal and mileage

allowances. Health and safety arrangements and written contracts are part of the

Code's requirements. BECTU distributed the *Code of Practice* to independent

producers and commissioners so that they agree and follow it (*ibid*.).

The Producers Alliance for Cinema and Television (PACT) is a trade

association 'committed to improving diversity within the media industry and [to]

work[ing] collaboratively with our members and broadcasters to ensure that diversity

is at the very heart of their businesses' (PACT, 2020). The *Pact Indie Diversity*

Training Scheme aims at supporting marginalised filmmakers at the start of their

careers. It does so by creating opportunities for placements and mentoring. A trainee

receives the *Indie Training Fund* supporting their professional development. PACT

provides information and practical support for those independent production

companies that seek to diversify their workforce. For example, PACT created the

Pact Diversity Tool Kit. This Tool Kit means to increase awareness about equality

law, unconscious bias, and diversity schemes. The PACT provides information about

various schemes and programmes available in the film and television industry. For

example, BAFTA Scholarships, BBC Careers, 4Talent, Creative Access, Grierson

Doc/Lab, and My First Job In Film.

6.2.3 Diversity initiatives by broadcasters

British broadcasters adopted various means to alleviate inequality 'behind the screen'. The BBC has its *Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2016-20* (2016a), which stresses the commercial interest that the BBC has in achieving greater representation. The strategy sets targets for workforce representation. Those targets include: 50% of all positions including senior ones are to be occupied by women; 15% of all positions are to be held by people from ethnic minorities; 8% of positions are to be held by disabled people; 8% are to be held by LGBTQ+ people by 2020 (*ibid.*: 13). The BBC identifies three main areas of work towards achieving the targets. Firstly, it published *BBC Content Diversity and Inclusion Commissioning Guidelines* (BBC, 2016b), and those guidelines are intended for in-house and independent productions making programmes for the BBC. *Guidelines* inform that all productions should meet the requirements of the announced targets. Secondly, the BBC launches various programmes increasing diversity. For instance, the Assistant Commissioner Development Programme aims at having commissioners from diverse backgrounds (BBC, 2016a: 11). The Diversity Creative Talent Fund provides £2 million in funding to producers from ethnic minorities and with disabilities (*ibid.*: 11). The BBC created a centre in Birmingham that coordinates its programme-making (*ibid.*: 11). And thirdly, the BBC launches the diverse audience panels (*ibid.*: 12). Within the BBC, the *Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2016-20* creates a new, anonymised, application process and diverse job interview panels (*ibid.*: 14). The BBC created diversity and inclusion training for its managers to 'meet business needs' – for instance, Fair Selection and Unconscious Bias training (*ibid.*: 15). A Women's Career Development programme was launched to help women obtain senior positions (*ibid.*: 15). Also, the BBC created, within itself, various mentoring programmes and diversity networks.

There also BBC's apprenticeship schemes designed to 'creating aspirational ladders of opportunity into our industry for everyone, regardless of background' (*ibid*.: 16). And the Creative Access Intern Programme is designed to support newcomers from socio-economically disadvantaged groups and from ethnic minorities (*ibid*.: 17).

The BBC published a report entitled, *Reflecting the Socio-Economic Diversity of the UK within the BBC Workforce*. The report discusses class inequalities within the company (BBC, 2018a). The report employs data about the social backgrounds of 60% of BBC employees; that data was first gathered in 2017 (*ibid*.: 5). According to the report, the BBC is not an (upper) middle-class institution but rather is characterised by social mobility and diversity (*ibid*.: 5).[16] However, the report identifies a problem of underrepresentation. 61% of BBC workers have parents with professional backgrounds, in comparison to 33% in the population at large;[17] and 17% of BBC workers attended independent schools, in comparison to 7% within the UK population[18] (*ibid*.: 8). The report argues that there are entry barriers for people from disadvantageous backgrounds, their slower career progression, and a low number of them on the top managerial positions (*ibid*.: 5, 9). The document gathered qualitative accounts from the BBC staff about the exclusion of people from disadvantaged class backgrounds (*ibid*.: 11). They argue that there are structural barriers to diversity, namely unpaid employment, 'fitting in' to a 'BBC person' type of sociality, and

---

[16]   My fourth chapter discusses the rhetoric of meritocracy that the research interviewees adopted.

[17]   The BBC (2018a: 8) distinguishes between professional, intermediate and working-class backgrounds. The socio-economic backgrounds of workers are captured by measuring their parental occupation at the age 14.

[18]   In its analysis of the workforce diversity (BBC, 2018a), the BBC ignores Oxbridge education.

underconfidence (*ibid*.: 11). The document states that there are no targets for workforce class equality in the Diversity and Inclusion Strategy – a strategy that considers socio-economic diversity as an 'add-on' to the schemes relating to gender, ethnicity, disability and so on (*ibid*.: 5). Based on the collected data, the report provides recommendations for facilitating socio-economic inclusion (*ibid*.: 6). The document sets a target of 70% of people from disadvantageous groups participating in training and placements; in that way, it aims to make recruitment consider class disadvantage along with other 'protected characteristics' (*ibid*.: 6). The BBC Outreach/Corporate Social Responsibility Programme aim to get young, disadvantaged people into broadcasting – by working with schools, colleges and charities (*ibid*.: 12). The report discusses training and recruitment bursaries for people who otherwise could not afford to travel to the BBC (*ibid*.: 12). It maintains that the BBC needs to further monitor diversity data and to review the BBC divisions. The report makes managers responsible for socio-economic inclusion within their units. The report acknowledges the inclusion work that has been done already by the BBC – for instance, Get-In Events, First Steps Talent Pools, North Young Ambassadors Scheme (*ibid*.: 7).

The report *Making the BBC a Great Workplace for Women* (BBC, 2018b) describes achievements and further actions towards the inclusion of women within the company. It acknowledges that already the BBC provides parental leave for women, organises a programme for women returning from leave, and has a BBC News Parents network supporting them (*ibid*.: 8). Also, there are various schemes and initiatives that aim to facilitate female career progression. For instance, the 'Women at the BBC' network supports women via lectures and discussions, and the Global Women in News (GWiN) network works towards increasing the number of female

managers (*ibid*.: 8). The report makes recommendations for further work on diversity and inclusion. It suggests developing flexible working patterns to accommodate caring responsibilities of employees (*ibid*.: 10). It recommends further development of opportunities for women 'through mentoring, sponsorship and role models' (*ibid*.: 10). It requires that recruitment be 'free from gender bias' by involving female interview panel participants, using gender-neutral language in the job application process, and having a gender-mixed list of candidates (*ibid*.: 11).

In its *360° Diversity Charter*, Channel 4 discusses its 'strong reputation for diversity' aiming 'to include and nurture talent, and to reflect contemporary Britain on and off screen' (Channel 4, 2015: 3). The document acknowledges a problem of underrepresentation of disadvantageous groups in its workforce and proposes implementing targets to solve the problem. The targets include having the following composition of the workforce by 2020: 50% women; 20% ethnic minority; 6% disabled; 6% LGBTQ+. The *Charter* dedicated special funds, including the Alpha Fund and the Growth Fund, and together amounting to £5 million, to improving diversity and inclusion (*ibid*.: 4, 5). Commissioning Diversity Guidelines were introduced in order to ensure that all commissioned programmes at Channel 4 meet the various targets and requirements (*ibid*.: 4). The report argues that Channel 4 makes efforts to create training, schemes and databases, all of which promote diversity and inclusion. For instance, Channel 4 and Creative Skillset run the £37 million Employer Ownership Pilot that develops new skills training (*ibid*.: 5). Channel 4 encourages its staff to take special training in order 'to develop a culture of diversity and inclusion', such as the Born Different programme and the Managing Diversity module (*ibid*.: 16). Channel 4 made managers responsible for ensuring that their teams are diverse and inclusive (*ibid*.: 11).

Diversity Analysis Monitoring Data (or 'Diamond') is a database of diversity in broadcasting (Creative Diversity Network, 2018; 2019; 2020). The project was launched in 2016 by the BBC and the Creative Diversity Network. The Diamond's participants are the main UK broadcasters, namely the BBC, Channel 4, ITV, Channel 5 and Sky. The document *Diamond: The Third Cut* (Creative Diversity Network, 2020) collected 600,000 production contributions across the UK. It reports a significant improvement in representation of women behind the screen, namely that there are 54% of women working on Diamond's broadcasting production (*ibid*.: 3). The data demonstrates workforce underrepresentation of transgender people, LGBTQ+ people, disabled people, BAME people and people over 50s. However, the Diamond project does not collect information on the class composition of the workforce in broadcasting.

6.2.4 Critical reflection on diversity policies in the film and broadcasting industry

The diversity initiatives in cultural industries are criticised widely in academic studies.[19] The main criticism is that despite all the initiatives diversity has little increased. Indeed the initiatives have worsened various forms of exclusion (CAMEo, 2018; Freedman, 2016; Malik, 2018; Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020; Nwonka, 2015; Saha, 2018).

The diversity policy interventions in the film sector are categorised by researchers into different groups. There are 'empowering' initiatives and

---

[19]   See: Ahmed (2012); CAMEo (2018); Freedman (2016); Freedman & Goblot (2018); Gray (2013); Malik (2013); Malik (2018); McGuigan (2004); Moody (2017); Nwonka (2015); Nwonka & Malik (2018); Newsinger & Eikhof (2020); Saha (2012); Saha (2018).

'transforming' initiatives that aim to facilitate diversity and inclusion (CAMEo, 2018: 42-43; Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020: 52). Most policy initiatives fall into the 'empowering' category and include training and mentoring opportunities facilitating workers' abilities to develop their careers (CAMEo, 2018: 42). As the CAMEo report states, there is 'little to suggest that these interventions have addressed the underlying causes of inequality or removed barriers to equal participation' (*ibid*.: 46). As Newsinger and Eikhof put it, there is not enough research evidence evaluating the empowering initiatives in the film sector (2020: 52). The 'transforming' initiatives are 'more far reaching' than 'empowering' ones in that they seek to change exclusionary practices (CAMEo, 2018: 43). The aforementioned BFI Diversity Standards amount to such a transformative practice; Diversity Standards change funding distribution to make film production more diverse. Following Ahearne (2009), Newsinger and Eikhof (2020) divide film diversity policies into the explicit and the implicit. The former cite diversity explicitly. The latter do not but nonetheless might affect it (*ibid*.: 48). Explicit diversity policies include the Equality Act 2010, Ofcom's Diversity and Inclusion Programme 2018–2022, and Channel 4's 360 Diversity Charter. Examples of implicit diversity policies are those affecting access to education and to employment in the film sector. Such policies include reductions in public expenditure and a shift to market relations (*ibid*.: 63). The distinction between the two types of policies matters because it helps one to grasp a broad policy climate that encompasses any programmes of changes designed by governmental and non-governmental actors (*ibid*.: 50). The distinction is essential if one is to understand the limited effectiveness of explicit diversity policies in the culture sector (*ibid*.: 65).

There is a dearth of compulsory regulatory frameworks that aim to tackle workforce underrepresentation in the film sector (CAMEo, 2018; European Women's

Audiovisual Network, 2016; Freedman, 2016). The various policy initiatives are 'localised and organisation-specific': different film and television institutions establish different diversity schemes (CAMEo, 2018: 43). Actors are provided with recommendations, rather than obliged to take actions towards achieving workforce diversity. The existing policy initiatives do not reach 'deep-rooted problems'; those problems call for 'stronger, coordinated action' (European Women's Audiovisual Network, 2016: 4 quoted in CAMEo, 2018: 43). As the report *A Future for Public Service Television* claims, the diversity initiatives are 'small steps in the right direction' that do not effect profound change to, for instance, structures of the sector and commissioning practices (Freedman, 2016: 112). The diversity policies do not provide the wide range of actions needed to tackle marginalisation and indeed, for that, more money is needed (*ibid*.: 113). As the report suggests, '[t]elevision must provide a means by which all social groups are able to speak, to be portrayed respectfully and accurately, to have equal employment prospects and, to have access to a wide range of content' (*ibid*.: 110). The report argues that the film and broadcasting sector should fall under the 2010 Equality Act, and that the sector should undertake 'public service equality duties' (*ibid*.: 157).

The policy initiatives indicate that a lack of workforce diversity is 'a lost opportunity' for the commercial success of a business (CAMEo, 2018: 49; see also Freedman, 2016: 111; Saha, 2018: 88, 92).[20] Saha (2018: 92) argues that 'commodification of Otherness' is an ideological feature of diversity discourse operating as a technique of government. As Newsinger and Eikhof add, the so-called

---

[20]   Chapter five discussed the entrepreneurial discourse that instrumentalises marginalised filmmakers for commercial purposes of small production enterprises.

'business case for diversity' is an overarching motif of diversity initiatives across the film and television sector (2020: 49, 58-64). Newsinger and Eikhof argue that 'a return-on-investment approach' to diversity is a common and legitimate way to discuss reasons for policy actions (*ibid*.: 61). For instance, the BBC and Channel 4 argue that marginalised talents could contribute to commercial wellbeing of the industry: it would attract new audiences by representing their unique stories (CAMEo, 2018: 50-51). Although the idea is commonly accepted by various parties, there is limited research evidence for the idea (CAMEo, 2018: 53; Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020: 60). Moreover, the costs of diversity initiatives for small companies are higher than for the larger ones (CAMEo, 2018: 53; Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020: 60). The CAMEo report argues:

> Both research and positive practice that can improve workforce
> diversity are dependent on financial resource and the ability to bear risk
> – neither are readily available for the many small and micro businesses
> and freelancers that make up a large share of the UK screen sector.
> (2018: 58).

Besides, it is argued that the commercial rationale for increasing workforce diversity 'implicitly undermine social justice rationales' (Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020: 62). The policy interventions imply that certain financial outcomes should be achieved as a result of bringing marginalised workers into employment. Consequently, various diversity initiatives compete with each other and with any other initiatives (*ibid*.: 61-62). Newsinger and Eikhof write:

> Where these alternatives promise a better, or even just a more clearly
> evidenced, return, the business case for diversity would accept and

establish a rationale that argues against any investment in diversity whatsoever. (*ibid*.: 62).

The diversity initiatives are criticised by researchers for a failure to consider systemic obstacles to marginalised workers in the film sector.[21] The diversity initiatives tend to focus upon inclusion, rather than upon structural mechanisms of exclusion (Freedman, 2016: 110). The policies interpret inclusion in terms of going beyond the social characteristics of employees. For instance, Channel 4 defines diversity as follows.

> Diversity is about being all-inclusive, regardless of culture, nationality, religious persuasion, physical and mental ability, sexual orientation, race, age, background and addressing social mobility. (Channel 4, 2012: 1 quoted in Freedman, 2016: 110).

Ahmed (2012) maintains that diversity policies detach social differences from the issue of discrimination, thereby alluding to their positive connotations. The discourse of diversity and inclusivity allows its interlocutors to avoid any political concerns about the marginalising nature of social inequalities. Malik (2013) argues that there is a 'depoliticised, raceless "diversity" consensus' (Malik, 2013: 17 quoted in Freedman, 2016: 111). A comprehensive historical account by Moody (2017) examines the depoliticised nature of the discursive move from depictions of discrimination to the issues of underrepresentation. He points out that the BFI inherits the 'cultural diversity agenda' implemented by New Labour and enacted by the UK

---

[21]   See: Ahmed (2012); CAMEo (2018); Freedman (2016); Eikhof & Warhurst (2013); Malik (2013); Malik (2018); Moody (2017); Newsinger & Eikhof (2020); Saha (2018).

Film Council (*ibid*.: 419). He concludes that cultural diversity policies fail to address 'the endemic problems of exclusion' (*ibid*.: 419).

Some recent studies criticise a quantitative approach to workforce diversity for its failure to understand structural causes (CAMEo, 2018; Freedman, 2016; Nwonka, 2015; Saha, 2012; Saha, 2018). These critics argue that using targets and dedicated funding to increase the representation of the marginalised is not structural change. Special funds for marginalised workers are an insignificant part of broadcasters' budgets and targets are 'rarely successful' and 'easily manipulated' (Freedman, 2016: 112). Those things do not remove systemic barriers – barriers that owe to, for instance, the nature of network sociality and the disadvantages of freelance work. Saha (2018: 88-89; 2012: 430) criticises what he takes to be an assumption of diversity policies, namely the idea that increasing the number of marginalised workers (in industries as a whole and senior positions in particular) would improve the quality of representation. The policy initiatives do not 'lead to a shift in the very discriminative nature of the film industry or have any impact in key decision-making roles in the sector' (Nwonka, 2015: 87 quoted in CAMEo, 2018: 44).

Although disadvantageous working conditions are major impediments for marginalised cultural workers, the policy interventions regard these workers as personally responsible for their lack of various resources (Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020: 54-55). Ostensibly empowering diversity policies presuppose that those they seek to aid lack skills and professional connections and that that could be fixed by providing them with suitable help. After being 'fixed', marginalised workers would be able to compete with the privileged (*ibid*.: 54). Such a 'deficit model of workforce diversity'

is highly problematic because it locates the cause of the marginalisation within 'deficient' workers themselves, rather than in power structures (*ibid*.: 54-55).

> The deficit model leaves no room for understandings of discrimination that are rooted in histories of racism, sexism, the reproduction of class inequality, and so on. Because of the deficit model of diversity that operates, implicitly, within and through them, most empowering initiatives work to preserve, reproduce and entrench inequalities rather than effectively reduce them. (Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020: 55).

As Newsinger and Eikhof argue, there is a need to discuss implicit diversity policies that shape a broader environment of the culture sector (*ibid*.: 64-65). They write:

> [A]ny attempts to increase diversity that do not tackle the structures of the industry, including its models of production and employment, are likely to be of limited efficacy; as Eikhof and Warhurst put it: 'A meritocratic world of work cannot be delivered within the creative industries' current model of production (2013: 504). (*ibid*.: 65).

The diversity initiatives are examined by researchers as a technology of governmentalities (Saha, 2018: 87; Gray, 2013). Diversity is regarded as a discourse that transforms and hides experiences of oppression, thereby reproducing the dominant structures within cultural industries, namely middle-classness, maleness and whiteness. These structures require marginalised Others to act in a way acceptable to the dominant forces (Saha, 2018: 92). The diversity policies are criticised by the researchers for contributing to the ghettoisation and stereotyping of marginalised experiences (CAMEo, 2018; Freedman, 2016; Malik, 2018; Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020; Nwonka, 2015; Saha, 2012; Saha, 2013; Saha, 2018; Randle &

Hardy, 2016). The film and television sector place marginalised voices in positions of producing specialist or minority programming that is deemed less worthy than the main programmes (Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020; Randle & Hardy, 2016; Saha, 2012). Therefore, these policy interventions do not benefit the careers of marginalised producers but rather the opposite. Malik (2018) criticises the policy recommendations of the *A Future for Public Service Television* report (Freedman, 2016). One of the report's suggestions about workforce diversity relates to increasing and 'ringfencing' funding (*ibid*.: 157-158). Malik argues that ringfenced funding schemes contribute to the ghettoisation and Othering of marginalised workers, as she puts it, 'whilst allowing more pervasive racialised inequalities and regimes of representation to remain intact' (2018: 109).

6.3   The 'bottom-up' approach to cultural policymaking

I turn now to the changes in policy advocated by the documentary filmmakers in the interviews.[22] The research participants provided accounts on how to reshape policies and to change the film workforce composition. The recommendations are based on experiences of the interviewees, therefore, they have speculative and suggestive character.[23] Without seeking to be comprehensive, the chapter section is engaged with the research questions: How are policy recommendations constructed discursively by the documentary filmmakers? What solutions are proposed by them with regard to class and gender inequalities in the film sector?

---

[22]   The chapter sections constitute policy recommendations that I will summarize in the main conclusion.

[23]   Chapter four explored the interviewees' experiences in filmmaking work of class and of gender inequality.

My exploration of policy recommendations by the interviewees is driven by theoretical considerations on reimagining new labour relations. Social changes are 'possible through rethinking and redescribing the social order and the possibilities for the future' (Barker, 2005: 410). Barker argues for a political aim relating to 'redescription' of sociality (*ibid*.). Following an idea held by Left Foucauldians, redescription is made by attending to a point of view of the disadvantaged who are excluded from policymaking (O'Regan, 1992).[24] In that way, a 'bottom-up' approach to cultural policies is adopted by me in this section of the chapter (O'Regan, 1992; McGuigan, 1996). According to this approach, cultural studies is to consider policies from the perspectives of culture practitioners (McGuigan, 1996: 18). As O'Regan adds, cultural studies are to be involved in policy formation by engaging with disadvantaged and excluded and aiming to 'defend or restore community' (1992: 410). As he puts it:

> In accordance with this largely 'bottom-up' programme, the policy of cultural studies involved foregrounding the recipient, the victim and the marginal in the exercise of social and cultural power. (*ibid*.: 409).

Malik et al (2017) adopt such a bottom-up approach to diversity in community filmmaking. They examine how filmmakers understand cultural diversity and what practices of diversity they implement. In his critique of the diversity agenda, Saha explores 'actual experience' of British Asian producers in television 'from the ground up' (2012: 425).

---

[24] The debate between Left and Right Foucauldians was already discussed earlier in this chapter.

The research interviewees articulated a need for film production to be open to a greater variety of people. They made various policy suggestions towards that end. My study identified four discourses that were produced by the interviewees. The filmmakers suggested that there was a need for changing working conditions, namely increasing film funding and creating stable employment. They argued that there should be a redistribution of power: marginalised filmmakers should be brought into creative and decision-making roles. The documentarians believed there was a need for action, institutional and individual, in order to bring marginalised workers into film productions. Finally, they admitted that there was a need for changing imagination about the filmmaking profession. My subsequent sections examine these four discourses.

6.3.1 Changes in working conditions in film production

The first discourse is about changes in working conditions that would help get marginalised individuals into the profession. The interviewees articulated a need to increase film funding and remuneration, to create stable and permanent employment, and to provide employees benefits. In what follows I provide excerpts from the interviewees in order to substantiate this interpretation of the interviews.

The documentarians worried about lack of funding.[25] Most of them thought that the lack of funding restricted opportunities for individuals and for the industry as a whole. As one interviewee put it: 'There is definitely a shortage of financial resources to be able to create a sustainable documentary filmmaking industry' (Jack, 2018). Commenting upon the inaccessibility of the profession to those from poorer

---

[25] Chapter four investigated the financial constraints in filmmaking work.

backgrounds, another interviewee said: 'You cannot live in London for what BBC pays you, so you have to have wealthy parents who basically support you' (Sam, 2018). And another filmmaker commented that people from working-class backgrounds 'cannot afford to be interns or to be on rubbish wages while working the way up in the industry' (Finn, 2017).[26] Thus, a large majority of interviewees thought that the sector needed more funding. Increasing funding would allow a rise in remuneration that in turn would give filmmakers financial security. The filmmaking profession excludes anyone unable to take high financial risks in their career; but sufficient funding would create more opportunities for marginalised individuals working as freelancers, employees or entrepreneurs. Those marginalised persons would be able to live and/or travel to London where the industry is concentrated. Thereby they could be part of the professional networks that are crucial for employment in the industry. The interviewees criticised of unpaid placements on the basis that only the privileged could afford to take them up.[27] One interviewee stated:

> A lot of companies use cheap labour. I think it [should be an] agreement
> [that] no one should do more than two weeks of work experience. But I
> know some companies, quite a lot of companies, have [unpaid] work
> experience built into their business plans, so they have someone who

---

[26] The Precarious Workers Brigade is an initiative of workers in culture and education who launched a campaign against unpaid internships. They published a guide *Surviving Internships: A Counter-Guide to Free Labour in the Arts, and Payback Campaigns* (2011) that explored unpaid labour and modes of resisting it.

[27] According to the Creative Media Workforce Survey 2014, 84% of the film production workforce undertook unpaid work experience (Creative Skillset 2014: 10). On a relevant criticism of unpaid internships in cultural industries, see Hesmondhalgh & Baker (2011), Oakley & O'Brien (2016), Percival & Hesmondhalgh (2014), Ross (2000), Terranova (2000).

works for two weeks or a year. They [do it] in advance. I think it's not

great. (Alex, 2018)

A recurrent theme in the interviews was a need for policy regulation protecting fair

and equal pay. Concerns were expressed about the gender pay gap. For instance, an

interviewee said the following.

I think legally in other professions you have to pay people the same

wage, you have to have equal employment [for women]. I think it just

got down to the nitty-gritty that the film industry didn't carry on, didn't

change. (Emily, 2018)

Some interviewees suggested that changes needed in relation to the precarity of

employment in the film sector. The filmmakers identified several related desiderata,

including: permanent contracts; standard working hours; employee benefits. The

filmmakers argued that secure employment would bring into the sector more

producers who are marginalised (both in terms of class and gender). By contrast,

intermittent short-time employment was a serious impediment to marginalised

workers in the film sector.

And the young people who were working in the business have been

exploited, disgustingly in many cases. They do unpaid internships that

go on forever. It's tough! And they are all keep short term contracts, so

nobody gets any security. All the younger kids that I watched, they go to

six to nine weeks, the longest contract that they have is twelve weeks!

Haha! That's tough to survive on that… in London… I think it's tough

and I don't think that by saying it's tough you can do in it. I'm just

saying if you want a 9-to-5 job, on a regular income and security, then

television is absolutely not the place to be! (Anna, 2018)

Some interviewees indicated a need for secure employments and articulated their

nostalgic feelings for the time before casualisation of employment. They referred to a

unionisation of labour relations in the film sector that guaranteed financial and social

security to its employees. They said that workplace security would take social

inclusion of filmmakers from a variety of backgrounds. One interviewee referred

explicitly to the benefits of unionisation in the following excerpt.

[U]nions were there who watched everything... I wouldn't have my

salary doubled [without their help]! […] They looked after you, they

fought for your rights, and there is no one there now to protect the

rights of the young people [from marginalised backgrounds]. (Anna,

2018)

Several interviewees were critical of the sector's lack of employee benefits such as

parental leave, sick leave, and annual leave. They argued that it contributed to social

exclusion. The interviewees argued that the lack of such benefits meant that care

responsibilities were strong impediments for women's careers in the sector because

there were no guaranteed parental leaves for workers with young children. According

to the interviewees, 'family-friendly' (Anna, 2018) arrangements in the sector would

contribute to the inclusion of female workers.[28] For example, one interviewee said the

following.

---

28 Chapter four criticised discourse that attributes family and childcare to women. That
    discourse contributes to regressively traditional models of gender inequality.

One of the things that structurally could be done is not to penalise women who stop for a while [to have family and children] and then come back [to filmmaking work]. Because of this experience of having children counts as nothing, but actually it makes you more empathetic, you understand the world in a different way and so on. So, being able not to be quite so linear, that you have to start like this and you do this and this, and then you get successful, and then you get more successful. Life isn't like that. So, if it was some kind of accommodation for people with small children because it is still the case that women do most of the primary care, that would change things a lot. (Dana, 2018)

6.3.2 Power redistribution in film production

Several filmmakers argued that a redistribution of power would mitigate the marginalisation by gender and class. As one interviewee stated, the industry was controlled by 'a self-selecting club of people' (Alex, 2018) that reproduced the social composition of the film workforce. The documentarians discussed abuse of power by the industry gatekeepers.[29] They argued that the gatekeepers needed to take responsibility for 'the problems that they have created' (Susanne, 2017).

People who need to be telling that [there is a problem of underrepresentation] are those who are hiring, who was sitting in the departments where everybody looks like that [white middle-class men]. [One] should be questioning them: 'Why is everybody in this department, in this office, are men from Cambridge or Oxford? Have you thought about why your office looks the way it does? Have you

---

[29]   As discussed already in chapter four, the film industry is nepotistic.

ever advertised outside where you are?' And let them answer these
questions! (Susanne, 2017)

Some interviewees argued for bringing marginalised filmmakers (both in terms of
class and gender) into creative and decision-making roles. In the film sector, socially
privileged workers hold the most prestigious creative jobs. So, the filmmakers felt a
need to redistribute positions of power within the profession – in the following sense.
Women and individuals from working-class backgrounds should hold a greater
number of creative and decision-making jobs. Those people would in turn contribute
further to inclusion by looking for new voices to be represented in labour relations.

> I think it's always a question of trying to change the culture, and you
> can only do that by having the people who create the culture be
> different. So have working-class people who'd become commissioning
> editors at [the] BBC or Channel 4. […] I think that how you change
> things by changing power. (Jasper, 2018)

Talking about this issue, another interviewee argued that the film industry with
powerful gatekeepers was outdated and eventually 'going to be destroyed':

> Because it's established, it has a lot of rigid structures that have been
> there for years. And at that time, when the film industry was very
> different, when making a film was so much more expensive, when you
> could not do it without the support of institutions. But then it was
> changed. But the system has not actually changed. So, it still kind of set
> up for that world where you only make a film… that possible if you are
> working at the BBC, ITV. […] I think that's because of the fact that the
> people who are running these institutions have been there for a very
> long time. And that's all they know. They don't actually realise that

> there is an undercurrent of the world that is changing, and the power
> structures are changing... In five years, Netflix would be more powerful
> than BBC, probably! […] I think it's just the fact that the UK film
> industry is established, and so it's rigid. And because it's so rigid, it's
> going to be destroyed! (Susanne, 2017)

In addition, the interviewees argued for redistribution of financial resources in the film sector. They argued that film funds tracked privilege rather than merit.[30] The film sector was a 'rigid system' that allowed only male filmmakers from upper and middle-class backgrounds to flourish (Susanne, 2017). The industry gatekeepers gave financial opportunities mainly to socially privileged producers.[31] By contrast, marginalised filmmakers had significantly fewer chances to get funding.

> There is a very rigid system. People come from film schools and then
> they go to the schemes, and then from schemes, they get to make their
> films, and then they go to the festivals with feature films. And their
> films are picked up or not. It is the same pattern. People that those
> things happen to always tend to be male, largely, and even when the
> women they are mostly Caucasian, they are mostly white. That was
> truly the trend. Which I think it's because the people who actually get
> these opportunities are not actually the best. They are just the people

---

[30] According to the Creative Media Workforce Survey of 2014, 71% of the film production workforce found their positions through informal recruitment method, namely through word-of-mouth recommendations made by colleagues, friends, relatives (Creative Skillset, 2014: 11). Chapter four discussed nepotism in documentary film production.

[31] According, again, to the Creative Media Workforce Survey 2014, 44% of film production workers had parents with degree level education, while 19% of them attended independent, also known as fee-paying, schools (Creative Skillset, 2014: 26).

who the system has decided they gonna let make a film. [...] Because

we kind of have this system where there are a lot of gatekeepers and

these gatekeepers have a lot of power, and they pick their hand, pick

who gets to make film or not. You almost kind of have to wait to get

picked. So, I have not waited to get picked. And I know a lot of reasons

why I would not get picked. (Susanne, 2017)

Various filmmakers articulated a need to move some film production centres, film funding, and film events from London and the South East to the regions.[32] They argued for redistribution of funding to regional producers who were at disadvantaged positions in comparison to their London-based counterparts. Also, it was important to develop work opportunities, training schemes and network events in the areas outside of the metropolis. Several interviewees agreed with the statement that the film sector needed to be 'properly regionally fragmented' (Sam, 2018). According to their accounts, policy initiatives were required for developing cultural clusters in the film industry. They attributed geographical fragmentation to class distinctions and argued that filmmakers from marginalised backgrounds should be included. What one interviewee said on the matter is worth quoting at length.

I think that the disadvantage of geography is sort of one of the least

understood dimensions of this [class inequalities]. If you happened to

live outside London, it's very very hard to become a part of a network

of people within the industry that is in London. And actually I think the

only way around that… the major way around that is through the area of

---

[32] According to the Labour Force Survey (Screen Skills, 2019: 63), there were 84,000 workers in London, out of total 169,000 workers in screen industries in 2017 (screen industries include film, television, games, animation).

public policy that would need to be financial incentives… I'm sure
there have to be government incentives to make it possible for people
who were a long way away from the centres of filmmaking to be able to
afford to live there and work there. […] It's possible that in big cities,
say Manchester, or Birmingham, or Cardiff, there are enough people
working there to be able to create… new clusters… If you can't take
people from miles away from London and bring them to London and set
them to work here, then obviously the alternative is… in some cases…
the alternative can be for that to be stated dimension to help promote
those self-sustaining creative clusters. […] I think the third thing that
can be done is that there are a number of initiatives that could be taken
that will make it easier for people who are by virtue of geography, or by
virtue of socio-economic class, are not part of the industry to become
part of that network. Which is a range of very simple things like having
roadshows that go out and travel around the country, having workshops
that bring and get people to introduce to other people in the industry.
(Jack, 2018)

6.3.3 The inclusion of marginalised filmmakers in the film sector

Some filmmakers believed that institutional and individual initiatives were needed in order to include marginalised filmmakers in film production. The institutional initiatives that they had in mind had to do with targets and quotas for workforce representation. The individual initiatives had to do with what individuals could do in order to bring marginalised filmmakers in workplaces. Some interviewees suggested creating inclusion initiatives such as film festivals, training opportunities, and networking events. Some filmmakers advocated the creation of radical film cultures operating outside existing mainstream film productions. They articulated a

need for developing networks operating as spaces of support and solidarity. This section discusses the filmmakers' suggestions in greater detail.

Several interviewees remarked that implementing targets and quotas would contribute to a greater representation of marginalised filmmakers (both in terms of class and gender). Some interviewees believed in positive discrimination that would create just allocation of positions in the filmmaking profession. One interviewee was emphatic: 'I think the only way things would change is if the regulator from broadcasting somehow put quotas [into being]' (Sam, 2018) They suggested that different schemes were implemented by policymakers and accepted by film productions. Another interviewee shared an experience of his company creating a placement scheme for marginalised filmmakers.

> And one of the things that we can do… and an employer can do as a response to that [problem of underrepresentation]… so, for example, we are a very very small company, but we have got here at the moment somebody who is working on a formal internship being set up by [<trade association>], which was set up to encourage… to increase the number of entrances into the film business, particularly, for people with diverse backgrounds. And we have somebody who is here under this scheme. (Jack, 2018)

Another interviewee argued that quotas should be implemented in order to support small independent productions outside of London.

> At the moment, [there are] the quotas on independent production which is good. But the trouble is that independent production tends to be provided by just a handful of very large companies or subsidiary

companies of large companies. Unless the regulator made a quota that
maybe half of all independent production had to be provided by
companies of less than ten people or companies living in regions, based
in the regions, it will never change. (Sam, 2018)

Some interviewees proposed that both regulators and companies had to do their parts:
the regulations had to regulate and the companies had to cooperate.

The thing is obviously the larger companies have to create a range of
things… but any company… there is only a half of dozen of us [in our
company]… any company, however small [it is]… can respond to
initiatives that exist to help deal with these issues of exclusion. And it's
obvious from the example I'd given, the basic initiative does have to be
taken either by [<association>], or have to be taken by the government,
or an official governmental body. (Jack, 2018)

Another research participant admitted that broadcasters should be engaged in
implementing quotas.

Well, I just think it would help if suddenly tomorrow the BBC had to
make, had to source, say, even just 20% of their programming from
companies outside London and companies of less than, maybe, ten
people, then I think things will start to change. (Sam, 2018)

Moreover, some interviewees thought that there was a need for filmmakers to
change their own workplaces. They argued that individuals should promote inclusive
practices at their workplaces, whether the latter be production houses or freelance
projects. Filmmakers were suggested to make efforts to bring in marginalised voices

and to increase their presence in the film sector. Talking about her contribution to the creation an inclusive workplace, an interviewee spoke as follows.

> Unless you structurally change things and you positively give [work] opportunities to people and training opportunities and so on [nothing would change in the film sector]. So, I actually, I sort of set up things… and I had one Pakistani heritage and one Caribbean heritage – young men who were former students of mine. And I said: 'I want them to be with me [on a film set]'. Because unless you set… you have to positively say: 'This is what I'm going to do in order to change anything'. Because, otherwise, everything stays the same. And everybody is going 'Oh dear that's terrible!' Haha, saying 'Oh dear' is pointless! You have to do something. (Dana, 2018)

Another interviewee shared his story of having a team of working-class filmmakers. He indicated that the presence of working-class people, by itself, would result in 'breaking down' of the nepotistic film industry.

> I would still say that there is a very high proportion of people who are privately educated, who are from a middle-class background or higher, and white. So we are still telling their stories. […] But I noticed that… the world is changing. So the production team I had before came with me and worked on other projects. And the production manager is working-class from Newcastle, he is the guy who worked with me, he is Irish Arabic, he is from London, but he has a working-class background. And then the other person who is working is a woman from a working-class background and from Manchester. It is a team. It is breaking down. But again it is breaking down this sort of nepotism.

[…] By people like us breaking through, it automatically changes the discipline [of the film industry]. (Finn, 2017)

Another filmmaker said that she made sure that she recruited women for her projects. She explained as follows.

I prefer to work with females. There are lots of females in roles like researcher roles, assistant producer role, producer roles – they tend to be held by females. So as a female director, when I'm working with a team, often the team is female. […] If I put the voice of those who normally don't get a voice on a platform where more people can see them, then we might understand each other better. (Greta, 2018)

A further excerpt illustrates the same rationale behind another interviewee's actions. His metaphor of 'sending an elevator back down' expresses a worry about social justice:

The more I grow, the more opportunities that I can give [to marginalised filmmakers]. You have a responsibility to send the elevator back down. You've managed to go up, you need to send it back down, so the next person can come up. (William, 2018)

A few interviewees argued that when they sought to do the right thing by inclusivity, justice was their main motivation. They referred to neglecting consequences of their actions for companies' prosperity. They assumed that their protégé might be unsuccessful. As one interviewee put it: 'If you are going to change things, you have to give opportunities to people and you have to let people fail' (Dana, 2018).

In addition to setting targets or initiating individual scenarios, the interviewees remarked that there was a need for creating various inclusive working practices. Their suggestions were about structural, rather than quantifiable changes. For instance, interviewees advocated for various training opportunities and inclusive networking events, which would provide accessible routes into film careers. Moreover, mentoring programmes could ease the career progression of marginalised filmmakers. An example discussed in several interviews referred to creating film festivals that would provide training, networking and distribution opportunities for marginalised filmmakers. In one case, an interviewee thought that creating specialised film festivals would increase the presence of marginalised workers within a socially homogeneous industry.

> I was involved in a film festival called [<festival>] which was all set up
> with the intension of giving a voice to marginalised people: a lot of
> Black filmmakers there, Arab filmmakers, women filmmakers. And that
> run for five years. [...] And there is a little pocket of people doing this
> sort of stuff all over the place. But it's a difficult business because film
> is an expensive medium, and the people who can control the things
> generally only commission things that they are politically comfortable
> with. (Jasper, 2018)

A company, which another interviewee ran, aimed at creating various inclusive initiatives such as a film festival, training opportunities, and production jobs. The film festival had various events that intended to support marginalised producers – for instance, seminars and advice support. It gave networking opportunities to marginalised workers who would otherwise have lacked them. Talking about her company's inclusive initiatives, an interviewee commented:

> Our focus has always been on… obviously, the best word is diversity,
> but we don't like to think of it in that way, because it makes you put
> people in boxes and not everybody fits in boxes haha… so we think of
> it as inclusion. And our biggest issue really is social mobility because
> we feel that it disproportionally affects women, disproportionally
> affects people from a different ethnic minority background. So the film
> and TV industry is much easier to navigate if you come from a well-off
> background, and if you are white, and if you are certain class, if you
> have been at certain school and university and you know a lot of people.
> So what we are trying to do? It's kind of give other people the same
> opportunities, so if they don't have these contacts and their uncle
> doesn't work for the BBC, they can still make efforts and move up the
> ladder. (Juliet, 2017)

The social mobility initiatives of this company aimed to create a platform that gave underrepresented voices 'mainstream exposure' (Juliet, 2017). The mainstream film and television sector was the company's priority. The same interviewee said that the mainstream media was more effective in contributing to inclusion than were 'niche' media.

> If you diversify the range of stories that are seen in the mainstream,
> then you are going to encourage filmmakers from different backgrounds
> because they are going to see stories that relate to them: 'Oh well, if
> they are doing that, then I can do it too.' (Juliet, 2017)

In contrast to suggestions about the 'mainstream exposure', there were various thoughts about creating radical documentary film cultures that would operate outside the oppressive structures of the film industry. Several interviewees sought to change

existing film production by developing, and supporting, new film cultures. As one interviewee put it, radical documentary film cultures could create 'politically oppositional' spaces of inclusion and solidarity.

> I don't think you can think of [the] documentary industry as one big industry. I think you've got lots of different people working in different areas, in different ways. So, you know there is the more formal world, funded – like the BBC or ITV. And, on the other hand, there are lots of people… out there making little films. It has been quite interesting with Greenfield Tower. The difference between an official [media] and… not documentaries, but kind of visual reports coming out. So, you've got the Channel 4 news and the BBC news, and then you've got little videos that have been made on the ground by the people who are working for the people… by the people themselves. And they are telling very different stories! And that's the kind of decision that you have to make about what kind of films you want to make, what kind of… how do you want to frame it. It's very very important how are you going to frame it. So, yeah, you can't talk about homogeneous documentary culture. I think you have to revise it to documentary cultures… It's not a perfect cinema, it's not necessarily well made, it's not necessarily perfectly edited. Cheap cameras, you know. But really politically very very interesting, and politically quite oppositional. (Alice, 2017)

This view was echoed by another interviewee, who suggested that the world of independent filmmaking could resist the exclusionary behemoths of film and television. According to him, independent producers should not have taken jobs in the mainstream industry but opposed it by creating alternative spaces and cultures.

There are particular strands on British television, which I'm very uncomfortable with… I think they exploit working-class culture… I'm uncomfortable with that whole culture that has gripped English television; and I have nothing to do with that: I've never worked in it, I walked away from it if I could get a job, I don't take it because I'm not happy with it. And how would I change it? The only way I could change is by refusing to touch it. And hoping that my dislike of it, my discomfort, becomes more general, as people realise that it's actually… it's a pretty sick entertainment, environment that we've created. […] I think the more the people create an independent world for their works, the better. (Jasper, 2018)

Another interviewee articulated a need for political transformations of class structures. She distinguished between being radical and 'working within the system' (Alice, 2017). She illustrated this opposition with an example from her career: she had refused to work with a film initiative that was not involved in a discussion about social class. The interviewee said:

Can you do anything different, can you bring it back, can you transform anything if you are working within the system? I think with [<film initiative>], it's like how can I let [<film project>] be part of something that doesn't want to talk about class? And as far as I am concerned, any radical transformative projects has to engage with questions of class because that's what it is about. So, if a lot of middle-class people [in the aforementioned film initiative] are talking about their films and radically informed but don't want to engage with [the questions of class], then I don't think that you have the right to call yourself radical. (Alice, 2017)

When talking about radical documentary film cultures, the interviewees emphasised the importance of creating support networks for filmmakers. Radical film cultures were discussed by them as a space that provided support and solidarity. For example, the same interviewee as before said the following.

> With this film that we just made, someone contacted us and said: 'I really really like what you are doing, if you need any kind of postproduction work, I'll do it for you for free.' Ah that's great! And he did some lovely animation for the film, and he didn't charge us. And the same with the music. We've got some original music. […] So you are never truly independent. You're kind of dependent on people who believe in what you are doing. (Alice, 2017)

6.3.4 Changes in how film production is conceived

A variety of perspectives were expressed by interviewees about changes in how the film profession is imagined by people. Several interviewees worried that people marginalised by class and gender did not see themselves as fitting into the filmmaking occupation. As one interviewee put it: 'How do we get kids from Rotherham [into the film profession] who don't know about the industry? One has got talent, but it is not seen as a potential career.' (Finn, 2017) Interviewees said that individuals internalised exclusion and that this reproduced the marginalisation. They proposed various solutions – for example, the creation of educational opportunities, and of mentoring programmes, and of role models. Some filmmakers suggested that increasing awareness of social inequalities would help. This section of the chapter moves on to describe these suggestions in greater detail.

A few interviewees discussed the internalised expectations of marginalised people who were excluded from cultural work. One research participant thought that cutting funds for culture and art resulted in school students neglecting the filmmaking profession as a possible career. As one interviewee put it:

> I don't mean to say that somehow to push themselves [will result in] things' changes because the system is there. And it's very oppressive. The class thing, again, it's to do with what people imagine is possible. And so, that's to do with education. And if in schools now they've cut all of the funding for art and music and so on. So, how kids even know [that they can become filmmakers]? Just as I didn't know that I could make films. (Dana, 2018)

Another interviewee shared a story of a potential student who did not apply for a film school because she did not feel fitting in:

> There was one student, and I said: 'Right, can you send me your application?' And she sent me an application. And I said: 'Okay, can you turn up for an interview at such time?' She didn't turn up. And I said: 'Why you didn't turn up?' And she said: 'I thought at the end, I thought, I'm not going to fit in at the [<film school>]. (Alex, 2018)

Some research participants agreed with the statement that inclusive education opportunities would help. They suggested that educational institutions should develop the confidence of marginalised people in being able to take a camera and shoot a story. One interviewee said that a film school that he worked for should demonstrate inclusivity of any social backgrounds.

> I don't know how you get to pass that [internalised exclusion] except by demonstrating time, and time, and time again that this is a place for people to come from different backgrounds. Certainly, we [the film school] make that bias that we make that compensation for people who have not got money for the fees because we don't want rich kids, just rich kids, come in. So, that's why we have hundreds of thousands of pounds of bursaries. (Alex, 2018)

Another interviewee shared her experience of developing a programme aiming at finding trainees from marginalised backgrounds. The programme involved creating educational events in colleges and schools that prepared young people for broadcasting jobs. She commented on this issue:

> We've worked on the programme [<title>] and that meant to be an essential part for everyone who from high-end television want to find trainees in all different departments from the camera to make-up, to production, to everything. […] It was meant to open the doors for everyone. So we worked with the body Creative Skillset to increase their intake and diversify their intake, so we went to Manchester, Leeds, Bristol and London and we did a series of workshops and interviews going up to further education colleges as well as universities. And worked with people from a less privileged background using film to support them. (Juliet, 2017)

This view was echoed by another interviewee who suggested creating a workshop space for young people from working-class backgrounds:

> I think the other thing – I'm just looking at doing – is thinking about setting up some sort of workshop space in the North [of the UK] to

enable ordinary kids to somehow have a voice and make a contribution.
[…] To go and take a camera, or a telephone, or whatever, and make
stories about their world. (Nick, 2018)

Nick argued that educational initiatives would provide knowledge and confidence and
that those things would contribute to the inclusion of marginalised people in
filmmaking work. He gave an example from his filmmaking experience.

We had a [film] presentation each evening with the questions and
answers. I went into the city, and I thought about my friend who is a
working-class woman. And I said [to her]: 'I want you to come and
present a film tonight.' She was [replying]: 'I can't.' [Me:] 'You can!'
And then they came. And each night I had a different person. They
came and presented. And afterwards, they said: 'Oh, that was great! Can
I do it again?' They found confidence in a film. So, for me, filmmaking
is a vehicle to provide confidence [for working-class people]. (Nick,
2018)

A recurrent theme was a sense among the interviewees that mentoring
programmes would address an issue of a lack of confidence. One interviewee talked
about her experience of mentoring students from marginalised backgrounds and
helping them to progress their careers.

I do some mentoring at [<university>]. So, I mentor some students who
do graduating films. And that was something that I was able to do while
working. So, students can come to my cutting room or come to my
house on Sunday morning… And I do that because it's a way of trying
to help younger people and… the students from different backgrounds

who are trying to do maybe more political things, or students who are

people of colour. So, I'm really happy to do that. (Dana, 2018)

Another interviewee cited his experience of mentoring a working-class filmmaker in

the following excerpt. He argued that mentoring is an important initiative that

addressed the exclusion. He said:

> In terms of ethnicity and, I suppose, to some extent class background,
>
> one or two initiatives that I've come across are potentially quite
>
> important. I was a mentor on a television society scheme [that aimed] to
>
> encourage people from less well-off background to [work] in television.
>
> So, I did that. […] I was running my own company. And they just asked
>
> me whether I could look after someone who was on the scheme. He was
>
> a young man who came from… living with his father… his mother
>
> gone, his mother died… and his father was unemployed and disabled.
>
> And he had no money, but he was obviously very talented and applied
>
> to some places to study film and television. And then [<film school>]
>
> arranged him a little bit of money… and I was a mentor, they didn't pay
>
> me. But I think they pay his expenses to go and see someone like me to
>
> help him. (Alex, 2018)

Another issue reported by interviewees had to do with role models. Some

interviewees argued that having diverse voices within the film workforce would help

other marginalised people to consider the career of filmmaking. As one interviewee

put it:

> If you don't see somebody represented then you don't inspire to be in
>
> it… You need the role model, don't you? And you can inspire to do

something. If you don't see working-class people doing it, you don't

think you belong that. (Greta, 2018)

Another interviewee evaluated positively increasing participation of marginalised

people in the profession:

I think it [representation of marginalised filmmakers] continues because

people are breaking through, people can see role models which is really

good. So they know that… maybe people are trying to get into film who

might not even have tried before. (Emily, 2018)

Another interviewee pointed out that changing minds about career possibilities was

an important mechanism of inclusion. He illustrated his point with an example.

If you are a kid from South Yorkshire, from Doncaster, and every time

you get the train to Sheffield you going to pass Channel 4, that's gonna

affect! [You would think:] 'That's a place where I can work!' It's kind

of making it accessible and putting voices out there. (Finn, 2017)

Moreover, several interviewees argued that increasing awareness about social

inequalities would change the filmmaking profession. One filmmaker said this:

I think it's very much a matter of awareness. I think in past decades [...]

you didn't even think about those issues, because nobody made noise

about them… I think now social media, communications in general, all

this knowledge of how the figures are changing, how they ought to

change is very much high profile for everybody. I think the adjustments

will come as long as those mechanisms keep making a noise about it…

I think it's highlighting awareness is probably the strongest thing I can

think of. (George, 2018)

6.4   Conclusion

In this final chapter, I have examined policy discourses of social inequalities in the film workforce. The discourses are intertwined with power relations that are understood in the Foucauldian sense of force relations originated from multiple sources (Foucault, 1978). UK governmental bodies, together with film institutions, trades unions, broadcasters and filmmakers produce policy discourses about marginalised minorities in the workforce. These discourses lie within various points of power relations, and these discourses support, transform or resist each other. Diversity policy was examined as a prevailing discourse operating as a technology of governmentalities that reproduces power structures, namely, here, the power structures of middle-classness and maleness. On the other hand, the voices of filmmakers provide different perspectives on policymaking in the film sector.

The first part of the chapter discussed diversity initiatives implemented in the film and broadcasting sector and its criticism identified in the secondary sources. Marketisation and commodification are prevailing discursive frameworks that form diversity initiatives. Various actors refer to the commercial rationale for diversifying the workforce, namely that of business success by finding new audiences. The cultural diversity agenda replaces concern with injustice and discrimination; thereby the former operates as a technology of governance. It is evident from examining diversity initiatives that social class becomes invisible in the official diversity agenda. The 2010 Equality Act does not include social class within its 'protected characteristics', and broadcasters pay little attention to class differences in their workforce. Classed Others are hidden within the cultural policies because marginalised individuals cannot contribute to the accumulation of capital and to the

increase of profit. Financially marginalised workers are not of any use to business success; indeed, they require additional investments and redistribution of resources. Social class cannot be erased in the diversity schemes because class is fundamental for contemporary capitalist productions. Remedying social class problems requires redistribution of resources, whereas remedying other inequalities requires recognition (Sayer, 2005; Fraser, 1999). Gender, for instance, receives greater policy attention in UK legislation and in the diversity agendas of broadcasters. There is a call for increased visibility and increased recognition of women in the film industry. However, the way in which diversity schemes correct for gender celebrates differences, rather than emphasises discriminatory nature of gender inequality. Thus, the correction of gender inequality and hiding of class problem in the diversity schemes operate as technologies of government that manage marginalised minorities in the interests of business and capital.

The second part of the chapter explored policy discourses produced by the filmmakers. It focused on the research findings drawn from the interviews with the documentarians who contributed to the discussion about inequalities in filmmaking work. Unlike the 'top-down' approach to policymaking, the approach I took explored the voices of workers who speculated about policy changes based on their lived experiences. The 'bottom-up' approach is adopted to cultural policymaking. Unlike the official publications on diversity, the filmmakers' testimonies indicated disadvantages related to class and gender structures. They argued for a need for fundamental changes in working conditions and practices that would allow marginalised producers to create autonomous creative spaces. Examining how labour relations are reimagined and redescribed by the filmmakers was driven by the political interest in how social inequalities should be remedied.

Discussion and conclusion

This research aimed to explore class, gender and cultural work within British documentary film production. I discussed this by examining the discourses of documentary filmmakers on social disadvantages. The study explored empirical material comprising thirty-three interviews and also ethnographic observations of the industry events. The study aimed to determine how, in their work, filmmakers experience and articulate class and gender inequalities and to see what they thought ought to be done about it. In this concluding chapter, I will outline the contribution of my research. It will summarise my main findings in relation to the research questions. The findings will be followed by identifying future research areas. Finally, the study will be linked to the overall research aim.

1   Debates on social inequalities within the film sector

Social inequalities at work are discussed widely in the film industry. The sector collects and publishes information about underrepresentation and about the misrecognition of particular groups of workers. Their reports contain quantitative and qualitative data on those matters. The film institutions implement various schemes to tackle inequalities. The media publishes numerous materials about inequality within the cultural workforce. Workplace inequalities are a common topic of discussions among cultural workers. The documentary filmmakers interviewed for this study disclosed their experiences and observations of social inequalities at work.

The first research question concerned how documentary filmmakers experienced and articulated class and gender inequalities in British documentary film production. I explored discourses of class and gender constructed by the

documentarians. The interviewees acknowledged the existing social exclusion that was connected to disadvantageous working conditions. The filmmakers recognised underrepresentation and misrecognition of marginalised individuals. The financial constraints and precarity of employment exacerbated marginalisation by both class and gender. The interviewees, though, provided various explanations of how class and gender operated and affected film workers, and the differences in their interpretations are connected to their experiences.

The filmmakers in marginalised positions were likely to be reflective about structural inequalities. Their experience of disadvantage allowed them to 'see comprehensively' (Haraway 1988: 584) and to produce critical accounts about social barriers within the filmmaking profession. Although there was little evidence of overt discrimination in the sector, the marginalised interviewees believed that there was a subtle, systematic discrimination. For instance, they argued that class and gender marginalisation was embedded in labour relations. The informality of professional relations within the sector was one way in which, according to them, bourgeois behavioural codes, and specific cultural tastes, became hegemonic. The interviewees discussed the gender division of labour and different modes of misrecognition of female workers. Thus, according to these accounts, the labour relations within the film sector replicate middle-classness and maleness.

The filmmakers holding privileged positions, on the other hand, were likely to contribute to the discourses of meritocracy and postfeminism than the filmmakers in marginalised positions. Those who were most rewarded by the sector argued that talent, dedication and hard work would result in professional success. They acknowledged social inequalities in general terms but put greater emphasis on recent

social changes that leaded to meritocracy. According to their accounts, these changes made social inequalities at work a problem of the past.

The current distribution of discourses makes social changes in the film labour composition less possible because workers in decision making roles are likely to believe in meritocratic and postfeminist ideals. These discourses contribute to class and gender marginalisation, thereby reproducing the current social structures within the filmmaking profession. This empirical research finding illustrates the Foucauldian idea that discourse is a constitutive element of social reality. Discourse is understood as a constructing force that shapes subjects, social relations and forms of knowledge. What individuals say and believe does matter because it forms the societies that we live in.

2   Social inequalities and governing the self

The second research question was what are the ethos and practices of governing the self among documentary filmmakers. I discussed the entrepreneurial activity of the filmmakers as a response to class and gender inequalities at work. Entrepreneurialism is a prevailing discourse and mode of subjectification in the film industry. I examined it as a self-governing programme and subjectification, rather than merely as an organisational form of film production. Innovation, self-reliance, individuality, resilience and dedication were found to be constitutive features of entrepreneurial subjects. The entrepreneurial filmmakers sought autonomy and independence in independent work and did so in response to disadvantages that they faced in the film sector. They started their own enterprises in order to avoid classism and sexism.

The entrepreneurial discourses about class and gender, however, demonstrated a lack of awareness of exclusions operating within the independent business sector. Some filmmaker entrepreneurs argued that the independent enterprise sector was inclusive, meritocratic, and empowering for marginalised individuals. Another discourse indicated that social inequalities comprised an instrument for increasing the profit of independent enterprises. Also, the entrepreneurs considered marginalised individuals to threaten enterprise development. The entrepreneurial discourses about class and gender do not transform or even challenge structures within the profession. On the contrary, they contribute to reproducing the exclusion. Additionally, the work practices of independent enterprises were characterised by class and gender marginalisation. I argued that the film entrepreneurs uphold, rather than depart from, the discriminatory working environment of the film industry. For instance, the filmmakers employed friends for short fixed-term or unpaid work. Thus, the entrepreneurial discourses and practices replicate the homogeneity of the entrepreneurial community, a community made up mainly of middle-class men.

The thrust of my argument is this: outsiders who find themselves more or less compelled to become entrepreneurial filmmakers do not become thereby a different kind of person – different to the type prevalent within filmmaking – but instead themselves become (or do not cease to be) the type of neoliberal self that populates the industry at large. True, the interviewees presented entrepreneurialism as a liberation from constraints, I have argued that the entrepreneurs adapt to and replicate the existing exclusion. This finding illustrates the idea of singularity of neoliberalism that imposes itself ubiquitously. Ways of doing and being are channelled into a singular model that does not provide any available alternatives. Being outside means being outside filmmaking.

3   Policy discourses of social inequalities

The third research question was how documentary filmmakers constructed discursively policy recommendations concerning class and gender inequalities at work. I investigated this question by examining the existing policy initiatives and policy suggestions articulated by the filmmakers in the interviews. The approach 'from the bottom' to cultural policies was implemented: I considered the perspectives of individuals who were such that normally they were excluded from policymaking (O'Regan, 1992).

Diversity initiatives within the film sector are, I have argued, technologies of governmentality and specifically ones that transform and hide experience of social inequalities. The policies detach social differences from the issue of discrimination and refer to their positive connotations. Increasing the number of employees from underrepresented groups does nothing about structural causes of inequality. Therefore, diversity policies are unable to consider systemic obstacles that are faced by cultural workers. Governmental and non-governmental actors attempt unsuccessfully to implement diversity within the sector where free market and deregulation privilege the strongest. Little improves notwithstanding the initiatives. Moreover, the policies at issue reproduce current social structures of the film industry.

As Foucault argues (1991c: 158-159), social problems are complicated phenomena that require complex solutions. Unlike lawyers and legislators who speak on behalf of others, researchers do not find a straightforward route to address the issues. On the contrary, research aims to understand social phenomena through the lens of actors who deal with social problems in their everyday life. According to Foucault, social problems can be addressed by listening to practitioners who can

formulate problems in their complexity (1991c: 151, 159; 1977: 207). In his conversation with Deleuze, Foucault argues that the counter-discourse of individuals who are involved in sociality 'ultimately matters' (1977: 209). They are able to formulate social problems in their entirety, and their testimonies are enough 'to explode' the social systems (1977: 209). As Deleuze adds, the concerns of those who are directly involved form a 'revolutionary action that questions […] the totality of power and the hierarchy that maintains it' (1977: 209). The idea of political reforms, on the other hand, implies speaking on behalf of the others and simplifies the problems. The complexity of social dynamic does not provide easy answers and quick solutions, but rather relates to a long process of changes. As Foucault puts it, the research objective is 'to introduce modifications', rather than to find ultimate solutions (1991c: 159).

The filmmakers interviewed for this study provided their own perspectives on cultural policymaking and those experiences differed from the official diversity agenda. I categorised their policy suggestions into four main narratives. 1) They argued for the improvement of working conditions in the film sector, something that could be done, they thought, by various means including the promotion of stable employment and the increase of the funding available for films. 2) The documentarians articulated a need for a redistribution of power in order to change the social composition of the film workforce. They suggested bringing women and working-class individuals into creative and decision-making roles. There was a need for reallocating funding to marginalised producers. 3) The interviewees argued that institutional initiatives such as quotas, targets, and schemes should be implemented. Individual initiatives would contribute to creating a fairer working environment by providing training and job opportunities. The interviewees suggested creating

inclusive work practices that would contribute to structural, rather than quantifiable, changes. A number of filmmakers articulated a need for creating radical film cultures that would be inclusive spaces operating outside the film industry. 4) Finally, some interviewees argued for changing how people conceive filmmaking. This could be done by creating various education programmes for individuals from marginalised backgrounds.

The policy suggestions of the film workers related to the political implication of the research. The study drew a distinction between the categories of equality and equity. Equality regards justice as equivalence, whereas equity concerns justice as fairness (Banks, 2017: 11). Thus, everyone should be treated not only equally, but equitably meaning that they should be given their due by adjusting to their positions in the power structures. Equity, as applied to filmmaking, is about ensuring that everyone is able to enter and participate in the filmmaking work as equals. Making fair adjustments is particularly important for filmmaking, as in practice the industry is structured for entrants from privileged social backgrounds. There is a need to adjust the allocation of resources for marginalised people because 'the fundamental egalitarian aim is to extinguish the influence of brute luck' (Cohen, 1989: 931). Making adjustments would allow marginalised filmmakers to participate in cultural work as equals, thereby operating according to the principle of 'parity of participation' (Fraser, 2013; 2009).

Parity of participation comprises different dimensions such as distribution, recognition and representation (Fraser, 2013; Banks, 2017). My study considered social justice in filmmaking work in terms of redistribution of economic and social resources – the redistribution that would be brought about by structural changes

concerning payments, education and employment opportunities. The redistribution of resources relates to the challenging of existing forms of power structures in film production, thereby relocating funding and positions to the currently marginalised workers. In addition to distributive justice, recognition adds another dimension to social justice by ensuring that no grounds for discrimination and oppression remain. Recognition relates to the opportunities to express different voices and interests, namely adopting new work practices which would allow everyone to express their different ideas in the way that most suits them. Finally, representation is understood in a political sense of creating democratic spaces that speak for the marginalised groups.

4   Research contribution

My study offered three contributions to research literature. First, the thesis contributed to studies of governmentality. I demonstrated how documentary filmmakers governed the self and others. Second, my study made contribution to cultural labour studies. The thesis showed how documentary filmmakers experienced and articulated filmmaking work and workplace inequalities. Third, the paper made contribution to studies of documentary film. I analysed historical context of film production and lived experience of documentarians.

My thesis made contribution to studies of governmentality. (The relevant literature is: Barry et al, 1996; Bröckling, 2016; Bröckling et al, 2011; Burchill et al, 1991; Dean, 2010; Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982; Lemke, 2012; Miller and Rose, 1990; Miller and Rose, 2008; O'Malley et al, 1997; Rabinow, 1984; Rose, 1999.) I used governmentality approach to investigate documentary filmmaking work. My thesis discussed rationality of government, that is, how documentarians thought about

government. I identified how government is articulated and problematised by documentary filmmakers. Studies of governmentality is 'an empirical mapping of governmental rationalities and techniques' (Rose et al, 2006: 99). My thesis explored how documentarians governed actions of others, i.e. government of women and government of working-class people. The study explored how research participants governed themselves. My interviewees talked about their careers with regard to appropriate conduct at work. Documentarians showed which decisions they made in order to modify themselves and improve their professional conduct. Thus, my study made contribution to the studies that apply governmentality approach to the sphere of culture. (The relevant literature is: Bennett, 2004; Bratich et al, 2003; During, 1992; Hunter, 1988; Hunter, 1991; Hunter, 1993; O'Regan, 1983; O'Regan, 1992.) Additionally, my thesis contributed to the debate about subjectivity and governing of workplaces. (The relevant studies are: Miller and Rose, 2008; Donzelot, 1991; Rose, 1999; Townley, 1994.)

The governmentality approach interprets neoliberalism as a political project that refers to forms of government and self-government (Lemke, 2012: 79). Neoliberal governmentality facilitates entrepreneurial forms of conduct. My study made contribution to studies of entrepreneurial subjectification. (The relevant literature is: Bröckling, 2016; Dardot and Laval, 2013; Dean, 2018; du Gay, 1996; Gordon, 1987; McNay, 2009; McRobbie, 2002; Miller and Rose, 2008; Rose, 1999; Ursell, 2000.) The thesis explored entrepreneurial experiences of documentarians. I investigated ethos and practices of entrepreneurialism and identified entrepreneurial stand on social inequalities. The relevant criticism of Foucault's work is his relatively little research attention to the questions of resistance and transformations (Fairclough, 1992: 56-61). Some argue that Foucault's primary research focus is on systems of

domination and power (*ibid.*: 57). However, other researchers of Foucault's works state that this is an invalid criticism (Rose et al, 2006: 100; Rose, 1996). They argue that studies of governmentality explore competing programs of resistance (Rose, 1996). My study contributed to this debate and explored resisting discourse of documentarians. I explored counter-conduct of documentarians whose aim was creating inclusivity and diversity in the filmmaking sector. (The relevant literature is: Perry, 2016; Perry, 2020.)

This thesis contributed to research of cultural labour that is conducted within the disciplines of sociology, cultural studies and media studies. (The relevant literature is: Abbing, 2002; Banks, 2017; Blair, 2003; Caldwell, 2008; Deuze, 2007; Forkert, 2013; Gill, 2002; Gill, 2010; Gill and Pratt, 2008; Hesmondhalgh, 2013; Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011; Leadbeter and Oakley, 1999; McRobbie, 2016; Ross, 2009; Shukaitis, 2016; Shukaitis and Figiel, 2015; Taylor, 2018; Ursell, 2000; Wing-Fai et al, 2015.) I explored how documentarians experienced and articulated social inequalities at filmmaking work. My thesis investigated discourses produced in interviews by documentarians. The study contributed to the research literature that aim for 'doing justice to cultural work' (Banks, 2017: 2). Working conditions in the documentary sector are oppressive and provide little opportunities for working-class filmmakers and women filmmakers. The thesis identified how to organise fair documentary filmmaking work: I took a critical stand on existing diversity initiatives and proposed policy suggestions made by documentarians. (The relevant literature is: Ahmed, 2012; CAMEo, 2018; Freedman, 2016; Freedman & Goblot, 2018; Gray, 2013; Malik, 2013; Malik, 2018; McGuigan, 2004; Moody, 2017; Nwonka, 2015; Nwonka & Malik, 2018; Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020; Saha, 2012; Saha, 2018.) Thus,

my study contributed to the critical research that speak to 'the formation of normative principles for action' (Banks, 2017: 4).

My thesis contributed to the emerging area of studies on documentary film sector that are undertaken within social sciences. (The relevant literature is: Ostrowska, 2019; Ostrowska, 2020; Presence et al, 2020; Presence et al, 2021.) The documentary sector is 'a *distinct* element' of the UK film industry; it is characterised by unique ways of film production and film distribution (Presence et al, 2020: 3). Hence, documentary film requires separate research attention. My study explored institutional, social and economic context of documentary film production in the UK. I reviewed the main changes in policy regulation and in funding provision that are the most relevant to explaining the current ecology of British documentary film production. Moreover, this thesis discussed lived experiences of documentarians: it provided an empirical mapping of class inequalities and gender inequalities in documentary film production.

5 Recommendations for further research work

This research has thrown up many questions in need of further investigation. Social class in the film workforce has been less studied than other types of inequalities such as gender and race. It would be beneficial to collect and analyse quantitative and qualitative data on the class composition of the workforce. Robust longitudinal data on social class is needed if we are to understand labour relations over lengthy periods. Such data would, for one thing, illuminate the processes of 'middle classification' in the film sector that brings individuals from working and low middle classes into cultural workforce. An ethnographic perspective upon the

workings of class within cultural production would enrich our understanding of the nature of work in the film industry.

More research on the documentary film industry should be done in the UK and other national contexts. Documentary film production is a specific thing, different from other cultural productions. Learning more about it would allow us to better understand social problems in the contemporary employment. Further research should be undertaken to explore alternative cultural productions within the documentary film sector. For instance, a growing radical documentary film culture argues for a collective ethos and for involving marginalised individuals in filmmaking work. This would be a fruitful area for further research.

6   Democratisation of documentary film production

Ultimately, social inequality is inequality of power. Foucauldian analytics of power relations is a useful theoretical framework for my work because it makes sense of class and gender struggles in the documentary filmmaking profession. These struggles are a local point of the exercise of power that reveals a general problem of power relations in societies. The notion of power relations, as I use that notion here, refers to historically specific modes of governing and self-governing that are a 'structure of actions' (Foucault, 1983: 220). These actions are dispersing and fluctuating, and their historically specific forms of distribution are subjected to the research scrutiny. The British documentary film sector presents a complex set of social positions and associated power strategies. Power is always exercised upon particular social groups that lack power, and in the case of the filmmaking profession, these groups comprise women and working-class workers. A desire to get marginalised individuals involved in cultural production is a political rationale for

undertaking this study. The thesis imposes itself as resisting against existing power relations within a regime of film production that greatly benefits the male and the middle class. Listening to film workers and implementing policies that take their voices into account would be a move towards changing power relations and hierarchies.

'Culture is ordinary', as Williams (1989: 34) puts it. Anyone has to be involved in creating cultural artefacts because cultural values and meanings originate from their 'common experience'. Williams criticises the current social exclusions within cultural production that is created 'sectionally', rather than 'widely' (*ibid.*: 35). He juxtaposes an ideal of 'a common culture' to the 'divided and fragmented culture' that currently exists (*ibid.*: 35). Williams argues that certain social groups lack opportunity to communicate their cultural meanings: exclusion occurs via various mechanisms such as education, communication, and ownership. The common culture, on the other hand, relates to creating social conditions that would allow everyone to participate in creating culture. The common culture would make possible a socialist democracy, or, as Williams puts it, 'an educated and participating democracy' (*ibid.*: 37).

In documentary filmmaking, the common culture refers to creating social conditions that would provide excluded people with opportunities to contribute to cultural meanings and cultural values. Stronger unionization would be an immediate step towards creating the common culture within the film sector. Filmmakers as cultural workers should have protection for their rights. A stronger trades union would be able to improve employment in the film sector by developing a set of instruments that provide workers with the stable employment, employees' benefits, and sufficient remuneration. The union would keep up pressure upon institutions that sponsor

filmmaking, thus, making sure that they increase the funding allocated to minority communities. It would negotiate the creation more workplaces and opportunities for a greater variety of people. The trades union would fight for stricter legislative requirements that would gradually make employment precarity unlawful. Stable employment and generous remuneration are adequate working conditions that would attract individuals who are currently excluded from filmmaking due to a lack of class and gender privilege.

Another instrument of democratising documentary film production is the reallocation of decision-making roles to an independent body of filmmakers. The film sector should be self-governed by the autonomous body of professionals that would have a new diverse structure and would advocate for social changes within labour relations. The regulator, which would include members of the professional community, should be democratic and accountable to the public. It should have a responsibility to comply with principles of objectivity and impartiality in their decision-making. They should aim to build professional communities that are characterised by a diversity of opinions and perspectives. The professional body should implement structural changes in film production such as in the distribution of funding and the distribution of opportunities. They would have really care about minority communities and programming. The new regulator should create transparent mechanisms of hiring and promotion, which would allow all kind of voices to be heard. These mechanisms would erase the nepotism and informal sponsorship which characterise the film sector. The professional body should take risks in their commissioning work by involving a newly diverse range of people into film production. They would support the experimentation and innovation that minority communities would bring to the sector.

The foregoing changes in policy are needed to create an independent industry that reflects stories of ordinary people in Britain. Independence is understood in terms of autonomy from the capital city and from American studios. Film institutions should put significant effort into developing regional centres of film production. They could do so by introducing quotas and schemes for independent film production in the British regions. The major film institutions should move their centres to outside of London. Their presence would facilitate regional development of film production via creating new workplaces, providing training and opportunities. Regional film companies need generous funding and support for developing their production. In order to reallocate funding to regional producers, a new funding mechanism is needed to prevent well-positioned Hollywood studios from being a main beneficiary of British film funding. Reallocating film production to the regions would be a response to class inequalities in filmmaking work because regional geographies of class are characterised by the prosperity of the metropolis and scarcity of the regions. These policies would democratise film production by creating and subsidising local networks through which a wide range of local people would be able to contribute to film culture.

Bibliography

Abbing H (2002) *Why Are Artists Poor? The exceptional economy of the arts.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Adkins L (1999) Community and economy: A retraditionalization of gender? *Theory, Culture and Society.* 16(1): 117–137.

Ahearne J (2009) Cultural policy explicit and implicit: A distinction and some uses. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 15(2): 141–153.

Ahmed S (2012) *On Being Included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press.

Alacovska A (2015) Genre anxiety: Women travel writers' experience of work. *The Sociological Review*. 63(S1): 128–143.

Allen K (2013) What do you need to make it as a woman in this industry? Balls! Work placements, gender and the cultural industries. In Ashton D & Noonan C (eds) *Cultural Work and Higher Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 232–253.

Allen K, Quinn K, Hollingworth S & Rose A (2013) Becoming employable students and 'ideal' creative workers: Exclusion and inequality in higher education work placements. *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* 34(3): 431–452.

Annan (1977) *Report of the Committee on the Future of Broadcasting*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Arendt H (1998) *The Human Condition.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Arksey H & Knight P (1999) *Interviewing for Social Scientists*. London: Sage.

Ashcraft K (2013) The glass slipper: 'Incorporating' occupational identity in management studies. *Academy of Management Review*. 38(1): 6–31.

Ashton D (2015) Making media workers: Contesting film and television industry career pathways. *Television & New Media*. 16(3): 275–294.

Atkinson P & Coffey A (2001) Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. In Gubrium J & Holstein J (eds) *Handbook of Interview Research*. London: Sage, 801–814.

BAFTA (2018) *Screen industries unite around new anti-bullying and harassment principles*. [Press release]. 14 February. http://www.bafta.org/media-centre/press-releases/bullying-harassment-principles-and-guidelines. Accessed: 29 July 2020.

Bailey M (2004) *Cultural Governance and the Formation of Public Service Broadcasting: The Early Years*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Sheffield Hallam University.

Bailey M (2018) Back to the future: The uses of television in the digital age. In Freedman D & Goblot V (eds) *A Future for Public Service Television*. London: Goldsmiths Press, 166–172.

Bailey M (2019) Changing tides of industrial democracy: Red Clydeside and the UCS work-in as political heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. DOI: 10.1080/13527258.2019.1599986.

Banks M & Hesmondhalgh D (2009) Looking for work in creative industries policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy.* 15(4): 415–430.

Banks M & Milestone K (2011) Individualization, gender and cultural work. *Gender, Work & Organization.* 18(1): 73–89.

Banks M & Oakley K (2015) Class, art workers and the myth of mobility. In Maxwell R (ed) *The Routledge Companion to Labour and Media.* London and New York: Routledge.

Banks M (2007) *The Politics of Cultural Work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Banks M (2017) *Creative Justice: Cultural industries, work and inequality*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Barry A, Osborne T, Rose N (eds) (1996) *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Barker C (2005) *Cultural Studies: Theory and practice*. London: Sage.

BBC (2016a) *Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2016–20.* London: British Broadcasting Corporation.

BBC (2016b) *BBC Content Diversity and Inclusion Commissioning Guidelines*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation.

BBC (2018a) *Reflecting the Socio-Economic Diversity of the UK within the BBC Workforce*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation.

BBC (2018b) *Making the BBC a Great Workplace for Women. A report on career progression and culture for gender equality at the BBC*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation.

Becker H (1973) *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: The Free Press.

Becker H (2008) *Art Worlds.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bennett T (1989) Culture: Theory and Policy. *Media Information Australia*. 53: 9–11.

Bennett T (1992) Putting policy into cultural studies. In Grossberg L, Nelson C & Treichler P (eds) *Cultural Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 23–38.

Bennett T (1998) *Culture: A reformer's science.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Bennett T (2004) *Pasts Beyond Memory: Evolution, museums, colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Benyon J and Solomos J (1988) The simmering cities: Urban unrest during the Thatcher years. *Parliamentary Affairs*. 41(3): 402-422.

Berardi F (2009) *The Soul at Work: From alienation to autonomy*. Los Angeles: Semiotext.

Bernstein B (1971) *Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

BFI (2006) *The Stats: An overview of the film, television, video and DVD industries in the UK 1990–2003*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2017a) *BFI 2022 Supporting UK Film*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2017b) *Future Film Skills: An action plan*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2017c) *Creative Skillset to deliver BFI's Future Film Skills Programme*. [Press release]. 14 December. https://www.bfi.org.uk/sites/bfi.org.uk/files/downloads/bfi-press-release-creative-skillset-to-deliver-bfi-future-film-skills-programme-2017-12-14-v2.pdf. Accessed: 29 July 2020.

BFI (2017d) *Employment in the Film Industry*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2017e) *Film Industry Companies*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2018a) *A Set of Principles to Tackle and Prevent Bullying and Harassment in the Screen Industries*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2018b) *A Practical Workplace Guide for the Prevention of Bullying and Harassment in the Screen Industries*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2018c) *Statistical Yearbook 2018*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2019a) *BFI Diversity Standards Criteria*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2019b) *Extended Guidance Notes for Meeting the BFI Diversity Standards*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2019c) *Filmography.* London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2019d) *Statistical Yearbook 2019*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2020a) *Diversity Standards*. London: British Film Institute.

BFI (2020b) About Into Film. https://www.bfi.org.uk/education-research/5-19-film-education-scheme-2013-2017/about-5-19-film-education-scheme-2013-2017. Accessed: 3 February 2020.

BFI (2020c) Diversity Standards resources. https://www.bfi.org.uk/bfi-diversity-standards/diversity-standards-resources#standard-a. Accessed 5 February 2020.

Bignell J (2010) Docudramatizing the real: Developments in British TV docudrama since 1990. *Studies in Documentary Film*. 4(3): 195-208. DOI: 10.1386/sdf.4.3.195_1

Binkley S (2014) *Happiness as Enterprise: An essay on neoliberal life.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Blair H (2001) 'You're only as good as your last job': The labour process and labour market in the British film industry. *Work, Employment & Society*, 15(1): 149–69.

Blair H (2003) Winning and losing in flexible labour markets: The formation and operation of networks of interdependence in the UK film industry. *Sociology.* 37(4): 677–694.

Blair H, Grey S & Randle K (2001) Working in film – employment in a project based industry. *Personnel Review*. 30(2): 170–185.

Blanchard S & Morley D (1982) *What's This Channel Four? An alternative report*. London: Comedia.

Böhm S & Land C (2009) No measure for culture? Value in the new economy. *Capital & Class.* 33(1):75-98.

Born G (2003) Strategy, positioning and projection in digital television: Channel Four and the commercialization of public service broadcasting in the UK. *Media, Culture & Society*. 25: 773–799.

Bourdieu P (1984) *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste.* Abington: Routledge.

Bourdieu P (1996) Understanding. *Theory, Culture & Society.* 13(2): 17–37.

Bourdieu P (1999) *On television*. New York: The New Press.

Bratich J, Packer J, McCarthy C (eds). (2003) *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Broadcasting Act (1980) London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Bröckling U (2011) Human economy, human capital: A critique of biopolitical economy. In Bröckling U, Krassmann S & Lemke T (eds) *Governmentality: Current issues and future challenges*. Abingdon: Routledge, 247–269.

Bröckling U (2016) *The Entrepreneurial Self: Fabricating a new type of subject*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Bröckling U, Krasmann S, Lemke T (eds) (2011) *Governmentality: Current issues and future challenges.* New York: Routledge.

Brook O, O'Brien D & Taylor M (2019) Inequality talk: How discourses by senior men reinforce exclusions from creative occupations. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*. 00(0): 1–16.

Brook O, O'Brien & Taylor M (2017) 'There's no way that you get paid to do the arts'. Unpaid labour across the cultural and creative life course. *SocArXiv*. DOI: 10.31235/osf.io/28hjx.

Brook O, O'Brien D & Taylor M (2018) *Panic! Social class, taste and inequalities in the creative industries.* London: Create London and Arts Emergency.

Brook O, O'Brien D & Taylor M (2018) There was no golden age: Social mobility into cultural and creative occupations. *SocArXiv*. DOI: 10.31235/osf.io/7njy3.

Brook O, O'Brien D & Taylor M (2020) *Culture Is Bad For You: Inequality and the creative class*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Brooks A (1997) *Postfeminisms. Feminism, cultural theory and cultural forms*. London: Routledge.

Brown M (2007) *A Licence to be Different: The story of Channel 4*. London: British Film Institute.

Brown W (2003) Neo-liberalism and the end of liberal democracy. *Theory & Event.* 7(1): 15–18.

Brown W (2015) *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. New York: Zone Books.

Bull A & Scharff C (2017) 'McDonald's Music' Versus 'Serious Music': How production and consumption practices help to reproduce class inequality in the classical music profession. *Cultural Sociology*. 11(3): 283–301.

Bull A (2019) *Class, Control and Classical Music*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burchill G, Gordon C & Miller P (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Butler J (1993) *Bodies That Matter: On the discursive limits of 'sex'.* London: Routledge.

Butler J (1997) *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in subjection.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Caldwell J (2008) *Production Culture: Industrial reflexivity and critical practice in film and television*. Durham: Duke University Press.

CAMEo (2018) *Workforce Diversity in the UK Screen Sector: Evidence review.* Leicester: CAMEo Research Institute.

Campbell L (2013) BECTU sets factual TV code of practice. *Broadcast.* 19 June. https://www.broadcastnow.co.uk/bectu-sets-factual-tv-code-of-practice/5057494.article. Accessed: 21 February 2020.

Carey H & Florisson R (2020) Getting in and getting on: Class, participation and job quality in the UK creative industries. *Creative industries and intersectional barriers:*

Exploring class and race. 8 June. London: King's College London and Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre.

Carey H, Crowley L, Dudley C, Sheldon H & Giles L (2017) *A Skills Audit of the UK Film and Screen Industries: Report for the British Film Institute.* London: The Work Foundation.

Castells M (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Chandler D & Reid (2016) *The Neoliberal Subject: Resilience, adaptation and vulnerability*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International, Ltd.

Chandler D (2016) Debating neoliberalism: The exhaustion of the liberal problematic. In Chandler D & Reid (eds) *The Neoliberal Subject: Resilience, adaptation and vulnerability*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International, Ltd, 9–17.

Channel 4 (1991) *Reports and Accounts (1985–1991)*. London: Channel 4.

Channel 4 (2012) *Equality Objectives*. London: Channel 4.

Channel 4 (2015) *360° Diversity Charter*. London: Channel 4.

Channel 4 (2016) *360° Diversity Charter: One Year On*. London: Channel 4.

Christiaens T (2019) The entrepreneur of the self beyond Foucault's neoliberal homo oeconomicus. *European Journal of Social Theory*. 1–19.

Christopherson S (2008) Beyond the self-expressive creative worker. An industry perspective on entertainment media. *Theory, Culture & Society.* 25(7-8): 73–95.

Cohen G (1989) On the currency of egalitarian justice. *Ethics*. 99(4): 906–944.

Cohen G (2009) *Why Not Socialism?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Collins R (2004) The fight for proportionality in broadcasting. In Calabrese A & Sparks C (eds) *Toward a Political Economy of Culture: Capitalism and communication in the twenty-first century*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 151–178.

Conor B (2014) *Screenwriting: Creative labour and professional practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Conor B, Gill R & Taylor S (2015) Gender and creative labour. *The Sociological Review*. 63(S1): 1–22.

Corner J (1996) *The Art of Record: A critical introduction to documentary*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Corner J (2011) *Theorising Media: Power, form and subjectivity*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Corner J & Harvey S (1991a) Introduction: Great Britain Limited. In Corner J & Harvey S (eds) *Enterprise and Heritage: Crosscurrent of national culture.* London: Routledge, 1–21.

Corner J & Harvey S (1991b) Mediating tradition and modernity: The heritage/enterprise couplet. In Corner J & Harvey S (eds) *Enterprise and Heritage: Crosscurrent of national culture*. London: Routledge, 45–75.

Coulson S (2012) Collaborating in a competitive world: Musicians' working lives and understandings of entrepreneurship. *Work, Employment and Society.* 26(2): 246–261.

Creative Diversity Network (2018) *Diamond: The first cut*. London: Creative Diversity Network.

Creative Diversity Network (2019) *Diamond: The second cut*. London: Creative Diversity Network.

Creative Diversity Network (2020) *Diamond: The third cut*. London: Creative Diversity Network.

Creative Skillset (2014) *Creative Media Workforce Survey 2014: Summary report*. London: Creative Skillset.

Creative Skillset (2016) *2015 Employment Survey: Creative media industries.* London: Creative Skillset.

Crisell A (1997) *An Introductory History of British Broadcasting.* London: Routledge.

Cunnigham S (1993) Cultural studies from the viewpoint of cultural policy. In Turner G (ed) *Nation, Culture, Text: Australian cultural and media studies*. London & New York: Routledge, 126–140.

Cunningham S (1989) Cultural critique and cultural policy: Handmaiden or no relation? *Media Information Australia*. 54: 7–12.

Curran J (2004) The rise of the Westminster School. In Calabrese A & Sparks C (eds) *Toward A Political Economy of Culture: Capitalism and communication in the twenty-first century.* Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 13–41.

Dardot P and Laval C (2013) *The New Way of the World: On neoliberal society*. London: Verso.

DCMS (2001) *Creative Industries Mapping Document.* London: Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.

DCMS (2008) *Creative Britain: New talents for the new economy*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

DCMS (2012) *A Future for British Film: It begins with the audience*. London: Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.

DCMS (2016) *Creative Industries: Focus on employment*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

DCMS (2019) *DCMS Sectors Economic Estimates 2018: Employment*. London: Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.

Deacon D, Pickering M, Golding P & Murdock G (2007) *Researching Communications: A practical guide to methods in media and cultural analysis*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder Arnold.

Dean H & Ford J (2016) Discourses of entrepreneurial leadership: Exposing myths and exploring new approaches. *International Small Business Journal*. 35(2): 178–196.

Dean M (2010) *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Dean M (2018) The secret life of neoliberal subjectivity. In Schram S & Pavlovskaya M (eds) *Rethinking Neoliberalism: Resisting the disciplinary regime*. New York: Routledge, 23–41.

Department of Trade (1984) *Film Policy*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Deuze M (2007) *Media Work in a Digital Age.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dickinson M & Harvey S (2005a) Public policy and public funding for film: Some recent developments in the UK. *Screen* 46(1): 87–95.

Dickinson M & Harvey S (2005b) Film policy in the United Kingdom: New Labour at the movies. *The Political Quarterly.* 76(3): 420–429.

Dickinson M (1999) *Rogue Reels: Oppositional film in Britain, 1945–90*. London: British Film Institute.

Donzelot (1991) Pleasure in work. In Burchell G, Gordon C & Miller P (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 251–281.

Dreyfus H and Rabinow P (1982) *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

du Gay P (1996) *Consumption and Identity at Work*. London: SAGE Publications.

During S (1992) *Foucault and Literature: Towards a genealogy of writing*. London: Routledge.

Eikhof D & Haunschild A (2006) Lifestyle meets market. Bohemian entrepreneurs in creative industries. *Creativity and Innovation Management*. 13(3): 234–241.

Eikhof D & Warhurst C (2013) The promised land? Why social inequalities are systemic in the creative industries. *Employee Relations*. 35(5): 495–508.

Equality Act 2010. London: HMSO.

European Women's Audiovisual Network (2016) *Where are the Women Directors? Report on gender equality for directors in the European film industry 2006–2013.* Strasbourg: European Women's Audiovisual Network.

Everingham C, Stevenson D & Warner-Smith P (2007) 'Things are getting better all the time'? Challenging the narrative of women's progress from a generational perspective. *Sociology.* 41(3): 419–437.

Fairclough N (1992) *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough N (2003) *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* London: Routledge.

Fast K, Örnebring H & Karlsson M (2016) Metaphors of free labour: A typology of unpaid work in the media sector. *Media, Culture & Society.* 38 (7): 963–978.

Film Policy Review Panel (2012) *A Future for British Film: It Begins with the Audience.* London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

Forkert K (2013) *Artistic Lives: A study of creativity in two European cities.* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Foucault M (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Foucault M (1977) *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected essays and interviews.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Foucault M (1978) *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An introduction.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault M (1981) The order of discourse. In Young R (ed) *Untying the Text: A post-structuralist reader.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 48–79.

Foucault M (1983) The subject and power. In Dreyfus H & Rabinow P (eds) *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 208–229.

Foucault M (1985) *The Use of Pleasure*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault M (1991a) Politics and the study of discourse. In Burchell G, Gordon C & Miller P (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in governmentality.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 53–73.

Foucault M (1991b) Governmentality. In Burchill G, Gordon C & Miller P (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 87-105.

Foucault M (1991c) *Remarks on Marx. Conversations with Duccio Trombadori*. New York: Semiotext(e).

Foucault M (1995) *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault M (1997a) Technologies of the self. In Foucault M *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth*. New York: The New Press, 223–253.

Foucault M (1997b) Subjectivity and truth. In Foucault M *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth*. New York: The New Press, 87–93.

Foucault M (1997c) Governmentality. In Foucault M *Power.* New York: The New Press, 201–223.

Foucault M (1997d) Questions of method. In Foucault M *Power.* New York: The New Press, 223–239.

Foucault M (1997e) Interview with Michel Foucault. In Foucault M *Power.* New York: The New Press, 239–298.

Foucault M (1997f) The Political technology of individuals. In Foucault M *Power.* New York: The New Press, 403–418.

Foucault M (2005) *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1981–1982*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault M (2007) *Security, Territory, Population. Lectures at the College de France 1977–1978*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault M (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault M (2010) *The Government of Self and Others. Lectures at the College de France, 1982–83.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fraser N (1999) Social justice in the age of identity politics: Redistribution, recognition and participation. In Ray L & Sayer A (eds) *Culture and Economy after the Cultural Turn*. London: Sage, 53–75.

Fraser N (2007) Re-framing justice in a globalizing world. In Lovell T (ed) (*Mis)recognition, Social Inequality and Social Justice: Nancy Fraser and Pierre Bourdieu.* Abingdon: Routledge, 17–35.

Fraser N (2009) *Scales of Justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Fraser N (2013) *Fortunes of Feminism: From state-managed capitalism to neoliberal crisis.* London: Verso.

Freedman D & Goblot V (eds) (2018) *A Future for Public Service Television*. London: Goldsmiths Press.

Freedman D (2016) *A Future for Public Service Television: Content and platforms in a digital world*. London: Goldsmiths Press.

Friedman & Laurison (2019) *The Class Ceiling: Why it pays to be privileged.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Friedman S, O'Brien D & Laurison D (2017) 'Like skydiving without a parachute': How class origin shapes occupational trajectories in British acting. *Sociology*. 51(5): 992–1010.

Gandini A (2016) *The Reputation Economy. Understanding knowledge work in digital society.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gandini A, Bandinelli C & Cossu A (2017) Collaborating, competing, co-working, coalescing: Artists, freelancers and social entrepreneurs as the 'new subjects' of the creative economy. In Graham J & Gandini A (eds) *Collaborative Production in the Creative Industries.* London: University of Westminster Press, 15–32.

Garnham N (1990) *Capitalism and Communication – Global culture and the economics of information*. London and Newbury Park: Sage.

Gill R & Pratt A (2008) In the social factory? Immaterial labour, precariousness and cultural work. *Theory, Culture & Society.* 25(7-8): 1–30.

Gill R & Scharff C (eds) (2011) *New Femininities: Postfeminism, neoliberalism and subjectivity.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gill R (1991) *Ideology and popular radio: A discourse analytic examination of disc jockeys' talk.* Unpublished PhD thesis. Loughborough University.

Gill R (2000a) Justifying injustice: Broadcasters' accounts of inequality in radio. In Burman E & Parker I (eds) *Discourse Analytic Research*. London: Routledge, 75–94.

Gill R (2000b) Discourse Analysis. In Bauer M and Gaskell G (eds) *Qualitative Researching With Text, Image and Sound: A practical handbook*. London: SAGE Publications. 172-191.

Gill R (2002) Cool, creative and egalitarian? Exploring gender in project-based new media work. *Information and Communication Studies.* 5(1): 70–89.

Gill R (2008) Culture and subjectivity in neoliberal and postfeminist times. *Subjectivity* 25(1): 432–445.

Gill R (2010) 'Life is a pitch': Managing the self in new media work. In Deuze M (ed) *Managing Media Work*. London: Sage, 249–263.

Gill R (2011) Sexism reloaded, or, it's time to get angry again! *Feminist Media Studies*. 11(1): 61–71.

Gill R (2014) Unspeakable inequalities: Postfeminism, entrepreneurial subjectivity, and the repudiation of sexism among cultural workers. *Social Politics*. 21(4): 509–528.

Gill R (2017) The affective, cultural and psychic life of postfeminism: A postfeminist sensibility 10 years on. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*. 20(6) 606–626.

Gill R (2018) Discourse. In Kackman M & Kearney M (eds) *The Craft of Criticism: Critical media studies in practice*. New York: Routledge, 23–35.

Gill R, Kelan E & Scharff C (2017) A Postfeminist Sensibility at Work. *Gender, Work and Organization*. 24(3): 226–244.

Glaser B & Strauss A (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Golding P & Murdock G (1986) The new communications revolution. In Curran J, Ecclestone, Oakley G & Richardson A (eds) *Bending Reality – The State of the Media*. London: Pluto.

Goldscheid R (1911) *Höherentwicklung und Menschenökonomie. Grundlegung der Sozialbiologie.* Leipzig: Verlag von Dr. Werner Klinckhardt.

Gordon C (1987) The soul of the citizen: Max Weber and Michel Foucault on rationality and government. In Lash S, Whimster S (eds) *Max Weber: Rationality and Modernity*. London: Allen & Unwin. 293–316.

Gov.uk (2020) Discrimination: Your rights. https://www.gov.uk/discrimination-your-rights. Accessed: 6 February 2020.

Government Equalities Office (2011) *Equality Act 2020: What do I need to know? A quick start guide to using positive action in recruitment and promotion*. London: Government Equalities Office.

Gray H (2013) Subject(ed) to Recognition. *American Quarterly*. 65(4): 771–798.

Grugulis I & Stoyanova D (2012) Social capital and networks in film and TV: Jobs for the boys? *Organisation Studies*. 33(10): 1311–1331.

Hammersley M & Atkinson P (2007) *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge.

Haraway D (1988) Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*. 14(3): 575–599.

Harvey S (1989) Deregulation, innovation and Channel four. *Screen* 30(1–2): 60–79.

Harvey S (1994) Channel 4 Television: From Annan to Grade. In Hood S (1994) *Behind the Screens: The structure of British television in the nineties*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 102–132.

Harvey S (2006a) Indigenous culture and the politics of place: Regulation for regionalism in British broadcasting. In Harvey S (ed) *Trading Culture: Global traffic and local cultures in film and television*. Eastleigh: John Libbey Publishing, 47–57.

Harvey S (2006b) Ofcom's first year and neoliberalism's blind spot: Attacking the culture of production. *Screen* 47(1): 91–105.

Hesmondhalgh D & Baker S (2008) Creative work and emotional labour in the television industry. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 25(7-8): 97–118.

Hesmondhalgh D & Baker S (2011) *Creative Labour: Media work in three cultural industries*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Hesmondhalgh D & Baker S (2015) Sex, gender and work segregation in the cultural industries. *The Sociological Review*. 63(S1): 23–36.

Hesmondhalgh D (2008) Cultural and creative industries. In Bennett T & Flow J (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Cultural Analysis.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 552–570.

Hesmondhalgh D (2013) *The Cultural Industries*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE.

Hesmondhalgh D (2015) Exploitation and media labour. In Maxwell R (2015) *The Routledge Companion to Labor and Media*. New York: Routledge, 76–91.

Hesmondhalgh D (2019) *The Cultural Industries.* 4th ed. SAGE: London.

Hesmondhalgh D, Oakley K, Lee D & Nisbett M (2015a) Were New Labour's cultural policies neo-liberal? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 21(1): 97–114.

Hesmondhalgh D, Oakley K, Lee D & Nisbett M (2015b) *Culture, Economy and Politics: The case of New Labour*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hewison R (2015) *Cultural Capital: The rise and fall of creative Britain*. London: Verso.

Higson A (2011) *Film England Culturally. English filmmaking since the 1990s.* London: I.B. Tauris.

Hill J (1993) Government policy and the British film industry 1979-90. *European Journal of Communication*. 8(2): 203–224.

Hill J (2004) UK film policy, cultural capital and social exclusion. *Cultural Trends*. 13(50): 29–39.

Hill J (2012) 'This is for the Batmans as well as the Vera Drakes': Economics, culture and UK government film production policy in the 2000s. *Journal of British Cinema and Television*. 9(3): 333–356.

Hill J (2016) Living with Hollywood: British film policy and the definition of 'nationality'. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 22(5): 706–723.

HM Treasury (2010) *The Spending Review*. London: The Stationery Office.

Hobson D (2008) *Channel 4: The early years and the Jeremy Isaacs legacy*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Holden J (2006) *The Big Picture: The regional screen agencies building community, identity and enterprise.* London: Demos.

Hunter I (1988) *Culture and Government: The emergence of literary education*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Hunter I (1991) *Accounting for the Humanities: The language of culture and the logic of government*. Brisbane: Griffith University Press.

Hunter I (1993) Subjectivity and government. *Economy and Society*. 22: 123–34.

Hunter I (1993) Setting limits to culture. In Turner G (ed) *Nation, Culture, Text: Australian cultural and media studies*. London & New York: Routledge, 140–164.

Ikonen H (2018) Letting them get close: Entrepreneurial work and the new normal. In Taylor S & Luckman S (eds) *The New Normal of Working Lives: Critical studies in contemporary work and employment*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 265–285.

James N (2009) British Cinema's US Surrender – A View from 2001. In Murphy R (ed) *The British Cinema Book*. 3rd ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones D & Pringle J (2015) Unmanageable inequalities: Sexism in the film industry. *The Sociological Review*. 63(S1): 37–49.

Keay D (1987) AIDS, education, and the year 2000: An interview with Margaret Thatcher. *Woman's Own*. 31 October. 8–10.

Kelan E (2009) *Performing Gender at Work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kilborn R (1996) New contexts for documentary production in Britain. *Media, Culture and Society.* 18: 141-150.

Kirby P (2016) *Leading People: The educational backgrounds of the UK professional elite.* London: Sutton Trust.

Kirzner (1973) *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Koppman S (2015) In the eye of the beholder: The stratification of taste in a cultural industry. *The Sociological Quarterly*. 56(4): 665–94

Kvale S (2007) *Doing Interviews*. London: Sage.

Lakoff G and Johnsen M (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lambert S (1982) *Channel Four: Television with a difference?* London: British Film Institute.

Latour B (1981) Insiders and outsiders in the sociology of science: Or, how can we foster agnosticism? *Knowledge and Society.* 3: 199–216.

Lazzarato M (2009) Neoliberalism in action: Inequality, insecurity and the reconstitution of the social. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 26(6): 109–133.

Leadbeter C & Oakley K (1999) *The Independents: Britain's new cultural entrepreneurs*. London: Demos.

Lee DJ, Corner J (2017) After Dark: Channel 4's innovation in television talk. *Journal of British Cinema and Television*. 14(4): 445-463.

Lemke T (2001) The birth of bio-politics: Michel Foucault's lecture at the College de France on neo-liberal Governmentality. *Economy and Society.* 30(2): 190–207.

Lemke T (2012) *Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lesage F (2018) Searching, sorting, and managing glut: Media software inscription strategies for 'being creative'. In Taylor S & Luckman S (eds) *The New Normal of Working Lives: Critical studies in contemporary work and employment.* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 109–127.

Lewis R (1990) *Review of the UK Film Industry: Report to BSAC*. London: Screen Advisory Council.

Lingo E & Tepper S (2013) Looking back, looking forward: Arts-based careers and creative work. *Work and Occupations.* 40(4): 337–363.

Littler J (2013) Meritocracy as plutocracy: The marketising of 'equality' within neoliberalism. *New Formations: a journal of culture/theory/politics*. 80-81: 52–72.

Livingstone S, Lunt P & Miller L (2007) Citizens and consumers: Discursive debates during and after the Communications Act 2003. *Media, Culture & Society*. 29(4): 613–638.

Lorde A (1988) *A Burst of Light and Other Essays*. Vancouver: Pulpfiction Books.

Magor M & Schlesinger P (2009) 'For this relief much thanks': Taxation, film policy and the UK government. *Screen* 50(3): 299–317.

Malik S (2013) 'Creative diversity': UK public service broadcasting after multiculturalism. *Popular Communication*. 11(3): 227–241.

Malik S (2018) Diversity: Reflection and review. In Freedman D & Goblot V (eds) *A Future for Public Service Television*. London: Goldsmiths Press, 104–116.

Malik S, Chapain C & Comunian R (2017) Rethinking cultural diversity in the UK film sector: Practices in community filmmaking. *Organization*. 1–22.

May T (2015) Subjectification. In Lawlor L & Nale J (eds) *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 496–502.

McDonnell J (1991) *Public Service Broadcasting: A reader*. London: Routledge.

McGuigan J (1996) *Culture and The Public Sphere.* London: Routledge.

McGuigan J (2004) *Rethinking Cultural Policy.* Berkshire: Open University Press.

McLane B (2012) *A New History of Documentary Film.* 2nd edn. New York: Bloomsbury.

McNay L (2009) Self as enterprise: Dilemmas of control and resistance in Foucault's The Birth of Biopolitics. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 26(6): 55–77.

McRobbie A (1998) *British Fashion Design: Rag trade of image industry?* London: Routledge.

McRobbie A (2002) Clubs to companies: Notes on the decline of political culture in speeded up creative worlds. *Cultural Studies.* 16(4): 516–531.

McRobbie A (2004) Postfeminism and popular culture. *Feminist Media Studies*. 4(3): 255–264.

McRobbie A (2009) *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, culture and social change*. London: Sage.

McRobbie A (2010) Reflections on Feminism and Immaterial labour. *New Formations*. 70(1): 60–76.

McRobbie A (2016) *Be Creative: Making a living in the new culture industries.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Menger P (1999) Artistic labour markets and careers. *Annual Review of Sociology.* 25: 541–571.

Merton R (1972) Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology*. 78(1): 9–47.

Miller P & Rose N (1990) Governing economic life. *Economy and Society.* 19(1): 1–31.

Miller P and Rose N (2008) *Governing the Present: Administering economic, social and personal life*. Cambridge: Polity.

Millward P, Widdop P & Halpin M (2017) A 'different class'? Homophily and heterophily in the social class networks of Britpop. *Cultural Sociology*. 11(3): 318–336.

Moisander J, Groß C & Eräranta K (2018) Mechanisms of biopower and neoliberal governmentality in precarious work: Mobilizing the dependent self-employed as independent business owners. *Human Relations*. 71(3): 375– 398.

Moody P (2017) The UK Film Council and the 'cultural diversity' agenda. *Journal of British Cinema and Television*. 14(4): 403–22.

Morgan G & Nelligan P (2015) Labile labour – gender, flexibility and creative work. *The Sociological Review*. 63(1): 66–83.

Nash K and Corner J (2016) Strategic impact documentary: Contexts of production and social intervention. *European Journal of Communication*. 31(3):227–242

Neff G, Wissinger E & Zukin S (2005) Entrepreneurial labour among cultural producers: 'Cool' jobs in 'hot' industries. *Social Semiotics*. 15(3): 307–334.

Neilson B & Rossiter N (2008) Precarity as a political concept, or, Fordism as exception. *Theory, Culture & Society.* 25(7–8): 51–72.

Newsinger J & Eikhof D R (2020) Explicit and implicit diversity policy in the UK film and television industries. *Journal of British Cinema and Television*. 17(1): 47–69.

Newsinger J & Presence S (2018) United Kingdom: Film funding, the 'corporate welfare system' and its discontents. In Murschetz P, Teichmann R & Karmasin M (eds) *Handbook of State Aid for Film: Finance, industries and regulation*. Cham: Springer, 447–462.

Newsinger J (2012) British film policy in an age of austerity. *Journal of British Cinema and Television*. 9(1):133–144.

Newsinger J (2015) A cultural shock doctrine? Austerity, the neoliberal state and the creative industries discourse. *Media Culture & Society.* 37(2): 302–313.

Nixon S (1996) *Hard Looks: Masculinities, spectatorship and contemporary consumption.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Nwonka C (2015) Diversity pie: Rethinking social exclusion and diversity policy in the British film industry. *Journal of Media Practice*. 16(1): 73–90.

Nwonka C J & Malik S (2018) Cultural discourses and practices of institutionalised diversity in the UK film sector: 'Just get something black made'. *The Sociological Review.* 66(6): 1111–1127.

O'Brien D & Oakley K (2015) *Cultural Value and Inequality: A critical literature review.* Swindon: Arts and Humanities Research Council.

O'Brien D (2020) 'I was the only …': An intersectional analysis of social mobility into cultural and creative occupations. *Creative industries and intersectional barriers: Exploring class and race*. 8 June. London: King's College London and Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre.

O'Brien D, Laurison D, Miles A & Friedman S (2016) Are the creative industries meritocratic? An analysis of the 2014 British Labour Force Survey. *Cultural Trends*. 25(2): 116–131.

O'Malley T & Jones J (2009) *The Peacock Committee and UK Broadcasting Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

O'Malley P, Weir L and Shearing C (1997) Governmentality, criticism, politics. *Economy & Society.* 26(4): 501–517.

O'Regan T (1983) Australian filmmaking: Its public circulation. *Framework*. 22(23): 31–36.

O'Regan T (1992) (Mis)taking policy: Notes on the cultural policy debate. *Cultural Studies*. 6(3): 409–423.

O'Reilly K (2005) *Ethnographic Methods.* London: Routledge.

O'Sullivan S (2017) The Rise of the Feature Documentary – Fact or Fiction? In: Wroot J and Willis A (eds) *DVD, Blu-ray and Beyond: Navigating formats and platforms within media consumption*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 135–57.

Oakley K & O'Brien D (2016) Learning to labour unequally: Understanding the relationship between cultural production, cultural consumption and inequality. *Social Identities*. 22(5): 471–486.

Oakley K (2009) From bohemia to Britart: Art students over 50 years. *Cultural Trends.* 18(4): 281–194.

Oakley K, Laurison D, O'Brien D & Friedman S (2017) Cultural capital: Arts graduates, spatial inequality, and London's impact on cultural labour markets. *American Behavioural Scientist*. 61(12):1510–1531.

Ofcom (2005) *The Communications Market 2005*. London: Office of Communications.

Ofcom (2018a) *Diversity and Inclusion Programme 2018–2022*. London: Office of Communications.

Ofcom (2018b) *BECTU response to the consultation on Ofcom Diversity and Inclusion Programme 2018–2022*. [Press release]. 1 February. https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0017/111950/Broadcasting-Entertainment-Communications-and-Theatre-Union-BECTU.pdf. Accessed: 29 July 2020.

Ofcom (2018c) *BFI response to the consultation on Ofcom Diversity and Inclusion Programme 2018–2022*. [Press release]. 1 February. https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0025/111949/British-Film-Institute-BFI.pdf. Accessed: 29 July 2020.

Ofcom (2019a) *Access and Inclusion in 2018: Consumers' experiences in communications markets.* London: Office of Communications.

Ofcom (2019b) *Diversity and Equal Opportunities in Television: Monitoring report on the UK-based broadcasting industry.* London: Office of Communications.

Ofcom (2019c) *Diversity and Equal Opportunities in Television: In-focus report on ten major broadcasters*. London: Office of Communications.

Ofcom (2019d) *Diversity in UK Television: Freelancers*. London: Office of Communications.

Ostrowska A (2019) *Not quite an auteur, more than a creative labourer: authorial agency of British women documentarians*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Southampton.

Ostrowska A (2020) "I felt more difficulty because of my class than I have because of my gender": Intersectional analysis of professional lives of British women documentarians. *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media.* 20: 135–149.

Ouellette L & Hay J (2008) Makeover television, governmentality and the good citizen. *Continuum*. 22(4): 471–484.

PACT (2020) About us. http://diversity.pact.co.uk/about-us.html. Accessed: 24 March 2020.

Parliament. House of Commons (2016) *Arts Funding: Statistics. Briefing Paper.* London: The Stationery Office.

Peacock A (1986) *Report of the Committee on Financing the BBC*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Percival & Hesmondhalgh D (2014) Unpaid work in the UK television and film industries: Resistance and changing attitudes. *European Journal of Communication*. 29(2): 188–203.

Perry C (2016) *Into the Mainstream: Independent Film and Video Counterpublics and Television in Britain, 1974–1990.* Unpublished PhD thesis. University of the Arts London.

Perry C (2020) *Radical Mainstream: Independent film, video and television in Britain 1974–90*. Bristol: Intellect.

Pratt A (2000) New media, the new economy and new spaces. *Geoforum*. 31(4): 425–436.

Presence S, Quigley A, & Spicer A (2021) *Making it real: A policy programme for UK documentary film*. Bristol: University of the West of England.

Presence S, Spicer A, Quigley A & Green L (2020) *Keeping it real: Towards a documentary film policy for the UK*. Bristol: University of the West of England.

Proctor-Thompson S (2013) Feminist futures of cultural work? Creativity, gender and difference in the digital media sector. In Banks M, Gill R & Taylor S (eds) *Theorising Cultural Work: Labour, continuity and change in the cultural and creative industries*. Abingdon: Routledge, 137–149.

Rabinow P (1984) *The Foucault Reader*. Harmondsworth: Pengum Books.

Randle K & Hardy K (2016) Macho, mobile and resilient? How workers with impairments are doubly disabled in project-based film and television work. *Work, Employment and Society*. 31(3): 447–464.

Randle K, Forson S & Calveley M (2014) Towards a Bourdieusian analysis of the social composition of the UK film and television workforce. *Work, Employment and Society*. 29(4): 590–606.

Randle K, Wing-Fai L & Kurian J (2007) *Creating Difference: Overcoming barriers to diversity in UK film & television employment*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire.

Read J (2009) A genealogy of homo-economicus: Neoliberalism and the production of subjectivity. *Foucault Studies*. 6(1): 25-36.

Reid J (2016) Debating neoliberalism: The horizons of the biopolitical. In Chandler D & Reid J (2016) *The Neoliberal Subject: Resilience, adaptation and vulnerability*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International Ltd, 17–24.

Rivas C (1998) Coding and analysing qualitative data. In Seale C (ed) *Researching Society and Culture*. London: Sage, 366–393.

Rose N (1992) Governing the enterprising self. In Morris P & Heelas P (eds) *The Values of the Enterprise Culture: The moral debate*. London: Routledge, 141–164.

Rose N (1996) Governing 'advanced' liberal democracies. In Barry T, Osborne N, Rose N (eds) *Foucault and Political Reason*. London: UCL. 37–64.

Rose N (1999) *Governing the Soul: The shaping of the private self*. 2nd ed. London: Free Association Books.

Rose N & Miller P (1992) Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 43(2): 173-205.

Rose N, O'Malley P, Valverde M (2006) Governmentality. *Annual Review* of *Law* and *Social Science*. 2:83–104.

Rosenthal A (2005) Staying alive. In Rosenthal A & Corner J (eds) *New Challenge for Documentary*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 167-179.

Ross A (2000) The mental labour problem. *Social Text*. 18(2): 1–31.

Ross A (2004) *No-Collar: The humane workplace and its hidden costs*. New York: Basic Books.

Ross A (2008) The new geography of work. Power to the precarious? *Theory, Culture & Society*. 25(7-8): 31-49.

Ross A (2009) *Nice Work If You Can Get It: Life and labour in precarious times*. New York: NYU Press.

Rubin H & Rubin I (2005) *Qualitative Interviewing: The art of hearing data*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Saha A (2012) 'Beards, scarves, halal meat, terrorists, forced marriage': Television industries and the production of race. *Media, Culture and Society*. 34(4): 424–438.

Saha A (2013) 'Curry tales': The production of 'race' and ethnicity in the cultural industries. *Ethnicities*. 13(6): 818-837.

Saha A (2018) *Race and the Cultural Industries*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sayer A (2005) Class, moral worth and recognition. *Sociology*. 39(5): 947–963.

Scharff C (2012) *Repudiating Feminism: Young women in a neoliberal world.* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.

Scharff C (2015) Blowing your own trumpet: Exploring the gendered dynamics of self-promotion in the classical music profession. *The Sociological Review*. 63(S1): 97–112.

Scharff C (2016) The psychic life of neoliberalism: Mapping the contours of entrepreneurial subjectivity. *Theory, Culture & Society* 33(6): 107–22.

Scharff C (2018) *Gender, Subjectivity, and Cultural Work: The classical music profession*. London: Routledge.

Screen Skills (2019) *The Annual Screen Skills Assessment*. London: Screen Skills.

Seale C (1998) Qualitative interviewing. In Seale C (ed) *Researching Society and Culture*. London: Sage, 202–216.

Sennett R (1998) *The Corrosion of Character*. New York: Norton.

Shukaitis S (2016) *The Composition of Movements to Come: Aesthetics and Cultural Labor after the Avant-Garde*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International Ltd.

Shukaitis S (2019) *Combination Acts. Notes on Collective Practice in the Undercommons*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.

Shukaitis S & Figiel J (2015) The factory of individuation: Cultural labor and class composition in the metropolis. *South Atlantic Quarterly*. 114 (3): 535 - 552.

Simmel G (1950) The Stranger. In Wolff K (ed) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: Free Press, 402–408.

Skeggs B (1997) *Formations of Class and Gender: Becoming respectable*. London: Sage Publications.

Skillset (2009) *2008 Creative Media Workforce Survey*. London: Skillset.

Sleeman C (2017) The gender imbalance in UK film crews. *Nesta*. https://data-viz.nesta.org.uk/bfi-offscreen/index.html. Accessed: 29 June 2020.

Smith S, Pieper K & Choueiti M (2017) *Inclusion in the director's chair? Gender, race, & age of film directors across 1,000 films from 2007–2016.* Media, Diversity & Social Change Initiative at USC Annenberg. Los Angeles.

Sørensen I (2012) Crowdsourcing and outsourcing: the impact of online funding and distribution on the documentary film industry in the UK. *Media, Culture & Society*. 34(6): 726–743.

Sparks C (1994) Independent production: Unions and casualisation. In Hood S (1994) *Behind the Screens: The structure of British television in the nineties*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Standing G (2011) *The Precariat: The new dangerous class.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Steele D (2015) Rethinking the focus of UK film support: Is subsidising US studios a safe strategy for UK film production in the coming decade? *Cultural Trends* 24 (1): 74–79.

Storey J, Salaman G & Platman K (2005) Living with enterprise in an enterprise economy: Freelance and contract workers in the media. *Human Relations*. 58(8): 1033–1054.

Strangleman T & Warren T (2008) *Work and Society. Sociological approaches, themes and methods*. London: Routledge.

Taylor M & O'Brien D (2017) 'Culture is a meritocracy': Why creative workers' attitudes may reinforce social inequality. *Sociological Research Online* 22(4): 27–47.

Taylor S & Littleton K (2008) Art work or money: Conflicts in the construction of a creative identity. *The Sociological Review*. 56(2): 275–292.

Taylor S & Littleton K (2012) *Contemporary Identities of Creativity and Creative Work*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Taylor S (2011) Negotiating oppositions and uncertainties: Gendered conflicts in creative identity work. *Feminism and Psychology*. 21(3): 354–371.

Taylor S (2015) A new mystique? Working for yourself in the neoliberal economy. *Sociological Review*. 63(SI): 174–187.

Taylor S (2018) Beyond work? New expectations and aspirations. In Taylor S & Luckman S (eds) *The New Normal of Working Lives: Critical studies in contemporary work and employment*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 327-347.

Terranova T (2000) Free labour: Producing culture for the digital economy. *Social Text*. 63: 33–50.

The Guardian (1999) *The day the telly went blank*. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/business/1999/sep/05/columnists.observerbusiness2 Accessed 7 May 2021.

The News Line (2014) TV workers exploited for 16 hours a day. *The News Line*. 22 February. https://wrp.org.uk/features/tv-workers-exploited-for-16-hours-a-day. Accessed: 21 February 2020.

The Whickers (2019) *The Cost of Docs: 2018/19*. London: The Whickers.

The Whickers (2020) *The Cost of Docs: 2020*. London: The Whickers.

Townley B (ed) (1994) *Reframing Human Resource Management: Power, ethics and the subject at work*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage.

Tyler I (2013) *Revolting Subjects*. London: Zed.

UK Film Council (2000) *Film in England: A development strategy for film and the moving image in the English regions*. London: Film Council.

UK Film Council (2003) *Film in the UK 2002: Statistical yearbook*. London: Film Council.

UK Film Council (2005) *UK Film Council Statistical yearbook and annual report 2004-5*. London: Film Council.

Ursell G (2000) Turning a way of life into a business: An account and critique of the transformation of British television from public service to commercial enterprise. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting.* 11: 741–764.

Vaizey E (2010) The future of the UK film industry. *Gov.uk.* https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/the-future-of-the-uk-film-industry. Accessed 27 May 2019.

Verkaik R (2018) *Posh Boys: How English public schools ruin Britain*. London: Oneworld.

Warwick Commission (2015) *Enriching Britain: Culture, creativity and growth*. Coventry: University of Warwick.

Watters S (2016) Old boy networks: The relationship between elite schooling, social capital, and positions of power in British society. In Koh A & Kenway J (eds) *Elite Schools: Multiple geographies of privilege*. London: Routledge, 101–116.

Waugh T (2011) *The Right to Play Oneself: Looking Back on Documentary Film.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wiener M (2004) *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1950–1980.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams R (1989) *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism.* London, New York: Verso.

Wing-Fai L, Gill R & Randle K (2015) Getting in, getting on, getting out? Women as career scramblers in the UK film and television industries. *The Sociological Review*. 63(S1): 50–65.

Wreyford N (2015) Birds of a feather: Informal recruitment practices and gendered outcomes for screenwriting work in the UK film industry. *The Sociological Review*. 63(S1): 84–96.

Wright D (2005) Mediating production and consumption: Cultural capital and 'cultural workers'. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 56(1): 105-121.

Young R (ed) (1981) *Untying the Text*. London: Routledge.

Zoellner A (2010) The changing face of UK documentary production: Commerce, reflexivity and professionalism. *Journal for the Study of British Cultures*. 17(1): 69-80.

Appendices

Appendix one. Fieldwork summary

Interviews conducted[1]

1   Albert (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 20 February 2018, London.

2   Alex (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 8 October 2018, London.

3   Alice (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 28 June 2017, London.

4   Anna (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 03 April 2018, Colchester.

5   Ben (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 18 October 2017, London.

6   Dana (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 23 June 2018, London.

7   Daniel (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 10 June 2017, Sheffield.

8   Dylan (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 4 April 2018, London.

9   Emily (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 21 March 2018, Colchester.

10 Finn (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 21 July 2017, Colchester.

11 Freddie (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 24 January 2018, Colchester.

12 George (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 24 September 2018, London.

13 Greta (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 30 January 2018, London.

14 Isabella (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 13 March 2018, Colchester.

15 Isla (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya*. 16 July 2018, Colchester.

---

[1] The names are assumed names – in order to ensure the anonymity of the research interviewees.

16   Jack (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 30 July 2018, London.

17   Jasper (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 27 September 2018, London.

18   Juliet (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 18 July 2017, Colchester.

19   Leo (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 23 January 2018, Colchester.

20   Lily (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 21 June 2018, London.

21   Luke (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 19 July 2017, London.

22   Marc (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 25 May 2018, London.

23   Matthew (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 22 January 2018, Witham.

24   Max (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 19 June 2018, London.

25   Nick (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 31 July 2018, London.

26   Olivia (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 27 October 2017, Colchester.

27   Oscar (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 16 June 2017, Sheffield.

28   Robin (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 1 August 2017, London.

29   Sam (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 7 March 2018, Colchester.

30   Sean (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 11 June 2017, Sheffield.

31   Susanne (2017) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 23 October 2017, London.

32   Thomas (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 17 June 2018, London.

33   William (2018) *Interview with Ekaterina Tarnovskaya.* 11 July 2018, London.

Ethnographic observations of

1   Talks and workshops at Sheffield Doc/Fest

–   'BBC Northern Docs Pitch' – 12 June 2017

–   'Chicken & Egg Accelerator Lab Live' – 11 June 2017

–   'OTOXO. Production Workshop' – 14 June 2017

–   'Celebrate the Queers Making LGBTQ Docs' – 12 June 2017

–   'New Leaders, Developing Equal and Inclusive Industry' – 10 June 2017

2   *Talks and discussions at Open City Documentary Festival*

–   'Using Your Skills to Pay the Bills' – 9 September 2017

–   'The Body Politic' – 9 September 2017

–   'Artist Talk. Marc Isaacs' – 9 September 2017

–   'Kötting's Köllaborators & Könfabulators' – 9 September 2017

–   'Night Time as Resistance' – 9 September 2017

–   'The Essay Film Bringing an Experimental Sensibility to Documentary Film Culture' – 10 September 2017

–   'Patchwork Archivists Present Existence as Resistance' – 10 September 2017

–   'Sound Music Image with Ben Rivers and Philippe Ciompi' – 10 September 2017

3   *Talks and discussions at Raindance Film Festival*

–   'Pitch Training with Elliot Grove' – 21 September 2017

–   'Live Ammunition' – 22 September 2017

–   'From Festivals to Awards: How Can a Film Festival Help to Access Awards?' – 22 September 2017

–   'Short Films – Calling Card to Features?' – 23 September 2017

–   'Women in Film: What Does It Mean to Be a Leading Female Character on the Big Screen' – 22 September 2017

–   'Takumi Masterclass with Paul J. Franklin' – 21 September 2017

–   'Lighting Technology. Masterclass Presented by Rotolight' – 22 September 2017

– 'Financing Your Film with The Enterprise Investment Scheme (EIS)' – 22 September 2017

– 'From Film to VR: The Road to Becoming a Creator' – 22 September 2017

– 'Location Location Location. How to Find the Right Locations for Your Film. Presented by Filmfixer' – 23 September 2017

– 'From Book to Film: Finding a Story' – 23 September 2017

– 'Directing Masterclass. Ate de Jong' – 23 September 2017

– 'Why Are We Still Talking about Queer Film?' – 24 September 2017

– 'Brand Integration – What Brands Can Do for You, Presented by Imaginative Exposure' – 24 September 2017

– 'Making Genre Work for You' – 24 September 2017

– 'Pitch Your Poster!' – 24 September 2017

4   Talks and discussions at BFI London Film Festival

– 'Does Gen Z Give a Damn about the Big Screen? How Do We Rethink the Future of Cinema-Going for Independent Film?' – 6 October 2017

– 'Understanding Brexit' – 6 October 2017

– 'Who's in Your Crew? Presented in Association with the Production Guild' – 9 October 2017

– 'Screen Talk: Takashi Miike' – 9 October 2017

– 'How I Made It. In Association with BFI Network, Clio Barnard & Michael Pearce' – 11 October 2017

– 'The Future of Public Film Funding' – 11 October 2017

– 'Busting the Bias: An Event Presented by the BFI London Film Festival, Carousel, Beacon Hill Arts and 104 Films' – 13 October 2017

5   Masterclasses at Colchester Film Festival

– 'John Wilson: Editing Masterclass' – 4 November 2017

– 'James Kent: Directing Masterclass' – 4 November 2017

– 'Matt Gray: Cinematography Masterclass' – 4 November 2017

6 Talks and workshops at TriForce Short Film Festival

– 'CrewStart Workshop with Sargent-Disc Ltd.' – 2 December 2017

– 'How to Fund a Feature & Manage Your Money' – 2 December 2017

– 'Camera Workshop with Paul McCallum' – 2 December 2017

– 'How to Get Into Postproduction with Elouise Carden' – 2 December 2017

– 'Opening Doors Seminar: Finding Entry Points into the Industry for Crew' – 2 December 2017

7 Annual Lecture at the National Film & Television School

– 'Colin Young Annual Lecture 2018 with special guest Sean McAllister' – 27 September 2018

8 Open City Docs Summer Documentary Filmmaking School organised by UCL Anthropology Department – July-August 2018

Appendix two. Interview questions

What is your social background? What education and profession did your parents have? Can you say that your family belong to any social group or class?

What and where did you study?

How did you get into film production? What are the most important moments of your professional biography? What was your work experience?

Are you a freelancer or employed by a company/institution? How long do you work like this? How did you get the position? If you are a freelancer, how do you find projects? What are your main duties?

Where and how do you raise funding for films? Is it possible to make a livelihood with documentary filmmaking? Do you work without being paid? Do you have any other jobs? Do you usually work as much as you can? Do you agree on every available job or do you choose the projects? Are you considering the balance between work and life as essential?

Who are your co-workers you usually work with? Do you have employees? How can you describe your relationships with colleagues?

What have you done to sustain your successful career? What do you consider as your highest achievements in the profession? How were the achievements possible? What were the obstacles for them? Tell me please about any professional failures. Why did they happen?

Have you ever experienced inequities/discrimination at work? Tell me about 1–2 cases from your professional biography when you encountered unfairness at work? If you did not, was there anything that stopped you in your career? Have you ever noticed injustice against other workers? Have you ever experienced conflicts with your colleagues? What were they?

What are the social differences between workers in the film industry? Who are the most vulnerable / most privileged workers in the film industry? Is it possible to take the differences and make them strengths?

What would help to address these problems? What would you do as a professional about these problems? What can your response be to inequalities? What are the survival strategies/forms of resistance? Does support network help? Do you discuss problems with other workers?

Appendix three. Consent form

Informed consent

Project: Social inequalities in cultural work in British documentary film production

Researcher: Ekaterina Tarnovskaya

Telephone: +44 (0)79 3372 3317

E-mail: ekaterina.tarnovskaya@essex.ac.uk

This consent form is intended to check that you are happy with the information you have received about this study, that you are aware of your rights and responsibilities as a participant and to confirm that you wish to take part in the study.

Please circle as appropriate

Have you been given a description of the general purpose of the research?	Yes / No
Have you been given the opportunity to discuss any questions with the researcher?	Yes / No
Have you received enough information to decide whether or not you wish to take part in the study?	Yes / No
Do you understand that you are free to refuse to answer any questions?	Yes / No
Do you understand that you have the right to terminate the interview at any time?	Yes / No
Do you understand that the information you give will be treated in the strictest confidence, and that any personal details will be anonymised?	Yes / No
Do you agree to take part in the study?	Yes / No

I confirm that quotations from the interview can be used in a final research report and other publications. I understand these will be used anonymously, with names, places and identifying details changed.

Signature   **Date**

Your name _____

Appendix four. Information sheet

INFORMATION SHEET

SOCIAL INEQUALITIES IN CULTURAL WORK IN BRITISH DOCUMENTARY
FILM PRODUCTION

You were asked to participate in the research about social inequalities in cultural
work in British documentary film production. This information sheet gives you
information about the research.

What is the research about?

In this project, I research the social inequalities in cultural work in British
documentary film production. The main focus of interest is the subjective experience
of social inequalities in filmmaking work. I seek to explore what impacts on
producing different social inequalities within the documentary film industry and how
the existing social inequalities influence filmmakers' career development.

Who do I study?

I want to talk to filmmakers in the British documentary film industry.

What does taking part involve?

You are interviewed by me, you tell me your career story and experience in the
documentary film industry. The interview will be recorded.

Who does the research?

The research is carried out by Ekaterina Tarnovskaya, PhD student, University of
Essex

Telephone: +44 (0)79 3372 3317

E-mail: ekaterina.tarnovskaya@essex.ac.uk