

Introducing the Creative Industries

From Theory to Practice

Rosamund Davies and
Gauti Sigthorsson



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC

6

Creative Producers and Products

What is it that people working in the creative industries make – or *create*? First, we must remember that not all productive labour creates *tangible* physical artefacts that we can touch, hear, see or taste. The designer Jonathan Sands offers a succinct definition of what a job in the creative industries entails: “At the end of the working day, there should be something there that didn’t exist when you arrived in the morning” (Wright et al. 2009: 79). This new something can be an individual creative expression of some kind, but it can also take the form of a more complex, collaborative effort that takes a long time to create (e.g., a film or a computer game), as we will see in Chapter 7, or it might be an experience of some kind, or a creative service that someone performs.

CREATIVE GOODS AND SERVICES: TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE

There are different ways of defining and understanding both what the creative industries make and who can be said to work in the creative industries. It’s important to note that these taxonomies are not fixed in stone – they are attempts to better understand an economic sector that is constantly undergoing change and development. New technologies, trends, fashions and businesses come along all the time, making the creative industries an evasive object of study.

There exists a great diversity of creative and cultural activities that can be gathered under the broad umbrella of the creative industries. This is a challenge for governments, policymakers and international organizations such as the United Nations. It is important to understand that the professions and products of the creative industries are not simply luxuries of the rich, developed economies of the world; quite the reverse, they are an important area of economic development across the world, as we have already seen in Chapter 1. This great variety is one reason why the UK’s National

Endowment for the Sciences, Technology and the Arts (NESTA) has suggested a taxonomy for the kinds of work performed within the creative industries. Instead of looking at the end-products (e.g., a film, a guided tour), we follow NESTA in dividing the creative industries into four different styles or ways of pursuing creativity (NESTA 2006: 54–55): creative *originals* producers; creative *content* producers; creative *experience* producers; and creative *service* producers.

CREATIVE ORIGINALS PRODUCERS

In this category we find anyone who creates, makes or trades in original, rare and unique objects: “Producers of creative originals typically include crafts makers, visual artists and designer-makers (for example, of clothing).” The work of creative originals producers is valuable because others see it as having creative or cultural value – it is exclusive and authentic. These are small-scale productions, one-offs or limited production runs – making them is the work of artists or artisans.

Creating a designer fashion collection

Christopher and Hannah run a small, independent fashion label based in the East End of London. They produce two collections a year – spring/summer and autumn/winter – doing the patterns and designs themselves, while outsourcing the manufacturing. They design women’s clothing, positioned in “the upper end of the contemporary market”.

Christopher doesn’t know exactly who buys the clothing that his company makes because his company does not retail the clothes directly. He imagines their typical client as a professional, someone who appreciates design and is willing to invest in a distinctive item: “The girl who would buy our clothes is probably someone working in the creative industries or in an office, and it’s a piece that she would save up a little to buy, but definitely not the very rich... well maybe. This is tricky, figuring out our brand positioning, because stores buy our clothes and [because] we’re not doing direct retail ourselves we don’t get to meet the customers. We get some feedback about who it is that buys – like Rhianna has bought pieces, some pop stars, some actors, and then it’s all the way down to the girls who would save up to buy something special that they’ve seen on a blog somewhere” (Christopher, 2012).

The process, from original design idea to a finished garment on sale at a fashion store, is dictated by the seasonal cycles of the fashion business, a collection of clothes appropriate for either autumn/winter or spring/summer. In some ways, the “product” of a fashion designer is the *collection* rather than individual items of clothing.

Each collection begins with a research phase, says Christopher – an activity that in other areas of the creative industries might be called *development* (see Chapter 7):

“We go through images, things we like, something we feel strongly about. Then it’s fabric research, finding the right fabric mills to work with, finding where we can get the various things we’re interested in. After that there’s the design phase [where we start to create] the concrete shapes and looks of the collection, the rough sketches. From there you go [on to] do more detailed drawings of the pieces that you want to make, the looks, what could go with each other, and how to make a coherent collection. Then it goes into sampling, where patterns are made, and patterns adapted from previous seasons we might want to reuse. They get made up in simple cotton fabrics, and when we’re happy with those they get made in real fabrics, or *toiles* (the plain cotton versions are called *calico*). Then we do a first sample where we see if the direction we’re going in is actually working. It depends whether we need a second revision, but most often we get it right the first time. Then the collection steadily grows towards Fashion Week.” (Christopher, 2012)

The autumn/winter collection is exhibited at the four main Fashion Weeks in New York, London, Milan and Paris in February into early March:

“We do a photo shoot before Fashion Week with a photographer where we style the looks the way we want to present them. Then either people do fashion shows or presentations, or take it straight to a trade fair or a showroom where they conduct sales. We do a presentation, and sales shortly thereafter. Stores come in for appointments, they make a selection and buy. They choose their numbers – five of that jacket, 10 of that jumper.”

Only after the fashion buyers have selected individual pieces from the collection for purchase do they go into production.

“After the sales season is done you collect all the orders, start finding which manufacturers would be good for which styles, and depending on the quantities you have and the quality you need it in, etc. A tailored jacket goes to a different manufacturer than a sweatshirt. That is quite a long process – ordering fabrics, having them made up. When that’s done, you get everything in from manufacturers, package everything, do quality control and ship it out to the stores that ordered.”

This means that there are parts of each collection that never go into production. Christopher points out that this is not exclusive to fashion – there is a rule of thumb when it comes to bringing original designs to market: “Something like 6% of your product range should make up for 30–50% of your sales. Then the next 25% should make up for 30%. It’s used all over the manufacturing industry. There are parts of your collection, around 30% that represents maybe 2% in sales. They are things you need to have for show, but they will never get ordered.”

“The sales go on until the end of March, maybe, then you close the order books and start production – ordering fabrics, etc. Fabrics take usually a month to get in, so production takes place from the beginning of May until the end of June or beginning of July. There are always delays, things go wrong, so products usually ship by

mid-July, and that's the autumn/winter selection you see trickling into stores at the end of July and the beginning of August."

While one collection is being shown and put into production, the next one is already being designed. In early September the Fashion Weeks start again for the spring/summer collections. Interviewed just after the Fashion Weeks in March, Christopher explained: "We're in the long season now, but the spring/summer is a short season, you have from the order books close mid-October, and then you have November to mid-December for production. Manufacturers are closed for Christmas and New Year holidays, and then you ship to stores in mid-January – so it's a much shorter timeframe. And meanwhile you have to start your new collection and have it ready for February" (Christopher, 2012).

CREATIVE CONTENT PRODUCERS

Comprising makers of content for various media, this category includes people working in film, broadcasting (TV, radio), publishing, recorded music, and interactive media (games, mobile apps, online media). Enterprises that make creative content produce intellectual property. Usually this is protected by copyright and distributed on a large scale to mass-audiences. The revenue for these productions comes through sales, advertising or subscription, usually after a significant initial investment. Creative content producers "invest capital upfront in order to develop creative projects prior to any revenues. Creative content enterprises typically include film, television and theatre production companies, computer and video game development studios, music labels, book and magazine publishers, and fashion designers" (NESTA 2006: 54).

Creative originals and creative content both involve the generation of new intellectual property and the use of existing intellectual property, often through a laborious process of development (see Chapter 7). Some enterprises will work on a project-by-project basis, starting from scratch in each instance (e.g., a TV production company will work from a new screenplay for each project). Others build on their existing body of work, drawing on a body of intellectual property that they own, for example when fashion designers rework previous ideas and production lines into new iterations.

Magazine publishing: *Vice* and *Monocle's* big bets on content

At first glance, it seems difficult to find more dissimilar media properties than *Vice* and *Monocle*. One is a youth and fashion brand that embraces a rough-and-ready aesthetic of street photography and DIY fashion alongside journalistic reporting that eschews mainstream subject matters and reporting styles. The other is beautifully designed and presented, with all photography produced in-house, a network of

correspondents around the world, providing updates on current affairs (commerce, transport and infrastructure, in particular), fashion and style for the international businessperson. However, the similarities between the scrappy punks of *Vice* and the well-groomed grown-ups of *Monocle*, are striking: setting aside their differences of style and presentation, we notice that these media brands both focus on content – delivering print, audio, and video both online and through broadcast channels.

Vice and *Monocle* illustrate how *content* and a strong *brand-identity* is the key to cross-platform media businesses. Founded in 2007, *Monocle* magazine should, according to conventional wisdom, not exist. Printed on multiple paper stocks, weighing more than a small laptop or tablet computer, and priced in the range of a mass-market paperback book, *Monocle* appeared at first to be an expensive folly, and was initially not predicted to last long (S. Rushton 2008; Bell 2010). By investing in a print brand, the owner and editor-in-chief, Tyler Brûlé, swam against the currents of digitalization by publishing a magazine. Global in scope, *Monocle* has correspondents (or “bureaux”) across the world, with a strong focus on style, business and current affairs – occupying a niche between *GQ* and *The Economist*.

Despite the editorial team’s commitment to ink and paper – even down to the smell of the printed magazine (Larocca 2010) – *Monocle* produces content that goes far beyond conventional notions of what a magazine does. Unified through its website, *Monocle* offers Monocle 24 web-based radio programming (which grew out of its Monocle Weekly podcast) with interviews, reportage, music and news – often featuring in-house writers and editors. Monocle TV on the Bloomberg network is an hour-long weekly programme, which Brûlé described at its launch as “gentle, good, informative viewing,” featuring magazine-style reports from correspondents around the world, delivered in a tone of leisurely analysis, distinguished from the breathless pace of television news channels: “I hope it will be a return to more *elegant* television” (Larocca 2010). Alongside the magazine, Monocle retail shops can be found dotted around the world, often near the local Monocle offices, offering accessories and designer travel goods promoted in the pages of the magazine itself. Finally, alongside publishing, radio, television and retail, Brûlé is chairman and creative director of the branding and advertising agency Winkreative, which shares offices with Monocle in London, New York, Tokyo, Zurich and Hong Kong. “Winkreative is a wholly owned subsidiary of Swiss holding company Winkorp, which Mr. Brûlé founded in 2002. Monocle is 70% owned by Winkorp; the remaining 30% is held by five wealthy European families, who so far have been more than happy to indulge Mr. Brûlé’s quest to turn Monocle into a multiplatform global brand” (Dumenco 2011).

Vice began life as the community-oriented *Voice of Montreal* in 1994, part-funded by the local government. After a change of title and ownership in 1996, it grew into an international magazine, distributed for free through fashion retailers, and became an established guide to trends in music, fashion and culture for the young, hip and fashionable, as described in an *Observer* profile of the publishers: “‘Vice’ is

practically a definition of the magazine's content. All off-kilter life is here. Skaters feature alongside interviews with the likes of Abu Hamza. And its take-no-prisoners approach has captured the imagination of what marketing people call 'trendsetting metropolitans' aged 21 to 34" (Wilkinson 2008). From its roots as a printed magazine, *Vice* has grown into a "globe-strangling youth media company that includes publishing, events, music, digital television, marketing and feature film divisions," according to the appropriately irreverent Vice UK Media Kit (*Vice* 2012: 2). *Vice* makes no secret of its core strategy: To be a hub for original media content aimed at young people.

The *Vice* brand pulls together a variety of content, across multiple platforms – magazine, video, books, music publishing, etc. – and distributes this content both through its own media assets as well as partnerships with other media brands, most notably having a dedicated slot for its current affairs documentaries on CNN (Carr 2010). Alongside this extensive and expanding content-production, *Vice* operates a marketing agency (appropriately named Virtue) and the newly established AdVice Network – an advertising distribution network operating in partnership with a variety of popular, youth-oriented media brands ranging from *The Onion* to *The New York Times* (*Vice* 2012: 5). For more staid corporate sponsors, unwilling to associate themselves with the more risqué content offered by *Vice*, separate sponsored outlets have been created, such as Noisey, Motherboard, and The Creators Project (in partnership with Intel), each offering curated content on music, technology and creativity.

As media businesses, *Vice* and *Monocle* are betting heavily that quality content (albeit for rather different audiences) can be profitable. In the first decade of the century, established media companies, such as Viacom and News International, found themselves in competition with new entities, some of which dominated the new online media platforms (e.g., Google, which owns YouTube). They responded by investing in competing platforms such as MySpace (News International) and Last.fm (CBS), often with mixed results. As Shane Smith, CEO and co-founder of Vice Media, puts it: "Everyone was spending all their money on platforms but none of it on what you put in the pipe. So we said, Okay, eventually the market's going to catch up, and everyone's going to need content" (Bercovici 2012). Both *Vice* and *Monocle* have been successful in getting investors on board with their content-focused strategies, *Monocle* through Winkorp, as we've seen, and the Vice Media Group through raising investment for an expansionist push into new markets such as India and China, with advertising giant WPP, and the media merchant bank The Raine Group on board, among others (Bercovici 2012). These two media groups have taken the familiar model of content commissioning from magazines, and adapted it for delivery across multiple media platforms: editorial oversight; commissioning of content from external parties (freelancers, **independent** production companies); quality control and editing; and distribution through branded channels.

CREATIVE EXPERIENCE PROVIDERS

People who create experiences include performing artists (actors, dancers, musicians) and anyone working in spaces that offer particular experiences, such as museums, galleries, libraries, music venues and those working in tourism and heritage – all of these make experiences happen for their audiences and clients.

Disneyland – the place that was also a TV show

Historically, the idea of the “creative experience producer” owes a great deal to Walt Disney and to Disneyland – “the place that was also a TV show” (Marling 1996). Struggling to fund the construction of an amusement park (originally to be named Disneylandia), Disney eventually made a deal with the ABC network – a weekly TV series in exchange for investment and loan guarantees so that construction could be completed:

Disneyland, the weekly series, premiered in October of 1954. It played on Wednesday nights at 7:30, the children’s hour, and within three months it had reached the top ten. *Disneyland* became a family institution: homework was deferred; sales of TV dinners soared. [...] “I saw that if I was ever going to have my park,” [Walt Disney] admitted, “here ... was a way to tell millions of people about it – with TV!” And so, every week, the program format introduced the audience to the principal themes of the park. One Wednesday, the topic would be Fantasyland, with the content made up of clips from animated films. Adventureland evenings recycled footage shot for the nature documentaries. (Marling 1996: 122)

Disneyland, the park, opened in July 1955, with the opening broadcast on live TV. Disney’s decision to unite the TV programme with the park under a single name proved highly influential, creating “an all-encompassing consumer environment that he described as ‘total merchandising.’ Products aimed at baby boom families and stamped with the Disney imprint [...] would weave a vast,

Spoiler alert! Try this for an experiment. Go see a thriller you know your friend has been looking forward to seeing. Catch it before your friend has a chance to go to the cinema. After the screening, phone him up and proceed to discuss in detail every twist and turn of the film’s plot, especially the ending. Make sure to tell him how much fun you had. If you’re still on speaking terms after this, he’ll probably tell you that you’ve “spoiled” the film for him, that is, diminished the pleasures of surprise, anticipation and delight that he otherwise would have enjoyed at the cinema, had you not spilled the beans in so much detail. Films are experience goods, and audience members are largely unaware of the specifics of each film in advance of seeing it. We may know about the genre of the film, the stars, the reputations of those involved (e.g., the director or the writer), which other films this one resembles (“It’s *Die Hard* meets *Bambi*”), and what the reviews have been like, but we don’t want to know *all* the details.

commercial web, a tangle of advertising and entertainment in which each Disney product—from the movie *Snow White* to a ride on Disneyland’s Matterhorn—promoted all Disney products” (Anderson 2000: 4).

There is not a clear-cut distinction between creative content and creative experiences, just as there isn’t between the Harry Potter films and the experience of visiting the sets on a Harry Potter Studio Tour. After all, these products are “experience goods” (Caves 2000). That is to say, the experience of the creative product is what the user pays for – whether that’s watching a film, playing a game or visiting an amusement park.

CREATIVE SERVICE PROVIDERS

Services are a major part of the creative industries, particularly in specialisms such as advertising, architecture, graphic design, public relations, promotion, production facilities, and the like. Creative service providers earn their keep by “devoting their time and intellectual property (IP) to other businesses and organisations” (NESTA 2006: 54). Many agencies, large and small, are creative service providers – marketing agencies, advertising agencies, architecture practices, design agencies, interactive agencies, and the like.

While it’s easy to see architects, software makers and graphic designers as “creative”, the inclusion of advertising agencies and media agencies in this category might perhaps make some of us pause. However, far from being an extraneous component of the creative industries, there are strong arguments for seeing media agencies and advertising agencies, or simply *marketing* in general, as an important part of the creative industries. Creative service providers, in their various functions, make creative content visible to consumers at large – taking products to a mass-audience:

Branding: A great deal of creative work goes into the design, development and maintenance of brands, brand identities and brand recognition. Branding is, at its core, about differentiation: the American Marketing Association defines it as “a name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods, or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors” (Moore and Pareek 2010: 12). More broadly, branding is about the creation and maintenance of a brand, its presence in the public eye (and mind, which is why some marketers use the notion of “mind-share” to describe what it is they acquire for their clients), its affiliations, contexts, and the connotations (or “brand associations”) it evokes for consumers.

Over the past 20 years economic, technological, social, and cultural changes have conspired to devalue cultural content and place a stronger emphasis on the services and systems that convert raw symbolic goods into meaningful and valuable experiences for consumers. Consequently creativity is closely linked to the management of cultural production and cultural distribution. (Bilton and Deuze 2011: 34)

One important way in which raw symbolic goods are turned into meaningful experiences for consumers is **branding**. A brand is a good example of how the mixture of tangible and intangible characteristics of creative products plays out in practice. It is a symbolic good that conveys meaning and even carries emotional associations that are not inherent in the physical manifestations of the brand, such as the products, the logo, the visual identity of the brand, or individual advertisements. In branding, such important but abstract elements as “brand values” are translated into material form (Moor 2008).

Taking music to market

When a musician or a band attempts to reach a wider audience for records and live performances, managers, record companies and other creative professionals come into the picture. Simon is a freelance A&R (artists and repertoire) manager who works with musicians on developing their songs, sound, performance and other aspects of their craft.

When asked what it is that he actually *makes*, what qualifies him as a *creative* practitioner, he sees himself as making music – as part of the creative process. However, the picture immediately gets more complex when he starts to describe how the musicians he works with actually make a living. Rather than seeing the sales of recorded music as the primary source of income, he suggests that a certain levelling has taken place among “the different things that make you money”:

“The physical products selling music in a CD or a download is a smaller part of the income you’d look at getting. It would be less than the other areas where you can earn money: live, merchandising, sponsorship, specific fan experiences, etc. It’s more about creating value and having multiple ways of exploiting that. [...] Taking the piece of music to market [is] part of the chain of things that might mean that you make money from DJ-ing or exploit it in other ways. Like, for instance, a lot of urban artists that have given away free mix tapes, but then have made money from selling T-shirts. It’s the music [that] – in commercial supermarket terms – becomes the loss-leader.” (Simon, 2011)

Simon was previously employed by a record label until 2007, when it was sold for its back catalogue and almost all the staff were made redundant. When he was interviewed, he worked with musicians on a freelance basis, while maintaining a portfolio of other work, including spending around half of his time employed in education.

Simon’s career trajectory is an interesting example of what Leyshon et al. (2005), in a study of the musical economy after the internet, argue is a long-term development in the music industry that arises from the changing importance of music in people’s everyday lives: “The problems facing the music industry have not suddenly been manifested overnight, or even in response to on-line digital file exchange, but rather have accumulated in time in response to a set of broader cultural forces that have changed

the role of music within society, and relegated its immediacy and importance among many of its consumers.” The chief reason for this, they argue, is that recorded music “is decreasingly valued for itself, but is, instead, increasingly valued more for the ways in which it is consumed in relation to other things,” that is, as part of the background of other entertainment, as soundtracks for advertising, film, TV and video games (Leyshon et al. 2005: 181–183). In other words, music no longer occupies the cultural central stage for young people the way it did when fewer media and technologies competed for their attention and disposable income – with games emerging as a significant winner over other forms of physically distributed media (Arthur 2009). “Music is ‘used’ rather than ‘owned’” in the digital environment, argues music manager Malcolm McKenzie (Smith 2008: 91). Therefore, the way Simon describes his work with musicians suggests that the various creative services that musicians previously relied on to get their recordings and live performances to a larger audience – promotions, advertising, music videos, radio play, etc. – are still important, but now these services have the purpose of locating music within other entertainment and deriving income from that integration, rather than selling music on a per-unit basis in the form of CDs or even digital downloads.

Collaboration and coordination: Simplicity and complexity are features of the collaboration and coordination involved in the making of a creative product. For a hypothetical example, the rock band Purse Snatchers compose a song together one evening, jamming in their rehearsal space. Having created the song as a band, they share the copyright evenly between themselves, each member having contributed something to the eventual composition. Then, after playing it live and releasing a recorded version, the Purse Snatchers are approached by a large computer games company who want to put it on the soundtrack of an action-packed snowboarding game. The Purse Snatchers’ song is now one of the many components of a complex creative good called *Thunderslopes*, which is the result of the work of large teams of writers, graphic designers, software engineers, actors, motion-capture technicians, directors, project managers, and many more. This is what defines a complex creative good – it can only

FROM SIMPLE CREATIVE GOODS TO COMPLEX CREATIVE GOODS

Richard Caves distinguishes between *simple creative goods* and *complex creative goods*, depending on how many (and complex) contracts are involved in the making of the final product. The work of creative originals gives us the most straightforward examples of simple creative goods: painting a picture, composing a song, writing a story – these are simple activities by individuals or small teams involving simple contractual arrangements. But that’s only the beginning of the story:

Artists of all types engage in creative processes and tasks that come to completion only with the collaboration of “humdrum” (or “ordinary”) partners, and perhaps of other artists as well. The painter needs an art dealer, the novelist

a publisher. The cinema film requires a number of actors, a director, screenwriter, cinematographer, production designer, make-up specialist, and many others who see themselves in some measure as artists (along with teamsters and accountants, who likely do not). These collaborations rest on deals and contracts – perhaps of the “handshake” variety, perhaps elaborately drawn. (Caves 2000: 1)

Simple creative goods, from the point of view of the contracts involved, are creative activities in their simplest setting, as Caves (2000: 19) suggests: “One artist deals with a simple firm that promotes and distributes her creative work.” This, however, can get quite complex quite quickly. A screenplay is simple, but a feature-length motion picture, with a budget in the millions of pounds and large teams of specialists working on different elements of the finished product, is complex, to put it mildly. It is also a good example of the project-based working so prevalent in the creative industries: a complex creative good is the end product of a production chain which involves not just many different teams of people, but also multiple projects that converge (Mayer, Banks, and Caldwell 2009). Each of the teams involved in a complex creative good has a specific set of goals within the overall project, many of which constitute separate subordinate projects in themselves.

exist because of “activities that require complex teams of creative and humdrum inputs” (Caves 2000: 85). Complexity enters the picture when large teams have to be coordinated, there is uncertainty about the success of the project (nobody knows how well the game will be received, how many copies it will sell, etc.) and the intricate problems of time-coordination against deadlines (because *Thunderslopes* has to be ready in time for the Christmas shopping season).

Assembling a complex creative good: assistant film editor

Shalane, a London-based assistant film editor, was interviewed about her experience of working on a feature film in summer 2011. She emphasized the project-based character of her work: “Most editors work on a freelance basis so I’ve been hired just for this film. So, I work for a company who’s funding this film, technically, but I’m only employed until the end of this film and then I’ll need to find something else.” While it’s going on, with everyone working against a coordinated production schedule and deadlines, the work is quite intense:

“We [the editors] are on this film from the beginning, right from day one of the shooting. For that time, every day, they bring the dailies, the rushes, which is everything they shoot in one day. They bring it in the day after it’s been developed, and you [the assistant] have to go through it, you separate it by every take of [every scene]. You sync the sound to it so the sound matches the picture – because the sound is recorded separately. Then you have to organize it all for the editor. So he’ll

look at the rushes all together but then he also wants stuff done so that he can see, you know, scene 1, scene 2, and he can see all the takes of things like that in the Avid [editing system]. So, he then goes through and he picks his favourites, he'll start to assemble the scene." (Shalane, 2011)

The film that Shalane worked on was shot over 60 days. By the end of shooting, the editor had a rough cut of the entire film ready.

"The director and the producer will watch that to make sure that there is a film and they've shot everything they need to shoot. Then the editor and the director will sit every day and just go through scene-by-scene: replacing takes with others. For us, the assistants, it's a lot of fixing the picture – you go through to make sure all the dialogue's in sync and add some temporary music so that the composer can hear, sort of, what the idea was for the way that scene is supposed to sound and they compose something. And then temporary visually effects, same thing again, so the VFX [visual effects] guys can know what you had in mind for what was happening there – temporary sound effects – all that will then get stripped out and done properly by someone who specializes in that. We just put it together." (Shalane, 2011)

The job of the editing team, as Shalane describes it, involves making sure that the work of various separate teams comes together seamlessly in the completed film, without the viewer knowing where the raw footage ends and the visual effects begin, or that the sound of footsteps was not made by the actor on the screen but by a dancer on a soundstage in suburban London. This is why the final stage of the filmmaking process is very demanding for the editing team:

"[We are] continually monitoring if anything changes, even the sound, or like this morning there were some frames that got repeated – honestly, I don't even know how he did that, but he did, and we had to go through and make sure that everything is exactly the way that it's meant to be so that nobody can get confused about anything." (Shalane, 2011)

Traditionally, the musical score is the last major creative element that is added to a feature film. In some films, a music supervisor will work with the director and editors, negotiating with composers and musicians, sourcing music, licensing it for use in the film – linking the music industry side of the project to the film industry side (Lewandowski 2010). Shalane was interviewed in the week when the score was being finalized for the one she was working on:

"Right now we've got a composer who's composed the score, but then there's also bits and pieces [in addition to the score itself]. In movies there'll be pop songs and that sort of thing. You've got to get clearance for all those things. If you've got someone who's going to sing a song for the end credits [you've] got to make sure that's happening, got to make sure the end credits are all correct and are sent out to the right people – that sort of thing." (Shalane, 2011)

SUMMARY

This chapter describes the different kinds of work people do when they produce creative goods and services, setting the stage for the stories of development and production in the next chapter. We borrow a handy typology of creative products that asks *how* a good or service is made, not what it is: creative originals, creative content, creative experiences and creative services are distinguished by the kind of labour they involve – the work that goes into them – rather than by what the end result is. This allows us to examine further the difference between what Richard Caves calls *simple* and *complex* creative goods – a distinction that turns out not to be straightforward because almost every creative good, once it travels beyond a writer's keyboard or a band's rehearsal space, becomes remarkably complex on its journey to reach a larger audience. Investigating how that works in practice, we draw primarily on the experiences of Christopher, a fashion designer, Simon, an A&R manager, and Shalane, an assistant film editor, to illustrate how these complexities play out in working life.

RECOMMENDED READING

Bilton, Chris and Mark Deuze, eds. 2011. *Managing Media Work*. London: Sage. An informative collection of essays on management and the work of creative producers.

Lash, Scott and Celia Lury. 2007. *Global Culture Industry: The Mediation of Things*. Cambridge: Polity Press. A look at certain material cultural objects (Nike shoes, *Toy Story*, global football, conceptual art) and how they move across national borders.

McRobbie, Angela. 1998. *British Fashion Design: Rag Trade or Image Industry?* London: Routledge. Groundbreaking study of the British fashion industry.

Passman, Donald S. 1994. *All You Need to Know About the Music Business*. New York: Simon & Schuster. A music manager dispenses tips and stories from a long career managing bands and helping musicians not to get fleeced by music labels.

Smith, Stuart James. 2008. *How to Make It in Music: Written by Musicians for Musicians*. London: Dennis Publishing. A short book featuring short interviews with jobbing musicians, managers and music professionals.