Managing Media Workers

Deuze, M.

Managing Media Workers

<div style="text-align:right">**19**</div>

Mark Deuze

19.1 Introduction

People spend more time with media today than at any previous point in history. The number of media channels, forms, genres, devices, applications, and formats is proliferating—more media get produced every year. Yet at the same time, the news about the media as an industry is less than optimistic. Reports about massive layoffs in all the creative industries—most notably film and television entertainment, journalism, digital game development, and advertising—are paramount.[1] This suggests a fascinating paradox: As people engage with media in an increasingly immersive, always-on, almost instantaneous, and interconnected way, the very people whose livelihood and sense of professional identity depend on delivering content and experiences across such media seem to be at a loss on how to come up with survival strategies—in terms of business models, effective regulatory practices (e.g., regarding copyrights and universal access provisions), and perhaps most specifically the organization of entrepreneurial working conditions that would support and sustain the creative process needed to meet the demands of a global market saturated with media. This puts the emphasis on management—of media as a business as well as the management of one's individual career. One needs a roadmap to navigate the unruly seas of the creative industries.

---

[1] For ongoing news about layoffs across the creative industries, I rely on reports such as regularly provided by IWantMedia (http://www.iwantmedia.com/); Journalism (in the UK; see http://www.journalism.co.uk/); the International Labour Organization (see, e.g., http://www.ilo.org/sector/Resources/publications/WCMS_161547/lang--en/index.htm); the Twitter feed of themediaisdying (https://twitter.com/themediaisdying).

M. Deuze (✉)
Department of Media studies, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
e-mail: mdeuze@uva.nl

This contribution is based on previous research integrating different fields of study regarding media management and media work (see Deuze, 2007, 2011; Deuze & Lewis, 2013; Elefante & Deuze, 2012; some of the current work is adapted). The chapter can be understood as an attempt to integrate theories of how media industries function in society with theories of how media professionals manage their individual careers and professional identity in this context and case-based work on how media industries and professionals alike manage creativity and innovation. The assumption is that the combination of these perspectives assists in articulating a bridge between theory and practice in media management. This approach to managing media work stems from a few key considerations about the field of media management:

- Media management tends to be underexplored and undertheorized (Mierzejewska, 2011);
- Most media management research does not look across boundaries between media professions or academic disciplines (Aris & Bughin, 2012).
- The traditional tendency in much of the field has been to artificially maintain distinctions between management and creativity, which seems unhelpful (Bilton, 2007).
- Media management (studies and practice) should take an integrative, holistic approach—something advocated by many yet practiced by few.

Of crucial importance here is a conceptualization of media management as the management of companies as well as careers in the media. Particularly the latter part of this equation has been somewhat absent from the literature in the field, as it tends to focus on either specific industries (e.g., journalism or Hollywood), specific aspects of businesses within these industries (copyright enforcement, revenue models, product differentiation, concentration of ownership), or specific cases of company and firm projects (change management, work floor culture). The focus on (individual or group) careers is of added value for two key reasons: first, the ongoing casualization and individualization of labor and working conditions of professionals throughout the creative industries and, second, a motivation based on pedagogy. Schools, departments, programs, and courses in information science, (tele) communication, journalism, and media studies attract more students every year who are seeking careers in "the" media. Generally, such departments don't actually teach or train students for this purpose, instead focusing on the theories and methods of media and communication research. A broad perspective on media as careers may address this particular oversight.

Beyond the popularity of the media industries as degree programs and career perspectives, it must be said that the trends affecting media management are not particular to the creative industries. A new world of work is taking shape across the manufacturing, service, and creative industries that seems to be premised on individual- rather than industry-level responsibility, requiring a high degree of skillset flexibility, and with an implicit expectation of portfolio careerism. Media industries are special in this context for a longer history manifesting these broader trends (such were not characteristic of manufacturing, especially). Moreover, the

media industries are unique with regard to the powerful link between work and self-realization that is generally evident in the motivation to pursue creative careers. This individualization of work (in motivations and careers) makes people in creative labor settings both easier and harder to manage: easier, because they are less likely to engage in collective action and bargaining, but harder because managing a more or less temporary network of fragmented individuals can be quite complicated and time-consuming.

It is difficult to adequately convey the complexity and dynamics of the typical work experience (anywhere) in the creative industries if relying on a traditional pedagogical focus that privileges the industry as the domain of corporations and companies. Such an institutional approach is reinforced by relying on the literature, which has generally omitted the individual from its consideration of media management, and by delegating "real-world" experience to the encouragement of internships and apprenticeships within media institutions. This is not to say that the characteristic approach is wrong or that it should be reversed. But it is to acknowledge that the work companies and firms do has increasingly less to do with the lived experience of an individual working in the media, and that the models for studying media management and managing careers in the media merit reconsideration. This chapter is an attempt to articulate a general context for managing media workers across creative industries and makes such a context specific to what generally defines and also drives cultural workers: their sense of self in terms of a professional identity (for more detail, see Deuze, 2007; Deuze & Lewis, 2013).

19.2   The Context of Managing Media Work

Driving contemporary media management and media work in all the creative industries is a shift in power away from professional content creators to users on the one hand and to owners on the other. Control over storytelling (including authority over what kind of stories is told and how) as well as the resources needed to creatively and effectively convey these stories are flowing away from professionals toward audiences. That is exemplified by decision-making processes that are increasingly governed by ratings and market research and a push toward including more user-generated content by and for corporations (see Napoli, 2010). Companies are exerting, or attempting to exert, increasingly control over financing arrangements, copyrights, and access to distribution platforms. For media workers, this means a loss of (negotiating) power in two directions at the same time, further contributing to what I characterize as an alienation process. In this context, the current shift toward individualized entrepreneurialism in creative labor can be considered the result of an increasingly precarious character of media work as well as a tactic to counteract its consequences.

As the industry, and especially its business models, focuses on user-generated content and consumer engagement, and as corporate media owners gain stronger control over their workforce via outsourcing production to loosely affiliated

networks of professionals and firms or by abandoning production altogether in a bid to control the marketing and distribution of content produced elsewhere, those who professionally create content are often left (or made to feel) more or less powerless. In this way, work is being outsourced to both ends of the labor spectrum, leaving many media professionals far more isolated that has historically been the case. This is exemplified by a constant and ongoing struggle for work and the loss of any direct sense of creative autonomy.

Further, managing media work must be seen within the larger social architecture of which it is part, and this means taking into consideration every factor that contributes to the organization of media companies and careers. Such would certainly include content, processes, people, technology, and a range of implicit and unconscious aspects of organizational life such as beliefs, values, affects, and emotions, all of which can have a tremendous influence on planning as well as behaviors. Thus, managing media work is necessarily made up of both material and immaterial factors, and these must be considered in conjunction. Simply put, a key approach to media management requires focusing on the many resources (both human and nonhuman) that combine to form the source of all media action. By thinking in terms of such factors that comprise the broad context within which media work takes place, one cannot emphasize enough both the distributed and the hybrid nature of media work in comparison to other industries.

Media work does not simply involve the transfer of information (of books into treatments into screenplays into movies into franchises into...) but is situated in and involved with complex networks of information and understanding, including those related to competition, markets, organization and structure, industry standards, technologies, and the evolving media environment. All of that is not unique to media industries. Most of these variables are evident in the literature on general management work in determining the best strategy for a firm. But a singularly important aspect about media work remains the keen relevance of personal motivation, dedication, and identity investment that practitioners invest in their contributions—i.e., in the fruits of their labors. Media professionals tend to identify first and foremost with how they see themselves as a practitioner—as a filmmaker, a beat reporter, or television producer, for example—and only in the second or third instance would their professional identities be related to a particular company or brand.

Arguably the most powerful factor to be considered in managerial strategy for media firms is the role of technology. The plethora of technological innovations being developed and incorporated into and by society on a routine basis serves to supplement and undermine previous technologies. This shift presents media companies and individual professionals alike with the constant challenge of adaptation to a continually emerging range of new technologies and the progressive realignment or abandonment of older ones. In turn, the media as an industry (including its professionals) are at the forefront of supercharging the development of, and demand for, technological innovation. Again, I would like to underline the intertwined nature of human and nonhuman factors in the management of media

industries—technologies are not neutral, "cold" machines nor is human talent something that exists in a vacuum (Winston, 1998).

Similar to the process of adaptation to technological development is the equally daunting challenge of adapting to the evolution of media content models. Business models are, like media technologies in general, always already remediated. That is to say, when new models emerge, the old models are supplemented and only rarely displaced. In media, traditional business models are perhaps not obsolete, but their effectiveness, which is based on markets and determined by channel scarcity and corresponding control over access, is diminished. This happens due to technologies that flatten the playing field and an overall tendency by management to cling to the familiar ("tried and true") when interpreting change that is disruptive. Media industries are experiencing a broad shift in the formulation of business models from an emphasis on mass media to personalized content and to participatory and user-generated content. Media products are becoming increasingly hybridized and are thus difficult to place into neat categories that can be isolated and therefore more effectively managed. Overall, however, communication between phases of the creative process, between elements of the global production network, and between technologies and practices, as well as between producers and consumers, is just as important a function as content itself.

Adaptation to technological development and the evolution of media content models are driving an increasing strategic emphasis on niche-oriented and also participatory media. A third influence on media strategy design is keyed to consumers' relationships with content. With technological advances facilitating the provision of custom products and an increased level of user participation in the production of content and experiences, the industry-driven construction of audiences is progressing from a mass of static objects conceived in passive terms to an unruly mob of active cocreators and people variously labeled by industry observers and scholars as "pro-ams," "amafessionals," "produsers," and "prosumers." Although this trend seems to be supported by data showing a growing group of people (especially teenagers) who are actively sharing, making, and up- and downloading content online, the audience construct is as much a product of industry rhetoric as behaviors (Napoli, 2010). But the changing nature of perceptions of and audience uses and relationships with media is forcing managers and workers alike to rethink their processes and practices when making content and designing experiences.

The contextual challenges that contribute to managing media work as discussed above are contributing to a different and far less stable environment than in the past. Additionally, rising costs, declining revenues (especially from advertising), and increasing competition (on a global scale) require companies and individuals to adapt to working with scarce resources for all elements of the production process: financing, conceptualizing, creation, marketing, and distribution. This leads to an increased focus on "creativity" as a real or perceived necessity to rise above the many challenges and win the ongoing competition for market demand—a trend that contributes to a global policy shift toward creative economies and creative industries (Flew, 2011). In short, more creativity and innovation on both the firm and the

individual level means more success and a greater competitive advantage, even though such "advantages" fit in a broader context of precarious labor, technological complexity, and shifting power dynamics between employers, employees, and audiences.

19.3 A Model for Media Work

The ways in which media professionals give meaning to what they do—as documented in the literature, articulated in interviews, and visible in how they express themselves in trade magazines and online—are a primary source for understanding what it is like to work across the creative industries. This does not necessarily mean that people's lived experience of cultural work describes what actually happens, nor does it translate easily across the different types of media industries and areas of production involved with each type. But it is noteworthy to observe striking similarities in these self-expressions. Here it is useful to collapse the discourse of media workers into several categories of values, goals, and priorities that feature prominently in their everyday strategies and tactics. Regardless of whether a media worker is (or considers herself or himself to be) successful, or whether the measure of that "success" conforms to traditional notions of good (or bad) work, the set of values she or he deploys to articulate that struggle (or joyride) remains largely constructed out of the same principal components. For a broad discussion on notions of good and bad media work, see Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011).

Doing cultural work shows that the market does not rule with an iron fist and that informal networks exist alongside sedimented structures and routines. It's also clear that the production process includes and also excludes both commercial aspiration and creative impulse and that the democratic nature of what Henry Jenkins (2006) effectively describes as *convergence culture* is both bottom-up (user-generated content) and top-down (cross-media marketing and franchising). Within this complicated frame of reference, the individual worker tends to stand alone—both in terms of labor protections (or rather the lack thereof) and regarding sense-making processes. Media work today is not only about what gets produced in terms of spoken and written words, audio, still, or moving images but (and increasingly) also is about providing platforms for people to make, edit, and exchange their own content. Four constituent elements comprise one's professional identity within today's creative industries: **content, connectivity, creativity**, and **commerce**. Professionals in media industries in particular, and creative industries more generally, produce content. That is obvious. But they also invest in platforms for connectivity where fans and audiences provide free labor. Media work is culture creation that tends to take place within a distinctly (and increasingly) commercial environment.

Within a context of destabilized legacy industries and dissolving boundaries between media consumption and production, the media worker may understandably feel individually isolated. However, this isolation can give some creative control to the media professional as well. Managing a boundary-less career can be considered

to be the best, if not only, way to survive in the current work environment. To some extent, individuals can thus be seen as taking control of their career paths, resulting in a new type of self-directed job security. It is also possible that those who are willing to train themselves to become more attractive to management and employers. By being proficient in various methods of media production, workers can use multiple creative talents to their advantage—and are increasingly expected to be doing that. At the same time, however, it must be noted that existing ways of organizing labor and the current system of worker protections (both in the workplace and in terms of public policy and legislation) tend to overlook or even harm the ability of the individual to chart her or his own career path. Labor laws, unions, and other working arrangements tend to protect those who are already "inside," i.e., employees already contracted with a specific employer, often as part of a long-term package. The legal (including tax) context of individual or independent entrepreneurship in the creative industries often adds complexity to an already precarious work-life.

The contingency and casualized nature of media work is not necessarily new, nor does it occur similarly across all creative industries. On the other hand, ongoing digitalization and globalization of production and distribution have impacted careers in media significantly, amplifying an already fragmented labor experience (from the perspective of the individual worker). For management, this process has accelerated the level of complexity that must be handled when addressing workflows and assessing strategies needed to adapt to fast-changing and often uncertain circumstances. Nowhere is this felt more acutely than in the software sector (including digital games), where a small number of publishers and a sprawling field of small-sized businesses (including many individual entrepreneurs) try to keep up with a global market where producers and consumers are literally everywhere.

Whereas for most workers in temporary and contingent settings the employment situation is far from ideal, many in the higher skilled knowledge-based areas of the labor market, which certainly includes media, seem to prefer such precarious working conditions, associating this with greater individual autonomy, the acquisition of a wide variety of skills and experiences, and a reduced dependence on a single employer. This, too, may be comparatively unique to media industries. The portfolio workstyle of the self-employed information or cultural worker/entrepreneur can be characterized by living in a state of constant change, and flux, while at the same time seemingly enjoying a sense of control over one's own career. But Zygmunt Bauman warns against overtly optimistic readings of the relative freedom the beneficiaries enjoy in a context of inequitable globalization: "We are called to believe today that security is disempowering, disabling, breeding the resented 'dependency' and altogether constraining the human agents' freedom. What is passed over in silence is that acrobatics and rope-walking without a safety net are an art that few people can master and a recipe for disaster for all the rest" (quoted in Bauman & Tester, 2001, p. 52).

Freedom and security, often seen as mutually exclusive, become ambiguous in the context of how different people from different walks of life deal with, and give

meaning to, the consequences of not having either. It is perhaps the perfect paradox: all the trends in today's work-life quite clearly suggest a rapid destabilization of social bonds corresponding with increasingly disempowering effects of a fickle and uncertain global hi-tech information economy, yet those workers caught in the epicenter of this bewildering shift also express a sense of mastery over their lives, interpreting their professional identity in this context in terms of individual-level control and empowering agency. Melissa Gregg (2011) shows how this interpretative process is part and parcel of being part of a community of peers in cultural work that sometimes quite willingly includes self-delusions of "making it work" while, from an outsider's point of view, the professional involved clearly does not.

We are describing a more or less deliberate negotiation of otherwise debilitating forms of labor exploitation that is characterized by rampant unpaid ("spec") work, expectations of 24/7 engagement, a mutually enforced always-on mentality, and experiencing no control over one's future under the guise of a "nobody knows" mantra and the disempowering effects of generally operating in a labor context without traditional lines of feedback and support. What explains this? In my view, it is the fact that media work tends to be affective. The professional identity of a job in the creative industries tends to have meaning beyond the instrumental functionality of doing something that earns a living. The fact that people who do media work often care so deeply about what they do (as, increasingly, also evident in many other sectors and industries) not only opens more opportunities for exploitation; it can also be seen as raising the stakes for a personalized sense of professional identity as a coping mechanism that can be self-delusional as well as self-empowering (see Neff, Wissinger, & Zukin, 2005).

In the everyday construction of a media professionals' sense of self—that which leads to a more or less coherent (at least imagined) professional identity—it is the interplay between the values of providing content, organizing connectivity, handling creative freedom, and being commercially successful (which is not necessarily an expression in monetary terms) that influences one's negotiations. The external factors intervening and complicating these everyday negotiations are many and certainly beyond the contemporary context sketched earlier. Key elements that are historically continuous include the uneven structure of ownership over cultural products and the control of its modes of distribution (where in all industries, a handful of major corporations and holding firms operate vis-à-vis many smaller or independently operating enterprises), the mentioned lack of adequate legal protections for atypically employed workers, as well as a profound age, gender, and life phase imbalance throughout the creative industries—featuring a workflow that tends to privilege young men living in unmarried and childless circumstances (Creedon & Cramer, 2007). These structural elements of the identity equation are not particular to the early twenty-first century and are not experienced in the same way by everyone involved. However, their omnipresence codetermines deliberations about one's choices and priorities when considering a career in media.

Although the role of technology impact is continual, there can be said to be something quite particular about the current media ecosystem within which media work takes place. This primarily has to do with the disruptive potential of

increasingly ubiquitous and pervasive information and communication technologies, wresting control over all aspects of the media value chain—especially production, marketing, and distribution—away from gatekeepers such as record labels in the music industry, distributors in the film industry, and publishers in the game industry. In a real sense, these trends further contribute to the individualization process in cultural work because the artist—whether a fashion designer, intrepid reporter, or aspiring moviemaker—is considered to be individually empowered by relatively cheap and easy-to-use technologies to do "their own thing" and be successful at that. Celebratory accounts of formerly unknown individuals striking it "big" through suddenly popular songs or viral videos on YouTube obscure the significant investments made by individuals to *make it work* both within and outside of creative industries and thus tend to highlight product over process. Notions of long-term affective investment in one's craft or art get sidelined in favor of often one-time oversized success (in turn generally only assessed through rather traditional industrial metrics, such as number of hits/ visitors/likes/re-tweets/copies sold).

It is within this system of variables that media professionals can be expected to be outlining their sense of professional identity in terms of the stories they want to tell (content), their relationship with audiences and publics (connectivity), their particular perception of what kind of work they aspire to (creativity), and the role success in whatever shape or form plays in all of this (commerce).

19.4 Professional Identity in Practice

The work of authors in various fields signals an increased prevalence of consumer-generated, customer-controlled, or user-directed media content and experiences across the creative industries (see Jenkins, Ford, & Green, 2013). Researchers in different disciplines signal a corresponding industry-wide turn toward seeing the consumer as cocreator in cultural work, particularly where the cultural industries' core commodity is (mediated) information. Online, media participation can be seen as the defining characteristic of the Internet in terms of its hyperlinked, interactive, and networked infrastructure and digital culture. None of this is essentially new, nor is it necessarily tied to the Internet. Yet it must be argued that continuous blurring of the real or perceived boundaries between making and using media by professionals as well as amateurs has been supercharged in recent years—particularly in terms of its omnipresence and visibility online.

I say supercharged because historically we find that people who make media have often collaborated with those who use media. Much of the great works of art came about because rich patrons commissioned painters and sculptors to make specific portraits, decorations, and other representations signifying status and prestige in society. Often such works were not created by single art "producers" but came to be through intense collaboration and exchange among dedicated teams of artists, their apprentices, sponsors, and visitors.

Participation as a value and expectation in journalism was first established through letters to the editor sections in newspapers and later expanded to include functions like newspaper ombudsmen and reader representatives that became an accepted part of news organizations worldwide. All areas of the creative industries from advertising, marketing communications, and public relations through journalism, architecture (visual and performing), arts and crafts, design, fashion, film, video and photography, software, computer games, music, publishing, television, and radio—all have historical trajectories that show how the oft-maintained distinction between production and consumption is quite artificial, largely serving to sustain discursive structures of power and control within hierarchies. This is manifest in the proclivity to see the "artist" as intrinsically more enlightened than the "audience" or, in the case of a radical democratization theory of digital culture, the other way around (see Benkler, 2006).

As discussed before, a significant consequence of the new media environment is the shifting of power to the audience, both in power of resources and power of selection. This presents a double-edged sword to professional media workers. For established professionals, it generally becomes more difficult to utilize their power in the industry, of course depending on their relative position in the (often informal) hierarchy of their field and the platform within which they work. For newcomers, there are more tools and opportunities to break into the field. The lines between production and consumption continue to be drawn, erased, and redrawn, all of which takes place within an industrial context offering a fascinating blend of large multinational corporations and grassroots initiatives. This predicates an hourglass structure of cultural employment where a few networked companies employ thousands of people worldwide, while most of the production of content and experiences in media takes place in thousands of tiny companies often employing a handful of people, or less.

This trend highlights the pressure on media workers to strike a balance for every project and therefore as a benchmarking element of their professional identity. That balance is between the "auteur" ideal of creating content and compelling user experiences versus the (often considered as oppositional) value of providing people with platforms for connectivity and sharing their own free labor. Participatory media production and individualized media consumption are two different yet co-constituent trends that typify an emerging media ecology that is determining the direction of media workers' professional identities in practice.

In today's media environment, consuming some kind of media also involves producing media because people's media behavior so often involves some level of participation, cocreation, and collaboration, depending of course on the degree of openness or closedness of the media involved. In this context, the concepts of "open" and "closed" media refer to the extent which a given media company or site of media work shares some or all of its modes of operation with its target publics. A media organization can, for example, increase the level of transparency about how it works, or can opt to give its customers more control over their user experience. Yet the same communication technologies that enable interactivity and participation are wielded to foster the entrenchment and growth of a global corporate media

system that can be said to be anything but transparent, interactive, or participatory. The creativity of workers—paid and unpaid alike—throughout the creative industries must therefore be always considered within the competing as well as enabling framework of commerce.

It is crucial to note, however, that the delicate dance of media work in convergence culture is not a phenomenon particular to the contemporary context. The stranglehold of major business entities in most creative industries over financing, organization of labor, mode of distribution, as well as promotion and marketing is a structural phenomenon. However optimistic some of the readings of media workers' individual agency and cultural productions' convergence are, uneven and exploitative relationships remain a significant structural factor in determining how one's professional identity gets shaped and correspondingly shapes the political economy of both media management and media work. This last point is significant in suggesting that much of the precariousness of media work is in fact maintained by individuals trying to "make it work" within the system by not collectively organizing or by acquiescing to free labor and speculative work, as examples. In this view, one cannot simplistically conclude that "the corporation" is the source of all constraints on the development of a professional identity in cultural work.

19.5 Discussion

In this contribution, I've attempted to connect the worlds of theory and practice in media management and media work. At the same time, I have tried to steer clear of explanations that either suggest work across the creative industries is necessarily benchmarked by exploitation (Ross, 2009) or celebrate the supposedly new and improved chances for creativity and success in the current cultural economy (Jenkins, 2006). In my view, it is crucial to follow the lead of scholars such as David Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker, who benchmark their analyses of interviews with media workers across three cultural industries with the deliberate intent "to take creative workers' accounts seriously" (2011, p. 50).

An important question when considering the current practice and future of managing media work is why we still talk so much, even entirely, about firms, companies, and organizations in an era that seems to celebrate looseness and non-commitment? The framing of this question suggests that the answer lies in looking at media management somewhat differently than is typical, as described early in this contribution. Here the perspective on media management is marked by an appreciation of the lived experience of media work. In order to generate a systematic way of understanding the individualized "workstyle" (meaning the way of working and being at work) in media work—I have framed the everyday negotiations a media worker makes within the axes of content, connectivity, creativity, and commerce. The daily deliberations that oscillate between these variables and values have been framed by both continuous and contemporary trends across creative industries. This taxonomy of individual lived experience, professional identity

formation, and structuring factors should help to unpack the particularities of media management within and beyond organizations and firms as well as between and across different areas in the creative industries.

When thinking about the practice of media management, a couple of closing considerations remain to be briefly addressed. First of all, let me reiterate something stressed at the outset: media management is about individual talent. This talent is either present in the company or network, or it is available otherwise to manage deliberately. What this also means is that the company in and of its self is not special—rather, the talent it manages is special. Although this may seem obvious, it is striking that the literature on media management calls for more attention to be paid to media workers and the creative process alongside business models and flowcharts (Aris & Bughin, 2012). So even if obviously important, it has been too often neglected.

Second, it seems clear that the trends affecting media are similar across the creative industries and that different disciplines—journalism, advertising, digital games, film, and so on—address such issues in a variety of ways. This should make it similarly obvious for people inside these industries that it is wise to consider each other's best (and worst) practices. However, such cross-pollination is so far rare.

Finally, media management today seems to be, perhaps now more so than ever, a reminder to all of us that the boundaries between commercial acumen and creative enterprise need to be erased. Furthermore, to deny or even downplay the role of the user in the life cycle of the media product or service seems equally misguided. Arguably missing from all of this is an appeal to ethics to serve as a warning against exploitation as well as an appeal to aesthetics to protect the art of producing culture.

References

Aris, A., & Bughin, J. (2012). *Managing media companies: Harnessing creative value* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Bauman, Z., & Tester, K. (2001). *Conversations with Zygmunt Bauman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bilton, C. (2007). *Management and creativity: From creative industries to creative management*. Malden: Blackwell.

Creedon, P., & Cramer, J. (2007). *Women in mass communication* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deuze, M. (2007). *Media work*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Deuze, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Managing media work*. London, UK: Sage.

Deuze, M., & Lewis, N. (2013). Professional identity and media work. In M. Banks, S. Taylor, & R. Gill (Eds.), *Theorizing cultural work: Transforming labour in the cultural and creative industries* (pp. 161–174). London: Routledge.

Elefante, P., & Deuze, M. (2012). Media work, career management, and professional identity: Living labour precarity. *Northern Lights: Film & Media Studies Yearbook, 10*(1), 9–24.

Flew, T. (2011). *The creative industries: Culture and policy*. London: Sage.

Gregg, M. (2011). *Work's intimacy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hesmondhalgh, D., & Baker, S. (2011). *Creative labour: Media work in three cultural industries*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York: New York University Press.

Jenkins, H., Ford, S., & Green, J. (2013). *Spreadable media: Creating value and meaning in a networked culture*. New York: NYU Press.

Mierzejewska, B. (2011). Media management in theory and practice. In M. Deuze (Ed.), *Managing media work* (pp. 13–30). London: Sage.

Napoli, P. M. (2010). *Audience evolution: New technologies and the transformation of media audiences*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

Neff, G., Wissinger, E., & Zukin, S. (2005). Entrepreneurial labour among cultural producers: "Cool" jobs in "Hot" industries. *Social Semiotics, 15*(3), 307–334.

Ross, A. (2009). *Nice work if you can get it: Life and labor in precarious times*. New York: NYU Press.

Winston, B. (1998). *Media, technology and society: From the telegraph to the Internet*. London: Routledge.