

The theatricalisation of the private domain and the hybridisation of television genres. The case of *Big Brother*

Mònica Terribas & Carmina Puig



Introduction

This article sets out some thoughts on the transformation of the use of the private domain which has occurred in television through certain products. Habermas' discussion (Thompson, J., 1996) of the transformation of the public domain and the gradual invasion of the private domain has set off a process of pseudo-professionalisation. Today, through certain television formats, from docusoaps to the most blatant examples of the recently baptised *voyeur television*, we can clearly see the transformation of the private domain into one which can be manipulated and incorporated as an essential element for the theatricalisation of the intimate experiences of anonymous people. All because the industrial dynamic of the mass media demands entertainment.

These thoughts on the issue are effectively illustrated by a case study of *Big Brother* by Carmina Puig, who has focused her analysis on a breakdown of the ingredients of this television product in order to elucidate the generic traits that define it and make it a paradigm of the hybridisation of programme genres.

1. The theatricalisation of the private domain

In the context of the operation and production of the mass media today, it is almost anachronistic to embark on any discussion of the transformation of the public domain and its loss of identity and identification in the forms with the greatest penetration in society, the peak audience television programmes. It is also anachronistic to suggest that in the public domain, inherent to the very nature of the mass media, there is a productive, effective struggle between the interests of society and the transformation of those interests into elements that can be turned into raw material for entertainment. Everyday life has invaded the public domain, but it has not done so to offer society a repertory of examples which might help to foster a rational discussion of its structural functioning, Habermas' old aspiration, but rather to fill the void left by the dialogue

that should have constructed objective representation, interpretation and reflection on the reality of our society.

The everyday life of the people in the street has invaded the public domain to fill it with contents that are not examples which can be analysed as paradigms of broader realities; they themselves are the content, broadcast without the contexts that provide it with global meaning (Bauman, 2000). The hope that the media might be a battlefield where the public domain would continue to be represented, in spite of the interference of everyday life with its private representations, has become a mirage (Scannell, 1992).

Society is not publicly structured with the inclusion of elements that belong to the private domain of the public in the media, a complement to the structural arguments of the collective. There are, however, cases that present themselves as life experiences which can be assimilated and even imitated, which have no pretension other than showing themselves (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994; Terribas, 1994). Thus the transformation of the dialogue opened up through debating spaces has gone from comparing the structures of society with specific cases to directly exposing isolated realities which do not help to understand and improve the global functioning of our environment. That function, which the public domain ought to fulfil, has been wiped out not so much by the presence of the private domain as by its use as the single source of the sender of the media message.

In that context, the gradual loss of importance of thought through a flight from or abandonment of intellectual discourse or the lack of will by the media to incorporate it for fear of losing the receivers' interest, has led the mass media to make use of the private domain as a priority source of production of its messages and as the beginning and end of its aims. And so in many television formats, as we can see in the case of *Big Brother*, the private domain is not only used as an essential element; it is structured and produced as a show in itself, subject to a process of theatricalisation which wipes out any possibility of a real reading of everyday experience.

The theatricalisation of the private domain through those formats requires everyday life to be transformed, adapted, subjected to the dynamic needed to make it an entertainment product. Theatricalisation insofar as the elements are laid out in a space, a time, through technical resources and with a purpose, which make it possible to turn it into a show. We are looking, then, at the discrediting of everyday life. The common experiences that were placed at the service of dialogue through radio and television programmes, as exponents that were to enable us to understand how we live and behave, have been relegated to the background. Everyday life is of no interest unless it is submitted to the machinery that makes it material for public entertainment.

The show business professionals and opinion leaders whose job was to manufacture a suitable language for conveying experiences or reflections to the receivers have lost ground in a context where the media production process itself may turn anyone into a broadcaster of entertainment through their behaviour. Everyday life in itself is not

important enough. The transformation of everyday life through the media becomes the axis of that change and, still more, brings about the abandonment of the dialogue between public and private domains, given that that last concept is also transformed by the media industry.

A recent study commissioned by the British Broadcasting Standards Commission emphasises essential aspects of the public's loss of protection in their participation in television (Hibberd, Kilborn, McNair, Marriott and Schlesinger, 2000). The study shows that in the process of producing programmes in which people in the street become the raw material, there are no effective mechanisms to guarantee their personal protection, nor is there any assessment of the possible consequences of their public appearance once the media experience is over. Systematic exposure to the media for people in the street, who are not professionals, involves a risk which is not taken on board by the media and ignorance of the operation and scope of their participation might cause serious personal dysfunction. The study, which focuses on programmes in which the participants reveal personal experiences in television studios, does not analyse the use of the participant in a context expressly created for cohabitation in front of the cameras, as in the case of *Big Brother*, *De Bus* and other similar formats. It is in those cases that individuals lose control over their revelations and are subjected to a context outside their power of decision. Individuals make a pact through which their behaviour, personal relations and everyday life are hired by the television production teams for the benefit of the show. The participants have no direct control over the space and time in which they are participating and that space and time have been designed for purposes which have nothing to do with their personal interests. We have therefore subjected their personalities and their lives to the theatricality required to create a media product. Their prior consent is necessary, but they have no idea of the possible consequences of the use of their image and behaviour for themselves or for the people who are part of their private life. In that process of theatricalisation of the private domain we are also seeing a loss of interest in everyday life. Our lives, which in other formats can apparently be valued as models of behaviour or food for thought in order to improve the functioning of society have lost all interest unless they can become the centrepiece of an entertainment process.

And so that context is essential to assess the existence of certain formats that have become crucial elements in programming on many private television networks in the USA, as well as some in Europe. The formats, which will be analysed in the last part of this study through the case of *Big Brother*, live side by side with other programmes where the borders of genres are more identifiable. In spite of everything, it is worth pointing out that those borders are increasingly blurred, since the business goals of the communication industries demand levels of penetration in the receivers' market that force the producers to create products which mix the maximum number of effective ingredients to anchor the audience's interest. The tyranny of economic efficiency in a domain of cultural production like the communications media brings about that generic disorientation.

A specific analysis of any media product easily shows that the functions and elements

of certain radio and television genres mingle. How much information, persuasion and entertainment is there in the discussions included in the news bulletins on morning radio? To what extent are the news items included in the TV news bulletins chosen according to the impact of the images that accompany them? Are the people interviewed in the media chosen for their objective contributions and/or their capacity to produce attractive media messages? The answer to those questions places us in the context of hybridisation, of confusion of aims and application of production techniques that inevitably end in a loss of identity by the genres. Competitions are a good example.

2. Competitions: framework of representativeness for the private domain

Competitions are a genre that revolved around a number of basic operational axes: (I) to secure material and/or symbolic recognition through luck and/or the deployment of personal and/or collective skills; (II) to pick out the participants from the collective and therefore to make them representatives who have emerged from anonymity; (III) to promote the recreational mechanism as an essential life activity; (IV) to achieve public success or fame; and (V) to promote the consumer dynamics of capitalist industrial society.

In fact competitions are a media transposition of the usual operation of our everyday life: each individual is equipped with skills and knowledge that are the weapons he or she uses in everyday actions to become more or less successfully integrated into the collective and develop within it.

The competitions manufactured for media activity are in fact a reflection of the structural operation of our society. That is why it is not so strange to think that in television competitions mechanisms which are outside the luck or skill of the contestants also operate, such as the production criteria and the interests of the companies that are behind them. The same thing happens in real life; success or failure do not depend exclusively on people's efforts. Some authors have studied the phenomenon of competitions as exponents of those mechanisms and have used empirical studies to break down the functioning and constituent elements of the formats (Fiske and Hartley, 1978; Gunter, 1982; Barnouw, 1978; Miroir, 1980).

And so competitions are formats with clear goals and easily identifiable effects: the audience turn the participants into a reflection of their potential and generate either identification with or admiration for or disappointment in that anonymous individual who represents them as part of the collective they belong to. They establish direct identification mechanisms which provide a transposition of fame between them and the participant in the competition. They play at being equal to or better or worse than the competitors and in that process the competitors become representatives of the collective. The participants in competitions are the anonymous heroes who pop up in the public domain to reveal their potential and, from home, the audience reward them with their admiration or punish them with their disappointment according to the results of the competition mechanism. That identification effect is essential for the success of

the competition, whatever its mechanism or staging. The gratification obtained in a competition always takes a back seat. The process through which that gratification is reached is the audience attraction mechanism.

In the analysis of the case of *Big Brother* we shall be examining which of those features are accomplished and effectively structured in that television competition and how other features of other television genres enable us to understand the process of hybridisation and the transformation of the private domain on television.

3. The case of *Big Brother*. The loss of genre identity

The television scene has been notable recently for the effective and, in terms of audience, successful irruption of a new television format which was designed in Holland by John Endemol, *Big Brother*.

Big Brother can be studied from different points of view in the framework of different disciplines. One of the most striking aspects of the programme is the genuineness of its structure and content, since it does not follow the premises of a specific television genre; it adopts features from one and another, thus assembling a hybrid programme which is impossible to classify in the traditional taxonomy.

Accordingly the **aims** of this study are:

1. To test the hypothesis that *Big Brother* is a significant example of the hybridisation of genres on television today.
2. To describe the programme *Big Brother* in terms of format, in other words, to decide which features it takes from each genre.
3. To provide a name, as far as possible, for the format that constitutes *Big Brother*.

The **hypotheses** are:

1. *Big Brother* is an example of the hybridisation of genres in television today.
2. *Big Brother* basically adopts the structure of the television competition, although it also takes features from other genres.
3. The soap opera and the reality show are two genres represented in the summary broadcasts of *Big Brother*.
4. The talk show and the reality show are two genres represented in the broadcasts of *Big Brother* where people are expelled.

The **sample** consists of two hours' programming of each of the different kinds of broadcast of the show: daily summary (1), broadcast with votes (2), weekly summary (3) and broadcast with expulsion (4). In spite of that initial distinction, once the sample has been analysed it has been observed that the daily and weekly summaries and the broadcast with voting follow the same line, which is quite different from the broadcast with expulsion. That is why, when it comes to presenting the results we shall only distinguish between two types of broadcast: **summary broadcast** (covering the daily and weekly summaries and the broadcast with voting) and **broadcast with expulsion**.

The study takes genre to mean one of the broad groups in which programmes can be classified according to their form, content, target audience and forms of production, in other words, the purest concept, although we are well aware that nowadays it is almost impossible to find a television programme that only adopts the features of a single genre. The blurring of borders between different genres, their interrelation and the borrowing of features is a trend that has been present from the outset, but which it seems today, with the competition for audiences, is being heightened by the networks. That, then, is the basis of a study that aims to show the tendency to genre hybridisation of television products through a study of the format of *Big Brother*, a modern programme which breaks with the past and points to the direction television is heading these days.

Given that the border between genre and format is not very clear either, the study has assessed different classifications according to different authors (5), and in the end the genres are considered to be *news, reportage, documentary, magazine, soap opera, competition, talk show, docudrama, educational, variety, reality show* and *children's programmes*; we have also included *candid camera* which, although it cannot be considered a television genre, is a resource which has close links to the operational dynamics of *Big Brother*. We have not taken into account the ones that derive from the main ones (6) because they do not cover a wide enough range to be considered genres, the ones based on broadcasts of events (7) since the events take place with or without television, or the thematic ones (8) because they are programmes which either broadcast a real event or adopt the form of the traditional genres.

Results of the analysis of the sample

Once we have analysed the sample of the different broadcasts of *Big Brother* according to the defining features of each genre we observe that to a greater or lesser degree all the ones identified, except children's, are represented in the programme, which validates the initial working hypothesis.

Competition

If *Big Brother* is often labelled a competition it is because it adopts one of its fundamental features: the presence of competitors (the occupants of the house) who, guided by a presenter (Rolf Wouters and Daphne Deckers), contest for a prize (250,000

florins) through tests (surviving in the house-studio) that come down to a competition between equals. Because the aim of the occupants of the *Big Brother* house, like any other television competition, is to obtain a gratification, in this case a material one.

The possible telephone participation of the audience, choosing which occupants they want to leave the house, the sound effects or musical themes introduced as the tests evolve (used to make the images of the weekly test more attractive), the importance of the time factor in their resolution, the typical moments of intrigue followed by periods of rest, the involvement of the studio audience with expressions of support and enthusiasm (taking their feelings to the limit when the name of the person who has to leave the house is announced in the expulsion broadcasts) are all features of the competition genre in this programme, which complement the main one, the one that defines the genre.

Soap opera

Big Brother adopts a large number of features related to plot development from the soap opera. It is quite common to observe that in the summaries there is a tendency to redundancy between and within episodes, to slow plot development, to boost speech to the detriment of action, to present conflicts simultaneously and to pile on tear-jerking situations. If in the soap opera those features appear because it is scripted that way, in *Big Brother* they are there because of the situation in which the protagonists are placed: a closed space with no contact of any kind with the outside world, living with strangers and with little or nothing to do to distract themselves apart from talking. The perfect situation, therefore, to produce more speech than action, because the plot develops slowly with a good deal of redundancy (a result of the exploitation of the few attractive images thrown up by the everyday routine of a house), because emotional situations occur (propitiated by the isolation, separation from family and friends, the pressure of the ubiquitous presence of the cameras) and because there are conflicts and tensions between them.

If one characteristic of soap operas is that they usually play with suspense by activating it just before the commercial break or at the end of the chapter, *Big Brother* uses the same strategy, making way for the advertisements in the broadcasts with voting at the very moment when the first occupant is about to say whom he or she wants expelled. In the same way and whenever something interesting happens, before the programme titles flashes of the most striking images of the day are played so that the audience are hooked to the broadcast, waiting to see what they have been promised.

Like most daily soaps, the passage of time in *Big Brother* is parallel to real time, so with the nationality of the occupants of the house, the language they speak, their way of behaving and their culture in general, it brings the audience features they can identify with.

Documentary

One of the genres most represented in the analysis of the sample of *Big Brother* is the documentary (9) insofar as there is an attempt to enunciate the events objectively. Although we have to state that it is almost impossible to be objective on television, we also have to accept that the documentary is one of the genres which comes closest. And the *Big Brother* summaries try to show reality in the most neutral and objective way possible. But the hand of the person editing the images broadcast from the house, like any documentary film-maker, is always present, deciding which images will be shown and which will not.

Along the same lines, the scant presence of music and voice-over, the predominance of direct sound with no later alteration, the non-manipulation of the image, the protagonism of people without assignments to follow or roles to play, the ubiquitous presence of the cameras, which, as time goes by, the protagonists have come to accept as elements of everyday life: all those things lead us to think in terms of objectivity.

But the great difference between the broadcasts of *Big Brother* and an ordinary documentary lies in the conception of the term “reality”. Whilst the images a documentary shows us come from a reality that exists independent of the camera recording it, in other words, a reality that exists before and will exist after recording, the reality of *Big Brother* has been specially created to be caught on camera. That structure excludes it the genre.

Reality show

The reality show is widely represented in *Big Brother* insofar as the programme focuses on the most routine, ordinary reality, the everyday life of anonymous people, turned into a show. The genre is based on showing the most scandalous aspects of the private domain to attract audiences, a feature adopted systematically by our programme.

But the reality show is not only provided by the images from the *Big Brother* house; also, and more importantly, it appears in the expulsion images. Because, following the reality show model, on that day the occupants’ family members (all anonymous people) use the set as a confessional to explain (in colloquial language) intimate details of the protagonists and to make their feelings about life in the house public: all made more agreeable with the presence of some expert who brings his or her point of view (a psychologist, parapsychologist, sociologist, former occupant or member of the production team) and a presenter who encourages the accounts. However, the climactic moment comes when the occupant to be expelled comes onto the set: that is when bottled up feelings come to the surface and the tears start to flow.

Talk show

One of the main features of the talk show, the fact that conversation and dialogue are the elements that bring different people together on set, is also the case with *Big Brother*, especially in the broadcasts with expulsion. That is the day when the

occupants' families and friends meet on set to talk and give their point of view on what happens from day today in the house.

The generic feature of talk shows consisting of varying the theme in each broadcast is adopted, with some nuances, on this programme. The fact is, although we may say that there is a macrotheme (life and living together in the *Big Brother* house), we also have to accept that each broadcast with expulsion focuses on the two people who have been nominated to leave. And so in our case we can speak of a macrotheme which is adapted every fortnight to the circumstances of the moment.

As in all talk shows, in these broadcasts there is a presenter who brings his or her own personality to the show and leads the conversation while interviewing the guests who, in the case of *Big Brother*, are on set as friends and family of the protagonists. Their remarks and arguments are often complemented by comments by experts and professionals who contribute their point of view on the subject under discussion,

Docudrama

Docudrama, a genre that adopts features of both documentary and fiction, is present in *Big Brother* insofar as the broadcasts mix elements from reality and fiction. The audience see basically real images of the everyday lives of anonymous people shut up in a house, but made more attractive and lively by fictitious elements created and directed by the programme itself which make everyday life in the *Big Brother* house more amusing, such as weekly tests and decorative elements (artificial snow) which force them to behave in a particular way.

And so although they do not reconstruct or fictionalise historical events —and therefore do not adopt the main feature of the docudrama— the *Big Brother* summary broadcasts incorporate other ingredients of the genre, such as not concealing the staging (through the presence in the shot of microphones and cameras) or the use of the characters' everyday space (in the case of *Big Brother*) for the recordings.

The use of voice-over to present the images, the musical themes introduced indiscriminately (especially in the images of the weekly summary where we are shown the whole evolution of the week's test), the alternation in the summary broadcasts of stories that have some point in common, are also features of docudrama adopted by *Big Brother*.

Reportage

One of the main features of reportage is to present an avalanche of information related to a specific current event. In *Big Brother* that feature is adopted most of all in the collections of images that are presented in the broadcasts with expulsion and, in some cases, in the summary broadcasts in which, owing to some event that has taken place during the day, the lot revolves around a single theme. For it is in those collections

(whether a compilation of one of the occupant's time in the house or a summary of any conflict that may have occurred during the day) when a specific theme is entered into in greater depth, all its components analysed as far as possible and the events presented from a full spectrum of opinions.

If the subject matter of any reportage is usually based on current events, that term has to be qualified for this programme: although it cannot be labelled pure current events, we do have to accept that in a way it is, since the success of the programme raised everyday life in the *Big Brother* house to that level. The role of the enunciator in that case, as in all reports, is mediator between the events and the audience, since he or she presents the assessments of the theme by the subjects involved.

Candid camera

If the basis of the candid camera technique is capturing images with hidden cameras without the people involved being aware of them, it is obvious that *Big Brother* only uses the first part, since the presence of the cameras is well known to all the protagonists. The fact is that the great difference between one and the other lies in the fact that the protagonists of the candid camera are involuntary victims of the television product whilst the protagonists of *Big Brother* are volunteers who are willing to have their private life turned into a show. In this case, then, there is an element of exhibitionism that does not occur with the candid camera.

The cooperation of friends and members of the family is used in both cases to comment on the images provided by the hidden cameras, but whilst the candid camera is often used to make the joke more believable, in the broadcasts with expulsion in *Big Brother* it is used to extract interesting statements about the life of the occupants of the house.

Not much more is systematically borrowed from this technique, since the poor quality of the images or the will to show ridiculous or comic situations only occurs at specific moments of the summary broadcasts of *Big Brother*.

News bulletin

The news bulletin is also present in *Big Brother*, especially in terms of structure, since the content of the programme, based on entertainment, has nothing to do with the information provided in the news.

The broadcast of *Big Brother* three times a day for about 30 minutes (in the case of the daily summaries), the structuring of the programme in small blocks or segments separated by bursts of image or sound and the presence of a speaker-presenter who directs the programme and makes way for the different blocks is a constant taken from the news bulletins which *Big Brother* adopts especially in the broadcasts with expulsion. Thus the broadcast from the studio (which coincides with the fixed space of all television news bulletins) is combined with direct connections, pre-recorded reports

and interviews presented by correspondents from the different variable spaces that depend on the news item. The fact is that in the context of the programme each small event in the dwelling is considered a newsworthy event which the audience must be informed of.

And the final touch: the concept of the set as an observatory of life—in this case the house-set—, achieved with the television screens located behind the presenter, is another feature taken from the television news bulletin.

Magazine

The television ragbag, the magazine, is represented only in the broadcasts with expulsion in *Big Brother*. For, as in any programme that can be classified within the magazine genre, it is made up of broadcasts of some length and heterogeneous content directed by popular presenters with the help of contributors in different sections of the programme and use is made of people in the street. Those broadcasts are made up of alternating blocks with different subject matter; in the case of this programme we have the studio piece (interviews with family and friends of the occupants), pre-recorded segments (interviews and reports) and in some cases connections with the outside broadcast unit. But although the structure in blocks can also be considered prototypical of the news bulletin genre, we see that the subject matter of the magazine segments is more along *Big Brother* lines, because whilst the aim of the news bulletin is to inform, the magazine sets out to entertain the audience, an aim shared by *Big Brother*.

Educational

The didactic genre *par excellence*, the educational programme, has little to do with *Big Brother*. If some feature can be observed it occurs in the broadcasts with expulsion when the presence of experts on some subject is used to instruct. For if the aim of any educational programme is to teach or instruct the audience, in this programme the discourse of the person schooled in a particular discipline pursues the same end. In that way the expert (whether psychologist, sociologist or parapsychologist) tries to educate the audience in the subject in question by means of a discourse that explains, shows or demonstrates.

Moreover, we may consider the educational genre to be the origin of the continuous presence of infographics in the different broadcasts of *Big Brother*. That resource, used most of all to help the audience understand and retain what is being explained, is adopted by the programme to show the percentages of votes and nominations that week. An outline of the most important things that have been said inserted into the programme by way of an ending is used to sum up the state of affairs.

Variety

The presence of the variety genre is of little importance in the programme. The *Big*

Brother broadcasts with expulsions only take some secondary generic feature or other, such as the length of the programme, the heterogeneous content, the blocks structured as independent segments within the programme and the usual presence of popular presenters. However, the defining trait of the genre, the style and spirit of theatre variety, with light entertainment and amusing subjects is only found, in minimal quantities, in the last broadcast of the programme, when the set is decked up as a party room and the theme of the winner is treated as mass entertainment.

Conclusions

With this brief review of the genres we have been able to show that *Big Brother* is a hybrid format that adopts features of all the television genres considered in this work, except children's programmes. Thus the first hypothesis that considered the programme as a hybrid format has been proved. The other hypotheses, which were based on specifying which genres influence each kind of broadcast, have been exceeded. The fact is that in this case we cannot speak of just two or three genres represented in *Big Brother*, but of almost all of them albeit, as we have shown, to different degrees. And so we can speak of *Big Brother* as a paradigmatic programme of the present tendency to the hybridisation of television genres.

What remains is to give the *Big Brother* format a name. If originally the idea was to use a name which, following the trend of the moment, would include a number of genres (10), when it comes to it, given the large number of genres represented in the programme, it is impossible. Distancing ourselves from the name which Endemol himself gave his format (*real life soap*), we prefer to designate a name that includes far more programmes than just *Big Brother*.

For if we look at the television scene since the appearance of this format, we see that in different European and American countries programmes have emerged adopting many of the premises of *Big Brother* to find a niche in the programming: *De Bus*, *Big Brother Vips*, *Geboeid*, *The 1900 House*, *Expedition Robinson* (11) and *El Gran Polvo* (12). In view of the rash of hybrid programmes following the guidelines of *Big Brother*, we find it more suitable and feasible to give a name to the whole group. For that reason, in agreement with Poniewozik (13), we shall call this new genre *voyeur television*, a concept under which all those programmes can be grouped, setting aside any small differences between them. The fact is that all those formats are based on the voyeuristic nature of any human being and the exhibitionist nature of the people who volunteer to be observed in the most intimate situations of their private life.

References:

BAUMAN, Z. (2000). "As seen on TV". Inaugural lecture at Politeia, Leuven (Belgium), 25 May 2000. Unpublished.

BARNOUW, E. (1978). *The Sponsor. Notes on a Modern Potentate*. New York:

Oxford University Press.

FISKE, J. and HARTLEY, J. (1978). *New Accents. Reading TV*. London: Matthew and Co. Ltd.

GUNTER, B. (1982). "Attitudes towards TV games & quiz shows", a *Research Paper*. BBC, London.

HIBBERD, M., KILBORN, R., McNAIR, B., MARRIOTT, S. and SCHLENSINGER, P. (2000). "*Consenting adults?*". London: Broadcasting Standards Commission.

LIVINGSTONE, S. and LUNT, P. (1994). *Talk on Television: Audience Participation and Public Debate*. London /NY: Routledge.

MIROIR, A. (1980). "L'exemple de la Belgique francophone en matière de jeux télévisés", in *Le divertissement*. "Etudes de Radio-Télévision". no. 28 - September, 1980.

SCANNELL, P. (1992). "Public Service broadcasting and modern public life", in *Culture & Power. A Media, Culture and Society Reader* (Scannell et. al. (eds), London: Sage.

TERRIBAS, M. (1994). *Television, National Identity and the Public Sphere: a Comparative Study of Scottish and Catalan Discussion Programmes*. Unpublished doctoral thesis: University of Stirling (Scotland, UK).

THOMPSON, J. (1996). "The theory of the public sphere in Habermas."

Notes:

(1) Broadcast summary of what has happened in the Big Brother house during the day.

(2) Daily broadcast summary including the votes, once a fortnight, of the inhabitants of the house.

(3) Broadcast summary of what has happened in the Big Brother house over the week.

(4) Special broadcast on the day —every fortnight— when one of the inhabitants is expelled from the house.

(5) Barroso, J. *Realización de los géneros televisivos*. Madrid: Síntesi, 1996. Sussman, S. *Así se crean programas de televisión*. Barcelona: Rosljai, 1995.

(6) Such as sitcoms, interviews, current affairs reviews, etc.

(7) Royal weddings, matches, services, concerts, Olympic Games, etc.

(8) Basically culture, sport and music.

(9) Owing to the different existing concepts of the documentary genre, the one adopted for the study is González Requena's: information discourse characterised by a non-subjective enunciation (wiping out all traces of the enunciator: the account of the events takes on an impersonal tone or rhetoric, with the consequent exclusion of the expressive, conative and factitious functions) and, naturally, full command of the referential context.

(10) Such as docudrama (documentary + drama), docusoap (documentary + soap opera), infotainment (information + entertainment), etc,

(11) Although the original Swedish Expedition Robinson format predates Big Brother by some time, it was not until the success of the later programme that it was first broadcast on different European and American networks.

(12) For a synopsis of the structure and functioning of these new formats, see the study "*Big Brother, a paradigmatic case of the present hybridisation tendency in television genres*", chap. 6.

(13) Poniewozik, J, "We like to watch a 'Time'", 26 June 2000, vol. 155. no.

