

This is a repository copy of *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the Screen Industries*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/170698/>

Version: Published Version

---

**Monograph:**

Ozimek, Anna Maria [orcid.org/0000-0003-3751-6994](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3751-6994) (2020) *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the Screen Industries*. Research Report. University of York

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# **Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the Screen Industries**

## **Scoping Report**

Dr Anna Ozimek



### **Screen Industries Growth Network**

The Screen Industries Growth Network (SIGN) is a unique, business-facing initiative supporting the TV, film and games industries in Yorkshire and the Humber. SIGN aims to make this region the UK's centre for digital creativity, and a model of diverse and inclusive activity. In order to do this, SIGN connects companies, support agencies and universities through a programme of training, business development, research and evaluation.

SIGN is a £6.4M project, starting in Summer 2020, and funded by Research England, the University of York, and its partners. The University of York leads the initiative, working with Screen Yorkshire and eight other Yorkshire universities. An extensive network of collaboration ensures that SIGN is equipped to deliver maximum impact across the region.

Report published, 2020.

# Contents

<b>1. Executive Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Data	6
1.2 Scope	7
1.3 Focus	7
1.4 Crises	8
<b>2. Introduction</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. Contextual Background</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Constructing Discourses about Equality, Diversity and Inclusion	12
3.2 Work Organisation in Screen Industries and Problems of Diversity	13
<b>4. Barriers for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1 Age	16
4.2 Disability	17
4.3 Gender	21
4.4 Caring responsibilities	25
4.5 Race and Ethnicity	28
4.6 Regions	33
4.7 Religion	37
4.8 Sexuality	38
4.9 Social class	39
<b>5. Discussing EDI Initiatives, Schemes and Support</b>	<b>44</b>
5.1 Empowering and Transforming Interventions	44
5.2 Data Collection Initiatives	46
5.3 The Business Case for Diversity	47
<b>6. Conclusion</b>	<b>50</b>
6.1 Data	50
6.2 Scope	51
6.3 Focus	51
6.4 Crises	52
<b>7. References</b>	<b>53</b>

# 1. Executive Summary

Numerous industry studies, academic research projects, journalistic accounts and worker testimonies have indicated the prevalence of inequality, discrimination, exploitation and exclusion in the cultural and creative industries. Reports from various representational bodies from the television to videogame sectors document the underrepresentation of different genders, ethnicities, ages, sexualities, disabilities, social classes, immigration status and geographical locations in the creative workforce. In addition, academic research has shown that the organisational structure of the screen industries exacerbates these inequalities because of project-based contracts and an increased reliance on informal networks for entering into and maintaining employment as well as the pervasiveness of unsociable working hours. Studies about inequality in the screen industries have demonstrated both implicit and explicit forms of discrimination, from policy makers constructing the depoliticised notion of 'creative diversity' (Malik, 2013) and the articulation of a 'reasonable sexism' justification in positing women as less suitable because of their assumed caring responsibilities (Wing-Fai et al., 2015) to more direct forms of abuse and harassment (Vysotsky and Allaway, 2019). Discussions about workforce diversity and the structural sources of inequality in cultural production are not new but have, in recent years, gained increasing attention from policy makers, industry representatives and the wider public.

This report provides a brief overview of the available statistical data, existing research and suggested approaches to discussing issues of equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) in the screen industries. The report is not designed to be exhaustive and has a specific focus is on the screen industries identified as television, film, visual effects (VFX), animation and videogames in the UK.

The aim of this report is threefold. Firstly, it aims to provide an overview of studies focusing on EDI themes in screen industries. Secondly, it identifies gaps in knowledge and the existing research. Thirdly, it attempts to identify specific data and issues relevant to Yorkshire and the Humber.

## **The report demonstrates the following key points:**

- There is an imbalance in the coverage of workforce diversity among the different screen industries, with the UK's film and television sectors achieving the best visibility in terms of industry data and academic research. Academic studies in these fields often discuss diversity from a range of angles, for example by investigating worker experience or addressing EDI policy and initiatives in the industry. There is increasing interest in collecting data about

other screen industries such as videogames (UK Game Census, 2020), animation and VFX (UK Screen Alliance, 2019). Nevertheless, studies in these other sectors are comparatively underdeveloped.

- In addition, there is an imbalance in the coverage of diversity characteristics with a greater number of studies focusing on gender and ethnicity than on age, disability, social class, sexuality, religion or geographic location (see section 3).
- Industry reports are, relatedly, inconsistent in their discussion of the various characteristics. For example, disability is only partially or not at all acknowledged in the reports and gender identity is mostly addressed in binary terms and primarily focused on women's experiences (see sections 3.2 Disability and 3.3. Gender).
- While various studies address the need to paying greater attention to intersectionality, most research in the field focuses on the structural barriers and inequalities experienced within one particular diversity characteristic.
- There is a substantial body of research about obstacles to jobs in the screen industries which draws attention to bias and discrimination in the recruitment process, reliance on informal networks and young people's preconceptions about working in the cultural and creative industries. There is comparatively more discussion about facilitating entry to the industries than about career progression and/or decisions to leave. This suggests the important research area of marginalised workers who experience problems in advancing their careers and therefore occupy lower positions within the screen industries.
- Marginalised workers are often segregated or ghettoised in specific occupations, genres or sub-sectors, and the segregation of these workers raises questions about structural logic and organisational practices within the screen industries (see Saha, 2018)(see sections 3.2 Disability, 3.3. Gender, 3.5 Race and Ethnicity).
- Academic studies rarely utilise comparative research methods to explore how the different screen industries approach questions of inequality and discrimination. Articulation of the similarities and differences between the sectors would provide important knowledge about how EDI issues are addressed.
- It is widely documented that project-based employment, informality, portfolio careers paths and unsociable working hours amplify inequality in the screen

industries. However, discussions about the socio-historical development of specific screen sectors, such as the differences between film, television and digital media, are less explored.

- Data about Yorkshire and Humber is limited to the handful of reports that mention geographical locations, namely the Creative Skillset Employment Census (2012), UKIE (Thompson and Hebblethwaite, 2018) and UK Games Industry Census (Taylor, 2020). As such, there is some difficulty in providing a holistic picture about screen industries in the region (see section 3.6 Regions).
- Despite the long history of equal opportunity initiatives and diversity interventions in the screen industries, mostly in film and television, there have been limited independent evaluations of their success (see section 4).
- There is a growing body of research investigating political, economic and social approaches to discourse about equality, diversity and inclusion in the screen industries (e.g. Malik, 2013; Nwonka, 2015/2020a). This provides important understanding about who, how and under what conditions EDI schemes are delivered (see section 4).

Based on the overview provided in this report, we can identify gaps for further research:

## 1.1 Data

*Scarcity* – the lack of data about workforce demographics and experiences of creative work in Yorkshire and the Humber requires further investigation of the inequalities and discrimination experienced in the region. These academic inquiries should be positioned within further discussions about inter-regional, national and international relations.

*Comparability* – data about the screen industries is often hard to compare over time and between places. To track change both these obstacles need to be addressed.

*Co-production* – data produced by academics and others outside the screen industries is most useful when co-produced by people working in the sector who can a) help ensure rigorous understanding of the issues in the design, implementation and analysis of research projects, and b) feed it into ongoing debates and initiatives with their own voice.

## 1.2 Scope

*Not only film and TV* - Issues of equality, diversity and inclusion concern all screen industries. However, the majority of published studies specifically consider workers' experiences and diversity policies in the UK television and film industries. Further studies could explore approaches to EDI in other screen industries (e.g. animation, VFX, videogames) and conduct comparative research to examine the similarities and differences in addressing inequalities and discrimination in the screen industries.

*Doing Diversity Work* - Given the prevalence of diversity trainings, schemes and initiatives in different screen industries and at different levels (from companies to institutional bodies) as well as the considerable resources spent on these initiatives, future research should provide a more robust independent evaluation of different policies, schemes and interventions. In addition, the experiences of creative workers of different forms of support as well as the efforts of private businesses engaged in 'diversity work' in the screen industries could be explored.

*Sites of inequalities and discrimination* - The studies on creative workers demonstrated that inequalities occur when attempting to 'break into' screen industries or production sites. However, there is a further need to assess inequalities related to networking or training sites. Kerr et al (2020) demonstrated that supposedly inclusive informal skills development sites, such as game jams, can perpetuate existing inequalities. Moreover, recent reports of sexual harassment and abuse in the gaming industry indicated that conferences, convention and networking sites are not safe for members of marginalised demographic groups (e.g. Schreier, 2020).

## 1.3 Focus

*Mental health* - Qualitative inquiries about creative workers' experiences of inequality and discrimination document numerous obstacles and challenges, from finding job opportunities to progressing in one's career and reconciling work and private lives. These difficulties raise questions about the workers' mental health and creative work. Industry reports, such as the UK Games Industry Census (Taylor, 2020) and The Mental Health in the UK Film and Cinema Industry (Wilkes et al. 2020), focused on mental health challenges among creative workers. Future research should pay attention to mental health issues in creative work more broadly, with a focus on specific marginalised demographics.



*Care* - Studies about gender inequalities in the workplace have examined issues relating to pregnancy and maternity (e.g. Wreyford, 2013; Dent, 2019), but other forms of caring responsibilities have been comparatively less explored (with the exception of a research project carried out by Dent, 2020). Thus, future studies could expand the investigation of caring responsibilities when discussing the variety of creative workers' experiences.

*Intersectionality* - Future research should focus on improving the coverage of different diversity characteristics. While previous studies have explored some aspects of diversity in terms of gender and ethnicity, investigations of workers' experiences in terms of social class, age, religion, sexuality, ability or geographic location are less robust. Future studies should also consider intersectionality when exploring the variety of creative workers' experiences.

## 1.4 Crises

*Creative Work, EDI and COVID19*: Equality, diversity and inclusion problems are longstanding crises in the CCIs and future research needs to understand the on-going covid-19 pandemic and its impact on inequalities and discrimination in the screen industries. Early publications about the impact of COVID-19 on the screen industries have highlighted this problem (Banks, 2020; Comunian and England, 2020; GDC, 2020). Therefore, future research should focus on COVID-19 and post-COVID-19 impacts on creative workers from different demographic groups, working in different screen industries and with different occupational positions/employment relations.

## 2. Introduction

Studies of employment and working practices in the cultural and creative industries (CCI) document widespread inequalities, discrimination, exploitation and exclusion workers experience due to their gender identity, sexuality, age, ability, class, ethnicity, race or geographical location. For decades, reports about the CCI workforce demographics demonstrate that the sector's workforce does not reflect the diversity of the UK's population. While the quantitative data collected by governmental and institutional bodies provides evidence for this lack of workforce diversity, it does not explore the systemic barriers, practices and beliefs that contribute to inequalities. In recent years, there has been an increase in discussions about discrimination and harassment experienced by cultural workers. These experiences have been presented in individual testimonies, journalistic inquiries and social movements (e.g. #MeToo; #Oscarsowhite; #1reasonwhy). Furthermore, numerous studies about cultural workers' experiences documented discrimination and inequality in the sector (e.g. McRobbie, 2016; Gill, 2013; Conor et al; 2015; Saha, 2018). A growing concern about equality, diversity and inclusion has resulted in various institutional representatives in the screen industries, creating a number of manifestos, initiatives and support measures that address inequalities and discrimination.

This report presents an overview of studies regarding workforce diversity in the screen industries, analysing and documenting themes of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI). This report primarily focuses the UK and therefore on the nine protected characteristics identified by the Equality Act (2010): age, ability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnerships, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and beliefs, sex and sexual orientation. These characteristics are supplemented with discussions about two further characteristics: social class and geography. This report presents the above characteristics separately because this is how they are most often dealt with in the publications reviewed here, but also to help structure the report. However, it is crucial to understand inequalities in intersectional terms; therefore, this report will attempt to highlight the intersectionality of these characteristics. Intersectionality<sup>1</sup> is a concept which directs our attention to complexity of oppression systems in society (e.g. patriarchy, heteronormativity, White supremacy and capitalism) which disadvantages and privileging individuals at multiple axes of identities (see discussion

---

<sup>1</sup> Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), critical race and legal scholar, is considered as an originator of this concept. For further information, please see the video (Hopkins, 2018 April 22): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O1isIM0ytKE>

by Harvey, 2020). For example, a Black woman with caring responsibilities and from underprivileged socio-economic background faces different barriers of entering and maintaining creative work than white, middle-class woman. Consequently, intersectionality is important in recognising that the improvement of participation for people with one diversity characteristic does not translate into facilitating participation for all people with this diversity characteristic.

This report looks specifically at EDI themes in screen-based media, which are composed of film, television, videogames, animation and VFX (Visual Effects). The aim of this report is threefold. Firstly, it aims to provide an overview of studies focusing on EDI themes in screen industries. Secondly, it identifies gaps in knowledge and the existing research. Thirdly, it attempts to identify specific data and issues relevant to Yorkshire and the Humber and the scope of SIGN. In synthesising a range of literature, it is important to recognise and acknowledge two further dimensions of work included here. First, scholarship on EDI issues in the CCIs has a long history and it is not possible to do justice to that history here. The focus, therefore, is on recent work of most relevance to the UK context. Second, research on EDI is frequently produced from within institutional and sectoral contexts which themselves have problems with discrimination, exclusions and exploitation. The field is therefore partial and the aim of SIGN is to help address these absences.

The report is divided into three sections:

- the contextual background of inequality and discrimination in the CCI
- a description and analysis of EDI characteristics;
- a discussion about the policies and schemes supporting EDI.

### 3. Contextual Background

The creative industries are celebrated for their potential for economic and employment growths, but ever since their inception in the 1990s have been criticised for not acknowledging their challenging working conditions (Oakley, 2013; Banks and Hesmondhalgh, 2009). Contrary to optimistic accounts, qualitative studies have documented widespread precarity, underpayment, overtime work and inequalities in the CCI (e.g. Bielby and Bielby, 1996; Ekinsmyth, 1999; Blair, 2001; McRobbie, 2002/2016; Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011; Gill, 2013). This body of research has drawn attention to how the supposedly attractive features of cultural work, such as the lack of rigid work-based structures, increased sociality and the perceived ‘glamour’ of creative occupations, contribute to the persistence of inequalities, discrimination and exclusions based on gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, social class or geographical location (Gill, 2013). Critical creative-labour studies have focused on addressing the paradox of ‘cool, creative, and egalitarian’ jobs by emphasising the structural inequalities and barriers to entering and maintaining employment in the CCI.

However, studies which explore work, work organisation and practices in the CCI comes from different academic fields and traditions from sociology of work, critical political economy, cultural studies, economic geography to business and management (see for an overview Hesmondhalgh, 2019, Banks, 2007, Roodhouse, 2006, O’Connor, 2011). In each of these fields, the problems of equality and diversity are presented or addressed differently, for example with focus on macro (e.g. critical political economy) or micro perspectives (e.g. production studies). Consequently, questions of equality, diversity and inclusion in studies about screen industries production varies greatly in terms of addressing implicitly or explicitly structural sources of inequalities and their historical positioning.

The exclusionary character of employment in the CCI has been widely acknowledged through a collection of quantitative data about workforce diversity. The existing data demonstrate that CCI workforce demographics do not reflect the diversity of the UK’s wider population (e.g. Creative Skillset, 2012). Measuring workforce diversity in the CCI presents many methodological and definitional problems (CAMEo, 2018). Data about CCI workforce diversity has been collected by various institutions and organisations that utilise different definitions, methodologies and scopes which presents problems for comparability. There is also an informational data gap within the different sectors of the screen industries. Overall, there is more research and data about workforce diversity in the television and film industries than in animation, videogame or VFX industries (also see CAMEo, 2018). Furthermore, while gender inequalities (mostly the experiences of women) have been widely researched, discrimination based on race, ethnicity, social class, sexuality, religion, location or

ability has been explored less. However, the issue of unavailable data presents a broader question of governmental and institutional approaches to equality, diversity and inclusion in the CCI. Conor et al. (2015:6) argue, that the lack of data about workforce ‘... both reflects and contributes to enduring inequalities. If what governments choose to measure and audit is a reflection of their concerns and priorities for action, then inequalities in the CCI seem to be low on the list’.

### **3.1 Constructing Discourses about Equality, Diversity and Inclusion**

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) are broad definitional approaches to addressing inequalities and discrimination that are persistent in workplaces. It is assumed that each of part of EDI adds a different dimension to the investigation of power dynamics in workplaces. Equality provides a base for a comparative reading of relations of power; diversity draws attention to multiplicity and a variety of lived experiences and categories of stratification in society; and inclusion encompasses the strategic dimension of investigating interventions that address power imbalances in workplaces (Ozbilgin, 2009:2). However, these definitions do not recognise that the emergence and use of given anti-discriminatory definitions are embedded in broader socio-economic and political contexts.

Oswick and Noon (2014) discuss the discursive positioning of EDI as distinctive, temporal-based political constructions in addressing work-based discrimination. The proliferation of the term ‘diversity [management]’ in the 1990s has been associated with increasing criticism towards equal opportunities/affirmative action programmes, which resulted in a shift towards a voluntarist/neoliberal notion of diversity management (see Kelly and Dobbin, 1998; Prasad, 2001). The propagation of diversity management also resulted in the increasing use of business case justifications for increasing diversity in workplaces over social justice arguments (Noon, 2007:775). Some scholars also address a conceptual distinction between diversity and inclusion (see Roberson, 2006:217), claiming that diversity is associated with the differences that are present in organisational demographics, and inclusion refers to strategies for removing barriers to participation. The shift in terminology and the underlying political forces raise questions about the increasingly visible discourses on inclusion as a form of backlash against diversity strategies that focus on social groups (Roberson, 2006). This shift from diversity to inclusion is also visible in the report by Creative Industries Council (EA Inclusion, 2020:5) which calls for ‘[l]ook beyond protected characteristics/move from Diversity to Inclusion’. This multiplicity of definitional explanations and the associated political actions emphasise the need to recognise the construction and conceptual positioning of EDI terminology. They also draw attention to the political and organisational environments in which strategies for EDI initiatives are developed and propagated. For example, Noon (2007) discusses

the rise of the ‘diversity industry’ alongside the propagation of the business case for diversity in various industries.

In relation to work in the CCI (specifically in relation to the television and film industries), scholars have demonstrated that particular policies, schemes, initiatives and/or strategies that are associated with questions of diversity are related to socio-historical and political contexts (see Newsinger, 2012; Nwonka 2015/2020a; Malik, 2013; Nwonka and Malik, 2018). Malik (2013) demonstrates how the shift of policy discourses from multiculturalism to cultural diversity and finally to creative diversity was associated with the New Labour politics and the strategy of depoliticising diversity in the context of creative industries’ policies. Furthermore, Newsinger and Eikhof (2020) discuss the strategic use of the business case for diversity justifications that are used by companies and representative bodies in the CCIs<sup>2</sup> (this is discussed further in the section 4.3). As Gray (2016:24) argues, studies on diversity in cultural production should ‘expand the analysis to include the way we frame and investigate the issue of diversity’ by investigating who, how and under what conditions approaches to diversity are shaped in screen industries to provide important insights regarding workers’ positionality, institutional approaches to diversity and propagation of support for particular justifications and interventions (see also section 4).

### **3.2 Work Organisation in Screen Industries and Problems of Diversity**

Inequality and discrimination are present in all societies and economic sectors. However, the organisation of work and the cultural production in screen-based media industries often amplify existing inequalities (Conor et al., 2015). Eikhof and Warhurst (2012) have discussed four elements of work that contribute to the persistence of discrimination, inequalities and exclusion in the CCI: 1) a project-based model of production; 2) pathways to ‘breaking into’ industries; 3) the informality of recruitment processes; and 4) work organisation.

Project-based employment is not unique to screen-based media, but it is particularly popular in television, film or video game production because of their cultural specificity. Project-based employment grants companies with greater flexibility and allows them to adjust their workforce numbers according to a specific project’s needs (Grabher, 2002). Consequently, the risk associated with employment shifts from employer to employee (Beck, 2000; Neff, 2012). Creative workers experience a significant precarity of employment in these sectors, which can result in financial as well as existential insecurity. Project-based employment calls into question who can afford to

---

<sup>2</sup> See also the CAMEo (2018) report for specific examples.

work in the industry, development of strategies for finding jobs and maintaining them, and the power relations involved in job search and employment processes.

Various studies on creative labour have demonstrated that careers in screen industries often rely on prolonged periods of un- or under-paid labour (e.g. Percival and Hesmondhalgh, 2014). People without access to substantial economic resources or living outside major urban locations are excluded. Studies about creative workers have documented that workers often put up with poor working conditions, approaching them as temporary struggles that eventually lead to better paid, more prestigious occupations<sup>3</sup>.

The informality of the CCI is widely researched and work in this area highlights factors that contribute to the exclusion, inequalities, exploitation and discrimination in the sector (Gill, 2013; Lee, 2011; Wreyford, 2015; Nixon and Crewe, 2004; Randle and Hardy, 2016). Gill (2013) demonstrates that informality becomes a 'structural principle' of creative work, and finding employment, recruitment of workers and accessing clients operates outside of formal regulations. Informal networks are often formed outside of work through social and industry events where 'being seen' and fostering relationships with potential employers is important (DeFillippi and Arthur, 1998). The pervasiveness of informality creates an important exclusion barrier, as it leads to a replication of the industry's workforce using 'homophily' principles and picking workers from the same social cycles. Informality contributes to the exclusion of workers without access to significant economic and social capital, as well workers with caring responsibilities and disabilities. Lastly, Eikhof and Warhurst (2012) argue that the work organisation and work cultures in screen industries, especially in addressing intensification and extensification of work in screen industries creates barriers of entry and career progression for many workers.

In analysing the characteristics of labour markets and the work organisation of creative industries presented by Eikhof and Warhurst (2012), this paper identifies the most common structural barriers that contribute to a persistence of inequalities and discrimination in cultural work. However, the discussed barriers present only general discussions about exclusionary barriers experienced by cultural workers. To understand the dynamics of inequality, discrimination and exclusion, there is a need to attend to specific practices, beliefs and discourses in and about any given screen industry. For example, the socio-historical development of these industries and the associated assumptions about their workers' talents and skills can be gendered or racialized (e.g. Hesmondhalgh and Saha, 2013).

---

<sup>3</sup> See concepts of 'hope labour' in Kuehn and Corrigan (2013) and 'aspirational labour' in Duffy (2017).



### Model of Production

- Individual creativity as key resource.
- High sunk costs for first unit of production.
- Nobody knows property.
- High risks on product market
- Project-based production

Project-based employment

### Work & Employment

- High employment insecurity
- Unpaid/underpaid entry level positions
- Recruitment through networks
- Long and unsocial work hours
- Requirement of mobility

construction of 'ideal type' of worker

### Work Culture & Practices

- socio-historical construction of specific working practices/identities (depends on a given screen industry)
- individualisation
- discourses about 'meritocracy' and 'talent'

### Social Inequalities

Employment insecurity difficult without supportive economic capital

Unpaid/underpaid entry level positions /internships not sustainable without substantial economic capital

Networks inaccessible without social capital

Temporal and spatial availability difficult with care responsibilities

Unequal participation of women and workers from ethnic minority and working class backgrounds

Unequal participation of workers with disabilities, workers with care responsibilities

Gender, racial and social class pay gaps

Difficulties with career advancement

Work culture - difficulties in voicing problems with structural inequalities

Based on Eikhof and Warhurst (2012:502)



## 4. Barriers for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

This section consists of nine sub-sections that present data about different diversity characteristics and barriers to entering and maintaining employment in the screen industries. These sections refer to characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 as well as social class and regional differences. Furthermore, the case of ‘pregnancy and maternity’ as protected by the Equality Act 2010 is expanded here to encompass a broader category of caring responsibilities. Each section is divided into two parts. The first part presents a synthesis of information about given characteristics from different screen industries’ reports; this data is mostly quantitative and does not provide in-depth information about work culture, workers’ experiences and production contexts in the screen industries. The second part discusses academic research that investigates screen industries’ production contexts and workers’ experiences. The coverage of diversity characteristics is not equal, with characteristics such as age, religion or sexuality being comparatively less explored. This imbalance in coverage is reflected in the depth of the presented statistics and academic research.

### 4.1 Age

Creative media industry workers are younger compared to the UK working population (Creative Skillset, 2014:25). Approximately 52% of people working in the creative media industries are aged over 35, compared to 65% across the UK (Creative Skillset, 2014:25). According to data from reports about demographics in various sectors of the screen industries in the UK, the workforce in these industries tends to be young (with fewer workers above 50). For example, a report by the UK Screen Alliance (2019:17) demonstrates age similarities among all three sectors (**animation, VFX, post-production**), with a large proportion of the workforce being 25–34 years old and very few workers in these industries being above 55 years old. Only workers in the VFX industry were slightly older, between 35 and 44. In terms of relations between age and gender, women in these industries tend to be younger than men. Similarly, in the **videogame industry**, the majority of workers are young, with 27% of workers in the 26–30 age category and 23% of workers in the 31–35 age category (Taylor, 2020:19). Only 3% of the respondents were 51 years old or higher (Taylor, 2020:19). Women and non-binary workers tend to be younger than male workers (Taylor, 2020:25). An Ofcom report (2019:6) divides workers in the **television industry** into two age categories: below and above 50 years old. According to their aggregated data, only 17% of workers are 50 years old or older. Furthermore, in terms of gender split, only 14% of all female workers are age 50 or over in comparison to 19% of male employees. Except for the BBC and ITV, the other main broadcasters all employ a lower proportion of women aged 50 or over. In terms of age differences, Ofcom (2019)

recommends initiatives that encourage the employment of older workers who would like to join the industry. These initiatives often include the introduction of flexible work arrangements (to allow carers to work in the industry) and the introduction of employment schemes without an upper age limit.

Studies about creative work in the television industry indicate the gendered dimension of ageism encountered by women. This relationship is mostly debated in relation to the television and film industry in discussing the social construction of the 'youthfulness' ideology and its contribution to age and gender based discrimination (see Spedale et al., 2014; Eikhof and York, 2015:158). Spedale et al. (2014) provide a critical discourse analysis of the final judgement of an employment tribunal concerning the BBC, which faced accusations of discrimination on both age and gender grounds. Their research demonstrated that organisational practices in the BBC (i.e., day-parting) promote a gendered construction of the ideology of youthfulness, with women's on-screen presence especially being judged by their appearance.

## 4.2 Disability

According to the recent parliamentary report, 7.9 million people of working age (16–64) have a disability, accounting for 19% of the UK working-age population (Powell, 2020). Data on workforce disability in screen industries is highly fragmented and because of significant differences among studies' methodologies, definitions, and scopes does not provide a sufficient basis for in-depth comparison. Overall there is little information about workforce participation of people with disabilities in screen industries, apart from the recognition that disabled people are significantly under-represented across all sectors (see also CAMEo, 2018). With this in mind, we must be wary of comparing statistics from different studies.

Data reported from different sectors include various definitions and scopes of the term 'disability'. According to the Disability Discrimination Act (1995 [amended in 2005]), disability refers to 'physical and mental impairment that has an adverse effect on someone's ability to carry out day to day activities' (see Randle et al. 2007:19). However, many organisations (e.g. the British Film Institute (BFI)) and studies (e.g. UK Screen Alliance, Taylor, 2020) utilise a broader definition of disability (social model), which refers to '(...) the loss or limitations of opportunities to take part in the normal life of the community on an equal level with others due to physical and social barriers' (Randle et al. 2007:19). Likewise, institutional and academic studies about workforce disability in screen industries approach questions of disability from different

perspectives<sup>4</sup>. Around 1% of all creative media<sup>5</sup> employees were described as disabled by employers, which is considerably lower than the 5.6% of creative industries workers who self-reported disability (Creative Skillset 2012:20). While some reports discuss disabilities as physical impairments (e.g. Randle et al. 2007), more recent reports expand this category by including questions about neurodiversity (see Taylor, 2020; UK Screen Alliance, 2018).

Data on inequalities within specific screen industries is also highly fragmented. According to the survey from the UK Screen Alliance (2019:32), in the combined sectors of **animation, VFX and post-production**, 9% of respondents reported having neurological conditions, 2% reported physical disabilities and 1% reported having both neurological and physical conditions. According to data collected about the **film industry**, 0.3% of the workforce has a disability across the film sector, ranging from 1% in film production to less than 0.1% in cinema exhibition (CAMEo, 2018:27). Disabled workers are also substantially under-represented in the **television** workforce, comprising approximately 2% of the workforce (ibid.). Participation of the disabled workforce was better represented off screen than on screen, reporting that the disabled workforce across industries is included in make-up and hairdressing departments (12%) (Creative Skillset, 2012:27). According an Ofcom report (2019) 6% of television workers self-identified as disabled, with the highest representation in Channel 4 (11%) and BBC (10%). In the **videogame industry**, 21% of respondents disclosed that they have a chronic physical health condition (which is higher than in general population, 13%). This census also included information about neurodiversity in the industry, which 11% of respondents reported<sup>6</sup> (Taylor, 2020:31).

Inequalities are not experienced uniformly but are mediated by different production processes and organisational settings, by different types of impairment and by other social relations such as gender, ethnicity, social class or geographical location (see also Hirschman, 2012). Disabilities in screen industries are comparatively less researched and explored than studies about gender, race and social class (Randle and Hardy, 2016). In considering the above data, it is also worth noting study methodologies. Reports present substantial differences in how disabilities are classified and also rely on ‘workforce disability’ data from various sources, such as self-reported by workers or reported by employers. Randle et al. (2007:20) suggest that in certain cases participation of workers with disabilities is under-reported, as

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, the DCMS data did not collect disability related indicators.

<sup>5</sup> Creative media industries definition includes: film, television, radio, animation facilities, interactive media, computer games, VFX, commercial production and corporate production.

<sup>6</sup> In the census, neurodiversity includes dyslexia (6% of respondents), ADHD (3%), autism (2%) and dyspraxia (2%) (see Taylor, 2020).

workers might perceive that disclosing a disability could obstruct their career development.

#### *4.2.1 Research on disability in screen industries*

Workers' disabilities in screen industries is an under-researched subject in studies on cultural production. Research about disability in screen industries focus on experiences of creative workers in the UK film and television sectors (see Lockyer, 2015; Randle and Hardy, 2016)<sup>7</sup>. However, there are also reports of past and ongoing initiatives that discuss challenges or initiatives directed towards disabled workers in screen industries (e.g. CAMEo, 2019).

Randle and Hardy's (2016) study of experiences of disabled workers in the UK television and film industry presents an in-depth exploration of challenges experienced by these workers. They argue that interviewed workers are 'doubly disabled' in both the labour markets and labour processes of the film and television industry. The authors draw attention to discriminations experienced by disabled workers that do not affect other abled-bodied minorities (e.g. type of performed tasks, access to work/networking sites). The study positioned experiences of disabled workers within debates about 'post-Fordist' capitalist production, which is often oriented toward the idea of an 'ideal worker'. The construction of the 'ideal worker' in studies about inequalities in cultural production appears mostly in the context of the gendered character of cultural work, most notably that the ideal worker is a masculine subject without caring responsibilities whose primary responsibility is to perform paid work (Foster and Wass, 2012:703). Randle and Hardy's study demonstrates how employment instability, recruitment practices and working patterns documented in screen industries contribute to discrimination of disabled workers. The requirements of frequently re-entering labour markets in search of new employment, limited opportunities for networking (e.g. accessibility, communication issues), culture of long working hours, multitasking and keeping up with the fast pace of television and film production contribute to the exclusion of disabled workers.

According to the interviewees, disabled workers experience significant obstacles in vertical and horizontal mobility, and 'glass partition'<sup>8</sup> (Roulstone and Williams,

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, in videogame industries or digital media industries, research on disabilities focuses on software and hardware accessibility and experiences of users/audiences/players with disabilities (e.g. IGDA game accessibility special interest group, 2020).

<sup>8</sup> In their studies about disabled managers, Roulstone and Williams (2014:22-25) discussed 'glass partition' as disabled managers reluctance to move jobs/roles both internally and externally because of ontological concern about moving roles, change organisational structures experiencing possible negativity from non-disabled colleagues.

2014:22). This problem was partially attributed to the lack of management awareness and mentoring (e.g. role models) that would support workers' career development. Furthermore, studies demonstrated that disabled workers are often assigned to work on disability-specific programming (Randle and Hardy, 2016; Randle et al. 2007). An opportunity to find employment in the sector through disability-specific programming was understood as a chance to get a foot in the door in the industry, but it was also perceived as a possible career limitation. Disability-specific programming was seen as devalued and of inferior quality in comparison to mainstream programming. Consequently, disabled workers experienced the practice of 'ghettois[ing] workers' that has also been documented in the experiences of other minority workers (e.g. Saha, 2018).

Disabled workers experience difficulties entering the television and film industries not only because of the expectation of participating in non-paid or under-paid entry-level jobs but also because of the specificity of entry-level tasks. Randle and Hardy's (2016) interviewees, for example, discussed how people with disabilities experience difficulties in fulfilling tasks of runners. Interviewees also indicated a difference between work in television versus film industries. Disabled workers argued that work in television production and especially work with established broadcasters (such as BBC) provides more favourable conditions for workers with disabilities.

On the contrary, the pace of work in film production and the limited resources of independent companies means they are less likely to accommodate the needs of disabled workers (Randle and Hardy, 2016). This situation further exemplifies the need to recognise approaches to discrimination and inequalities in the context of cultural production logistics, where the disabled workforce is approached in the context of a financial burden. The importance of understanding specific production processes and characteristics of cultural production are also emphasised in Lockyer's (2015) study about disabled TV comedians. Lockyer's research demonstrates the prejudice and discrimination that TV comedians experienced, from the recruitment process to commissioning programs that include disabled characters. Commissioning decisions are justified by the notion that an audience is not ready for programs with increased representation of disabled people and themes. Lockyer linked this justification to Caldwell's (2008:335-336) studies about production cultures in which he argued that television executives master the prose of 'speaking for the audience' and undermining audiences' capacities for enjoying diverse media content. Both the example of approaching disabled workers as a financial burden for companies as well as perceiving media content with representation of disabled people as risky and undesirable by audiences indicate the profit-oriented, risk-aversion logic of cultural production. This logic contributes to maintaining the status quo in screen industries and the exclusion of individuals with disabilities in the workforce.

### 4.3 Gender

Gender-based inequalities are one of the most extensively researched diversity characteristics in the screen industries (see CAMEo, 2018:33). However, what are often referred to as ‘gender inequalities’ mainly encompass discussions about the participation of women in the sector and their experiences. Consequently, gender inequalities are defined in binary categories when comparing data on women workers with data on men workers.

According to the UK Screen Alliance (2019) report, **women participation in animation** (51%), **VFX** (34%) and **post-production** (46%) increased compared to the data from 2018. However, as the report’s authors admit, this increase might have been the result of survey bias rather than increased participation by women in these industries<sup>9</sup>. Furthermore, according to the report, women of colour<sup>10</sup> encompass 8% of the VFX workforce, 8% of the animation workforce and 9% of the postproduction workforce (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:31). The report also notes the gendered occupational segregation of women in animation, VFX and post-production. Women in these industries tend to work in administrative and production management roles, with a minority of female workers based in technical roles. In the VFX sector, 82% of women work in administration, and 64% work in production management, while only 27% work as creative operators or artists (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:19). Animation and post-production follow a similar pattern as VFX, with the majority of women working in management roles (84%). However, animation has higher percentages of women as creative artists (49%) and in creative production roles (55%) (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:19). Only 14% of the female respondents work in technical support roles (ibid.). Regarding post-production, 85% of women work in production management, and 62% work in administrative roles, with only 12% of female workers in technical support roles (ibid., 20). The report data also indicate that men are more likely to occupy senior and mid-level roles (54%) than women (44%) (UK Screen Alliance, 2019).

According to the **UK Games Industry Census** (Taylor, 2020:23), women account for 28% of the overall workforce, men account for 70% and respondents who identified as non-binary account for 2%. The fraction of women working in games is significantly below that in the overall UK workforce (52%) and slightly below the overall CCI

---

<sup>9</sup> Data on women participation in 2018 – 27% (VFX), 40% (animation), 28% (post-production) (UK Screen Alliance, 2019).

<sup>10</sup> These data were only presented for workers identifying as cisgender.



average (33%)<sup>11</sup>. The census data also include positioning of the data on gender with the data on workers' age and ethnicity. These data demonstrate that younger groups (30 years old and below) have a higher participation of women and non-binary people (62%). In contrast, in the age category of 36 years old and above, 80% of those participating are men (Taylor, 2020:25). Regarding the relation between gender and ethnic group, the majority of male workers are of white British origins (22% white other). Although the majority of female workers also identified as white British (58%), there is a considerable participation in the industry of women from different ethnic backgrounds (14%) (Taylor, 2020:26). In the UK game industry, the most gendered balanced occupations include localisation, writing, project management and business operations, while programming is dominated by men (at about 87%) (Taylor, 2020:36). Men also represent between 77%-80% of the senior positions, especially in core production roles (Taylor, 2020:37).

According to data from Creative Skillset (2012), women participation in **the film industry** is above the average of other creative media industries – 47%. Data collected by the BFI (2020) demonstrates that women encompass 25% of all credited roles, 32% of cast and 24% of crew members. BFI data (2020) also indicates women underrepresentation in technical occupations such as: photography, sound, writing or stunts and women are overrepresentation in costume, casting, make up and publicity related roles. Furthermore, according to data from the 'Calling the shots' (Cobb et al., 2018:1) research project: 'women make up 14% of directors and 7% of cinematographers on the 3452 British qualifying film productions between 2003-2015'.

According to the Ofcom (2019) report, gender balance in the **television industry** remains a problem, but they also observed improvement in women representation in senior positions. According to the report, women make up 45% of the UKTV employees (which is a decrease from 47% three years ago). Overall, women participation in the industry is slightly lower than the UK female worker participation in the overall population (47%). However, for specific broadcasters, women participation is the lowest at Sky TV (39%) and BBC (44%), with participations rates of 57% at Channel 4 and 53% at Viacom. Regarding gendered occupational vertical segregation, representation of women in senior positions increased slightly from 41 to 42% compared to data collected in 2016/2017 (Ofcom, 2019:21). Furthermore, as noted above, in the screen industries, women are underrepresented in technical and

---

<sup>11</sup> However, the data suggest that this number is higher than the participation of women in IT/Software production (14%) (Taylor, 2020:23). Furthermore, it is worth acknowledging that the participation of women in other national videogame industries varies between 15% and 20% (see IGDA statistics). Creative Skillset data (2012) estimated women participation in the videogame industry as 14% of the overall workforce.

engineering roles and, to a less extent, underrepresented in creative and content production roles (43%).

The reviewed reports documented women under-representation in the UK screen industries. Women are often positioned in administrative and lower management roles and are less likely to work in technical as well as creative and content production occupations. Furthermore, the reviewed reports indicated the under-representation of women in senior management roles.

There is increasingly more attention being paid to collecting data on non-binary and transgender people in the industry. The UK Screen Alliance (2019) survey about workers demographics in **animation, VFX and post-production** also included responses of workers who identified as ‘transgender male’, ‘transgender female’ or ‘non-binary’; these categories were presented as ‘other preferred descriptions’ and encompassed a total of 1% of the respondents. The granular data on these respondents’ participation in the industry were not discussed because of confidentiality reasons. Respondents who identified as non-binary are also included in the **UK Game Industry Census** – encompassing of 2% of the workforce (Taylor, 2020). In contrary to other screen industry reports, the UK Games Industry Census also included a question about ‘gender at birth’ to assess the participation of transgender people in the industry; they accounted for approximately 3% of the respondents (Taylor, 2020:23). However, other industry’s reports and statistics such as Ofcom (2019), Creative Skillset Census or DCMS figures do not include data about other gender identities. Creative Skillset workforce survey collected related information about gender identities, indicating that approximately 1% of the workforce identifies as transgender (CAMEo, 2018:25). The experiences of non-binary gender identities and transgender workers in the screen industries are also comparatively under-explored in qualitative studies.

#### *4.3.1 Research on gender identities in the screen industries*

Women participation and their experiences in the screen industries have mostly been explored in studies on working in the UK television and film industries (e.g. O’Brien, 2014/2019; Eikhof and York, 2015) and to a lesser extent in studies on the videogame industry (e.g. Prescott and Bogg, 2011). This body of research explored the persistence of structural inequalities which lead to gender-based inequalities and discrimination (Gill, 2002/2013), workers’ opinions and attitudes about their own experiences in the CCI (Scharff, 2017; Conor et al., 2015) and workers’ articulation of gender-based inequalities in their workplaces (Gill et al., 2017; O’Brien, 2019; Bryant, 2016). Women under-representation in the CCI sector has been attributed to a variety of structural inequalities, from the project-based organisation (see introduction) of



work which poses challenges for reconciling work and private lives (see the next section: ...), discriminatory character of informal recruitment practices and networking patterns (e.g. Gill, 2013, Johnson, 2015) and inequalities in career progressions to addressing sexism and harassment in many CCI (Conor et al., 2015).

Women in the CCI experience both vertical and horizontal gendered occupational segregation (Conor et al., 2015). Hesmondhalgh and Barker (2015), drawing on their studies on creative labour in three cultural industries, discussed four areas of gendered occupational segregation. First, in cultural industries, women tend to occupy positions associated with public relations and marketing. Second, tasks performed by women are often associated with stereotypes about women's abilities. Women work in occupations which require co-ordination and facilitation of production, based on assumptions about women's caring, nurturing and supportive characteristics. However, these stereotypes could be also negative and represent significant obstacles in career development, such as the assumption that women are not good leaders. Third, women compared to men are less likely to occupy not only higher senior management positions but also 'creative' occupations associated with social and financial prestige (see Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2015; Prescott and Bogg, 2010/2011; Weststar and Legault, 2018). Furthermore, studies have demonstrated that when women are engaged in creative content production, they tend to be working in particular film and television genres (e.g. O'Brien, 2014; Alacovska, 2015) or videogame sectors (e.g. Chess, 2017). Lastly, gendered occupational segregation is based on socio-cultural narratives about gender, skills and technology (see Banks, 20; Taylor and Littleton, 2012; Gurrier et al., 2009). Women often work in lower occupational positions and exert a considerable amount of emotional labour in caring for others at workplaces while their skills are often undervalued. Banks (2006) demonstrated how craft and technical occupations associated with women's work such as costume design are often not recognised, while Johnson (2015) demonstrated a gendered approach to different programming languages in videogame development studios.

Studies on the experiences of women in the industry have explored different approaches and understandings of gender inequalities in the CCI expressed by workers themselves. Research on workers' attitudes has revealed the persistence of 'unspeakable inequalities' among creative workers (see Gill, 2014, also McRobbie, 2009). Gill (2014) found that while workers acknowledge the persistence of the structural causes of gender inequalities in the CCI industries, they often repudiated them, instead referring to the 'pastness' of structural problems or individualised strategies to deal with inequalities that are experienced (e.g. self-surveillance, personal resilience) (see Gill et al., 2017). These types of workers' attitudes which comply with the characterisation of entrepreneurial, resilient workers co-exist with

increasingly visible reports, testimonies and public discussions about gender inequalities, discrimination and harassment experienced by women in the CCI industries (e.g. Vysotsky and Allaway, 2018). Furthermore, a given screen industry's culture and work organisation influence who can speak about inequalities in the CCI and how they can do so. Gill (2014) argued that the self-presentation of workers as entrepreneurial subjects can be guided by pragmatism. In other words, workers do not want to limit their career options by being seen as problematic to work with. In a similar manner, de Castell and Skardzius (2019) analysed how women in the North American videogame industry discussed inequalities. Through their analysis, they raised questions about the mechanisms which prevent workers from speaking about discrimination they have experienced (through non-disclosure agreements, black listing system) but also who can speak about gender inequalities in the industry and how they can do so.

#### 4.4 Caring responsibilities

In this report, we acknowledge that care responsibilities include not only 'pregnancy and maternity', which are protected by the provisions of the Equality Act 2010, but also other forms of care, such as care for dependent child or adults, as well as paternity issues (see CAMEo, 2018:58). Expanding the definition allows for the inclusion of a variety of care responsibilities. Furthermore, it acknowledges that women are not the only ones performing care labour but are the ones who are disproportionately affected by it (see Raising Films, 2017, Berridge, 2020).

Reports about workforce diversity in screen industries sporadically mention different forms of care responsibilities. For example, the UK Screen Alliance (2019:42) estimates that among the **animation, VFX and post-production** workforce, 3% of workers are sole carers for children, 2% are sole carers for dependent adults and 0.5% are sole carers for both dependent child and adults. However, most of sole carers for dependent children were women (approximately 5% of all women workers) (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:42). According to **the UK Game Industry Census** (Taylor, 2020:29), 23% of the surveyed workforce had childcare responsibilities, and 3% were identified as carers. In comparison, in the overall working population in the UK, 38% of workers have childcare responsibilities (ONS, 2019). The report's author draws attention to the fact that the workforce in the videogame industry tends to be younger, which is confirmed by further analysis of statistical data. Half of workers between 36-50 years of age have childcare responsibilities compared to 5% of workers aged 30 and younger (Taylor, 2020:29). Furthermore, the report noted that younger men (31-35 years of age) are twice as likely to have childcare responsibilities in comparison to women (Taylor, 2020:29). In terms of the workforce in the **television industry**, Ofcom's (2019:29) report does not provide statistics about care responsibilities;

instead, it discusses various flexible and job-sharing schemes offered by major broadcasters (e.g., Sky's paternity leave/second carer scheme or ITV's return to work scheme). In 2016, Raising Films (2017) conducted a more comprehensive survey about care responsibility experiences among **television and film workers**. The collected data indicated that 71% of surveyed parents and carers admitted that their care labour had a negative impact on their careers. Furthermore, the report also demonstrated that those responsible for providing care labour tended to work as freelancers or self-employed workers (63%), which contributes to an unstable financial situation (Raising Films, 2017:4). These insecurities and barriers to entering and maintaining jobs in the television and film industries are further impacted by geographic location (e.g., London's maternal employment is the lowest of all regions (Raising Films, 2017:14) and intersectionality of other diversity characteristics (e.g., social class, ethnicity, disability).

#### *4.4.1 Research on caring responsibilities in screen industries*

The questions of parental responsibilities in relation to gender identities require a separate discussion to address the challenges, inequalities and discrimination experienced by women working in the screen industries. Wreyford (2013:1) commented on these challenges in her studies on women and motherhood in the UK film and television: 'it is difficult to talk about women and work without talking about childcare. The same is not true of men and work, and this is still one of the most obvious difficulties to be managed by working women, even those who choose not to have children'.

The issue of pregnancy, maternity and care responsibilities in the screen industries have been addressed in creative labour studies from two perspectives (Wing-Fai et al., 2015, CAMEo, 2018). First, the structure and organisation of work in the screen industries provide many challenges associated with combining work with childcare (or other care responsibilities) (see Wing-Fai et al., 2015, Gill, 2013; Berridge, 2019). Project-based employment, an unstable income and the need to work long hours are only a few of the challenges which prevent working mothers from remaining employed in the industry (O'Brien, 2014). Scholars have demonstrated that norms of working lives are built on male experiences and a 'masculinist' culture of long working hours, but specific patterns of socialisation also pose important barriers of entry for women (Wreyford, 2013/2015). The majority of the discussions about the challenges in reconciling work and childcare are from the perspective of work in the UK film and television industries (e.g. Wreyford, 2013; Wing-Fai et al., 2015). However, other screen industries, such as new media industries and videogame industries, with similar working patterns have also posed questions about reconciling work with childcare (see Prescott and Bogg, 2011; Consalvo, 2011). In these discussions, there

is often a postulate for the introduction of more flexible work arrangements in the industry which will allow women to accommodate their family responsibilities. However, Wreyford (2013) demonstrated that the connotations and assumptions of flexible work arrangements might present women as not being as committed or willing to work in the industry. Similar employers' attitudes were also discussed in the study by Wing-Fai et al. (2015), and they found that a worker's status as a mother made a person no longer attractive as worker because of limited availability. The second perspective reflects that women are discriminated in the industry based on the assumption that they might have children in the future (Wing-Fai et al., 2015). This form of discrimination, termed by Gill (2014) as 'new sexism' or 'reasonable' sexism, is visible in employees' perspectives which view women as more 'risky' for their businesses because of the possibility of them leaving or moving to part-time work.

However, these studies present two important issues in discussing childcare responsibilities. First, focussing primarily on the link between women and childcare might cement essentialist associations between women and childcare, which leads to further gender inequalities and does not explore other life experiences associated with issues of care (broadly defined). Second, there is a need to remain attentive to questions about men's experiences of parenthood and not fall into assumptions that men's family and careers lives are not impacted by the societal expectations and imaginations of motherhood/fatherhood (see Wing-Fai et al., 2015:59, Berridge, 2020). Similarly, authors of the Raising Film report (2017:37) point out that 'we need to think in more detail about the barriers that prevent men from taking on more caring roles, both within the context of openly discussing caring responsibilities in the workplace and also the ability to take paternal leave'. Berridge (2020) conducted a study about differences in articulating childcare responsibilities between women and men who work in the Scottish film and television industries. In this study, Berridge (2020) demonstrates that men and women use different language to describe their experiences of childcare. Women tend to define childcare responsibilities more broadly, also drawing attention to the mental labour of organising care and domestic labour, while men identified childcare responsibilities as activities performed outside working hours, such as participating in bedtimes, bath times or school drop-offs (Berridge, 2020:7). Women were also more likely to readily address and describe obstacles to their careers as the result of their childcare responsibilities. However, both men and women acknowledged that men are more at risk of 'missing out' on participating in family life because of their work patterns. Berridge's (2020) study demonstrates different ways in which the notion of women as primary childcare givers is reinforced by the societal expectations as well as work organisation in the screen industries. However, there is a need for further studies that will explore different perspectives on caring responsibilities in the screen industries, including fatherhood, sole parenthood and care for dependent adults. Furthermore, the notion of 'care' in

screen industries might also refer to different dimensions of work, not only family and kinship relations but also institutional and workplace culture (see Aust (forthcoming)).

## 4.5 Race and Ethnicity

Apart from gender, ethnicity is one of the characteristics that are mostly included in reports about creative workers' demographics. However, various sectoral reports differ in the way they report ethnic background data (e.g. division of specific ethnic backgrounds) or how these data are conceptualised (e.g. in relation to other diversity categories, such as gender, socio-economic background and nationality). According to the Creative Skillset census (2012:17), ethnic minority groups encompass 5.4% of the whole creative industries' workers. The census also demonstrated a decrease in ethnic minority workers between 2003 and 2012 from 7.4% to 5.4% (Creative Skillset, 2012:21). The representation of people from ethnic minority backgrounds differs significantly among screen industry sectors. Furthermore, there is evidence of occupational segregation of ethnic minority workers, with the highest numbers of ethnic minority workers being in the legal field, libraries, archives, editorial, journalism and sports (Creative Skillset, 2012:18). Furthermore, workers from ethnic minority backgrounds are underrepresented in senior positions in all sectors of the screen industries (see CAMEo, 2018). All the reports that investigated the workforce in the screen industries demonstrated that workers from ethnic minority backgrounds are underrepresented in senior roles in the industry and often experience occupational segregation.

According to data from the Creative Skillset census (2012:52), 3.5% of workers in **animation** are from ethnic minority backgrounds. Ethnic minority workers are mostly represented in legal work (18%), strategic management (8%), editing (7%), business management (6%), production (5%) and distribution (4%) (Creative Skillset, 2012:54). In terms of work in the **VFX** sector, ethnic minorities encompass 1% of workers with the following occupational distribution: art and design (5%), engineering and transmission (4%), business management (3%) and production (1%). (Creative Skillset, 2012:65). Data collected recently to investigate specifically the demographics of the animation, VFX and post-production sector present a diametrically different picture of the above sectors (UK Screen Alliance, 2019). According to the UK Screen Alliance report (2019), ethnic minorities representation in these sectors is higher than or equal to the UK working population (14%<sup>12</sup>), as workers from ethnic minority backgrounds consist of 19% of the **VFX** workforce, 14% of the **animation** workforce

---

<sup>12</sup> ONS UK census 2011 from England and Wales.

and 18% of **post-production**.<sup>13</sup> In terms of the ratio of self-identified specific ethnic backgrounds, there is a higher participation of Black African, Black Caribbean, Mixed White/Black Caribbean workers in the post-production sector, while the Black and Black Mixed population is less well represented in VFX where ethnic minority workers mostly self-identified as 'other mixed ethnicity' (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:25). The largest percentage of ethnic minority workers is located in technical support occupations (24%). Furthermore, workers from ethnic minority background represent only 8% of senior management positions (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:10).

According to the **Videogame industry** census, 67% of the workforce self-identified as White British, 23% as White Others and 10% as other ethnic minorities (Taylor, 2020:20). Workers from Asian ethnic groups are the largest minority group among the industry workforce (6%), while Black workers encompass only 2% (compared with the UK population statistic of 3.4%). Videogames are more ethnically diverse compared with other CCI industries (average of 8%) and the UK workforce in general (14%). Only the IT sector is slightly more diverse than the UK game industry in terms of ethnic minorities' participation of 14%. The UK Games census also investigated the nationality of workers and indicated that workers from ethnic minorities background have predominantly British nationality (61%), followed by nationalities from other parts of the world (non-EU/EEA) (29%), with only 10% from other EU/EEA countries (Taylor, 2020:38). The census also demonstrated the occupational segregation of workers from ethnic minority backgrounds, with ethnic minority workers mostly based in IT roles, which consists of approximately 16% of workers in this occupational group (in the context of the videogame census, IT is defined as support/infrastructure). In other occupational roles, ethnic minorities encompass approximately 10–12% of all workers. However, White British workers dominate in senior roles and in higher managerial positions, with 75% of Directors/CEOs of larger organisations in the industry self-identifying as White British (Taylor, 2020:38). White other workers represent 25–27% of senior positions, while ethnic minority workers are mostly found in other/junior roles (13%).

Data about ethnic minority workers in the **film industry** is coming from the Creative Skillset census (2012), which estimated that approximately 5.3% of workers in the industry are from ethnic minority groups. Their participation further varies in terms of the film industry's sector from 3.4% in film distribution to 4.5% in cinema exhibition (Creative Skillset, 2012:32). According to the Ofcom<sup>14</sup> report, 70% of workers in the

---

<sup>13</sup> The report's authors, however, acknowledge problems with data collection about ethnic minorities in the following sectors.

<sup>14</sup> Ofcom (2019) report refers to 'racial groups' in distinguishing between minority ethnic groups (MES) and white ethnic groups (WES).



UK **television industry** belong to White ethnic groups and 13% to minority ethnic groups (Ofcom, 2019:6). In the context of the Ofcom (2019:11) report, the surveyed ethnic minority groups include White ethnic groups: 70%; East Asian/East Asian British: 1%; South Asian/South Asian British: 5%; Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: 3%; Mixed: 3%; Other: 2%; Non-disclosed: 5% and Non-collected: 11%. In terms of ethnic minority groups' participation among the workforce in the five major broadcasters, Viacom has the highest number of ethnically diverse workers (20%), followed by Channel 4 (19%), Sky (16%), BBC (13%) and ITV (10%).<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, minority ethnic talent is underrepresented in the areas of creative and content production. According to a Directors UK (2018:3) report, only 2.22% of television programmes are directed by directors from ethnic minority backgrounds. Ethnic minority groups are also underrepresented in the senior roles, with 9% of ethnic minority workers based in senior positions.

#### *4.5.1 Research about race and ethnicity in screen industries*

While ideas associated with race have been discredited, discourses about race and racism persist in society along with discussions about social class, migration or religion. Therefore, the word 'race' has a significant socio-economic and cultural historical associations with colonial domination and political and economic oppression (Fenton, 1999:61). The problematic notion of 'race' contributed to the embracement of the concept of 'ethnicity'. The term which can be criticised for is too generalised outlook as well as being also racialised (see discussion in Hesmondhalgh and Saha, 2013). Studies about cultural production and ethnicity have explored the experiences of workers in television, film or videogame production (Saha, 2012; Warner, 2016; Srauy, 2016). Discussion about race/ethnicity in media production has also been presented in research about journalism practices (e.g. Mellinger, 2003). However, as many studies demonstrated, there is a need for further investigation of intersectional approaches to ethnicity in media production (see CAMEo, 2018).

Research about inequalities and discrimination experienced by people from ethnic minorities backgrounds discuss limited access to networks and opportunities, which will advance workers' career progression (CAMEo, 2018). This argument is based on the recognition that people from ethnic minority backgrounds often come from more disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds without access to social, economic and cultural capital, which is dominated by the screen industry's white middle-class workers. Furthermore, workers from ethnic minority backgrounds experience difficulties in accessing professional networks not only because of their assumed lack of desire by the industry's social or economic capital but also because of implicit and

---

<sup>15</sup> The data gap is on the level of 11% with Sky TV reporting problems with their data collection system.

explicit forms of discrimination. These forms of discrimination are visible in racialised approaches to defining 'skills' and 'talent' in creative work. For example, Warner (2016), in her studies about casting practices in the US film industry, demonstrated how the supposed 'expertise' of higher-ups in the industry and colour-blind recruitment contribute to the formation of toxic discourses about meritocracy based on a claimed desire to select talent without focusing on candidates' ethnic backgrounds.

In terms of the intersection of ethnicity and gender, scholars demonstrated the universal idea that 'women' working in the CCI are often assumed to be white, heterosexual and middle class (see for discussion Harvey, 2020). As Warner (2016) paraphrases: 'all women workers in the industry are white, and all ethnic minority workers in the industry are male'. Warner draws attention to the importance of intersectionality in addressing the experiences of women of colour in the screen industries. Furthermore, in her work about workers in the US film industry, Warner (2016) drew attention to practices and strategies used only by ethnic minority workers to blend into the industry's expectations and practices. Examples are workers of colour defining themselves during job search as racially ambiguous in the hope of not being assigned racially specific roles and the emphasising of a universal message for all audiences in the marketing films produced entirely by people of colour (Warner, 2016).

Apart from the investigation of pathways to the industry and discrimination experienced by ethnic minority workers, there is also a need to recognise ethnic minority workers' career progressions and experiences while working in the CCI. In his studies about South Asian British cultural production, Saha (2018) questioned if more ethnic workers in the cultural industries contribute to a greater diversity of cultural texts/products. Saha (2018) uses the concept of *racialising/rationalising logic of capital* to draw attention to the process and logics of cultural production, which contributes to the persistence of commodified racialised cultural goods. Saha (2018), drawing on Ryan's work (1992), sees rationalisation as the defining logic of cultural production under capitalism. Rationalisation encompasses a variety of practices and logics of cultural production from industrialisation and marketisation, bureaucratisation to formatting. Saha (2018), through his research, demonstrates that the process of rationalisation contains racialising tendencies. Racialisation broadly refers to 'social, economic and cultural process through which texts, ideas, issues become imbued with racial meaning' (Saha, 2012). In other words, it is an ideological process that imbues cultural products with racial meaning mediated through the process of rationalisation visible in industrial cultural production. Furthermore, through the case studies of three types of South Asian British cultural production (i.e. independent record label, theatre and broadcasting), Saha (2018) demonstrates that even in sectors where ethnic minorities are represented, the established practices and logics of cultural production contribute to the preservation of the ideological representation of 'the other'. Saha



(2018) gives the example of the head of religion and multicultural programming in Channel 4 who acknowledged that religious programming does not attract considerable audience attention, so he decided to commission programming with a more sensationalist presentation of Islam and Muslim culture. Saha's studies provide important contributions in shifting questions of '(...) how cultural industries *represent* race to how cultural industries *make* race'. Therefore, his research indicates the importance of understanding not only representation on screen but also production practices and the logics of cultural production. His research questions the assumption that greater workforce diversity will contribute to a greater diversity of cultural commodities. By doing so, he provides an important finding for existing discourses around company, sectoral and industry-wide diversity initiatives.

Saha's concept of racialising/rationalising the logic of capital has also been applied in understanding the approaches to diversity off- and on-screen in other screen industries, including videogames (see Srauy, 2019). Videogame development is known for its problematic approach to diversity, both in terms of workforce composition and representations in videogames (e.g. Shaw, 2009; Chess, 2017). The lack of diverse game content is often justified by the preferences of the imagined videogame audience, which is assumed<sup>16</sup> to consist mostly of white, male and heterosexual players (see Shaw, 2009). Based on this assumption, the investment by major videogame developers (i.e. Triple-A videogame production) in any deviation from this norm will have a significant socio-economic cost for the companies. Consequently, as in the examples studied by Saha (2018), the industry's rationalising and business logic have an impact on what kind of representation of ethnicity, gender, social class or disability are presented in games. In opposition to Triple-A videogame development, independent game development contributed to greater inclusion of diverse subjectivities in videogame development and content. However, the discourse of independent game development as the champion of 'diversity', both in workforce composition and in taking business 'risk' with diverse game content, allows the status quo of the Triple-A companies to remain and downplays the extremely precarious conditions in which the majority of independent games are made (Srauy, 2019:803). In fact, independent game developers are also positioned within the neoliberal culture and specific patterns of cultural production logics as well as competitiveness of the global videogame market. Therefore, as Srauy (2019:809) argues, 'developers of color are doubly-bound, that is, forced to constantly expand immaterial labour to either stay silent and maintain work ties to speak out and become victims of rationalising logic of capital that channels one's career into bounded categories'. Srauy's (2019) work demonstrates that, as in many other cultural productions oriented toward the

---

<sup>16</sup> These beliefs are held by videogame companies even when audience research demonstrates that the videogame audience is in fact more diverse (e.g. see discussion about gender, Chess, 2017).

production of diverse cultural products, workers from marginalised groups are often disproportionately overburdened with maintaining and developing diverse media content.<sup>17</sup>

## 4.6 Regions

The screen industry's production centres are found around the UK, with significant hubs in Glasgow, Manchester-Salford, Leeds, Cardiff and Bristol. Financial and discursive power over production, however, is predominantly based in London and the South East of England, reflecting the size of the workforce and companies based in those regions (see Creative Skillset, 2012; Taylor, 2020; UK Screen Alliance, 2019). ONS data shows 54% of screen industries employment is found in London with a further 10% in South East England (BRES, 2019). This reflects where most screen industry businesses are located, with 48% in London and 16.5% in South East England (ONS, 2019). Although now 8 years old, the 2012 Creative Skillset census indicated that the majority of television (57%), film (69% in production and 85% in distribution) and animation (56%) workforce is based in London. In comparison, 3% of creative workers are based in Yorkshire and Humber. The report also estimates that approximately 2% of television production, 4% of film production, 4% of animation and 6% videogame development workforce is based in the Yorkshire and Humber region (Creative Skillset, 2012).

Creative Skillset Census (2012) provides detailed information about specific sectors' workforce distribution according to regional/national locations (as well as gender and the participation of ethnic minorities populations). In terms of workers' diversity characteristics represented among different regions/nations, the workforce composition depends on concentration of sectors in each area and their links to employment. For example, the lowest representation of women in the creative media industries has been recorded in South East and South West of England where there is a high concentration of interactive media companies. Similarly, women are also underrepresented in West Midlands, where a larger percentages of videogame companies are based. According to the Creative Skillset (2012) data, approximately 35% of the creative media industry workforce in Yorkshire and Humber are women. Women are particularly well represented in the animation sector in this region (88%) (Creative Skillset, 2012:53). Ethnic minority workers are primarily located in London, where they encompass 8.9% of the entire creative media industry workforce. However, when considering the demographic composition of London's working population (where 28.8%<sup>18</sup> of workers come from ethnic minority backgrounds), ethnic

---

<sup>17</sup> See also Ruberg's research (2019) about LGBTQ+ videogame developers.

<sup>18</sup> Data from 2012

minorities are still underrepresented in the creative media industries (Creative Skillset, 2012:19). Scotland was cited as the only region/nation where the proportionate representation of ethnic minority workers in creative media industries is higher than that of its wider economy. In comparison, ethnic minority workers encompass only 1.7% of all creative media industry workers in Yorkshire and Humber (while ethnic minority workers in the whole economy in Yorkshire is 5.5%).

Some of the sectoral reports also discuss inequalities associated with the geographical distribution of jobs in the screen industries (e.g. UK Screen Alliance, 2019). Below, I will present how sector-specific reports refer to localities of the surveyed screen workforce.

The UK Screen Alliance (2019:39) report included responses for questions about location through asking respondents about ‘Where you work compared to where you grew up?’ The report demonstrates that 93% of VFX respondents work in London; similarly, post-production jobs are based in London while animation jobs are more regionally diverse. Overall, 89% of jobs in **VFX, post-production and animation** are based in London and the South East. Forty-eight percent of respondents grew up outside London and the South East. Six per cent of respondents grew up in Yorkshire and Humber, but only 1% of respondents actually work in the region (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:40). The report also demonstrates that respondents argue that the need to move to the capital was indicated as an important barrier to inclusion in these industries. Furthermore, the cost of living in London without substantial financial support was considered by respondents a major career barrier for young people hoping to launch careers in these sectors (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:39).

The report provided by UKIE (Thompson and Hebblethwaite, 2018:14) about the national and local **videogame industries** demonstrates that with 53% of film companies based in the capital, compared to 28% for games’ the videogame industry is less London-centric than the UK film industry (see also Vallance, 2014). However, London still remains an important centre of the videogame industry in the UK, with 588 companies and 91% of publishing segment roles based in the capital. In comparison, approximately 55% of game-development roles are based outside of London and the South East (Thompson and Hebblethwaite, 2018:43). Film production in Yorkshire and Humber comprises 2.6% of the whole film industry, in comparison to the region being home to 7.1% of the whole videogame industry. According to the report, Yorkshire hosts approximately of 149 game companies, employing 767 people (according to data from 2016). However, as Taylor (2020:16) argues, reporting on respondents’ work locations in the videogame industry is difficult, as some of respondents work for regional sub-divisions of development studios with headquarters in other locations.

An Ofcom (2019:19) report does not provide discussions about inequalities or problems resulting from disproportions among regions/nations in **television**. Instead, the report lists a variety of regional/national initiatives in which five major television broadcasters are engaged. These initiatives include Channel 4's '4 All the UK' plan, Channel 4's Alpha Fund for Northern Ireland, ITV's regional news teams and Viacom's Channel 5's investment in ethnic minority production companies.

#### *4.6.1 Research about regions/place, workforce diversity and screen industries*

While there are many discussions and initiatives that aim to support development of the CCIs on regional and local levels, the uneven development of the CCIs in the regions/nations is symptomatic of the UK economy as a whole (see Oakley, 2006). Despite propagation of progressive rhetoric focused on developing knowledge economy, disparities both between UK regions and inter-regionally are growing (Oakley, 2006; Jayne, 2005; Newsinger, 2012). The concentration of the CCIs, and specific screen industry companies and jobs, in London and the South East raises questions about inequalities experienced by creative workers stemming from geographical disparities.

A majority of studies discussing the problem of workforce diversity and regional inequalities demonstrate how the consolidation of CCI's companies and institutions in major urban locations contribute to inequalities in accessing professional networks (formal and informal) and job opportunities (e.g. Swords and Wray, 2010). This body of research is based on the idea of creative workers requirement of being highly mobile and flexible workers (see Brown, 2015). While in theory the development of ICT's technology allows creative workers to work from any location—and indeed, certain types of jobs are less place-bound than others (see Wreyford, 2015)—access to work opportunities, skill development and professional networks are often concentrated in specific locations. Discussions about geographical disparities are often discussed in relation to social class origins (e.g. lack of economic or social capital for mobility) or caring responsibilities (e.g. time required to travel to certain destination) (Wing-Fai et al. 2015; Randle et al. 2015; Bhavnani, 2007:58).

Geographical differences impact how young people approach their prospects of work in the CCIs industries (e.g. Allen and Hollingworth, 2013). Regarding the prospect of working in the CCIs, Allen and Hollingworth (2013) discuss aspirations of young people from three different localities: an eastern borough of Greater London, an area of inner-city Nottingham and a norther district of Stoke on Trent. Through their studies, they demonstrate how young people's socio-economic background, family history and experiences of place shape their perceptions about jobs in the CCIs. Allen and Hollingworth (2013:505) demonstrate how the lack of a visible creative sector in Stoke

on Trent, along with participants' families' histories of unemployment and financial struggles, contribute to the perception of work in the creative sector as 'too risky'. Furthermore, the study documents how participants from underprivileged backgrounds were discouraged by career professionals to consider careers in the CCIs. In contrast, participants from Nottingham and London were more likely to consider careers in the creative sector. Allen and Hollingworth's (2013) study demonstrates the importance of considering unequal economic development of regional and local geographies, social class inequalities and construction of an exclusionary discourse about work in the CCIs (see also section: social class).

Patterns of graduate migration in the UK highlight problems faced by cities and regions outside London and South East England in retaining recent graduates. Work for the Centre of Cities illustrates the net outflows of university leavers from almost all major cities to London (Swinney and Williams, 2016). This form of brain drain is a major advantage for London as a centre for the CCIs and reinforces its position relative to other parts of the country. The consideration of the roles of place, education and young people's career aspirations is also explored in Noonan's (2015) studies about career plans of media studies undergraduate students from Cardiff. Noonan (2015) demonstrates how young people construct their emerging professional identities in relation to their educational institutions and place of cultural production. This study further demonstrated the perception of major urban locations as synonyms to opportunity and creativity. Noonan's interviewees also expressed awareness of the importance of networking and opportunities of certain places (major urban locations) and obstacles created by others (e.g. fear of isolation). Consequently, as Noonan's (2015) argue 'any discussion of place is inevitably bound with questions of exclusion and inclusion, and how one can transition from one to the other'.

Apart from studies about the meaning of place for people who are considering careers in the CCIs, there has also been research about experiences of people already engaged in creative labour (e.g. Swords and Wray, 2010). Swords and Wray (2010) examine problems of physical and relational distance in experiences of creative workers from the North East of London, which is a region not characterised by high levels of CCI activities. According to data collected for Creative Fuse North East project (2017:13), for businesses and freelancers distance to London was considered as disadvantage in terms of developing sector in the region. Swords and Wray (2010) articulate barriers encountered by creative workers in an attempt to engage in non-local professional activities, which include problems with financial and time resources but also a perceived lack of knowledge about networking and negotiating projects in London. The study demonstrated a variety of reasons that contribute to difficulties in mitigating obstacles in collaborating with other CCI entities in other locations. While these inequalities may stem from workers' lack of access to specific economic capital

or support networks, they may also be the result of discrepancies in knowledge about business cultures (e.g. knowledge about particular social and cultural capital).

While these studies are helpful to understanding the presence of CCI in different regions, the nature of much screen industries work makes it hard to identify where production happens. The value chain of screen media is complex and involves multiple companies, freelancers and funders with various geographies. For example, a London-based broadcaster might commission a company in Leeds to produce a TV series which is shot in Newcastle. Cast and crew may be hired from around the country, post-production done in Manchester and distribution handled by an online platform. Identifying where this series was made, and its contribution to regional production systems is therefore difficult. Moreover, different parts of the value chain are worth more in terms of returns on investment, intellectual property, prestige and influence. Parts of the first Harry Potter film, for instance, were shot in North East England, but the impact on the region was minimal because very few local people or companies were involved. Decisions about what gets made, who gets to make it and where the new value ends up are still made by a relatively small number of people and organisations. We have seen BBC move five department to Salford and Channel 4 is moving to Leeds, but these moves have not seen a concomitant shift in influence. Thus, when considering regional variations in screen industries, it is crucial to examine the circuits of financial and discursive power, alongside company or freelancer counts, or where work is undertaken. It is the former which create and reinforce inequalities, and it is from these change needs to happen.

## 4.7 Religion

Workers' rights to protection of their own religious beliefs is guaranteed by the Equality Act of 2010. However, information about workers' religions and beliefs is not included in major reports about **animation, VFX, post-production workers, film workers or videogame workers** (e.g., UK Screen Alliance, 2019; BFI, 2020; Taylor, 2020). Only Ofcom (2019) collects data about religious beliefs among the **television workforce**, indicating that 22% of the respondents declared their religious beliefs (this is significantly lower in comparison with the UK workforce population data: 67%). However, as the report's authors demonstrate, this data is highly fragmented as not all broadcasters collect this type of information. Furthermore, not all workers would like to disclose information about their religion and beliefs. According to the division by five major broadcasters, the following fraction of workers identifies as religious: BBC (37%), Channel 4 (48%), ITV (did not collect data), Sky (26%) and Viacom (31%)



(Ofcom, 2019:6).<sup>19</sup> Religious beliefs not only encompass a significantly private aspect of work identities but are also intertwined with workers' cultural and ethnic backgrounds. These diversity characteristics require a more nuanced approach in addressing, for example, the organisational dynamic in screen industry workplaces (see Abd Karim's 2015 ethnographic study about Islamic television production). Furthermore, religious beliefs are often associated through stereotypes with certain cultures, ethnicities and socio-economic backgrounds, which is reflected in, for example, on-screen representation of ethnic minority groups in the television industry (see Saha, 2012).

## 4.8 Sexuality

Data about the sexual orientation of workers in the CCI is rarely included and monitored in statistical surveys, such as the DCMS figures or the Creative Skillset census (2012). Since 2014, the Creative Skillset has collected information about the participation of LGB people in the creative media industry, estimating that around 7% of the industry's workforce identifies as lesbian, gay or bisexual (Creative Skillset, 2014:25). According to these estimations, the participation of LGB in the creative media industry is higher than in the overall UK working population<sup>20</sup> (Creative Skillset, 2014:25). However, the participation of LGB and LGBTQ+ people in specific sectors of the screen industries varies significantly (e.g., UK Screen Alliance, 2019; Taylor, 2020; Ofcom 2019). Furthermore, the available reports also use different terminology and include various categories of sexual orientation in their surveys (e.g., LGB+ or LGBTQ+).<sup>21</sup>

**In the animation, VFX and post-production industries**, approximately 6–7% of workers identifies as gay or lesbian (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:33). The report also indicates a significant proportion of non-heterosexual workers in animation (21.5%), with a higher proportion of bisexual (9.5%) and pansexual (4%) people in the sector (UK Screen Alliance, 2019:33). The lowest percentage of LGB people was recorded in the post-production industry, but this sector also had the greatest amount of undisclosed information about workers' sexuality. There is a substantial participation of LGBTQ+ people in the **UK videogame industry** workforce, with 21% of workers identifying as LGBTQ+. Among all the survey respondents, 79% self-identified as heterosexual/straight, 11% as bisexual, 5% as lesbian or gay, 2% as queer, 1% as

<sup>19</sup> The largest percentage of workers defined themselves as non-religious (28%), followed by Christian (16%), Hindu, Sikh, Muslim and Jewish (each approximately 1%), Buddhist (less than 1%) and other (2%) (Ofcom, 2019:11). There is also a significant data collection gap of 35% in this diversity category.

<sup>20</sup> In the ONS statistics from 2020, the participation of LGB people in the UK is approximately 2.2% (data from 2018).

<sup>21</sup> In this section, I refer directly to the terminology used in a given report.

pansexual and 1% as asexual (Taylor, 2020:27). Furthermore, a majority of male workers identified as heterosexual/straight (86%), with 65% of female workers identified as heterosexual/straight (ibid.:28). A similar fraction of men and women identified as lesbian/gay (5%–4%) while more women (22%) than men (6%) identified as bisexual (Taylor, 2020:28). According to data from a Creative Skillset (2014:27) workforce survey, 10% of the respondents from **the film industry** self-identified as LGB. In terms of data about workers' sexual orientation in the **television broadcasting sector**, approximately 4% of respondents, according to Ofcom data (2019), identified themselves as LGB. A further data division demonstrates the following participation of LGB people in five major broadcasters' workforces: 7% in the BBC, 8% in Channel 4, 5% in ITV, 2% in Sky and 9% in Viacom.

Kerrigan and O'Brien (2020), in their studies about Irish film and television production, explore experiences of LGBTQ+ workers<sup>22</sup>. Their studies documented how the structural dynamic of heteronormativity that is persistent in film and television work cultures impacts workers' decisions to disclose their identities and contributes to workplace discrimination and bullying. However, Kerrigan and O'Brien (2020) also present interviewees' strategies for overcoming heteronormative work cultures by establishing networks for LGBTQ+ workers within the organisations and using jokes and humour (e.g., performing 'camp identity') to deal with discrimination. Kerrigan and O'Brien (2020) focus on television and film industries' work culture, but studies about videogame consumption and production also explore the experiences of LGBTQ+ players, representation of LGBTQ+ people in videogames and the game-making practices of LGBTQ+ creators (e.g., Ruberg, 2019, Shaw, 2014, 2009, Ruberg and Shaw, 2017).

## 4.9 Social class

The socio-economic backgrounds of workers in screen industries are measured by various factors including: parental qualifications, parental occupations, type of school attended, eligibility for free school meals (see Ofcom, 2019; UK Screen Alliance, 2019; Taylor, 2020). Furthermore, Creative Skillset Workforce Survey (2014) collected information about percentages of workers who use informal networks to find jobs in the sector (also see introduction). According to the collected data 56% of workers found jobs through support of their networks (Creative Skillset, 2014:5).

However, not all major reports from the sector collect data about workers' socio-economic backgrounds. There is also evidence that the measurement of socio-economic background characteristics has been recently introduced to the screen

---

<sup>22</sup> See also Martin (2018).



industries. For example, Ofcom (2019) introduced questions about socio-economic diversity in 2019, while the UK videogame industry census was one of the first to acknowledge a problem of socio-economic diversity in the industry (Taylor, 2020). The data collected about socio-economic backgrounds are highly fragmented with significant gaps (Ofcom, 2019:10). In comparison to other diversity characteristics, such as gender or ethnicity, the socio-economic backgrounds of screen industry workers are underexplored (see also Randle, 2015). Socio-economic background is not one of the protected characteristics in the 2010 Equality Act. This lack of attention to socio-economic background is associated with its assumed lack of ‘visibility’ in comparison to other diversity characteristics. The quantitative and qualitative data collected about workers’ socio-economic backgrounds in cultural–creative industries (CCIs) provide evidence that most creative workers come from more affluent socio-economic backgrounds (see Brook et al., 2018). This evidence is further supported by data from different screen industry sectors.

According to the UK Screen Alliance (2019:35), information about parents/guardians’ education and workers’ education indicates that ‘it is fair to assume that workers in these sectors have come from more economically advantaged areas of society’. Workers from the **visual effects (VFX), animation and post-production** sectors are educated to a high level, with 85% possessing a higher education degree or post-grad degree. This workforce also holds a significantly higher education level than their parents.

According to data about workforce in **the film industry**, structural barriers to join industry especially film production are also visible (Creative Skills, 2014). Brook et al. (2018:12) research, participation of working class workers in film, television and radio combined is on the level of 12.4%. Furthermore, available statistics suggests that jobs in the film industry are mainly found through informal networks (56%), especially for film production (71%) (Creative Skillset, 2014:11).

The UK **videogame industry** census data about the socio-economic backgrounds of workers were based on questions about the main income earner’s occupation (in a household when an employee was 14) and school type attended by an employee (Taylor, 2020). According to the connected data, 62% of respondents come from a household in which the main earner is in a managerial or professional role. This indicates that the videogame industry has a much larger fraction of people who grew up in managerial/professional occupation households than the general population (33%) and most other CCI sectors (average: 48%), apart from the publishing sector (Taylor, 2020:33). The industry also includes a higher proportion, in comparison to the overall population (7%), of workers educated in independent and fee-paying schools (12%; Taylor, 2020:34). However, comparing data about the socio-economic

backgrounds of screen industry workers is highly difficult. While the UK videogame industry has a significant proportion of workers from more affluent socio-economic backgrounds, it is, as Taylor (2020:33) posits, roughly comparable with data about the socio-economic backgrounds of workers at major broadcasters (BBC, Viacom and Channel 4).

Ofcom just recently (from 2019, survey from 2018–2019) required **television broadcasters** to provide data about their workers' socio-economic backgrounds. However, as the Ofcom report (2019:30) indicates, only three out of five broadcasters are collecting data about social mobility. Therefore, the data presented by Ofcom are incomplete, but also, as the report authors admitted, their data are driven by data collected mainly from the BBC. According to their data, the television and broadcasting workforce comes mostly from households with main earners in professional occupations (overall: 60%, BBC: 61%, Channel 4: 50%, Viacom: 61%). Furthermore, workers come from households in which parents/guardians have higher education degrees (52%).

#### *4.9.1 Research about social class in screen industries*

The problem of class inequalities is mostly explored in studies about work in UK film and television (Randle, 2015; Randle et al., 2014; Blair, 2001; Friedman et al., 2016). Some studies also explored the different CCI sectors, from publishing to videogames, while accounting for socio-economic diversity (see Brook et al., 2018). Studies about class inequalities in CCIs focus on educational pathways to the industry (e.g. Allen et al., 2012; Banks and Oakley, 2015) or on privilege drawn from access to powerful social networks (e.g. Grugulis and Stoyanova, 2012). Friedman et al. (2016:994) argue that studies about class inequalities focus primarily on discrimination experienced while starting a career in the CCI. To address this gap, in their studies about class inequalities in British acting profession. Friedman et al. (2016:994-1003) documented how actors experience class inequalities throughout their careers, from entering the chosen occupation and approaching the risk of employment in CCIs to being judged by one's 'embodied markers' of class: speech, accent or mannerisms.

The authors also demonstrate the existence of a class pay gap, where working-class actors earn a lower average income (Friedman et al., 2016). Furthermore, O'Brien et al. (2016:120) analysis of the 2014 British Labour Force survey demonstrated the existence of a 'class ceiling' in the CCI occupations, with people from lower-occupational origins experiencing obstacles in receiving equivalent earnings to those from more affluent backgrounds. There is also evidence of occupational segregation along the lines of class origins, with senior positions occupied by people from middle and upper classes.

Studies about class inequalities turn to the Bourdieusian analytical framework in demonstrating how different forms of social, economic and cultural capital shape the trajectories of creative workers' careers (e.g. Randle et al., 2014; Friedman et al., 2016). In discussing the case of social class inequalities, there is a need to recognise class inequalities within the historical social stratification of British society, as well from the perspective of its intersection<sup>23</sup> with race and ethnicity, gender, age, religion and geographical location (e.g. Randle et al., 2014; Randle, 2015).

The uncertain patterns of employment and the structure of work organisation in CCIs provide an advantage to workers who can draw on financial resources beyond their own income (see Friedman et al., 2016; Brook et al. 2020). Workers who can rely on financial support can use it to build their portfolios (e.g. through unpaid internships), endure longer periods of unemployment and invest in their skills development. Furthermore, these studies demonstrated how access to desirable social capital in terms of connections and networks that would support career entrance or progression are distributed along the lines of a middle-class monoculture (see Randle et al., 2007). The markers of a middle-class span from workers' access to certain types of education (e.g. Oxbridge education) to class-cultural identity markers, such as speech patterns, behaviours and practices associated with middle class origins. As Grugulis and Sotyanova (2012:1322) argue, that even when unrelated to the work itself, middle class habits and practices were recognised as good professional practices. The persistent inequalities and discrimination because of workers' class origins are also associated with attitudes and beliefs about work in CCIs, including a strong belief in workplaces governed by meritocratic values, such as hard work or talent (see Brook et al., 2018/2019), rather than in explicitly addressing structural barriers to and prejudice towards people from working class backgrounds.

Research that explores class inequalities among creative workers demonstrated how structural (organisation of work, recruitment patterns in CCIs) but also socio-cultural associations, beliefs and prejudices contribute to the replication of 'middle-class(ness)' among workers in CCIs (see Brook et al. 2018). The existing body of research demonstrates further the need to analyse social class inequalities in terms of both structural barriers and persistence among creative workers' attitudes towards work in CCIs. Social class inequalities are mostly explored in screen industries from the perspective of the television and film workforce (e.g. Randle, 2015). Therefore, there

---

<sup>23</sup> Randle et al. (2007) demonstrated, in their studies about film and television in the UK, that even when a worker from an ethnic minority background has comparable class origins to their white peers, they are often assumed to be working class. The other example includes the intersection of class origins and gender, where women from more advantaged backgrounds have the ability to use their financial resources to support their care responsibilities (and facilitate remaining employed).

is a need to explore class inequalities from the perspective of other screen industries, including animation, VFX and videogames.

## 5. Discussing EDI Initiatives, Schemes and Support

### 5.1 Empowering and Transforming Interventions

Interventions addressing workforce diversity in the screen industries can be divided into two categories: interventions aimed at *empowering* workers from different backgrounds and interventions aimed at *transforming* the industries' structures and practices (Newsinger and Eikhof, 2020; CAMEo, 2018). These interventions can be employed at different institutional levels, from the level of national government or a particular sector or company. Both of these interventions have advantages and disadvantages, and they need to be considered as complementary in attending to the lack of workforce diversity in the screen industries.

**Empowering interventions** refer to interventions which provide training or mentoring schemes which aim to facilitate individuals' career start or progression in the screen industries. A CAMEo (2018:43) report demonstrates that empowering initiatives are the most prevalent in the screen industries, with examples including the BBC's extended programme or Creative Skillset Buddy Programme. Despite its potential to provide designated demographic groups with skills, networks and support needed for further career progression, these initiatives are not designed to address underlying structural causes of inequalities and discrimination. Newsinger and Eikhof (2020:52) argue that empowering initiatives can have undesirable effects which will only help to perpetuate existing structures of inequalities and stereotypes about workers from diverse backgrounds. Empowering initiatives rely on an individualistic perspective, which is based on an assumption that a worker is simply lacking skills, support networks or knowledge to develop their careers. The ethos of empowering initiatives is in accordance with the portrayal of creative workers perpetuated by proponents of the creative industries strategy whereby a creative worker needs to constantly invest in and update skills (e.g. Gill, 2002), gaining access to networks and mentorship (e.g. Neff, 2012; Wittel, 2001) and becoming a resilient worker.<sup>24</sup>

This 'deficit model of workforce diversity' demonstrates that the challenge of workforce diversity lies in the individual and not in the industries' inherently discriminating practices (see Newsinger and Eikhof, 2020:54). For example, Nwonka (2015:84) in his analysis of the UK Film Council's emphasis on training and development schemes draws attention to the importance of cultural capital in entering and developing careers

---

<sup>24</sup> See for example the discussion about coding skills' trainings for women by Sara Banet-Weiser (2018). These trainings, while associated with the idea of empowerment of women in IT, focus mostly on depoliticised ideas of resilience and female empowerment rather than addressing structural problems and seeing workers as a collective.

in the film industry. He indicates that ethnic minority workers are excluded from participation in the industry because of stereotypical assumptions about their skills and qualifications. This perspective was also demonstrated in a review conducted by Bhavnani (2007:66) which argues that underrepresented groups ‘do not necessarily have lower levels of education or qualifications and that this is not a significant barrier to accessing the film sector’. Furthermore, empowering initiatives can have unintentional consequences in leading to segregation of workers from under-represented backgrounds in specific programmes, genres or types of occupations in television and film industries (see also sections on disability and race and ethnicity; Randle and Hardy, 2016; Saha, 2018). Lastly, empowering initiatives in the screen industries rarely undergo any form of robust independent evaluation (see CAMEo, 2018:44), and their effectiveness is mostly presented through anecdotal evidence (Newsinger and Eikhof, 2020). While empowering initiatives can provide some form of support for workforce skills development, access to networks or mentorships, they are oriented towards short-term goals, which does not address structural problems in the industry. Empowering initiatives should be supplemented by more long-term initiatives which will address the abovementioned systemic problems. Furthermore, due to the popularity of such initiatives, there is a need to conduct independent evaluations of trainings and mentorship schemes. These evaluations would provide knowledge about the positive and negative impacts of such initiatives and possible further developments.

**Transforming interventions** seek to alter the context in which workers are based and transform discriminatory practices in the screen industries. These interventions often operate on the level of policy or funding, for example, establishing workforce quotas or offering targeted production funding, incentive schemes or different work patterns (e.g. for workers with caring responsibilities; Newsinger and Eikhof, 2020:55). Examples of such interventions include the BFI Diversity Standards Criteria, the Channel 4 360 Diversity Charter or the BBC’s Diversity Commissioning Code of Practice (Newsinger and Eikhof, 2020:56). Drawing on research by the European Women’s Audiovisual Network (2016), creative workers support initiatives which aim to increase women’s participation in the sector by paying attention to gender equality in funding commissions, targeted production funding for women or incentives for producers to work with female directors (see also CAMEo, 2018). Data from Raising Films demonstrates support for initiatives which raise issues about the prevalence of anti-social hours in the sector and support for workers with caring responsibilities. There is limited published data about creative workers’ attitudes towards different interventions. Further studies could explore workers’ experiences and opinions about different forms of interventions (e.g. trainings, schemes or support for quotas). Continued investigation is also important as transformative interventions are sometimes approached as controversial within the screen industries (Newsinger and

Eikhof, 2020:56), especially in the institutional environment which is closely entangled in discourses about meritocracy and individual talent.<sup>25</sup> In addition, the introduction of transformative interventions based on particular targets and distribution of funding opportunities does not guarantee structural changes in the sector. Nwonka (2020a:33) demonstrates how the BFI's Diversity Standards (2020), designed to encourage greater diversity and representation in the film workforce, actually 'offers a plethora of methods for productions to circumvent the spirit (if not the intention) of the scheme by employing a combination of a temporary student placement, a consultant and production in the UK outside of London in order to appeal to a new cinema audience'. While the BFI's Diversity Standards<sup>26</sup> provides an important attempt in addressing the challenges of inequality in the UK film and television industry, it does not necessarily challenge structural sources of inequality and discrimination.

Transformative interventions are less popular than empowering interventions as they require long-term planning, funding and discussions about systemic inequalities and discrimination. Consequently, transformative interventions are often slow to implement. Furthermore, there is a lack of systematic evaluation and review of different schemes, strategies and proposals which aim to transform the screen industries' practices.

## 5.2 Data Collection Initiatives

In recent years there has been increased effort from the representatives of various screen industries in collecting data about workforce diversity (Diamond Project, 2017–present; UK Screen Alliance, 2016; Ofcom, 2019 Diversity report). However, as demonstrated throughout this report, data collected about diversity characteristics and particular screen industries' sectors vary in terms of data collection methods (e.g. self-identified by workers or reported by employers), methodology (e.g. how diversity characteristics are approached in reports), data presentation and granularity of collected information (e.g. persistent data gaps or lack of detailed data about workforce diversity by region). The problem of data initiatives has been also mentioned by creative workers themselves, especially in terms of data collected and reported for the Diamond Project by the Creative Diversity Network (see Amin, 2020 June 11). Creative workers raised problems with reporting diversity characteristics through

---

<sup>25</sup> The socio-cultural differences and histories of specific screen industries need to be taken into account here, for example, in discussing discourses of talent, meritocracy and workforce quotas in digital media industries (e.g. videogames). There is also a need to acknowledge how these discourses are politically used in the context of the tech-industry.

<sup>26</sup> See also Nwonka's (2020b) analysis of the BFI Diversity Standards.



employers' databases and the existence of significant data gaps in the Diamond Project data.

Recognition of this problem has led to the screen industries' representatives and academic reports recommending the establishment of more extensive and reliable data sets: 'consistent and sector-wide monitoring of key workforce characteristics that can provide reliable sector statistics, preferably designed with a view to international comparability' (CAMEo, 2018:53). The collection of better and more detailed data (e.g. coherency, reach or type of diversity characteristics) is indeed important in understanding the lack of diversity, monitoring workforce demographic data and establishing strategies for improving workers' participation in the screen industries. However, current data collection initiatives raise several important questions. Newsinger and Eikhof (2020) argue that data initiatives establish the lack of diversity as an unknown problem in the industry. The collection of reliable data is important; however, it is also as important to use the collected data to inform specific activities, strategies and interventions. Data initiatives are also one of the easiest activities to perform by companies and organisations to demonstrate some level of engagement in issues associated with diversity. However, data initiatives on their own do not challenge a lack of workforce diversity and do not transform the screen industries. Their quantitative nature also fails to appreciate the complex nature of discrimination, exclusion and exploitation faced by people, and can be seen to diminish their lived experiences. Therefore, there is a need for more in-depth discussions about the purpose and outcomes of data collection initiatives about diversity characteristics in the screen industry with increased emphasis on understanding over measurement.

### **5.3 The Business Case for Diversity**

The business case justification for workforce diversity in the screen industry is particularly prominent in statements and advocacy documents from the industry's institutional bodies (e.g., Newsinger & Eikhof, 2020; CAMEo, 2018). Newsinger and Eikhof (2020:58) argue that the presentation of diverse work teams as profitable for companies is a cross-cutting issue in explicit diversity policy in the television and film industry. The often-repeated narrative of 'more diverse teams do better' attempts to use the language of business operations to convince companies to consider a diverse workforce. However, in doing so, it also demonstrates instrumental utilisation of 'diversity' as good for economic performance, rather than for a fairer society (i.e. social justice justification).

According to the analysis provided by Newsinger and Eikhof (2020:58), the business case for diversity in the UK's television and film industry draws on the study published in McKinsey & Company's *Diversity Matters* report (Hunt et al., 2015). The study found

a statistically significant relationship between diversity in workplaces (i.e., diverse in the sense of gender and ethnicity) and better financial performance. The report also articulates why diversity is important for the development of organisations and discusses the possibility of accessing wider talent pools, changing a customer base (e.g. women and ethnic minorities as key consumers), and strengthening a company's image. These ideas align with the broader neoliberal framework within which creative industries' policies have been developed alongside many other screen industry companies' and institutions' operations. It is notable that 'diversity' as a catalyst of progress, innovation, creativity, and economic performance has also been used by entities in the UK film and television industry (see CAMEo, 2018; Newsinger, 2012). Through these ideas, diversity is seen as an asset for companies both in possible improvement of financial performance and as a form of symbolic gesture (see also Nwonka, 2020a).

Newsinger and Eikhof (2020) draw attention to the problematic articulation of diversity through economic reasoning. According to the McKinsey report, gender diversity in workplaces increases a company's financial performance by 15% (above average), but ethnic minority diversity contributes to a 35% increase in a given company's performance (see Hunt et al., 2015). In this particular case, it can therefore be suggested that to achieve better financial performance, companies should prioritise ethnically diverse hires over gender diverse hires for better results. This form of diversity presentation, within a cost/benefit framework, pits different diversity identities and diversity initiatives against each other (Newsinger and Eikhof, 2020). A similar argument has been presented in studies which review different support schemes for gender equality in companies (see Cullen and Murphy, 2018; Elomaki, A., 2015).

Secondly, a company's or institution's financial performance relies on a variety of factors. As Bahvnani (2007:158) argues, 'a range of factors may contribute to better financial performance, and it is difficult to argue that diversity alone causes increase or decrease.' Furthermore, as demonstrated throughout this report, workers from historically marginalised backgrounds often struggle with their career progression and seldom occupy senior positions in companies. Therefore, they are less likely to influence vital performance decisions in the companies. Workforce diversity is also dependent on a company's economic and organisational context and how, within these structures, decisions are made and leadership is organised. Newsinger and Eikhof (2020) also emphasise that there is a lack of evidence to support the business case for diversity justification. This is not to say that diverse work teams do not contribute to the higher economic performance of companies in comparison to more gender and ethnically homogenous workplaces; we simply do not have robust evidence and detailed evaluations to prove this justification.

In the recently released report by McKinsey & Company, *Diversity Wins: How Inclusion Matters* (Hunt et al., 2020), the research team pays more attention to the context in which the business case justification is positioned. They acknowledge the importance of the dynamic around inclusion issues but also expand their data in their analysis of employees' attitudes. Overall, the report demonstrates 'a stronger business case, but slow progress overall' (Hunt et al., 2020:3–4). It also acknowledges that the majority of investigated companies did not make particular progress in addressing the lack of diversity among their workforces: 'But more firms have made little progress or remained static and, in some, gender and cultural representation has even gone backwards' (Hunt et al., 2020). The report's analysis of employees' attitudes reveals experiences of nepotism, discrimination, underrepresentation, and lack of attention to equality, diversity, and inclusion in investigated companies. These problems were particularly noted by employees in discussions about leadership, accountability, bias, and discrimination. While diverse teams *might* do better in terms of contributing to a company's financial performance, workplace cultures, structures, and practises are not good for workers from diverse backgrounds.

The use of the business case for diversity as an instrument for diverse workforce participation has its shortcomings, especially if ongoing structural issues are not addressed. Further studies could explore how the justifications based on economic and social justice imperatives are constructed and implemented in the context of screen industries.

## 6. Conclusion

This report provided an overview of the demographics of the workforce in the screen industries as well as studies about inequalities and discrimination in the CCIs. The three sections of this report provided 1) contextual information, 2) a review of diversity characteristics and 3) a review of studies and arguments on diversity interventions. The first section discussed the emergence of CCIs politics, the etymology of diversity, equality and inclusion (EDI) terms and an overview of the work organisation and structures that contribute to the persistent inequalities and discrimination in the screen industries. The second section focused on different diversity characteristics, including those protected by the Equalities Act of 2010, in addition to inequalities related to social class and geographical location. The last part of this report drew attention to discussions about diversity interventions and their justifications in the context of screen industries.

The report demonstrated that the majority of academic studies on diversity in the screen industries focuses on the film and television industries. Furthermore, gender and ethnicity are the most widely discussed diversity characteristics, while inequalities and discrimination related to age, ability, sexuality, religion, social class and geographical location remain underexplored. The published studies highlighted the need to consider intersectionality when discussing diversity characteristics. The use of the terms ‘equality, diversity and inclusion’ is not incidental; rather, it is embedded in the current political and economic climate. In fact, scholars have demonstrated how specific discourses about equality and diversity in the screen industries are mobilised by the government, institutional bodies and companies (e.g. Malik, 2013; Newsinger, 2012). Therefore, it is also necessary to pay attention to how inequalities and discrimination in the screen industries are conceptualised and how ‘diversity work’ is performed by different institutions and actors. This is especially important because independent evaluations of various diversity support schemes, from ‘empowering’ trainings to ‘transforming’ interventions, are scarce (except for Nwonka, 2020b).

Based on the overview provided in this report, we can identify gaps for further research:

### 6.1 Data

*Scarcity* – the lack of data about workforce demographics and experiences of creative work in Yorkshire and the Humber requires further investigation of the inequalities and discrimination experienced in the region. These academic

inquiries should be positioned within further discussions about inter-regional, national and international relations.

*Comparability* – data about the screen industries is often hard to compare over time and between places. To track change both these obstacles need to be addressed.

*Co-production* – data produced by academics and others outside the screen industries is most useful when co-produced by people working in the sector who can a) help ensure rigorous understanding of the issues in the design, implementation and analysis of research projects, and b) feed it into ongoing debates and initiatives with their own voice.

## 6.2 Scope

*Not only film and TV* - Issues of equality, diversity and inclusion concern all screen industries. However, the majority of published studies specifically consider workers' experiences and diversity policies in the UK television and film industries. Further studies could explore approaches to EDI in other screen industries (e.g. animation, VFX, videogames) and conduct comparative research to examine the similarities and differences in addressing inequalities and discrimination in the screen industries.

*Doing Diversity Work* - Given the prevalence of diversity trainings, schemes and initiatives in different screen industries and at different levels (from companies to institutional bodies) as well as the considerable resources spent on these initiatives, future research should provide a more robust independent evaluation of different policies, schemes and interventions. In addition, the experiences of creative workers of different forms of support as well as the efforts of private businesses engaged in 'diversity work' in the screen industries could be explored.

*Sites of inequalities and discrimination* - The studies on creative workers demonstrated that inequalities occur when attempting to 'break into' screen industries or production sites. However, there is a further need to assess inequalities related to networking or training sites. Kerr et al (2020) demonstrated that supposedly inclusive informal skills development sites, such as game jams, can perpetuate existing inequalities.

## 6.3 Focus

*Mental health* - Qualitative inquiries about creative workers' experiences of inequality and discrimination document numerous obstacles and challenges, from finding job opportunities to progressing in one's career and reconciling work and private lives. These difficulties raise questions about the workers' mental health and creative work. Industry reports, such as the UK Games Industry Census (Taylor, 2020) and The Mental Health in the UK Film and Cinema Industry (Wilkes et al. 2020), focused on mental health challenges among creative workers. Future research should pay attention to mental health issues in creative work more broadly, with a focus on specific marginalised demographics.

*Care* - Studies about gender inequalities in the workplace have examined issues relating to pregnancy and maternity (e.g. Wreyford, 2013; Dent, 2019), but other forms of caring responsibilities have been comparatively less explored (with the exception of a research project carried out by Dent, 2019). Thus, future studies could expand the investigation of caring responsibilities when discussing the variety of creative workers' experiences.

*Intersectionality* - Future research should focus on improving the coverage of different diversity characteristics. While previous studies have explored some aspects of diversity in terms of gender and ethnicity, investigations of workers' experiences in terms of social class, age, religion, sexuality, ability or geographic location are less robust. Future studies should also consider intersectionality when exploring the variety of creative workers' experiences.

## 6.4 Crises

*Creative Work, EDI and COVID19*: Equality, diversity and inclusion problems are longstanding crises in the CCIs and future research needs to understand the on-going covid-19 pandemic and its impact on inequalities and discrimination in the screen industries. Early publications about the impact of COVID-19 on the screen industries have highlighted this problem (Banks, 2020; Comunian and England, 2020; GDC, 2020). Therefore, future research should focus on COVID-19 and post-COVID-19 impacts on creative workers from different demographic groups, working in different screen industries and with different occupational positions/employment relations.

## 7. References

- Abd Karim, N. K. B. (2015). *The Production Culture of Religious Television: The Case of the Islam Channel*. (PhD), University of Leeds.
- Alacovska, A. (2015). Genre anxiety: women travel writers' experience of work. *The Sociological Review*, 63(S1), 128-143.
- Allen, K., & Hollingworth, S. (2013). 'Sticky Subjects' or 'Cosmopolitan Creatives'? Social class, place and urban young people's aspirations for work in the knowledge economy. *Urban Studies*, 50(3), 499-517.
- Allen, K., Quinn, J., Hollingworth, S., & Rose, A. (2012). Doing diversity and evading equality: the case of student work placements in the creative sector. In *Educational Diversity* (pp. 180-200). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Allen, K., Quinn, J., Hollingworth, S., & Rose, A. (2013). Becoming employable students and 'ideal' creative workers: exclusion and inequality in higher education work placements. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 34(3), 431-452.
- Amin, A. (2020, June 11). *The TV Mindset: Racism in TV and how to combat the culture* [Webinar] Zoom/Facebook.
- Aust, R. (Forthcoming). Care and cultures of television news production: the case of BBC Newsnight. In eds. A. Holdsworth, K. Lury & H. Tweed (Eds.) *Discourses of Care: Care in Media, Medicine and Society*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Banet-Weiser, S. (2018). *Empowered: Popular Feminism and Popular Misogyny*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Banks, M. (2007). *The Politics of Cultural Work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Banks, M. (2009). Gender below-the-line: defining feminist production studies. In J. T. Caldwell (Ed.), *Production Studies* (pp. 87-98). New York: Routledge.
- Banks, M. (2020). The work of culture and C-19. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 0(0), 1-7.
- Banks, M., & Hesmondhalgh, D. (2009). Looking for work in creative industries policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(4), 415-430.
- Banks, M., & Oakley, K. (2016). The dance goes on forever: Art schools, class and UK higher education. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 22, 41-57.
- Beck, U. (2000). *The Brave New World of Work*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Berridge, S. (2019). Mum's the world: public testimonials and gendered experiences of negotiating caring responsibilities with work in the film and television industries. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 22(5-6).



Berridge, S. (2020). The gendered impact of caring responsibilities on the parents' experiences of working in the film and television industries. *Feminist Media Studies*, 0(0), 1-14.

BFI. (2020). Women in UK film 1911-2017. Retrieved from <https://www.bfi.org.uk/news-opinion/news-bfi/features/infographic-women-uk-film-1911-2017>

Bhavnani, R. (2007). Barriers to Diversity in Film. Retrieved from <https://www.bfi.org.uk/sites/bfi.org.uk/files/downloads/uk-film-council-barriers-to-diversity-in-film-2007-08-20.pdf>

Bielby, D. D., & Bielby, W. T. (1996). Women and men in film: gender inequality among writers in a culture industry. *Gender and Society*, 10(3), 248 - 270.

Blair, H. (2001). 'You're only as good as your last job': the labour process and labour market in the British film industry. *Work, Employment and Society*, 15(1), 149-169.

Brook, O., O'Brien, D., & Taylor, M. (2018). Panic! It's an Arts Emergency. *Social Class, Taste and Inequalities in the Creative Industries*. Retrieved from online <https://createlondon.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Panic-Social-Class-Taste-and-Inequalities-in-the-Creative-Industries1.pdf>

Brook, O., O'Brien, D., & Taylor, M. (2020). "There's no way that you get paid to do the arts": unpaid labour across the cultural and creative life course. *Sociological Research Online*, 1-18.

Brown, J. (2015). Home from home? Locational choices of international 'creative class' workers. *European Planning Studies*. 23(12), 2336-2355.

Bryant, S. (2016). Black and female in tech. An intersectional guide for intersectional people. In Y. B. Kafai, G. Richard, T., & B. Tynes (Eds.), *Diversifying Barbie and Mortal Kombat. Intersectional Perspectives and Inclusive Designs in Gaming* (pp. 133-143). Pittsburgh: Carnegie Mellon: ETC Press.

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

CAMEo. (2018). Workforce diversity in the UK screen sector: evidence review. Retrieved from: <https://www.bfi.org.uk/sites/bfi.org.uk/files/downloads/bfi-workforce-diversity-in-uk-screen-sector-evidence-review-2018-03.pdf>

CAMEo. (2019). Doubling Disability. Research Report. Retrieved from: <http://creativitydiversitynetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Doubling-Disability-Trifold-Black-Font.pdf>

Chess, S. (2017). *Ready Player Two: Women Gamers and Designed identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cobb, S., Williams, R. L., & Wreyford, N. (2018). Calling the Shots: Women Directors and Cinematographers on British Films since 2003. Retrieved from: <https://wft.ie/856-2/>

Comunian, R., & England, L. (2020). Creative and cultural work without filters: Covid-19 and exposed precarity in the creative economy. *Cultural Trends*, 29(2), 112-128.

Conor, B., Gill, R., & Taylor, S. (2015). Gender and creative labour. *The Sociological Review*. 63(S1), 1-22

Consalvo, M. (2011). Crunched by passion: women game developers and workplace challenges. In Y. Kafai, C. Heeter, J. Denner, & S. JY (Eds.), *Beyond Barbie and Mortal Kombat: New Perspectives on Gender and Gaming* (pp. 177-191). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Creative Fuse North East (2017). Initial Report. Retrieved from <http://www.creativefusene.org.uk>

Creative Skillset.(2012). Employment Census of the Creative Media Industries. Retrieved from: [https://www.screenskills.com/media/1552/2012\\_employment\\_census\\_of\\_the\\_creative\\_media\\_industries.pdf](https://www.screenskills.com/media/1552/2012_employment_census_of_the_creative_media_industries.pdf)

Creative Skillset.(2014). Creative Skillset Workforce Survey. Retrieved from: [https://www.screenskills.com/media/1559/creative\\_skillset\\_creative\\_media\\_workforce\\_survey\\_2014-1.pdf](https://www.screenskills.com/media/1559/creative_skillset_creative_media_workforce_survey_2014-1.pdf)

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-167.

Cullen, P., & Murphy, M. P. (2018). Leading the debate for the business case for gender equality, perilous for whom? *Gender, Work and Organization*, 25(2), 110-126.

de Castell, S., & Skardzius, K. (2019). Speaking in public: what women say about working in the video game industry. *Television and New Media*, 20(8), 836-847.

DeFillippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1998). Paradox in project-based enterprise: the case of film making. *Californian Management Review*, 40, 125-139.

Dent, T. (2019). Devalued women, valued men: motherhood, class and neoliberal feminism in the creative media industries. *Media, Culture and Society*, 42(4), 537-553.

Directors UK (2018). Adjusting the Colour Balance. Black, Asian and minority ethnic representation among screen directors working in UK television. Retrieved from: <https://d3qujhbyl1boep.cloudfront.net/uploads%2F1537376389641-48nno7a8g5d-a2f386db65fdcecec7ac1fb44dac221b%2F2018-Adjusting-the-Colour-Balance.pdf>

Duffy, B. E. (2017). (Not) Getting Paid to Do What You Love. *Gender, Social Media, and Aspirational Work*. London: Yale University Press.

EA Inclusion. (2020). Diversity and Inclusion Progress Report. Retrieved from: <https://www.thecreativeindustries.co.uk/media/557057/v24-july-final-draft-cic-diversity-and-inclusion-progress-report-2019-20-2.pdf>

Eikhof, D. R., & Warhurst, C. (2012). The promised land? Why social inequalities are systemic in the creative industries. *Employee Relations*, 35(5), 495-508.

Eikhof, D. R., & York, C. (2015). 'It's a tough drug to kick': a woman's career in broadcasting. *Work, Employment and Society*, 30(1), 152-161.

Ekinsmyth, C. (1999). Professional workers in risk society. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 24(3), 353 - 366.

Elomaki, A. (2015). The economic case for gender inequality in the European Union: Selling gender equality to decision-makers and neoliberal women's organizations. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 22(3), 288-302.

European Women's Audiovisual Network. (2016). Where are the women directors? report on gender equality for directors in the European Film Industry 2006-2013. Retrieved from Online: [https://www.ewawomen.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Complete-report\\_compressed.pdf](https://www.ewawomen.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Complete-report_compressed.pdf)

Fenton, S. (1999). *Ethnicity: racism, class and culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foster, D., & Wass, V. (2012). Disability in the labour market: an exploration of concepts of the 'ideal worker' and organisational 'fit' that disadvantage employees with impairments. *Sociology*, 7(4), 705-721.

Friedman, S., O'Brien, D., & Laurison, D. (2016). 'Like skydiving without a parachute': how class origin shapes occupational trajectories in British acting. *Sociology*, 51(5), 992-1010.

GDC. (2020). State of the Game Industry 2020: Work from Home Edition. Retrieved from: <https://careers.uw.edu/blog/2020/07/16/state-of-the-gaming-industry-work-from-home-edition-free-download/>

Gill, R. (2002). Cool, creative and egalitarian? Exploring gender in project-based new media work. *Information, Communication and Society*, 5(1), 70-89.

Gill, R. (2013). Inequalities in media work. In P. Szczepanik & P. Vonderau (Eds.), *Behind the Screen: European Contributions to Production Studies* (pp. 189-205). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gill, R. (2014). Unspeakable inequalities: post-feminism, entrepreneurial subjectivity, and the repudiation of sexism among cultural workers. *Social Politics*, 21(4), 509-528.

Gill, R., Kelan, E., & Scharff, C. (2017). A Postfeminist sensibility at work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 24(3), 226-244.

Grabher, G. (2002). Cool projects, boring institutions: temporary collaboration in social context. *Regional Studies*, 36(3), 205-214.

Gray, H. (2016). Precarious diversity: representation and demography In M. Curtin & K. Sanson (Eds.), *precarious Creativity* (pp. 241-253). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grugulis, I., & Stoyanova, D. (2012). Social capital and networks in film and tv: jobs for the boys? *Organization Studies*, 33(10), 1311-1331.

Gurrier, Y., Evans, C., Glover, J., & Wilson, C. (2009). 'Technical, but not very...' constructing gendered identities in IT - related employment. *Work, Employment and Society*, 23(3), 494-511.

Harvey, A. (2020). *Feminist Media Studies*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2019). *Cultural Industries*. London: Sage.

Hesmondhalgh, D., & Baker, S. (2015). Sex, gender and work segregation in the cultural industries. *Sociological Review*, 63(S1), 23-36.

Hesmondhalgh, D., & Saha, A. (2013). Race, Ethnicity, and Cultural Production. *Popular Communication*, 11(3), 179-195.

Hirschman, N. (2012). Disability as a new frontier for feminist intersectionality research. *Politics and Gender*, 8(3), 396-405.

Hopkins, P. (2018, April 22). What is intersectionality? [Video]. YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O1islM0ytKE>

Hunt, V., Layton, D., & Prince, S. (2015). Diversity Matters. Retrieved from: <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/why-diversity-matters>

Hunt, V., Prince, S., Dixon-Fyle, S., & Dolan, K. (2020). Diversity wins: how inclusion matters. Retrieved from: <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/diversity-wins-how-inclusion-matters>

Jayne, M. (2005). Creative industries: the regional dimensions? *Environment and Planning C*, 23, 537-556.

Johnson, R. S. (2013). Toward greater production diversity: examining social boundaries at a video game studio. *Games and Culture*, 8(3), 136-160.

Kelly, E., & Bobbin, F. (1998). How affirmative action become diversity management. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(7), 960-984.

Kerr, A., Savage, J. D., & Twomey-Lee, V. (2020). Decoding and recoding game-making events for diversity, inclusion and innovation. Retrieved from: <http://mural.maynoothuniversity.ie/12575/>

Kuehn, K., & Corrigan, T. (2013). Hope labour: the role of employment prospects in online social production. *The Political Economy of Communication*, 1(1). Retrieved from: <https://www.polecom.org/index.php/polecom/article/view/9>

- Lee, D. J. (2011). Networks, culture capital and creative labour in the British independent television industry. *Media, Culture and Society*, 33(4), 549-565.
- Lockyer, S. (2015). 'It's really scared of disability': disabled comedians' perspectives of the British television comedy industry. *The Journal of Popular Television*, 3(2), 179-193.
- Malik, S. (2013). "Creative diversity": UK public service broadcasting after multiculturalism. *Popular Communication*, 11(3), 227-241.
- Martin, A. (2018). What is queer production studies/Why is queer production studies? *Journal of Film and Video*, 70(3-4), 3-7.
- McRobbie, A. (2002). Clubs to companies: notes on the decline of political culture in speeded up creative worlds. *Cultural Studies*, 16(4), 516-531.
- McRobbie, A. (2009). *The Aftermath of Feminism. Gender, Culture and Social Change*. London: Sage.
- McRobbie, A. (2016). *Be Creative*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mellinger, G. (2003). Counting color: ambivalence and contradiction in the American Society of Newspaper Editors' Discourse of Diversity. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 27(2), 129-151.
- Neff, G. (2012). *Venture Labor. Work and the Burden of Risk i innovative Industries*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Newsinger, J. (2012). The politics of regional audio-visual policy in England: or, how we learnt to stop worrying and get 'creative'. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 18(1), 111-125.
- Newsinger, J., & Eikhof, D. R. (2020). Explicit and implicit diversity policy in the UK film and television industries *Journal of British Cinema and Television*, 17.1, 47-69.
- Nixon, S., & Crewe, B. (2004). Pleasure at Work? Gender, consumption and work-based identities in the creative industries. *Consumption Markets and Culture*, 7(2), 129-147.
- Noon, M. (2007). The fatal flaws of diversity and the business case for ethnic minorities. *Work, Employment and Society*, 21(4), 773-784.
- Noonan, C. (2015). Professional motilities in the creative industries: the role of 'place' for young people aspiring for creative career. *Cultural Trends*, 24(4), 299-309.
- Nwonka, C. J. (2015). Diversity pie: rethinking social exclusion and diversity policy in the British film industry. *Journal of Media Practice*, 16(1), 73-90.
- Nwonka, C. J. (2020a). The new babel: the language and practice of institutionalised diversity in the UK film industry. *Journal of British Cinema and Television*, 17.1, 24-46.

Nwonka, C. J. (2020b). Race and ethnicity in the UK film industry: an analysis of the BFI diversity standards. Retrieved from: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/105675/>

Nwonka, C. J., & Malik, S. (2018). Cultural discourses and practices of institutionalised diversity in the UK film sector: 'just get something black made'. *The Sociological Review*, 66(6), 1111-1127.

O'Brien, A. (2014). 'Men own television': why woman leave media work. *Media, Culture and Society*, 36(8), 1207-1218.

O'Brien, A. (2019). *Women, Inequality and Media Work*. London: Routledge.

O'Brien, A., & Kerrigan, P. (2020). Camping it up and toning it down: gay and lesbian sexual identity in media work. *Media, Culture and Society*, 0(0), 1-17.

O'Brien, D., Laurison, D., Miles, A., & Friedman, S. (2016). Are the creative industries meritocratic? An analysis of the 2014 British labour force survey. *Cultural Trends*, 25(2), 116-131.

O'Connor, J. (2011). The cultural and creative industries: a critical history. *Ekonomiaz. Revista vasca de Economia*, 78(3), 24-47.

Oakley, K. (2006). Include us out - economic development and social policy in the creative industries. *Cultural Trends*, 15(4), 255-273.

Oakley, K. (2013). Absentee workers: representation and participation in the cultural industries. In M. Banks, R. Gill, & S. Taylor (Eds.), *Theorizing Cultural Work* (pp.56-68). London: Routledge.

Ofcom. (2019). Diversity and equal opportunities in television. Monitoring report on the UK-based broadcasting industry. Retrieved from: <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv-radio-and-on-demand/information-for-industry/guidance/diversity/diversity-equal-opportunities-television>

ONS. (2019). Business Register and Employment Survey: Open Access. Retrieved from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/surveys/informationforbusinesses/businesssurveys/businessregisterandemploymentsurvey>

ONS. (2019). UK Business Counts. Retrieved from: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/articles/1180.aspx>

Oswick, C., & Noon, M. (2014). Discourses of diversity, equality and inclusion: trenchant formulations or transient fashion. *British Journal of Management*, 25(1), 23-39.

Ozbilgin, M. F. (2009). Equality, diversity and inclusion at work: yesterday, today and tomorrow. In M. F. Ozbilgin (Ed.), *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion at Work: a Research Companion* (pp. 1-16). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.



Percival, N., & Hesmondhalgh, D. (2014). Unpaid work in the UK television and film industries: resistance and changing attitudes. *European Journal of Communication*, 29(2), 188-203.

Powell, A. (2020). People with disabilities in employment. Retrieved from House of Commons Library: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-7540/>

Prasad, A. (2001). Understanding workplace empowerment as inclusion. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 37(1), 51-69.

Prescott, J., & Bogg, J. (2010). The computer games industry: women's experiences of work role in a male dominated environment. In A. Cater-Steel & E. Cater (Eds.), *Women in Engineering, Science and Technology: Education and Career Challenges* (pp. 138-152). New York: IGI Global

Raising Films. (2017). Raising our game. Next steps for the UK film and television industry. Retrieved from: <https://www.raisingfilms.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Raising-our-Game-report-2017.pdf>

Randle, K. (2015). Class and exclusion at work: the case of UK film and television. In K. Oakley & O. C. Justin (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to the Cultural Industries* (pp. 330-344). London: Routledge

Randle, K., & Hardy, K. (2016). Macho, mobile and resilient? How workers with impairments are doubly disabled in project-based film and television work. *Work, Employment and Society*, 31(3), 447-464.

Randle, K., Forson, C., & Calveley, M. (2014). Towards a Bourdieusian analysis of the social class composition of the UK film and television workforce. *Work, Employment and Society*, 29(4), 590-606.

Randle, K., Wing-Fai, L., & Kurian, J. (2007). Creating difference: overcoming barriers to diversity in UK film and television employment. Retrieved from: <https://uhra.herts.ac.uk/handle/2299/4575>

Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group and Organization Management*. 31(2), 212-236.

Roodhouse, S. (2006). The creative industries: definitions, quantification and practice. In C. Eisenberg, R. Gerlach, & C. Handke (Eds.), *Cultural Industries: The British Experience in International Perspective* (pp. 13-32). Online: Berlin University.

Ruberg, B. (2019). The precarious labor of queer indie game-making: who benefits from making video games 'better'? *Television and New Media*, 20(8), 778-788.

Ruberg, B., & Shaw, A. (2017). *Queer Game Studies*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Ryan, B. (1992). *Making Capital from Culture: the Corporate Form of Capitalist Production*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.



- Saha, A. (2012). 'Beards, scarves, halal meat, terrorists, forced marriage': television industries and the production of 'race'. *Media, Culture and Society*, 34(4), 424-438.
- Saha, A. (2013). 'Curry Tales': the production of 'race' and ethnicity in the cultural industries. *Ethnicities*, 13(6), 818-837.
- Saha, A. (2018). *Race and the Cultural Industries*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Scharff, C. (2017). *Gender, Subjectivity and Cultural Work*. London: Routledge.
- Shaw, A. (2009). Putting the gay in games. Cultural production and GLBT content in Video Games. *Games and Culture*, 4(3), 228-253.
- Shaw, A. (2014). *Gaming at the Edge. Sexuality and Gender at the Margins of Gamer Culture*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Spedale, S., Coupland, C., & Tempest, S. (2014). Gendered ageism and organizational routines at work: the case of day-parting in television broadcasting. *Organization Studies*, 35(11), 1585-1604.
- Srauy, S. (2019). Precarity and why indie game developers can't save us from racism. *Television and New Media*, 20(8), 802-812.
- Swinney, P., & Williams, M. (2016). *The Great British Brain Drain: Where Graduates Move and Why*. London: Centre for Cities.
- Swords, J., & Wray, F. (2010). The connectivity of the creative industries in North East England - the problems of physical and relational distance. *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit*, 25(4), 305-318.
- Taylor, M. (2020). UK Games Industry Census. Understanding diversity in the UK games industry workforce. Retrieved from: [https://ukie.org.uk/ukie\\_files/uk-games-industry-census-understanding-diversity-uk-games-industry-workforce-0](https://ukie.org.uk/ukie_files/uk-games-industry-census-understanding-diversity-uk-games-industry-workforce-0)
- Taylor, S. (2010). Negotiating oppositions and uncertainties: gendered conflicts in creative identity work. *Feminism and Psychology*, 21(3), 354-371.
- Taylor, S., & Littleton, K. (2012). *Contemporary Identities of Creativity and Creative Work*: Ashgate.
- Thompson, D., & Hebblethwaite, L. (2018). Think global, create local. The regional economic impact of the UK games industry. Retrieved from: <https://ukie.org.uk/regional-economic-report>
- UK Screen Alliance. (2019). Inclusion and Diversity in UK: Visual Effects, Animation and Post Production. Retrieved from: <https://www.animationuk.org/subpages/inclusion-and-diversity-in-the-uks-vfx-animation-and-post-production-sectors/>
- Vallance, P. (2014). Creative knowing, organisational learning, and socio-spatial expansion in UK videogame development studios. *Geoforum*, 51, 15-26.

Vysotsky, S., & Allaway, J. H. (2019). The sobering reality of sexism in the video game industry. In K. L. Gray & D. J. Leonard (Eds.), *Woke Gaming. Digital Challenges to Oppression and Social Justice* (pp.101-118). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Warner, K. J. (2016). Strategies for success? Navigating Hollywood's 'postracial' labor practices. In M. Curtin & K. Sanson (Eds.), *Precarious Creativity* (pp. 172-185). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weststar, J., & Legault, M.-J. (2018). Women's experiences on the path to a career in game development. In K. L. Gray, G. Voorhees, & E. Vossen (Eds.), *Feminism in Play* (pp.105-123). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilkes, M., Carey, H., & Florisson, R. (2020). The Looking Glass. Mental Health in the UK Film, TV and Cinema Industry. Retrieved from: <https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/media/lancaster-university/content-assets/documents/lums/work-foundation/TheLookingGlassFinalReport-12Feb19.pdf>

Wing-Fai, L., Gill, R., & Randle, K. (2015). Getting in, getting on, getting out? Women as career scramblers in the UK film and television industries. *The Sociological Review*, 63(1), 50-65.

Wittel, A. (2001). Toward a network sociality. *Theory, Culture and Society*. 18(6), 51-76

Wreyford, N. (2013). The real cost of childcare: motherhood and flexible creative labour in the UK film industry. *Studies in the Maternal*, 5(3), 1-22.

Wreyford, N. (2015). Birds of a feather: informal recruitment practices and gendered outcomes for screenwriting work in the UK film industry. *The Sociological Review*. 63(S1), 84-96.