UNPACKING THE INDUSTRIAL, CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXTS OF *DOCTOR WHO*'S FAN-PRODUCERS

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Mark Richard Adams

College of Business, Arts and Social Sciences
Brunel University London

15th August 2016

Contents

Abstract

The approach that emphasises the active audience, and the subversive potential of audience encounters with texts, has greatly influenced the study of media fandom which has tended to see media fans, and the cultures they produce, as set in opposition to writers and producers. My thesis challenges this view of the relationships between fans and producers by examining fan-producers in contemporary television. This research challenges the influential theoretical models that see authorship as a major source of social control and thus sees audiences that 'poach' meanings from texts as engaged in rebellion. The approach that perceives fandom as in opposition to the meanings of production falls short in representing the complexity of fan and producer interactions and thus curtails our understanding of these relationships.

My thesis moves beyond the untenable opposition between fans and producers and, in doing so, paves the way for an understanding of fan studies more suitable for the contemporary, and still developing, climate of audience interactions. I believe that the practices of fandom demonstrate that consumption and authorship are more closely linked than previous tendencies to divide them would suggest. Previous works have served to both underestimate fandom, as powerless rebels or dupes, or exaggerate its position as a force of political or cultural resistance. My research engages with the contemporary developments within fan culture, and emphasises the importance of deconstructing monolithic ideas of the media industry in order to better understand the influences and pressures placed on the figure of the fan-producer. I argue that the media industries are not as homogeneous as previously implied, and that the fan-producer is forced to negotiate the complex and often conflicting relationships within the worlds of both fandom and official production.

Acknowledgements

This has not always been an easy journey, with the hard task of researching a myriad of areas coming hand in hand with illness and personal struggles. Reaching the end would not have been possible without the help and support of many people over the last five years.

Many thanks must go to my supervisor Milly Williamson who has come along this journey, and been supportive when I have needed it most. Thanks also go to colleagues at Brunel University, who have often provided support, encouragement and a sounding board for ideas and wandering thoughts – Leon Hunt, David Ingram, Julian Petley, Geoff King, Sean Harrington, Sean Holmes, and, without a doubt, Sarah Harman, whose friendship and support has been indispensable.

I would also like to acknowledge the help and assistance of the staff at the BBC Written Archive Centre in Reading, who were able to grant access and give advice during my research into the history of the BBC and Doctor Who merchandise.

Also, special thanks must go to all those who supported me along the way, and gave advice, encouragement and were generally there when I needed to vent some frustration, as well as those who have supported and encouraged my academic thinking and progression: Claire Hines, Eve Bennett, Wickham Clayton, Xavier Mendik, Sorcha Ni Fhlainn, Thomas Dennett-Cook, Chrissey Harrison, Rich Jeffery, Emma England, Matt Warner, Johnny Walker, Dan Taylor, Bethan Jones, Frazer Lee, and all the rest who I have no doubt forgotten to mention!

Most importantly, I wish to thank my family without whose love and support I would have never made it this far. Thanks to my parents, brothers, uncles and in-laws. My wife Amy: thank you for putting up with me as I shut myself away for days on end, and for believing in me even at the times that I did not. Thanks to Chloe, Leon and Aidan for the love, laughter and smiles they have provided on this long journey.

Introduction

This thesis examines the emergence of the fan-producer in contemporary fan culture, and its particular manifestation in relation to the long running BBC television series, <u>Doctor Who</u>. I come to this subject as a lifelong fan of <u>Doctor Who</u>, and user of numerous internet resources related to the series, although I have only had limited personal experience with organised fandom. My interest in the fan-producers stems not only from how they blur the supposed divide between production and consumption, but also from how they have made this transition. Growing up in the nineties, many of the future fan-producers were familiar names to me, from fan circles, tie-in novels, conventions, magazine articles and even original television series they produced. There was a sense of ownership of <u>Doctor Who</u> by fans who kept the flame alive, and I argue that this fan-led era had an impact on the relaunch of the series, and its subsequent mainstream success. One important aspect that many of the theories and portrayals of fandom have in common is that they illustrate only a part of the bigger picture of the field of fan culture. Fans may be resistant, they may be co-opted, they may be united or divided and they may have power in some cases or be powerless in others. No single definition, or interpretation, can accurately summarise the scope and variety within fan communities, and any attempt to simply view fandom as a utopian force of resistance (Jenkins, 1992) or as an inherently co-opted and controlled part of consumer culture (Gwenllian-Jones, 2003) is constricted by its own decisiveness. Theorists have begun to explore how there are degrees within fandom, and that these can involve conflicts, power struggles and constant shifts in power. I suggest that this is echoed by those within the institution of media production, in the forms of conflicts between writers, producers and those higher up, or even 'sideways', within the complex corporate structures. Thus I argue that the fields of cultural production should be seen less as a conflict between fans and producers, a struggle over the control of culture itself, but as a constant negotiation, and experimentation, into the extents to which each side may use and interact with the other. I intend to build upon previous work that has started to de-construct the monolithic ideas of official production that establishes them as a united, oppressive force in opposition to the more varied fan cultures. Therefore, in this thesis I wish to propose that we turn our attention away from a singular focus on fans, and towards the media industries themselves. We have seen the prominent rise of the figure of the fan-producer in the last couple of decades, who makes the transition from the world of fandom to that of official production.

Doctor Who makes for an excellent case study, as the previous generation of fans have now grown into the industry and are now producing the relaunched series that started in 2005. They call into question previous binaries between fan and producer, as Matt Hills has succinctly highlighted:

> Rather than being viewed simply as 'poachers', fans had become part-time collaborators with official producers... co-opted word-of-mouth marketers for beloved brands. But these convergence-led shifts... do not quite address the generational experiences of *Doctor Who* fans who have now become official media producers, being called to 'keep faith' with established 'old' fandom, and professionally reach out to new audiences and new fans. (2010, p.58)

Thus the fan-producers have a complicated identity that exists as both fan and producer, and subject to the pressures of fandom, as Hills emphasises, but who are also subject to the pressures inherent with the media industry. My aim is therefore to deconstruct the monolithic ideas of the media industries through a case study of Doctor Who's fan-producers, and position these findings in an historical context of publishing, capitalism and understandings of authorship. In order to do this, I have approached this thesis as comprising of three distinct sections, the first of which will provide the necessary groundwork for the discussions to follow. The second section examines the discourses that surround authorship and audiences, and explores their historical contexts. The final section charts the parallel developments of Doctor Who fandom and the BBC from the sixties through to the present. These discussions lead into my concluding chapter where I apply these previous discussions to Doctor Who's contemporary fan-producers.

The first chapter of my thesis constitutes a literature survey of existing material in the field of fan studies. In this chapter, I will identify problematic areas of fan studies and suggest that it has yet to completely break away from either binary ideas of fan and producer conflicts, or from monolithic conceptions of the media industry. I emphasise here that the fan-producers oblige a re-examination of the relationship of the often-invoked producer and consumer binary. This is followed by an examination of the methodologies I have utilised in my research, and my reasoning behind the approaches I have decided upon. I begin by explaining my focus on Doctor Who as a case study and the importance of the fan-producers before proceeding to discuss why I have avoided an ethnological approach, common in studies of fandom. I use a brief autoethnography to address my concerns on how my own fan identity may be reflected in my work. I next argue for a wider appreciation of historical research in understanding contemporary fan cultures and industries, and highlight also the

difficulties and benefits of my archival research at the BBC Written Archive Centre in Reading. Finally I explore the work of Pierre Bourdieu and his theory of the field, of cultural production, which I draw on heavily throughout this thesis. My reasons for using Bourdieu are explored, alongside discussing previous academic approaches, where I primarily draw upon the work of Milly Williamson (2005), Matt Hills (2005) and Paul Lopes (2009).

Chapter Three looks at the historical context for ideas of authorship, and how the 'author' as an individual 'genius' figure was constructed in the eighteenth and nineteen centuries. I argue that the 'producer' aspect of the fan-producer identity is as much dependant on historical developments and ideas of what that means, as the 'fan' identity is on existing theorisations of fandom. The fan-producer's activity resists their authority over the texts at times, and reinforces it at others. I argue that the concept of a singular 'author' is problematic, and is historically used as a means to assert meaning or power or legitimacy. I trace the use of the 'author' through to cinema's conception of the auteur, and then the contemporary figure of the showrunner. I illustrate how the showrunner draws on discourses of legitimation, authorial value and brand marketing, drawing primarily on the work of Michael Z. Newman and Elana Levine (2012). Chapter Four complements its predecessor by examining the historical precedent for the activity of audiences, and their interactions with producers. I argue that these practices serve to destabilise the fan-producer by questioning the presumed power of the author and by also illustrating how they are not unique to the digital age. Rather, I will argue that active audiences and audience/producer relationships can be distinctly identified at times of technological development in contemporary culture and historically, such as with the development of modern printing presses or digital media in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

In Chapter Five, I focus on the BBC as a corporation, and examine the pressures and problems it must contend with, and how these relate to the rise of the fan-producer. I begin by looking at the institutional background of the BBC and examine how notions of public service broadcasting have evolved. I illustrate how commercial interests have influenced and directed aspects of public service from its very inception, and thus how the BBC is forced to negotiate between its highbrow remit of contributing to society, and a need to justify its own existence through popular entertainment. This initial chapter utilises Georgina Born's extensive study of the BBC as a starting point for unpacking the problematic ideology bound up in the

corporation's charter, and how it has responded to the increasing pressures of neoliberalism and commercialisation. I also make use of the earlier ethnographic study of the BBC undertaken by Tom Burns, which prefigures Born's work by almost two decades and offers further historical detail. My examination of the BBC's history establishes the context for the following chapters, by demonstrating that media organisations (even ones as venerable as the BBC) are racked with contradictions and differing interests, rather than acting as homogeneous entities. Thus this begins the process of examining the media industries as more complex than monolithic readings imply.

Chapter Six is the result of detailed research at the BBC's Written Archive Centre whereby I examined records relating to the early creation of <u>Doctor Who</u> and how the BBC sought to market it. The research revealed a corporation that demonstrated a great deal of uncertainty with its commercial ventures, and highlighted conflicted attitudes to merchandise that reflected its own struggles between elitist ideas of sophisticated programming versus mainstream, light entertainment. My research involved following numerous internal memos and external correspondences that related to the licensing of both <u>Doctor Who</u> and the Daleks, the latter of which was complicated by a shared license with writer Terry Nation. I argue here that this historical evidence illustrates a BBC that desired to be taken seriously as a commercial entity but had no suitably structured system to go about organising the distribution of licenses. The success of the Daleks, as I will show, forced the BBC to adapt rapidly and played an integral part in the development of the BBC's skills in commercial exploitation.

I continue the theme with Chapter Seven, which examines the way in which the fan-producers emphasise the collapsing positions of production and consumption, as I explore the processes by which the fans were able to gain access to official production. I utilise the work of Miles Booy (2012) in briefly examining fandom in the seventies, before following the developments in the eighties and nineties. I explore the emergence of the fan-producers at a time that parallels the BBC's increasing commercial exploitation. This chapter therefore charts the trajectory from the sixties, and through the formation of BBC Enterprises and then BBC Worldwide. It brings together discussions of merchandising, fan and producer interactions, the commercialisation of the BBC, and fan approaches to the text. I argue that the fan-producer's fan identities are just as much an influence on their behaviour and interactions with fandom, and that they cannot be seen as ever exclusively taking up

one position or the other. I continue the theme of merchandising with Chapter Eight, but bring it up to date with an examination of branding in the relaunched series, primarily drawing on the work of Catherine Johnson (2013) and Celia Lury (2004). I make use of Russell T. Davies's early on-going column in the official <u>Doctor Who Magazine</u> to examine how he interacts and attempts to engage with the existing fandom at a point in time before the new series launch, and subsequent mainstream success. I contextualise this as a form of self-branding and examine how Davies attempts to reassure existing fandom even as the new series is marketed to a new, mainstream audience. It is important to look at the way that branding, whilst predominantly an aspect of commercialisation, is also important for fandom. I discuss Matt Hills's (2010) concept of the 'fanbrand' in relation to this, and explore how branding is also used for reinforcing the narrative cohesion between the 'classic' and 'new' series.

My final chapter, then, examines the fan-producer's own sense of identity, and how they have made the gradual shift, for it is a shift and not a leap, from consumption to production. I argue that the conflicts that the fan-producers have had with fandom do not necessarily mean they are taking an 'official' position, but that their identities and actions are consistently informed by their history as <u>Doctor Who</u> fans as much as their responsibilities within the BBC. Thus this final section of my thesis illustrates the various historical and industrial contexts which I believe must be taken into consideration when examining fan and producer relationships. I argue that the discourses of the fan-producers must be understood as informed by their fan histories, the history of the BBC as a conflicted public service broadcaster, the context of branding and the historically influenced constructed ideas of authorship and authority. Examining these contexts will allow for a more nuanced and sophisticated understanding of media producers, and allow fan studies to begin moving away from restrictive binary ideas of resistance or co-option. By bringing together the discourses of branding, the showrunner and the fan-producer, I argue that they serve to illustrate the conflict and position-taking that occurs between not only the dominant and subordinate ends of the fields of cultural production, but always between heteronomous and autonomous poles. It will also become clear that the influences of other areas of culture, industry and society, have, and have always had, a significant impact on the positions and values that are fought over. To this end, I will now begin my literature survey, and examine the discourses of resistance and oppression that have long been associated with fandom.

-Chapter One-
Literature Survey:
The Fan/Producer Dichotomy &
Re-evaluating Binary Ideas within Fan Studies

Throughout the last two decades there has been an ever-increasing interest in the study of fandom, particularly cult television fandom, and the activities in which fans indulge. With this increased interest comes an increasing awareness of the problems, gaps and inconsistencies in previous attempts at theorising fandom and the limitations imposed by the specific agendas of individual writers. This chapter will act as a literature survey and examine the earlier writings on fandom, how these are being developed and the criticisms of certain approaches. My analysis will include examining the first wave of fandom studies conducted by John Fiske, Henry Jenkins and others, in particular Jenkins's writings on "textual poachers" and his placement of fans as subversive. I will show this to be a restrictive view on fandom, and I will illustrate the flaws inherent in the way Jenkins approaches fan culture theory, emphasising a less binary approach to fans and producers of cult texts. I will support this approach with an examination of the cultural theory born out of a second wave of the study of fandom, and I will explore alternative avenues of understanding fan activity. I will examine the false binaries used in exploring fandom and directly address current writings on the subject, such as the positioning of fans and producers within the field of cultural production, and what has been termed the third wave of fan studies (Gray, Sandvoss & Harrington, 2007). This will lead into examining current theories surrounding fan-producers, and the revived series of Doctor Who. The aim of this chapter is to analyse current ideas in the field, establish weaknesses and strengths within these debates and provide a theoretical basis to the discussions throughout the rest of this dissertation. It is important to establish these arguments and the theory involved so as to clearly define the space in which my discussion of fan-producers will take place. The remaining chapters making up the opening section of this thesis will detail my methodology in approaching this research, and then add additional context by exploring the historical development of the concept of the author figure and their perceived authority.

Poaching, Opposition and the Celebration of Fandom.

One of the definitive texts in the study of fandom was Henry Jenkins's <u>Textual</u> <u>Poachers</u> (1992), published as part of the first wave of fan studies. Jenkins argued for an understanding of fans as active and creative individuals who could claim and transform texts beyond the control of their original producers. Jenkins's central notion is that "fans possess not simply borrowed remnants snatched from mass culture, but their own culture built from the semiotic raw materials the media provides" (H. Jenkins, 1992, p.49). He makes some important observations on how the media portrayed fans in a negative, almost threatening, light and deconstructs this to examine fandom as a cultural group. Jenkins would later suggest that in media representations, as opposed to an academic perspective, "fan activities are still defined primarily through relations of consumption and spectatorship rather than production and participation" (Tulloch & Jenkins, 1995, p.4). There has been a tendency to view the positioning of fans and producers as opposing forces, whereby the two positions struggle with each other over their authority and power to control and make use of a text, and also clearly sets the agenda of looking at and celebrating the creativity of fans. Jenkins predominantly uses de Certeau, but also addresses Pierre Bourdieu, in examining how fans construct meaning from a text and use their knowledge of characters and events to imagine an entire world beyond the original television show presented. De Certeau suggests that there exist institutions that are "strategic", in opposition to non-producers whom he labels as "tactical": terminology that seems to emphasise the war-like struggle he perceives between the groups (1984, p.xix). Producers, for de Certeau, are dominant and have social, economic and cultural authority, and whilst fans would use tactics to subvert, he suggests that "a tactic insinuates itself into the other's place, fragmentarily, without taking it over in its entirety" (1984, p.xix). Jenkins uses de Certeau and his own models of "textual poaching" in exploring fandom, most importantly the emphasis of conflict and resistance. De Certeau's notion of "reading as poaching" is resistant to two ideas, that "to read is to receive [the text] from someone else without putting one's own mark on it, without remaking it" (1984, p.169) and the use of books by privileged readers which "constitutes it as a secret of which they are the "true" interpreters" (1984, p.171). He suggests that the positioning of reading as inferior to the position of writing (producing) stems from earlier eras where institutions such as the Church controlled knowledge and meaning through strict interpretations of religious writings, which only few had the

literate skills required to access[1]. De Certeau suggests that this "social hierarchization seeks to make the reader conform to the "information" distributed by an elite" (1984, p.172) and that the same practices are found in contemporary media industries and areas of power. It is these practices that obscure the true nature of readers as nomads who "move across lands belonging to someone else... poaching their way across fields they did not write" (1984, p.174). Jenkins's own elaboration of textual poaching, and its emphasis on fans as resisting the dominant forces of production, clearly finds its origins in the politicised cultural conflicts of de Certeau. He suggests that "what is significant about fans in relation to de Certeau's model is that they constitute a particularly active and vocal community of consumers whose activities direct attention onto this process of cultural appropriation" (H. Jenkins, 1992, p.27). Jenkins's overall conception of fans is of a creative, productive group that employs tactics of appropriation with which they can produce their own materials, including the prospect for limited economic returns within their fandom. De Certeau's framework is thus elaborated on by Jenkins, who suggests that fans, rather than having "temporary and transient" modes of readings, are able to construct new cultures, ideas and productions extrapolated from the original object of fandom.

Jenkins's work, however, is clearly not without flaws, flaws that we find repeated in both his, and others', later writings, and which serve to both underestimate fandom and to exaggerate its position as a force of political or cultural resistance. Jenkins tends to position fan culture as a unified movement, predominantly in opposition to producers and studios, those who own the copyrighted materials that they 'poach', and it is this oppositional stance on fandom that is perhaps the most tenuous. He claims that "fan culture finds that utopian dimension within popular culture a site for constructing an alternative culture" (H. Jenkins, 1992, p.282). This alternative culture, whilst not permanent, and separated from the day to day reality of work and education, is nevertheless viewed by Jenkins as its own democratic society. Jenkins refers to fandom as a form of utopian society, rejecting any "self-interested and uncharitable… greedy and rude" fans on the basis that the fan community would also reject these members as their behaviour would be "a violation of the social contract that binds fans together and often becomes the focus of collective outrage" (H. Jenkins, 1992, p.282). This in itself is a far cry from the petty squabbling, aggressive debating and often fragmented groups found within contemporary fandom, and highlighted in the second wave of fan studies discussed

---

[1]　　This is discussed in more detail in Chapter Four.

further on. Jenkins avoids the issue of conflict within fandom with a weak gesture towards the vague notion of "collective outrage", failing to explore the wider implications of a disunited and factional form of fandom. This leaves Jenkins's work open to the accusation of being overly celebratory of fandom, emphasising the positive and progressive elements to forward his agenda of constructing a moral dualism, viewing the cultural world in clear areas of 'good' and 'bad' (Hills, 2002, p.8). The 'bad', in this instance, is the non-fan, whom Jenkins sees as perpetuating the negative stereotypes associated with fandom, such as the social reject or psychologically damaged obsessive stalker, a psychoanalytical approach which Jenkins appears opposed to.

The pathological criticism of fandom is an approach that the first wave of fan studies were generally opposed to, those addressing the topic including Jenkins, Fiske, Camille Bacon-Smith and Joli Jenson. Jenson argues that this pathologisation of fandom was born out of a social desire to separate 'us' and 'them', the normal and the obsessive. In those early days, Jenson suggests that there was "very little literature that [explored] fandom as a normal, everyday cultural or social phenomenon" (1992, p.13). Rather, fandom was seen "as a risky, even dangerous, compensatory mechanism" in a dissatisfying modern age, and "'normal' fans are constantly in danger of becoming 'obsessive loners' or 'frenzied crowd members'" (1992, p.18). This 'othering' of fans only serves to separate them from 'normal' social culture, whereas it would be more useful to see fans as part of society and explore what that can tell us about contemporary culture. Abercrombie and Longhurst propose a continuum from ordinary consumers to petty producers, which could illustrate this point. They suggest that this continuum would not only account for different levels of fan interaction and productivity but also varied types of fandom, such as Elvis followers or car enthusiasts, and consumers who follow popular programming (1998, pp.121-157). Lincoln Geraghty is critical of this approach, suggesting that it reinforced prejudiced ideas of fans as "consumers working in isolation" and marked them out as immature and underdeveloped (2014, pp.18-19). Jenkins's approach is less encompassing and focuses more on the progressive potential within fandom itself, as an independent culture, separated from the masses who are merely spectators. Jenkins says "fans have found the very forces that transform many Americans into spectators to provide the resources for creating a more participatory culture" (H. Jenkins, 1992, p.284). This helps move fandom away from the pathologised vision that has dominated mainstream perceptions and, through the notion of textual poaching, positions them as a progressive, political force for resistance. Jenkins sees fans as consumers who are

also productive, becoming producers themselves through empowering activities that also serve as a form of resistance against the mass media producers.

Bacon-Smith's approach to fandom has much in common with Jenkins's, but displays some key fundamental differences that has led Jenkins to criticise aspects of her work. As with Jenkins, Bacon-Smith's work displays an overall appreciation and celebration of fandom with, in her early work, a particular focus on female fan fiction writers. She uses an ethnographic approach to become involved in fan communities, charting her journey of becoming involved in fan activity, including writing fiction herself, and exploring the relationships of those involved, with the text, each other and the wider 'real' world. The rhetoric of resistance can still be found in her work; fandom is said to have "an almost limitless supply of ingenuity and a capacity to maintain secrecy that again can only be compared to the poetry movement in Russia" (Bacon-Smith, 1992, p.5). The underground, hidden nature of the fandom she studies is reiterated time and again, along with the notion that individuals are 'initiated' into the community by seasoned fans. She identifies that fandom "has developed an extensive mentor-apprentice system for training newcomers in the structures and customs of the community, including the codes and aesthetics of fan fiction, and a particular aesthetic of television viewing" (1992, p.81). Fans can also create physical spaces, to different extents, through the display of materials related to their fandom; "in these spaces participants feel safe to give free rein to their cultural identities in the fanwriting community" (Bacon-Smith, 1992, p.77). Fan communities are a place where women, Bacon-Smith argues, can build their own culture together, free of outside (masculine) influence, using materials created for mass audiences. She suggests that her study of fandom reveals "the *joy* of creating a new kind of community that fulfils women's needs to reach out and be heard" and her overall approach appears to celebrate the potential freedom for women rather than the overt political resistance implied by Jenkins (Bacon-Smith, 1992, p.6). Bacon-Smith has addressed fandom's conflict with itself, especially when considering the area of slash fiction writing, although she appears to give the subject only a cursory examination. She recognises that within the community, fans can disagree on the value of slash and that "some fans are reverently opposed to the homoerotic material on religious or moral grounds" (1992, p.222). She also identifies criticisms on the lack of strong female characters, both in homoerotic slash and stories featuring females. However, her argument focuses on the progressive potential for women within fandom, and the use of slash fiction, which Jenkins sees in a less positive light. Bacon-Smith suggests that

Jenkins's research fails to see the bigger picture, only focusing on a small aspect of fandom, and dismissing the slash fiction which features heavily in her study (Bacon-Smith, 1992, pp.282-283). Jenkins himself suggests that "fans themselves are increasingly critical of many of slash's basic conventions" and that slash "represents a negotiation rather than a radical break with the ideological construction of mass culture" (H. Jenkins, 1992, pp.219-220). This is at odds with Bacon-Smith's argument which ultimately sees women as creating their own communities and identities within fandom, and refusing to adapt to a masculine culture's perception of how they should behave and act. Whilst this approach does articulate a form of political resistance along gender lines, it is not a form that visibly resists or subverts the mainstream society, but rather hides and works to build a hidden alternative culture. Jenkins has been further critical of this, claiming it sees a return to the pathologising of fans by explaining their behaviour through a narrative of "pain and victimisation". He suggests that fandom "constitutes a site of feminine strength, rather than weakness, as women confront and master cultural materials and learn to tell their own stories, both privately and collectively, through their poached materials" (H. Jenkins, 1995, p.203). Jenkins suggests that Bacon-Smith isolates the women in her study from wider feminist issues and fails to separate the experiences of women fans from women's overall social history. Cornel Sandvoss has considered the discrepancies between Jenkins's and Bacon-Smith's approaches, suggesting that if "fandom is based primarily on forms of exceptional reading rather than a shared symbolic basis, levels of resistance displayed in fandom are likely to vary between different fan groups" (Sandvoss, 2005, p.27). He considers the different social and cultural backgrounds of their respective objects of study, and proposes that "an important line of distinction in fandom thus emerges along demographic lines" to account for these discrepancies (Sandvoss, 2005, p.28). This potential solution does, of course, open up a whole new area of problematic ideas, which I will address further in this chapter. It is clear that neither Jenkins nor Bacon-Smith can fully account for how fandom interacts with its chosen text, with both lacking a wider appreciation for the complexities of fan interactions.

Fandom, Cultures and the Fields of Cultural Production.
The central binary that Jenkins discusses is one between the celebrated, creative fandom, and the strategic producers, production companies and media giants. These forces of oppression represent the powerful forces of production that exist at the top of a cultural hierarchy and produce many of the texts that fandoms are organised around. Jenkins concludes that "fans have found the very forces that

reinforce patriarchal authority to contain tools by which to critique that authority" (H. Jenkins, 1992, p.184). Here, Jenkins is addressing the authority that appears inherent within existing cultural hierarchies, whereby those in positions of power have control over what is accepted as valued cultural products. Of particular interest is the idea that the cultural bourgeoisie value a critical distance from an object, a concept which is untenable with regards to fans and their object of fandom. Jenkins makes use of Pierre Bourdieu in discussing this, and Bourdieu also plays a critical role in the work of John Fiske. Fiske constructed some of the earliest theories surrounding fandom that informed much of the first wave, including Jenkins's views of the oppositional power of fandom. In forming an understanding of where power and authority is positioned in culture, Fiske turns to Bourdieu's conception of "the habitus", and the fields of cultural production. The habitus is formed through an individual's interaction with their environment, between themselves and the social world, and it can be the basis for individual tastes and judgements. For Fiske, "a habitus involves not only the cultural dimension of taste, discrimination, and attitude towards the cultural objects or events, but also the social dimension of economics (and education) upon which those tastes are mapped" (1992, p.45). An individual's position within a field and their own concepts of taste all work towards forming their personal judgements of value, and in terms of fandom, the particular value of any given fan-produced object. According to Richard Jenkins, Bourdieu identifies a field as "a social arena within which struggles or manoeuvres take place over specific resources or stakes and access to them" (R. Jenkins, 1992, p.84). The field of cultural production is a space occupied by consumers, fans, producers, and artists; it is where we find judgements of taste and value relating to culture and cultural products. Bourdieu sees culture as a form of economy, with cultural wealth distributed unequally amongst those in the field, creating areas of privilege and lack. The bourgeois upper classes work to naturalise their tastes and attitudes towards culture through education and social systems, creating the implication that aesthetic distance and distinguished tastes are naturally occurring rather than, as Bourdieu suggests, learnt from the social field. Fiske claims that "this cultural system promotes and privileges certain cultural tastes and competences, particularly through the education system... which taken together constitute a 'high' culture". He terms this as "official culture" and suggests that it "distinguishes between those who possess it, and those who do not", thus mapping an individual's social position (Fiske, 1992, p.31). Bourdieu has been used by those who would argue that there is an active, resistant audience to identify distinctions between those with and without power.

Fiske states that Bourdieu "reveals the attempt of the dominant classes to control culture for their own interests as effectively as they control the circulation of wealth" but suggests that "meanings and pleasures are much harder to possess exclusively and much harder to control", setting up the location for Jenkins's notions of resistance against oppressive producers (Fiske, 1987, p.18). This is to say, those in the dominant positions on the field of cultural production control judgements of value towards cultural products but they cannot prevent fans from using 'low culture' in more valued ways. This interpretation of Bourdieu sees the cultural elite, which can include both the bourgeois and also the wealthy industry producers who control much of our culture, as controlling; fandom as a force for resistance. Bourdieu also outlines the struggles for position amongst the cultural elite, and David Hesmondhalgh suggests that fields of cultural production are "structured by sets of possible positions within them" and "fields are, to a large extent, according to Bourdieu's scheme, constituted precisely by struggles over these positions, which often take the form of a battle between established producers, institutions and styles, and heretical newcomers" (Hesmondhalgh, 2006, pp.215-216). Fiske has criticised Bourdieu's model precisely because, whilst the dominant culture is divided up and examined, he fails to "accord the culture of the subordinate the same sophisticated analysis" (Fiske, 1992, p.32). Fiske has argued that audiences are greatly varied and that television's popularity is due to it being "capable of offering such a variety of pleasures to such a heterogeneity of viewers" (1987, p.19). However, he makes use of specific aspects of Bourdieu's model in his approach to fandom and, along with Jenkins, he positions fans as a resistant force against the dominant forces in the field of cultural production.

Cultural Capital.
Fiske has also explored Bourdieu's notion of cultural capital and how fans use this to construct and circulate values and meanings within their own social groups (1987, p.80). Cultural capital, as we have seen, is integral to the negotiation of the fields of cultural production, and informs an individual's social position. Fiske suggests that fans produce "a fan culture with its own systems of production and distribution that forms... a 'shadow cultural economy' that lies outside that of the cultural industries yet shares features with them which more normal popular culture lacks" (1992, p.30). Bacon-Smith's study highlighted the potentially hidden, secretive nature of these systems, and how fandom circulates its materials in a form of underground, between fellow fans, with potential for feedback and kudos. Fiske proposes that fandom "offers ways of filling cultural lack and provides the

social prestige and self-esteem that go with cultural capital" (1992, p.33). It has been argued that Bourdieu treats "proletariat culture" as homogeneous, thus "he does not allow that there are forms of popular cultural capital produced outside and often against official cultural capital" (1992, p.32). Therefore, Fiske sees fandom as a site where fans can accrue their own form of cultural capital, and he suggests that they can form discriminations towards popular cultural products. This "popular cultural capital" is central to Fiske's positioning of fans as resistant, as it rejects dominant aesthetic judgements of taste and, in his view, asserts the subordinates' subcultural values in opposition to dominant ones. He argues that "pleasure for the subordinate is produced by the assertion of one's social identity in resistance to, in independence of, or in negotiation with, the structure of domination" (Fiske, 1987, p.19). Fans are able to create their own meanings and interpretations and acquire popular cultural capital; Fiske sees fans as highly participatory, not just producing texts but interacting with existing ones in a variety of ways. He suggests that "fandom typically lacks the deference to the artist and text that characterises the bourgeois habitus", they lack aesthetic distance, and have a propitiatory approach to the object of fandom (Fiske, 1992, p.40). Through reading, re-writing and interpreting the texts, fans continue to take control of the text, and through this, generate their own culture and capital. Fiske's argument can be summarised thus: people are not cultural dopes, at the mercy of either text or producer, but active producers in their own right, creating their own meanings and pleasures. Resistance is central to understanding popularity in an unequal society, and resistances are a source of power themselves. Dominant ideology attempts to create a mass, controlled audience, whilst resistance comes from diverse social groups and interests. Fantasies embody the power of the subordinate and act as a response to the dominant, offering opportunity to wield power and make meaning (Fiske, 1987, pp.316-319). Fiske states that "popular cultural capital consists of the meanings and pleasures available to the subordinate to express and promote their interests" (1987, p.314). Popular cultural capital is central to Fiske's interpretation of fandom as a form of resistance; he interprets the actions of fans, in using texts and acquiring this capital, as a form of folk culture.

Fandom can be seen as a creative community that constructs its own culture and meanings by appropriating a given text and using it to also produce its own materials, although these technically have no official status and are in conflict with both media representations of them and the corporations that own the characters. Fiske positions the fans' use of the text as comparable to folk lore and oral

traditions of communication which, he suggests, have historically been used as a powerful force of control. That is, the repression or policing of oral communication by a dominant force, usually for political reasons, which prevents the empowerment of a smaller or weaker culture. He believes that fans 'gossip,' talk and engage with texts in a manner akin to an oral folk lore; a freedom of use and speech of materials produced by the media industries. Fiske suggests that "gossip works actively in two ways: it constructs audience-driven meanings and it constructs audience communities within which those meanings circulate" (1987, p.80). Fiske suggests that television shows, as texts, are 'open', suggesting wider diegetic worlds, which fan audiences engage with, and use as a form of folk culture, independent of the copyright owners. He argues that "the segmented, fractured nature of television, its producerly texts, and its active audiences, come together to oppose any forces of closure within its narrative structures" (Fiske, 1987, p.147). This is a political fight, between the 'folk' and the capitalists, between those who seek to use culture freely and those who seek to control it, a rhetoric shared with Jenkins. Jenkins has not only favoured the notion of a politicised conflict, a continuing struggle between dominant, capitalist corporations and the seemingly independent and creative fandom, but he appears to suggest that any areas of collision between the two sides will result in, at the very least, elements of fandom being appropriated by the producers. Jenkins has clarified his position in his lamenting of the privatisation of culture and his hope that cyberspace will act to alter the balance of power between "media producers and media consumers", again positioning the two sides as opposing forces. He suggests that this struggle may result in "a more powerful cultural industry which co-opts fan politics and defuses its threat to corporate power" and cites potential legal battles and cease-and-desist orders from companies towards fan productions (Jenkins, 1998). Both Jenkins and Fiske, then, continue to speak in a rhetoric of conflict, between a more natural folk community and the monolithic corporations based on capitalist greed which fear the grass-root appropriations by fandom and seek to co-opt them. According to Sandvoss:

> their endeavour was not only the analytic representation and theorisation of fandom, but also a form of political representation: a statement against the double standards of cultural judgement and the bourgeois fear of popular culture; a statement in favour of fan sensibilities which gave a voice to otherwise marginalised groups. (2005, p.3)

This approach to fan studies, and view of fandom as resistant, persists in their later writings, and Jenkins has addressed how the development of mass communication cultures has affected the fan communities.

Convergence Culture.

Jenkins more recently argues for an understanding of the 'convergence culture' that we are currently living in, where numerous different technologies are used to access media. He makes a clear distinction between a medium, such as music, and the technology that conveys that medium, such as CD Players, MP3 Players, mobile phones, internet downloads, and so on. He argues that "delivery technologies become obsolete and get replaced; media, on the other hand, evolve" (H. Jenkins, 1998, p.13). This is a shift in the way consumers view and relate to their media, using different technologies in different locations for both different and similar reasons. The social networking website Facebook can be accessed and checked via computers, laptops, mobile phones and even games consoles, allowing individuals to keep in constant forms of contact with friends and with an individual's fandom. It is within this convergence culture that Jenkins suggests new cultural shifts are occurring, which involve "both a change in the way media is produced and a change in the way media is consumed" (1998, p.16). He argues that convergence allows a greater empowerment for consumers, but alongside a growing strength for multinational media conglomerates.

> Media producers are responding to these newly empowered consumers in contradictory ways, sometimes encouraging change, sometimes resisting what they see as renegade behaviour. And consumers, in turn, are perplexed by what they see as mixed signals about how much and what kinds of participation they can enjoy. (Jenkins, 1998, p.19)

Whilst Jenkins is clearly engaging with the interactions that occur between producers and consumers, he does so only within the same binary framework as before. Convergence, for Jenkins, is "both a top-down corporate-driven process and a bottom-up consumer-driven process. Corporate convergence coexists with grassroots convergence" (1998, p.18). What seems clear is that this approach implies starting positions in dynamically opposed positions; convergence acting as the area where these two forces conflict and struggle. What this approach leaves little room for are the more ambiguous positions, such as those inhabited by the fan-producers, and use of 'grassroots' media environments by producers, not for 'revenue opportunities', but for interaction on equal terms with fandom. Whilst I am not suggesting that there is equality when a producer visits a fan forum, a trend discussed in Chapter Nine, it is possible for there to be more complicated layers of interaction occurring than those set out by Jenkins. In fact, he questions his own analogy of fandom and fan productivity being akin to 'folk culture' on the somewhat bizarre grounds that "in a folk culture, there is no *clear* division between producers and consumers" (H. Jenkins, 1998, p.136, emphasis added). Are we to presume

from this that Jenkins believes that current media culture *does* have clear divisions between producers and consumers? This is not the case, as highlighted by numerous writers such as Alan McKee, Sarah Gwenllian-Jones or Sarah Thornton. Jenkins does recognise that "consumers are applying skills learned as fans and gamers to work, education, and politics", but again fails to engage with the idea of that 'work' potentially being within the media industry itself (H. Jenkins, 1998, p.22). Equally, he cites the example of a S*tar Wars* fan film-maker finding success within Hollywood following the popularity of his independent work (H. Jenkins, 1998, p.136). How can there be, then, any clear distinctions between producer and consumer positions, perhaps unless Jenkins believes this is simply a case of fans being co-opted by studios, and thus a shifting from one position to another? It seems unhelpful, given his otherwise detailed accounts of fandom, that Jenkins refuses to more fully engage with the more complex, almost cyclical, nature of consumer and producer interactions.

I have discussed how Jenkins tends to position fandom in a positive, almost utopian light, but it is important to realise that, equally, he tends to position the media producers as monolithic organisations, acting as a united, authoritative whole. This approach, the constructing of two opposing sides, informs much of the first wave of fandom, and fans as oppositional is found in the works of Jenkins, Bacon-Smith, Fiske, Tulloch and others. These two sides together create a site of opposition and resistance but, as the second wave of fan studies highlight, the reality is more complicated than these early works may suggest. So far I have worked to highlight the key issues that informed early explorations of fandom, the contemporary social climate and attitudes that influenced those discussions and how further developments in the field have still been tainted with the same binary oppositions. The second wave of fan studies provided some vital re-evaluation of these early works, and asked key questions about the degree of fan potential for resistance, the importance of the academics own fan positioning and the inherent conflicts and hierarchies within fandom itself and it to these approaches that I will now turn my attention.

Policing the Boundaries of Fandom.
So far I have endeavoured to negotiate the concepts and debates surrounding the first wave of fan studies, emphasising the theoretical concepts and models that informed these early debates and highlighting the political emphasis of this period of analysis. What I shall now engage with more fully is the criticism and reactions to

these early debates, as well as exploring the relative merits and benefits of the first wave. The next stage of fan studies was characterised by a move away from the simplistic concept of fandom as political resistance, looking at the flaws in fandom itself, the inner conflicts and a reassessment of fans' relationships with the media producers they supposedly resisted.

In their discussions on fandom, Jenkins and Bacon-Smith both emphasise its position as an alternative culture, in some ways distinct from the mainstream. As we have seen, Jenkins's rhetoric is of a utopian community whilst Bacon-Smith focuses on fandom as a place for women to escape to. Jenkins also focuses on the pathologising of fans and the stereotypes that are reiterated across media outlets, arguing "these representations won widespread public acceptance" (H. Jenkins, 1992, p.12). What he does not fully consider is how fan cultures themselves can work to create representations of the mainstream, of mass audiences, and that these distinctions are equally used to make judgements and criticisms both externally and within a subculture itself. Sarah Thornton's study (1995) on club culture provides an invaluable insight into music subcultures that can easily be transposed onto cult media fandom. Thornton addresses the apparent separation between 'mainstream' and 'cult', suggesting that these are constructed distinctions, usually articulated from within the subcultures themselves. She suggests that:

> [this] contrast between 'us' and the 'mainstream' is more directly related to the process of envisioning social worlds and discriminating between social groups. Its veiled elitism and separatism enlist and reaffirm binary oppositions such as the alternative and the straight, the diverse and homogeneous, the radical and the conformist, the distinguished and the common. (Thornton, 1995, p.5)

To elaborate, this approach suggests that the 'mainstream' is a concept created within the subculture itself in order to distinguish itself; a subculture can discriminate against those who 'don't fit in' and can define itself in opposition to a fantasised 'other'. Thornton suggests that these "inconsistent fantasies of the mainstream are rampant in subcultural studies" (1995, p.93). That is to say, cultural studies found it particularly easy to interpret fan communities as resistant, and a cause to celebrate as a utopian or socialist movement, when they could "invoke the chimera of a negative mainstream" (Thornton, 1995, p.93). Rather than being a triumph for Marxist philosophy, Thornton's research suggests that subcultural ideologies "are almost as *anti-mass culture* as the discourses of the art world", both seeing the mainstream masses as derivative and superficial (1995, p.5). The art world, representative of bourgeois culture, is thus ideologically aligned with the very subcultures that they are often positioned in opposition against. What is also

problematic here is the creation of binaries and distinctions, particularly between a general consumer and a fan, something Abercombie and Longhurst address in their previously mentioned continuum (1998). Geraghty suggests that 'nerd' figures, fans and the 'mainstream' are far more integrated in contemporary culture, with fandom being "more mainstream than ever... idiosyncratic is now the norm" (2014, p.19). Geraghty also suggests that there is an increasing variety of representations of fans, although the cultural stereotype of the nerd continues to circulate, notably in shows such as The Big Bang Theory (2014, pp.13-31). Geraghty questions the way media defines and represents fandom, and fans, whilst Thornton's work has questioned assumptions of accuracy in how a subcultural group defines itself, and emphasises that these cultures will use discourses related to high culture to distinguish itself. She suggests:

> When investigating social structures, it is impossible to avoid entanglement in a web of ideologies and value judgements" and academics have "relied on binary oppositions typically generated by *us-versus-them* social maps and combined a loaded colloquialism like the 'mainstream' with academic arguments, ultimately depicting 'mainstream' youth culture as an outpost of either 'mass' or 'dominant' culture." (Thornton, 1995, p.92)

It is important to be careful around the use of terms such as 'mainstream' and 'masses' just as it is important to appreciate a subculture's own desire to see itself as important. Indeed, Jenkins's work may have been popular amongst fan cultures as it not only works to validate them but also validates their own sense of importance and even superiority over a mainstream audience. Sara Gwenllian-Jones rightly points out that:

> many fans have seized upon and perpetuated this ennobling of their activities... such interpretations are a preferable alternative to the mainstream's stigmatisation... but the fact that many fans prefer to see themselves as representatives of a radical cultural underground doesn't make this description uniformly accurate. (2003, p.164)

It is always important to keep in mind that the desire to be distinct within fandom directly relates to what fans will accept as 'truth', and how fans will seek to define the wider culture they oppose. This rejection of the 'mainstream' is a key aspect that leads to the constructing of hierarchies within fandom, the policing of boundaries and the notion of the 'true fan'.

Conflicted Fandom.

Problematising the binary ways of thinking about fandom is a necessity as they represent a more idealised, politically motivated interpretation of fan interactions which fail to appreciate not only the fractures and conflicts within fandom but also

the variant class-status of this apparently resistant force. Fandom is not a utopian, united whole and, whilst Jenkins's assertions that fandom may rally against those with self-interest is certainly something that can and does happen, it is far from being a consistent course of action. The reality is that fandom can often be greatly fractured, rife with infighting and often divided into not only opposing groups with opposing opinions but even entire opposing communities, including rivalries between members of separate fan internet forums. Mark Jancovich and Nathan Hunt argue that "the cult fandom oppositional community presented by some writers is actually ridden with factional animosity; the need to maintain a clear sense of distinction between the authentic insider and inauthentic outsider breeds hostility and contempt not only for the more obvious outsiders but also for other fans" (2004, p.28). As I have previously highlighted, Bacon-Smith's study (1992) suggests fandom to be secretive, and wary of people coming new into the community. However, conflicts within fandom go further than this, encompassing bitter internet arguments, website rivalries, and accusations that other community members are not 'true fans'. As quoted by Derek Johnson, Jenkins has admitted that his early work deflected away from these conflicts, in order to "distance fandom from perceptions of it as immature, deviant, and ultimately immaterial to academic study" (Johnson, 2007, p.285). Bacon-Smith has also discussed the flame wars that occurred on early use-net groups, publicly available discussion forums where fans could debate, at times violently, issues surrounding their object of fandom. She suggests that "the seeds of the conflict existed in the nature of human beings behaving as they do, asserting claims for status and struggling to define the rules of behaviour for a private discourse taking place before an unknown public" (Bacon-Smith, 2000, p.83). However, this appears to resolve much of the matter for Bacon-Smith and she seems content to see the intense fighting as a naturally occurring aspect of any community, which can even serve to help a group survive. She claims that:

> you are looking less as a community, perhaps, and more at a metaphorical family, a term used in a positive sense by many participants... more obviously true when its members are fighting... than when they are happy with each other. (Bacon-Smith, 2000, p.83)

This seems an all-too-easy way to move past these conflicts and retain an overall picture of unity within fandom and does not convince. Johnson's 2007 study of <u>Buffy the Vampire Slayer</u> fandom sufficiently illustrates how fans' textual analysis can lead to bitter arguments and the questioning of other fans' credentials as a "genuine fan". He suggests that "discursive attempts to retrospectively define

golden ages and all-time lows aggravate this fragmentation of antagonistic fan communities" (Johnson, 2007, p.289). The source of enjoyment that many fans find in the community, the discussions and shared experience of a text and fictional world, can then also be the source of conflict when fans find their opinions differ in key areas. Johnson rightly rejects the notion that conflicts are brief moments within an otherwise unified community and opens up the discussion to incorporate a wider array of issues and ideas. His central argument combines fan antagonisms with the interactions between both fans and text and fans and producers:

> Practices of cult television fandom [should] be considered in terms of "fan-tagonism" - ongoing, competitive struggles between both internal factions and external institutions to discursively codify the fan-text-producer relationship according to their respective interests. (Johnson, 2007, p.287)

Johnson constructs the factional conflicts within fandom as central to their practices, and he also addresses the potential external factors that can affect these relationships. Matt Hills addresses the way that fandom may react in different ways to those unknown to the community when he discusses internet 'lurkers': members of forums and communities who read and follow threads but rarely, if ever, actively contribute. Hills suggests that "lurkers may be discursively constructed and fantasised as parasitic, as invasive, as lacking motivation or the ability to engage, or they may be simultaneously welcomed as a form of friendly readership" (2002, p.173). Fans may, as Thornton illustrates, resent a growth in the community, seeing the object of fandom as losing its exclusivity or 'selling out', again distinguishing between the authentic and inauthentic fan. This can, theoretically, divide a fandom if, for instance, there is a sizeable group with differing opinions. Rather than dissenters being cast out or a majority of fans chasing off others, larger divides can result in large 'flame wars' as both groups of fans argue to establish their point of view as the 'accepted' one. Johnson accurately points out that in his study of Buffy fandom, "for both sides, "true fan" status necessitated appreciation of one aesthetic, one prescribed evaluative relationship to the text" (2007, p.290). Milly Williamson has also examined the 'fan versus fan' conflict in relation to Anne Rice fandom, also evidencing the break out of "flame wars" (2005, p.127). This factional infighting, then, is often integrated with politics of power and authority within a fan community, and the different power relations that can be found between fans depending on their individual positions, influenced by cultural, social and economic factors.

Fans not only police borders of their fandom but also use their cultural capital as a weapon for asserting power and authority, something that Jancovich and Hunt

suggest fandom has appropriated from the mainstream cultural field. They claim that "cult fandom opposes itself to the easy and transparent readings that distinguish popular taste and draws on the terms and strategies of legitimate culture" (Jancovich and Hunt, 2004, p.28). Sconce's 1995 exploration of para-cinema fans argues that the community is presenting "a direct challenge to the values of aesthete film culture" but he also identifies how contemporary academia was revealing similarities of opinion to these supposedly resistant audiences. Jancovich has accounted for this by suggesting that fan and academic discourses have a shared history, both emerging from "art cinemas, college film societies and repertory theatres of the post-war period, and hence employ similar discourses and reading strategies (2002, p.308). He criticises Sconce's approach for failing to "investigate the contradictory and problematic nature of this concept" and suggests the "shared opposition" of both groups is necessary "because it presents them as standing in clear distinction to a conformist mass of viewers" (Jancovich, 2002, pp.309-310). Thus, fans and academics alike use similar rhetoric and approaches to distinguish between a valued cultural product and mainstream tastes, reinforcing elitist approaches to distinctions and judgements. Thornton coins the term "subcultural capital" in describing how fans can strengthen their position in fandom, accumulation of this can occur through various means, including the collection of physical objects; "subcultural capital can be *objectified* and *embodied*" (1995, p.11). Subcultural capital is represented by a fan's collections, by their knowledge and ability to make this appear 'second nature', with fans being put off by those who appear to be "trying too hard" (Thornton, 1995, p.12). She claims that "subcultural capital is the linchpin of an alternative hierarchy in which the axes of age, gender, sexuality and race are all employed in order to keep the determinations of class, income and occupation at bay" (Thornton, 1995, p.105). This comment is interesting, and it seems to work within the context of Thornton's own study, but it seems too specific to be applied directly to other areas, such as the study of fandom. This is not to say that subcultural capital may not help in forming an alternative hierarchy. Binaries can be created through this, between the 'mainstream' and the 'alternative' culture, and subcultural capital has the ability to differentiate between fans, fan groups, the 'true' or 'dedicated' fans and the fans that are not as 'knowledgeable'. This subcultural capital, to use Thornton's term for the moment, is a key component in the construction of hierarchies within a fan community, being used to distinguish between the various fan positions. This, then, returns us to Bourdieu and the first re-examination of how his work has been interpreted and used by early fan scholars. Milly Williamson is particularly critical of

the notion of subcultural capital in relation to Bourdieu's schema. She argues that whilst fans may accrue a form of cultural capital it is not subcultural, primarily because "there is no such thing... subcultural capital is simply the cultural capital that is jockeying for position with more traditional and established forms of cultural capital" (Williamson, 2005, p.105). Williamson's argument is that popular taste embraces emotional investment, not because it has a subcultural capital, but because it is *excluded* from the dominant aesthetic and thus access to its cultural capital. The proletariat, then, reject the concept of cultural capital in favour of *content* over *form*, which is generally not the dominant approach found in fandom, thus evidencing the lack of working-class dispositions within media fan cultures which, instead, tend to be predominantly white and middle-class (Williamson, 2005, p.105). Rather than subordinate, fans predominantly come from relatively privileged social positions, potentially from the same backgrounds as the academics discussed previously, further tying together the two aesthetic approaches to judgements of value. Williamson suggests Jenkins's (and others') view of grass roots fandom unhelpfully transforms "the middle-class, white, educated fan into an oppressed rebel, and ignores the elitist distinctions that fans make" (2005, p.102). Fans' use of their cultural capital echoes its use in dominant culture, and it can be used to create elitist conceptions of a text, creating an accepted 'correct' approach to the object of the fandom that closes down alternative readings. Johnson has suggested that fan opinions can form a general consensus across communities which other comments and narratives may be judged against:

> fictionalised fan interest can provisionally install certain evaluations as hegemonic common sense through antagonistic, intracommunity discourse. By constructing a consensual legitimization of a particular season or storyline, the habitus of fan discourse encourages future interpretations to evaluate narrative elements against a privileged meta-text... a supposedly consensual and objective view of the past. (Johnson, 2007, p.291)

As well as serving to construct a fan consensus, this can also play into fan cultural capital, whereby an adherence and an understanding of accepted 'fan lore' is an important part of being recognised in a fan community. Those who refuse to adhere to this, or disagree with the 'received wisdom' of fandom may find their alternative interpretations unwelcome, creating further tensions and conflicts within the fan community. Fans use cultural capital and language and judgements acquired from dominant cultural positions to create distinctions, police the boundaries of fandom and battle for their own positions within the fan hierarchy.

This discussion has illustrated the interwoven relationships between fans, academics, industry producers and consumers within a mass audience and highlights the problematic way fandom can use academic rhetoric to define itself as oppositional and make judgements between 'true' fans and cultural outsiders. Thus the use of overt politics in discussing fandom can come too close to creating a binary conflict between supposed good and bad sides, failing to recognise the more complicated relationships that exist. It should also be understood that fan subcultures and the production industries are not so easy to separate as has been attempted: their very existences can be seen to be entwined; the producers are vital to fans who are often intelligent enough to appreciate this more symbiotic, and less antagonistic, relationship. (Thornton, 1995, p.117). This is not to say there are no conflicts, only that the line of distinction is not as clear-cut as some would argue and that, in attempting to write about fandom, the intricate and often complex relationships involved should never be underestimated or simplified into simplistic, political rhetoric. Some theorists have tended to create binary oppositions that simply do not exist, and celebrate fandom as a cohesive and unified force, failing to recognise the conflicts and divides within it.

Re-evaluating Fan Consumption.
So far we have seen how fandom was conceptualised in early studies, generally using a rhetoric of resistance and empowerment, and how this has then been challenged. Fandom has been revealed to be a community rife with conflict and contradictions, making value judgements, constructing cultural hierarchies and using language borrowed from high art and academia in doing this. The culture of fandom has been defined by both resistance and conflict, but with the loss of a discourse surrounding a unified, political movement, new ways of understanding fans and fan cultures were needed. It has become important to look beyond fandom itself, at the surrounding institutions and industries that create the media product in the first place. How closely tied are fandom and producers, and how do we position media producers in the fields of cultural production? Are fans co-opted by the media industries, and just how much control do the producers have over the finished text?

Until now, these discussions have followed a predominantly binary rhetoric, representative of the way many of these debates appeared to position fandom and producers. In later writings, we find, increasingly, an attempt to move away from these binary notions of resistance and control, although not always successfully.

Sara Gwenllian-Jones suggests that scholarly accounts had assumed "the mutual exclusivity of the culture industry and fan culture, constructing an antithetical relationship in which the former is constituted as unequivocally exploitative and the latter as a species of resistant folk culture" (2003, p.163). For Gwenllian-Jones, fandom is "a profoundly liminal occupation, one that takes place neither within nor outside commercial culture, creative but also derivative, a celebration of consumerism as well as a maverick mode of consumption" (2003, p.164). This is a strong step away from the more simplistic pictures of fandom painted in early writings, and works to begin to illustrate the complicated, and often contradictory, nature of fan consumption and creativity. Fans are, as Gwenllian-Jones rightly points out, consumers, and consumption can play an important role within fan cultures. As previously discussed, Thornton's subcultural capital can be accrued and represented through fan collections, through material often purchased by, and marketed directly towards, fans. Matt Hills suggests that because "their consumption habits can be very highly predicted by the culture industry, and are likely to remain stable", it actually makes them an ideal consumer (2002, p.29). Shop chains such as Forbidden Planet are marketed directly at the cult fandom market, and fans themselves can be implicated in the processes of capitalist industry. Lincoln Geraghty argues that spaces utilised by fans "evolve depending on physical surroundings, assumed and actual audience, and the use of new media technologies" (2014, p.142). Despite the growth in online shopping, Geraghty suggest the physical location where fans can "witness the spectacle of toys, props, books, games and other collectibles is an important part of being a fan that the Internet cannot fully replace" (2014, p.161). Abercrombie and Longhurst (1998) have argued that we live in an increasingly consumerist society, where numerous aspects of culture are commodified, and individuals are constructed as consumers. For objects to be transformed into commodities there needs to be willing consumers, a function that fans eagerly fulfil, and this in turn sees audiences reconstituted as markets (Abercrombie and Longhurst, 1998, pp.96-97). Hills argues that "conventional logic, seeking to construct a sustainable opposition between 'fan' and the 'consumer', falsifies the fan's experience by positioning fan and consumer as separable cultural identities" (2002, p.29). His account of Abercrombie and Longhurst's audience continuum criticises their positioning of "consumers" as a separate, skilfully inferior group in relation to "fans". Whilst they deny that their continuum makes "judgements about the relative worth of these different positions" (Abercrombie and Longhurst, 1998, p.141), the logic of their argument nonetheless suggests that this is not the case and, as Hills emphasises,

"consumers are at the bottom of the pile" (2002, p.29). Fans are consumers themselves, and their object of fandom is not removed from consumerist systems by any potential appropriation. Rather, fans find new uses and values for objects, and can find an increased closeness to their object of fandom through attending commercial spaces such as Comic-Con. Geraghty suggests "within these generic spaces fans are able to reignite their passion for popular culture texts in physical ways that are not typically afforded to them at home" (2014, p.141). The Forbidden Planet chain of stores offer a potential safe, fantasy space for fans but, Geraghty argues, it also "inundates them with products and images that characterises it as a space for industrial marketing practices" (2014, p.155). The store not only represents the breaking down of the false binary between fans and consumers, but also the binary between fandom and the imagined 'mainstream' other. Geraghty notes that whilst "more mainstream and commercial products are pushed to the front, near the door, and the exclusive items are located at the back", the stores tend to be designed so that hierarchies are "flattened out by multiple zones and mixed product displays... indicating the increasing mainstreaming of cult media" (2014, p.157). Some fans, the 'petty-producers' of Abercrombie and Longhurst's continuum, can even generate income through their fan activity, further integrating fandom with the processes of commercial culture. Hills suggests that "fan 'appropriations' of texts or 'resistances' to consumption can always be reclaimed as new instances of exchange value" (2002, p.35). Fan appropriation may, he argues, work to separate a text from its official exchange value, but in doing so, generates a private use-value, but the two will remain entwined. Fans who share a common fandom will also find that certain items, texts, or objects may have a specific value within the community which is significantly more than its wider perceived value outside of fandom. Fans are arguably consumers *par-excellence*, often having disposable income that they spend on official merchandise, and even those that do not may go beyond their means in spending money in pursuit of their fan activities. This is perhaps the maverick fandom of Gwenllian-Jones, consuming in unorthodox ways, but maintaining clear consumerist endeavours. What is important to appreciate is the complexity of fan relationships with the consumer markets, something I have managed to only touch on here. There can be no doubt that fans are consumers of a kind, and they utilise a variety of spaces that have a shared commercial, even mainstream, purpose in addition to appealing directly to fandom. The media industry recognises fans as a potential market, and are increasingly attempting to direct their products towards these audiences. This can, however, lead to further questions as to whether the industry may work to co-opt fandom,

and whether fandom, in light of its consumer status, can truly be seen in any way to resist or have any power within the media culture.

Capitalism, Fandom & Monolithic Industries.

Capitalist society is, of course, geared towards generating profit through commercial endeavours, and media producers are often linked to multinational corporations and conglomerates dedicated to enormous profit-building. How then, does this powerful force of capitalism correlate to the elitist idea of art and value based on aesthetic judgements? Dominant cultural ideology encompasses commercialism, capitalism, the means of media production (to a greater extent) and elitist judgements of aesthetic value based on apparently inherent artistic quality (to a lesser extent). The view of dominant culture itself as monolithic, then, is an error that Milly Williamson argues has been repeatedly articulated due to a misinterpretation of Bourdieu by early fan scholars such as Jenkins. Jenkins and others suggest that fans "operate against a single monolithic dominant taste" (Williamson, 2005, p.99), which Williamson argues is not the case, summarising the reality of the field of cultural production as featuring two dominant sets of values:

> Bourdieu argues that the field of cultural production is dominated by two opposing sets of values which are in constant conflict with each other, and it is this conflict which provides the dynamic of the field. This is not the conflict between bourgeois aesthetics and proletarian aesthetics, but between the commercial bourgeoisie and the cultural elite. (Williamson, 2005, pp.105-106)

The "commercial bourgeoisie" is the more powerful pole, certainly, and controls media production, but the cultural elite, who emphasise art-for-art's-sake and aesthetic value, are still a powerful group within the field, and openly conflict with the former. This division of the previously assumed "monolithic dominant taste" has clear impacts on the ways in which fan studies position fans and fan communities, and notably in how their actions are interpreted as affecting dominant culture. Williamson criticises Jenkins's assertion that 'dominant taste' would in some way fear the undisciplined readings of fandom, firstly because the different sections of bourgeoisie may react in a variety of different ways to fans. More importantly, the elitist elements of dominant culture, the autonomous pole of the field, define themselves and their greater cultural legitimacy in opposition to precisely these overenthusiastic fan readings that Jenkins seeks to position as resistant (Williamson, 2005, p.99). Fan readings, in this case, may merely serve to reinforce current hierarchies and the expectations of the cultural elite. Further to this, both poles, the autonomous and the bourgeois heteronomous, are directly influential upon a fan culture whose values and judgements are informed by the dominant

forces of a field of which fandom is a component (Williamson, 2005, p.109). Williamson applies this approach to her study of the fans of Anne Rice and her vampire novels, highlighting not only the different hierarchies within fandom, but also the struggle between "commercial values and the values of cultural distinction" (2005, p.138). The depiction of Anne Rice fandom is hierarchical, and rife with internal conflict and position-taking, with individuals with stronger connections to the author acting as gatekeepers. This has, Williamson argues, "produced a distinction between 'official' fandom which is intimately associated with Anne Rice and unofficial fandom, which is not" (2005, p.137). Fandom itself is not only fragmented but it blurs distinctions between fan activity and the forces of official production, Anne Rice herself, at times, distancing herself from these to position herself more as a fan. What, then, of the corporations and official industries that these negotiated values are (if original theoretical approaches are to be believed) in conflict with? Just as Williamson highlights how a singular, but not cohesive, fandom can be pulled in different directions, influenced and utilising the different poles within the field, I will argue that so too can the forces of official production be equally divided.

The BBC is the primary corporate interest of this study, as the owner and producer of Doctor Who, and thus takes the role of the dominant power that the series' fandom could be seen to resist. Monolithic readings of official culture can be found both in early fan studies and later readings, as discussed in the next section. Whether fandom is seen as resistant or in some way culturally exploited by commercial industries, the forces of production remain generally united. In an era of globalisation and mass media, this is far from the truth, and even more so in the case of the BBC and Doctor Who's fan-producers. The contemporary BBC, as I shall demonstrate in Chapter Five, is obliged to operate a system of internal competition, where departments within the organisation may bid for separate production contracts. The BBC has many external companies both working on and making programme material, and it has a tiered organisation. Different departments, separate but related companies such as BBC Worldwide, the Director General of the BBC, the creative teams of producers and writers; the industry itself is a potential site of struggle and position-taking. Williamson's criticisms of the application of field theory, therefore, need to be applied, not only to distinguish different organisations and authorities within culture, but also to explore the multifaceted nature of contemporary mass media industries. It is not surprising in some ways that this has been neglected, for two distinct reasons. Firstly, fan

studies, as we have seen, evolved from generally positive interpretations from academics like Jenkins and Bacon-Smith, and thus positioned official production as the enemy. Secondly, as Williamson identifies, Bourdieu himself does not focus on this struggle between dominant fields, instead "he concentrates on the struggles between various dispositions of the cultural elite and says less about the impact on the cultural field of the instability in its core dynamic" (Williamson, 2005, p.109). Rather than a stable structure, the field of cultural production is rife with struggle and position-taking, and where Williamson explores the applications of this in fandom, I argue that it also has relevance in the way we theorise the dominant cultural producers. It is the struggle that allows for the fan-producers to emerge, in part, because rather than existing as monolithic entities to be fought, official industries also feature internal struggles, position-taking and, in the case of the BBC, a conflict between commercial interests and more public service, artistic considerations.

As we have previously seen, fandom repeats the rhetoric of value judgements in constructing their own hierarchies, and fan production itself is not free from the processes and ideologies of capitalism, despite claims towards folk culture. The field of cultural production is also characterised, for both Williamson and Rebecca Williams, by not only a struggle over existing positions but the taking up of new positions which serves to alter the structure of those already available: Williams states that fields "include people who are able to create the value of cultural objects" and suggests that in television, these include not only producers and critics, but academics, audiences and fans (her distinction). She argues that "if fans grant legitimacy and power to cultural objects and producers, they occupy a position within the broadcasting field which has specific expectations" and that tensions between fans and producers may result from not "knowing one's appropriate position within this field; for example, from the discomfort felt by producers when fans do not appear to 'know their place' and challenge the on-screen narrative events" (Williams, 2010, p.281). This is an interesting approach, and television shows have gone on to be successes, spurred on strong fan followings, although such events are of course never as simple as some writers may suggest.[2] Whilst the idea that fans somehow legitimise cultural objects sounds like it should empower fandom, Williams is clear to position the producers as

---

[2]   Bacon-Smith makes the bold claim that <u>Babylon 5</u>'s creator could not have made the show a continuing franchise success "without the determined efforts of fans who recognized the consistently high quality of the product, based on community standards, and sincerely appreciated the effort, and worked hard to keep it on the air" (2000, p.89).

ultimately in control, despite the struggles. Williams claims that "all fields are fields of struggle in which individuals and organisations compete to maintain their positions and the associated power and capital" (2010, p.288). The incorporation of fan positions in the wider struggles of production and consumption makes sense, seeing fan positions in negotiation with producers. However, although Williams engages with the idea of the different positions in the field of cultural production, her stance can appear to see fandom as generally dominated with no genuine potential for resistance or influence.

The work of Thornton and Williamson has helped to shift fan studies away from the idealistic concepts of rebellion against a vague, monolithic opposition, and they also help open up a space for deconstructing these concepts. The fields of cultural production are driven by conflict and position-taking, and just as fandom can now be seen for its internal struggles and vying for power, or authority, so too can the representatives of official culture. My work will draw on existing criticisms that see the cultural industries as monolithic and oppressive and unpick the internal conflicts and differing approaches to authority that can be found. However, the risk becomes that fandom, and individual fans, if moving closer and into official production, could become co-opted, perhaps what some fans might term an example of 'selling out'. It is to these debates that this discussion now turns.

Co-option and Fandom.

The idea of a co-opted fandom sees fans as in some way seduced by the corporate industries who have taken the skills and benefits of a dedicated fan-base in order to further promote their products and generate greater profit. Fan websites may even be given official status, and those who run them, privileged positions, linking fandom and the producers, also increasing their personal status within the fan hierarchy. Williams appears to see fandom as inherently co-opted, a tool of the media industries, where any tensions between the two are ultimately sidelined by the dominance and ownership of the media producers. She argues that although "fans do not merely accept the texts presented to them by media producers" they "rarely have any genuine power over their fan objects" (2010, p.282).

> Despite the apparent democratisation in fan/producer interactions engendered by the Internet, this illusion of reciprocity often conceals an empty relationship that encourage fans to believe that they have an input when actually they have little impact on the TV industry or the texts it produces. (Williams, 2010, p. 282)

Gwenllian-Jones, despite having a more sympathetic approach to fandom and, as we have seen, having identified the consumerist ideals within fan activity,

nevertheless returns to the same binary conflicts. She sees fandom as co-opted and, like Williams, sees fans as vulnerable, "their activities dependent upon the tolerance of the studios" (Gwenllian-Jones, 2003, p.176). Milly Williamson is rightfully critical of this approach, as it focuses only on the heteronomous pole of the field, as other accounts have solely focused on the autonomous, and to suggest that this is true of all fan groups simply "returns us to the notion of the passive audience who are duped by consumer capitalism" (2005, p.115). Fan cultures, as we have seen, can deal in elitist judgements and anti-capitalist rhetoric, as much as they can be "commercial culture's adoring and irreverent offspring" (Gwenllian-Jones, 2003, p.173). An important aspect that Gwenllian-Jones and Williams both address is the interactions and the encouragement that producers show towards fans: it is without a doubt that fandom can be a powerful marketing tool. Producers use public internet forums to engage with fans, judge their reactions, and address fan complaints, differing on whether to refute them or not. Williams suggests that:

> in keeping with their positions as producers within the broadcasting field who must both protect the economic and artistic interests of their cultural products but who must also behave in ways expected by fans, producers/writers often simultaneously encourage *and* deny the impact of fan's opinions and campaigns. (2010, p.282, emphasis in original)

If this is the case, and producers not only encourage fans, but market texts as multimedia, interactive entertainment then, Gwenllian-Jones argues that "fans who use them as such surely should not and cannot be prosecuted for doing so" (2003, p.176). As Williamson suggests, we cannot have fixed ideas of fandom and approach this from one direction; producers may attempt to co-opt fans, texts may be designed to be interactive but this does not mean that *all* fans are dupes or that all fans use the text in the intended way. Producers themselves are emerging out of fandom, which helps to destabilise arguments based on co-option, and demands at least a reassessment of the relationship of fandom and official production.

Fan-producers, Fan Studies & Fan Narcissism.

Matt Hills has written one of the first detailed academic accounts of 21st century Doctor Who, analysing this connection between fandom and the show's producers as well as the distinction between mainstream and cult in relation to the show's successful reinvention. Hills highlights that new Doctor Who is the product of fan-producers, and he is perhaps one of the first to fully engage with the implications of this. Previously, Alan McKee, in discussing the fan-edited official Doctor Who Magazine, has asked:

> Is this fan publishing? But in that case, how can we reconcile that with its capitalist status… how do we explain that a group of fans are creating the primary text that

should, logically, belong only to the faceless and powerless producers? (2004, p.173)

The fan-producers have highlighted his query to a greater extent, making it clear that "the retention of a simple binary between the powerful and the powerless, between the fans and the producers, is a misleading one" which draws emphasis from questioning the different forms of production, both official and unofficial, I'd suggest also including fan opinion and debates (McKee, 2004, p.183). This calls further into question the approach of Williams and Gwenllian-Jones, as we have seen above, and could arguably bring together the fan elitist attitudes of quality television with the commercial interest of corporation owners who employ the fan-producers, although this is a discussion for later chapters. What is important here, is to note the shift from consumer to producer positions, and how this has affected the view of fan cultures. Bacon-Smith, in her exploration of science fiction literature (2000), addresses the notion of the shift between consumption and production, although retaining the tired rhetoric of resistance. She initially states her position, arguing that:

> participants in the science fiction community regularly move from position to position, acting sometimes as consumer, sometimes as producer, sometimes as critic, and sometimes as community builder in the literary world that explodes the boundaries that scholars have put on roles or position-taking... it becomes impossible to say who is immutably powerful, or in what position, in a constantly changing field of cultural production. (Bacon-Smith, 2000, p.3)

However, by her conclusion she seemingly places the power firmly in the consumer camp.

> The readers are in control now, as always, but they lose control over how the genres will *change* if they don't exercise that control quickly enough. The Science Fiction publishing establishment are not helpless either. They must learn to market their best to the mainstream literary establishment, so that their brightest stars will come home to the genre. (2000, p.266, emphasis in original)

Whilst she does concede to some negotiation between the publishing industry and its target audience, the overall thrust of her argument fails to move away from previous problematic exaggerations of fan power. Bacon-Smith states that:

> [Power] rests first and always in the hands of the individual buyer with his six or twelve or twenty dollars in hand, making choices about what he will or will not buy... the industry meets with its readers because it is desperate to predict what that audience will want *next*. (2000, p.265, emphasis in original)

This seems a simplification that does not take into account the undeniable power of marketing which can work to influence consumer decisions and hype the 'next big thing' in whatever medium. Equally, Bacon-Smith continues to draw divisions between the fan consumer and the producers, even as she marks the shift of individuals from fan writing to official publishing. The fan-producers themselves

appear under-explored, although this is changing, and after a decade in production, the new series of Doctor Who is generating an extensive amount of new research.

In the last half a decade, the volume of academic work surrounding Doctor Who appears to have expanded exponentially, bringing in an era of specific "Doctor Who studies", as Matt Hills terms it. Hills elaborates that what exactly this entails is not entirely clear, and that as the franchise has an increasingly transmedia identity, so it attracts academics across different disciplines. Doctor Who studies, Hills suggests, must be "up to the task of exploring so many years of adventures" and "articulate Who with a range of other texts, histories and concepts" (2013, p.4). This is beginning to happen, and different academics have approached the series from numerous angles, and this thesis aims to further supplement and expand these studies. The list of academics engaging in all aspects of Doctor Who is growing all the time, making full use of over fifty years of material. Indeed, such is the degree of material that publisher I.B. Tauris has its own line of Doctor Who-related academic books, released under the umbrella title of '*Who* Watching'. This range of material is especially helpful for obtaining a broader view of the way the BBC operates, the series' position within the organisation, and how its different generations of fans are engaging with it. Thus Doctor Who fandom has now been addressed in terms of fans live-tweeting episodes and conventions (Williams, 2013), fan nostalgia and returning characters (Garner, 2013), female fans and knitting (Cherry, 2013), engaging with a variety of social media tools (Sarachan, 2013), fan vidding (Freund, 2013), fans negotiating the changing lead actor (Cherry, 2014), fan-fiction and fan-produced texts (Britton, 2011), and many more besides. The inescapable figure of the fan-producer can be found throughout these works, so bound up are they in the new series of Doctor Who, from the prominent showrunners Russell T. Davies and Steven Moffat, to the various writers, including literary celebrities such as Neil Gaiman. Will Brooker (2013) identifies how Gaiman negotiates a number of positions and, in turn, is interpreted differently by different fans. Whilst Brooker viewed Gaiman as "a powerful author-figure" with his own "motifs and traits" that he would bring to the series, fan commentators reversed this, "locating Gaiman in a far humbler role as *Doctor Who* fan" and his earlier television series Neverwhere as "essentially *Doctor Who* fanfic" (Brooker, 2013, p.77). Brooker notes that "any writer engaging with *Doctor Who* now enters a conversation with a 50-year heritage" (2013, p.86). A fan-producer would have more awareness of this heritage, and arguably an ability to more fully engage with it, and an audience's awareness of the fan-producer identity can affect their

interpretation of the writer and the resulting episode. Thus, many fans saw Gaiman's episode as "a loving homage from a fan position", but this is certainly not the only possible reading, and emphasises the fluidity of the fan-producer identity (Brooker, 2013, p.77). The figure of the fan-producer, and the increased engagement of many television fandoms with official production, means there are increasing shifts in how fan studies view these activities. Lynn Zubernis's and Katherine Larsen's 2012 work on Supernatural fandom is of particular interest and will be revisited later in this thesis. Their work begins the process of pushing fan studies to address the producers themselves, and they argue that "the creative side is equally curious about fans" and that actors "negotiate their own boundaries with fans and make careful decisions about their constructed personas" (2012, p.15). However, Supernatural, whilst lasting a long time by American television standards, has only a fraction of the fictional and extra-textual history of a series like Doctor Who, and this longevity and legacy of material provides a wealth of information and resources for expansive study.

Current Doctor Who studies, then, has a focus on the use and interpretation of over fifty years of textual material which, as later chapters of this thesis will demonstrate, was often produced outside the BBC and by early fan-producers. As well as the television show, there have been numerous book ranges, comic strips and full cast radio plays, as with those produced by Big Finish Productions, an independent company established by fans of the series. Karen Hellekson reminds us that "fandoms are not monolithic" and yet her argument fails to afford the producers the same status (2013, p.129). Hellekson describes the Big Finish audios as "derivative texts written for a specialist audience" and whilst the latter half is true, the former is problematic. 'Derivative' has negative connotations, which Hellekson also conflates with fanfiction, which is not too surprising as she also states the show has a 'canon, the authoritative official text that aired' (2013, p.219). In the case of Doctor Who, with no singular voice guiding the entire franchise, and with the BBC as a multifaceted and internally divided organisation driven by a public service remit, there is, and cannot be, any definitive 'canon'.[3] The canon debate is further blurred by the on-screen identification of the audio series' companions in the mini episode 'The Night of the Doctor' which gained greater coverage than other short prequels due to it featuring the previously undepicted regeneration of the Eighth Doctor as played by Paul McGann. In the short, written and endorsed by Steven Moffat, a dying Doctor names 'Charlie', 'C'Rizz', 'Lucie' and 'Molly' amongst his friends, all

---

[3]   More on this issue of 'canon' is discussed elsewhere in this thesis.

characters created for and by Big Finish. Richard Wallace also notes how Big Finish producer Nicholas Briggs has not only transitioned from fan-fiction productions to licensed audio drama, but that he also now voices the Daleks and other monsters in the revived series, as well as having an on-screen role in <u>Doctor Who</u> spin-off series <u>Torchwood</u> (Wallace, 2013 p.34). At the time of writing, Big Finish appears to have secured a license to produce further plays based on the new series, with David Tennant's Tenth Doctor and John Hurt's anniversary special 'War Doctor' already lined up to reprise their roles. There is an increasing need, perhaps, for an in-depth study of Big Finish alone and the company's impact on, and relationship with, the television series, and the BBC itself. Wallace also presents an interesting examination of fan 'reconstructions' of missing television stories, using off-air recordings and visual material, which he says are "complicating the relationship – and collapsing the distinction – between official producers and fan creators" (2013, p.29). This form of fan activity has been occurring for decades, long before the series was revived, but the proliferation of <u>Doctor Who</u> studies seems to have opened up spaces for properly examining its history and the spaces where fan and production roles are entwined. Wallace concludes that "the tension between fan and official products and producers is highlighted by the shifting attitudes that the BBC has displayed... and complicated by the corporation's recruitment of fan-producers in order to produce official products" (2013, p.35). Though Wallace's work is useful, this statement, with its slight variant use of the term 'fan-producers,' emphasising the 'fan' aspect seems to somewhat be missing the bigger picture. Quite aside from the reconstructions Wallace discusses, the BBC has essentially recruited fan-producers to produce the series itself, albeit ones with industry experience themselves. As Miles Booy notes, the 1990's saw "many fans in their early 20s/30s emerge as writers and production staff within the industry, bringing their fan sensibilities with them" (2012, pp.142-143). Booy's work will be drawn on throughout this thesis, as his work touches on many of the same themes and eras that will be discussed, presenting a wider cultural view on the evolution of fandom and tie-in merchandise and arguing that eventually "some of these products would help set the agenda for the revamped series" (2012, p.2). <u>Doctor Who</u> studies have, then, started to address the shifting relationship between fandom and production, albeit generally with a focus on fans themselves. With the fan-producers having such negotiated and negotiable identities, it seems impossible for the industries in which they work to function as a monolithic entity. As I have shown, there is an increasing space for discussion on

the nature of the fan-producer and a need for a more in-depth assessment of the forces of official production.

The fan-producers are the next development in examining the nature of fandom and its position in relation to the dominant forces in the fields of cultural production, and Chapters Three and Four will examine the historical contexts for these forms of interactivity. Fan studies have already begun to address the different audience positions, with theories such as Abercrombie's and Longhurst's (2008) attempting to account for them. Williamson highlights the need to readdress approaches such as the use of Bourdieu, and importantly illustrates the two distinct dominant positions in the field of cultural production. Rhetorics of co-option and media dominance are equally tied up in binary ways of thinking, and Bacon-Smith's writing has shown the persistence of these oppositional approaches. Fan studies need to attempt to break away from this and uncover new ways of looking at fandom, fan and producer interactions and how fans both consume and produce. Therefore, if there is a third wave of fan studies, as Sandvoss suggests, then it is probably best characterised by uncertainty. There have been a variety of discussions and attempts to reconsider both the value of, and most suitable theoretical approach to, fandom studies, and whilst Sandvoss's own suggestions as to the direction it should take are generally not ones I agree with, he makes a strong case for a reassessment of the field. Sandvoss interprets fandom as a form of narcissism, whereby he proposes a "model of fandom as a form of narcissistic self-reflection not between fans and their social environment but between the fan and his or her object of fandom" (2005, p.98). His basic premise is that "the object of fandom... is intrinsically interwoven with our sense of self, with who we are, would like to be, and think we are", thus his approach employs psychoanalytical theory in analysing fans (2005, p.96). For Sandvoss, fans give contradictory meanings to their object of fandom based on their own position in life being reflected, which serves to explain the various differences of interpretation and interaction that can be found amongst different fandoms and individual fans. He suggests then that "this means it is not just the fan who appropriates the fan texts, but that the text assumes the power to appropriate the fan" (2005, p.110). Whilst Sandvoss addresses older writing that has served to pathologise fandom, he does so in order to excuse himself from the same practice, arguing that "it is important to avoid equally one-sided interpretations of fandom by exploring the interdependence of psychological motivations of fandom on their social, cultural, textual and technological framing" (2005, p.94). However, his work still contains a sense that fans are being

pathologised, and his concept of self-reflection fails to answer certain questions. If, as Sandvoss believes, fandom is self-reflective, why do certain fans latch on to specific texts, or a variety of texts? Why can someone be a fan of one series but not another similar one, and are fan communities now to be seen as groups of people who share a similar self-image? There can be disagreements in fandom, but also agreements, and whilst fans may be "prepared to adjust to changing external textual characteristics of their object of fandom, even when they are understood to be in opposition to the fan's world view and self-image", this is not always the case (2005, p.112). Sandvoss's argument seems to make fandom, on one hand, a unique individual experience based entirely on the individual's own background, experience and projected ideas, and, on the other, a homogeneous group with similarly predicative reactions. This perhaps, comes more from Sandvoss's endeavour to incorporate a broad range of cultural and social groups into his conception of fandom.

Sandvoss's desire to create a far-reaching conception of fans that encompasses not just media fans, but football fans, fans of athletes or any other personality is interesting but problematic. He defines fandom as:

> *the regular, emotionally involved consumption of a given popular narrative or text* in the form of books, television shows, films or music, as well as popular texts in a broader sense such as sports teams and popular icons and stars ranging from athletes and musicians to actors. (Sandvoss, 2005, p.8)

Sandvoss aims to "reduce individual fan cultures in scale and move from 'rich descriptions' to the common themes, motivations and implications of the interaction between fans and their object of fandom" (2005, p.4). However, I am neither convinced that he is successful in his own aims, or that this is even possible, without rendering the very object of study valueless due to its lack of definition. His scope seems so wide, so as to include everyone as a fan, you would be hard-pressed to find someone who would not fit this loose definition. Not only this, but he notes that "the emotional commitment of these fans is reflected in the regularity with which they visit and revisit their object of fandom" and refers to an example of soap fans watching their show five times a week (2005, p.8). This is a problematic example to illustrate his point, considering that many soap operas broadcast new episodes that many times each week; to find correlation between the cult media fan revisiting the same episodes on DVD, time and again, examining each detail, with soap opera fans catching the latest episodes, which most likely will never even see commercial release, seems an odd choice. What this does illustrate though, is that fans and the ways they interact with a text can differ, and trying to have an umbrella

concept of fandom seems only to remove the more interesting differences, and thus any potential exploration of how different fans may have different conceptions of what a fan is, and why they are a fan, rather than a blanket notion of self-reflective narcissism.

Conclusion.

The history of fan studies has often hinged on making fans and fan cultures relevant subjects of discussion, with the earliest writings striving to portray fandom as a political force of resistance. Opposition to this approach worked to illustrate the shortcomings and simplicities of these early theorisations, whilst developing new understandings of the way fan cultures operate. Sandvoss is right to question how, in the wake of deconstruction of fandom's potential power as a force for consumer-driven productivity, fan studies can be relevant as a discipline. His attempt to broaden the scope, whilst well intentioned, is also flawed and, by making everyone a fan, manages to lose sight of the cultural and social changes which are occurring, for the sake of some unclear terminology. I have sought to engage with a wide range of important issues that will relate to my study of fan-producers, discussions surrounding the activities of fans and the way they have been attempted to be theorised. What has become increasingly clear is that even within fan culture there is a wide range of differing actions and interpretations, and equally the dominant end of the field of cultural production is divided. Fans use dominant discourses of elitism, and they engage in consumer practices. Fans also move in positions, take hierarchies, and can become "petty-producers". But they can do more, they can move into official production too, where they must engage with not only the forces of fandom, but of official culture, corporate executives and issues of authorship and authority. This chapter has served to provide a framework of the history of fan studies, and a look into possible developments that have to be addressed. However, it has yet to find any answers, only suggesting different possibilities that have opened up, whether approaching Bourdieu in different ways or applying psychoanalytical theory. In short, it is vital to start looking at how an understanding of the emerging fan-producers shapes our understanding of media and culture, obliges a new and more liberal perspective on the intersection of production and consumption, demands the construction of a new, or stronger, theoretical model to explain this, and an examination of how we define who exactly is a fan, and how they are different, or similar, to consumers, enthusiasts, producers, or even academics.

-Chapter Two-
Methodologies

The relationships between <u>Doctor Who</u> fans and the programme's producers have evolved in striking ways over the last five decades, whilst in wider culture, the changes and negotiations between positions of production and consumption have been an ongoing concern for over a century. In this chapter I will explain the methodological approaches I have taken in conducting my research, and the theoretical ideas central to my work. The premise of this thesis is to try and unpack the figure of the fan-producer who, rather than spontaneously appearing at the end of the twentieth century, is actually the product of various cultural, industrial and historical forces. Arguably any one of these might support a work of this size, but what I am interested in is the intersection and relationship of these approaches in establishing the space for the emergence of the fan-producer *par-excellence*, embodied primarily in the figures of Russell T. Davies and Steven Moffat. I will begin by exploring the importance of 'context' in regards to <u>Doctor Who</u>, and its fandom, before explaining the reasoning for my three approaches. This discussion will also highlight my reasoning in using Bourdieu and the importance of his work, and I will also briefly discuss my own fan identity and why this is important to clarify at this stage. Finally, this chapter takes a critical appraisal at the methodologies used and discusses potential issues or areas that could be expanded upon.

<u>Doctor Who</u> in context.
In the time it has taken to complete this project, <u>Doctor Who</u> has become, in some aspects, almost unrecognisable as the series that returned in 2005. Indeed, when the initial research began, the incumbent star of the show was David Tennant as the tenth incarnation of the title character, and only the second to feature in the revived series. Since then the show has produced two more leads, Matt Smith and the current Doctor, Peter Capaldi, and even offered a glimpse of a previously unseen 'past' Doctor, as played by John Hurt, primarily in the fiftieth anniversary episode, 'The Day of the Doctor'. It could be said that this study has occupied an entire Doctor's era, with Matt Smith taking and leaving the role towards the beginning and end of my research. I raise this point as illustrative of how quickly, and seemingly completely, <u>Doctor Who</u> as a show can change, in a relatively short amount of time. The major change in showrunner, from Davies to Moffat in 2010, is further marked

by changes in lead actors, both Doctors and 'companions', changes in key set designs, and even in the structure, length and broadcasting schedule of seasons. At the time of writing, Moffat remains showrunner but is due to step down in 2018 in favour of somewhat controversial new producer Chris Chibnall, whose previous work has included the spin-off series <u>Torchwood</u>. All of these changes serve to not only influence the story lines and narrative structures, but also how the fans engage with and consume the series. Whilst many fans continue to enjoy the series, some have become highly critical of Moffat's time as showrunner,[4] whilst, on the other hand, some see his stewardship as an improvement over that of Davies. Production discourses, and author figures are important to fans, as are the ways in which fan-producers engage with their audiences. Change may well be one of the few consistent elements across the series, but it is fan reactions to these changes, and fan-producers' reactions to criticisms that I find of particular interest.

<u>Doctor Who</u> fandom has always had a strong interest in the show's production, with 'The Making of *Doctor Who*' being the earliest example of a mainstream published text on the series, written by series script editor Terrance Dicks and writer Malcolm Hulke, and paving the way for many more texts, whether academic, official or fan-produced.[5] Fandom then, as with academia, is interested in contextual information, learning about the reasons for decisions that affect the object of their affections. In many ways it is this extra-textual knowledge that can be seen as a prerequisite for a fan identity, separating the *aficionado* from the casual viewer. Matt Hills discusses how horror fans appear to follow this pattern in particular, noting how they have been viewed as having scholarly leanings where they "master their beloved texts through repeated viewing and aesthetic *study*" (2005, p.75, emphasis in original). Hills argues that there is a clear contrast between the academic view of horror fans, and the fans' own view of their object of affection. As academics legitimise their own explanations of the audience, who are seen as "passively and emotionally subjected to the genre's products... fans assume that they can actively explain horror... whereas non-fans or casual consumers of the genre are passively subjected to its scares" (Hills, 2005, p.90). Certain terminology, notably the 'Final Girl' in the horror genre, made famous in Carol Clover's (1992) work, has become very much part of the lexicon of horror fandom, and even broader cultural discussions of the horror genre. Despite sometimes ambivalent relationships between fandom and academia, there is a clear desire amongst fans to deconstruct and understand the texts they

---

4   For details and further discussion of this, look to Chapter Four.
5   The divisions of which, as we shall see, are often arbitrary at best.

follow, and especially to learn about the production experiences of those involved in producing them. This fan fascination with the production contexts of <u>Doctor Who</u> has increasingly been complemented with fans' own theoretical work, where fans take positions as scholars of the text to produce their own books examining the themes and ideas in the series. Often these fans are not fan-scholars in terms of working as academics, but rather they are fans who produce theoretical essays, just as other fans produce fiction, artwork or reviews. Matt Hills argues that whilst some fans see academia as a form of 'monster' using 'jargon', this is, in reality, just "another cultural group's language" that readers may not wish to take the time "getting to grips with" (2010, p.3). Fans can, and do, embrace media theory even if they do not always make use of academic vocabulary, and drawing distinctions between fans writing as scholars, and fan-scholars is not always appropriate or accurate. Whilst this subset of fandom has arguably always been present, the last decade has seen a notable increase in its visibility, with entire series of books, such as the <u>About Time</u> series, dedicated to the subject, often published through independent press by fans themselves.[6] Hills asks us to consider the consequences of these developments, asking "what can being a *Doctor Who* fan add to academic analysis", as well as what being an academic can add to a fan identity (2010, p.4)? Fandom and academia alike are interested in contexts, in analysis and in understanding how certain developments, ideas and concepts have come about and evolved. It is from both these approaches that I have found an interest in expanding the arena of these contextual studies. Rather than focusing exclusively on fandom or the fan-producers themselves, I am interested in a variety of factors that have led to their development. The industrial context of production is represented by my interest in the marketing strategies of the BBC at the time of the series' inception, where the corporation had less interaction with the commercial industries than in later decades. Understanding how these developments occurred, and how <u>Doctor Who</u> played a part in the evolution towards BBC Worldwide as it exists today, will also provide an important exploration of the environment that allowed for the emergence of the fan-producers in the late twentieth century. The history of fandom itself is explored by looking at how audiences consumed and engaged with texts that preceded television and other modern media, and by turning to analysis from outside the field of fan studies I have been able to draw links between different forms of fan activity across time. History and industrial contexts also combine in an analysis of the notion of authorship, and how it has evolved, and a look at the history of Victorian publishing

---

[6]   Independent publishers started and run by <u>Doctor Who</u> fans include Telos Publishing, Obverse Books and Mad Norwegian Press.

highlights certain echoes that can be found between that era of technological development and the contemporary leap forward of digital media and the internet.

By utilising a variety of contextual approaches there is, of course, the risk of overgeneralising or not allowing equal discussion to each of the topics. Whilst this is undoubtedly an issue, I am primarily seeking to open up a space for further discussion of the fan-producer figure, and in doing so I feel it is important to discuss these three subject areas. The complexity of the fan-producer figure, and how those in the producer roles have not been studied in a suitable level of detail, considering their prominence as one half of the historically assumed producer/consumer binary, is my central argument. Thus, the variety of approaches is intended to complicate and unpick the figure of the fan-producer, expanding the future potential for academic examination into the production/consumption dynamic. I will now unpack my reasoning for each of the contexts that this thesis will examine, and discuss the relevant theoretical framework.

Cultural Contexts and Negotiating Ethnography.

Ethnographical study has been a cornerstone of fan studies almost since its inception, and positions the academic as an intrepid explorer (in Time and Space?), entering into another culture and examining its nature, its values, and its rituals. There has been plenty of research into fan cultures, and criticisms of ethnography where it seemingly places the scholar as an outsider infiltrating the secret society of fandom. Matt Hills identifies and struggles with this dilemma, suggesting that the ethnographer creates narrative accounts that skew results towards an outcome they may be predisposed towards (2002, p.70). Ethnography itself has been criticised as an approach to audiences, with Abercrombie and Longhurst arguing that its focus on specific groups may not "adequately capture the complexity of contemporary audience activity" (1998, p.161). They argue that whilst this can be useful, it can only be used adequately once audiences have been contextualised in everyday life (1998, p.161). In studying fandom, the freedom and activities of fans must be determined in contexts of both the history of audience interactivity and the media producers to whom the object of fandom belongs, and if the academic researcher also identifies as a scholar-fan then the context of his or her approach to the material as both a fan and an academic is vital, a concept discussed in more detail below. John Tulloch highlights the benefits of audience ethnography, not as a privileging of one specific account, or perspective, but rather to emphasise "the local, partial and fragmentary micro-narrative" and then to go on and contextualise

it, "to interconnect it, to globalise it" (2000, p.9). There are numerous ethnographic accounts of fandoms (Jenkins, 1992; Fiske, 1992; Bacon-Smith, 1992; Thornton, 1995; and others) and Tulloch highlights his own work in production ethnographies, but my own interest is in a sustained examination of the wider contexts for these previous works. Ethnography itself is not my primary methodology, but it is the inspiration for it, as I intend to explore the contexts of fans-turned-producers in regards to specific historical, industrial and cultural influences and developments. As a methodology it remains contentious, and C. Lee Harrington and Denise D. Bielby argue that it can lead to "paralyzing debates" over its role "in the study of global media" found within "overlapping and often contradictory discussions" (Harrington & Bielby, 2007, p.182). Again, the emphasis is on the limitations of small-scale and local ethnography and the importance of wider contexts. In the study of fan-producers, the existing ethnographical studies of fan cultures become a context for understanding their positions as moving between consumption and production, and what this entails. The fan-producer in some ways presents a dilemma in regards to an ethnographical approach due to their own fan identities and engagement with a fan community to which they have belonged far longer than they have been an official producer. My focus on examining and deconstructing the fan-producer, rather than the 'fan',[7] has led me to forgo an ethnological route as a primary tool for research, but the fan-producer's presence within fan communities has obligated my foray into fan communities nonetheless.

Unlike the approach presented by previous academics, notably Bacon-Smith in her study on *Star Trek* fandom (1992), I cannot claim the position of an outsider looking in, of investigating unknown and new territory. The spaces of fandom are familiar to me, as are its attitudes, reactions, and discussions, and thus, so are the fan-producers. Matt Hills, himself a scholar-fan, has suggested the application of a form of authoethnography in order to address this issue, and allow someone the space for a form of self-reflexive look at their own fan identity. Just as the very nature of the fan-producer as operating within fan spaces obliges ethnographical aspects to my research, so my own fandom necessitates at least addressing how this influences my researches. Hills explains that this approach may show how "multiple fandoms and interests in different media forms may cohere in intriguing ways" (2002, p.81) and whilst these connections may become over-simplified, maintaining an awareness of what is being left out and what is being 'fitted in' can at least

---

[7]   The distinction between 'fan-producer' and 'fan' is used here for clarity, and is the subject of discussion further on in this thesis.

provide the basis for future discussion (2002, p.83). Elsewhere, Jeanette Monaco offers that these accounts "make visible the reflexive voice of the writer while foregrounding the theoretical implications of objective/subjective dualisms through examinations of the relationship between 'academic' and 'fan' selves" (2010). In revisiting and revising my research, I have become increasingly aware of the impact of my own fandom and fan ideals on the interpretive approaches I have to texts. I have also noted how examples and ideas I have derived from my fandoms other than Doctor Who have found their way into this work, and it is this influential aspect of my own scholar-fan identity that I feel should at least be acknowledged. I aim then to follow Monaco's suggestion that academics "embrace a willingness to question their potentially secure identities as completely objective researchers", whilst hopefully avoiding the risk of 'self-indulgence' she warns of (Monaco, 2010). Whilst this is certainly a limited reading of myself, its purpose is to make clear my awareness of my own identity and highlight a couple of keys areas where I feel this has influenced my work, and thus areas in which I must tread carefully in not allowing my fandom to result in bias within my analysis.

I have been a fan of Doctor Who almost as long as I can remember, and indeed, misremembered scenes and snippets of events of late eighties serials form a significant portion of my earliest memories. For many years, finding the stories in the pages of magazines, or through VHS releases, of these half-remembered scenarios was an important part of my fandom, and emphasised both feelings of nostalgia and exploration. My fandom in many ways further placed me as an outsider; the only family member without an interest in football (itself a signifier for masculinity) and fascinated with a television show that for most of my generation was a forgotten childhood memory following the series' cancellation in 1989. However, Doctor Who fandom itself was not something I was heavily involved in, and I generally would be considered to be at the fringes of organised fandom. Matt Hills's account of his own fandom has a lot of similarities with my own; although I did attend some conventions, these were few and far between and generally with the same, limited crowd that seemingly 'adopted' me as a young fan, in need of guidance (Hills, 2002, p.86). Despite this, I remained on the outskirts of organised fandom, essentially only connected through a couple of friends, the official magazine and occasional convention. Thus, despite identifying primarily as a Doctor Who fan, my experience was of being something of an outsider to fandom as well. During my early teenage years, my fandom grew to encompass other science fiction television series such as Star Trek and Babylon 5, although my focus was in watching and collecting the

episodes, rather than in any additional fan activities. My fandom waned most in my late teen years and early twenties, primarily overtaken by my passion for the horror genre, although, reflexively looking back, it seems to be that the love of being scared and of monsters stems from Doctor Who itself, famous for putting children behind the sofa.[8] My television fandom also leant more towards the supernatural, with shows such as Buffy the Vampire Slayer, The X-Files and Carnivale dominating my fan proclivities. My interest in Doctor Who was sustained mostly by Big Finish Productions, whose regular release of original audio plays starring the original casts of the series occupied more of my time than the classic series DVDs at this stage, and these were, notably, directly aimed at a fan audience. It was the announcement of the series' return in late 2003 that actually drew my interest more directly back to Doctor Who and led to an increased presence on online forums and, although I was a somewhat regular poster to message boards, I had little social capital in terms of being a recognisable individual on them. Thus my interactions with fandom continued to occupy many of the common spaces, but on the fringes of actual interaction and personal discussion. I maintained my presence in areas of forums, such as Outpost Gallifrey, dedicated to the series, and not the social discussions or 'off-topic' sections. These forums however, were also my first experience of the fan-producers, many of whom had active forum presences even before the announcement of the series' return. By this point, my involvement in both Doctor Who fandom and the other shows I have mentioned had shaped much of my thinking in terms of what I considered positive or negative story-lines and characters. My fringe involvement in Buffy fandom led to my awareness of the issues of representation of queer sexuality in television, in turn sparking an interest that would lead to focusing on academic writing as an undergraduate, discussing queer theory and horror. There is, then, a chicken-and-egg element to how my overall identity was influenced by both fandom and education, and in hindsight it seems perhaps inevitable that I would bring this interest together in my examination of the fan-producers. Fandom has thus shaped my identity, and influenced my own personal social, economic and cultural capital in a variety of ways, and these have in turn been influenced by the specific ideals, interpretations and values of the specific fan communities in which I interacted.

In bringing this discussion to a close at this point, I risk enacting the very problem that Hills finds in many authoethnographical accounts, asking which "cultural categories, common sense narratives and systems of value do we leave in place by

---

[8] In my case, hiding behind the largest cushion in the living room whilst on the sofa.

assuming we have reached rock-bottom in our self-justifications?" (Hills, 2002, p.73). I will make clear that this is far from a detailed examination of self; the purpose of this discussion is not to unpick my entire fan identity but simply to scratch the surface of key points whilst acknowledging the potential problematic aspect of my fan identity in regards to my researches. Hills's work here is vital for any fan that studies within their field, whether as scholar-fan or fan scholar, most notably in the attempt to avoid the trap of "twisting theory to fit the preferences of the self" (Hills, 2002, p.81). As a fan I have far more support for the vision of <u>Doctor Who</u> that Russell T. Davies exhibited within his era, whilst I am far more critical of Steven Moffat's period as showrunner. Perhaps contrary to large sections of fandom, I have an optimistic outlook towards the upcoming third showrunner, Chris Chibnall. Academically, my work reflects these views of the fan-producers, but I must question myself and be aware of the dangers of placing Davies on some fan pedestal, at odds with a more problematic Moffat. I must also be aware that much of what I dislike about Moffat's <u>Doctor Who</u> stems from my own academic reading and education, notably in regards to issues of gender politics, sexuality and representation within the texts. My dislike of the female characters as written by Moffat, whilst not universal, is enough to affect my opinion of both his writing and the show under his stewardship. This opinion is not enough to prevent me watching the show and emphasising the aspects I do like, however, whereas some fans may simply abandon the show altogether.[9] It was my fandom that led to my interest in studying film and television, and it was my education that informed my awareness of social issues, and it is this academic influence that has shaped how I, as a fan, am now responding to the text. This textual response, a preference for Davies over Moffat, then clearly influences my writing, however much academic detachment might be attempted. That is not to say that it should not be attempted, and this should not be seen as a justification for any academic bias. I endeavour to question my own approaches with these notions in mind, and whilst this has been far from the detailed autoethnography that Hills offers, it has raised the value of having an awareness of my own fan identity and its intersection with my academic-self (Hills, 2002, pp.81-88).

Thus far, I have offered several important contexts for my research, both in terms of the history of <u>Doctor Who</u> fandom and its desire for theoretical exploration, and in regards to my own fan identity and how I relate and fit into the fandom I am

---

[9]   Or, indeed, write their own academic articles that deal with these very issues within the show!

studying. This context has, however, primarily served to illustrate what I must be wary to avoid, and explained the approaches to fandom that I have chosen to not focus on. The remainder of this chapter, then, will focus on the methodologies I have utilised, and illustrate my reasons for these approaches.

Archival and Historical Research.

Fan studies have generally looked at the contemporary actions of fandom, how they engage with texts and what draws specific fans to specific programming, music and so forth. Television shows, especially, tend to have a finite life and there has even been work on what happens to fandom following the conclusion, or cancellation, of their object of affection. Whilst there has been research looking at the past, such as the fandom of the classic Star Trek investigated by Bacon-Smith, it is not surprising that fan studies tend to look forward. As I have argued elsewhere, one element that makes Doctor Who stand out is its longevity; it continues to tell stories in the same fictional universe, about the same character, since it began in 1963, and has expanded into almost every other medium one could care to name. Miles Booy argues that fan studies tend to be written in the 'present tense' and that "an historical element is so often missing from those academic accounts of fandom which exist" (2012, p.3). His study endeavours to explore the history of the series' fandom, how fan opinion has altered, such as with notable differences between stories considered the series' best, between the late seventies and late eighties. Booy works to unpick the history, changes, contradictions and evolving fan- and producer-relationships of Doctor Who, but always focusing on the fandom itself. However, he does so within certain acknowledged limits, focusing on organised fandom rather than that which has "taken place outside organized lines" (Booy, 2012, p.5). The historical aspect of fandom, specifically Doctor Who fandom, is thus under explored, and I would like to think that my analysis sits alongside Booy's work, looking at history, not from the point of view of the fan, but of the producers, and of the BBC as an organisation.

My initial research has contributed primarily to my examination of the industrial contexts of the BBC, and both how Doctor Who's creation was influenced by its public service remit, and also how the success of the series impacted back on the corporation itself. The success of the Daleks, jointly owned by writer Terry Nation, led to commercial interest unprecedented within the BBC, and an extensive range of merchandise followed. Booy highlights the importance of merchandise both in the development of an individual's fandom and in the changing relationships between

the text, its fans and its producers. Notably, he examines the early novelisations of television stories and how at times they "diverged from the fan view of the series", and yet were also a crucial record, for fans, of the series narratives in the days before home video (Booy, 2012 p.20). His discussion starts in the late seventies, however, and only includes brief mentions of the 'Dalekmania' of the sixties, which saw merchandising at a peak. I believe that whilst this may not be as definitive an era for fandom, something Booy suggests that the seventies are, it is a major turning point for the BBC itself, and its relationship to the commercial industries. It is with this hypothesis of <u>Doctor Who</u>'s importance in the BBC's early development, that I decided to research the relevant production files at the BBC Written Archive in Reading. The archive provides internal notes, scripts, production information, contracts and a great deal more related to the BBC's productions, and I approached this research with some caution. As Booy highlights, there has been a great deal of research into <u>Doctor Who</u>'s production already, both by academics, journalists and fans themselves, whom he describes as "rapacious collectors of knowledge of their chosen programme's production" (2012, p.22). I have already discussed my own fan credentials and as such I had an awareness of both the scope of material that existed, and what areas had been explored in some detail previously. I limited my research to the two earliest time periods in the show's history where its mainstream popularity led to large scale marketing or tie-in merchandise. The first would be the 'Dalekmania' period of the early sixties, and the second the late seventies where lead actor Tom Baker led the show to its highest ever ratings. Even these limits proved too expansive, with the files on the sixties taking up two trolleys alone, and thus I decided to focus my primary efforts into the earlier era. This would prove somewhat serendipitous as not only did my research lead to some fascinating discoveries, but Booy's own work explored the late seventies time period in far more detail, and complements my study of the sixties in notable ways that are addressed in later chapters. However, I did look at seventies correspondences between the production team and members of the <u>Doctor Who</u> Appreciation Society, focusing less on the merchandise of this period, and more on the evolving relationships between the fans and the programme's producers. Matt Hills has examined how the contemporary BBC continues to negotiate the relationship between its public service and commercial activities through its brand management, and use of fans as illustrative of the programme's cultural value (2015, p.57). Booy's studies clearly illustrate the importance of merchandise and extra-textual material in the development of fandom, whilst Hills's illustrates its importance in contemporary brand-orientated <u>Doctor Who</u>. Therefore my examination of the development of that

material, and how it affected the BBC and the production of <u>Doctor Who</u> itself, works to provide additional context and history to these existing discussions.

Archival research can be difficult to begin, especially when there is a wealth of material as with <u>Doctor Who</u>. My request for merchandise and marketing-based material from the early to mid-sixties and the late seventies produced an incredible number of files. Whilst <u>Doctor Who</u> began on November 23rd 1963, I was aware that it had been developed for some time before this,[10] and therefore requested files as early as 1961. This would prove to be fortuitous, as it led to the discovery of early production files that indicated the BBC was already anticipating some degree of interest in <u>Doctor Who</u> from commercial buyers, at the very least in regards to selling the series overseas. However, one potential area where this could perhaps have been expanded on, would have been to look more closely at comparable series made at the BBC during this era, and to what extent marketing was considered in their cases. There were also some unfortunate absences that may have been beneficial to my research, notably surrounding copyright issues in the late sixties, where the BBC's representatives clashed with writers for <u>Doctor Who</u> over the ownership and licensing of the alien 'Quark' characters. Whilst material was available, some correspondences had been removed, and the remaining files appear to insinuate this was likely due to the hostile nature of some of the later exchanges. I also needed to be aware of what was not included, and whilst the BBC's archives were very thorough and illustrate the official negotiations that were occurring, there is the occasional mention of discussions had in person, or at promotional events. Archival material alone cannot tell the entire story, but properly utilised, it can illuminate the internal politics and discussions, and the negotiations with external companies, which occurred within the BBC during this pivotal, formative era. My use of archival material from the earliest days of <u>Doctor Who</u> also complements existing scholarly work that utilises similar files, with some crossover, to explore other aspects of this era, such as Brian J. Robb's study of the series' development (2009) or Jonathan Bignell's study of the 'child as consumer' in the mid-sixties (2007).

The history of the BBC and the evolving nature of its relationship with the commercial interest, whilst important, was only part of the historical contexts I was

---

[10]   A detailed analysis of the archival material surrounding the creation of <u>Doctor Who</u> has been made by Brian J. Robb, which also makes brief mention of the Reithian ideology utilised in some of the early production decisions (2009, pp.17-45).

interested in exploring. As well as these industrial contexts, I endeavoured to highlight the historical contexts for the relationships between producers and consumers, specifically in the period of the late nineteenth century, and during the expansion of printed media. I had initially hoped to feature a greater use of archival material in this discussion, intending to uncover early material relating to the publication of the works of Dickens, and the audience's responses. As a starting point I looked to academic accounts of his work, and in doing so, found my research moving away from my originally intended archival analysis. My focus became more on secondary sources, drawing on existing work in literature studies and other related fields. This alternative approach benefited from drawing on the work of Raymond Williams, whose work has heavily detailed the evolving nature of art and authority. My intent, then, was to draw on different fields of research that had looked at historical approaches to texts and the usage of books, and writing, and create an inter-sectional examination of the notion of the author, and of the fan. In this, I drew heavily from the work of Ellen Gruber Garvey, a cultural historian who specialises in the history of print, whose work has strong parallels with discussions occurring within fan studies and yet is generally overlooked. Garvey's work primarily focuses on scrapbooking at the end of the nineteenth century, but highlights some interesting and valuable connections to contemporary audience engagement (Garvey, 2012). Further academic work on literary authors can provide further contextualising information in regards to historical audience activity. I discuss this through two brief case studies of Charles Dickens and Isaac Asimov, the former seeking to engage with and react to his contemporary audience and the latter acting as an early fan-producer in the field of literary science fiction. Whilst the tools and media have changed, I have looked to history and to the common medium of these periods, the written page, to illustrate how activities identified with fandom have a far more extensive lineage. Thus I worked to highlight that certain aspects of fan activity, and the fan and producer relationship, had a historical precedent in previously existing forms of texts, and that a trajectory could be drawn between them and contemporary media fandom.

These two approaches have led to some interesting, and varied results and I have encountered a number of interesting ideas from outside the usual arena of fan studies that nevertheless have potential application. The difficulties I experienced, notably in my examination of the development of printed media highlight the limitations of attempting a larger overview of the subject. However, this overview is necessary in beginning to unpick the historical strands of producer and consumer

interactions. Further expansion of this work could focus on primary material, and make greater use of existing archival sources, which were out of the remit of my own researches. Drawing links to studies outside the usual frame of reference for fan research, such as Garvey's work in scrapbook fandom, or literature studies of the work of Charles Dickens, has allowed for a greater depth of understanding in how audiences consume. I argue that there is room for further and more in-depth development along these lines, and intersectional studies of fans across temporal lines and across media formats can only add to our understanding.

Fandom and Field Theory.

This final section will look at the theoretical model of Pierre Bourdieu which I draw on throughout this work, examining its strengths and criticisms, notably those directed towards the concept of the fields of production. Bourdieu has often been utilised in the study of fandom and subcultural groups, as his central idea that producers and consumers can take up, and create new, positions within their field of expertise, in competition for authority within that field, has wide ranging application. Studies have included horror fandom (Hills, 2005), club culture (Thornton, 1995), fan communities (Jenkins, 1992 and Williamson, 2005), and comics (Lopes, 2009). Chapter One has already featured some discussion on Bourdieu in relation to previous work in the field of fan studies, and I will be both addressing this whilst highlighting how this thesis will continue to draw on Bourdieusian philosophy.

Field theory has had wide application throughout cultural studies, and although it faces some criticisms, Bourdieu's concept has been utilised far more widely than his original focus on literature and art. I have already drawn on the issues that surround both my own fan identity and the dilemma that faces the fan-scholar as to what influences their fan identity may have on their academic writing. Lynn Zubernis and Katherine Larsen directly address this issue, and relate it to the work of Bourdieu, noting that the "traditional concern with aesthetic distance which has long shaped acceptance of high art and literature, thought necessary for legitimate art, has influenced the perception of necessary distance" (2012, p.47). They emphasise that Bourdieu's notion of "holding art at a distance" is in contrast to fan pleasure, and that Hills and Jenkins have taken issue with this. However, Zubernis and Larsen suggest that this is "in reality a caution against excessive emotional intimacy" and they suggest that scholar-fans are not exempt from exhibiting the kinds of behaviour that lead to the pathologizing of fans (2012, p.47). Emotional investment and emotional behaviour continue to be problematic in both the fan-scholars' approach

to research, and in how it affects the application of relevant theoretical approaches. Hills argues that Bourdieu's model privileges cultural capital and suggests that it is automatically "a source of cultural legitimisation" (2002, p.49). However, he states this cannot explain how fan-scholars can be marginalised and stereotyped both within their own fan culture and within academia also. This problem stems in part from John Fiske's influential work on television culture which, Milly Williamson argues, utilises a misinterpretation of Bourdieu and thus is partially responsible for its "problematic effect on fan scholarship" (Williamson, 2005, p.104). She states that Bourdieu argues that "popular taste embraces *content* and emotional investment because it is *excluded* from cultural capital, not because it possesses an alternative form" (Williamson, 2005, p.105, emphasis in original). Indeed, for the fan-scholar it is, theoretically, a judgement of excessive emotional investment that negatively impacts their standing within academia, and this would represent an attempt to exclude them on the basis of inappropriate tastes. It is not surprising, however, that this is a difficult arena to negotiate as conflicting and competing ideas of cultural worth are central to the manner in which Bourdieu's fields operate. Since cultural value and "dominant tastes" are not fixed "but in the process of continual conflict", the values of cultural worth are also not fixed, but shifting due to the "competition between the two dominant sets of positions" (Williamson, 2005, p.109). Emotional investment, of course, can describe a wider range of emotions and engagements with a text, and the role of pleasure in Bourdieu's theories has been debated. Hills argues that whilst pleasure is under-theorized by Bourdieu, it is "nevertheless narratively implied in his theoretical framework" as, for example, the "prestigious reputation in the eyes of fellow specialists" cannot be effectless (2005, p.170). The individual's expression and reaction to pleasure, and their appearance of emotional distance, even if not genuine, can be a factor in how they are positioned within different cultural groups. It is this inherent sense of struggle and position-taking within Bourdieu's field theory that lends itself so well to my exploration of fan-producers and their contemporary contexts.

In my introduction, I set out my position that the sometimes-contradictory or competing approaches to fandom are in fact all aspects of a wider field of fan culture that thrives on struggle and position-taking. Whether navigating between a fan and academic identity, or a fan and producer identity, or struggling between fan narrative desires or the requirements of a mainstream television drama, the players involved are in constant states of negotiation. Bourdieu's field theory, visualising different spaces as interconnecting fields, themselves offering various positions of authority

and power, therefore works as a prime candidate for mapping out these interactions. Bourdieu's theory also accounts for the changing identities of fans, and how the fan-producers can emerge to take up new positions within the fields of cultural production and fan cultures. Williamson clarifies that "positions only become positions when taken up and occupied by a social agent, and that the taking up of positions can alter the structure of available positions" (2005, p.107). These positions can also intersect with other fields, other "social and cultural terrains", such as is the case with the fan-scholar (Hills, 2005, p.168). Likewise, when Hills discusses "hybridizations of 'autonomous' and 'heteronomous' production", viewing the field of horror as "between 'restricted' and 'large-scale' cultural production" there is arguably a similar negotiation occurring (2005, p.169). The struggle for positions can be applied to the explorations of authorship and the notion of branding that I will be discussing throughout this thesis. Discussing the American comic industry, Paul Lopes argues that "comic book heroes worked hard to regain a mass market for comic books as well as institutional recognition of the comic book as a legitimate art" (2009, p.xv). The struggle for legitimation is one of the most common, especially in new social spaces, as noted by Lopes, and I will be examining discourses of legitimacy in regards to authors and television. Position-taking and struggle define Bourdieu's fields, and a position between restricted and 'large-scale' could equally be seen as an example of the processes of attempted legitimisation. Bourdieu therefore accounts for changes and struggles in the field, and the conflicts between separate identities, which can work to reduce an individual's standing at both poles. Lopes highlights how Bourdieu suggests that when "the rules of art are undergoing radical transformation", the social space itself can become chaotic (2009, p.xv). Lopes argues that out of the chaos surrounding changes in comic art "something miraculous happened", and comics did become a more legitimate art form (2009, p.xvi). The extent to which contemporary developments in fan and producer relations can be seen to be chaotic may be a subject for potential discussion following the next several chapters, but it will become clear that the showrunner figure and contemporary media branding are tied into issues of legitimation. The potential for the impact of different fields as well as different positions allows for my wider engagement with the contexts behind the rise of the fan-producers. Fields, rather than existing in a vacuum, are affected and influenced by changes elsewhere, and the contemporary media industries operate in an environment of political, social, cultural and economic pressures and interests, competing and jostling for control. I have already discussed how my research has entailed a look at historical contexts as well as the use of archival material and secondary sources from other disciplines.

Having explored the different approaches and theoretical underpinnings to my work, I will now move on to utilising the results of my research to examine key areas relating to the evolution of the producer and consumer relationship, and its amalgamation in the form of the fan-producer. In Chapter Five I will turn to unpicking the history and development of the BBC, and, drawing largely on the work of Georgina Born, demonstrate the inherent contradictions and difficulties in discussing the BBC in light of its public service remit. I will argue that the contradiction at the heart of the organisation's structure has a direct influence on its relationship with commercial interests, branding and its audiences. In Chapter Six, I apply my archival research to exploring how the success of <u>Doctor Who</u> and the Daleks obligated the BBC to more direct commercial exploitation, and the impact this would have on the corporation's public service remit. This is developed into a discussion of the use of branding, following on from the history depicted in the previous chapter. Chapter Eight then returns to Bourdieu to look at fan position-taking and the rise of the fan-producers, in light of these contexts. However, first, I will begin with my historical research, where I look back at the historical contexts for these developments and explore early versions of fandom, and the cultural development of the 'author' as a concept.

-Chapter Three-
Contextualising the Author:
Destabilising Concepts of Authorship and Authority.

"I'm just the writer. I've got no more authority over the text
than you!"

Russell T. Davies,

Doctor Who Head Writer 2005-2010.

Authorship is a concept that cannot easily be defined. Nor does it offer a definitive
role that an author must play in the evolution and use of a text once it has been
created. The question of authorship has influenced a wide variety of work, and
provoked difficult discussions on the nature of the author and what degree of
authority they might hold over their creations. A television text can be seen as
having many authors, although at times the authorship of a text is identified with one
specific individual. For example, Russell T. Davies and Steven Moffat are seen as
the primary authors during the eras in which they act as showrunners for Doctor
Who. With upcoming showrunner Chris Chibnall, the question within fandom is what
his approach will be like; is he an auteur as with Davies and Moffat, is he too
strongly associated with fandom, and even whether he is suited for the job at all.
These arguments tend to utilise an inherited concept of authorship that stems from a
historical evolution of the author figure, most notably in nineteenth-century literature.
The authority and ability of an author to maintain control of a text after, and
sometimes before, its release is also questionable, and the reactions (and
interactions) of audiences cannot always be predicted. In coming chapters, I will be
discussing the development of the BBC as an organisation from its very beginnings,
and looking at the evolution of academic writing on fandom. First, however, this
chapter will turn to examining the concept of authorship itself, through tracing its
historical development, progress and evolution, whilst asking questions as to the
motivations - political, economic and social - that gave rise to the figure of the
author. This context will provide relevant theoretical groundwork for the upcoming
discussions of the BBC, television auteurs and fandom. Through a historical
analysis stemming from the nineteenth century to the utilisation of theories of
authorship in modern media formats, I will demonstrate that the 'author' as a figure
has been constructed and defined by numerous social and political influences that

bring into question the way in which authorship is understood. This analysis will illustrate how the evolution of authorship is tied directly into industrial and commercial developments, and how the authorship of a text is bound up in capitalism.

This chapter will begin by examining the emergence of the concept of the author-artist around the nineteenth century, including the context of earlier understandings of authorship. It will look at how authorship has been theorised and the different philosophical debates that have surrounded it as the concept has developed and evolved. An examination of popular writing from the nineteenth century, focused on Charles Dickens as a case study, will demonstrate how authors then could be seen as early incarnations of fan-producers, and how their own interactions with audiences may have shaped their own products and careers, as well as highlighting the complicated history of authorship. The rise of the printing press, and changes in technologies at the end of the nineteenth century led to a rapid re-negotiation of issues surrounding authorship, copyright and the consumption of texts. The twenty-first century has also seen an analogous period of rapid change, with the advent of digital media and the internet impacting fandom and culture, just as the advances in industrial printing had a century before. This chapter will examine how auteur theory brought many of the same problematic engagements with authorship into the medium of film, and highlight how this has led to a conflicted ability to define the author in more collaborative media, including television production. Finally, I will illustrate the rise of the contemporary figure of the showrunner, their relationship with audiences, and how this relates to developing notions of authorship. This chapter will illustrate how the author is not inherently powerful, and that claims of artistic greatness have always emerged through a variety of social, political and industrial influences. These historical contexts will thus highlight that periods of technological change can serve to highlight the ongoing negotiations within media cultures, and demonstrate how contemporary fan-producer debates are the latest iteration of producer and consumer relations. Rather than a new, or uniquely twenty-first century discussion, it forms part of a historical trajectory that sees increasingly blurred and negotiated boundaries between positions that have inaccurately been perceived, at times, as binary oppositions.

From Artisans to Authors.
The concepts of the author and the artist are ones that seem to be bound together, particularly in early writings, and both emerge from attempts to define and establish

a notion of culture and high art. Raymond Williams writes prolifically on this, notably in some of his earliest work, where he successfully emphasises the ability of the cultural elite to elevate its own tastes as a benchmark of excellence (1958, and 1961). Michel de Certeau has also written on the processes whereby a text or belief can be made into a reality through the use of laws or proliferation of 'facts' within a society (1984, pp.147-150, 177-189). Ideas, tastes, and notions of what is an accepted truth, can be utilised in various ways, such as in the elevation and definition of the author and artist. The desire for an author figure rests in ideas of both authority and authenticity, as the literary genius provides a clear figurehead who can be elevated as an artist who has created a superior piece of work in comparison to other 'lesser' works (see Bourdieu, 1979 and Williams, 1977 for discussions on this). It is through the context of the developments of the author figure, that it can be understood how contemporary approaches to authorship have been arrived at. In addition, by understanding this historical development, it will become more apparent how external influences have continued to influence ideals of authority and authorship.

Pierre Bourdieu's fields of production are a key battleground for a theoretical understanding of the transitional shift in bourgeois art towards popular authorship, primarily from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, and it is Raymond Williams who perhaps best articulates the detailed changes in society and attitudes that inform this. In later chapters, I will address how the BBC has been conflicted between public service notions of educating the masses, demonstrating some very elitist approaches at times, and the mainstream popularity that would ensure its survival. It is this same argument and struggle that, at least in part, informs the development of the concept of the 'author', as technological advances aid a shift from elite patronage to mass-produced popular texts. Randal Johnson describes Bourdieu's theory of the cultural field as "a radical contextualization", a succinct but not inaccurate summary that emphasises the importance of his work to this chapter (introduction for Bourdieu, 1993, p.9). Bourdieu's approach opens up discussions of authorship to the historical cultural-political contexts that have helped shaped the author-concept across the centuries. Bourdieu's theory of the fields leads to "both a rejection of the direct relating of the individual biography to the work of literature" as suggested by subjectivism, and also the "rejection of internal analysis of an individual work or even of intertexual analysis" - instead "what we have to do is all these things at the same time" (Bourdieu quoted by Johnson, 1993, p.9). Williams's approach is one based on a Marxist perspective, one that leads to a questioning of

social order and a deconstruction of how culture and society are driven and shaped by the elite. It is the cultural elite, historically, the rich and influential upper classes and/or nobility, who defined culture and art through their own tastes and who emphasised the ideology of different artistic values. This will also be addressed again in later chapters, in terms of public service broadcasting, whereby the privileged are able to designate which texts and authors are of cultural value. "What interests Bourdieu is the genesis, 'the mode of generation of practices'; not, as in Foucault, what they produce, but what produces them" (de Certeau, 1984, p.58). Work on fandom generally leans towards viewing the activity and relationships of fans, and the way producers interact with them, but whilst the former have been contextualised to an extent, the latter remain remarkably under-explored, as we have seen. In order to de-construct and examine the fan-producers, figures of authority and authorship, it is vital to understand the construction of the author.

Art and the artist, the latter used in the sense of a role that can be occupied by the writer as well as the painter, as an aspect of society, is one that emerges historically through early attempts at defining culture. The earliest discourse on authorship was centred on the notion of inspiration, specifically of a divine nature, perhaps most widely understood in the figure of the Muse. This approach "at once elevates the poet or author as an elect figure – set apart from the rest of humanity via the gift of a divine afflatus – but deprives the author of the role of originating force" (Burke, 1995, p.5). Indeed, Plato was very clear in his discourse on the removal of any human authorship in the area of poetry, suggesting that "the lyric poets are not in their senses when they make these lovely lyric poems" (1995, p.15). Plato also states that "poets are nothing but interpreters of the gods", both suggesting a form of divine possession and removing any sense of what would now be understood as authorship (1995, p.16). However, the poet is still positioned in a specialist role, albeit more along the lines of a conduit for the gods. The relationship between writing and religion continued well beyond ancient Greece, as the church played an important social role in education, and arguably represented the primary hub for reading and writing before the eighteenth century. Raymond Williams has shown that the literature of the fifteenth century had "a high proportion of theological and educational writing with most vocational writers having ties to either the church or universities" (1961, p.256). It is not until later in the sixteenth century, Williams argues, that vocational writing becomes more detached from the church, primarily through "the first generation of Elizabethan dramatists" (1961, p.256). The ties between religion and writing, whether in Greece or the fifteenth century, arguably

help maintain a lack of authorial ownership over a work due to its link to the divine. Modern conceptions of authorship perhaps best find their origins in the emergence of the 'arts'. Williams suggests that "the word *Art*, which had commonly meant 'skill', became specialised during the course of the eighteenth century, first to 'painting', and then to the imaginative arts generally" (1958, p.60). As art is tied in with notions of culture, so it is also directly related to authorship, and alongside the change in the definition of 'art', Williams also identifies further semantic shifts in terminology surrounding production and producers. *Artist*, as a word, came to replace *artisan*, and shifted away from a more skill based meaning, related to *craftsman*[11], and focused more on a sense of creativity and genius, themselves terms whose meaning had shifted. The elevation of 'the author', to greater and lesser degrees, persists, but the notion of the outside and divine origin of the art is supplanted by different cultural ideas, as will become apparent further on. That is to say, the author is always marked out as different or separate to 'ordinary' people, in some respect. However, the degree to which the author is distinguished clearly evolves as changing social and economic forces shape the publishing industry by the nineteenth century. The elevation of the author's own individual importance as a creative force is perhaps the most visible symptom of this.

The shift from *artisan* to *artist* in the eighteenth century coincided with a "period of patronage, and of the emergence alongside it of a more organized bookselling market" (Williams, 1961, p.259) as well as the "growth of the reading public" to create a greater potential audience for a potentially greater numbers of texts (Williams, 1961, p.185). Whilst the activity and engagement of readers will be the focus of the next chapter, it is important to note here the role that reading played in the development of publishing, and the evolving concept of the author. The very notion of reading has a deeply political, and somewhat turbulent, history and the growth of a reading audience has always been bound up with social issues. Early on, reading itself had been a controlled form of power, a privilege held by officials, and often confined to religious circumstances, related to the doctrine of pervading thought. Williams highlights the key dilemma of the Church, which held sway in the centuries before mass literacy, whereby Latin needed to be taught in order to allow people to understand the Bible and help it survive, but "the ability in it led not only to the Bible and the Fathers, but also to the whole range of Latin literature and 'pagan' philosophy" (1961, p.148). The expansion of an audience to read a single text was

---

[11]   Burke briefly discusses approaches where authors have been perceived more as craftsmen rather than artists (1995, p.6).

the creation of potential readers for other, different texts; the act of reading itself essentially is re-purposed from its intended religious utilisation. In various forms this politicised take on reading survived and evolved; the educating of the masses could lead to the reading of revolutionary or radical texts, or access could be gained to certain reading materials that could debase and demoralise society as a whole. Increased literacy also led to increased writing skills which again potentially opened up new spaces for radical ideas or suppressed voices, such as the history of women's discourse, hidden from view through "embroidery, diaries and letters" (Cook, 1981, p.273). To read is to be politically engaged on some level, and writing and reading are bound together.

The eighteenth century, then, saw the emerging idea of an exalted appreciation for an author as being an artist, as understood in the contemporary age, but closely combined with an implication of higher thinking and aesthetic taste. That is to say, an author-artist, who could have increasing public recognition, was judged to be exceptionally gifted and perceived as a superior individual, a notion that continued on into the Romantic period where writing gained increasing potential as a form of full-time employment. Romanticism consolidated the idea of individualism, a philosophy that helps drive forward the rise of the author-artist. It could be suggested then, that the more fanciful belief of divine inspiration had been reconstructed (but not completely replaced) by a notion of artistic intellect and superior thinking. The work of Edward Young had already begun to carry this implication as he appears to move creativity towards an inner inspiration, defining 'genius' as "the power of accomplishing great things without the means generally reputed necessary to that end" (1759, p. 42). This retained a sense of the inspiration from a divine power, whilst also giving greater emphasis to the creative ability of the author as an individual, with Burke proposing that Young suggests "a kind of 'inner God' who dictates to the imagination from a darkling region of the poetic self" (Burke, 1995, p.8).

The emergence of the author as an identifiable individual is a key moment in history, emphasising notions of responsibility over a text and, eventually, a greater sense of ownership and commercialisation. This argument perhaps appears to offer up the notion that 'the author', as we would understand it, is a creation of the Romantic period. However, Stephen B. Dobranski suggests that authorship, in terms of the single figure of the 'Author', originated from before the Romantic period and claims that at that point in the seventeenth century there still existed a cultural process of

co-authorship, a concept discussed elsewhere in this chapter (Dobranski, 2008, p.24). Williams does concede that the notion of the artist as someone who can reveal "a higher kind of truth", and was somehow special, was not new to the Romantic period, as has been shown via Young. Rather, Williams suggests that it is during this period that it "received significant additional emphasis" (1958, p.60-61).

It is clear that the author has always played an important role, whether as a figurehead for his Muse or as an intellectual genius, and this is important to consider when engaging with contemporary authorship theory. By the nineteenth century, writing was a more prominent profession, with a wider potential audience, and whilst notions of 'genius' were believed, they were beginning to unravel due to the pressures of the industrial production of 'art', and particular emphasis was more overtly placed on the artist as an individual originator. The shift in authorial authority could also perhaps be seen as a microcosm for understanding how some of society's attitudes and approaches to the author have *not* changed, as much as an illustration of what has. That is to say, the seemingly inevitable propagation of the ideology of a higher power, whether God, muse or inherent genius, that seems to inform the artists' work and renders them as separate, elevated or otherwise *different* to ordinary people. This discussion has highlighted how the author came to be a focus of critical attention, and suggests perhaps that the investment of authority in a text's author is a displacement of a previously accepted divine authority that occurred at a critical point of social and cultural development.

The ideology of the genius author implies a singular creator whose own skill has produced a complete, meaningful text, one that can be deciphered and interpreted, but always in the context of a single, unequivocal 'truth'. The issues inherent in this are twofold. First, it isolates the author from all outside influences and potential interactions and collaborations, many of which, as will be shown, were very much deliberate at certain points in history. Secondly, it suggests a fixed 'truth' to a work, closing down other possibilities, and placing a sole authority in the figure of the author. Historically, texts have rarely been fixed, and the 'truth', whether that of a fictional world, a political outlook, or a religious doctrine, has rarely been an inflexible constant. Writing and ideas have often existed in a collaborative and adaptive environment and it is only the proliferation of the author-artist, discussed previously, and then the burgeoning strength of the publishing industry and copyright, discussed more below, that has worked to close down the possibilities of the text and fold them into the constructed figure of the author.

Stephen B. Dobranski highlights that phrases, lines, ideas and even specific text would be appropriated from other writers, without credit, and texts would often be the result of discussions and collaborations with peers, as was the accepted process of writing in the seventeenth century (2008, p.33). He concludes:

> the paradox is that a writer's individual authority grew out of a collaborative process, in which various people co-operated to produce printed books, various people benefited financially from their sale, and various people were ultimately held responsible for the ideas that the books contained (Dobranski, 2008, p.37-38).

The accounts of a complex century or so of relatively rapid development in the cultural understanding and definition of authorship have been both under-explored and over-simplified. Authorship has an historical basis as a communal and shared activity. Under the previous patronage system, the writer would have access to his audience, and his contemporaries, creating a more communal form of writing, which will be the focus of a discussion further in this chapter (Williams, 1958, p.50).

During the earlier periods, in particular around the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, despite the assertions of either divine inspiration or artistic genius, writers had little legal authority, and publishers did not need an author's permission to publish a work. At the same time as this, the author could still be held accountable for the content, with Dobranski providing some gory examples of punishments inflicted upon writers of 'seditious texts', but also alongside them, punishments would be given to publishers and even book sellers, to both greater and lesser extents (2008, pp.25-27). Speaking on this, Foucault suggests that "speeches and books were assigned real authors, other than mythical or important religious figures, only when the author became subject to punishment and to the extent that his discourse was considered transgressive" (1969a, p.235). Authorial importance then, was only important as a means of placing blame, and identifying guilt, within the context of a text being considered dangerous or unsuitable. The inference is clear, also, that there is no one singular author, but a collective of those responsible for the undesirable text being produced and/or distributed. The writer may play an integral role, but even in the case of punishments, there is clearly no singular authority associated with a text.

Authors and the Cultural Shifts in Leisure and Reading.

It is to the author and their changing role within the societies of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries that this discussion will now turn its focus. As I have demonstrated, the historical origins of authorship illustrate how contemporary

definitions are constructed through socio-cultural influences, rather than having an inherent authority and power. This section will elaborate on the processes that saw the contemporary ideas of the author-function evolve, and provide a context for contemporary forms of reading and author and audience interactions. It will serve to identify how the boundaries between production and consumption were historically formed, policed and navigated, and suggest how periods of technological developments can lead to these boundaries being negotiated. Despite having become a more prominent figure, the author was still often lacking in both social and economic power, and indeed, many had difficulties finding payment for their work. In this turbulent period, issues surrounding copyright, responsibility, collaboration and appropriation were arguably coming into prominence. As authors became known for works, so they became responsible for them, whilst dealing with both the increasingly capitalist ambitions of publishers and the aforementioned complicated and uncertain issues of ownership and copyright. With an increasingly dominant capitalist ideology gripping the nineteenth century, authorship would ultimately emerge more prominently out of a period characterised by conflicted interests, a culture torn between ambitions for high art and an emphasis on greater profits. The growth of the author went hand in hand with the increasing strength of the publishing industry, which became increasingly organised and profit-driven. Paul Schlicke has discussed how entertainment in general became increasingly commercialised, through organised sporting events and theatres. He suggests that "age-old traditions of local, largely spontaneous, small-scale participatory amusement were gradually superseded by commercially based, large-scale, highly organised professional entertainment" and this is perhaps emblematic of a wider cultural shift. He further states that "during the 1830s and 1840s the older cultural tradition was fading faster than the new forms were emerging to replace them" (2011, p.94). Jennifer Hayward, using J. H. Plumb, suggests that "newspaper advertisements and articles helped to institute the idea of leisure as inseparable from consumption" and that the "public and private spheres were diverging", in regards to home life and 'work' (1997, p.35). Serial fiction, which will be returned to and discussed in greater detail below, played a vital part in this cultural shift which saw leisure and entertainment become clearly distinct from the working day. It is within these contexts that we can see the changes in the publishing industry of the time, and in which we can form a greater understanding of the transformation of the author. As entertainment throughout society became industrialised, the iconographic potential of the singular writer or creator became a marketing instrument for publishers. Barthes almost poetically suggests that society discovered "the prestige of the individual" and that this

represented "the culmination of capitalist ideology" (1967, p.126). This prestige stemmed from the 'recognition' of artistic genius that has been discussed previously, and it neatly slotted into an ideology based around individual labour and profit and reward based on personal enterprise. That said, it was the capitalist approach of publishers that arguably posed the greatest threat to authorship in its formative days, although the relationship of writers and printers was a notably complicated one. Stephen B. Dobranski's discussion of the seventeenth-century approach to authorship and publishing gives a useful context for the changes that were to occur, whilst highlighting again that authorial ideals at least began in these earlier time periods. Dobranski argues that "even as writers started to exert more control over and gain new responsibility for their printed texts, they... continued to depend on collaborative practices of writing and publishing" (2008, p.24). Patronage was a declining concept, something Williams suggests positively contributed to the changing relationship of authors and readers, but which also led to "the increasing commodification of art" and which in turn "aided the rise of the novel" (quoted in Jones, 1998). Dobranksi warns not to overstate "the significance of the author's name" and that "a distinguished dedicatee might overshadow the writer, while, for theatrical work, the writer might be upstaged by a patron, company, or popular actor" (2008, p.41). His caution is worth noting and remembering, especially in light of the increasing influence of publishers of the era (2008, p.41). Charles Dickens, arguably epitomising the popular author of the eighteenth century, had a complicated relationship with the publishing industry, at times greatly beneficial and at others, swamped with conflict. The turbulent relationship of author and publisher reached back to previous centuries and issues of responsibility and ideological motivations.

In some of the earliest iterations of authorship, the authority for a text is distinctly spread across separate individuals, at different stages in the publication history of a text. In a sense this was an acceptance of publishing as a collaborative process, arguably an unambiguous denial of the sole importance of an authorial voice. However, as time moved forward and culture moved towards the elevated author, it seems that the law stayed somewhat mired in the previous centuries.

Rise of the Publishers.
By the nineteenth century, the publishers themselves gained greater control of the industry, through both the institutional systems that existed for publishing and the weak copyright laws that failed to keep up with changing attitudes towards authorship. Florian Schweizer has suggested that "the logistics of the book trade

were organised by publishers who emerged as middlemen between writers and audience. They professionalised the world of letters with a commercial outlook and focus on profits, often at the expense of authors" (2011, p.118). The weaknesses in copyright law also saw works of authors such as Dickens being utilised for other purposes, the details of which will be discussed further in this chapter in the context of audience interactions and relationships with texts. Schweizer locates the conflict as stemming from the very beginnings of organised publishing, creating anger during the Romantic period:

> With the rise of the publisher, the economics of writing became commercialised, and by the end of the century books had become a commodity, their success now measured by sales rather than quality. The commodification of literature and the degradation of authors sparked a strong reaction, staged more prominently by Romantic poets such as William Wordsworth who subscribed fully to the newly developed notion of originality and genius. (Schweizer, 2011, p.118)

Jennifer Hayward argues that as the publishing industry developed, they expanded their range of potential consumers by "distinguishing an elite from the growing mass of readers" necessitating "different marketing strategies for different readers" (1997, p.38). The notion of authorial power clashed with the economic strength of the publishing houses, especially when the profits could often fail to reach a work's author. Schweizer emphasises that writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century could, and did, die in poverty, whilst at the same time their work generated profits for the publishers (2011, pp.117-124). Serial fictions, as the cheapest form of fiction, Hayward suggests, were perceived as the lowest form, although certain magazine narratives such as those of Dickens were seen as being separate from these (1997, p.38-39). Certainly Dickens was given some aid from his publishers at the early stages of his career, where careful promotion and reduced rates of pay allowed them to eventually create a success of a failing book by the author (Hayward, 1997, pp.22-23). The motivations are clearly to generate a profit from the title, but still emphasise the variation present in a constantly changing relationship of authors and publishers. Whereas Dickens had support then, later years would see unknown writers living in abject poverty, a situation that was subject to political debate according to Schweizer.

Dickens actively fought for the rights of authors, and attempted to obtain an international copyright agreement that he would not see come to fruition in his lifetime (Schweizer, 2011, p.117-124). This almost contradictory account of authorship in relation to publishers highlights the uncertain nature of copyright and ownership of the era, as well as the constant negotiation between artistic ideals and

capitalist economy. However, it seems clear that the relationship with publishers placed authors in a weaker position, in opposition at times, and on some level the active legal authority resided predominantly with the former. There is an unfortunate irony that copyright was fought for by individuals such as Dickens for arguably noble reasons, intended to protect authors from commercial exploitation and the vulgarities of publishers within the market. Authors now seem more closely aligned with the publishers, the contemporary 'producers' often combining the roles of author and 'publisher' (used loosely in terms of television, but a suitable correlation for the point discussed), whilst the enemy of both, and indeed the enemy of 'copyright', is now the audience itself. Whilst perhaps putting in mind the phrase 'the enemy of my enemy is my friend', this apparent alliance in opposition to consumers, to be less flippant, represents a key and quite dramatic cultural shift. This is not to say that the fan-producers cannot be critical of other departments and decisions made within the production industries, as I illustrate further in this thesis, but authors are more closely aligned with the forces of production in contemporary culture. Dickens at least presented himself at times as no friend to the publishing industry, and many writers were in open conflict with it whilst Dickens, as we shall see further in this chapter, courted the attention and interaction of his audience.

The publishing industry, through its early interactions and conflicts with writers, greatly contributed to the eventual emergence of the singular authorial figure as generally understood now. Williams states clearly that "in the modern period there is an observable relation between the idea of an author and the idea of 'literary property': notably in the organisation of authors to protect their work, by copyright and similar means, within a bourgeois market" (1997, p.192). In the context of the earlier discussions of authors seeking to establish their ownership to avoid poverty, it is important to consider the power and influence of capitalist culture, which arguably both creates the problem of poverty and then offers a solution in claiming material rights. The singular, authoritative author must retain control over all other uses of their work in order to resist the exploitative publishers, in the original context, but now this has led to a more dominant ideology of authorship throughout culture. The birth of the author as a singular authority over the later nineteenth and then twentieth centuries is better understood as a divergence from the more open and free use of texts, the restoration of which is now being fought for culturally, across media and technologies.

This does have implications that may bring to mind Jenkins's 'Robin Hood' account of current television fandom, and this is certainly not something that should be dismissed. Indeed, this study perhaps best highlights the useful components of Jenkins's theories, namely the resistance to strict ownership, whilst we must remain critical of the limitations of his work, as discussed in chapter one. Despite various clashes with the publishing industry, the idealisation of the author continued, and the notion of the art of a creative text stemming from a single creative genius is a notion that obviously still finds popular support today.[12] However, for all its propagation, perhaps the bitterest irony is that the ideology of authorship had emerged at the actual moment that the individual power of the author went into sharp decline due to the rise of the publishing industry. The capitalistic approach to writing worked to render authorship as an industrial practice, even as it was culturally moved towards the arts; this was a contradiction that served to fuel the struggle between the different poles of production, between the authors and the publishers, and informed much of the conflict of the nineteenth century. In many ways it is a struggle that has never ended; although a semblance of unification was found through the advancement in copyright laws, as has become clear, this has simply redrawn the boundaries of conflict, moving authors generally into the arena of publishing[13] and positioned audiences as adversarial. Authorship is thus rendered uncertain upon its conception; it cannot be utilised as a means of dictating textual meaning or authority as it is inherently unstable.

Auteur Theory and Repeating History.

The focus thus far has been on the literary, and it seems somewhat redundant to point out that this is because of the medium's mainstream emergence and dominance within the time periods discussed. As has been demonstrated, contemporary understandings of authorship emerged in the context of specific movements, influences and pressures, and the same can be said for its application in more modern entertainment media. The fan-producers who make <u>Doctor Who</u> do so primarily within the television industry, although the series and merchandise crosses various media, and the involvement of fans, as has been discussed in previous chapters, can be found in almost all areas. Television authorship is therefore an important focus for these discussions, although the wider media

---

[12] This is the mainstream understanding of authorship, particularly in literary terms, but also across other media, notably with film directors being primarily positioned as the 'authors' of that medium, the existence of screen writers generally ignored in their favour.

[13] Although not exclusively, and there are numerous example of copyright conflicts and legal battles between authors and publishers that continue to occur today.

industry, particularly cinema, is a vital and relevant component to be considered in understanding authorship within this context. This discussion will now, then, look at how notions of authorship were transposed and utilised in the different, more modern, media, and how this has led to the current mainstream understanding of the author and authorial authority. Whilst the entire debate surrounding auteur theory is not entirely within the remit of this exercise, it is still important to briefly note how this was used as a way for early cinema to obtain a form of cultural legitimacy. Authorship, as has been demonstrated, played an important role in the organisation and cultural understanding of writing, especially as it increasingly became part of mass culture and society, rather than specifically for an educated elite. Indeed, it was through auteur theory that early cinema coveted and gained legitimacy as an art form, also obtaining a greater cultural value, in turn relating back to Williams's discussion on the emergence of art and high culture. This connection is made by Edward Buscombe, who suggests that Andrew Sarris's approach to auteur theory, as a means of elevating an author's individuality "as a test of cultural value", echoes Williams's discussion on the rise of aesthetic theory in the Romantic period, as also touched upon earlier in this chapter (1981, p.27-28). Sarris was a key figure in applying a form of auteurism to the Hollywood system, and in many ways he arguably did much to bring the idea of authorship within visual media to the wider attention of audiences. Buscombe places the origins of the auteur theory in early cinema magazines, explaining that:

> It was inevitable that part of the project of a new film magazine would be to raise the cultural status of the cinema. The way to do this, it seemed, was to advance the claim of cinema to be an art form like painting or poetry, offering the individual the freedom of personal expression. (1973, p.23)

Literature, of course, could be also mentioned alongside painting and poetry, and this chapter has already explored how the elevation of artists was tied into the sense of personal expression and artistic skill. Buscombe further points out that, by the sixties, questions were already being asked as to "why the cinema should be discussed largely in terms of individual artists" (1973, p.23). What this points to overall is a consistently unsteady understanding of film authorship; the foundation of auteur theory was not a strong central idea to be resisted but rather, one that began from a precarious position. The nature of this uneven foundation is the core issue already discussed in terms of authorship, and repeated here for clarity. The notion of the artist was a way of elevating individuals within society as being noteworthy, and valuable, and by this stage had become bound up in capitalist systems. The figure of the author-artist was both a way to raise a profile and cultural value, but also to

generate greater profit and sales. The author was often seen as an individual, distanced from pressures and influences around them, such as publishers in literature, and then production teams and producers on film, and later television. The conflict of art and commerciality, and of the individual versus co-authorship, was far from resolved, and carried over directly into the cinema. Whilst auteur theory in many ways served its purpose at the time, generating a sense that cinema could be art and therefore 'matter', it also brought with it numerous other problems and issues.

Within the auteur approach to film, there have been criticisms of its suppression of outside agencies beyond the elevated individual, a legitimate complaint that recalls the same position of the early 'literary geniuses' and the strength of the publishers. That is to say, both encounter the dilemma of a more collaborative reality within authorship, whereby the theoretical position that elevates the author cannot seem to be compatible with the realities of the collaborative creation of texts. Early auteur theory tended to focus on the art-house cinema, avant-garde and often European film-making, something Sarris would come to oppose and counter with his elevation of Hollywood cinema.

Using Sarris, Buscombe highlights how in Hollywood, European (often synonymous with art-house) film is seen as artistic and free from pressures due to its geographical and cultural distance from America, which renders social and economic pressures on other films' forms invisible, at least to some extent (1973, pp.28-29). However, these pressures do still exist, and so cannot be ignored in any attempt to discuss film authorship. A monolithic approach to any institution is inherently flawed, a concept explored further in the following chapters. As will be examined further below, Pam Cook's distinction between the supposedly independent film-makers, and the companies distributing and exhibiting the completed works, is not too far removed from the fan-producer's role of creating a television programme, and the wider corporation's task in marketing and broadcasting it (Cook, 1978).

Collaborative Authorship in Fiction and Films.
One of the first dilemmas of auteur theory is one that is directly relevant to this exploration, that being the acknowledgement of the impact of exterior forces upon the text's author, whether the direct actions of other individuals, or in the form of influences upon the film's director. Pam Cook, in discussing the avant-garde

cinema, identifies how a film author's own unconscious and conscious concerns can inform and manifest in their work "without suppressing the personal, but without privileging the discourse of the artist" (Cook, 1978, p.279). This ties in with previously discussed notions that work to move a central authority away from the author, not necessarily completely, but in allowing an understanding of exterior pressures and forces upon both the artist and the work itself. These forces can include corporate or funding organisations, which even in terms of the avant-garde, where 'aesthetic freedom' is privileged, can alter and influence the product ultimately created. Cook urges an understanding that:

> the relationship of avant-garde film practice to such an institutional practice is contradictory and can only be understood in terms of the specificity of both, not in terms of an ideal of autonomy for the former or a monolithic repressive function on the part of the latter. (1978, p.279)

Equally, the surrounding corporate or commercial pressures on film auteurs cannot be detached from the historical precedent set by the publishing houses and patrons of previous generations of authors. The same breakdown of traditional ideals of authorship can be seen in the collaborative medium of film, as have been theorised in the co-authorship of early literary work. Cook focuses on the various outside influences on film-making, both technically and within the minds of the intended audience, the latter being a discussion that will be expanded throughout this chapter.

> The intentions/concerns of the film-maker are subject to extraneous factors, filmic and non-filmic, which are out of her or his control: chance and random elements, the unconscious of the viewer, among other things. The discourse of the film-maker is one code among many, and this foregrounding of the coding of the personal changes the problematic from the basically defensive position of Brakhage's controlling visionary to a recognition of the artist's vulnerability in a capitalist economy where her or his autonomy is only apparent (Cook, 1978, p.278).

Here we find a return to a discourse on capitalism, which both renders the author vulnerable whilst at the same time celebrating her individual talent as a base for establishing authority and presenting what is essentially a form of commercial branding. Timothy Corrigan highlights how the use of auteurism "identifies mainly the desire and demand of an industry to generate an artistic (and specifically Romantic) aura during a period when the industry as such needed to distinguish itself from other, less-elevated forms of mass media" (1991, p.102). The elevation of film-makers to auteurs supported a capitalist desire to separate film from the implied inferior medium of television, and also formed "a kind of brand-name vision that precede[d] and succeed[ed] the film" (1991, p.102). As we have seen with Dickens, the name of a successful and popular author is a powerful tool for publishers keen to

generate greater profit, and this has perhaps never been more the case than it is in contemporary media markets. History is indeed repeating itself, and the iconographic power of a single writer, director or producer can be utilised in the marketing of media productions[14]. Corrigan argues that, by the seventies, auteurs had "become increasingly situated along an extratextual path in which their commercial status as auteurs is their chief function as auteurs" (1991, p.105). Capitalism, rather than being an unfortunate burden on cinema and authors/auteurs, is rather bound up in the very conceptualisation and reproduction of notions of authorship. The difficulties discussed by Buscombe, Cook and others stem from auteur theories' avoidance of engaging with the complexities surrounding production and authorship. The auteur themselves becomes a star attraction and, Corrigan argues, "in a twist on the tradition of certain movies being vehicles for certain stars, the auteur-star can potentially carry and redeem any sort of textual material" (1991, p.105). The media industries themselves have little incentive to question the notion of the auteur as it is a useful marketing tool, utilised in branding and contextualising of films. Thus, films become recognised and identified by these brands; a Spielberg film, or a Stallone film, for example. Similarly, Doctor Who's different periods are correlated with their showrunners, as in 'the Davies era' or 'the Moffat era' (Corrigan, 1991, p.106-107). There is not just a difficulty in fully reconciling the collaborative nature of the medium, but there is also a lack of any real engagement in how the concept of 'author' is understood to begin with, overlooked in favour of the auteur as brand.

Whilst the following example is used to illustrate how authorship as a concept only accompanies certain texts, the rhetoric could be applied to film with little difficulty; a film may have a cinematographer, but he is not an author, a film may even have a script writer, but he too is not the author. The discourse of cinematic authorship elevates the director as the authority and artistic visionary of a production; thus it is not just that only certain texts have authors, but only certain writers or producers within a text can be the author. This observation will certainly gain further relevance further on in this thesis in exploring the author-function of the principal fan-producers of Doctor Who. In discussing French law in relation to authorship, Molly Nesbit makes note of how there were attempts by the late fifties to engage with the co-

---

[14]   Joss Whedon has cultivated a media identity and a level of authority that can dictate the 'canonicity' of a product. Thus, new *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* comics are given additional importance because Whedon claims they are 'canon'. Fandom's desire for extra-textual expanded worlds is exploited along with Whedon's own authorial power in order to give a commercial advantage to an additional text.

authored nature of cinema, but ones that ultimately seemed to reaffirm the auteurist approach. Directors were given central identification as the author, but at the same time, rights were also given to writers and composers, and the finished product would belong to the production company. Nesbit suggests that this "denied the contribution made by those who worked on the image itself and it has the effect of submitting all authors to the will of the producer" and thus positioned culture as subordinate to the corporate industries (1995, p.254). Nesbit's discussions highlight how laws themselves needed to adapt to new technologies, and seemingly have as much difficulty in identifying the figure of the author, as those involved in earlier copyright negotiations. Whilst auteur theory, in many ways, was a convenient approach to gaining legitimacy, and essentially worked by accepting widely held beliefs regarding authorship and authority, it never really resolved any of the ongoing problems within authorship theory. In working from this position, auteur theory inherited the same problems and questions of the nature of authorship that previous (generally literary) media would encounter, arguably to an even greater extent due to the greater visibility of cast and crew members beyond the given author. However, ultimately, the origin of auteur theory can be positioned within the academic magazines of the era, and as discussed, within the attempts to legitimise film as an artistic medium. Greg Taylor suggests that, at its root, auteur theory was "merely a polemical assertion that at least the personalities of the most interesting movie directors manage to shine through their humdrum, generic material" (1999, p.87). Criticising Andrew Sarris, Taylor suggests auteurism was "used to shore up the cultural authority of spectators who had seen enough films to be able to claim the artists in their midsts" (1999, p.88). Auteur theory has, in many ways, informed, and continues to inform, authorship in film and television, and has often been the justification for elevating certain paracinematic texts, such as the works of Dario Argento or George Romero. That is to say, the notion of the author now carries such weight that it is the primary tool for attempting to reclaim or elevate the cultural standing of non-traditional texts. Arguably, it is for this very purpose that auteur theory exists, and whilst it "may have pretended to favour inherent value by rescuing the unheralded artists in our midst... the true value of these artists' works could be activated only by a critic able to see each auteur film within the broader context of an oeuvre, and within the restrictive context of studio pressures" (Taylor, 1999, p.155). Whilst auteur theory can serve both studio branding purposes, and marking out critics' own distinctive talents in identifying auteur film-makers, it has less use in actually understanding authorship. The recurring ideology of authorship has been reproduced again and again, including within the figures of the fan-producers of

Doctor Who, whose eras are seen predominantly (and with some justification) through the lens of their own particular artistic sensibilities. However, as this chapter has already demonstrated, this model of authorship is both flawed and has developed, sometimes for noble reasons, out of reactions to many economic or cultural pressures throughout the history of modern publishing. Just as the 'genius' author was born out of a sense of elevating the individual writer, and tied into arguments for greater control of their work, so the relatively new visual medium of film attempted to elevate 'auteurs' as a vessel of cultural legitimacy. The theorists then, that were making the case for 'auteur' theory, were simply repeating the historically developed concept of the 'author' and supplanting it to a new medium, one that arguably was already a much more collaborative experience than literary writing. The genius 'author' and the 'auteur' are arguably the forefathers of the contemporary notion of the 'showrunner' and it is to this concept that this discussion will now turn.

Showrunners and Quality Television.

Just as the medium of film had to struggle to obtain legitimacy, so too has television attempted to change the perceptions and attitudes towards its content, and to stand out in an increasingly saturated global marketplace. In my previous references to branding, I highlighted how identification with key values has become an integral part of media production. The media landscape is "increasingly contoured by national industry deregulation and global media conglomeration" and "high-profile original movies and mini-series are used to attract new viewers and build network brand identities" (McMurria, 2003, pp.66-67). McMurria focuses on event television, but increasingly, these are tied into not only network and company brands, but the individual brands of the figure of the showrunner. A television series such as the fourth series of Doctor Who spin-off Torchwood was an American co-production with the channel Starz, and its identity was constructed around the brands of the series, Russell T. Davies as showrunner, and the channel's own reputation for strong, original drama. This discussion then, will highlight how the showrunner identity can become a signifier for quality television, a brand in itself, and work towards the legitimisation of television as a platform for serious, dramatic material.

There will be somewhat of a bias towards American television in this discussion, as this is the arena in which the figure of the showrunner emerges, and Doctor Who, in replicating this, was the exception rather than the rule for British television production at the time of its return. Davies, as I have discussed elsewhere,

deliberately set out to emulate the American style of lead writer, to some extent, and has cited Buffy the Vampire Slayer and its creator Joss Whedon as an influence (Shimpach, 2010, p.169). Christine Cornea argues that whilst "the advent of the writer-executive producer as a powerful authorial figure" is relatively new to US television, Britain actually "has a long and well-established tradition of elevating the importance of its writers" (2009, p.117). As Cornea highlights, this has roots in both literary tradition and the BBC's mandate to promote "high culture", and Davies is able to be associated with "this longstanding British tradition at the same time as he boasts a new-style authorial voice" (2009, p.117-118). The emphasis on this "new style" voice ties back into notion of quality television, and the appeal of associating the new series of Doctor Who with American production values. Michael Z. Newman and Elana Levine suggest that there are "a key set of tensions marking American television during the contemporary period, as the cultural value of the medium undergoes negotiation and revision" (2012, p.124). Television's process of legitimation began in earnest in the eighties and early nineties, as more challenging programmes, designed to attract a higher class of viewer and compete in the growing media landscape, started to proliferate. Various writers have identified several key texts in the eighties and early nineties that began to mark a transition in how television was viewed, with series such as Hill Street Blues and Twin Peaks gaining multiple mentions (Jancovich & Lyons, 2003, p.1; Gwenllian-Jones, 2003, p.166; Newman & Levine, 2012, p.720). Some of these discourses, Newman and Levine suggest, offered "a sense of television's possibility that would be amplified in the discourse of the convergence era" (2012, p.720). In the nineties, this developed further, and Shimpach notes that "this period witnessed the rise of lavishly produced, multi-character narrative dramas featuring characters whose actions are motivated by deep and complex syntheses of psychology and biography" (2010, p.49). These very features would also appeal to fandom, who are likely to engage with texts they judge as superior, such as with Twin Peaks, and thus "new technologies, select television programs, and viewers' conception of themselves as exceptional" are combined within the processes of legitimation (Newman & Levine, 2012, p.746). Shawn Shimpach examines how the television series 24 was "at its essence a programming stunt" whose "unique approach gathered plenty of attention" (2010, p.126). Shimpach notes that whilst it was not a ratings success initially, it brought critical acclaim and was renewed. Whilst the format was primarily designed "to make the show unique and to garner attention from amid the clutter of early twenty-first century television programming" it became "a site of 'quality' programming for a flailing network" (2010, p.126). Quality and acclaim, then, take on

increasing importance, and can work to increase the brand identity of television channels, such as HBO, that has become known for productions such as The Sopranos and, more recently, Game of Thrones. Dean J. DeFino has examined the impact of HBO as a key defining force in helping to "give shape to that otherwise ill-defined term, 'quality TV'" (2014, p.9). HBO, he argues, "is itself a by-product of that long history" of American television and popular culture, and is "a manifestation of something immanent to television and popular culture generally" (DeFino, 2014, p.23). The branding, identity and approaches of HBO are implicitly tied to the history of legitimisation of different media forms, which has seen certain forms of television considered "quality". It should be remembered, however, that in venerating certain television as exceptional, there is an implied judgement of inferiority towards programming that does not reach these standards. Newman and Levine note that the process of legitimation is "premised upon cultural hierarchies, and hierarchies of all kinds require the denigration of some to justify the elevation of others" (2012, p.931). Jason Mittell suggests that whilst Newman and Levine "shine an important light on how evaluative approaches to television often strive for legitimacy by highlighting connections to more legitimated media... instead of focusing on specific attributes unique to television" they themselves fall into the trap of dismissing "broader trends of legitimation" (2015, p.214). Mittell suggests that they "provide little room to account for the multifaceted pragmatics of taste distinctions and evaluations that cultural consumers regularly engage with pleasurably" (2015, p.214). Mittell is critical of the work of Bourdieu being treated "as gospel" as it serves to shut down discussions of different forms of textual engagement, and suggests it should form part of a discourse including "issues of aesthetics and evaluation" (2015, p.214-215). Mittell argues for an analysis of taste as something other than "a reflection of either textually inherent aesthetic value or contextually determined markers of the critic's social strata" (2015, p.207). However, such judgements of individual taste do not serve the required purposes of branding and exemplifying specific texts and channels, such as HBO, but it is perhaps for this very reason that Mittell's suggestions should be heeded. DeFino notes that the tagline "It's not TV; it's HBO" implies the channel is not striving to reach an assumed standard of television, but that it both surpasses and redefines it, demonstrating that notion of inherent aesthetic value that Mittell criticises (2014, p. 12). Thus, whilst not universal, and with both exceptions and previous attitudes still remaining, "an emergent set of discourses proposes that television has achieved the status of great art, or at least of respectable culture, disturbing long-standing hierarchies that placed the medium far below literature, theatre, and cinema, in social, cultural, and technological worth"

(2012, p.124). HBO can now seek to not only define itself as respectable, but as superior, primarily through intense marketing of its brand. As I have shown throughout this chapter, emerging media have struggled to find legitimacy, and the discourses surrounding television, and particularly the showrunners, have several historical precedents. However, as HBO demonstrates, a showrunner is not the only means to authorship and legitimation, as DeFino highlights how the channel "made *itself*, not just its programming, the very brand of 'quality'" (2014, p.12). Catherine Johnson also highlights some of the difficulties HBO faced in creating its own branding, whereby "the economic demands on HBO as a media business that combines production, distribution and exhibition can run counter to the demands of HBO's channel brand" (2012, p.34). The desire to brand is bound up in the economics of commercial television and, though HBO is funded by its subscriber base, it must maintain its brand identity, its production of "quality television", in order to maintain its revenue stream. The showrunner is one specific method to demarcate quality, and is perhaps more applicable to individual programming, although it should be noted that the producers of Doctor Who are inherently bound up in the brand of the BBC. Branding, and the use of brands in Doctor Who will be explored in more depth in Chapter Eight.

Showrunners, then, are one of the central author figures that can be positioned as markers of quality television, whose reputations and brand identities can offer additional benefit to the productions they engage with.[15] When the BBC set out to resurrect Doctor Who, it would be as an example of quality television; "this production was to be an 'authored' drama" unlike the original series (Shimpach, 2010, p.169). For Newman and Levine, showrunners "are well-known public figures, credited as both the creators and destroyers of TV greatness, even as many of the medium's production personnel remain anonymous" (2012, p.124). They argue, much as in the days of early film legitimation, that the showrunner can be seen as an auteur, and is positioned in much the same way as directors were in regards to the film industry (2012, p.954). They highlight that the term itself has no official standing, and its origins are obscured, but that its widening use "to mean television artist has arisen as a strategy of legitimation for certain kinds of programming" (2012, p.973). Despite the multi-authored nature of much of television drama, the showrunner works to obscure this in favour of the prestige that may come from

---

[15]   I say 'engage with' as showrunners may find their name utilised on certain programmes that they only help establish. A showrunner may become permanently connected to a series that they have little impact on after the initial pilot, or season.

individual authorship. Indeed, the brand associated with a particular showrunner may act as a further selling point, or a means to attract further talent and thus prestige, to a project. As Newman and Levine point out, "authorship functions as branding to attract a desirable upscale audience to programming constructed as authentically artistic" (2012, p.1044). The brand works within the industry as well, as highlighted by Russell T. Davies's decision to take joint credit on scripts written during his final year as showrunner on <u>Doctor Who</u>, something he had previously avoided. With fewer episodes being made, replaced with several special event episodes, Davies was able to be convinced that his name would attract bigger guest star names, despite not re-writing the scripts to any greater extent than he usually did without taking credit (Davies & Cook, 2010). The importance of the figure of the showrunner lies in their branding potential, their reputation, and their associations with notions of perceived quality and integrity. It is interesting to note that on the last two series of <u>Doctor Who</u>, current showrunner Steven Moffat has started receiving a co-writer credit on a wider number of episodes, arguably highlighting the strength of his own personal branding. Newman and Levine note that particular showrunners can exhibit certain authorial marks, found repeatedly across their work, which they apply to Joss Whedon (2012, p.1261). Matt Hills similarly notes Davies's recurring themes across his work prior to <u>Doctor Who</u>, and suggests a number of authorial marks, including specific forms of dialogue and how he positions queer identity as a 'non-agenda agenda', resisting becoming an 'issue' (2010, p.36). The showrunner is the central figurehead and thus both an important figure and constant target within fan cultures, blamed for events in their programmes as much as they are celebrated. Thus the new series of <u>Doctor Who</u> is divided far more into the two eras represented by its fan-producer showrunners, Russell T. Davies and Steven Moffat, than it is by the four principal leads since the series began. Newman and Levine also draw connections from the figure of the showrunner to the "conspicuously authored forms of literary and cinematic culture" but urge that we keep in mind that "authorship in any medium is a fact of production and an effect of publicity" (2012, p.1380). This chapter has worked to explore these notions in some depth, and demonstrated historical examples of the development of authorship, whilst the next will look at the role played by audiences through this history. History repeats specific patterns of legitimation, and these notions find ground in the media industries, popular culture, and academic study alike. These repetitions feature numerous variations, and the different media forms are legitimised in the context of how previous ones found critical and cultural success. That is to say, legitimising television through notions of quality has often drawn on cinema, whilst cinema was legitimised through existing

notions of authorship, notably stemming from literature. It is important to trace the historical trajectories of these notions of legitimacy, quality and authorship, as it further illuminates the potential difficulties in applying contemporary notions of authorship and production to culture.

The difficulty in the approach that venerates showrunners, or artists, authors and auteurs, is clear, in that it is partially academia itself that is responsible for perpetuating potentially flawed notions of authorship, and establishing them within the cinematic and televisual worlds where even now they inform the popular approach to cinema and directors or writers. In a sense, then, is the problem of authorship one of academia's own making? Newman and Levine argue that "one of the central strategies employed in discourses of television's legitimation is comparison with already legitimated art forms, such as literature and cinema" (2012, p.199). I have illustrated how this is a repetition of historical techniques of legitimation, previously utilised by cinema and print, and suggests that quality comes from certain criteria. However, it is not only academia that has made use of these notions, and it would be remiss to ignore how the groups that are often most invested in highlighting a text's worth are its fans. Discussing Lost fandom, Mittell notes how fans rest "ultimate authority with the series authors, both creative and industrial" but continue to explore what they consider to be clues and paratextual material (2015, p.281). Mittell suggests that this depth of engagement, "where complexity is a marker of quality over surface pleasures of sensation and surprise" is a binary form of legitimisation that rejects viewer evaluation, and different forms of cultural engagements can be "appropriate depending on a viewer's context and goals" (2015, p.290). Mittell argues that whilst we must recognise how contemporary media consumption has a broad range of "textual pleasures" available to viewers, these do not necessarily mark a series out as of inherently better quality, or more valuable than other texts (2015, p.291). However, fans themselves often still use these various signifiers of quality whether complex texts, notions of authorship, or specific brands, in order to emphasise the quality of their object of fandom. As many academic scholars have aca-fan identities, including myself, there is an argument that academia's reliance on legitimising notions of authorship can be traced to existing fan discourse. The problematic nature of auteur theory has been criticised of course, notably in Roland Barthes' (in)famous 'Death of the Author', but many of these discussions, as will be demonstrated, perhaps rely too much on the author themselves, and neglect the relevant historical context that has been considered above. Auteur theory was a useful tool, this is hard to deny, but since its inception it

is arguable that authorship theory has found itself unable to disentangle itself from the same binary ideas. Indeed, Newman and Levine also emphasise that the process of legitimation, which I have shown occurring through discourses of quality, branding and the showrunners, "is premised on a set of hierarchies that ultimately reinforce unjust social and cultural positions" (2012, p.153). Reinforcing the notions of the author and authorial authority further repeats history and fails to embrace a more nuanced understanding of the forces of production, and their relationships to consumers.

Death of the Author.

Attempts to redefine an understanding of authorship that takes into account the various problems and conflicts that have been discussed are, of course, an ongoing concern. Thus far it has been shown that the notion of the author and high culture emerged in its early history, and how the perception of what an author was had changed and developed into the more familiar figure of authority. The notion of authorship has been tied into film and television media through auteur theory, which has been criticised for repeating the same problematic ideologies surrounding authorship. The criticisms of auteur theory, most famously in Barthes's 'death of the author' concept, and more contemporary negotiations and debates surrounding the notion of the author are the focus of this discussion. Whilst this chapter intends to focus on the interactivity of authors and their audiences, this brief examination of these theories is vital in establishing a wider context for the issues under discussion.

The responses to Barthes comprise the next phase of authorship theory, and it is to the discussions of the author's importance, theoretically, in a modern context that this section shall now turn. Barthes's 'death of the author' essentially reaches back to an idea of textual creation and reading from before the Romantic period and elevation of the artistic genius. It can be likened to Henry Jenkins's allusions to 'poaching', which has similar historical precedent. This is to say, in the cases of both, they appeal to an ability within the audience to understand, interpret and take possession of a text beyond the figure of the author. This is perhaps not so surprising considering that, as has been demonstrated, the very concepts of ownership and copyright are relatively recent, even taking into account the notions of the earlier muse-inspired authors. Foucault makes clear that there was a historical point when there was no real question of authorship, as folk tales, epics and so forth were validated through their assumed age (1969, p.236). The author, with their inherent relationship with capitalism, was a more recent invention, whose

creation established the need for questioning the originator of a text. Barthes himself opens his criticism with just this observation, stating that "the author is a modern figure, a product of our society" (1958, p.125). The use of the word 'product' feels notable, in light of previous discussions on the commercialisation of art and literature during the expansion of capitalism; the author itself became a commodity whose value was both cultural and monetary. For an author to have value economically, their value and use must be convincing within culture, and so again the author as artist as authority dynamic is one that is perpetuated. Barthes summarises his own argument best, proclaiming that "once the Author is removed, the claim to decipher a text becomes quite futile. To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing" (1958, pp.128-129). It should be noted that Barthes is not outright rejecting the author's voice, or importance, and there is room in his argument for literary genius in the creation of texts. Rather, Barthes rejects the authority of the author, and the sense that there is a singular 'truth' to a work that must be uncovered and explored. Such an approach removes any agency from the readership, and indeed, would render obsolete any activity beyond a set interpretation that an audience may engage in. Barthes's theory is a strong starting point for engaging with alternative approaches to authorship and authority, and remains an important text to consider due to its clear, if relatively uncomplicated, reminder of the inherent weaknesses of authorship.

There has, of course, been a rebuttal to the criticisms of authorship, with detractors claiming that reports of the author's death are increasingly premature. Rather than rendering an author as a metaphorical 'living dead', they claim that whilst still alive, the author in turn gives life to their work. Jeremy Hawthorn neatly summaries the contrasting arguments, once more turning to metaphor to do so;

> They hold that the living presence of the author quickens the literary work, rescues it from the graveyard and from those cemetery attendants, literary critics. For the post-structuralist, quite the opposite is the case. The living author is, paradoxically, a dead hand, a stern parent who prevents the work from living a full life of its own. (2008, p.69)

The argument against the theory popularised by Barthes, then, is based on an understanding of the author as a grounding influence, who contextualises their work in their contemporary settings, society and the literary values of the time. Hawthorn negotiates the conflicting opinions well, and brings out the questionable aspects of Barthes's work and his followers, whilst highlighting suitable applications of the theories. Hawthorn's argument also brings into question the extent to which an author can be 'dead' and at what point this becomes desirable. His address towards

unfinished works, such as Dickens's The Mystery of Edwin Drood, is a useful addition to these debates, highlighting that however little importance an author must be seen to have, it is preferable that their works are completed before any literal death. Hawthorn suggests that more freedom from authorial control would actually be found if "all novels were published without their final chapter" before implicating the obvious undesirability of this (2008, p.79). Yet this is not necessarily as clear-cut as Hawthorn seems to suggest, once removed from the purely literary context that he is discussing. The shift in media to television means that issues of both television cancellation and fan interactivity can be added to the equation. Television as a medium destabilises the notion of a set and complete text, whether it is because the programme is prematurely cancelled, or simply because a text has gone in a direction at odds with certain areas of its fan base. For example the queer following of lesbian couple Willow (Alyson Hannigan) and Tara (Amber Benson) in Buffy the Vampire Slayer have rejected the tragic ending afforded the characters, with a fan website proclaiming to be where "Willow and Tara live happy together in a place untouched by Mutant Enemy" (The Kitten Board, 2012). The text is voluntarily curtailed in this example, and in others, fans have simply to guess and predict where a television show may have gone had it not been cancelled. Dean J. DeFino highlights how endings can be constructed in deliberately ambiguous ways, nothing how American channel HBO "is famous for its controversial endings, which frustrate familiar expectations of satisfying closure" (2014, 99). Discussing the ambiguous conclusion of The Sopranos, DeFino suggests the series had "two overlapping audiences", those watching for sex and violence and "those who marvelled at he thoughtful deconstruction of the postmodern gangster" (2014, p.99). Different audiences may respond to the conclusion of a series in different ways, and depending on the nature of that ending. DeFino argues that "millennia of stories have taught us to mistake endings for meaningful conclusions, rather than mere stopping points" (2014, p.100). Martin Zeller-Jacques states it has been argued that "despite the modern and post-modern tendency of endings to be more attenuated, less final, we continue to desire an ending in order to provide us with a point from which to make sense of what has come before" (2014, p.115). Zeller-Jacques further emphasises how the "deep emotional engagements" encouraged by viewing media, whether as it airs or whole boxed sets, further leads to passionate reactions to endings (2014, p.115). Fans can elaborate on and expand from a series ending, or even ignore it, in their own creative endeavours and programmes that offer more ambiguous or open endings are perhaps more malleable texts. Despite this desire for endings, Zeller-Jacques argues, television productions often have a vested

interest in delaying conclusions, to maintain viewer's interests and thus remain lucrative, even creating cliffhangers when faced with cancellation in order to galvanise support (2014, p.115-116). Rebecca Williams examines these "post-object fandoms" where dedicated audiences respond to a programme's conclusion in a variety of ways, and how they "may impact upon fans' self-identities and sense of ontological security" (2015, p.2). Williams also observes how "fandom continues and attracts newcomers after the cessation of programmes" and illustrates "how fans across different fandoms cope with the endings of shows and discuss these after networks cease airing new TV episodes" (2015, p.3-4). Using the example of Twin Peaks, Williams notes how endings without closure, or endings not intended as such, "can still offer pleasures of analysis and discussion, and prompt affective and emotional responses" (2015, p.38). In these and other cases, television narratives feel inherently more open to a cessation without completion, likely attributable to the generally more open-ended format of the medium. Hawthorn raises the issue of completion, and the difficulty of stating that a work has been finished, and texts that are completed by other literary writers after the death of the original writer, but he cannot seem to resolve this. Hawthorn brings this particular discussion to a close, noting that;

> Readers and critics are generally not prepared to grant the author absolute interpretive authority over his or her completed work, but yet demand that he or she have complete and relatively uninterrupted authority with regard to the establishing of a text – even though the establishing of a text has interpretative implications. (2008, p.81)

This feels more of a criticism than a resolution and this is perhaps not entirely unexpected. It might be more useful, and indeed accurate, to perceive readers, as with viewers and fans, as being less rigid in their supplication to the author; just as Hawthorne concludes that "the author's authority is not fixed" (2008, p.88), so too should the attitudes and approaches of readers be seen as varied, and their vocalism dependant on factors, both social and related to media and levels of engagement. Williams in particular, demonstrates the different variety of responses fans can display in reaction to the end of a television narrative, whether expected or not, and illustrates the conflicting emotions fans may have. Post-object fandom does not suggest texts cannot gain new fans, but rather that "television's scheduling and presence – it's 'liveness' - supports the idea that watching a television show on a DVD box set after its cancellation is very different from watching it while it remains an 'active object'" (2015, p.152). Thus post-object theory suggests that even when an author has essentially finished with a text, through choice or cancellation, a dedicated fandom will still engage with and make use of it, whether through

engagement with repeats, enjoying it again vicariously through new viewers, or creating their own extension through fan activities, such as fiction or videos.

Conclusions.

There have been, of course, critiques of these ideas, and calls for a return to the author. These discussions will be undertaken, and in some detail, in later chapters, once the central ideas of audience interactivity and shifting positions of fans and producers have been more properly, and fully, explored. The work of scholars such as Sean Burke in arguing for a reappraisal of authorship should be noted here, as an awareness that work has taken place and a reassurance that it will be addressed at a more appropriate juncture. The discussions thus far contribute to both an understanding of author-audience interactions, and the contexts from which contemporary fan-producer and showrunner discourses are drawn. The struggle to define the importance of the author is also a struggle for the activity of the audience; it is a negotiation between the authority and engagement that either position can have, as well as the origin for any potential crossover between the two subject positions. The author may not be quite as dead as Barthes had stated, but nor is he a singular, authoritative figure, and the author-function must be understood in light of the deconstruction of binary attitudes towards authorship across multiple media. The challenge in discussing authorship is to find a degree of truth and understanding amongst the conflicting theoretical approaches. The figure of the showrunner must also be discussed in ways that do not so easily repeat the problematic discourses historically connected to authors and auteurs. It seems that whilst the debate may continue on, to try and place too much emphasis on authorship can only be counterproductive, and the contemporary developments in technology are forcing a reassessment of authority and ownership that cannot be separated out from these debates. However, this holds true for arguments in favour of the author's continual survival, and media such as the internet have created a greater visibility for authors, and an increasing degree of interaction between them and their readership. This in turn, creates a greater sense of authority, as well as a more centralised fan base focused on and around the author, such as, for example, Kelley Armstrong whose series of dark fantasy novels are discussed by her fan base via an internet forum on her website, which the author herself frequents, and is watched over by selected guardians acting as administrators and moderators. Milly Williamson has discussed similar set-ups for the works of Anne Rice, although in the formers case, it is perhaps a more contemporary development that has stemmed from the height of the internet era, whereas the latter emerged in the early days of online communities,

and after Rice had already reached a high level of acclaim. However, what this relationship may also do is allow a re-evaluation of the author's potential for authority, and the potential of the author's continued life and input into a work, though it could equally illustrate an even greater need to remove the author from the equation, lest the narrative works become entirely superseded by a cult of celebrity surrounding their originator. The author has not disappeared, and indeed it could be argued that the author-function is becoming increasingly tied up in capitalistic exchanges as corporations and industry producers increasingly recognise and exploit the potential of an author's name and sense of authority. Advertisers have long understood the power of using celebrities to endorse a product, and authors are increasingly becoming utilised as a form of cultural endorsement, whereby they can be used to sell additional and spin-off material from a brand. However, the gulf between authorship theory and criticism, and the utilisation of the author-function, feels like an increasing one. The author as a brand is a carefully constructed marketing tool, as much, if not more so, than it is a reality of writing for contemporary television. Academia has also played its part in celebrating the showrunner figure, although this participation in the legitimating process is not an exclusive approach. Newman and Levine encourage "more self-reflexivity and caution as scholars take on the changes of television's present" and to avoid replicating the hierarchical judgements of taste of the dominant ends of the fields of cultural production (2012, p.3927). There is a sense that whilst authorship is still being negotiated as it always was, the function of the author in culture, and specifically in television, is evolving further. The showrunner model, combined with the increasing prevalence of fan-producers and fan and producer activity, opens up new avenues for exploring media culture and notions of authorship. The following chapter will build on this discussion of authorship, examining a similar historical account for audience consumption and interactivity with texts, along with the problematic producer and consumer binary. More work must be done in order for theoretical discussions to keep pace with the changes ushered forth in an era of internet interactivity, fan-producers and industry awareness, and it must be done with a constant vigilance against the repetition of potentially elitist cultural judgements.

-Chapter Four-
Contextualising the Fan:
Audience Engagements with Industries, Texts
& Authors from the Nineteenth Century.

As the previous chapter has demonstrated, the notion of authorship and authority has numerous political, economic and cultural reasons for emerging in the way that it has. In expanding this discussion, it is vital to gain an understanding of how reading patterns and the use of cultural materials have transformed, both in response and, potentially, in resistance to ideas of authorship. To this end, the following chapter will endeavour to examine the ways in which very early printed material was used and distributed, and trace how this developed.

In the first section of this chapter, I will be discussing the early perceptions of the role of the audience, and the role of reading itself as an activity, and how these are surprisingly less restrictive, in some ways, than perhaps might be imagined. The degree and nature of audience activity has transformed and adapted to numerous changing circumstances and often external pressures, both political and cultural. In the early period of authorship, as discussed in the previous chapter, around the seventeenth century, authors "did not envision a passive readership but instead expected their audiences to participate in their books to make them meaningful" (Stephen B. Dobranski, 2008, p.35). Dobranski emphasises that the view of audiences as historically passive is a common misconception, and thus there must be a clear understanding that the interaction between a reader and a text is an inherent and potentially essential part of the process of consuming texts and that it always has been. I will be looking at the early use of texts by audiences, through Ellen Gruber Garvey's work on scrapbooking, which draws some fascinating parallels with more contemporary technological developments. It is important to appreciate how the act of reading has been historically perceived, and how this often reflected political and social beliefs of the eras. Books and published materials were once conceived of as incomplete or malleable texts, where the audiences themselves were inherently perceived as actively engaged, changing and distributing the original material.

As has been briefly noted in Chapter Two, audiences would have been generally much smaller, and the system of patronage privileged a select few who would interact with the writer and give responses and opinions. Access to a writer, and presumably therefore the ability to comment on and influence his work, was thus extremely limited, and likely contained within specific social conditions. However, this does not dispute the fact that interaction was a component of the authorial process, although Raymond Williams is correct to illustrate that a writer "addressing a limited audience… is often able to get to know this audience well enough to feel a directly personal relationship with them which can affect his mode of address" (1958, p.291). Williams's context was the early developments of mass communication and he observes that as the audiences expand, so the personal aspect may be lost. That is to say, it is impossible for any personal interaction between an author and his intended audience, thus rendering the act of writing as much more impersonal. However, there were more complex degrees to which audiences and writers could continue to intersect. Williams emphasises printing as the "first great impersonal medium", contrasted with direct aural communication, and suggests that writing to authors or papers is merely 'transmission', a "one-way sending" (1958, pp.290-291). This point is understandable but contestable to an extent, as the communication depends perhaps just as much on the reception of the transmission. Dickens, as shall be demonstrated, actively coveted interaction with his readership, whilst the twenty-first century's technological developments have given rise to a greater degree of interaction. In Chapter Three, I illustrated how the strength of the publishing industry at first resisted sharing profits with writers, before apparently supporting them in opposition to copyright violation. This chapter, then, will examine the different ways in which audiences have historically attempted to engage with different forms of media, production and their producers.

Scrapbooks and Cultural 'Gleaning': An Alternative to Poaching?

It was during the nineteenth century that the compiling of scrapbooks was at its height as a means of engaging with, reconfiguring, and circulating a variety of texts that could otherwise potentially be permanently lost. Ellen Gruber Garvey has written extensively on the activity of scrapbooking, and its relationship to the changing engagement of nineteenth-century readers towards written material, and its perceived ephemeral natures. Garvey draws parallels between the production of scrapbooks and contemporary digital media, website production and fan activity, and she also engages with the theory of textual poaching, as put forward by de Certeau and utilised by Henry Jenkins in the early development of fan studies. The

compiling of scrapbooks occurs in tandem with industrial developments in the publishing industry, such as the increasingly widespread accessibility to newspapers and other written materials. Thus, Garvey's research presents three useful points of interest of use in discussing the history of readership and readers as authors. Firstly, it offers an alternative to the concept of textual poaching that has already been articulated within scrapbooking communities themselves. Secondly, Garvey emphasises and illustrates the connections between nineteenth-century scrapbook creation and modern technological innovations, such as the internet. Thirdly, the scrapbook represents a form of audience creativity and interactivity with texts that adds to our understanding of the history of different forms of active audiences and author and audience interactions.

Re-purposing and Altering Texts.

Scrapbooks are a pulling together of ideas, and texts, often compiled from multiple sources and not always with any distinguishable logic to their contents, although at times they can have a thematic cohesion. Scrapbooks themselves predominantly emerged in the nineteenth century, although the history of notable tactile interactions between readers and texts can be directly traced back further to at least the Renaissance period. Dobranski highlights that earlier forms of authorship were not necessarily about working to "come up with something new to say" but could rather entail "finding salient, earlier works and then deploying them effectively" (2008, p.34). This could then, as with the examples he gives, involve the use of other authors' ideas or words within an original piece of poetry which would generally involve the physical copying and reproduction of the text, but it could also consist of more dramatic alterations to existing texts.

Manuscripts in the seventeenth century would often be passed between communities and readers; it was common practice to "personalise and expunge manuscript copies" and readers were also regularly "invited to correct faults in printed books" (2008, pp.34-35). The Renaissance period, which is generally seen to have lasted until the seventeenth century, also saw the popularity of the 'commonplace book'. The book was a collective product whereby an author would write down quotes, passages and ideas of interest from various other works and compile them into a single volume, almost as a form of note taking. Referencing to the source may occur, but Garvey argues that "more likely it leaves the readers of the commonplace book with something new: a collection of passages that lead nowhere but have been remade into freestanding 'quotes' and sayings

recontextualized for new use". The crucial point Garvey argues is that "the reader becomes an author" and that these compilation books would themselves sometimes be published (2012, p.26). The commonplace book was the precursor to the scrapbook, although it was a privileged activity to create one due to its reliance on time and literacy. Thus both Dobranski and Garvey highlight the tactile interactions between reader and text and how, in similar yet different ways, the reader may appropriate and change the original text.

This activity was taking place within a period of centuries where texts were much rarer and more exclusive, and the ability to both read and write was less prevalent. The major shift to the more widespread adoption of scrapbooking as a past-time was therefore reliant on two major cultural changes. Firstly, through the expansion in literacy, linked to better availability of education, and secondly, due to the rapid increase in the amount of printed material available. Raymond Williams suggests whilst there was growth in the reading public throughout the eighteenth century, it was in the early nineteenth century that there was a very rapid expansion, itself driven by the application of steam-printing, the greater range of newspapers and cheap magazines carrying popular serial fiction (1961, pp.182-187). These circumstances generated the ideal environment for the creation and circulation of scrapbooks as a far more widespread and mainstream preoccupation, compared to the earlier system of commonplace books. There were thus not just more readers reading more materials, but more readers engaging with these texts, altering and changing them, to a far greater extent than had existed in the Renaissance period.

Ultimately, the greater access to material brought about by the advent of a publishing industry on an industrial scale meant that more people could utilise written materials and texts. More people were reading, and more people were interacting and engaging with these texts and, most notably, wanting to keep them, reorganise them and redistribute them in their own personal and distinct ways. Scrapbooks were created by readers from material they decided to keep and compile, therefore "revealing reading practices" of the era; they "not only created a record of reception but contribute to our understanding of readers' roles in *recirculating* both the items they read and their own readings or interpretations of those items" (Ellen Gruber Garvey, 2008, p.212, emphasis in original).

Scrapbooks were generally produced by cutting and pasting texts from newspapers, journals and even other books into one location which, Garvey states, was often an

old unwanted bound book in itself, which was re-purposed. Effectively, scrapbookers would paste over an existing text with their own choice selections of material, creating something new and judging something else as valueless. Garvey argues that they "reused and recontextualized the physical copy of an item as printed matter, giving it a new purpose" and overcoming the disposability and ephemeral nature of newsprint (2012, p.36). Further, she suggests that this reuse "signals greater regard for newer material and often at least implied a critique of the original book" (2012, p.57). Scrapbooks were often filled with subjects from a wide variety of interests, from fiction and poetry to religious verses, housekeeping guides and news articles of interest. They were books created for very personal reasons, often to share items of interest or to highlight material that the scrapbooker felt was important and were appropriating and distributing.

Scrapbooks and Poaching.

Those creating scrapbooks have sought to describe their activity, often in metaphorical terms that draw interesting parallels to the theories of textual poaching. De Certeau's basic conception of poaching was one devised in opposition to the idea of consumers as merely "grazing on the ration of simulacra the system distributes to each individual", the masses merely being moulded by the consumption of low culture (1984, p.166). He argues that the rhetoric of Enlightenment around the eighteenth century worked to isolate producers as a cultural elite whose creativity could be used to educate and improve the tastes of the common people. The further implication in this binary dynamic was, de Certeau tells us, that "the efficiency of production implies the inertia of consumption" and privileges the power of the author, a notion I explored in the previous chapter. Poaching, then, was de Certeau's way of deconstructing these ideologies and using a metaphor to explain how readers might make use of existing texts in new ways.

Henry Jenkins made use of de Certeau in order to propose "an alternative conception of fans as readers who appropriate popular texts and reread them in a fashion that serves different interests, as spectators who transform the experience of watching television into a rich and complex participatory culture" (1992, p.23). This utilised the notion of poaching meaning from productions, although Jenkins is also keen to point out that he sees no reason to completely abandon authorial intent but to understand it as one aspect of reading rather than the 'correct' reading (1992, pp.25-26). Jenkins sees the inherent conflict in the poaching metaphor and sees fandom as inherently tied to notions of struggle, suggesting that "the history of

media fandom is at least in part the history of a series of organized efforts to influence programming decisions" (1992, p.28). Even in his later writing, Jenkins sees the convergence between audiences and industries as both something new and something predicated on a sense of struggle, a tug of war, or a series of political negotiations. Jenkins suggests that:

> convergence is changing the ways in which media industries operate and the ways average people think about their relation to media. We are in a critical moment of transition during which the old rules are open to change and companies may be forced to renegotiate their relationship to consumers. The question is whether the public is ready to push for greater participation or willing to settle for the same old relations to mass media. (2008, p.254)

The emphasis is on the public to demand change, and the rhetoric seems to suggest that there is a form of revolution occurring against the old ways of industry domination. Struggle and conflict remain tied to fandom, and this must also be tied to the implied conflict in the notion of textual poaching. Poaching is simply not enough to describe either fandom or the earlier iterations of audience interactivity, as it cannot detach itself from either the implied theft and conflict with the landowners, or from media producers, in this instance. Poaching is a criminal act and it is also generally an undesirable act, and whilst it is indeed useful to exploring fan engagement, it is a problematic metaphor that focuses on conflict.

Garvey suggests that poaching does come close to "describing the act of creating new media from old at which scrapbook makers industriously plied their scissors", but she also finds problems with its use, identifying an alternative terminology utilised by her subjects (2003, pp.207-208). Garvey is mainly critical of the poachers being "engaged in a kind of warfare with the landowner" which echoes the previously discussed criticisms of the poaching metaphor (2003, p.208). She also perceives an implied masculinity, linked to the shooting of game, and, I presume, the association of masculinity to warfare and conflict in general.

Garvey offers an alternative for consideration. Her concept is *gleaning* and, Garvey argues, the term "shifts from the implied masculinity of shooting game... to a model of gathering that is not passive or compliant, and is decidedly open to feminine participation" (2003, p.208). Garvey is thus addressing a perceived male bias in the model of poaching that echoes the perception of fandom (especially science fiction fandom) as a male exploit. She is also attempting to avoid the often-criticised suggestion of conflict, which positions fans and producers as opposing forces. The gleaning metaphor, Garvey argues, is able to do this as it focuses on consumers

making use of surplus meaning and excess within the media. Gleaning as a term refers to the process of leaving grain and produce on the land for others, rather than using up every last scrap, and Garvey suggests this ties into the idea that "authors inevitably leave a surplus of meaning, sometimes obvious as ambiguity, which readers manoeuvre within, or scoop up, glean, and reuse" (2003, p.208). The materials involved in gleaning are "waste and treasure simultaneously according to the person and the context", thus there can also be a transformative aspect to the process and the value of a text is dependent on the individual gleaner (Garvey, 2012, p.48).

Such a metaphor strikes me as equally beneficial for looking at the producers of the texts themselves, as it directly ties to the idea that fan-producers (and indeed some 'non-fan' producers) might deliberately leave material within a text with the purpose of being picked up and utilised by fans. Garvey argues that the gleaner "can still create multiple meanings and readings from the text, and can even bake bread from gleaned grain and sell it under the gleaner's label" (2003, p.208). I cannot help but be reminded of the numerous ways in which fans have used their own productivity in commercial ways, from selling music based on texts to unofficial publications. Whilst poaching may well encompass these activities, they seem to come more naturally under Garvey's conception of gleaning, and it is interesting to note that the label of being a gleaner appears to originate from scrapbooking communities themselves. Garvey herself ultimately draws the connections between gleaning and fandom, and draws in issues of copyright and authorship as well;

> Just as authors cannot nail down meaning to a fixed spot, neither can they or their publishers control the circulation and ordering or reordering of meaning. Even when copyright locks down the right to reproduce a text, readers have the option of moving an old text to a new context, creating a new tier of circulation: clipping texts out of newspapers, pasting them into scrapbooks (or today onto web pages), and circulating this new compiled version... like present-day fan groups writing and sharing fan-fiction and analyses based on TV series, scrapbook makers applied sophisticated approaches to popular media and remade it into a new form as they enriched their sense of connection through that work. (2012, p.48)

This highlights one of the key interests of this research, and I can appreciate the desire to find an understanding of fan activity that retains the metaphorically useful ideas of the landowner and outsiders without the more simplistic implications of a conflict between binary opposing forces. Garvey's metaphor for gleaning has its own potential pitfalls, notably in that it could suggest that fandom is only left with the unimportant left-overs of media, and cannot influence the primary texts themselves. Garvey does argue that this avoids labelling fans as passive, and is perhaps wary of

arguments that might see fans as complicit with the commercial industry: cultural dupes providing free marketing to production companies whilst having no real power or agency. Fan activity, for Garvey, appears to be aware of its engagement and relationship with official production, whilst remaining a productive pursuit. Sara Gwenllian-Jones, as discussed in my initial literature survey, has described fandom as both "creative and derivative" and she has highlighted the way that audiences and producers are bound up together, with fan culture being fully implicated in the cultural processes of production (2003, pp.164-165).

Garvey also sees this as a gendered issue, with passivity being historically gendered as female in contrast to male activity. Garvey equates poaching with being a primarily male pastime, linked to aggression and hunting, and perhaps linking those traditionally male pursuits to the common perception of the fan as a solitary male. Thus her approach seeks to prevent the conflation of the feminine with the passive, rendering fans active through the metaphor of gleaning without inadvertently emphasising stereotypical male-ness, conflict and aggression through the iconography of poaching. Gleaning is therefore gender-neutral, still allowing fans to be perceived as active, while also allowing for a more symbiotic relationship between the gleaners and the producers of the original text. Therefore gleaning does begin to feel like a more appropriate metaphor for fan activity than poaching. However, it should be considered as to whether this is simply a question of semantics. Is gleaning simply another word for poaching, dressed up with a pretence of being different or can it genuinely offer an alternative approach to understanding audiences? Gleaning does not mean that fans rely on only the excess material provided by producers, but on an excess of meaning, ideas and materials provided by the cultural industries in general. Producers, and especially fan-producers, can and often do include materials that they intend fans to notice and utilise; Chapter Nine will explore this idea in some detail in regards to Doctor Who, but this certainly does not limit the ability of fandom to engage with other aspects of a text. The benefit of the term gleaning over poaching, I would argue, is the implicit sense of co-operation rather than opposition, which serves to prevent discussions on audience activity beginning from a position of defensiveness. That is to say, audience activity, when understood as gleaning, is not necessarily confrontational but is very much interactive and engaged. That is not to say that it cannot be confrontational in certain scenarios, I have already noted how gleaned material may be used in unexpected ways, but it removes the inherent aggression that the term 'poaching' suggests. Additionally, it also gives agency to the creative industries

themselves in engaging with their audiences and providing audiences with additional material specifically aimed at them.

New Texts from Old.

Throughout her discussions on scrapbooks, Garvey consistently makes reference to their relationship to the technology of today, identifying various features that foreshadow audience engagement with, for example, the internet (2012, pp.25, 41, 48, 229; 2003, p.218, amongst other examples). These are not vaguely drawn links between two entirely separate modes of engagement but a concise, thoughtful exploration of how technological advancements have altered the tools for engagement but not necessarily the forms of activity that would occur. Garvey looks at the value of knowledge, and the importance of being able to find information quickly, something almost taken for granted in an age of Wikipedia and search engines. She argues that a device as simple as a bookmark is still a notable technological innovation that is akin to the opening of multiple electronic windows, or tabs, on a computer screen (2012, p.25). Both are systems for comparison and moving between required information, and both make use of the available technology. Garvey discusses different methods utilised to attempt to cross-reference books and recirculate information, and highlights that tactile interactions with physical texts and the copying and manual writing of new texts were moments of intersection between reader and writer.

Whereas in earlier periods there was limited access to materials, and readers were generally educated and able to both read and write, the advent of the scrapbook, combined with the expansion of publications and education, allow more ordinary people to become active consumers of materials. The scrapbook, Garvey illustrates, "democratised and industrialised" the process as, whereas "one could be an avid and extensive reader, but not a skilled writer, either in the sense of composing or facility in handling a pen", this would not be an issue as "scrapbooks allowed all types of readers to 'write' a book with scissors" (2012, p.27). Describing the form these scrapbooks took, Garvey suggests that they were generally "domestic, like the 'profiles' on a personal computer, storing the user's choices for what should be on the desktop, for example... the circuit of circulation within which they were engaged was neither wholly domestic nor wholly public" (2003, p.218). As well as illustrating one of Garvey's frequent comparisons to modern technology, here she also highlights the sense of negotiation between positions that seems to surround scrapbooks.

Scrapbooks are both domestic and public; they are both an act of reading and an act of writing, they are at once a method of merely re-contextualising existing writing but also, within this action, a method of creating something new and potentially resistant. Scrapbooks and scrapbook-making are implicated in the same conflicts and discourse surrounding contemporary audience studies, notably between consumer and producer, and between resistance and co-option. Most importantly, they also showcase the potential for a mode of interactivity that is more symbiotic, between production and consumption, and not simply understood purely as a conflict, as highlighted with the rhetoric of gleaning, as previously discussed. In many ways, scrapbook-making echoes both the production of zines, and implicitly fanzines, and fan websites, especially in the early days of the internet. The creation of both zines and web pages is often a similar form of activity to scrapbooking, the internet often acting as a form of digital scrapbook. Garvey suggests that scrapbooks "might be shared with an intimate or large circle, and were a form of private publication, like the amateur press publications or 'zines' of their day" (2003, p.219). Jenkins has made note of how some controversial fanzines could be distributed via underground networks of friends, without any public advertising (1992, p.31) and also emphasised how fans could grow hostile to the idea that a fanzine could be utilised for commercial gain by unscrupulous 'bootleggers'. He suggests that fanzines were perceived as "artifacts shared with friends and potential friends" rather than as commercial commodities (1992, p.160). The rhetoric used by Jenkins and Garvey in describing the community nature of both scrapbooks and fanzines is in itself similar, and illustrates the links between the two forms of activity. Scrapbooks could be made up of "commonly available mass-produced materials and be valuable for the unique stamp the reader has put on them... leaving traces of readings, and passing traces of that reading along are meaningful, meaning-making activities" (Garvey, 2008, p.219).

Karina Hof has also drawn comparisons in her study of female scrapbook creators where she draws on Bacon-Smith's work on female Star Trek fans in order to explore the parallels between the activities. Hof emphasises the sense of community and belonging to a group, which is a common attitude that can be found within fandom (2006, p.380). Hof's research is not purely historical, and highlights that scrapbooking as an activity in itself does continue today and she also illustrates how a scrapbooking fan can commercialise her hobby and provides the example of how one woman was able to become a full-time representative of a supply company

(2006, p.380). Previously, I have briefly alluded to the blurring of the lines between official publications and scrapbooking, and also to how publishers recognised and attempted to engage with the scrapbooking community. Whilst Hof's example of what we could essentially see as a scrapbooking fan-producer may be more contemporary, as with the media industries, there is a long history of negotiated interaction between official production and active audiences.

The popularity of the scrapbook in the nineteenth century was such that the publishing industry, and some well-known authors within it, began to explore ways of generating profit for themselves from these activities. This is perhaps most notably visible in the printing and selling of bound ready-made scrapbook volumes. Garvey cites the example of popular author Mark Twain who lent his name to a specialised bound scrapbook that was marketed with the innovation of gummed strips allowing for pasting without the use of a glue pot (2012, pp.60-62). Mark Twain's Self-pasting Scrapbook increased a form of brand recognition that gave him a kind of authorship over readers' own collections of materials, whilst also authorising the activity of collecting and redistributing appropriated texts. Garvey argues that it was "re-channelling the benefit stream of recirculation, at least to one writer. It invited every purchaser to create his or her own pirated book" (2012, p.61). Twain was both using audience activity, which included recirculation of his own material, to emphasise his authority as a writer, whilst at the same time encouraging behaviour that would seem to be counter-intuitive to this.

The exploitation and utilisation of fan activity for commercial profit is something that has been debated in regards to fandom, notably by thinkers such as Jenkins, Gwenllian-Jones and Alan McKee, amongst others. Similar negotiations of copyright and authorial control were occurring within scrapbooking culture from the nineteenth century onwards and it is important that this is considered when exploring the history of interactivity. Scrapbooking was not small-scale and unnoticed, but something that the publishing industry and its writers were very much aware of, and were keen to exploit themselves. So prolific was it, that scrapbooking itself became a topic of discussion whereby "newspapers across the country published articles with suggestions on scrapbook composition, production, and manufacture" (Jessica Helfand, 2008, p.3). Certain papers would have certain columns labelled as being especially for the scrapbook, essentially an endorsement of this form of appropriation. Not only were they discussed by the official media, but some scrapbooks themselves eventually became subject to publication:

Papers even solicited, paid for, and reprinted the 'priceless gems' readers had collected, in one case in a volume subtitled 'The Old Scrapbook', which was thus 'written' by 52,000 readers who sent in clippings as well by the authors of inspirational verse and anecdotes they clipped, initially for use in the *National Magazine* and then in this anthology. (Garvey, 2003, p.223)

The authors of these clippings have been removed and replaced by the scrapbookers themselves in this instance, and the publishing industry is essentially re-publishing material that had been appropriated. The scrapbook is a site of a negotiated appropriation on both the parts of the readers and the publishing industry. It is illustrative of the uncertainty that technological advancement can bring to the media, and certainly, many of the examples cited by Garvey are influenced by the contemporary novelty of commercial publishing on a wide scale. The scrapbook, then, is easily comparable to many of the sites of negotiation between the media industries and audiences today, notably internet fan sites and, as has been mentioned already above, Garvey draws these connections across the centuries.

The narrative of scrapbooks thus appears to include both ideas of resistance and co-option, active audiences and questions of authorship; it is a nineteenth-century pastime that is certainly comparable to fan pursuits in the twenty-first century. Garvey's history of scrapbooking charts the path from the earliest commonplace books to "our current age of digital information", which she argues involves the increasing commercial interest in collecting 'scraps' and the use of archives and data managing businesses to keep records of and distribute information (2012, p.229). The full history is fascinating, but dense, and I wish only to highlight that an industry grew up that collected and stored published material and employed workers to search through its vast stocks in search of material relevant to its clients. They are, Garvey argues, the "foundations of more recent filtering of information via digital methods, namely Google, LexisNexis, blogging" (2012, p.235). She emphasises that the importance of this is not that "clipping bureaus are a pale foreshadowing of the internet, the steampunk version of Google", but that it signals an overall shift in the perception of information and reading, whereby "it positioned other people's writing as a natural resource to be incorporated into one's own writing" (2012, p.249). Whereas the physicality of altering books has been removed to an extent, the use of materials by modern audiences is not entirely different, especially within fan communities, with the internet essentially superseding scissors, paper and glue. "Repairing errata, jotting down commonplaces, annotating the margins, and, in extreme cases, creating new texts by having the sections rearranged at the binders", fandom now partakes in equivalent activities, which were once a

commonly accepted, perhaps even expected, mode of engagement with a text (Dobranski, 2008, p.35). Technologies have developed and changed, and affected the way in which reading is understood, yet the engagement and activity of audiences, and the desire to use, appropriate and circulate materials of a personal interest, is something that Garvey has illustrated as a vital component of nineteenth-century life, just as it is for fandom now.

When discussing the notion of *gleaning*, Garvey suggests that:

> even when copyright locks down the right to reproduce texts, readers have the option of moving those old texts to new contexts... clipping texts out of newspapers, pasting them into scrapbooks, or today onto Web pages, and circulating this new compiled version. (2003, p.208)

Restrictions do occur and laws develop and change, as does the way that audiences can access and manipulate information, but the desire to engage with it seems a far more consistent component of the relationship between audiences and the media industries. The internet, especially in its formative years, represented a digital scrapbook, with images, ideas, stories and likenesses being copied, cut and pasted into new forms across a digital landscape, a landscape with potentially a far wider reach than any scrapbook could hope to have. Gwenllian-Jones notes that where "a successful fanzine in the 1970s might have reached a few hundred fans, today a successful fan website can accumulate thousands, even millions, of hits" (2003, p.168). The internet continues to have an impact on the way audiences interact and yet there is a call for more simple ways of sharing such as the website Tumblr which essentially operates as a digital scrapbook of images and notes pasted on the screen in a way that feels almost identical to its nineteenth-century equivalent. Interactivity and the re-contextualisations of texts and materials are an ongoing, and important, set of cultural activities. Garvey's research into scrapbooks is important to understanding fandom in that it addresses a predominantly untapped history of engagement that helps us to better understand the context from which fandom and the notion of poaching emerges.

Serial Fiction, Adaptation and Appropriation: Copyright Issues in Victorian Narratives.

The nature of early copyright laws and the evolving definition and cultural understanding of authorship was discussed in the previous chapter, whilst the first half of this chapter has looked at audience use of existing material through the work of Garvey. The previous chapter also highlighted the struggle that authors had to undertake in order to obtain a legal authority over their texts. This chapter will return

to this earlier period, in order to look at Charles Dickens as a case study of an author who was attempting to engage with his audience, who in turn made use of his work. Just as material was taken and utilised in the creation of scrapbooks, so readers would use the narratives and ideas of serial fiction in the nineteenth century to create both new texts and alternative versions of existing material. As will be demonstrated, this was not just within the print medium but also crossed over to the thriving stage industry of the era where, Anne Humpherys argues, many of the working class would have their first experiences of the works of authors such as Dickens through unofficial means. She suggests that it is arguable that Dickens actually became most known and popular amongst the working class through unofficial melodrama adaptations of his work rather than through the original texts (2011, p.29). The exploitation of copyright weaknesses, re-appropriation of Dickens's work and the production of unauthorised sequels will thus now be discussed, in relation to both readerships and previous discussions of authority.

It has already been shown that copyright law developed slowly, and that even as authors gained more legal rights and authority, there were still limits to their control over their work. Humpherys tells us that "a 1709 copyright act had given authors of books the right to receive payment for use of their texts, but this did not apply to dramatic adaptations. Thus novelists were usually powerless to prevent their novels being staged" (2011, p.28). Dickens's work was therefore transferred from the page to the theatre stage, often with changes and additions to fit both the format and the expectations of its new audience. From a modern multimedia perspective, this is especially important, and indeed fascinating, as it highlights not only the development in the understanding of what a 'text' is in regards to copyright and ownership, but it is also an early conflict between separate narrative media. Dickens would have no control over how his work was adapted and the stage authors could essentially re-work his words and characters as they pleased. With modern ideas of authority, this seems baffling, and it throws open the debate for authenticity, as legally Dickens can claim no ownership over the stage productions, whilst they remain themselves an entirely legal appropriation of his work. Humpherys demonstrates the degree of interpretation in highlighting how an adaptation of Hard Times for the stage actually saw the ending softened and a traditional moralistic happy ending applied to the new text, supplanting Dickens's own conclusion (2011, pp.32-33). Mark J. P. Wolf has highlighted how adaptations and alterations of existing classic works can still be found in contemporary transmedia culture. A film adaptation of Dickens's Great Expectations was promoted with a novelisation,

based on the author's much longer original text. Wolf suggests that "someone could begin with the short novelization, see the movie, and then read the full-length Dickens original" (2012, p.266). Wolf further observes that a consumer's preference in media "may be determined by the investment each medium requires in terms of length, amount of time needed, the cost to purchase or experience a work, and individual media biases" (2012, p.266). These contexts determining investment and preferences of media forms, whilst accounting for a contemporary transmedia environment, nonetheless, echo the ways in which nineteenth-century audiences would encounter the work of Dickens.

The movement between fiction and stage thus constructs a form of multi-media environment during the nineteenth century, where the act of reading and engagement with texts was less simple than the assumption of singular texts read in a private space. Deborah Vlock invites readers to "imagine what sort of larger collective text" was formed from multiple texts encompassing novels, plays, actors and reviews (1998, p.12). It should also be noted that the relationship between authors such as Dickens and the theatre was thus not entirely one of appropriation and conflict. In fact the relationship between the novel and the theatre "was a fairly complex symbiosis" that arguably worked in both directions (Vlock, 1998, p.11). Vlock's work in Victorian fiction and theatre works to open up the private space of readership, in discussion with Foucault and Bakhtin, and "imagine a reading subject constituted otherwise than in the interior spaces of home and privatised imagination" (1998, p.8). Her writing is focused on opening up the notion of a Victorian reading audience as publicly engaged, through various means including the stage. Vlock asserts that Dickens's work was not entirely as original as is often thought, and that the author took from the stage productions of the time, as much as they took from him. She suggests that "when Dickens' characters spoke, they sounded familiar – they had already been circulating as part of a standard theatrical repertoire by the time he wrote his novels" (1998, p.10). Links can also be drawn to Wolf's notion of the "circles of authorship", wherein, the larger the imaginary worlds are, "the more likely it is that they are the work of many people, not just as influences on an author, but also as workers who contribute new assets and storylines to a world" (2012, p.269). The application of Wolf's perception of authorship to Vlock's narrative of Victorian fiction is well-suited, and whilst it is outside the remit of this immediate discussion, a comparison with Wolf's work of early imaginary worlds (2012, p.65-129) might also lend further insight to writing practices of the era. However, I would emphasise that Vlock's work describes a vibrant symbiotic process of creativity and

consumption, further rendering the authorship process as inherently shared as a form of cultural co-authorship.

Dickens "called the dramatic adaptations of his novels 'piracies', a term not unfamiliar in a contemporary setting when dealing with the distribution of copyrighted material" (Humpherys, 2011, p.28). Whilst there was clearly interplay between stage and novel, this was seemingly viewed in a negative light by Dickens, and we can perhaps see his later undertakings in staged readings of his work as a way to take direct control of his writings across different media. Vlock's argument makes Dickens's complaints even more interesting, as she suggests that the theatre provided the primary source of influence to Dickens whose contribution back was only in more 'specific material' (1998, p.11). The performances and usage of them however, do highlight the continuing negotiations in copyright and the expansion of ownership and control over specific ideas and characters within narrative fiction. Whilst another copyright law in 1842 gave Dickens more success in preventing unauthorised productions, he had little control over foreign, predominantly American, productions (Humpherys, 2011, p.28). Thus the boundaries of authority altered over time, becoming increasingly restrictive. Despite the use of his materials in this way, and perhaps in part because of it, Dickens desired an interactive and open relationship with his readership.

Author and Audience Interactions.

It has already been mentioned that Dickens attempted to develop a relationship with his readers, and that this occurred within the context of both disputes and struggles with publishers, and within an environment of cross-medium textual openness and appropriation. It has been observed that despite this, he craved a relationship and interaction with his audience and, in turn, his audiences interacted with, used and influenced his texts. Finding direct evidence of reader responses is difficult, as it is rare that such material survives. What is known is generally gathered from critical reviews and Dickens's rhetoric of his own desires for interacting with his audience, which eventually led to him performing public readings of his work. Reviews, though, attempted to reflect views of their readership, and attempted to influence the direction of the narrative through their suggestions and criticisms. Whilst evidence does exist to demonstrate the interactive aspects of Dickens's work, it must be born in mind that much of it is secondary; however, key examples of textual changes in response to the readership have been documented, notably by Jennifer Hayward. Hayward explains that "we have little direct evidence of reader response to his

novels" but that there are "anecdotal accounts... attesting to the fact that readers believed him responsive to their suggestions and demands" (1997, p.33). It should also be emphasised that the question of interactivity is one that comes in opposition to a binary approach to separate author and audience positions, and as such, anything that serves to blur this distinction at the very least works to deconstruct these existing conflicted approaches. Thus this analysis will work to suggest that even as early as the nineteenth century, the distinctions between production and consumption are far more complicated and interrelated than generally discussed, and that this reflects an overall historical trajectory of such interactions.

Dickens's desire for a relationship to his audience is well-documented, and Hayward stresses that it is only because of his iconic prominence that such material still exists (1997, p.16). Whilst this limits the amount of textual material that can be drawn on, it does not serve to negate the relevance of this discussion as there must be a broader understanding of a history of reading and writing, in any medium. That is to say, the very fact that there was any sense of interactivity calls into question both the historically prominent notion of the independent genius-author, but also the contemporary notion that fandom represents a relatively 'new' approach to reading. What must also be understood is that the interaction was one that went both ways, and as much as readers felt they had a form of relationship with authors, Dickens in particular was keen to respond. Hayward has even suggested that Dickens, "in his eagerness for some sense of interaction with the readers... constantly used his friends as a test audience" (1997, p.59). Whilst they would, of course, be closer to him, the point that should be noted is that Dickens apparently craved feedback and reactions, specifically from those whom he saw as his readers, and thus, at the very least, the *appearance* of a relationship was paramount. Dickens did still claim his authority as an author, however, and has been discussed previously in this chapter, he worked towards obtaining greater legal ownership and authority;

> His productivity was, he repeatedly insisted, dependant on his relationship with his readers.... he is widely recognised as an innovator in the process of developing the complex and constantly negotiated author/audience relationship so characteristic of continued fictions, not just because he was produced by the historical moment when technology made large-scale publication and mass readership a reality, but because of his obsession with that particular relation (personally affectionate and like no other man's) which subsists between me and the public. (Hayward, 1997, pp.39-40)

There was certainly no sense of denial of authority, as seen with Doctor Who's fan-producers and highlighted in the quotation that opens this chapter. Dickens craved a relationship with his audience whilst struggling for legal recognition of his, and other

authors', works, whilst Davies finds himself in a clear authoritative position and seeks to deny authorial control in order to align himself with the existing rhetoric within the series' fandom. It is also important not to fall into the trap of praising an apparently utopian interactivity between producers and consumers;

> Dickens's interaction with his audience was not as personal or direct as the mythology he so actively fostered would imply. Like the exchange between any producer and consumer in an industrial economy, it was a highly mediated one. His refusal to acknowledge the degree to which he simply produced a commodity can be seen in the fact that he worked strenuously to bridge the gap of alienation by means of perpetual strolls through London, talks with readers, and public readings. (1997, p.40)

This negotiation of the role of the author can be seen as continued even today, especially with the two contrasting approaches of <u>Doctor Who</u>'s modern producers; Russell T. Davies and Steven Moffat. As with Dickens, they both seek to navigate the space between author and reader, although in their case the relationship is focused on their own history of fandom and awareness of fan activity and perception. Whilst Dickens clearly fought to bridge the theoretical gap between positions, Davies and Moffat both negotiate a sense of *distance* from fandom, whilst at the same time desiring a continued relationship with it. The nature of both their interactions will be explored in greater depth in Chapter Nine, but it is worth now highlighting how modern issues of production and institutionalised authority perhaps demand an appearance of a form of critical distance for the fan-producers that Dickens was apparently less subjected to. This might even suggest that the pressures for a divide between fans and producers are felt from the separate hierarchies within production, rather than from the authors themselves, although it is not, of course, as simplistic as this, as Chapter Nine will demonstrate.

Hayward demonstrates perhaps one of the most prominent examples of how the interactivity that Dickens craved could be reflected in his work, arguably changing a text in a pivotal way. There is a social awareness and an attempt to address inherent cultural attitudes at the time by either re-writing or re-appraising certain character tropes in his serials. Thus Hayward highlights how he "responded to reader's complaints about stereotypical or unfair portrayals", giving two clear examples of this. This included a response to the portrayal of a dwarf character as a sideshow freak, whereby Dickens responded by "transforming the projected role of [the] character to a much more positive one", and at another point writing a positive Jewish character in a later novel, after criticism of the depiction of Fagin earlier (Hayward, 1997, p.59). The serial format of his writing, arguably akin to

contemporary television, perhaps then allowed for a more direct response to his audiences, and an awareness of audience critiques allowed him to adjust future work. Doctor Who's fan-producers have also echoed this interactivity very closely, with references being made within the show to online forum discussions, and through the introduction of positive role models such as the omnisexual Captain Jack Harkness, played by John Barrowman. In the cases of both Dickens and the modern fan-producers, there is a recurring sense of adjustment to outside influences that can have a strong textual impact. Showing similarities to the soap opera genre, Dickens "'tried out' characters and plot shifts, enlarging their role if they proved to appeal to readers" (Hayward, 1997, p.58) and serials featured "the interweaving of multiple story lines and the transformation of characters over time" (1997, p.50). This approach to writing and creating is, of course, not limited to soap operas, and is increasingly used across other genre shows, including the traditionally anthology-like Doctor Who that now embraces story arcs and character development across its seasons. Somewhat under Davies, but more so under Moffat[16], the revived series has responded to audience comments, and criticisms, sometimes overtly and at other times simply by developments in the text that echo audience discourse. Feminist criticism of Moffat in particular has been prominent, often addressing his problematic representation of women, and has had enough cultural impact to be mentioned in online headlines for major newspapers[17]. Moffat's discourse feels defensive as he denies the accusation of misogyny, suggests he's more liberal than his critics and makes reference to being "married to a strong woman", with the implied assumption that this means he could not be sexist. However, despite these denials, the latest series to broadcast in 2015 saw an increase in female writers and directors, alongside the departure of Clara Oswald (portrayed by Jenna Coleman) in a manner that positions her as a female version of The Doctor. The series concluded with Clara, alongside Me (portrayed by Maisie Williams) fleeing the Doctor's home planet of Gallifrey in a 1960's-style TARDIS, echoing the fictional origins of the show's titular character. Media coverage has picked up on this as a feminist re-telling of the series, and it is notable that at this stage Moffat admits the need for stronger female characters, although he still repudiates wider criticisms of misogyny[18]. However, the fact that both he and the media draw attention to this

---

[16]   The differences and comparisons between the two eras of the revived Doctor Who will form substantial sections of Chapter Nine, including their relationships with fans and audiences.
[17]   https://www.theguardian.com/media/2015/nov/28/doctor-who-writer-steven-moffat-denies-misogynist-claims , accessed 11th August 2016
[18]   http://www.vanityfair.com/hollywood/2015/12/doctor-who-finale-feminist-clara-tardis , accessed 11th August 2016

highlights that Moffat, despite his earlier denials, is clearly influenced by the criticisms of his work, and has adjusted both the narratives, and the female presence in production, so as to address them. However, again, there must be some caution in this approach, as the degree to which evidence can be applied to these apparent relationships of cause and effect is not always clear. Hayward again emphasises that serial fiction is defined by "its ability to (at least pretend to) respond to its audience while the narrative is still in the process of development" (1997, p.23). The degree to which genuine change is impacted on the text is always a questionable point, and one that cannot simply be ignored. There is a certain ambivalence surrounding this, and the two key problems could be defined thus; one, whether positive alterations to the text were genuinely a response to audience suggestions and two, the potential aversion to admitting that certain textual changes are the result of (negative) audience criticism. The former is more likely to be admitted to by a producer/author who is keen to encourage a sense of interactivity, although it could equally be emphasised when perhaps the changes might have occurred anyway. The latter is far harder to both examine and theorise and stands as a weakness of this form of analysis of audience and author interaction, remaining in need of more detailed scrutiny at a later, more pertinent stage. Whilst Moffat is keen to develop the impression of having a relationship with fans, he also seems less likely to actively admit that his writing has been influenced by criticism, and can often come across as highly defensive when he does address some of these issues, as discussed above. The rhetoric of interactivity does exist, however, and both Dickens and modern fan-producers covet and utilise the suggestions and responses of their audiences. Whilst the nature of this involvement may be questioned, the address is clearly there and the interaction on a textual level remains a visible result of this relationship. It highlights that, to some extent at least, audiences may have direct influence over a production itself, beyond the perceived limitations of fan productivity.

Dickens may exist as the most prominent and visible example but this is not to say that these forms of interactivities were not to be found elsewhere. Visibility is a historically important factor, as it is the famous whose work continues and whose stories are most readily available. As this discussion moves forward from the early Victorian writers, there will be examples of other names such as Conan Doyle and Isaac Asimov as writers whose work both inspires in-depth audience activity, and who demonstrated a relationship with readers within their lifetimes. These visible authors and fan-producers help highlight an existing culture of interaction, rather

than merely being the exception to a general inactivity, as has been demonstrated through the historical examination of how audiences used and appropriated different media. What has been argued thus far is that fandom is an inevitable and important part of the cultural industry and that, far from resisting it, it is bound up in a symbiotic relationship of production and consumption. There is no clear line to divide them into two competing, or opposing, sides, but rather modern television's fandoms actually follow a long tradition of fan and producer interactions, found most visibly in literary roots. Though this may appear to be a relatively modern development in fan and producer relationships, it is actually a development of a literary tradition stretching back to the nineteenth century and notable figures such as Charles Dickens. Henry Jenkins has made brief allusions to this, comparing fans to "the readers of Dickens and other serial writers who wrote their suggestions for possible plot developments, not unlike the fans of Sherlock Holmes who demanded the character's return even when the author sought to retire him", but he fails to recognise the historical trajectory directly from this to modern fandom (1992, p.27). That is to say, the connection of progression is not made, and the historical influences and events that both highlight and repress audience power are not taken into account, especially in early fan studies. In Dickens's <u>Old Curiosity Shop,</u> the popular character of Little Nell was killed off, apparently sparking strong reactions, not unlike those of internet fans in the modern age when their favourite characters meet a dramatic end (McGrath, 2006). Due to the serial format of his stories, Dickens was able to keep in touch with his audience and receive feedback, less direct but once again, still evocative of fora today (Porterfield, 1970). Arthur Conan Doyle, best known as the creator of Sherlock Holmes, also demonstrated an awareness of, and interaction with, his audience and, despite Doyle's intention to kill him off, his most famous creation was eventually resurrected following negative reaction to the death. I have already discussed how Moffat has responded to fan criticism in narrative ways as an example of the contemporary fan-producer, but it should also be noted that television and film production, in general, has always utilised perceived audience opinion to some extent. John Thornton Caldwell argues that an "imagined audience" used "for authorial justification has a long history in both Hollywood and broadcasting" (2008, p.223). Audience research and testing, rather than being purely a marketing tool, must also be seen in terms of authorship, and Caldwell suggests that "models of audience behaviour and competence to justify proposed directions in show creation" are regularly invoked (2008, p.222). Caldwell notes that whilst this is often used in defensive strategies, "defending themselves against popular dissent", it nevertheless demonstrates that authorship is inherently bound up in audience

reaction (2008, p.223). This earlier use of audiences has evolved in contemporary media to the point that corporations "go with the flow of the audience, rather than to fight it; to tap the audience hive as a source for production not just consumption" (Caldwell 2008, p.334). Caldwell emphasises the contradictory nature of the media industries, that both utilise audiences but also segregate "professional practices from audience activities... continuously re-defining and re-valuing the otherwise uncertain futures of creative communities through expressions of professionalism" (2008, p.331). Thus the tension exists between the way in which audiences can influence and alter narrative worlds, and the industrial discourses and understanding of the notions of authorship.

This is not a claim that audiences controlled or dictated the direction of the stories but that simply since the emergence of widespread reading and publishing, there is already clear evidence of a non-oppositional relationship between writers and readers. Whilst much has certainly changed, with increasing awareness of copyright laws and the increasing involvement of powerful worldwide corporations, it seems disingenuous to suggest that the relationship of audience and producer would have shifted to such oppositional stances as suggested by Jenkins and others. Thus, the historical existence of fan-author relations obliges fan studies to consider a far more complex, ongoing relationship which also incorporates the potential for crossing over from the role of fan to producer. Hayward likens Dickens's writing to modern soap opera in its capacity to try out ideas and reflect audience reactions, although this form of interactivity can be found in various genres of television to varying degrees, something I explore further in later chapters in regards to <u>Doctor Who</u>'s fan-producers reactions to audience feedback. She does warn that Dickens's relationship with his audience must not be mystified and that he was equally motivated by economic concerns. What I believe this highlights is the fact that the binary of 'production' versus 'consumption' is a far too simplistic starting point in dealing with fandom and audience activity, and that the interaction and negotiated relationships that are predominant features of the fan-producers have a certain historical context that must be understood.

Authorship, Fandom and Asimov as Early fan-producer.
This final section will briefly look at another example of an early fan-producer, and illustrate how these forms of position-taking and negotiated roles have continued to occur prior to the digital age. Magazines devoted to science fiction, the first science fiction conventions and the creation of fan clubs all contributed to a growing

awareness of science fiction and its writers and appealed to young fans amongst whose number would likely have included Isaac Asimov. Considered by many to have been one of the greatest science fiction literary writers, Asimov is a genre icon whose work has influenced other writers' television productions and Hollywood blockbusters, amongst other things. However, it would not be inaccurate to position Asimov as a fan himself, indeed arguably making him one of the earliest and most famous examples of a fan going on to become a producer in their own right. Asimov first began reading science fiction magazines when they were sold in his parents' shop (Gunn, 1987, p.9). He became a fan and, as he got older, began writing his own stories, later describing himself as "a devoted science fiction reader, and a fumbler at [his] second-hand type-writer" (Asimov, 1987, p.9). He was encouraged in this by the editor of the <u>Astounding Science Fiction</u> magazine, John W. Campbell Junior, who Asimov claimed imprinted "his dynamic personality on the field" and managed to "find, encourage and inspire a whole new generation of science fiction writers", another example of producer and fan interaction, in this case encouraging Asimov to become a producer himself (1987, pp.8-9). As with many fans, Asimov had particular interest in a specific product, in this case a specific magazine and so although "two of his stories were published in *Amazing Stories* before one appeared in *Astounding*; only the *Astounding* story really mattered to him" (Gunn, 1982, p.6). That is to say, Asimov made value judgements of true success based on his own fandom and his personal tastes within the genre, just as many of the fan-producers of <u>Doctor Who</u> have articulated their joy in finally writing for the series. James Gunn also describes how Asimov's early efforts were often not science fiction as he had an "exalted notion of the intense skills and vast scientific knowledge required of authors in the field" and he "dared not aspire to such things" (1982, p.11). Gunn also suggests that "Asimov started many stories and finished none, and what he wrote was derived mostly from what he liked to read" and that this 'derivative' writing continued into his early professional career (1982, p.12). Finally, Gunn discusses Asimov's discovery of fellow science fiction readers; "not just readers but fans, fanatics like himself" and how this led to his involvement in club meetings and fanzines, becoming "involved in the debates and schisms to which fandom is so susceptible" (1982, p.13). Gunn's descriptions of Asimov, and Asimov's own assessment of his early life, both echo fan interactions and experiences still common today and clearly demonstrate how the lines between producer and fan have never been distinct. Asimov thus provides clear evidence of the potential crossover between fans and producers. As with <u>Doctor Who</u>'s modern production team, Asimov made the shift from being an active member of fandom into producing

texts as a professional himself. I have discussed how he wrote his own amateur stories, having read science fiction magazines, and sought out organised fandom, as well as forming the relationships with publishers that led to Asimov becoming a producer himself. This is not an inherently unusual story; it is not something that is restricted to Asimov, only rendered more prominent in its visibility by his own prominence within the field. Camilla Bacon-Smith suggests that "writers in science fiction can move so fluidly through their various fields of production and power because they, like almost everyone at every level of science fiction production, start in the 'field' of consumer, and do so at a very young age" (2000, p.192). Asimov's amateur science fiction stories fulfil the same function as the fanfiction written by the likes of Mark Gatiss and Paul Cornell, contemporary fan-producers of <u>Doctor Who</u>, acting as part of the shift from supposedly 'inauthentic' to authentic fiction. In both cases, their fandom started at a young age, as Bacon-Smith suggests. Fans and producers are not exclusive positions and there is, in fact, historical precedent for individuals to cross over from one position to the other, often those whose fandom started at an early age. Whilst the discussion here may seem somewhat limited, and it is true that this is a singular prominent example, what should be appreciated here is what ramifications it may have for fandom studies. Alongside Dickens and Doyle, and in the wider context of publishing and authorship that has been discussed, a pattern of a further-reaching sense of interaction can be found that works to break down the binary structure of the fields of production and consumption. These literary figures all had distinct relationships with their readers, their texts and in the case of Asimov, a direct involvement with science fiction fandom itself. What could be drawn from this is that, ultimately, fan-producers are not an entirely new phenomenon, but one that has developed from a distinct history of changing positions, and born out of historical trends that demonstrate that fan and producer relationships have always been closer to a complicated system of interactions than outright opposition.

The active readership and engagement with texts emerged and existed alongside the changing understanding and definitions of authorship. Active audiences and interactions were a symbiotic and natural part of the creative process, and integrated into culture at most levels. As copyright laws developed, however, publishers attempted to suppress this activity, at first under the principle of giving authorial control to writers, and later for more overt capitalistic reasons. This was generally successful, as the laws existed and could be policed and had a strong cultural impact, as did the idea of authorial authority, which became a clear component of a cultural understanding of writing and creativity. However, as

technology develops, and greater levels of communication and digital media become available, the visibility of audience and author interactions becomes more prominent. This trajectory has also highlighted that we must understand contemporary fandom and audience-producer interactions in light of this entire history and in the context of how it emerged out of the 'birth' of modern ideas of authorship, alongside the nineteenth-century novel. There has always been a symbiotic relationship, in many ways between authors and audiences, and it is at moments of technological change and development, such as the modern printing press, or the spread of the internet, that they are at their most visible.

-Chapter Five-
Commercial Interests & the BBC:
Public Service Broadcasting, Commercialisation and *Doctor Who.*

The British Broadcasting Corporation states its mission as being "to enrich people's lives with programmes and services that inform, educate and entertain" and that it aims to be "the most creative organisation in the world" (BBC, 2011a). Funded by a licence fee, the BBC is a public service broadcasting service, ideologically separate from the majority of media corporations, and theoretically removed from notions of profit and marketing. The BBC is also responsible for the production of the hugely successful television series Doctor Who, a series surrounded by expansive quantities of marketing, merchandising and promotion, generating vast sums of money through toys, books, comics, games, DVDs, concerts, stamps, plates, bed sheets, bubble bath, and seemingly every other form of commercial production imaginable. Doctor Who, therefore, has an important position within the debates surrounding public service television and notions of the free market, as the series ties together the BBC, public service broadcasting, merchandising, and issues of fandom and fans as consumers.

This chapter will serve to establish a detailed background of the BBC as an organisation, one with hierarchies, tiers, internal and external conflicts and coming under constant government and corporate pressures. This model of the BBC is the arena in which we find the emergence of Doctor Who's fan-producers, and will highlight the disjointed nature of the corporation's structure, serving to further dispel any ideas of it as being in any way 'monolithic', as discussed elsewhere in this thesis. It will also illustrate the responsibility theoretically implied within public service institutions and how productions, such as Doctor Who, must be made with both these ideologies, and the benefits of commercial possibilities, in mind. The importance of ratings, value for money and programming for the public interest are amongst the areas that will be examined. Ultimately, this chapter will provide an interwoven history of the BBC as a potentially compromised public service broadcaster, and set the stage for the following chapters where Doctor Who will be positioned as a product of this system. The changes and developments in the

institution will clearly have affected the programme, including its cancellation and artistically, critically and commercially triumphant return. A strong understanding of this background material - the BBC as an institution - will be vital in understanding the situation which gave rise to the series' fan-producers, and which also continues to influence the series, its production and its relationship with both mass and fan audiences.

As a concept, public service broadcasting (henceforth referred to as PSB) may appear to be an unusual system, stemming as it does from the production and distribution of entertainment, often through commercially available products such as television or radio, employing suitable casts and crew and often making use of the latest in technological developments (Williams, 1974, pp.26-29). Monetary concerns surround television production, and the use of the medium as a method for generating further profit would seem an obvious conclusion within a capitalist society. However, PSB did emerge, and is perhaps best represented by the BBC as a brand that is known worldwide. As the commercial world grows ever stronger, the nature of public services means that it is under constant pressure to adapt in order to survive against increasing commercial interests. This chapter will begin by discussing the nature of public service broadcasting, its intentions and how it may differ from commercial broadcasting, including its ability to act as a source for both entertainment and education for the general public. The history of the BBC as public service broadcaster will be examined, including its establishment, the difficulties it has faced and continues facing, and the questions surrounding the value of having such a corporation, paid for out of public money. Also discussed are the conflicts and problems with PSB, such as the pressures from the market, government interference and the increasing impact of modern global communication and media empires. This will lead into an examination of how the BBC uses the commercial potential of its products, and finally, to an exploration of the inner workings of the corporation that will reveal the fractional nature of its internal politics.

Genesis of the BBC: The Origins of British Public Service Broadcasting.
As previously mentioned, PSB emerged from within an inherently capitalist system. The main reason for this might seem to be a recognition of the inherent power of broadcasting images, and a desire for governments to retain control of this resource. Paddy Scannell and David Cardiff have argued that the BBC emerged from specific historical circumstances, initially set up by wireless manufacturers in order to buy licences from the Post Office in able to utilise the existing broadcasting possibilities

(1982, p.161). Initially, there were difficulties in selling licences due to the number of homemade receivers, which the post office could not give licences to, and the different commercial entities involved in manufacturing and broadcasting (Burns, 1977, p.7). Whilst the initial licence was exclusive, it was extended after "an official commission of enquiry had recommended that although the state should regulate broadcasting, it should not itself operate the broadcasting system" (Scannell & Cardiff, 1982, p.162). This led to the implementation of John Reith's notoriously elitist notions of 'public service', but not without negotiation, and these concepts, elaborated on later in this chapter, were not present at the corporation's very beginnings. There was no "simple realisation and fulfilment of an initial conception of radio's social and political role in national life" (Scannell & Cardiff, 1982, p.165), but more a series of practical developments, deals, debates and arguments which led to the introduction of PSB as an addition to an extant and loosely defined corporation, stemming from manufacturers. Raymond Williams argues that the manufacturers of the technology did not necessarily dictate its use, and demonstrates how different world governments approached the organisation of PSB, whether through direct state regulation as in Italy and France, or as "a natural instrument of policy" by fascist societies (1974, p.28). However, he also illustrates how in the United States, despite "pressure to control broadcasting in the national interest", the increasingly powerful manufacturing industry moved swiftly to acquire production facilities, producing radio and television as essentially a secondary concern to support the sale of the viewing products themselves (1974, p.29). This commercial approach, then, clearly differs from any public service ethos from its inception, placing the production of programming as a secondary aim, in support of generating profit, which also extends into advertising revenue and sponsorships. Whereas private media can generate profit, PSB relies on government policy in order to maintain itself, often funded through taxes; in the BBC's case specifically through the television licence fee. The result of this public system is a change in priorities, whereby broadcasting's predominant aim is usually perceived as providing material in the public interest. Burns suggests that "the BBC's relationships with Government, Parliament, and political parties, and its handling of current political affairs have confronted it with a perpetual and unresolvable dilemma" (1977, p.13). This is, Burns argues, an ever-changing dilemma, altering depending on political leanings at any given time, and sees the BBC and PSB having to justify the extent of its own potential political and cultural power. Of course, depending on the government, this can differ drastically, and a fascistic government, for example, could use public service for predominantly propaganda purposes, with which to support the authority

117

of the current regime. Indeed, it could be argued that all governments, and other private interests, use media in this way even within democracy, through selective focus of news stories and reinforcing certain ideologies. The elitist ideologies of Reith emphasise that even for PSB, certain ideological messages can be deemed more valuable and acceptable than others. It is important to make note of this in order to avoid any initial simplistic approaches that equate public service broadcasting with being inherently superior to an inherently inferior commercial system. However, where PSB has been established within less extreme government systems, or indeed where it was installed by a foreign government, an aspect of professionalism and a duty to educate appear to be common themes. Michael Tracey highlights how, following the Second World War, public service broadcasting was established in Germany and Japan, in both cases because, he argues, it was understood by the American and allied leadership that "the mind of the society was far too precious and important to be left to the vagaries of a commercial system" (Tracey, 1998, p.18). The power of mainstream media is clear, and PSB potentially walks a narrow path between commercial interests and governmental ideologies.

Despite the governmental connections, PSB is not always linked so closely with government and the BBC[19] was founded under the influences of the Sykes Committee which "rejected the notion both of a commercial monopoly in broadcasting and of direct government controls" (Georgina Born, 2004, pp.26-27). However, as will be explored further below, governments can come under pressure from commercial sectors and through their controls on regulation, can heavily influence and place pressures on broadcasters. Even with the introduction of the commercial ITV in the late fifties, there were tight restrictions, "with commercial broadcasters still heavily constrained by public service requirements imposed by the legislation and regulation of the time" but with increasing developments in technology and a global media market, there have been "severe challenges to the public service ethos which used to predominate" (Feintuck & Varney, 2006, p.41). This ethos, and the principles established by the BBC's first director-general John Reith, were to emphasise education, to inform through entertainment, and that public service broadcasting should "be committed to maintaining high standards and to leading rather than simply following public tastes" (Born, 2004, p.27). In whatever form it might occur, non-commercial broadcasting attempts to negotiate the terms of its existence in relation to the public, and generally as an alternative to more profit-driven, commercial approaches. Tracey sums up, but also notably simplifies, the

---

[19]   In its early days as the British Broadcasting Company.

different perspectives in the clearest and most basic sense when he states that "in a public system, television producers acquire money to make programmes. In a commercial system they make programmes to acquire money". Tracey admits his statement's simplicity but argues that "this little epigram articulates the divergence of the basic principles, the different philosophical assumptions, on which broadcasting is built" (1998, p.18). These ideological differences and conflicts will become more apparent in exploring the BBC as a public service broadcaster and will also highlight how Doctor Who is, as a successful BBC television series, implicated in these debates. PSB often stems from an origin fraught with conflict and negotiation, notably with government and commercial interests. These forces have only seen increasing controversy and debate across media history, as greater pressure is put on the remaining public service broadcasters.

Contradictions and Conflicts within Public Service Broadcasting.

The BBC has the almost unique position within the modern television industry of being a public service broadcaster, funded by a licence fee, that has also had enormous international recognition and success. Georgina Born summarises the BBC as "epitomising the heights to which non-commercial independent broadcasting can aspire. It remains the model for public broadcasters on every continent" (2004, p.5). Indeed, domestically, it has been described as "the cornerstone of British broadcasting" (Goodwin, 1998, p.95) and as ensuring the "broadcasting standards which are the envy of many other countries" (Goodwin, 1998 p.37). Despite this however, the BBC remains in a delicate position where its every actions are scrutinised and judged, often accused of contradictory failures. As the licence fee comes up for renewal again in 2016, the BBC is obliged to attempt to justify its own existence, especially during an era of political austerity. Born suggests that "it is an institution riven by contradictions, at once liberal and elitist, arrogant and fragile, a cornerstone of British democracy yet replete with internal hierarchies mirroring Britain's broader social inequalities" (2004, p.5). Thus, despite its international reputation, the BBC faces consistent persecution within Britain, many criticisms stemming from problems deriving from its early organisation and the establishing of the public service mandate. Both these issues will be addressed throughout the rest of this discussion, focusing on the aims of the BBC as a PSB, the contradictions and factions within it and the external pressures and criticisms it faces.

The founding principles of the BBC, usually primarily accredited to Reith, highlight education as a goal, and include the notion of raising the intelligence and standards of the public. Tracey sees PSB as an ideal, an ambition that is aimed for, claiming that it is:

> [a] belief that the sheer presence of broadcasting within all our lives can and must be used to nurture society, to proffer the opportunity for society and its inhabitants to be better served than by systems which primarily seek consumers for advertisers. (Tracey,1998, p.18)

However, this ideal is perhaps based, at least originally, on a form of class bias, specifically in its belief that the masses must be educated by the tastes of elite culture. Burns suggests that whilst popular material that "appealed to the lower classes were included in large measure... the manner in which they were purveyed, the context and the presentation, remained indomitably upper middle class", and that this was essentially a method to draw these audiences in so they could appreciate the more culturally valuable offerings (1977, p.42). This ties into the work of Pierre Bourdieu who, as highlighted in elsewhere in this thesis, has criticised the acceptance of the apparent self-evidence as to what constitutes high culture, cultured art and educationally beneficial art forms. This is to say, the value of high culture is in itself defined and perpetuated by the higher social classes invested within that culture. The tastes of elite culture are culturally assumed to be superior because they are a higher class, and therefore it can only be a good thing to educate the lower classes as to the validity of this, and the quality of these forms of culture. Bourdieu states that tastes "are the practical affirmation of an inevitable difference. It is no accident that, when they have to be justified, they are asserted purely negatively, by the refusal of other tastes" (1979, p.56). These early instances of the BBC's attempts to educate were focused on reinforcing the dominant aesthetic tastes, and demonstrated a distaste and distinct side-lining of anything so vulgar as to be 'popular'. In its early days, the BBC's Music Department focused entirely on classical music, with popular music handled as an aside by the Variety Department under the heading of light entertainment. Andrew Crisell claims that the "assumption was that if you liked music you could not be displeased with Bach or Beethoven, and that if you liked the theatre you could not be discontented with Shakespeare" (1997, p.34). Tracey suggests that PSB "rests on the mighty and worthy ambition that we can, collectively, be *better* than we are" (1998, p.20) and that within the elite there was "a residual faith, tied to the whole condition of the Enlightenment, humanism, and belief in progress, that popular culture need not be debauched but could in fact transcend itself" (1998, p.24). The concept of

'standards', for Tracey, "invokes a commitment to quality, to a refusal to pander to dull and barren mass taste, to preserving a sense of value and moral purpose" (1998, p.18). Crisell makes clear the attitudes that inspire this direction of thought. Classical music was not superior because the elite liked it but rather the elite liked it because it was superior, and everyone, including the working classes, could equally appreciate and enjoy Bach and Shakespeare if they were given the opportunity to do so (Crisell, 1997, p.34). Thus the aim of PSB was "to give the public a 'better' service than it asked for", a service that could allow it to 'transcend' itself (Crisell, 1997, p.34). This returns again, then, to the criticism made by Bourdieu who has worked to deconstruct this inherent belief in a superior art form, but also whose work highlights how this concept of 'standards' is inherently flawed. Bourdieu makes it clear that aesthetic taste, the appreciation of art forms, is something learnt, and specifically learnt through a class position. Value is perceived through individual class views and experiences, and judgements are made based on these, and so the working classes would not necessarily, as assumed, be welcoming of the opportunity to appreciate Bach (Bourdieu, 1979, pp.44-47). Crisell is also rightly critical of this, and it is clear that the BBC did not stick rigidly to this initial attitude towards its purpose, but the policy of education would, however, go on to influence the development of shows such as <u>Doctor Who</u>, whilst the conflict of popular entertainment with notions of quality would be a continuous issue for the corporation.

If the corporation only appealed to the cultural elite, then it could be deemed a failure, whilst attempts to appeal to the masses were accompanied with complaints of 'dumbing down' or complaints from commercial competitors. Therefore, there was:

> [a] political vice that gripped the corporation when, as a consequence, it competed aggressively for audience to maintain popular legitimacy. For if it took the high road, focused on 'market failure', it risked being condemned as irrelevant and out of touch; if it took the populist low road, it risked being damned as insufficiently distinctive. (Born, 2004, p.377)

The BBC therefore was, and is, caught in an impossible impasse that partially goes towards explaining why the same controversies and issues have surrounded it through most of its existence. Although to a degree, the complaints of 'elitism' within the BBC appear to have lessened, or at least become less visible, they do still exist alongside the more common 'dumbing down' criticisms, and, within the corporation itself, elitist attitudes had become synonymous with particular sections or departments within the corporation. One BBC Producer, interviewed by Born

discussing the Serials department, concludes that "there's a sense of 'us' making programmes for 'them', whereas here in Series, people make programmes they're going to enjoy: it's 'us' for 'us'. We are 'them', the audience, and they *are* us" (BBC Producer quoted in Born, 2004, p.334, emphasis in original). The attitudes therefore clearly differ within the corporation, suggesting that elitist attitudes are more likely found amongst departments that traditionally deal with more 'highbrow' entertainment, drawing clear distinctions between those who produce material for the 'inferior' mainstream audience and those who seek to simply produce the best possible quality of programming that they themselves would enjoy. This elitist attitude perhaps condemns the audience to a product that cannot be of the highest possible quality, if those producing believe they are making inferior content. Thus the elitist approach actually infers a possible conflict in the corporation's dedication to standards. Can producers who have already decided that they are not producing material of a quality they can appreciate be said to be living up to the standards that the BBC supposedly stands for? Elitist attitudes and approaches within the BBC are deeply problematic in that they call into question not only its ability to fulfil its function but also create a paradox of standards. There is no reason to believe that all departments can produce quality programming for themselves that can also be popular with the mainstream. This also highlights the concept of distance between producer and audience, with Born's interviewee positioning themselves at the same level as the audience, removing the conceptual space between. Perceived divides between production and consumption, and specifically, producers and audiences, can thus be as much tied into elitist attitudes as they are other power relations. This argument is of particular interest because of its connections with Doctor Who and Doctor Who fandom, perhaps best described as echoing the divides that some factions within fandom perceive between fan and mass audience, and between quality and light entertainment, an idea that will be discussed in more detail further on in this study. This discussion has thus far then illustrated how internal conflicts surrounding ideas of elitism and mainstream audiences have always been part of the structure of the BBC, and I will now move forward to directly address the wider problems in viewing the BBC as a monolithic entity.

The BBC and Monolithic Perceptions of the Media Industry.

Current writing on fandom has tended to focus on the fans themselves,[20] rarely positioning the production companies or studios behind the programmes in any way

---

[20]   As discussed in some detail in Chapter One.

other than as a singular source of conflict and oppression. In considering any potential conflict between fans and the loosely defined category of 'producers', it is also important to have a detailed understanding of the nature of the corporation in question, and these discussions thus far have appropriately focused on the BBC. Jenkins and Fiske, amongst others, have viewed the cultural industry as monolithic and as "the homogenising force of the dominant ideology", a singular, dominating force that seeks to maintain control over the various social groups opposing them (Fiske, 1987, pp.309-310). The writings of Georgina Born, Tom Burns, and David Hesmondhalgh have demonstrated that the BBC cannot be simply seen as a unified organisation that ought to be resisted, but that it comes with its own contradictions and internal conflicts. The uncertain nature of the aims for PSB has already been highlighted, and stands as one facet of the conflicts that occur. Corporations, organisations, and other forms of media companies may appear to present themselves as a single entity, but they are inevitably formed out of departments, associates, and sub-companies, featuring hierarchical structures that do not always communicate nor agree with each other. Burns's ethnographic study looked at changes in the BBC from the sixties and into the seventies, and he noted that the latter decade saw the corporation form a management structure designed as "an instrument for devising, administering, and monitoring corporate strategy in much the same terms... as are familiar in the administration of large industrial and business corporations" (1977, p.212). Thus the segmented organisation is very much mirrored in the commercial sector, where the increasing size and power of conglomerates, often through purchasing other businesses, leads to large networks of interconnected (and sometimes competing) companies, ultimately under one roof. In discussing the growth of corporate ownership, Hesmondhalgh has argued that the "changing pattern of ownership and structure is... more nuanced and complex than some critics of developments in the sector would have us believe" (2007, p.160). He also highlights how the cultural industry features conglomerates which "compete with each other, but, more than ever before... are connected, with each other and with other companies – in complex webs of alliance, partnership and joint venture" (2007, p.2). The BBC itself has associated companies such as BBC America, BBC Worldwide and previous links with channels such as satellite channel UK TV Gold, in themselves often further divided, whilst various television series have been produced as joint ventures with foreign commercial producers, such as 2011's Torchwood: Miracle Day, a BBC and Starz co-production. It is impossible to imagine that a system that operates in this manner would be unified and, indeed, it is inevitable that there will be problems between different, and even rival, sections of

the same company. Rivalries and disagreements can come between departments, between producers and executives, members of staff and even outside contractors. Burns suggested that "inter-departmental rivalry has a direct appeal to management, because it seems to import the classic merits of competition into the organisation", a notion which would be emphasised during the nineties with "producer choice", discussed below (1977, p.222). What is vital to appreciate is that corporations are neither monolithic nor inherently united, but in fact form structures that almost inevitably lead to clashes within themselves. These conflicts are perhaps illustrated best by the internal turmoil and challenges the BBC faced in some difficult periods of transition during the nineties, highlighted by Born throughout her anthropological studies during this time. Thus, this discussion will now turn to examining the internal politics of the BBC and how it adapts and changes and competes with various external pressures, including those that have been alluded to so far.

The primary source of funding for the BBC, in the form of the licence fee, is perhaps one of the biggest areas subject to debate. Almost ironically, the origin for the creation of the licence fee stems from support from both the British press and the government, two forces now often utilised in criticising it. Tracey explains that:

> newspaper interests were eager to ensure the BBC not be allowed to compete with them for advertising. Political parties were equally anxious to make sure that broadcasting was not run by government, if only because they feared it might be used against them when they were in opposition. (1998, pp.99-100)

The licence fee therefore would not just fund the corporation but serve it by "articulating the national status of the BBC and guaranteeing its creative and political independence" (Tracey, 1998, p.100). The theory was that, by having an independent source of funding, it would be free from the critical dominance of any specific government or corporation who could otherwise have dictated its content on the basis of providing its funding. However, the BBC has become forced to justify the licence fee in an increasingly multimedia-driven environment, and pressures from its opponents have arguably driven it to the point where "the BBC is forced to engage in a ratings war despite not being driven by the advertising revenue imperative" (Feintuck & Varney, 2006, p.83). The argument suggests that the government, who regulates the licence fee, will only continue to support and increase it if it sees the corporation producing material that people want to watch, thus creating active competition for viewers with commercial channels, producing more populist entertainment and increasing concerns surrounding both standards and fair market practice (Feintuck & Varney, 2006, p.83). Thus, despite its public service remit and use of a licence fee, the BBC is engaged in both marketing and

merchandising-based activities, used to further raise revenue for the corporation, and in producing populist entertainment which does not arguably fit with the original ethos of educating and improving society.

The Changing Face of the BBC.

Under these pressures, dealing with the reality of this situation has led to various attempts to either change the very nature of the BBC or reshape its internal structures, and emphasising audience research in order to, theoretically, aid in the production of material suited to carrying out the corporation's public service remit. In Burns's study, he notes that the organisation of the BBC had changed drastically during the periods of his research, notably in the structure and procedures of the corporation (1977, p.211-214). This was seen particularly strongly in the nineties during John Birt's reign as director-general of the BBC, where he began to more fully embrace a commercial model, with targeted programming directed by market research. Born suggests that:

> propelling the rise of audience research at this time was an unholy alliance between the critique of producer elitism and the neo-liberal doctrine of consumer sovereignty. Both formed part of a slew of forces that tended to weaken and displace the creative responsibility. (2004, p.287)

She argues that Birt's BBC came to value high-viewing figures at low-cost, leading to increased numbers of cheap reality shows, docu-soaps and lifestyle programming (Born, 2004, p.307). Hesmondhalgh also sees this as symptomatic of attempting to create event, or 'water cooler', television, which claims to depict the real lives of individuals, although he questions how cheap such programmes actually are, seeing them more as an attempt to boost television's status by highlighting its superior ability to "reveal the inner depths of ordinariness" (2007, p.291). Attempts at re-organising the BBC to be more in line with audience concerns, then, potentially served to damage the organisation's remit to produce quality programming and the predominance of 'docu-soaps', as an example, showed signs of "increasing disenchantment and scepticism about television" (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p.291). The emphasis became too focused on producing programmes aimed at particular demographics, a potential result resisted and criticised even by those high up within the BBC's internal hierarchy. Matthew Bannister, a controller for BBC Radio 1 in 1997, suggested that "the worst thing that could happen to the BBC is if we started designing cynical formats aimed at allowing us to tick boxes for particular groups that aren't being served" (quoted in Born, 2004, p.288). Some felt there had been a clear shift in approach within the organisation, suggesting that "the BBC was a production-led, boffin-led organisation; now it's marketing-led" (quoted in Born,

2004, p.306). A BBC journalist, Mark Tully, launched an attack on Birt claiming that, under his changes, "the whole institution had become top heavy and rigid, smothering the creative potential of the production staff" (cited in Tracey, 2002, p.198). In the BBC of the nineties, Born argues that "integration became centralisation, and it disciplined production, compromising freedom and diversity in programme-making. Here we see the most serious effect of the Birt period: the erosion of the creative autonomy and confidence of BBC production" (2004, p.304) and an increasing reliance on outsourcing. Crisell further discusses how Birt's policy of "producer choice" heightened the sense of competition within the BBC; "every programme production became an autonomous entity which was obliged to bid for funding against other productions and buy its resources according to the best deal available", further leading to the BBC looking to external private companies to supply its productions (2001, p.250). Mike Tucker, a visual effects artist working on <u>Doctor Who</u> in the late eighties, has commented on how the constant changes and adaptations at the BBC not only caused consistent confusion and turmoil in the internal departments, but also led to them having to employ outside companies themselves to support their own work due to the relatively low costs. The picture that is clearly painted is one of internal strife and negotiation, and a struggle not only between creative freedom and corporate organisation, but over the very purpose of the BBC, with the commercial approach seemingly dominating. The BBC was forced to interact to greater extents than ever before with external companies, and became more integrated in the methodologies of the commercial system. The nineties period resulted in a great deal of struggle, and it will become clear in later chapters that these struggles, which inform many of the decisions and actions taken by the BBC, have a direct impact on the producers' relationships with fandom. For the present, it is centrally important to note that hierarchical struggles destabilise the means of production for television, and that corporations are not monolithic and singular entities but clearly factional and conflicted organisations of different values, views and directions. Born concludes that the systems Birt had in place restricted the quality and potential for BBC programming because both power and responsibility should ultimately rest in the arena of production rather than predominantly with management.

> For in all genres, creativity requires that producers exceed and confound the expectations of audiences, the better to renew their desires and interests... producers shoulder both creative power and responsibility and we lose sight of the necessary autonomy of producers at our peril. The more inventively and responsibly that creative autonomy is deployed, the more it is benign. (Born, 2004, p.492)[21]

---

[21]   Here Born's view is diametrically opposed to the notion of producer-as-enemy, whilst still making progressive claims. This line of discussion will be pursued further elsewhere in this study.

As the BBC has moved to echo more commercial channels in the way it operates, this is likely to remain an important area of debate. The degrees of authority throughout the corporation are far from clear; the differing attitudes and responses of different sections of the BBC may have adverse and contradicting results in their address to and interactions with their audiences, and fandom in particular.

Politics and the BBC.

The debate surrounding the BBC's status as a public service has been a pertinent one to address and, as has been demonstrated, it would be extraneous to express that the corporation is currently under a great deal of pressure, as this has been perhaps its most consistent state for almost a century. Arguments surrounding its supposed impartial nature and the national media often reporting on controversial issues and decisions, such as the 2010 appearance of BNP head Nick Griffin on <u>Question Time</u> or the amount of coverage given to UKIP in 2014, are a common fixture of the contemporary media climate. The BBC's own editorial policy claims that:

> impartiality lies at the heart of the BBC's commitment to its audiences. It applies across all of our services and output, whatever the format, from radio news bulletins via our web sites to our commercial magazines and includes a commitment to reflecting a diversity of opinion.[22].

As well as stating their goal of impartiality, this statement also reflects the multiple media outlets for the BBC across various media platforms. The policy also states that the BBC "offer[s] artists, writers and entertainers scope for individual expression in drama, arts and entertainment and… seek[s] to reflect a wide range of talent and perspective". The BBC thus must emphasise an impartial, informative service, deemed to be in the public interest, whilst producing original, popular entertainment within a competitive marketplace, often in opposition to commercial channels such as ITV and Sky. The impossibility of any stable organisation within this remit has been demonstrated, but this is not to say it is not worth attempting, and the BBC continues to do so, adapting to the changing political situations.

Margaret Thatcher was clear in her belief that the BBC should carry advertising (Goodwin, 1998, pp.76-77) and was critical of its political coverage, the Conservative party viewing the corporation as "a hotbed of leftism" (Goodwin, 1998, p.73). Thus the Thatcher government of the eighties placed enormous pressure on

---

22   http://www.bbc.co.uk/guidelines/editorialguidelines/edguide/impariality/, accessed 16th March 2010

the BBC, including increasing control over the organisation (Born, 2004, pp.48-50) and attempts to remove the licence fee altogether, through the controversial Peacock Committee (Crisell, 2001, pp.234-235). The report aimed to position the viewer, or consumer, as 'king' and emphasised the need for British broadcasting to move towards a "sophisticated market system" (Tracey, 1998, p.48). That this consisted of embracing more market- and commercial-led attitudes, perhaps goes some way to suggesting why it ultimately failed to achieve its goals. The notion was that consumer choice would allow audiences to only pay for the television they wanted to see, but the Peacock Report's own findings were that advertising finance led to channel owners not selling "programmes to audiences, but audiences to advertisers" (quoted in Goodwin, 1998, p.81). The report was understandably greeted with hostility from within the industry, and ITV, already carrying advertising as its primary source of funding, was nervous of the addition of a further competitor were the BBC to be forced to take on adverts. The Peacock Report's key alternative suggestion for subscription-based payments for the BBC was undermined by a separate study into its practical implementation which concluded that there was little viability in making the changes (Goodwin, 1998, p.88). Whilst the extremes of the Peacock Committee's intentions were not carried through, the effect on the BBC was clear, and under this threat, the BBC responded by cutting staff and services, a reaction echoed again at times of crisis (Tracey, 1998p.108). The conservative government had both ideological and editorial oppositions to the BBC, the former in terms of supposed "consumer choice and the disciplines of the market" and the latter in how the corporation covered political issues such as the Falklands War and miners' strike (Crisell, 2001, p.233-234). These concerns, of course, conflict directly with much of the original reasoning that led to the founding of the licence fee and the BBC in the first place, and only serve to emphasise the intrinsic incompatibility of the two ideologies of public service and the free market. Tracey illustrates how the situation can only be exacerbated by the continued government interventions, suggesting that "public broadcasters have been forced to spend considerable energy on managing political defences, which diverts them from programme planning and production and leaves them in constant turmoil" (1998, p.57).

A consistent area for attack is that the BBC is not fulfilling its remit as a public service broadcaster, despite this remit being difficult to define or enforce as evidenced previously. Crisell illustrates one argument that claims that "the BBC's only real public service justification lies in serving minorities which the market would serve either poorly or not at all" and that the majority of programmes for a mass

audience could just as easily be paid for via advertising (2001, p.250). Suggesting that the licence fee merely subsidises minority programming would be a weak basis for argument and, indeed, despite being PSB, the BBC still struggles to cater for minorities, and often the smaller services come under attack during cost-cutting measures. Born cites an example of a BBC youth channel executive, speaking in 2001, criticising the organisation on the grounds of being too "white middle-class" and not fully representing different ethnic communities (2004, p.84). The BBC has certainly moved to diversify and has used digital channels to offer more alternative choices, but in 2010 two such digital radio stations, BBC6 and the Asian network, faced closure, supposedly to allow commercial rivals a more fair opportunity. The BBC Trust overruled the closure of BBC6 but approved the loss of the Asian Network, the latter notably a less successful venture than the former.[23] More recently, changes at the BBC have seen the channel BBC Three move to an entirely online platform, via BBC I-Player.[24] What is clear is that there is a struggle between the BBC appealing to a mass licence fee-paying audience, and the necessity, as a public service, to cater to all corners of society, all the while adapting to growing technologies and dealing with budget-cutting and scandals. The government itself comes under consistent and increasing pressure from commercial enterprises, and that pressure is transposed to the BBC and at the time of writing the licence fee has been frozen for the next six years, encouraging further cuts within public broadcasting. Tracey demonstrates an understandable but bleak pessimism for the future of public broadcasting, predicting that "the notion of paying for television from the public treasury will become increasingly rare, replaced by commercial funding and direct payment" (1998, p.34). However, this is not a new concern and, indeed, it pre-dates the BBC's own success with Freeview, and other strategies under Dyke that have worked to counter the public broadcasting apocalypse that Tracey foresaw, although the pressures continue. Equally, however, there is reason to see this as a stay of execution, and many of his concerns are still ones that must be addressed if the futures of institutions like the BBC are to be secured and safeguarded from the ever present pressures from the commercial sector.

Conclusion.

This discussion has highlighted the inherent flaws within the current public service system, and how key components of the BBC's establishment, the licence fee and its responsibilities to the public, represented by its charter, are the very factors that

---

23   http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10507286, accessed 22nd January 2011.

24   http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-26452235, accessed 25th October 2014.

contribute to the pressures it is subjected to. It is clear that there is no resolution for the contradictions the BBC is rife with, and so no solution to the pressures faced within the corporation. It is historically interesting to note that Reith argued for a PSB monopoly precisely because he foresaw this paradox occurring. It would be impossible to comprehensively chart the dilemmas faced, and largely irrelevant to the overall aims of this study, but this discussion has sought to lay a foundation of understanding for the contemporary media environment that informs the internal attitudes and policies that are reflected in the production of shows such as <u>Doctor Who</u> and the methods through which they are marketed. Fandom cannot exist in the way that it now does without a relationship with the means of production, and the companies will almost certainly be comprised of a varied mixture of production teams, marketing arms, creative individuals and corporate managers. This discussion also expands on how 'monolithic' visions of media corporations cannot fully account for their often contradictory responses to fan engagement. Important aspects of the debates surrounding the BBC will be addressed throughout the rest of this thesis as they become relevant, and it will be revealed how the factors outlined in the preceding discussion play important roles in the development of <u>Doctor Who</u>, fandom and ultimately the fan-producers themselves. This paradoxical position of the BBC is perhaps best highlighted in its developing expansion into merchandising and marketing, an area of strong historical significance in relation to <u>Doctor Who</u>, which serves to emphasise the tension between the public service principles and the corporation's commercial endeavours. Having established the history of the BBC as a conflicted entity, I shall now look to its own history of marketing, and examine the role that <u>Doctor Who</u> has played in expanding the BBC's own commercial enterprises.

-Chapter Six-
The Commercial Power of the Daleks:
Merchandising and Marketing *Doctor Who* in the 1960's – A Case Study.

The merchandising of the series is something of a nexus for the issues that continue to surround the BBC and its relationship with both the government and its commercial rivals. In the BBC's marketing ventures we find what are perhaps the most prominent collisions between a public service mandate and commercial exploitation. The merchandising that surrounds the current series of Doctor Who has been, without a doubt, a phenomenal commercial success, and there seems to be no sign of this subsiding despite the change in lead cast member once David Tennant left the series in 2010, and again when Peter Capaldi took over in 2014. It remains to be seen what impact the lack of a new series in 2016 or the transition to a new showrunner at the end of 2017 will have on the brand, but all evidence thus far suggests it will continue to succeed. This success is not without precedent as previous eras of the show have enjoyed equally lucrative marketing opportunities, reaching all the way back to the beginning in the early sixties. This chapter will be focusing on the historical progression of the BBC's commercial exploits, primarily in regards to Doctor Who, whilst the contemporary branding and re-branding of the series will be discussed in Chapter Eight. The contexts explored will thus be both historical and industrial, charting an evolving history of British media, the BBC's internal politics and the position of Doctor Who within the organisation. It is important to realise that the BBC's commercial ventures stretch back into its earliest periods, and that the corporation recognised the increased potential for the exploitation of television material on the international market. It is just as important to understand how these changing contexts of the media industries directly affected the production and fandom of Doctor Who, both historically and in its contemporary iteration.

The BBC archives provide a valuable record of key decisions, and will be used to provide a case study of the early years of Doctor Who and what marketing and merchandising issues surrounded it. This chapter will examine the organisation of the early BBC and its relationships with writers, and how it dealt with the joint ownership of characters and scripts from shows such as Doctor Who. This will lead to an examination of how Doctor Who's success led to various attempts to market

the series, and how there were increasing pressures from the writers' representatives to strike lucrative business deals. The obvious pressures between the public service remit and the need to exploit properties shall be addressed, and the influence and input of the series' production team will be examined. This approach will address what changes, differences, similarities and developments there have been in the BBC's approach to marketing and merchandising over the last half-century. The BBC and its public service mandate are intrinsicly tied to Doctor Who, and its position as a expanding commercial property, places it firmly in the midst of ongoing discussions regarding the continuation of the license fee in the UK. A case study will allow a detailed insight into the inner workings of the BBC, and highlight the conflicts and negotiations that were not only present in that period, but that have developed and continue to be central to many debates surrounding the continuation of public service broadcasting.

The Early Emergence of BBC Marketing.

There were many notable changes that occurred at the BBC throughout the sixties, many addressed by Tom Burns in his ethnographic study of the organisation (1977). As well as the re-organisation of the corporation, as discussed in the previous chapter, there were numerous factors, both internal and external, that led to developments in its funding. Burns argues that "the rising costs and inflation which combined to make life so unpleasant for the BBC after 1960 faced management with problems which were not only unprecedented for the BBC, but unique to it" (1977, p.223). The most notable is that the license fee would no longer cover the increasing costs at the BBC, nor the expense of improving technology, such as the transition to colour television. Burns highlights how operating costs rose from around thirty million pounds in 1960 to five times that amount just over a decade later (1977, p.224). It is interesting to note that it is throughout this period of financial instability and pressures that the BBC would also become increasingly involved in the commercial exploitation of its properties. The BBC was aware of the marketing potential of a production such as Doctor Who before production had even begun. In July 1963 a document was compiled that discussed the BBC's policy on the "exploitation of rights in programme material" which directly addressed the changing face of the global media market.

> The development of television has given rise to considerable outside interest in the subsidiary rights in programme material and the Corporation is now seeking to establish in its contracts those rights which it can properly secure so that it can participate in their subsequent exploitation. This includes recognition of the principle

that the Corporation has rights in programmes to whose concept or characterisation the BBC has made a material contribution.[25]

However, the extent of the success of <u>Doctor Who</u> could not have been predicted, and licences to produce products associated with both the series and the hugely popular Daleks became highly desirable commercial properties. The BBC was simply not equipped to handle this interest with essentially one man, Roy Williams, in charge of organising licences. When faced with the prospect of incredible interest in the Daleks, Williams turned to an outside company, Walter Tuckwell & Associated Limited, to take on the responsibility of talking with external companies and issuing licences, with BBC consent, for a share of the profits. Williams became Exploitation Manager, dealing with "copyright agreement and clearance procedures" and would provide final approval for specific licences (Howe & Blumberg, 2003, pp.19-20). Thus in its earliest days the BBC was not only ill-equipped to handle the licences it owned, but it did so on a relatively small scale, using an external company to deal with obtaining contracts, and feeding these offers through a single BBC employee responsible for giving acceptance. This is a far cry from the modern BBC's approach of multi-platform brand immersion, where merchandising plays an important role in a programme's presence across all forms of media, highlighting the degree of change in the corporation's approach across less than half a decade (Hills, 2010, p.66). However, it is clear that the BBC were aware of a degree of potential interest and, indeed, evidence suggests they were looking towards other media of publication for their properties. Therefore, notions that the BBC were removed from commercial exploitation altogether would be naive, but there is a sense of inexperience and uncertainty in the corporation's approach. An earlier document, from April that same year, suggests that the publication of broadcast material in a print form was an issue of concern for the BBC, and during this period the appearance of particular standards was an important factor in the decisions made.

> Publication should be in the best interests of the BBC. Consideration should be given to the possibility of publication by the BBC itself, and the standard of publication, the material to be published, and, if an outside publisher is concerned, his public standing should be in keeping with the standing of the BBC.[26]

The BBC demonstrates an awareness, and concern, for how it is perceived, and that any products bearing recognisable BBC properties must live up to the perceived standards of the corporation. The rhetoric surrounding this, however, tends not to be

---

[25]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/22/1 3 July 1963
[26]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/22/1 19 April 1963

of 'merchandise', but as an extension of BBC production, perhaps due to a strong awareness of staying close to the public service broadcasting (PSB) mandate.

Having discussed in Chapter Five the pressures the BBC often faced, it would not be unreasonable to suggest that this concern also extended to a desire to maintain a distinction from its more profit-orientated rivals. Indeed, an internal hand-written note discussing a potential *Daily Mail* article on the BBC's exploitation of the Daleks expresses an abashment at some of the corporation's own products. It was felt that a biscuit tin featuring The Black and White Minstrel Show was not the sort of exploitation that should be mentioned to the press, but licences found on jigsaws or records were more acceptable[27]. The cultural implications seem clear enough; the biscuit tin licence could be perceived as the BBC shamelessly marketing products that do not have any intrinsic artistic merit. Jigsaws and records, on the other hand, would better represent the BBC as involving itself with cultured, beneficial merchandise. The Black and White Minstrel Show, as well as being based on racist content, was also associated with mass entertainment and the working classes. Tom Burns suggests that although it commanded one of the BBC's biggest regular audiences, it was "undisguisedly regarded and used as groundbait... for audiences who might be induced to continue watching programmes of a more informative, or intellectually stimulating but less entertaining kind" (1977, p.54). This echoes the elitist perceptions that were found in the earliest days of the BBC, as discussed previously, with the BBC making value judgements as to which forms of merchandise might best represent them as a cultured corporation. It is also worth noting that at this stage the BBC are continuing to use PSB rhetoric in relation to activities which are more inherently commercial and not inclined towards such public service principles.

As will become apparent, such value judgements seem to, if not disappear completely, at least become far less of a concern when the opportunity for Dalek merchandise is presented, with the creatures featuring on almost any imaginable product. Documentation also suggests that "there will be occasions when the interests of the Corporation will justify publication in the absence of financial return to the Corporation"[28]. However, it also seeks to clarify that any publication arrangements must not come at the expense of the BBC's broadcasting service

---

[27]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/22/1 unknown date
[28]   It is worth noting here that many products of this era are referred to as publications and, it is possible that before the Dalek merchandising era, there was little merchandising beyond print and audio forms, both of which seem to be referred to as publications in documentation.

which is its "primary obligation"[29]. What this all serves to demonstrate is an early uneasiness, or at the very least a wariness, with dealing in the exploitation of its licences, something that contrasts sharply with the contemporary BBC. Indeed, the modern BBC embraces secondary media as an outlet not only for branded products but numerous extended narratives that could potentially "displace the film or television as the necessary centre of the text and franchise, or as the privileged site of meaning-generation" (Gray, 2010, p.206). This displacement will be a key feature in the later history of Doctor Who and is discussed further in later chapters. For now it is sufficient to clarify that the focus on broadcasting, whilst still central to the corporation, is not as clearly defined as it once was. However, this is not to say that everyone within the corporation during the sixties shared this cautious approach and, indeed, evidence suggests that the BBC wished to be taken seriously in terms of marketing, and have it understood that their licences were not free for public use. Walter Tuckwell & Associated Limited (henceforth referred to as 'Walter Tuckwell') was given the responsibility of distributing licences to manufacturers for the BBC, and they produced a pamphlet to promote this. Kenneth Adam, the General Manager of Television Enterprises who dealt with merchandising in the period, wrote to express his appreciation for this.

> Congratulations on your Dalek promotion brochure. This, I am sure, will really shake numerous people who believe we are in the 'give-away' game. I had an opportunity of displaying it to several industrialists at lunch time today and they were astonished that we were up to this sort of thing.[30]

Whilst the BBC was clearly nervous about its reputation and public perception as it moved into exploiting its properties, it was at the same time seeking to be taken seriously within that industry. Adam's comments also emphasise that though the BBC acts as a PSB it will protect its properties, and engage with commercial considerations. The influence of the success of Doctor Who and the Daleks cannot be overlooked, however, and it is possible that this contributed to the BBC's increasingly determined and uncompromising approach to what it saw as protecting what it judged to be its properties. Certainly, following the period of 'Dalekmania', the BBC would not only actively seek similar successful creatures, but come into conflict with writers as to who owned the rights to them.

Remuneration of the Daleks: Copyright and Merchandise in the Era of 'Dalekmania'.

---

[29]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/22/1 19 April 1963
[30]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/22/1 12 February 1965

Perhaps the most prominent example of the collision between the PSB mandate and commercial interests can be found in the ownership and distribution of rights for merchandise surrounding the Daleks. The policy held by the BBC in the sixties was that hired scriptwriters retained rights of their own creations, but shared copyright with the corporation in specific aspects of these (Howe & Blumberg, 2003, p.20). The concept and characterisation of the Daleks stems from the original scripts written by Terry Nation but the design and realisation of the creatures were the product of a BBC staff designer, and thus of the BBC as a whole. In these instances *ex gratia* payments[31] could be made to the BBC employee who produced the design work, such as Raymond Cusick who designed the look of the Daleks, but otherwise any other payments were made direct to the BBC as an organisation (Chapman, 2006, p.29). Doctor Who's almost instantaneous success cannot be discussed without due credit to the Daleks who, from their first full appearance in the sixth episode of the fledgling show, immediately caught the attention of the nation, and more importantly, the imagination of the child audience. Due to Nation's shared ownership, which included recognition of his creation of the characters, names and story lines featuring the Daleks, the writer was able to directly control the merchandising potential for his creations. The Daleks represented a huge marketing opportunity, one that would eventually go on to make Nation extremely wealthy and spark a period of 'Dalekmania' in the mid-sixties (Robb, 2009, p.59). The BBC were therefore forced not only to grapple with marketing but to directly deal with the representatives of Nation who, unlike the corporation, could directly aim to generate as much profit as possible.

It is not surprising then, that this would lead to conflicts of interest and clashes over BBC policy and ownership rights, many of which can be viewed in letters between the corporation and Beryl Vertue, Nation's representative. On one occasion, the BBC was contacted by a concerned Vertue after turning down a potentially lucrative offer for the use of the Dalek image, suggesting this represented a change in policy and a loss of revenue for Nation[32]. The BBC's response was firm, claiming they "cannot give permission for an item produced under licence to be used to promote the sales of a third party"[33]. This was a clash between values relating to commercial interests, and values of PSB, and demonstrates the pressure the ethos of public service would come under when attempting to negotiate with the commercial sector,

---

[31]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/22/1 19 April 1963
[32]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/19/5 28 July 1965
[33]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/19/5 6 August 1965

as will now be more widely demonstrated. For instance, the shared ownership led to several difficult situations for the BBC, such as the use of a Dalek on the cover of an officially licensed <u>Doctor Who</u> annual[34]. In this instance, the annal's makers, World Distributors, assumed that the Daleks could be included and produced cover art featuring the creatures, although Nation had provided exclusive rights to a Dalek annual to a rival publisher, Souvenir Press. Nation's agent Beryl Vertue was forced to contact the BBC at one stage to get official confirmation that references to the Daleks would not feature in a <u>Doctor Who</u> annual[35]. The issue was resolved, with the BBC accepting a reduced amount of money to cover costs of the unusable prints, but it serves to show the confusion that may be caused by the differences between the BBC and the wider commercial industry. Similar difficulties were encountered when licensing a <u>Doctor Who</u> comic strip for <u>TV Comic</u> whereby the publishers suggested to the BBC that the licensing of a rival publisher's comic, featuring the Daleks, might weaken their sales and thus force them to reconsider their agreement with the corporation[36]. Walter Tuckwell, despite representing the BBC in its commercial endeavours, also expressed concerns with licensing different components of the series to competing companies. They noted that "having sold *Dr. Who* – of which the Daleks are far and away the most important part – to one company it would, to us, not seem right to agree to the use of these by a competitor".[37] Throughout various negotiations in this period there is a sense of the commercial parties attempting to persuade the BBC or, as in the previously cited incident, imply they may no longer wish to do business. This is, of course, a more business-orientated approach that perhaps reveals a lack of appreciation for the BBC as PSB, and as such, as much unable as unwilling to make any favourable compromises. In their joint ownership of such a lucrative property as the Daleks, the BBC were thrown into a world of commercial interest that they were clearly inexperienced in, but which set a precedent for an increasingly confident corporation that would seek to emulate this success.

Replacement of the Daleks.

Following the commercial success of the Daleks, there was a general sense of anticipation at finding their successor. Whether the BBC itself encouraged the use of potentially lucrative monsters is not certain, but an expectation from both the media and commercial parties looking to buy licences is undeniable. The next science

---

[34]   BBC Written Archives Centre R43/977/1
[35]   BBC Written Archives Centre R43/977/1 31 December 1964
[36]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/27/1 11 December 1964
[37]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/27/1 22 December 1964

fiction based serial[38] featured the alien Voord who received extensive press coverage, with headlines suggesting "after the Daleks a new horror – Voord!". The Voord, along with a selection of other creatures from the show's first two seasons would eventually appear in the series' first official annual, albeit without the presence of the Daleks, as discussed earlier. Nation himself attempted to echo his success by creating the 'Mechanoids' who only made one appearance on television but returned to feature in the Daleks' own comic strip as an adversary (Robb, 2009, p.63). The 1964 serial The Web Planet seemed to gather particular interest, but despite a flurry of merchandise, the success of the Daleks was neither matched nor even approached. Following this early period of 'Dalekmania', the sales in merchandise notably began to wane, and once the Daleks' popularity lessened, so too did the profits. Nation retained his ownership of the Dalek concept, which he attempted to launch in a series in America, and the creatures were eventually phased out of Doctor Who, not returning for five years. However, the BBC continued to try and sell licences for other monsters which had an increasingly prominent role within the show (Howe & Blumberg, 2003, pp.20-21). Chapman suggests that "this greater emphasis on monsters was part of the new production policy initiated by Innes Lloyd, largely with a view to finding enemies for the Doctor to match the popularity of the Daleks" (2006, p.53).

A potential successor to the Daleks was perceived in the characters of the 'Quarks' who appeared in a 1968 story The Dominators. The writers of this story claim that they deliberately designed the robots with marketing in mind, with interchangeable weapons as a potential idea that could be utilised in action figures. This would seem to be in line with Innes Lloyd's desire to find new, popular enemies, but events surrounding the creation of the 'Quarks' would lead to some potentially surprising clashes, especially considering the BBC's earlier reluctance, and inexperience, in the exploitation of the show. Disagreements over ownership of the creatures sparked difficulties between the BBC and the writers (Haisman and Lincoln), who would go on to remove their names from the show, 'The Dominators' storyline broadcasting with the pseudonym Norman Ashby attached as writer. The problems stemmed from an argument over who created the characters of the 'Quarks', and went on to further incorporate the 'Yeti' robots the writers had created in previous stories. On the 12th July 1968, the BBC wrote to Haisman and Lincoln stating they

---

[38]   Early Doctor Who tended to alternate between historical stories, set in the past and featuring no science fiction elements, and futuristic space stories. This itself stemmed from the BBC's public service remit and is discussed elsewhere in this thesis.

had joint ownership of the 'Quarks' and requesting that they be assigned all international merchandising and broadcasting rights for them[39]. The BBC considered their offer of joint 25% ownership share for the two writers as very reasonable and claimed that they had provided only the name 'Quarks' and child-like voices. The letter from the BBC to Haisman and Lincoln indicates that if this was not accepted then both Quarks and Yeti would have to be unused, in both the show and merchandising opportunities[40]. The BBC continued to reject counter-offers from the writers, refusing to shift from its position although by this stage the Quarks had featured in issues of TV comics and the writers received a payment for this "made without prejudice to the present negotiations taking place between yourselves and BBC Copyright Department"[41]. Following these disputes, Haisman and Lincoln would not write for <u>Doctor Who</u> again. This again serves to illustrate the departmentalised structure of the BBC, but more notably it suggests a stronger shift in position, from the reluctant PSB moving into a commercial market to a more dominant stance, searching for potential opportunities and seeking control over licensing rights. What has been made clear through these discussions is the changing face of the BBC in its relationship with the commercial sector, and the evidence presented suggests that the success of <u>Doctor Who</u> and, in particular, the Daleks played no small part in this. As a series, <u>Doctor Who</u> is not only implicated in the earliest days of the BBC's exploitation of its products, but it continues to be a key representation of the developing commercial nature of the corporation. The question of what this commercial expansion entailed, and how the BBC engaged in it in relation to its charter, public service ethos and political pressures will be the next subject of discussion.

Public Service Broadcasting, Commercialisation & the Rise of BBC Enterprises.

There are many complicated and intertwined interests in a series such as <u>Doctor Who</u>, including the BBC, its current commercial arm BBC Worldwide, the writers, the directors, owners of separate copyrights such as the Daleks, and, of course, the various incarnations of fandom. <u>Doctor Who </u>itself has origins very much in-line with the BBC's public service remit. The show's creator, Sydney Newman

> wanted the adventures of *Doctor Who* to be consistent with both historical and science fact... he ensured that the crew of the Doctor's time/space machine included a science and a history teacher and hence aligned the programme with the BBC's historical public service mission to educate. (Cull, 2006, p.54)

---

[39]   BBC Written Archives Centre T48/296/1 12 July 1968.
[40]   BBC Written Archives Centre T48/296/1 15 July 1968.
[41]   BBC Written Archives Centre T48/296/1 31 July 1968.

By the late sixties, under a later production team, these historical stories were being phased out, disliked by both the production team and audiences, and Doctor Who began to shed much of its earlier educational purpose (Chapman, 2006, p.54). Arguably this process started even earlier, instigated by the massive success of the Daleks, which brought an educational time travel show into the realms of monsters and alien threats, and it was only a matter of time before the series embraced its more escapist adventure elements.

Thus Doctor Who, in terms of its format, was fundamentally changed forever from its public service educational remit by its own audience engaging with the more escapist aspects of the text, and bolstered by the consumer demand for Dalek-related merchandise. What was created, therefore, was a reciprocal relationship between production and consumption, where the shape of the programme, and arguably the BBC, was both influential to and influenced by its audience. This ties into John Thornton Caldwell's discussions cited in the previous chapter, whereby audience research and the producers' desire to give viewers "what they want to see" directly influences the creative direction of a programme (2008, p.222-223). In this instance, the public reaction to the Daleks, and the commercial exploitation of them that followed, would directly influence the direction of the series, leading it away from its original educational remit. Thus, the continuing change of the programme towards seeking further exploitable monsters is further born from the corporation's decision to explore and exploit the commercial possibilities. In the sixties, the *Daily Mail* had contacted the BBC about running an article on how readers could make their own Daleks but were told that was not possible due to Enterprise's exploring commercial possibilities, leading to the *Daily Mail* expressing a desire to do an article on the exploitation of the property. The BBC internal letter seemed concerned that the *Daily Mail* would want to know where the money from such exploitation would go, and interestingly the final article produced by the paper seems to play up the perceived unusual nature of the situation. The article asks, is it "unusual for the BBC to market goods? No. There is a department called 'BBC Enterprises' selling programme recordings"[42]. Whilst clearly not directly critical, the article seems to express the surprise that readers should feel about the BBC's selling products, and it would be the issue of sustainability, and alternatives to the licence fee, that would consistently circle the BBC through the next few decades. Indeed, many of the debates surrounding the BBC often return to discussion of the licence fee paid for

---

[42]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/22/1 unknown date

the privilege of viewing a television in the UK, with the threat of privatisation ever present.

Whilst the profits of BBC Worldwide supplement the licence fee, the very existence of a commercial company related to a public service broadcaster arguably leaves it open to further attack, and questions as to its relevance. However, it is through the history of merchandising and rights negotiations discussed in this chapter that BBC Worldwide would evolve. Indeed, at one stage Walter Tuckwell would take a 50% cut of the money generated from sales[43], thus it is clear that the BBC exploiting its own brands is inherently better value for the licence fee-payers. The commercial potential and power of the BBC has come to be seen as a rival, and potential threat, to notions of the free market on one hand, and a potential source of alternative funding for the corporation on the other. Born states that, during the nineties, "the BBC grew its commercial activities in order to augment its income" and, she asks, "given this commercial expansion, as well as greater internal and external competition, how did the public service and commercial sides of the BBC coexist?" (2004, p.156). As has been demonstrated, public service values contrast and conflict with commercial values, and the printed media has always sought to draw attention to this problematic aspect of the BBC. Notably newspapers owned by Rupert Murdoch have been specifically critical of the BBC, and it has been suggested that this was in order to "destabilise a major state-funded potential competitor" (Tom O'Malley quoted in Goodwin, 1998, p.74). Such arguments calling for a reduction in the fee, or for the BBC to be completely restructured and to stop producing certain types of entertainment that others could produce, could often be somewhat undercut by the fact that the owners of the papers printing these articles were the ones who stood to benefit (Goodwin, 1998, p.75). However, it should also be noted that it is important to try and avoid demonising figures like Murdoch, although the influence they have is clearly important in discussing the pressures surrounding the BBC. Certainly, there is no doubt that the media empires of commercial rivals have been and still are utilised in attacking the BBC and placing pressure on them, under the guise of fair market practices and moral outrage[44]. The development of BBC Worldwide from these early commercial exploitations, the

---

[43]   BBC Written Archives Centre R120/19/5 11 January 1965

[44]   Examples include articles from The Sun and Daily Mail, accessed February 2011:
http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1080621/Russell-Brand-Jonathan-Ross-face-prosecution-obscene-air-phone-calls-Fawlty-Towers-actor-78.html /
http://casino.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/1910755/BBC-bungles-Sachs-apology.html /
http://casino.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/1910755/BBC-bungles-Sachs-apology.html /
http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/showbiz/tv/3108458/BBC-fee-spent-on-Stig-fight.html

negotiation of public service ideals and consumerism, and the political policies influencing it, will be explored further in the next chapter. The danger the BBC faced, therefore, was risking losing its ability to justify the licence fee due to productive commercial success which its critics could use as evidence to support a case for fully commercialising the corporation.

Conclusion.

The sixties was a turning point for the BBC; the success of the Daleks was the corporation's first major engagement with commercial culture, and the difficulties it had with adjusting are apparent. This case study has served to contextualise the contemporary standing and attitudes of the BBC through an historical analysis of the organisation's approach to merchandising, conflicted attitudes towards the market and increasing awareness of its audiences and fan-bases. This chapter began by demonstrating that the BBC was ill-equipped to handle any major merchandising projects in its earliest days, although it was always aware of the potential of its properties to generate further funds through more than just overseas sales. Following on from Chapter Five, it is also clear how the public service nature of the BBC played a key part in the series of events that lead to Terry Nation sharing copyright of his creations, the Daleks, with the BBC. This shared copyright was integral in forcing the BBC to adopt a far more rigorous commercial approach, as Nation set out to market his creations, which were hugely popular. Indeed, the BBC would find itself in a number of difficult situations due to either its licensing policies, or the failure from commercial companies to understand its limitations, enforced by its public service remit. I examined developments in the sixties, as Doctor Who's producers were searching for the next commercial monster, and suggest how the commercialisation of the BBC would, in later years, cause more embittered clashes with private sector media.

In this chapter I hope to have illustrated the role Doctor Who played in the BBC's rapid expansion into the commercial exploitation of its properties, and just how quickly it adapted to become protective of its intellectual properties. The growing commercial impetus within areas of the BBC would impact on not only Doctor Who's production and narratives, but also on its emergent fandom. Merchandise, tie-in novels and magazines would become a source of knowledge and focus for the shows growing fandom, and the corporations responses to the series fans may be seen as developing, at least in-part, from the historical contexts discussed in this chapter. The next chapter will take a leap forward, to examine how the

contemporary series has been branded, and thus offer a sharp contrast to the early days of the BBC and Doctor Who's marketing. As we have seen, the BBC has to constantly negotiate its public service nature with the wider pressures of a capitalist society, and this case study has served to emphasise that these struggles have a long history, and that Doctor Who remains entwined with the corporation's commercial history. Having started to fully embrace the commercial exploitation of its properties in the sixties, the BBC's ongoing commercial enterprises in the next few decades would often be implemented in response to, and influenced by, the growing fan-base.

-Chapter Seven-

Fans in the Machine:

Developments in Fandom and the BBC

through the Eighties and Nineties.

Doctor Who returned to television after over a decade without regular production, a time in which merchandise dominated fandom as the main source for new material, and in which the BBC went through some of its most traumatic developments and changes since its inception. This section will briefly address the progress of Doctor Who fandom and its growing relationship with the BBC up until the nineties and then explore how the future fan-producers emerged more predominantly in that decade. It will explore how the BBC was altered by this turbulent period, and how it attempted to justify its public service status, and how this too would come to influence the way in which Doctor Who would return to British screens. This will include a broader look at the development of BBC Enterprises and, later, BBC Worldwide. This chapter will also explore fan hierarchies, and how organised fandom would become directly involved in the programme's production. What shall become clear is that the entire history discussed throughout this chapter and the ethos of the BBC has contributed to the emergence of the modern series' fan-producers. This will also illustrate the implications this has for any attempt to generalise or position the corporation as a singular, unified entity, and discuss the potential relevance of this in developing a new understanding of fan and producer interactions.

Fans and Producers in the Seventies.

Whilst this chapter will primarily focus on the development within fandom and the BBC during the eighties and nineties, it would be remiss to leap forward past the seventies without first addressing what is still an important developmental era in fan history. It is worth establishing that Doctor Who fandom has often defined the history of the show as comprising of separate eras, demarcated in a variety of ways, at times using a broad definition (the sixties era, the seventies era), at others focusing on casting (the 'second Doctor era' or the 'Tom Baker era'), and even further and varied divisions (Booth, 2014, p.195). Paul Booth has suggested that dividing the series in this way "may not be an incorrect assessment of the show" and that it is arguably a "loosely connected series of programmes [rather] than one coherent text" (2014, p.196). Booth highlights how this carving up of Doctor Who helps fans

articulate their preferred iteration, but that "no value judgement can be said to be authoritative" (2014, p.198). However, as I shall demonstrate, the seventies saw emergent fandom begin to establish what would be termed "received wisdom" within the communities, where fans with greater authority would attempt to reinforce certain ideas of which value judgements were 'correct'. In exploring this initial era, I will return to the work of Miles Booy, whose account of seventies fandom and merchandise covers much of the necessary background for my own analysis. Whilst Doctor Who merchandising continued after the 'Dalekmania' period, it was not until the mid- to late seventies that the next major era of successful exploitation would come about. This coincided with a strengthening emergent fan-base, in the UK broadly centred on the Doctor Who Appreciation Society (DWAS). Brian J. Robb has briefly outlined the evolution of Doctor Who fan clubs, which began on a far smaller scale as early as the 1960s with the William (Doctor Who) Hartnell Fan Club, which later became The Official Doctor Who Fan Club. Under Keith Miller in the seventies, the group became more closely tied with the production office, with Miller visiting Television Centre to see the series in production. As the club grew larger and more unmanageable, Miller quit in 1976, but paved the way for DWAS (Robb, 2009, pp.190-191). The predominant merchandising successes in the seventies were the Target-published novelisations of television stories, a means in the pre-home recording era to revisit and own older Doctor Who stories (Robb, 2009, p.202; Howe & Blumberg, 2003, p.21; Booy, 2012, p.20). Booy also identifies how the novelisations contributed lasting vocabulary to the series itself, which "were later used in the television series once their usage by fans and other viewers had become accepted" (2012, p.20). Despite this and the "retrospective fondness" given to these books, he also argues that they "diverged from the fan view of the series which was emerging at the time", being notably less bloodthirsty and more suitable for younger readers (Booy, 2012, pp.20-21). However, despite this potential issue, the books allowed for a more continual engagement with the text, for a growing fandom, than the broadcast once and usually unrepeated television series. Combined with the launch of an official Doctor Who Magazine (DWM) in 1978, they provided the focus for an increasingly dedicated fan following. Booy argues that DWM, then under the title Doctor Who Weekly (DWW), was "a carefully constructed product" that was "plugged into [a] pre-existing network of SF/fantasy publications" (2012, p.27). Whilst its majority audience was young children, DWW also catered for older fans with coverage of the series' early days, drawing on a format from other publications that mixed original comic stories with informative articles (Booy, 2012, pp.27-28). These comics also appealed to the UK's "emergent constituency of comic

fans" and were designed and formatted with American reprints in mind (Booy, 2012, p.28). However, despite this, Booy highlights that it was not an overall success and that after its initial launch, sales fell off, eventually leading DWM to be rebooted as a monthly magazine with a greater focus on the fan audience (2012, pp.32-33). This period saw the increasing shift towards fan-focused merchandise, and an expansion of available material connected to the programme's history. Booy argues that until 1979:

> the merchandise and the fan base remained largely distinct from one another. The production office approved merchandise, but its touch was light, and the resulting products roamed well away from the style of the television programme... there was no notion of fans as a target audience for merchandise, and thus no opportunity for articulate fans to market their specialist knowledge. (2012, p.25)

However, as Matt Hills emphasises, this era was one that would have far-reaching repercussions for the series' future, through what he terms 'public service consumption'. Without this early commercial exploitation, "without a generation of fans reading Target novels and *Doctor Who Weekly*, *Who* would have been far less likely to hold the passions of fans who would then be inspired to become media professionals, academics, journalists and creatives" (2015b, p.63). Lincoln Geraghty emphasises the importance of fan consumption and suggests that not only is it devalued "as a fan practice because of its basis on consumption rather than production" but also due to "the negative critical attention nostalgia as an emotion has attracted" (2014, p.2). Both Geraghty and Booy thus evidence the importance, not only of contemporary fan consumption, but also of establishing long-term emotional connections to the object of fandom. Geraghty argues that "fans are always reassessing and re-evaluating media texts from the past; they bring them into the present and reconstitute them as part of contemporary fan culture" (2014, p.2-3). I would note here that Geraghty could almost be describing the process through which Doctor Who itself was revived by its fan-producers. The thrust of Geraghty's argument is that "fan culture is commodified but personalised" and fan memories "embedded within collections" work as markers of identity that are "symbolic of the cultural capital that fans accumulate in their life-long engagement with a media text" (2014, p.4). Even though in the earliest periods of marketing the fans were not identified as a core audience, as stated by Booy above, the materials produced would still have a lasting impact. Through the processes highlighted above, this changed rapidly and the relationship between fandom and the representatives of official production, and the marketing, selling and branding of Doctor Who, would be permanently steered in a new direction.

Fans arguably took on a role as cultural intermediaries in this period, positioned between producers and mainstream audiences or other fans, between official production and fan production, and between official culture and the fan culture that served to elevate the status of the programme within its own spheres. The "circles of authorship" suggested by Mark J. P. Wolf incorporate a range of voices, "with each circle of delegated authority being further removed from the world's origination", stretching from the "originator" to "heirs, and torchbearers" and incorporating "the noncanonical additions of elaborationists and fan productions" (2012, p.269). Doctor Who would be an "open" world by Wolf's definition, as it is one in which "canonical material is still being added", and he further suggests that "the longer a world remains open, the more likely we are to find its authorship spread out over the concentric circles of authorship" (2012, p.270). As I have established elsewhere, the public service nature of the BBC has led to the "*Who*niverse", as Wolf terms it, having no singular originating authority, or definitive canon of what does and does not count. Thus Doctor Who is not only an "open" world, but also one that can never really be "closed". This likely contributes to the sense of ownership felt by the fans, who define and debate 'canon' amongst themselves, but have no singular author-figure who can provide a definitive answer. Fans of the series, then, became not only invested in the narrative worlds of the show, but also with engaging with the producers themselves in order to gain a greater sense of control, even if this was mostly illusionary. This closeness was encouraged by increasing interactions between the production team and leading figures within the Doctor Who fandom, although this was not without its difficulties and compromises. Graham Williams, the then producer of the show, was criticised by sections of early fandom for taking the show in a direction that was deemed "a comical low-point" for the series, focusing on humour and slapstick (Booy, 2012, pp.36-37). Booy suggests that there was a resistance amongst older fans to acknowledge the pre-teen audience for the show, and that they would attempt to justify their fandom through "seeking parity for the programme with other prestigious, adult dramas" (2012, p.35). Whilst fandom is seen as having stronger connections to the series under the following producer, John Nathan-Turner, that is not to say that certain gatekeeper fans did not act as representatives and engage with the production team. Graham Williams wrote a letter to the head of the Doctor Who Appreciation Society (DWAS), Jan Vincent-Rudzki, on 23rd August 1979, where he thanked him for arranging a fan convention and inviting him. There is a clear relationship between them, and Williams shares with him some behind-the-scenes details, such as the titles of stories in production, which would be valued amongst fans and suggests that he is attempting to reinforce

their positive relationship before he goes on to discuss a problem with fan relations. Williams directly sets out his position by stating "now to a point which I'd hoped, by ignoring, might go away. It hasn't and it's of vital importance to the future of relationships between the fans and the production". His concerns centre on fans watching recordings, a common feature of the day, but he suggests that enthusiastic fans are bothering actors and possibly even stealing items, and that this may have consequences.

> If the abuse continues I shall have to take whatever action seems necessary to ensure that the programme's prime responsibility to the public in general is not undermined by a few mavericks. At the risk of sounding pompous, privilege carries responsibility and those few fans who can take advantage of the co-operation we try to extend can very easily spoil it for everyone else.

Here Williams deliberately appeals to the corporation's public service remit, seemingly as a way of both legitimising his comments and avoiding any sense of personal malice or involvement. That is to say, he attempts to avoid damaging the relationship with fandom or upsetting his correspondent by emphasising that it is BBC policy that drives him to write, and he will take action to live up to his responsibilities. The use of "mavericks" is interesting, but is clearly designed to separate out the individuals causing the problems from the majority of fandom, as he emphasises in his next sentence by suggesting these few could spoil the privileged relationship for the majority of fandom. It is clear then, that he is particularly careful in his dealings with fandom and the letter illustrates a clear desire to nurture and continue a positive relationship with DWAS, but within certain limits and with certain restrictions. Therefore the terms of the relationship are predominantly being set by the producers, although phrased in such a way as to present the power relations as perhaps being more balanced than they might more realistically be. Williams makes a final warning for things to improve before returning to more positive notes, such as the series' growing international reach, and reaffirming that "BBC Enterprises have plans for more merchandising and publications – I can't say more in case I breach a contract, but rest assured that more "'*Who* Products', in whatever shape and size, are on their way!" Williams concludes by informing Vincent-Rudzki of his decision to depart as the show's producer and stating that he will contact him again soon[45]. The emphasis is clear here, a relationship based on fandom respecting its boundaries, and a producer willing to allow inside knowledge as long as the fans do not take their enthusiasm too far, a situation that is often repeated, as will be discussed in later chapters.

---

[45]   BBC Written Archives Centre T65/23/1 23 August 1979.

Williams also clearly uses him as a specific intermediary between himself, representing the production itself, and Vincent-Rudzki as a representative of fandom, in a sense supporting fandoms' own internal hierarchies by legitimising his position via their correspondence. Also notable is how Williams attempts to retain a positive relationship by surrounding his critical requests with positive statements in the interests of fandom, particularly the references to merchandise, emphasising fandom's desire at this point to be able to obtain products, whatever they be.

Fans and Producers in the Eighties and Beyond.

John Tulloch and Manuel Alvarado's 'Doctor Who: The Unfolding Text', whilst perhaps somewhat outdated in terms of how fandom has progressed, is still a useful source for considering Doctor Who fandom at the time of its publication in 1983 and earlier, and is a useful tool in examining fan opinion and relationships with the text and its producers within those decades. As the eighties began, John Nathan-Turner took over as the producer and his approach seemed to directly appeal to fans by taking Doctor Who seriously, and Tulloch and Alvarado suggest his "emphasis on dramatic realism and programme continuity was… seen as the norm by the fans who strongly disliked the 'spoof' of the Williams era" (1983, p.166)[46]. However, Williams's predecessor Philip Hinchcliffe had been removed from the show after introducing a strong horror element, which brought about negative attention from Mary Whitehouse. Thus BBC bosses had required the programme to take on the lighter tone that Williams himself became personally criticised for by some quarters of fandom. However, Williams's final season still gained far superior ratings to Nathan-Turner's debut, with as many as eight million viewers more, perhaps suggesting that the general audience's preferences were not the same as fandom's, something also noted by Booy (Booy, 2012, p.38; Outpost Gallifrey, 2008c). At this stage, the programme was broadcast against imported new and expensive American genre programming such as The A-Team and Buck Rogers in the 51st Century, which may also account for the loss of mainstream viewers, and with fandom becoming more visible within this era, it is arguable that all these factors contributed to a closer relationship between fans and the production team of Doctor Who. Taking over as producer for the eighties, John Nathan-Turner would remain with the programme until its cancellation in 1989 and from the outset of his time he instigated changes across all aspects of the series. Nathan-Turner, or JNT as he became known as by fans, courted publicity and "laid out his aesthetic ideas publicly in a way no producer had ever done before" (Booy, 2012, p.56). He brought fan

---

[46]   Graham Williams, who produced Doctor Who before Nathan-Turner.

concerns for continuity into the production of the series itself and "continuity references edge[d] closer to the spine of the narrative" (Booy, 2012, p.72). Wolf states that "material created by fans rarely becomes official canon" and that "relatively few fans have the means and opportunity to devote their careers to working on their favourite worlds" (2012, p.280). Yet with JNT and Doctor Who, there was an open courtship of fandom, and whilst many clear divides still existed, it is notable that 'canon' advice was being sought from fans by the producers, rather than the other way around. Booy also emphasises that this worked to increase fandom's own visibility and that, whilst at the start of the eighties "most UK viewers were unaware of the existence of *Doctor Who* fans... a little over two years later, they were common currency in the UK media" (2012, p.73). The attitudes and opinions of the fans were becoming increasingly important and addressed by the show itself, and fans even began setting up small companies dedicated to merchandise. Howe and Blumberg suggest that the BBC was wary of these as "there were numerous demands for licenses for small, one-off projects which the BBC were generally reluctant to grant, feeling that the time and effort to issue a licence would not be justified by any financial return" (2003, p.21). Booy suggests that "the boom in conventions could work hand-in-hand with the escalating merchandise and the fan niche market if a bit-part player were enterprising enough" (2012, p.103). Licensed productions began to appear, and fandom's increased size and visibility led to "not just more fanzines than ever before, but a similar increase in conventions" (Booy, 2012, pp.102-103). Thus this era gives rise to an important issue in fandom, an emerging and increasingly important form of fan productivity, notably in the creation of fanzines and fan fictions which were produced within the limits of licensing laws to avoid any copyright or legal issues.

The commercial aspect of fandom is an important one; fans are notorious spenders and collectors and, even in the nineties, Doctor Who had the potential to generate large amounts of capital from merchandising, such as the Virgin books which by 1995 were being published at the rate of two new novels every month, alongside various factual and spin-off publications. This next period of rapid growth in merchandise came at a time when the television show had ended, a victim of dropping ratings, increasing pressures on the BBC and a desire by the corporation to have production move to an independent company, or even a Hollywood film studio. As we have seen, the BBC was adapting and changes in policy meant in-house production was becoming less common, and with limited funds, the corporation seemed unable or unwilling to continue producing Doctor Who. It is also

notable that it was in 1989 that Philip Segal, producer of the eventual TV movie starring Paul McGann, contacted the BBC to try and "go after the rights" for the series (Segal & Russell, 2000, p.9). This contact would continue for several years, during which Segal would end up working for Amblin Entertainment, the production company of Steven Spielberg, where he continued to contact the BBC. Segal discusses how he used this to his advantage; "Yes, I admit it, I used Steven's name and powerful influence to hook the BBC – and obviously it worked" (Segal & Russell, 2000, p.16). Thus it could be argued that despite the PSB status of the BBC, as discussed in Chapter Five, it did not produce Doctor Who in the nineties, at least in part, due to the lure of Hollywood and American money. Without regular production, and with many fans from the field of fan publication attempting to turn their hobbies into careers, this era saw the escalation of an increasing blurring of the lines between fandom and Doctor Who itself (Robb, 2009, p.202). Indeed, this was the origin of many of the fan-producers themselves, as many writers made the shift from fan-fiction to licensed novels and eventually the resurrected television show itself, a process discussed in further detail shortly. By the nineties, Doctor Who was being released on VHS, and would eventually make the leap to DVD. Merchandising was becoming an increasingly important part of the BBC's operations, partially born out of the turbulent restructuring it faced, and by the time of the show's eventual return to television in 2005, the corporation was ready to exploit the full marketing potential of its success. As the next chapter will explore, branding plays a vital component in the BBC's commercial enterprises, and the show would return to a very different corporation, with far stronger marketing and exploitation policies. However, the success of the BBC in generating profit through the exploitation of its properties was not without fresh controversies and the BBC faced some of its biggest challenges in the decade leading up to the programme's return. It was in this era that we find the strongest convergence of the histories of fandom's development and the changes and adaptations within the BBC.

Fandom and Doctor Who into the Nineties.

As Doctor Who fandom has become more organised, there has been an emergence of celebrity 'Super-Fans' within fandom, and this next section will examine these, alongside how fans began to interact directly with the show for the first time and the results of this. As has been mentioned, organised Doctor Who fandom first became prevalent in the mid-seventies with the establishment of the Doctor Who Appreciation Society (DWAS) which gained official recognition by the production team in 1976 and an acknowledgement in that year's The Making of *Doctor Who*,

written by series script-writers Terrance Dicks and Malcolm Hulke (1976, p.6). Henry Jenkins argues that "fans draw strength and courage from their ability to identify themselves as members of a group" and this places them in "a position of collective identity, to forge an alliance with a community of others in defence of tastes" (1992, p.23). Although Chapter One demonstrated that Jenkins' theories are problematic, Doctor Who fans were indeed drawn together, and so were also able to better articulate their own grievances with the series. At this stage, there was already evidence of a strong sense of ownership of Doctor Who by the fans, with DWAS publishing a review of the story 'The Deadly Assassin' in 1976 that criticised it for disregarding what fans considered the already-established canon, in regards to the Time Lords. Whereas the Time Lords had previously been portrayed as godlike and all-powerful, this story made them far more bureaucratic and politically motivated, and "lowered them to normal people". Sara Gwenllian-Jones has discussed the importance of creating a fictional world, stating that "the meticulous gathering and mapping of textual and metatextual data is a characteristic activity of fans" and that this information "is collected, cross-referenced, and often further elaborated on through reference to and investigations into related external texts and discourses" (2004, p.92). Mark J. P. Wolf states that "retconning is controversial enough when performed by the work's original author, so even greater objections usually arise when someone else makes changes" (2012, p.275). Understanding and cataloguing the textual world is important to fandom, so perceived diversions or alterations are thus often looked upon negatively, as a threat to the fans' constructed fictional world. The perceived deviation in the depiction of the Time Lords was enough for the story to warrant a negative response in the reviewers' opinion, although modern Doctor Who fandom holds the story in high regard due to these very same alterations. This is an example of the shifts in what could be termed 'received wisdom' within fandom, whereby the older and apparently more important fans, could dictate how the series should be, and what was good and bad Doctor Who. With no singular author-figure, Doctor Who has been written and constructed by a series of what Wolf would term "torchbearers" who work for the property's owners (in this case, the BBC) and actively shape and develop the imaginary world (2012, p.276). However, as I have already highlighted, it was the fans themselves who were more dedicated to creating a coherent fictional world, with the current producers initially having little overt regard for continuity. However, the beginnings of organised fandom saw the increasing emergence of fan opinion, often centred on the continuity and textual world of the series, and a growing interaction between the programme and the fans.

The letter between Williams and the head of DWAS has already served to highlight how these relationships developed and gave a clear example of the negotiation of power relations between producer and fan positions. This would perhaps reach its zenith with the advent of the eighties where John Nathan-Turner took over as producer for the eighteenth season of the series, as briefly addressed above. Nathan-Turner had a highly public profile and was enthusiastic in publicising the show; including talking with fans and engaging directly with fandom in ways previous producers had rarely done, although this, perversely, actually opened him up for much more criticism. His vision of the show included the continued use of returning villains and monsters and references to the show's past, intended to encourage the favour of fandom, although this also is now criticised by fans who believe it made the show more inaccessible to mainstream viewers who may be expected to remember details of decades-old continuity[47]. Whilst the series had "developed a huge continuity within which viewers could immerse themselves", it also struggled under this weight, and fans became ambiguous in their reactions to references to the past (Booy, 2012, pp.72-73). Nathan-Turner remained producer up until the programme's original end in 1989, throughout the eighties, during which time the relationships between fans and producers simultaneously became increasingly hostile and interwoven. One notable fanzine, DWB, became synonymous with criticism of the producer, Booy suggesting it "frequently read [more] like conspiracy literature than anything else", though the publication enjoyed a large following (2012, p.101). Celebrity fan Ian Levine had taken on the role of an unofficial advisor to Nathan-Turner in the early eighties (Tulloch and Alvarado, 1983, p.146), only to become one of his harshest critics in later years, such were the ever-changing relationships between fandom and the producers. However, the twenty-sixth, and at that point, final, season saw Doctor Who fan Marc Platt writing the serial Ghost Light. Platt had been "a contributor to fanzines, and a familiar face around fandom, who had been submitting stories since Phillip Hinchcliffe's day" in the mid-seventies (Booy, 2012, p.128). Segal and Russell suggest this serial was "created for the video age, destined to be watched again and again rather than viewed and forgotten, as was so much television made ten years earlier" (2000, p.6). Technological innovation may have played a part, but could Platt's own fandom have influenced him to create a narrative that was denser and more inclined to suit the detailed level of analysis he would have been aware that fandom would subject

---

[47]   Example of this criticism and debate around it can be found here: http://www.doctorwhoforum.com/showthread.php?t=201878, accessed 27th September 2008.

it to? The full extent of fan-producer influences on <u>Doctor Who</u> will be further explored in Chapter Nine, but for now it is primarily important to note the increased presence of fandom within the production and how this would potentially affect the programme.

Relationships between fans and producers were fragile at best; fandom was always ready to criticise when it felt the show was not being taken seriously and certain fans attempted to influence the series. The eighties were, without a doubt, the decade that <u>Doctor Who</u> fandom began to change, as older fans outgrew and criticised the programme and younger fans were encouraged to look up to these textual gatekeepers. This is only a summary of the complex developments that occurred, but it demonstrates how the relationships between fans and producers evolved and converged over time, and how more distinct divisions would begin to appear between different generations of fandom, further planting the seeds for the eventual emergence of the fan-producers of the new series. The eighties, therefore, saw the earliest convergence of fandom and production, with an increasing prominence towards the end of the decade, leading into the nineties where the programme itself would go off the air, but where fans were more suitably positioned to work towards continuing the concept in other media in increasingly official capacities, with many future fan-producers becoming important contributors to <u>Doctor Who</u>'s overall survival.

The BBC into the Nineties.
Whilst fandom evolved towards a more productive and arguably powerful position, the BBC of the nineties, as has been mentioned previous, was an increasingly turbulent place, and under the direction of John Birt, the corporation was almost completely restructured, and not often to the liking of those working within it. As much as anything else, the controversies of Birt's era both highlight and exacerbate the fractional elements within the BBC, and showcase how it is impossible to discuss the corporation without recognition of its internal conflicts. Birt's policies for the BBC involved massive downsizing in order to save costs and generate competition through producer choice. However, Georgina Born argues that as he was removing the technically skilled and creative individuals from permanent contracts, he was hiring lawyers and accountants, and market researchers, adding layers of bureaucracy to the corporation (2005, p.181). It became increasingly fragmented as different areas were forced to compete and staff were consistently looking for their next contract, removing any long-term training, dedication or

creative relationships (Born, 2005, p.186). It was in this era that the BBC looked to more commercial means to supplement its income, and moved towards international partnerships within the private sector, a process that would, amongst other things, lead to the 1996 Doctor Who TV Movie US co-production. It also set-up BBC World, a world service that carried adverts, and the danger seemed to be that it would become identified with commercial services and lose its public service 'brand' (Crisell, 2002, pp.251-252). Therefore, for all the reforms, the BBC seemed to be increasingly conflicted, and the diversity and internal good-will was being eroded, as marketing and audience research became dominant.

Born mentions the '100 Tribes' survey, that broke down audiences into sub-groups, as an example of how the BBC under Birt valued ultimately fruitless research over programme-makers. She suggests that "100 Tribes seemed to ignore a golden rule: that television audiences are not strongly segmented, since the most popular programmes in every genre attract the most viewers from all social groups" (2005, p.285). Before the return of Doctor Who, the notion of 'family viewing' was considered an archaic one, and there was serious concern as to whether a family audience would gather round to watch television together on a Saturday night (Robb, 2009, pp.217-218). The success of the programme perhaps suggests that research that divided audiences up was doing so artificially, and that it was less a case that such shows could not be made, but that simply they were not being made because of a perception of divided demographics brought about by too much emphasis on market research within the BBC. However, it should also be noted that in the years since the return of the series, viewing habits have evolved again, and with the advent of technologies such as I-Player, viewers are once again drifting away from viewing programmes upon their actual broadcast. At any rate, Born describes what she considers "one of the most fruitful potentials of research: *not* to conform to executives' preferred outcomes, but to act as a resistance and an irritant, with the effect of opening up debate and rendering strategy *contestable*" (2005, p.297, emphasis in original). However, under Birt, the leash of chasing demographics continued, and even afterwards the feeling was that certain classic Saturday-night line-ups were an outdated concept.

It is clear from this that the BBC throughout this period was a turbulent place, and it seems that it was not until the BBC was reorganised under its next director-general that there was any real chance of a resurrection for a programme like Doctor Who. Birt's successor at the BBC was Greg Dyke, whom Born considers to have

reorganised the BBC in the aftermath of his predecessor to increasingly prolific success with a "dual strategy taking in both organisational and programming change in the service of creativity" (2005, p.468). Dyke is credited with boosting the corporation's competitiveness, and increasing its popularity with viewers, as well as a continued focus on digital services, seeking to "re-affirm the case for a universal licence fee" (Crisell, 2001, p.265) This was not necessarily a success however, as the BBC's popularity and expanding services once again drew criticism and cries of unfair practice from its opponents. Born emphasises the irrefutable conflict at the heart of the BBC, the fact that "success was OK, but not too much" (2005, p.473). Tracey considers the future bleak for public service broadcasting as it finds itself "between two worlds, two different sets of expectations... in the end it is not possible to have a viable social institution which is out of step with the prevailing sociological realities" (2002, p.279). Despite pessimistic warnings, the BBC has continued to negotiate the different pressures placed upon it; Dyke's policies emphasised in-house production and organised a commissioning structure that left central decisions to "those expert in each genre, as well as more equal access for regional production". Of course, this could arguably have been made more difficult due to the loss of much of the talent due to the closing of many of the BBCs in-house units, meaning many of those initially trained within the BBC were now working independently of it. Many of the last in-house units to close did so whilst struggling to keep up with developments in modern technology, and whilst overwhelmed by independent competition, such as the Visual Effects Department which survived long enough to work on the first two series of the revived Doctor Who (Irvine & Tucker, 2011, p.235). Whilst on the production side the BBC undoubtedly suffered, the corporation's marketing and commercial ventures in this era would prove to be far more successful, albeit serving to create more problems for the public service broadcaster.

BBC Enterprises and BBC Worldwide.
In the sixties, the BBC was far more aligned with its original public service remit and, as previous chapters have explored, it took tentative but uncertain steps towards further exploiting its properties. The BBC grew more confident, asserting its own copyrights and moving to directly exploit its properties without the aid of external companies such as Walter Tuckwell & Associated Ltd. However, it was not until 1979 that BBC Enterprises was formed as a wholly owned subsidiary, a merging of previously separate departments, and the forerunner to BBC Worldwide as it exists today (Cain, 1992, p.118). It would be as late as 1986 that all commercial interests

in the BBC were merged into the one company, and the following years would suggest that the BBC had still not entirely grasped the complexities of commercial systems, or formulated the best method in which to reconcile commercial interests with its public service remit. Georgina Born suggests that before the eighties, the BBC "earned a small commercial income from its print operations... and from overseas programme markets" (2004, pp.58-59). Whilst Chapter Six has shown that there were more sources of income than Born implies, she actually highlights the general lack of a cohesive commercial strategy within the BBC.

BBC Enterprises was an attempt to change this, to have a central company responsible for much of the corporation's commercial exploitation. However, despite the ambitions of the BBC, the key problem faced was that Enterprises was "not particularly effective or profitable as a business" (Born, 2004, p.59). Doctor Who in the eighties had a dedicated fan base that craved merchandise of all kinds, and yet this was exploited far less than the contemporary system of global commercial branding. Booy highlights how the BBC, "whilst happy to take the accumulated money, didn't fully explore the merchandising possibilities which the programme offered" whilst, despite the lack of support, JNT "attempted to integrate it into the values of the programme itself" (2012, p.88). Enterprises also faced external and internal criticisms of its actions, diversifying into areas not related to programme-making. Born states that this internal review "emphasised the importance of the BBC's commercial extensions being linked to its core broadcasting and media activities, and the need to protect the corporation's 'brand image'" (2004, p.59). The concerns for 'brand image' and the extent of the BBC's attempts to engage with the commercial world reflected wider political shifts as the neo-liberal ideology of the free market dominated through the eighties and into the nineties. The Peacock Report, briefly discussed in Chapter Five, had been a direct attack on the corporation as a public service broadcaster and following it, the BBC began "busily ingratiating itself with the government" (Crisell, 1997, p.236). Primarily this involved making "the corporation leaner and more efficient and seek[ing] commercial ways of supplementing the licence fee" (Crisell, 1997, p.236). Despite attempts to expand the BBC's commercial endeavours, the conduct of BBC Enterprises was disappointing, and with political pressure mounting throughout the eighties, and the licence fee due for renewal in the early nineties, the BBC came under increasing pressure to find a method of commercialisation that would work for the corporation, without betraying its ideological public service remit.

Following the perceived failure of BBC Enterprises, and with the BBC undergoing extensive internal changes under John Birt, in line with free market ideology, a new approach to commercial exploitation was required. Born states that "in 1994 BBC Enterprises was relaunched as BBC Worldwide under a new chief executive, Bob Phillis" who "announced a goal of raising 15 to 20 percent of license fee revenue" from commercial activities (2004, p.59). Whilst this would seem somewhat exaggerated considering BBC Enterprises' problems, by 1998, the corporation "proved itself no longer commerce-averse" (Born, 2004, p.475). Born explains that "revenues grew so that a £53 million cash flow back to programme-making in 1997 reached £123 million by 2003" (2004, p.475). This period of expansion occurred alongside a wider commercialisation and adaptation of neo-liberal policies within the BBC, much of which I discussed in Chapter Five. Born argues that "commercialisation was not simply an economic imperative... it took hold in the collective consciousness of those working for the BBC" and by the mid-nineties these developments would "install a culture of entrepreneurialism throughout the BBC, one that was manifest in the smallest of everyday interactions as much as at the highest levels of corporate policy" (2004, p.60). BBC Worldwide was a product of the new commercial imperative within the BBC; its mandate would be to "exploit the BBC's expertise, rights and brand name in all areas other than the UK radio and television markets" (Richard Collins & Cristina Murroni, 1996, p.148). However, as Peter Goodwin suggests needs remembering, the creation of BBC Worldwide, whilst a reaction to government policy, was not mandated by it and was an internal BBC initiative (1998, p.168). Whilst BBC Worldwide would find greater success than its predecessor, this would have its own risks. Crisell argues that the "more closely identified with the private sector the corporation becomes... the greater the risk it will lose its distinctive 'brand'" and the necessity of the licence fee would naively be called into question (1997, p.252). Branding, the image of the BBC and the authority that stems from their ownership of <u>Doctor Who</u> would become key factors in the relationship with fandom. The new series needed a clear identity in line with modern media branding, and BBC Worldwide would be one of the various sections of the BBC that would need to engage with fan activity and perceptions of the series, as I shall now begin to illustrate.

Branding the BBC Image.
Since its creation, BBC Worldwide has been the legal commercial arm of the BBC, allowed to trade and profit, unlike the main public body of the corporation (Born, 2004, p.157). Merchandising would play a key role in not only the success

surrounding the return of the series, but also in supporting the rise of the fan-producers in the previous decade. Whilst the next chapter will explore branding in far more detail, it is necessary to look at this in the wider context of the changes within the BBC, and the BBC brand itself. Matt Hills has discussed how BBC Worldwide has set out to "protect the brand" of <u>Doctor Who</u>, including taking actions against a fan who produced a knitting design of a creature from the show, seeking to "restrict fan productivity or 'poaching'" (2010, p.69). Nicholas J. Cull has considered the BBC's international relationships and its attempts to sell products abroad, specially discussing <u>Doctor Who</u>. He suggests that the series' creation stems from the BBC seeking to rival genre imports such as <u>The Twilight Zone</u>, broadcast by commercial rival ITV, (2006, p.53) and that, over the show's history, it attempted to appeal to the American market (2006, p.62). Whilst being a public service broadcaster, the BBC and BBC Worldwide clearly emphasise the importance of international sales and merchandising of successful franchises, a far cry from the situation in the early sixties. However, it should also be noted that BBC Worldwide stated that they "take the view that if it's small-scale and not for profit, then we turn a blind eye" and the BBC itself reported on this news event that potentially casts its own commercial arm in a negative light (2010, p.68). What is important to take from the points raised thus far is an awareness of the struggles in and around the BBC, struggles that serve to highlight the futility of attempting to position a corporation as an homogeneous, all-powerful organisation. As one of the BBC's top rated shows, and potentially biggest profit earners, <u>Doctor Who</u> is directly implicated in these issues.

The show's return coincided with a BBC pledge to move more production out of London and into its various regional departments, and the resurrected <u>Doctor Who</u> was announced as being produced by BBC Wales from Cardiff. Matt Hills addresses this directly, suggesting that "the show was passed over to them seemingly via centralised contingencies of BBC deal-brokering" (2010, p.44). Hills emphasises that <u>Doctor Who</u> originated from the BBC in London and discusses the impact of its Welsh production base on the content of the programme, and vice versa. He concludes that <u>Doctor Who</u> treats London as its "narrative centre" and fails to represent Wales after its first series, a 'burden' left to the spin-off series <u>Torchwood</u>, which itself adopts a tourist-based representation of Cardiff (2010, p.46-48). It is interesting to note that in 2007, the BBC was accused of not focusing enough on representing Wales in its news broadcasts, and as mentioned previously, the licence

fee was brought into the debate[48]. Hills's discussion serves to illustrate how important a greater in-depth examination of the series' institutional home has been in understanding the complex political, economic and cultural impact that the BBC as an organisation has on the production of the series itself. The BBC's desire is to not only expand its range of programming, but to appear to more fully represent the United Kingdom by producing more programmes outside London. By creating a unifying image of the entire country, the BBC could arguably propose a greater relevance for its public service status. As well as adapting itself to satisfy concerns of being too London-centric, the BBC also sought to take advantage of the digital age by leading the way into new digital technologies, which included an engagement with the fans that made use of them.

Henry Jenkins identifies the BBC as recognising the shifts in the way that audiences consume media and he claims that the BBC were "encouraging grassroots experimentation with ways to annotate and index these materials" and quotes a BBC director as stating that "the traditional 'monologue broadcaster' to 'grateful viewer' relationship will break down", although it could be said that this had already begun in certain areas (2006, p.253). Jenkins argues that the BBC were "opening up television content to the more participatory impulses shaping digital culture" and that this was emblematic of what he terms "convergence culture". This 'convergence' is the changing shape of the media industries which Jenkins argues is driven by multiple motivations from both producers and consumers that are largely based on economic power rather than empowering the public. Note here that Jenkins seems to reiterate the idea of this as a conflict, questioning whether the public will 'push' for their power or simply 'settle' for already existing relationships (2006, p.254). This seems to return, then, to the same basic binary ways of thinking that academia needs to be moving away from. However, what has become clear is that fandom has become a recognised source of revenue, which the BBC set out to fully exploit whilst securing its public service nature through diversifying the production bases for its programmes. Doctor Who's return at BBC Wales was implicated in wider BBC policy, and its recognition of both fans and wider media outlets were signs of an increasingly modern BBC that set itself the task of leading British media into a digital age. With a stronger emphasis on in-house production, and a desire to produce a broader range of programmes making use of regional sectors of the BBC, it seems the corporation had become the ideal environment in which the return of Doctor Who had become a real possibility (Born, 2005, pp.469-

---

[48]   http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/wales/6955263.stm, accessed 18th March 2010.

470). However, just as the BBC had developed and adapted to reach this stage, much the same could be said for Doctor Who's fandom itself which, having seen the rise of the Super-Fans, would more prominently see many fans begin to shift into the field of official production. I will now discuss this development, leading up to the programme's revival.

Fandom and Doctor Who Fiction in the Nineties.

With the cancellation of the show at the end of the eighties, it was many of the younger fans themselves that would continue the legacy with Virgin Publishing's 'Doctor Who: The New Adventures' series of novels. What I will now address is the impact that the advent of the novels had upon Doctor Who fandom and how it relates to theories surrounding fan relationships with the text. The early 'New Adventure' novels were written by a combination of professional novelists, writers from the television series and members of fandom, notably Paul Cornell. Cornell's novel Timewyrm: Revelation was his first professionally published work and it marked the beginning of a successful career, with his books consistently being fans' favourites, and his development from fan to producer is discussed in detail in Chapter Nine. Tulloch and Jenkins state that "the primary text retained an authority" that could not be successfully replicated by secondary and fan-produced texts, but in Doctor Who there is no clear divide between which texts are constituted as primary and those which don't (McKee, 2004, p.176). With many fans actively writing novels that were, at that point, the only officially licensed continuation of the series, it seems inevitable that fan concerns with continuity, references and creating a coherent world would become a central aspect in these debates. As previously noted, Wolf has argued that there are different levels of canonicity and that, in general media texts, "the author is considered the true source of world material, the creative vision that makes it a unified experience" (2012, p.271). Whilst Wolf discusses a variety of forms of authorship that give rise to canonicity, his analysis lacks any detailed look at what happens when no such unifying figure is present, as we have seen is the case for Doctor Who. Using Wolf's definitions, Doctor Who media tends to best be described as permanently existing under the authority of "caretakers", "heirs and torchbearers" who are "given creative control of a world" (2012, p.273-275). Whilst Wolf illustrates how "some worlds have very well-defined levels of canonicity" (2012, p.271), McKee argues that an analysis of Doctor Who suggests "that canonicity-aura, reality- is not distributed in a binary manner according to the modes of production" as Tulloch and Jenkins imply (2004, p.176). The 'New Adventures' displayed a back cover blurb that suggested they consisted of "stories too broad and

deep for the small screen" and were somewhat controversial for featuring sex, violence and swearing, definitely at odds with the programme's origin as a family television series. However, this new direction clearly appeals to the expectations and desires of fans who had grown up with the series, now mature adults, and presents Doctor Who as 'serious' science fiction. Brian J. Robb suggests, then, that this adult content reflected the core audience for Doctor Who in the nineties: "men in their 20s and 30s who'd grown up with the programme" but had outgrown the earlier Target books from their childhoods (2009, p.202). Fans often perceive the text as 'quality television', arguing that "their programs *should* be continued because of a 'quality' that admittedly only a minority seemed to prefer", and that these novels written by, and predominantly for, fandom are targeted towards a fan concept of what 'quality' should be (Brower, 1992, p.168). I have already shown how fandom often rejected anything they saw as a 'spoof' within the show, and prioritised 'dramatic realism' which, for the mature fan audience in the nineties, would include adult themes and ideas. Much of the fan creativity that academics have written about can be seen as played out in authorised material, with Jenkins's fan meta-text now providing the foundation for many stories[49]. Jenkins points out that "the fan, while recognising the story's constructedness, treats it as if its narrative world were a real place that can be inhabited and explored and as if the characters maintained a life beyond what was represented on the screen" and the novels provided an outlet for this approach to the texts, particularly the 'Missing Adventures' series that actually told stories with past characters, set between episodes of the series, and greatly elaborating on the personal lives of the main cast (1992, p.115). This elaboration can be found elsewhere, and was prolific across all forms of Doctor Who during this period, as fans pushed at the boundaries of the series. Booy discusses how one comic storyline "mixes the harsher, more aggressive tone of the late 1980s with the gentler adventures of the 1960s" and that the story frames the character Victoria's thoughts "within a nineteenth-century mindset in ways that the programme itself had rarely bothered with" (2012, p.151). Fan knowledge allowed for both a hybridisation of styles from across the television programme's history, but also an awareness of the characterisation of its leads, and how this could be explored

---

[49]   To further illustrate this, I'd like to cite some story elements that occurred across the 'New Adventures' series. A teenage television companion, Ace was written out of one novel, only to return later, "older and harder", now a swearing, aggressive warrior. A new companion, Bernice, was created as an academic, alcoholic feminist. One companion was revealed, across several books, to have been raped, contracted a sexually-transmitted disease but was then fatally shot and killed by a solider hypnotised by villain The Master. UNIT, a military organisation in the series, was seen on screen to have several different ranking officers, and writer Gary Russell in fact produced a document to explain the continuity in proposing a novel, a discussion of which can be found on the BBC website (Russell, 2008).

further than the original series had allowed. However, whilst fans were allowed greater influence and control over the narrative worlds of Doctor Who, the series lost much of its mainstream appeal, becoming synonymous with notions such as 'cult', 'sci-fi' and 'anoraks', terms often tinged with negative connotations by wider culture. Booy argues that, in this period, fans "enjoy[ed] products aimed at no one but themselves, [and] had won the interpretation wars, but the cost was not only their beloved show's cultural centrality, but its actual existence" (2012, p.136). However, whilst this is indeed true in the short term, it is arguably this trajectory that would lead to the show's return and subsequent global success, led by the fan-producers who emerged in this period.

Following the novels, the next major development was the licence issued to Big Finish Productions to produce original audio dramas with the original cast of Doctor Who. As with the novels before, these drew on a range of fan authors, alongside familiar names from the final years of the television series, although by the time Big Finish began its range in 1999, many of these writers were well-known within fandom, and were carving out careers elsewhere in the media. Whilst generally true, Wolf's assertion that "fan productions almost never become canon themselves" is further complicated by Big Finish, whereby a fan-centred production company became the producer of, potentially, the most authentic iteration of Doctor Who then in production (2012, p.280). With the additional benefit of actors from the series returning to play their parts, including companions and familiar enemies, the audio plays had an extra degree of authenticity for fandom. Piers D. Britton has suggested that these early fan-producers used the audio plays to explore ideas that go beyond the television series, notably complicating villainy and "probing its psychological modalities and causes rather than merely setting it in play" (2011, p.70). Britton highlights that "fan-produced texts involve avoiding comfortable narrative patterns" and addresses how these "frequently complicated notions of villainy" have thus been integrated into the revived series (2011, p.82). Following the 1996 television movie that introduced Paul McGann as the Eighth Doctor, the character had taken the lead in a series of novels published by BBC Books. McGann himself eventually returned to the role for Big Finish in an annual series of audio plays structured in seasons and intended as a continuation of the series narrative, looking forward rather than backwards. Many of the plays starring McGann were eventually broadcast on BBC7, "giving them an extra seal of authenticity" (2009, p.212). Doctor Who, under the guidance of its fan-producers, proliferated throughout the nineties and into the new century. Britton points out that by 2009, following the show's return, "*Doctor Who*'s

adventures in print and audio media... outnumber[ed] the television episodes produced to date by very nearly two to one" (2011, p.16). In such circumstances, and with the majority of this material produced when the television series was no longer in production, it becomes difficult to make authoritative claims as to what is either 'canon' or, indeed, the primary text. The BBC makes few specific references to these issues, and with the books and audio plays, and more, directly influencing the television series and the future fan-producers, Doctor Who stands as a truly transmedia franchise. Britton's study attempts to "give equal weight to *all* textual forms in which *Doctor Who* has materialized, whatever the intended audience or readership", and whilst he acknowledges the importance of canonicity to many fans, his approach more closely echoes the official position, or lack of one, taken by the BBC itself.

The BBC, as a public service broadcaster, has certain restrictions on what it can do, and merchandise may support a television programme but it can never be made necessary to follow one. Also, the series has had many creators down the years, and as has been demonstrated previously, a complicated system of divided copyrights, all of which has contributed to the lack of any official word on what 'counts' as 'official' Doctor Who. This has arguably resulted in a sense of great freedom for the programme's fandom, who could perhaps feel that they had more control and authority over the narrative of the series, which of course some ultimately would. Another critical impact of this was that Doctor Who had slipped out of the mainstream and now belonged very much to that loosely defined category of 'cult', emphasised by the BBC themselves who placed the series in the 'Cult Television' section of BBC Online. Jancovich and Hunt both discuss how texts can shift from mainstream to cult,[50] and suggest how screening on "minor network channels" and appearing "hopelessly outdated" may make a series "become a rare taste" and develop a cult following it previously did not have (2004, pp.28-29). Doctor Who already had a large cult following when it was cancelled but, with repeats on digital channel UK Gold, and famously low budgets, without new productions, the series clearly lost its mainstream association. There can be no doubt that the novels were an important stepping stone between the original series' run and the revival, representing fandom gaining an authorised control over the text, albeit in literature form, and they saw the stories being marketed directly at the fan market. This was essentially "world-building for profit" by the BBC and its licensees; by allowing the fans creative control it encouraged consumer loyalty with the brand,

---

[50]   As well as from cult to mainstream.

arguably helping to keep Doctor Who a viable product across the sixteen years when there was no regular series (Gwenllian-Jones, 2003, p.166). It cannot be said for certain to what extent the BBC's PSB nature contributed to this situation, but it is a fair proposal to suggest that the lesser commercial drive and willingness to engage with its fandom were instrumental in eventually amalgamating the two positions in the figure of the fan-producer. With many of the novel writers going on to work on the revival, there was inevitably a lot of crossover from the books into the new television series, perhaps suggesting that fan participation, as producers, was also a key factor in sustaining the franchise and keeping it financially profitable. There is no doubt that Doctor Who survived through the nineties under the care of fans themselves, and that many fans such as Mark Gatiss and Steven Moffat rose to prominence within the television industry in this era, in part inspired by their childhood love for the show. As Booy notes, Steven Moffat's first Doctor Who reference, a sign reading *Trespassers Will be Exterminated* in his series Press Gang, occurs "five minutes into his career" (2012, p.143). Fandom, and specific fans such as Moffat, had shifted through the different authorial positions described by Wolf, becoming employees, or freelancers, and eventually "torchbearers assigned to continue a world" (2012, p.280). The emergence of the fan-producers through the media industry will be discussed further in Chapter Nine. The almost unique institutional status of the BBC had resulted in a programme creating a generation of fans who would in turn go on to become the very individuals who could revive and continue the show's production for a next generation audience, although in doing so, there would still be some turmoil between the new fan-producers and older fans.

The Return of the Doctor.

The return of Doctor Who was not unproblematic for fandom. In the years off the air, the fans had become the custodians of the series, and through the spin-off merchandise and increasing internet presence, had begun to define what Doctor Who was and could be. For some, the new series went against what they believed the show to be, some claiming it has been recreated "in the image of a soap opera" and criticisms were aimed at almost every aspect of the returning show, and continued once it was on air (Robb, 2009, p.234). A further criticism, linked to the 'soap opera' comment was that it was too centred on Earth, an interesting complaint considering that Doctor Who had a long history of this. Tulloch and Alvarado observe that "unlike a lot of popular science fiction, the diegetic world of its characters was not simply 'displaced' in some other time or place. It was located, insistently, in the present: London, 1963" (1983, p.16). They go on to describe how:

> the 'naturally' rational curiosity of a teacher of science and a teacher of history was to be the point of focus of audience identification, inscribing viewers within the foregrounded hermeneutic code (the code of puzzles and mysteries) of the new programme. (Tulloch & Alvarado, 1983, p.16)

'Rose' the first episode of the revival, echoes this opening set-up, using Rose (Billie Piper) as an identification figure in order to introduce the mystery of the Doctor (Christopher Eccleston), although in a more modern way. This modern approach also favoured a more character-driven approach and made use of notions of "televisuality, a more cinematic look, to further distinguish from the, at times, almost theatrical original run" (Chapman, 2006, p.192). Televisuality, as defined by John Thornton Caldwell, saw television "flaunt and display style" and "battle for identifiable style-markers and distinct looks" (1995, p.5). Modern <u>Doctor Who</u> defined itself through clear brand identities, discussed in Chapter Eight, and through contemporary aesthetics in the direction of the programme, as well as its narrative content. Rose was also an icon for young girls, "a representative of the 'Girl Power' generation of British women: determined, opinionated, and independent" and was instrumental in introducing the series to not just a new generation of fans, but a larger female audience than there had previously been (Chapman, 2006, p.191). This interest in the lives and emotions of the companions takes its precedent from the nineties novels, comics and audio plays, as has already been touched upon. Britton argues that characters in the later years of the books and audio "exhibited both *scepticism* and affection for the Doctor, and exhibited also a self-determination which goes well beyond ignoring his 'words of wisdom' or defying him" (2012, p.128, emphasis in original). The strength and questioning nature of the companion character is found in the revived television series and is certainly part of its appeal. Thus Robb's assessment of the new series' female fans has an unfortunate, and likely unintended, sexist connotation to it, suggesting that the growing female audience was "partly down to the casting of Tennant, but also due to the show's new emotional intelligence" (2009, p.233). He appears to fail to consider that the presence of a strong, central female character used as the eyes of the audience, appealing to a young female audience, and played on equal footing to the Doctor, might contribute to the changing face of fandom as much as sexual attraction and 'emotion'. Indeed, despite this statement, it should be remembered that the new series launched, not with Tennant but with Christopher Eccleston in the lead role, with the character introduced through the eyes of Rose Tyler, a clear role model for young female viewers.

The new series launched to almost unprecedented success, following a dedicated marketing campaign, and was followed by an influx of merchandise onto the market. The response of the media suggested that it was still a national institution, and it currently remains a critical and popular success. The show also illustrates the BBC's commitment to further digital media, producing spin-offs for digital channels, mobile phone and internet mini-episodes and making use of the BBC's red button service. It seems that Doctor Who, throughout its history, has stood as a hallmark of excellence at the BBC, not only in programme standards, but for the ways the public broadcasting nature of the organisation can exist hand in hand with the more commercial realities of the world. The success of the series, and its continued popularity and existence, only serves to more fully highlight that a public service broadcasting institution can remain true to its standards and commitments whilst successfully following marketing-led strategies. Equally, this more fully illustrates the lie that suggests that only through commercial and money-led ventures can fandom, profits and quality television, be produced. Certainly, the attempt by ITV to match the success with a show like Primeval, also marketed with action figures and DVDs, only highlights the benefits of public broadcasting in being able to take risks and lead the way into more challenging and popular televisual material. The return of Doctor Who seems to have sparked a new wave of genre television in the UK and a new generation of fandom, but it has also sparked controversy and change within existing fandom in its attempts to negotiate with 'their' show becoming a modern, mainstream success. This difficulty came about besides the fact that the majority of the writers for the new series were known fans and often prolific figures within fandom, and contributors to much of the merchandise and texts produced in the years before the return. Whilst many in the production team were fan-producers, the vast majority of fandom still existed as fan-consumers, and I have already explored the hierarchies and contradictions that fandom is rife with. Fans would have different tastes that may not always align with the fan-producers, and the BBC had its own agendas in the commercial exploitation and branding of the series, which will be discussed further in the following chapter.

What should hopefully have been highlighted here is the importance of context in analysing fan and producer interactions. Whilst it is true to say that there are limits to the amount of depth that can be explored, it is vital to understand that these conflicts are affected by influences from within the wider BBC, the wider media and from the fan-producers' own personal experience within fandom itself. Throughout this section I have aimed to provide an overview of the structure of the BBC and the

pressures it has to overcome, both internally and externally. I have highlighted how the struggle between fandom and the producers must be understood in light of both a divided and varied fan-base and equally non-unified corporation. The BBC has also expanded in the digital age, made use of new technologies, whilst fandom has equally adapted, with many fans moving directly into television production themselves. The BBC, as a public service broadcaster, and certain fans within the hierarchy of fandom, eventually converge in the resurrected series of Doctor Who. This has, I hope, raised some key issues that can be more fully explored in later chapters, and provided a framework for my explorations into the world of the fan-producers.

Conclusion.

This chapter has set out to explore the transitional period of time from the eighties, and predominantly, through the nineties, which saw major developments in both the BBC as a corporation and within Doctor Who fandom. I began by highlighting some early examples of fan and producer interactivity during the late seventies, where Doctor Who fandom was becoming more visible. I explored how this developed in the period of the show where John Nathan-Turner was the producer, and how, through the decades, fans occupied an increasingly visible position. Merchandise, which I examined in Chapter Six as integral to the BBC's commercial development, continued to play a role. The BBC began to take more notice of the potential of fan interest in merchandise, and the expansion of Doctor Who products and spin-off material grew alongside a more engaged and aware fandom. In the nineties, when Doctor Who went off the air, I looked at the changes within the BBC, and the politics that surrounded its increasingly lucrative and efficient commercial ventures. I argue that the developments in the BBC, and the commercial success of the 'New Adventures' tie-in fiction, play important roles in the emergence of the fan-producer figures. I followed this up with a discussion of the Big Finish Productions audio plays and highlighted how Britton positioned these as precursors to the more emotive and morally ambiguous writing in the revived series. A generation of fans were able to make the shift from fandom to official production, and their fan histories would go on to influence the direction of the show and the engagement with the new series' fandom. Whilst this chapter provides the backdrop of change that occurred concurrently in the BBC and within Doctor Who fandom, Chapters Eight and Nine will begin to directly address the fan-producers in more detail. Fandom in the nineties developed a strong sense of ownership over the series, evolving from an increased engagement with the production team in the seventies and eighties. Once

the series returned, to a changed and more commercial BBC, the fandom would have to adapt again to a new situation, and the potential conflict between their sense of ownership and the authorship/authority of the new fan-producers. First, however, this discussion will shift to the notion of branding and how the commercial success of the new series would impact on both the merchandise and fan productivity, and how the fan-producers engaged with and influenced these developments.

-Chapter Eight-
"This Infinite Text":
Branding and Fan-Producer Identities in the Worlds of New *Who.*

During the audio commentary for the <u>Doctor Who</u> story 'The Time Monster', actor John Levene, who played Sergeant Benton in the series during the seventies, describes the show as "this infinite text"[51]. His observation may sound like hyperbole, but as the expansive nature of the spin-off merchandise and media attests, and as the previous chapters have shown, it has influenced and informed the development of British culture, television, and many of the individuals working within the industry today. As a text, <u>Doctor Who</u> is expansive, and cannot be contained by more traditional notions of canon, authorship (as explored in Chapters Three and Four), or even copyright law, with ownership of key components of the franchise, notably the Daleks, being shared with parties outside the BBC. This environment has directly contributed to the emergence of the series' fan-producers and their elevation into official roles of production. Having seen the fan-producers materialise, the possibility for members of the new generation of fans to one day become producers of the series would seem to no longer be an unlikely dream, but a visible possibility. However, there are two points to consider in regards to this. Firstly, the success of <u>Doctor Who</u> as a brand has led to a much greater control over both the television text and the spin-off material, and new products created since the relaunch have tended to use fewer new, or fan authors than those before, thus arguably restricting access to official production more than when the show was off the air. Secondly, whilst fan creativity may be encouraged, perhaps fans who are known within fan communities are now less likely to 'make it' due to their fan status. Could hiring a known contemporary member of fandom negatively impact the media image of <u>Doctor Who</u> as quality television? This chapter, then, will consider the future of <u>Doctor Who</u> and how the resurrected series' success, and commercial branding, has impacted upon fandom, the fan-producers and the potential future direction of fan activity.

I will begin this chapter by examining the current literature on the subject of branding, exploring what is meant by the term, and discussing how the notion of a

---

[51]   Episode three, 'The Time Monster', BBC DVD commentary.

'market brand' has developed, and how it has been theorised in regards to fan activity. I will develop this by looking to Bourdieu and discussing the field of cultural production and how contemporary media industries problematise his work. I will utilise the work of David Hesmondalgh in discussing the media in relation to Bourdieu before bringing in contemporary work on media branding which easily finds a place within his existing scheme. In addressing branding, I will work to bring together Bourdieu and the world of branding, using Celia Lury's discussions on what we understand a brand to be, and Catherine Johnson's work will form the basis of a discussion of cult media merchandising and brand building. Lury and Johnson's work, together with others such as Matt Hills (2010 2015), will allow me to demonstrate the complicated and negotiated role of the fan-producers in regards to the branding of <u>Doctor Who</u>.

This discussion will be followed by a case study of Russell T. Davies's 'Production Notes' column that ran in the official <u>Doctor Who Magazine</u> both before and during the launch of the new series. Here, I will examine how Davies utilises his fan capital to reassure existing fans of his authenticity, and to 'prepare' fandom for the anticipated mainstream success of the series. This is very much an exercise in negotiated branding, as Davies is aware of the way the series will be marketed and packaged, and seeks to reassure the existing fandom that the new series will still remain part of the overall quality brand that the classic series, and its spin-off material, is perceived to be.

I will be aligning this examination of branding with a discussion on the different ways in which both Davies and his successor as executive producer, Steven Moffat, have interacted with fandom and how they negotiate the show's own ambiguous status between a text intended for cult and mainstream audiences. I will also briefly address the announcement of Chris Chibnall as the next writer to take charge of <u>Doctor Who</u>, beginning with the 2018 series. This discussion will engage with Hills, along with other key writers on the fan-producer phenomenon, and explore the negotiated cultural positions through again utilising Bourdieu and his exploration of the fields of cultural production. In concluding this chapter, I will illustrate how the pressure of commercial realities and the branding model of the new series creates a contradictory and ambiguous relationship between fandom and the series, that obliges a reassessment of the manner in which power relationships shift and change, and the role of fandom, and fan-producers, within official production.

Branding, the Media and Fandom.

I have already demonstrated that the BBC has had a long history of concern over its public image and identity, from concerns over licensed biscuit tins in the sixties (Chapter Six), to how it should present its image globally during the eighties and nineties (Chapter Seven). The use of the term 'brand' has increased across both the commercial industries and culture itself, and brand image is a key marketing tool across all forms of industry. This discussion, then, will address the proliferation of brands, and highlight key texts that have worked to explore this issue. I shall begin by examining what exactly is meant by the term itself. Celia Lury has suggested that "the brand is an object... that it is *a set of relations between products or services*" (2004, p.1, emphasis in original). Clarifying, Lury describes the brand as incorporeal and intangible but not immaterial, and states that the brand is "a platform for the patterning of activity, a mode of organising activities in time and space" (2004, p.1). Lury sees the brand's "object-ivity" as emerging "out of relations between its parts, or rather its products (or services), and in the organisation of a controlled relation to its environment – that is, to markets, competitors, the state, consumption and everyday life" (2004, p.2). Brands then, for Lury, are vibrant, transforming objects, that engage with, and can be transformed by, its consumers through their activities, and cannot be mistaken for being a single entity. They are a conglomerate, produced by "multiple and sometimes divergent layers of activity" and the "diverse professional activities of marketing, (graphic and product) design, accountancy, management and the law... it is not suggested that these activities are explicitly co-ordinated... let alone purposely integrated" (Lury, 2004, p.16). Lury's description of branding is convincing in its familiarity. She avoids the monolithic interpretations of industry through her work on brand management, and emphasises that brands are formed from multiple influences, both within and without the corporate industries. Lury suggests that they have "multiple histories, are internally divided, in tension with each other, and may even be contradictory or opposed" (2004, p.16). This succinct description could equally be describing the hierarchical power structures that form corporations such as the BBC, which is even further divided between commercial imperatives and public service ideals. Media branding, and the creation of media brands, is actually implicated in the negotiations and struggles that occur within the fields of cultural production, an idea that I shall be returning to further in this chapter. The impact and use of brands within popular culture itself certainly cannot be overlooked, as it has a global reach, and the obsession with branding can be found in "a wide range of different consumer groups" (Arvidsson, 2006, p.3). Adam Arvidsson argues that brands "are part of the mundane context of action

within which we become subjects", and identifies their importance in contemporary social life, and as able to build communities around them (2006, p.5). As well as this social aspect, Arvidsson emphasises the economic aspects of branding, arguing that "brand value has acquired a growing weight in financial decisions" (2006, p.5) whilst Johnson has explored how the rise of branding should also be understood in relation to the expansion of digital media (2012, p.219). Aeron Davis has argued that one of the main impacts is that "individuals and organisations have become more promotionally orientated" and give greater priority, and resources, to branding (2013, p.4). Johnson suggests that "the emergence of digital television in the late 1990s consolidated the role of branding as a central strategy in the changing media landscape" (2012, p.1807). The proliferation of digital channels added further competition to the television landscape, along with increased deregulation, and brand identity would become a key tactic in attempting to stand out in "a more competitive commercial environment" (Johnson, 2012, p.1952). Johnson, however, suggests that where the BBC is concerned it would not simply be a case of market-led branding, but that it could also be seen to support its public service remit (2012, p.1977). Branding has become an integral aspect of the modern media industries, and it is to the impact it has had on public service broadcasting in the UK, and the brand positioning of the BBC itself, that this discussion will now turn.

Catherine Johnson's work on the BBC and its brand identity directly addresses the previously explored dilemma faced by the BBC within the commercial sector. She argues that "the programme's, channels and services developed by the BBC exist in a two-way relationship, drawing on the values associated with the corporation while simultaneously contributing to those values" (2013, pp.326-327). This is in line with Lury's description of a brand as an evolving, transforming object, influenced by both its official producers and the consumers who engage with it. Lury suggests that in an "increasingly media-intensive culture... the distinction between advertising and media message is increasingly blurred" (2004, p.38). Brand positioning, Lury argues, is central to modern advertising, and "the activities of the consumer are linked – or looped – into the process of building the brand ever more intensively" (2004, p.96). This is especially the case in relation to the BBC, which draws its main funding from a licence fee and thus is directly accountable, theoretically at least, to the public to whom it must sell its own brand and values. Johnson identifies that there is a tension "between separation on the one hand and brand congruence on the other, particularly in relation to the symbolic management of commercial exploitation of BBC brands" (2013, p.318). Thus, Johnson's concern is for the ways

"in which the public might experience the commercial and public service activities of public service broadcasters and the impact this may have on the reputations of public service broadcasters" (2013, p.316). The BBC's reputation is inherently bound up in its brand identity, and it is difficult, if not unhelpful, to try and distinguish between the two, especially in the contemporary global media industries. The eighties and nineties saw "a rapid increase in both the branding of services and corporate branding – that is, the branding of a company rather than either particular products or services" (Lury, 2004, p.32). The BBC, as we have seen in previous chapters, strengthened its commercial interests and own brand identity during this period, a reaction to the neo-liberal policies of the Thatcher government. The BBC brand is one of value, trust and unbiased content, free from the vulgarities of the market or the influence of government. More importantly, it focuses on its British identity, both in taking the UK to the global market (Johnson, 2013b, p.321) and in celebrating the corporation's own contribution to the country's cultural identity. The licence fee relies on public good will, and governments are less likely to threaten full privatisation without public support, further encouraging the BBC to emphasise its own brand identity. As shown previously, there is a historical precedent for the BBC to highlight what it feels to be the more complimentary aspects of its commercial endeavours. In Chapter Six, I noted that, in the sixties, the BBC was keen to emphasise its licensing of records rather than lunch boxes, the former having greater cultural value than the latter. Matt Hills's works suggests that little has changed, as he notes that "some merchandise is seemingly more securely articulated with cultural value", evidenced by the BBC Media Centre's emphasis on the production of coins and stamps, operating as prestigious, high-end products (2015b, p.60). The dilemma is that the success of BBC Worldwide and its marketing ventures, connected to the BBC through its brand identity, threatens to undermine the argument for the licence fee itself. Johnson suggests that one possible solution would be for the BBC to develop a clear, distinctive brand for BBC Worldwide, effectively separating the commercial aspects from the public service ideology, although I might suggest we have already seen that all areas of the industry are too interrelated and influential in a cyclical structure for this to be effective (Johnson, 2013b, p.328). The BBC itself articulates these symbolic boundaries, but Hills emphasises that this commercialism is not a corruption of public service ideology, "but rather feeds on, and into, the BBC's public service identity" (2015b, p.57). The success and cultural value of Doctor Who exists in a symbiotic cycle with its commercial exploitation, whilst navigating the way in which both cultural and commercial aspects are presented to the general public. As the BBC relies on public

support to survive, and commercial interests to supplement the licence fee, it is not surprising that the corporation would look to <u>Doctor Who</u> as a pre-existing franchise with brand-building potential.

Arvidsson suggests that the ideological positioning related to the brand works by allowing the consumer to articulate that "with a particular brand I can act, feel and be in a particular way" (2006, p.7). The brand helps construct identity, if this is the case, and that has an interesting relation to how media fandoms relate to the objects of their affections. Arvidsson clarifies that "brands work by enabling consumers, by empowering them in particular directions" (2006, p.8), which perhaps goes some way towards illustrating why branding and fandom can become inseparably integrated. In 'becoming' a fan of a particular cultural object, and exploring a new fandom, the individual may find a choice of identities or positions that are taken within the existing space, and which are bound up in the object's own brand. The importance of the consumer, fan or otherwise, should not be ignored, as they are a key component of two-way mechanisms of branding, as discussed above. Johnson elaborates, highlighting that "for branding to be successful, these symbolic dimensions added to the product have to be accepted by the consumer" (2012, p.265). Branding thus depends on an interactivity between producer and consumer, albeit one that is "not open or equal" (Johnson, 2012, p.265). Johnson argues that branding attempts to maintain control, and shape the product, and the uses to which the product is put, meaning it exists as a constant "mediated and dynamic communication" between producer, consumer and product (2012, p.265). Teresa Forde suggests that there may be "a dialogue between producer and consumer [that] allows space to develop alternative meanings" and implies that it is often different engagements with the brand across all its forms that can allow fans an influence (2013, pp.67-68). Whilst this is not developed in much more detail by Forde, it perhaps begins to illuminate the important role that branding may play in the fan and producer, and fan-producer, interactions. Through discussing branding, a confluence of cultural struggle and position-taking, fan engagement, commercial and public service interests, and fan-producer identities begins to take shape. Shawn Shimpach suggests that by shifting "a valuable property and internationally recognised brand into new circumstances" the BBC utilised <u>Doctor Who</u> in its efforts to remain relevant and justify its public service status (2010, p.157). It is not difficult to see why this could be the case, as <u>Doctor Who</u> appears to appeal to all the values of the BBC brand, as something both intrinsically British but with international appeal, as a text that is culturally relevant and beloved, and also commercially

successful. Johnson elaborates that in Doctor Who, the BBC has "an existing property that had the key characteristics of longevity, transferability and multiplicity to be able to function as a media brand and so generate extensions across a wide range of media" (2013a, p.109). Having looked at the series' historical success, we might question why it took the BBC so long to come to this realisation, and might consider to what extent this revelation, the potential of the Doctor Who brand, was driven and directed by the fan-producers.

Branding and the Fields of Cultural Production.

As we have already started to see, the processes involved with branding can easily be mapped onto Bourdieu's field theory, something which I suggest that Aeron Davis contributes to. Davis argues that industry conglomerates have worked to reduce industry risks by employing professionals "who, in various ways, constrain creative autonomy". Further to this he suggests that "marketing experts have an increasing say over what gets selected and how it is modified during production by 'creatives'". The creation of new material, then, would be led by committee, with creativity and business centred interests both involved, and often competing. Thus he states that this "creates a series of organisational tensions between cultural producers and creative artists" (2013, p.100). This is symptomatic of the conflict within the two poles of the fields of cultural production, as identified by Milly Williamson and discussed previously, which sees opposing forces both within dominant positions vying for the foregrounding of specific values (Williamson, 2005, p.112). Davis positions this conflict as being between the "desire to create something new and original" and "producing something that is regular, predictable and recognizable to audiences" (2013, p.100). The debate is essentially between artistic integrity, creating originality, and re-producing the familiar which will already have a targeted audience and is more likely to be commercially successful. Jonathan E. Scroeder identifies the inherent connections between branding and art, suggesting that "artists are subject to market forces, career management issues, substitution effects, and product life cycles, just like brands" and emphasising the value of an original Rembrandt over an identical painting "by one of his followers" (2010, p.18). Aesthetic judgements, standards of authenticity, and originality can struggle for position with commercial interests and values, where the value of similar products is divided by cultural judgements. Artistic intent finds itself in competition with the desire for safe, previously proven and commercially exploitable material, a dilemma that, as I have demonstrated, reaches to the very heart of the public service debate.

Branding is inherently tied to commercialisation within the media industries; it is a way of categorising, identifying and selling a specific product. For television, and specifically Doctor Who in terms of this study, to become a product is certainly at odds with the idea of public service broadcasting, and potentially with the notion of television as predominantly driven by artistic endeavour. If television is a product, and its audiences are consumers, then branding is about selling and generating profit through specific marketing strategies. Catherine Johnson suggests that branding is "a useful tool within an increasingly commercialised broadcasting environment within which programmes are devised and exploited as products" and that it also "functions as a form of product differentiation" (2013a, p.96). Matt Hills emphasises the way media in the twenty-first century has been "shaped and defined by discourses of branding" and suggests Doctor Who "is policed carefully in terms of merchandising consistency so as to ensure brand values are properly reflected" (2010: 66-67). Johnson also suggests that "programme differentiation becomes... part of a larger production logic in which programmes function as forms of intellectual property whose difference can be legally protected" and thus "the programme brand becomes a template for the extension of the programme into new products, such as spin-off texts and merchandise" (2013a, pp.96-97). Chapter Six has already highlighted the importance of merchandise and spin-off material in the history of Doctor Who and the BBC, and both Hills's and Johnson's observations draw a direct tie between media branding and a fandom that has historically felt a large degree of ownership over the text. However, Hills suggests that rather than interpreting the series brand consistency "simply as an imposition of the current TV industry's 'will to brand'" the role of the fan community, notably whilst the show was off the air, should be considered (2010: 73). Branding plays a vital role in both the commercial television industries, and also in how fans are able to interact and engage with the texts, and a re-branding, such as with the *new Who* relaunch, could potentially act as a threat to fans' sense of authority. Through the use of Hills's concept of a 'fanbrand', however, it can be argued that "its fetishisation of consistency can also be read as a result of fandom's movement into official production" (2010: 73). Hills also draws parallels between the series' re-branding and 'make-over television' by drawing on the 'promotional para texts' used to launch changes within the series, whether a new Doctor or a newly designed villain, amongst other subjects (2015, pp.320-321). Thus I will explore the role of branding and its place within the media markets and its relationship with both public service ideology and audiences, including fans, as consumers.

The very need for a discussion of branding in regards to the BBC only serves to emphasise the impact of neoliberal-backed capitalism within the public service organisation. As Douglas B. Holt emphasises, branding is very much a core activity of capitalism, and he argues that "a brand becomes an economic asset... when people come to count on the brand to contribute to social life, when it is embedded in society and culture" (2006, p.300). As a media brand, <u>Doctor Who</u> not only has global recognition and success, but is now arguably ingrained in British culture and identity, to the extent that the distinctive TARDIS sound effect was used as part of the opening ceremony for the 2012 Olympic Games in London. Interestingly, Holt suggests that "brands are a paradoxical mode of capital accumulation: brands are more valuable to the extent that they enter the public, less under the control of the owners" (2006, pp.300-301). Branding is about distribution of ideas and imagery, and creating associations and desires for the products in question, but it is the very nature of the success of <u>Doctor Who</u> that means that, more than ever, different fan cultures and groups are appropriating the texts for their own use. The series brand has strong national meaning, an international reach, and a worldwide fandom that, through its engagement and use of the brand, perpetuates it further. This, then, would appear to suggest that the branding of <u>Doctor Who</u>, and its BBC kin, is a defeat for public service, surpassed by commercial interests. Johnson argues that the situation is more complicated, that "branding is used by the BBC to manage both its public service and commercial ambitions... and makes it increasingly difficult to untangle its commercial and public service values" (2013a, p.101). Using the new series logo designed for Matt Smith's first year in the role as an example, Johnson discusses how it was designed both for purposes of commercial branding but also with simplicity in mind. An additional 'TARDIS emblem' was created from the letters 'D' and 'W' that were intended to be easily copied by the series' young audience. Johnson argues that "the intention behind the redesign is in part to encourage participation by the programme's core child audience, and to encourage the forms of participatory culture more commonly (and historically) assigned to fan practice" (2013a, p.103). However, as Holt has shown, the integration of brand imagery into society and culture is exactly how capitalist marketing thrives, and so even this seemingly innocuous piece of design is intended to perpetuate a marketability for <u>Doctor Who</u> as a product.

"The Great Prevarication" and Beyond: Fan-producers and Fans as Cult Audience.

It is now a matter of history that <u>Doctor Who</u> became, almost overnight, a mainstream success following its relaunch in 2005. Despite the series producers' proclamations of surprise and joy, this was not an accidental success but the fruits of a rigorous and detailed marketing scheme. As Catherine Johnson emphasises, "when the new series was launched, branding had been firmly established as a central strategy in BBC management, extending across the corporation, its channels and key programmes" (2013a, p.95). There is much that can be discussed in terms of <u>Doctor Who</u> as a mainstream text, and Matt Hills has explored the notion of <u>Doctor Who</u>'s ambiguous status between mainstream and cult, and how fandom has integrated this debate into its own discourses (2010, pp.178-231). Hills argues that it is actually the producers who are more concerned with removing the 'cult' label, and its negative connotations, whilst fans tend to take a more pragmatic acceptance of the necessity of having a mainstream audience, "arguing that 'their' show could once again be a popular success" during the time it was off air (2010, p.205). The mainstream versus cult arguments inherently lead to the question of branding, and how the series is sold to both existing fandom, and more importantly, to a potentially suspicious mainstream audience. Johnson observes that "the development of the series as a brand articulates a broader tension between commerical and public service values" (2013, p.96). Further, the branding "becomes a template for the extension of the programme into new products, such as spin-off texts and merchandise" (2013, p.97). We have already seen the role <u>Doctor Who</u> has played in the commercial development of the BBC,[52] and touched upon the importance of merchandise and alternative texts in this development. What this discussion will centre on is how these variant influences are manifested through the early engagements that Russell T. Davies had with a predominantly fan audience, and how he uses his position to reconcile the dawning of a modern, branded series with a fandom used to a greater sense of authority over the spin-off material and merchandise through the years the series was no longer produced.

As the show prepared for its relaunch, there was a period of time when the production team continued to battle against its cult status whilst simultaneously seeking the support of its cult audience. I will thus now be addressing this somewhat under-explored period of the franchise's history, which executive producer Russell T. Davies had jokingly dubbed 'The Great Prevarication'. The period Davies identifies is that which occurs between the announcement of the television show's

---

[52]   See the previous chapters of this work.

return, on Friday 26th September 2003, until the vaguely defined point of establishing more concrete facts regarding the series return, which for my purposes will stretch to the broadcast of the début episode, 'Rose', on 25th March 2005. What this period of time really represents is a point of ambiguity where <u>Doctor Who</u> exists predominantly as a cult text, as it had done for the past decade or so, whereby the pre-existing audience of fandom is the most invested, and yet where the fan-producers' mainstream publicity seeks to avoid the cult label. This is an important and overlooked moment of transition, and tension, where the fan-producers can address fandom as a group that are generally keen to see the series return (but have not yet seen Davies's iteration of it) and refer to the 'mainstream' as a separate group whose approval is desired (but generally do not know much about the series at all). This is also then, a matter of branding, as the series was relaunched as something new, modern and relatable to a whole new generation.

Pre-textual Poaching.

I will begin with discussing the way in which Davies addresses fandom during "the Great Prevarication', how he articulates his fan identity and what he has to say about mainstream audiences. This will predominantly be examined through his regular 'Production Notes' column in the official <u>Doctor Who Magazine</u>, which notably gives him a one-way dialogue with an audience that, in the time before the relaunch, consisted of a core fan base for the classic series. I will thus illustrate how Davies engages with fandom, and reassures fandom both of his credentials as a fan and that the series will be respectful to its history, whilst simultaneously preparing them for the possibility of mainstream attention and engagement. A cursory glance over the Production Notes column would perhaps lead a reader to judge it as a somewhat vague behind-the-scenes ramble in regards to the development of the new series. Davies is upfront about his inability to give too much information away, proclaiming that he has to remain 'professional' and not reveal information too soon. Thus the column begins with vague discussions of his own experiences, laced with fan-pleasing references and occasional revelation of a morsel of information, such as an upcoming episode title. These hints, in themselves, reflect the way in which fandom can trawl through texts of every kind, searching for clues, desiring morsels of information that Hills has conceptualised as a form of 'pre-textual poaching'. Hills claims that "unlike 'poachers' of the early 1990s, they are instead contesting producers' control over pre-transmission information... their struggles with fan-producers necessarily pre-date rather than follow the texts' transmission" (2010, p.72). However, the situation is, again, arguably more complicated than this, as

Davies is fully aware of the fan desire for 'pre-textual' material, something which has a historical precedent that a fan-producer would have knowledge of. The fan urge to seek out information before broadcast was already around as early as the 1980s. In both earlier decades and the modern era, fans have had access to the production team, notably through 'super-fan' Ian Levine in the eighties, as discussed in other chapters. Levine became an unofficial continuity advisor for the programme, at first supporting producer John Nathan-Turner before later becoming one of his biggest critics. Magazines run by Levine would endeavour to gain pre-textual information and comment on upcoming storylines, outside the control of the production team. Pre-textual poaching was certainly rarer in the pre-internet days but to suggest it is a contemporary invention is too precise, drawing a clear line under what was actual a gradual shift. Hills further illustrates that the idea of 'fan advisers' is entirely superseded by the fan-producers being elite fans in themselves. Russell T. Davies merges the previous figures of John Nathan-Turner and Ian Levine (and arguably eighties script editors such as Eric Saward) into one individual, the 'showrunner', and thus the new series needed "no such additional fan input" (Hills, 2010, p.214).

Davies, as a fan-producer, takes on both the official role of emphasising the branding of the series, whilst acknowledging the fan desire for information and pre-textual clues. Davies feeds fandom what he knows it wants, not just as a producer, but from his own fan perspective, knowing the desire for intimacy and details at a very early stage of production. He is not coy about this, and in his very first column he says how he cannot tell readers about the information they are clamouring for but also reassuring that "the facts will come. I swear. For all the current frustration, there will come a time – soon, I hope – when you can't move for costumes and spaceships and actors' CVs" (2004a, p.50). These initial Production Notes also address the magazine audience directly, specifying that "as that time approaches, I hope you'll be able to read about it here first, in the pages of DWM. Because I love this comic. I really do. I've bought it since the very first issue" (2004a, p.50). Again, Davies draws direct connections between the audience and himself, and highlights his history as a fan, and notably by referencing the magazine as a 'comic', he is reinforcing this. Doctor Who Magazine began very much as a weekly comic, and thus referring to the current iteration in this way draws a temporal line from those early days, suggesting that Davies has stuck with it throughout this time (something he goes on to outright state). This first edition of Production Notes is a microcosm of how it will continue – reinforcing fan credentials, reassuring the series is a continuation, and consistently including fan references that are both obscured and

notable for a dedicated fan audience. Davies, in future columns, makes other efforts to reinforce his fan status, and his suitability to produce a modern version of the show in the wider context of contemporary genre television. His discussion of episode titles in the second column is a prime example of this form of writing. Describing his ongoing production meetings, he mentions at one stage that it was:

> [a] random leap to next subject – episode titles. Should we have them or not? Does *Revenge of the Moxx of Balhoon* still work? Or would we go for a cryptic *Balhoon?* Or the musical, *Balhoon!* Or maybe a *Babylon 5*ish *Balhoon Is Upstairs And Had Drunk The Sky*. Or an X Files version, *Balhoonistica*. (Davies, 2004b, p.50)

Davies evokes three different forms of reassurance as to his fan credentials in this discussion. First of all, is the importance for titles held by Doctor Who fans, something Davies is aware of, and how the typical 'classic Who' story would be called something rather pulpy in tone, and thus reinforcing his Doctor Who fan status. Secondly he mentions two other very popular science fiction texts, reinforcing his knowledge of the genre in general, as well as connecting an untested new Doctor Who with critically acclaimed science fiction of the past decade. Thirdly, his joke titles reflect a strong knowledge of these series beyond anything a casual audience would be aware of – he highlights the surreal nature of The X-Files's titles, and the, sometimes absurdly, poetic Babylon 5 approach. Thus in a relatively short space of time, and through a joke, Davies reinforces himself as a fan-producer who knows the genre, is aware of fan concerns and sees Doctor Who in comparison to highly visible quality television iterations of science fiction. This form of reinforcement can be repeatedly found across his Production Notes columns, especially in the lead up to the series relaunch.

Perhaps one of the biggest questions for fans was whether the new series would be a continuation of the previous twenty-six seasons, or a reboot which wipes the slate clean. With the passion and engagement that fandom has, it is understandable why this would be a major point of concern as a reboot risks alienating the existing audience who may not feel the same sense of loyalty to characters they feel they do not truly know. Davies is fairly clear early on that he is bringing back the existing series and his fourth Production Notes column tackles the issue directly, tapping directly into fan rhetoric of continuity and a desire to see The Doctor return, rather than just new Doctor Who (an important distinction).

> People will argue about that for as long as fandom exists, and it will always be a matter of opinion. I'm just another opinion – canon can't be defined by producers. But I do think that the act of writing has power. So, as a writer, I'm saying now: the Doctor I am writing is the same man who fought the Drahvins, the Macra, the Axons, the Wirrn, the Terileptils, the Borad, the Bannermen, and then the Master in San

182

Francisco on New Year's Eve, 1999. One man, nine faces. Still denying it? Good luck. (2004c, p.50)

Johnson has pointed out that "programmes characterised by longevity, transferability and multiplicity become highly valuable" in the commercial television industry (2013, p.97). She highlights how the format of the show allows for a recasting of its lead, but it should also be noted that this has also led to a re-branding twice since the series returned. These overt re-brandings centred on the identity of its lead actor are supplemented, and sometimes enhanced, by a variety of brand alterations such as the changing designs of the TARDIS or the Daleks. Matt Hills suggests that as Doctor Who lacks "any single authenticating author-function" it extends the "capacity to be replaced" aspect of make-over television to its "stars and showrunners" (2015, pp.323). Hills focuses on the idea of the 'reveal', whereby the re-branding becomes an event in itself, akin to the final presentation of a transformed body or space at the conclusion of make-over television. This 'reveal' can happen in the promotional paratext, such as when an entire programme was dedicated to unveiling Peter Capaldi as the latest actor to portray The Doctor, but it can also occur textually. This is most notable with the Daleks who suffered one of the shows only major failures of branding when the 'New Paradigm' models debuted in an episode of Steven Moffat's first season. The new designs were rapidly phased out following fan and critical criticism, although Hills is quick to identify that fans "didn't challenge the underlying logic of franchise transformation and 'updating'... and they didn't question the general merchandising of the show" (2015, pp.322-323). In addition, it is also this narrative latitude that allows for the 'relaunch' of the show as a continuation of what came before, rather than the 'remakes' usually produced.[53] Doctor Who is relaunched with a pre-made history and many marketable assets that can maintain relevance to a new audience due to their connection to the new series, and the fandom is accepting of the 'franchise transformation' noted by Hills. Davies's words can also be de-constructed to see how they address fandom in a variety of ways, engaging with different concerns. Notably he both attempts to disavow his authority whilst claiming power for a more abstract sense of writing. That is to say, as a producer, he, Russell T. Davies, has no authority, but the general concept of writing something can and does influence fandom. This is interesting in light of Hills's discussion of Davies as the disappearing/materialising author, "present and absent, simultaneously displaced in favour of other production team members, and solidified via specific, queered

---

[53]   Remake examples include Randall and Hopkirk (Deceased), Battlestar Galactica, Bionic Woman, V, Survivors; none of these series continued the original narratives.

meanings and readings" (2010, p.26). The show seems to function by having an author figure at specific 'moments', who can impact the show in their own contemporary period of working on it, but once that becomes historical, whilst it may be addressed as an era, the author themselves becomes amalgamated into the vast whole of <u>Doctor Who</u> lore. Davies is no longer the showrunner, nor even a writer, and his contributions are now examined in light of both what came after and what the current showrunner, Moffat, is now doing.

Finally, it is worth noting the period of change, as Davies takes it upon himself to welcome to the fold new readers of his column, as he presumes the new series audience have begun to pick up the magazine (an opinion reinforced by its increase in sales following the series return). This begins early on in the column, where he hints at the possibility of outsiders entering the world of fandom, notably addressing them directly after making an obscure series reference; "to a *Doctor Who* fan, those numbers are bristling with power, like Logopolitan spells. But with all the brouhaha about the new series, I hope there might be newcomers browsing (already wondering what 'Logopolitan' means)" (2004c, p.50). This has an interesting two-fold purpose of firstly a form of welcome and indoctrination into the magazine, the series and the fandom as a whole, and secondly a reassurance to current fans that the new readers will be integrated within fandom, one of them, rather than changing or being separate and new. To what extent this may be true, of course, is open to discussion and there have been differing factions and opinions within fandom, in regards to the classic and new series, as touched upon earlier in this chapter. The BBC and mainstream media were integral to a widespread campaign of branding the new series, whilst in the pages of <u>DWM</u>, Davies was essentially undertaking a more low-key form of branding. Davies was "getting the fans on side" and assuring the legacy of the series to a fandom that otherwise may have felt threatened by the branding messages presented through mainstream media and advertising.

RTD vs. The Grand Moff: fan-producers and Controlling the Brand.
The long history of <u>Doctor Who</u> has left it with numerous key voices at the helm, with influential figures predominantly being either the series producer or script-writer of a given era. The resurrected series was structured in a way that works more as a hybrid of the UK writer-led drama style and the writer's room format employed in America. The former format often utilises a single author figure and, indeed, Davies claimed that had the new series only received six episodes then he would have written them all himself, a normal state of affairs within the British television industry.

The latter approach utilises a group of writers who come together and plan a series as a collective, before writing individual story-lines that have already been established under the supervision of a head writer. Thus, the new series of <u>Doctor Who</u> was headed by an executive producer who would be dubbed the 'showrunner;' Russell T. Davies was the first such showrunner, and Steven Moffat was his successor in the role. Chris Chibnall is set to replace the latter in 2017, and will also be addressed, although I will primarily focus on Moffat and Davies. As previously noted, Moffat and Davies are both fan-producers, and have both worked to establish fan identities for themselves, although the ways these developed make for an interesting subject to contrast. The approaches and attitudes towards fandom for both Davies and Moffat have a number of notable differences, and the way in which they engaged as authors of new <u>Doctor Who</u> is dependent on their very different initial circumstances, as I will highlight. Furthermore, their approaches to the series, their themes, ideas and recurring motifs are distinguishable and emphasise the different ideological and authorial voices that can stem from alternative fan perceptions of the same television text.

Perhaps one of the most controversial and fascinating areas of departure for Davies and Moffat are in the way in which they deal with spoilers, and more specifically, they deal with situations where fandom is deemed to have in some way crossed a line in terms of revealing information, or even in addressing the producers. Hills has theorised the contemporary form of obtaining spoilers as a form of 'pre-textual poaching'; he claims that they are "contesting producers' control over pre-transmission information" and that their "their struggles with fan-producers necessarily pre-date rather than follows the text's transmission" (2010, p.72). Pre-textual poaching can encompass "intense fan speculation and spoiler-chasing" and involves a form of info-war where the BBC struggles to maintain control of branding, publicity and PR whilst under the gaze of an intelligent and determined fandom (Hills, 2010, p.72). Hills also overplays the 'pre-textual poaching' in some of his examples, which would seem to imply an ignorance on the part of the fan-producers. Hills suggests that in "posting blurred digital images of Piper online, the fan community scored a minor tactical victory over the producers' PR control", yet goes on to state that a planned press release for the day allowed producers to "maintain brand 'quality' through the release of official information" (2010, p.71). The images of Piper came from filming in public, on the streets of Cardiff, and it would be disingenuous to suggest that the producers were not fully aware that this meant fans could and would obtain photographic evidence. Whilst the producers might wish to

maintain secrecy, they clearly were aware of the risk in advance, and potentially timed a press release for the next day as a possible strategy in advance. Considering the history of the show's production, in its fourth year at this point, and the awareness of the fan-producers of this kind of activity, it seems somewhat of a stretch to proclaim a 'tactical victory' for fans, even a 'minor' one. Davies himself addresses these issues in his Production Notes columns, discussed earlier in this chapter, recounting surprise at being undetected by fans or media on an evening shoot in the centre of Cardiff (2004d, p.50). This followed the experience of the first location shoot in the city which Davies describes as a "bedlam", stating that "the paparazzi descended, and the fans, and anyone else who fancied a gawp" (2004d, p.50). For Davies, neither the interest of fans nor the gathering of spoiler information is presented as a battle to be fought and won, but as an inevitability that they can plan against, an inherent part of what they are doing. This illustrates a rather mature cultural perspective, I would argue, born out of his own fan history, where Davies is not as critical or condemning of fan interest and suggests an awareness of his own contradictory position between understanding fan desires, and wishing to maintain secrecy as an author.

For all the discussion of conflict, and planned avoidance of fans, what is most notable with Davies is a general sense of the inevitability of spoiler information. Davies talks about spoilers as something that should be anticipated and he himself has admitted to officially sanctioned 'spoilers' as a form of publicity. The more notable example is in relation to the 'Daleks in Manhattan' storyline from the third season of the show, which was the first half of a two-part narrative, and in the traditional Doctor Who fashion ended on a cliffhanger. The cliffhanger in question was the reveal of the human-Dalek hybrid creature that Dalek Sec has been transformed into, and despite this being an important narrative twist and dramatic conclusion, readers of the Radio Times, or indeed perusers of supermarket shelves, would have seen Sec's hybrid face staring out at them from the magazine's front cover. In a strange reversal of the expected events, fans took to the forums to complain about the pre-textual spoilers that had given away an important moment, especially for older fans, in revealing the cliffhanger of the episode almost a week in advance. What Sec-gate perhaps illustrates most succinctly is the divided nature of fandom when it comes to spoilers, and the idea that not all fans are seeking them. When we talk about pre-textual poachers, and fans seeking out information, we are discussing one section of fandom, rather than fandom as a whole. Fans are well aware of this, and Doctor Who fan website Gallifrey One divides its main discussion

forums into two distinct areas; 'The Infinite Quest' where spoilers are sought out, discussed and debated, alongside rumours and uncertain information, and 'The Zero Room' which has a zero-tolerance policy on any spoiler-information where fans can discuss upcoming stories and their own theories without fear of having their enjoyment ruined by pre-textual information. The relationship between Davies and fans-for-spoilers and fans-against-spoilers, is thus a complicated one, whereby there can be no 'right' or 'wrong' approach, and where fans themselves can clash if they perceive other fans to have revealed spoilers they did not wish to know. However, the relationship is rarely overtly hostile, and Davies constantly demonstrates an awareness and understanding for the desire for spoilers, and information on the series in general, as my previous discussion on his Production Notes column has illustrated.

This approach does perhaps contrast, however, with that of Steven Moffat, who has demonstrated a greater likelihood to actively attack and insult fandom as a collective group. In May 2011, comments made by Moffat on the subject of fans who spread spoilers were seen as so shocking or controversial that they not only made the news pages of cult television web sites, but also the BBC's very own online news page, as well as being picked up by a number of newspapers. The comments were made on BBC Radio 5 live which interviewed Moffat, and are an incredibly hostile and unpleasantly aggressive assault on certain fans, and I have repeated the key points here in full:

> "You can imagine how much I hate them. It's only fans who do this, or they call themselves fans... I wish they could go and be fans of something else... It's heartbreaking in a way because you're trying to tell stories, and stories depend on surprise… so to have some twit who came to a press launch, write up a story in the worst, most ham-fisted English you can imagine, and put it on the internet... I just hope that guy never watched my show again, because that's a horrific thing to do." (BBC, 2011b)

Hills has positioned this as part of a binary between skilled authorised writers and untalented fans that he suggests Moffat propagates, and this would certainly tie into the more critical approach to fans in general demonstrated by Moffat. This is described as a method to "ideologically put fandom in its place", and separate it from the perceived authority of the writer (Hills, 2013, p.146). Again, this is distinct from both Davies's rejection of authorial authority (although this is not total, as we have seen) and also the way that Davies appears to acknowledge and accept, at least to a degree, the inherent nature of fandom to both create and seek out information. Once again, however, we do not see fandom rallying against Moffat as

a collective mass, but actually dividing into conflicting groups both for, and against, what he has said. The fan community on the GateWorld forum seem to exclusively support him, with forum member Pharoh Atem stating a form of solidarity with the problem, explaining "I have a co worker who loves spoilers and every time he sees me he starts ruining the show for me. I 100% agree with Moffat"[54]. Forum user DigiFluid goes further, emphasising the anti-fan sentiment by claiming that "people who spread them should be made into the pariahs they deserve to be". Fandom is divided, in itself, between those who decry and those who support the comments and thus automatically position themselves as separate to the targets of Moffat's rant, but also in doing so, distance themselves from the amateur accusations he makes. Moffat does seem to later regret his comments via a self-deprecating post on his twitter account where he states: "Finally heard my own rant. Grumpy sod. And what a boring, inflection free voice! It's like being told off by the shipping forecast"[55]. This both compares and contrasts nicely with Collinson's 'bastards' comments, which will be discussed further in Chapter Nine, whereby the comments feel less totalising and more justified, when compared with the less specific anger that Moffat displays. That is to say, Moffat's anger seems directed at the fan acquisition of spoilers in general, and suggests that this is an activity he is highly opposed to, which may also tie into his own authorial voice that, unlike Davies, is based much more on twist endings and sudden unexpected plot developments. Spoilers, pre-textual or otherwise, remain an important issue within fandom, and within the temporal rhythm of the show's consumption, from production and through to consumption. Hills's work on the narrative flow of the show, through to its broadcast, is fascinating, and it's important to acknowledge how the way television shows are viewed has changed. In Hills's examples looking at <u>The X-Files</u> in the late nineties, there are marked differences between UK- and US-based fan consumption, based on earlier and later broadcast dates, and a English fan is desperate for discussions to be marked with spoiler warnings. These would be warnings of spoilers that are common knowledge following a US broadcast that may be months ahead of the UK one, whereas now broadcasts are more concurrent, and even when they are not, the advent of internet technology has allowed fans to keep up with their shows through various means, legal or otherwise. Contemporary spoilers, therefore, are more likely to be the pre-textual kind, or within a shorter time frame, based on a viewer maybe missing a broadcast for social reasons and

---

[54]   http://forum.gateworld.net/threads/81299-Moffat-On-Fans-Who-Post-Spoilers, accessed 6th June 2013.

[55]   http://metro.co.uk/2011/05/11/steven-moffat-hits-out-at-vandals-who-reveal-doctor-who-spoilers-7199/, accessed 6th June 2013.

needing a day or so to catch up. With a great emphasis on pre-textual spoilers, as Hills highlights, there is an inevitably greater sense of conflict with the producers, who otherwise would have less interest in stopping post-broadcast spoilers. However, this conflict is more often a negotiation and in Davies's case, something that is both expected and understood. Whilst Moffat's aggression suggests a less forgiving or tolerant approach to fandom, his apparent need to apologies via twitter at least suggests a sense of appreciating that the situation is not as simplistic as his rant implies. Of course, this could also be a form of damage control, considering the widespread nature of the story and the negative feedback it acquired in some areas of the internet. Ultimately, the spoiler conflict highlights some differences, both in Davies's and Moffat's approaches to fandom but also to how they view fans and choose to engage with them. It is interesting, then, to look at the different thematic elements of their versions of Doctor Who and how these not only reflect their ideological views of the series, and television, but also how they engage with, and listen to, fan criticisms of them. Whilst both writers have had criticism levelled at them, their initial announcements as showrunners were generally met with positivity, something that was not so much the case with Chris Chibnall who will take over the programme beginning with the 2018 season. Moffat took on the role after writing a number of hugely popular episodes, whilst Chibnall's previous contributions to the series had generally received mixed reviews. Chibnall was also one of the lead writers for the Torchwood spin-off, and came in for criticism for his approach to adult material in that series. Articles written critiqued and dissected his previous work, and suggested that Chibnall was unsuited for the role of Doctor Who's showrunner[56]. Whilst his Doctor Who work might not convey a specific authorial voice, unlike Moffat's, which features numerous recurring themes, fans seem to overlook his success in the wider television industry, notably with the award-winning Broadchurch. Another potential pitfall for Chibnall was his infamous appearance on an eighties episode of BBC feedback programme Open Air, where he heavily criticised the production team and writing of the time. There is no doubt that, as with Davies and Moffat before him, Chibnall was a fan, but his history seems to reinforce the more negative stereotypes of fans, and with fewer popular scripts to his name, he seems to be perceived as the 'wrong type' of fan. Whilst it remains to be seen what his vision of the programme will involve, fan reaction suggests that branding and world building will continue to play a vital role in convincing certain sections of the audience.

---

[56]   http://www.doctorwhotv.co.uk/why-im-not-optimistic-about-chris-chibnall-taking-over-79692.htm , accessed 12th July 2016.

Conclusion: Conflict and Control of the New Who Brand.

Branding is inherently bound up with issues of commercialisation, public service and authority. I have explored how branding is used within capitalist culture, and discussed how the BBC and Doctor Who have been branded, and examined a range of theoretical approaches to this. The second section looked at how showrunner Russell T. Davies had engaged with fandom in the lead up to the series relaunch, and how his writing indicated a very careful negotiation of his fan and producer identities. This was a form of brand control in itself, as he was aware of how strong fan reaction could be and was preparing, and reassuring, an existing fan audience for not just the potential new mainstream interest, but for the BBC's own approach to marketing the series. The fan-producer open-ness of the text is contrasted with the pressures of the BBC making the series less open to fans than when it was off the air due to branding and management. Also, new writers for the latest seasons are less likely to come from fandom. Thus the shifting relationships are fraught with contradictions, as fans and fan-producers alike negotiate not only the texts and their engagements with them, and each other, but always with an awareness of the BBC's own brand management concerns. The final section, then, looked at differences in how Davies and his successor Steven Moffat dealt with fans whose actions were outside the control of a BBC public relations team, and how they threatened specific PR and branding timetables. The different reactions highlight the different possible approaches to these situations, and the difficulty in trying to operate within a system consisting of varied hierarchical positions of power or authority.

Importantly, this illustrates just how much and how directly the institutions of the BBC, and its commercialisation, influence the actions and engagements of the fan-producers, and thus oblige the net to be cast wider in analysing fan activism and producer authority. Indeed, it seems that the powerful grip of capitalist ideology, through the principle of branding, casts its shadow over both 'sides' of what has often been viewed as a very binary conflict between production and consumption. Rather than distinct and conflicting positions, both fandom and the producers who claim authority have their engagements influenced and mediated by the series' brand. The showrunner is almost a brand in themselves, and it is this conceit that forms the focus of the next chapter, which will build upon this discussion of branding to explore the identities of the fan-producers. Capitalist imperatives, via the method of branding, touches and influences all aspects of the contemporary Doctor Who

franchise, influencing production decisions at all levels, the fan-producers and their identities, and even fandom itself. Artistic decisions are bound up with commercial intentions, and rarely can the two be easily separated. Branding both sells a product and creates more identifiable media sources that fandom can engage with. This is not an epitaph for fan activism and engagement, however, and I argue that the Doctor Who brand, whilst at its core a tool for commercial exploitation of a property, can also be tied directly into fan experiences, notably through the fan-producers, and also should be seen as exerting a notable influence over the franchise's future development. The showrunner brand, and the importance of fan identities and histories in the emergence of the fan-producers, and in turn the success of the modern Doctor Who brand, will be addressed directly in the chapter to follow.

-Chapter Nine-

No More Authority?:

Examining the Contexts and Narratives of

***Doctor Who*'s Fan-Producers.**

"How much more public a tragic-geek-fan could I be? I hate football, the rest of sport, cars, and almost all proper man-stuff. I can list all the Doctor Who stories in order. I've got Picked Last For Games written all over me (they held me down and got a felt tip.) I'm a member of this forum, posting under my own name. I've stood on the bloody Newsnight set, with David Tennant, on television, and humiliated myself with a depth of enthusiasm bordering on Speaking In Tongues. I write stories where tragic geeks get hot women. Over and over again. Till I start crying."

Steven Moffat.

The showrunner brand, integral to the revived series of Doctor Who, has an additional layer of value through the fan identities of the fan-producers. Whilst the fan-producers have cultural value, and are identified with quality television, for fans they are associated with an era of fan creativity, and ownership. This chapter will endeavour to draw together ideas discussed throughout this thesis and illustrate the fan-producers in further detail, and question the identities and brands they construct around themselves. In the first section of this chapter, I explore previous readings of Davies's fandom and draw on Matt Hills's work to examine the different positions he takes when discussing problematic fan actions, such as releasing online spoilers. This chapter, then, will delve deeper into the different discourses and interactions of the fan-producers, it will analyse in detail how we can understand them to be fan-producers and the history that has led them into these positions, picking up from threads in previous chapters. I will begin by looking at the contemporary thinking on fan and producer interactions and the concept of Web 2.0, before stepping back and considering how Doctor Who's fan-producers came to this point. Here I will again discuss how the 'New Adventures' series of novels served as a gateway into official production, before focusing my attention on Paul Cornell as a fan-producer case study. I will be considering how the fan-producers can be understood as fans, how they made the transition from fandom to official production, developing ideas from previous chapters, but also examining the risks of over-emphasising the degree to which fans can become producers. I will propose that the fan-producers must be

understood to draw from both their experience and histories as media producers and as fans, without necessarily prioritising one above the other. Finally, I will examine the current fan-producer showrunner, Steven Moffat, and explore his relationship with fandom and his own brand identity.

Davies's Rhetoric of "Bastards!" and "Hysteria".

In discussing the desire of fans to uncover 'spoilers' for forthcoming series of Doctor Who, Matt Hills returns to using the rhetoric of conflict, describing a "producer-versus-fan info-war – sometimes won by fandom, sometimes by the *Doctor Who* production team" (2010, p.11). An example he cites as "extraordinary" is an interview where Phil Collinson, series producer in the early Davies era, refers to a fan as a "wanker". Whilst Hills frames this as "one fan who leaked series four production details online", what Collinson himself states is that the fan entered a costumer's work shop without permission and "read emails and took pictures... then stuck them on the internet" (2010, p.10). Hills seems to frame this as an attack on a 'typical' fan, but Collinson's account at least suggests a degree of criminality. The fan did not take pictures on the street or spread rumours but actively accessed someone else's email accounts in search of information. I argue that other fans, not just the fan-producers, are equally likely to respond negatively to illegally gained material. Collinson is not berating fans in general for seeking spoilers, but attacking a single fan for what could amount to criminal behaviour. This point also implicitly leads to a later discussion by Hills on how Russell T. Davies, the show's executive producer, and Collinson "oscillate between fan discourses and media professional production discourses". However, these distinctions can be problematic, as illustrated when Hills suggests one example of hostility towards fandom is a "totalising attack", with Davies positioned "purely as a media professional". This appears to ignore Davies's own clarifications elsewhere, the contexts of the statements being made and that seemingly sweeping statements are not uncommon within fan discourse itself.

This is not to say that we take Davies's explanations at face value, but rather, we realise that Davies's opinions and comments are regulated by a wide variety of influences, some of them from his own fan experiences. This is not immediately a point of conflict and it is impossible for Davies to 'purely' be a professional, as his professional identity is directly integrated with his fan identity. Hills does clarify that fan-producers can move from drawing "strongly on fan discourse" to drawing "centrally on production discourse", but the use of terms "purely" and "totalising"

inadvertently draws attention away from this. As I discussed in previous chapters, the showrunner brand of Davies stems in part from both industry success and fan authenticity. Fans are often their own worst enemy, and the responses to Davies's comments were not universally rejected by fans but rather debated by them. Fans either sided with or against Davies, and those with him obviously did not see themselves as part of the 'bastards' that he is said to describe. Hills's use of Foucault helps to clarify his argument, stating that "we cannot accuse fan-producers of being somehow self-contradictory, or displaying hypocrisy... in specific contests fan-producers draw strongly on fan discourse... and at other moments they draw centrally on production discourse" (2010, p.78). It is rarely useful to suggest that anything is uniformly one thing or the other, and whilst it is true that the fan-producers are industry professionals, it is also true that they are fans. Whilst the context of Hills's claims suggests that they are drawing "centrally" on one form of discourse, this only highlights the unsuitability of describing the attack as being "wholly purged" of fandom (2012, p.78). The fan-producer negotiates the complex systems of both official industry practice and fan cultures, and how they relate to each other, and they cannot be purged completely of one another. However, the power relations between the different positions also work to emphasise the authority, and thus authenticity, of Davies's statements. Hills's argument is that, within specific statements, production discourse can dominate, and this carries weight due to the authority of the individuals involved, just as at other times the fan-producers may draw on and utilise fan discourse. I would suggest that the rhetoric implying that Davies is "purged" of fandom is unfortunate, as it gives the impression of being too categorical, which is clearly not Hills's intent. Whilst production discourse can be dominant, the fan-producers are often aware of and influenced by their fan identities. This is visible itself in Russell T. Davies's own book on his time as show-runner, where he discusses the conflict between his fan and producer identity; of course, we must be aware that this again may have been presented in a particular way and in order to convey a certain image and narrative for a presumed fan readership. However, Davies is not beyond criticisms, and there are some interesting and more overt examples of his drawing on industry discourses in addressing elements within fandom.

Davies has worked to maintain a detached sense of authorship, as explored in previous chapters, and during his time as showrunner had claimed the current Doctor Who authorial position. However, this came with an awareness and open admission that this was essentially ephemeral and that, once his era ended, his

work would be incorporated into the wider body of lore which has no clear owner beyond the BBC as an institution. The BBC itself makes no specific claims of canon or authenticity, and therefore Doctor Who as a wider text is predominantly conceived and defined by fandom itself. It is worth keeping this in mind when examining the situations when Davies does invoke more aggressive terminology and reductive approaches towards fandom, as it provides important contexts. Perhaps one of the most divisive and prominent examples is not in fact related directly to Doctor Who, but to the adult spin-off, Torchwood, which Davies developed alongside the parent programme. Laurie Cubbison has discussed the circumstances surrounding the fan reaction to the death of popular queer character Ianto Jones (Gareth David-Lloyd), then partner to series star and previous Doctor Who companion Captain Jack Harkness (John Barrowman), and notably the writers' responses. When the character was killed off at the end of the fourth episode of the third season, the fan response was extensive, and social networking spread the reactions rapidly and encouraged "a highly emotional response over a reasoned response... outrage is propagated and reinforced across the internet" (Cubbison, 2012, p.139). It is worth noting first of all that Davies is not the only writer of Torchwood, and that, in fact, for the first two seasons of the show he contributed only the opening episode of series one, and the opening scene of series two. Davies maintains a sense of being the author of the series, and is referred to as such by Cubbison, despite having a lack of direct involvement, something Davies himself puts down to his workload on Doctor Who. Davies's brand as a showrunner is thus clearly felt throughout the series' run despite his lack of direct scriptwriting. However, for the third series, entitled Torchwood: Children of Earth, utilising a mini-series format that was broadcast across five days, Davies was much more heavily involved in both the production and writing of the series. However, whilst suggesting that Davies be identified as the author, Cubbison, and fandom, directly identify James Moran, another of the writers, as a key authorial voice. Moran, Cubbison argues, had the greatest online presence of the writing team and thus "became the lightning rod for early fan reaction" (2012, p.139). This perhaps ties into an argument that fan-producers should have a professional distance from fandom, despite claiming to be part of it, and this point of order will be returned to and addressed in the next section. What is evident from this situation, however, is that fans will seek to address as directly as possible, anyone they see as having a sense of authorship over the text, and that a form of scapegoating can occur from fans who are angry about the direction the programme has gone in. With anger directed at them from fans, Davies and Moran both responded with rhetoric that emphasised narrative integrity, the former saying

"powerful drama isn't just there to make you smile" and the former stating "the ONLY thing I need to serve is the story" (Cubbison, 2012, pp.142-143), but also with statements that take a more derogatory treatment towards their critics, with Davies claiming that the criticisms came from "nine hysterical women" (Cubbison, 2012, p.145). Cubbison suggests that Moran challenges "the right of the fans to expect a story to go the way of their expectations" and whilst this is a fair interpretation, it again ignores that Moran is essentially correct (2012, p.142). Moran identifies that everyone wants different things, and Cubbison admits that many fans were happy with the storyline, and it is impossible to please all fans, all the time. When we discuss the 'fans' what we are, in this instance discussing, is a particular subset of fans, in particular Ianto/Jack shippers. There is evidence that this fandom is predominantly female, likely influencing Davies's comment, and whilst vocal it cannot be taken to be a majority opinion within fandom as a whole. Davies's comment on "hysterical women" is reductive and unfair, and openly hostile and perhaps one of the more overt times that Davies's anger comes across as quite cynical and anti-fandom. However, in spite of this, Davies is correct to identify that this was not a universal reaction from fandom, and that as Cubbison also notes, many fans supported the decision to kill off Ianto. Indeed, many fans on forums have echoed Davies's sentiments, although this does not excuse the misogynistic tone, attacks on 'fan-girls' and the showrunner's use of the "hysterical women" phrase. Rather than evidencing a clear producer and fan conflict, however, the reactions and responses to the events of <u>Torchwood: Children of Earth</u> actually serve to highlight the difficulty in reducing arguments to ones of straightforward conflict. <u>Torchwood</u> fans are not necessarily <u>Doctor Who</u> fans, and Jack/Ianto shippers are in themselves a subset of fandom. Conflict is loud and prominent, and the noted heated exchanges and passionate emotions, including the defensive position of writers who have every right to stand by their work, create a disproportionate emphasis on the struggle. Whilst it is an example of a fan and producer conflict, it cannot be taken as evidencing an overall message of conflict and warfare because, in the wider picture of the fan-producer relationship it is a minor skirmish, emphasised by the passions of a particular fan community. Cubbison concludes her exploration by stating that when "the audience finds that the new instalments do not cohere with the existing text, then author and audience may come into open conflict over their shared guardianship of the text" (2012, p.148). Whilst true, one must also bear in mind that the audience will likely conflict with itself, between different subgroups of fandom and with different tastes. As with the previously discussed 'bastards' comment, there must be an awareness of the divisions within fandom, and

that Davies is as likely referring to a specific subset of fans. <u>Torchwood</u> is not <u>Doctor Who</u>, and whilst it is related, it is a programme that is more directly controlled by Davies, which perhaps can account for his increased hostility towards its fandom, although this would require further exploration.

The fan-producers proclaim to love <u>Doctor Who</u>, and have certain engagements with it as fans, which inform how they perceive the object and its quality. Pierre Bourdieu argues that in examining any art:

> [analysis] has to take into account everything which helps to constitute the work as such, not least the discourses of direct or disguised celebration which are among the social conditions of production of the work of art *qua* object of belief. (1993, p.35).

Whilst we must not lose sight of the pressures of the production industries, as previous chapters have argued, we also cannot ignore that the opinions and vision employed in the relaunch of <u>Doctor Who</u> by the fan-producers, is one that comes with a history that stems from their own fan experience. The fields of cultural production are not closed systems, as I have shown, and numerous forces can apply pressure from within and without. The fan-producers may shift more towards a professional position in attacking fandom, but it is not totalising, and aggression towards specific groups and attitudes within fandom is actually an inherent part of internal fan discourse. Hills summarises that "fandom is sometimes shared by official producers, sometimes targeted, and sometimes opposed", but I would suggest, in terms of their identities, or perhaps their brand, that fandom is *always* shared by <u>Doctor Who</u>'s official producers (2010, p.78). The conflicts between fans and producers occur but it is problematic to suggest at any point that conflict momentarily 'removes' their history, knowledge and passion as a fan because, as Hills illustrates, it risks returning to notions of oppositional struggles between dominant industries and fan resistance. Instead, the hierarchy of both fandom and official production must be considered.

The fan-producers, as we have seen, have extensive television industry experience. Miles Booy highlights how in the early nineties, when many fan-producers were beginning to write for the licensed novels, Russell T. Davies and Moffat were already applying their skills to the television industry, notably through the children's department of the BBC. <u>Dark Season</u>, Davies's children's science fiction series draws on many thematic elements and, Booy suggests, the "style of storytelling" of <u>Doctor Who</u>. Indeed, the episode 'School Reunion', whilst not written by Davies personally, echoes a lot of the plot elements and imagery found in the first storyline

of Dark Season, primarily a malevolent force utilising school computers to control children (2012, p.143). Hills identifies several recurring themes of Davies's, some of which can be found in Dark Season, notably what the scholar refers to as "*persona ex machine*" conclusions, where ordinary people resolve the threat through the use of ordinary technology (2010, p.39). Steven Moffat, the second showrunner for the revived series, also started out with the previously mentioned children's drama Press Gang, which Booy suggests "was the first show to arrive with a British fan's sensibility to formal possibilities" (2012, p.145). It is interesting to note that upcoming showrunner, Chris Chibnall, despite receiving mixed receptions upon taking on the role, arguably has greater showrunner experience, and experience in writing for genre television, than either Davies or Moffat did before Doctor Who. As I have identified in my discussions on branding and the showrunner figure in previous chapters, industry prestige is vital in forming both an authorial voice and garnering critical attention. Thus Davies and Moffat both have strong cultural and economic capital, from which they both continue to derive and expand their industry statuses. Whilst the wider media industries may not be interested so much in the fan cultural capital they have, both Hills's and Booy's work suggests that they are drawing on these experiences and narrative sensibilities in creating their own original dramas. Discussing approaches to fandom, Milly Williamson argues that "one approach sees resistance everywhere and can end up celebrating consumer capitalism... the other refuses to recognise resistance where it actually exists" (2005, p.113). The fan-producers constitute another similar dilemma, whereby they clearly represent a blurring of lines between fan and producer positions, but these discourses risk over-stating the extent to which this occurs. The fans may be running the asylum, but they have had to earn the relevant economic and cultural capital in order to take up these positions and operate in the industry. In examining the fan-producers it is therefore important not to overlook the different industrial contexts or their official positions within the fields of production, but equally the fan behaviours and discourses that may influence these must also be addressed if we are to avoid binary and oppositional readings of fan and producer interactions.

Fandom and Web 2.0.
The contemporary fan-producers are those who are encouraging historically visible modes of interactivity and, in the case of Doctor Who, are specifically individuals who have originated from a fan culture itself. Fan studies, even when looking at the increase in *participatory cultures* and the concept of *Web 2.0*, has tended to examine the fans themselves, and in particular their reactions and responses to the

fan-producers. This section will consider the recent evolutions in fan and producer interactions and the theoretical approaches used in understanding them. It will address the concept of *Web 2.0*, offering a critique of the rhetoric that surrounds it and exploring the recurring problematic celebration of fandom through writers such as Henry Jenkins. It will also highlight the useful aspect of participatory cultures, and how these ideas are helpful in positioning and understanding the fan-producers and their role as potential emissaries from fandom within the world of official production.

The concept of *Web 2.0*, originating from a conference talk by the head of the O'Reilly Media Group, sees "a reorganisation of the relationships between producers and their audiences in a maturing Internet market, as well as a set of approaches adopted by companies seeking to harness mass creativity, collectivity and peer production" (Jenkins, Ford and Green, 2013, p.49). Essentially, Web 2.0 posits a next stage of evolution for online media, shifting from a previous model of consumption towards a greater sense of interaction, and participation where content is generated on a more grass-roots level, through sites such as Youtube. Youtube is a strong example whereby a large business-led site is supposedly dependant on user-generated material, although there is again a considerable gap between the rhetoric of collaboration and the reality of how individuals utilise and share certain forms of media, including copyrighted music (Jenkins, Ford and Green, 2013, p.49). This ties into Jenkins's overall assertion in regards to our current convergence culture, which is that participation is now a normalised feature of how the media operates and thus "current debates center around the terms of our participation" (2006, p.257). As Leora Hadas and Limor Shifman highlight, Jenkins's ideas of participatory culture are based on the notion that the "dichotomy of powerful producers and powerless consumers is swiftly losing its relevance as audiences gain resources, technical expertise, and the ability to make themselves heard not only by media companies but also, and just as importantly, by each other" (2012, p.4). Paul Booth's work on digital fandom serves to further illustrate this point by examining the ways that fandom is able to come together and form networks of information. Booth is critical of the notion of Web 2.0 and argues that it ignores "a history of user-made websites, many of them fan-based" and that whilst the tools may have changed, fans continue to conduct themselves in similar ways (2010, pp.87-88). The change in tools, however, allows for fans to engage with narratives in a far wider, more collaborative manner, notably in the case of Wiki's. Booth suggests that "by forging digital links within the narrative chain of the cult serial, fan wiki writers turn a linear story into a multi-accessed archive of narrative material"

(2010, p.88). This is, he argues, a redefining of narrative boundaries as fans "create and re-create the serial cult narrative in a new form" (2010, p.89). This is, then, in some ways, world-building not for profit, and there are perhaps links to be drawn with the fictional narrative worlds of <u>Doctor Who</u> created by the fan-producers of the licensed novels during the nineties. Booth concludes by arguing that technology is developing faster than academic scholarship can theorise it, and that fan communities are heavily engaged with these new media technologies (2010, pp.191-192). Participatory cultures are changing the way fans engage with media productions, and allowing more integrated and complex activities, but this does not necessarily equate to a greater degree of resistance to commercial culture. Milly Williamson has criticised Jenkins's later works for maintaining the same ideology of fan resistance, and whilst participatory cultures may appear to challenge this by suggesting new ways of interacting, ultimately this stems from the same basic assumption. Williamson's statement that Jenkins's "characterisation of fandom-as-resistance has not significantly altered" is still just as appropriate now as it was then, as participatory culture only serves to suggest a victory for fan resistance in its increased ability to participate with industry producers (2005, p.98). Participatory cultures are useful in describing the changing shift in fan activity and relationships with producers, but they do not challenge nor seek to question the celebratory attitude to fans themselves, who often maintain an active, progressive position in contrast to the co-options of the media industry. This theoretical approach, then, places the emphasis entirely on the fan as active and repeats the more celebratory ideology of Jenkins's earlier work, whilst largely ignoring the impact and influence of fans that have 'made it' in terms of official production. Charting the movement and identities of the fan-producers from their position as fans is less common, and this in turn creates a lack of context. It is also important to bear in mind that this is not inherently in opposition to a fan position, and criticism of aspects of fandom can equally come from different subcultures of fans as it can from the fans-turned-producers. It is not surprising then that the term 'fan-producers' has gained a lot of ground in recent years, and Matt Hills uses it frequently in discussing many members of the <u>Doctor Who</u> production team since the series' resurrection. He suggests that fan studies "has moved away from fan/producer binaries, beginning to focus instead on fans' 'career paths'", that is to say, on the trajectory from fan to fan-producer (Hills, 2010, pp.56-58). This correlates with Mark J. P. Wolf's notion of "circles of authorship", which theoretically sees fans moving through different positions, from a fan to producer to maybe even the role of "torchbearer", who officially continues a fictional world (2012, p.268-280). This journey from fan to

producer involves a shift in power for the individuals, and in many ways an adaptation of their fan capital into the economic and cultural capital of official production.

The majority of <u>Doctor Who</u>'s fan-producers emerged from within the series' fandom, and as such have a unique insight into the activity and mindset of the series' devoted followers. Their history and identity as fans is important to understand, because it allows us to contextualise decisions made, statements said and relationships forged in terms of not just a producer and audience dynamic, but also both a fan-producer and audience dynamic and a fan engaging with other fans dynamic. These two are similar but not the same, as the former emphasises their producer role, whilst the latter asks us to consider how their fan identity may take precedence in their decision making. It is therefore important to establish some of the key fan activities that inform the fan-producers' own actions. The three central points I will highlight are that i) fandom is inherently fractured and rife with infighting, ii) <u>Doctor Who</u> fans retroactively create historical narratives, often based in nostalgia, and iii) there is a history of <u>Doctor Who</u> as authored text, but one that contrasts with the contemporary fan-producers. These three ideas will not only form an overview of <u>Doctor Who</u> fan narratives and activity, which will be compared and contrasted with how the fan-producers both present themselves, and are perceived, but will also construct a narrative of fans' own self-authorship of the text as they seek to claim authority over the series, especially following its cessation of production at the end of the eighties. The history of the fan sense of ownership of <u>Doctor Who</u> goes hand in hand with the development of the fan-producers, and both must be examined in the contexts of the other. They also provide a necessary context to the decisions and perceptions of the fan-producers in both their approaches to writing and constructing the series, and their engagements with fandom and fan culture. I will begin, then, with a look at the fractured, often antagonistic nature of fandom, as it has developed over the series' lifetime.

Post-Object and Fractured Fandom.
What makes <u>Doctor Who</u> such an exceptional case study is arguably its longevity. When the series ended in 1989, rather than quietly fade from view, the franchise instead jumped media and continued to live on in the newly licensed Virgin books. Rebecca Williams has explored what she terms as "post-object fandom" which comes about "when a fan object moves from being on-going to dormant, yielding no new instalments" (2015, p.2). She argues that although DVD s and repeats offer an

opportunity to revisit the programme, the period of 'post-object fandom' sees "fan practices and interactions inevitably change" (2011, p.269). The concept usefully avoids suggesting the fandom is 'over' but allows us "to consider the differences in fan practices and response between periods when objects are ongoing and dormant" (2011, p.269). As we have seen, Doctor Who fandom shifted media, and although the novels had a far smaller audience than the television series, it was a constant and dedicated one. Williams notes that fan discourses regarded the novels very much in this way, and she discusses the way in which novels and fiction can be used to continue a series after its televisual form has expired (2015, p.183). She notes "that for some fans, post-object fandom means engaging with the resurrections and continuations of a beloved programme in whatever media form it is presented" (2015, p.183). Further to this, Williams notes the popularity of fanfiction as a means of continuation, and I would argue the licensed 'New Adventures' novels essentially merge the two approaches (2015, pp.186-188). These were a form of authorised fan-fiction, as discussed previously, which kept the series narrative active, and saw the emergence of many prominent future television fan-producers. Williams identifies how fans are aware of changes in the television and media landscape and that they believe that "a revived series needs to move with the time and adapt to the contemporary era in which it is being made" (2015, p.182). The new series of Doctor Who has succeeded in this, and arguably this is due to the fan-driven official continuations during the 'post-object' period.

One of the defining features of fandom, and Doctor Who fandom in particular, is its diversity and ability to divide itself strongly into differing areas of interest, methods of participation and, most importantly, judgements of taste. That is to say, fans will separate into even smaller subcultures focused around particular aspects of their object of fandom, and it is the individual tastes of fans that often serve to inform their own particular engagement with fandom. These engagements can be widely varied, and may not even involve connections to other areas of fandom. Brigid Cherry has examined the Doctor Who fan knitting community, a relatively overlooked area of fan production, and found groups involved are "more likely to include casual viewers who do not otherwise participate in organized fandom or online Doctor Who fan communities" (2013, p.107). She notes this provides a space that "does not exclude casual viewers or intensely emotional female fans" who are, she goes on to suggest, looked down on by "male-dominated masculine fandom groups" (Cherry, 2013, p.108). Cherry's study highlights a previously undiscussed section of fandom that is not only separated from other fan communities, but may actively avoid them,

or at least seek refuge from the criticisms of other fans. Studies of other areas of fandom have found equally isolated[57] pockets of fan activity, and productivity, often focused around a specific means of participation; fan vidding (Freund, 2013), fan fiction (Bacon-Smith, 1992), tweeting (Rebecca Williams, 2013), crossover gif production (Perez, 2013) and so forth.

Equally, fans who do frequent the same social circles, and online communities, can still find themselves competing against other fans in regards to their preferred textual reading or attitudes towards the object of their fandom. Mark Jancovich has suggested that some fans can save their most direct and violent attacks for their own peers, directing them at "the tastes of other fans – fans who are dismissed as inauthentic" (2002, p.312). This can take the form of competing shippers, where two groups each favour different character pairings, whether canon or otherwise, and can become hostile towards fans of a rival pairing such as, for example with Buffy/Angel and Buffy/Spike shippers in the <u>Buffy the Vampire Slayer</u> fandom (Williams, 2004). Fan divisions can also form along the lines of those who seek out spoilers (which can be linked to problematic terms such as 'spoiler whore') and those who wish to remain unspoiled, with the latter often having less immediate knowledge about the show and thus "less subcultural and fan social capital... and therefore are less able to occupy dominant positions within the fan culture" (Williams, 2004).

Fandom, then, is divisive and fractured. Not only is a 'single fandom' subdivided into different areas of interest, levels of power and focuses of interest, but these separate groups may also come into conflict with each other, or never even encounter each other at all. As these groups, and the individuals within them, can have different kinds of capital and authority, and make differing judgements in regards to other fan groups, it becomes increasingly difficult to limit any definition of a fan. The fan-producers have held different and changing positions within the hierarchy of fandom, and arguably their final movement into authority over the television text does not suggest a removal or distance from fandom, but a further evolution in the possible positions that fans are able to fulfil. However, as we have already discussed, this can only come about with the accrual of capital associated with legitimated culture, in this instance, an already existing media career. That many fan-producers began their writing careers within licensed novels is arguably attributable to <u>Doctor Who</u> never truly becoming a purely 'post-object fandom' but

---

[57]   This is, of course, a generalisation and there can be crossover between communities.

rather shifting to a transmedia model, where fan culture focused on continuing adventures in new media, primarily those of on-going novels and, later, full-cast audio plays.

Fan Narratives.

Whilst also existing between different eras of 'classic <u>Who</u>', to use a common fan terminology, a sense of distinction is most prominent, likely due to the increased agency of the latter's contemporaneity, between 'classic <u>Who</u>' and 'NuWho' and between the two eras of 'NuWho', that is, those overseen by Davies and then Moffat. Thus 'classic <u>Who</u>' is invariably grouped together despite its radical changes in style, tone and focus across its more than twenty-six years. Hills suggests one reason to see 'classic Who' and 'NuWho' as separate is due to how they "were produced in radically different industrial and cultural contexts" (2010, p.4). Whilst separate eras are frequently evoked by fans, they are often still considered to have a fundamental '<u>Who</u>-ness' which the revived series, so its critics claim, lacks. In examining the series, Paul Booth argues that <u>Doctor Who</u> must be seen as both "a continuous programme fragmented into parts" and, concurrently, "as a series of fragments cohered to a whole" (2014, p.197). Booth suggests that the divisions between different segments of the programme's history leads to "placing artificial value on particular periods of the text" and thus "becomes less a debate about canon than it does a debate about the relative weight given to any particular piece of canon" (2014, p.196). Fan discourse can debate the relative merits and quality of these different periods of the show, and individual preferences and tastes in regards to <u>Doctor Who</u>'s past will often influence a fan's judgements of new material. Quality is often connected with fan discourse, canon and authenticity; separate ideas that can become entwined when fans are discussing what makes good <u>Doctor Who</u>. Hills points out that whilst different media, eras and stories are debated, "for many fans the 'telly' question tends to play like a trump card, defining *Who*ness beyond all other murky areas of dispute" (2007, p.284). Chapman highlights that some critics "deride the 'soap opera' element of Davies-era *Who*" (2013, p.200) whilst Hills has briefly looked at how critics and fans can attempt to establish parameters for 'authentic' <u>Doctor Who</u> based on their own idealisation of the show's past (2010, p.5). Changing the perceived past stability, itself a falsehood, of the show's identity, such as by making it into a 'soap opera' is heavily resisted by sections of fandom, as it interferes with the constructed narrative of what <u>Doctor Who</u> is, and should be, like.

Elsewhere Hills has argued that the Big Finish audio plays perform a role of televisuality without television, created by fan-producers to act as a kind of "'textual conservationism'.... 'authentic', 'traditional' and 'televisual' (that is, tele-centric) Doctor Who is realised entirely without the technology of television" (2007, p.281). The original releases of these CD audio plays included mock Radio Times listings and reconstructed the episodic nature of the television series, even including a fake announcer before the start of each play; "And now a new four-part adventure starring Peter Davison in *Doctor Who*". Hills describes this as "a matter of fan nostalgia... the desire to re-experience 'classic' *Doctor Who* as it was as an ongoing TV programme" (2007, p.283). This might further explain the seeming lack of disconnect between the 'classic series' and its spin-off media, despite their more contemporary approaches to production, storytelling and characterisation. The Big Finish audios, especially, continue the sense of authenticity and televisuality that serve as identifiers for fans, who read these texts as familiar, and thus part of the ongoing narrative of Doctor Who. From a contemporary fan perspective; one individual, using the user-name Kinggodzillak on Gallifrey Base, when faced with the idea that audio company Big Finish might make stories based on the new series, was particularly vocal in his reaction; "Hope not. Old *Who* is good, Big Finish is good...New *Who* is dreadful. I know, I know, that's only my opinion, but I came to Big Finish to *escape* the new show…" The new show does not continue the fan's constructed narrative of the classic series, and thus is perceived as inauthentic, and the fan is unable to gain pleasure from it, whilst Big Finish is recognisable and thus its Whoness is more assured. For many then, there is something that classic Who has that the new series lacks, although fans cannot necessarily agree what exactly this is.

Hills refers to criticism of the new series from both Kim Newman and fan-author Laurence Miles, who argue it is neither gothic enough, nor subversive enough. Neither argument really comes close to describing Doctor Who in all its forms, which were constantly shifting, and yet the binary is created between the 'classic' series that did this right, and the new series that lacks a certain essence of Doctor Who (Hills, 2010, pp.6-7). It is hard not to be reminded of Bourdieu's description of an "indefinable essence" when first discussing judgements of taste, and indeed the phrase 'indefinable magic' has long been used by Who's fans to try and summarise its apparent inherent quality (1979, p.11). The conflict between 'classic' Who and the new series is ill-defined but centred around a perception of inherent quality across all of the classic series (whilst paradoxically also admitting that some segments of it

are better than others) that is juxtaposed against the shallow, mainstream frivolity of the reboot. The rejection of the new series by some in fandom is often based on the idea that it is somehow dumbed-down, lacking in genuine meaning and impact as Laurence Miles suggested, and that this is counter to the 'classic' series that had depth beyond any lack of flashy special effects. Bourdieu suggests that a rejection of shallow and undemanding cultural objects "leads to the refusal of what is facile in the ethical or aesthetic sense, of everything which offers pleasures that are too immediately accessible and so discredited as 'childish' or 'primitive' (as opposed to the deferred pleasures of legitimate art)" (1979, p.486). Indeed, Bourdieu's list of descriptors associated with 'vulgar' works almost reads like a shorthand account of fan criticism of Davies-rebooted <u>Doctor Who</u> (1979, p.486). New <u>Who</u> is too fast, working at a much greater speed than the classic series, leading fan-author Robert Franks to note that "everything moves so quickly that hopefully the audience won't notice that the other two and a half episodes are missing" (quoted in O'Day, 2013, pp.117-118). For many 'classic' fans this is a problem; the new series does not have 'room to breathe', and some fan reviewers have also accused Davies's writing of being lazy and "not particularly concerned with complex plotting" (Cooper, 2011, p.215). Whilst it is a generalisation to divide fandom between old and new fans, this is certainly a distinction that is worth considering. The fan narrative we have been discussing comes predominantly from an older fan perspective as newer fans would have far less awareness of this history initially, and thus an inclination to perhaps try and retroactively understand the classic series in light of their perception of the new. Bourdieu again provides a somewhat familiar description, suggesting how "the positions whose numerical decline expresses their economic decline are occupied by individuals whose objective properties, practices and opinions can be seen as linked to a past age" and that they often demonstrate "their repressive inclinations, particularity visible in their reactions to every sign of departure from the old order, not least, of course, the behaviour of young people" (Bourdieu, 1979, p.346). Whilst many older fans embrace the new series, those fans who reject the reboot, and cling on to the nostalgia-driven past narratives, often citing their superior quality and status as more worthy, are a dwindling, and increasingly irrelevant group, and also prone to disparaging, often gendered, criticisms of new, younger fans. Their cultural capital, and separation from the series' new, ongoing narrative, places them on the periphery of fan discourse in certain communities, although they may continue to thrive in a sub-sub-culture of Big Finish <u>Doctor Who</u> fandom.

In discussing Doctor Who in terms of inherent but undefined quality, fans lay bare the judgements being made, whereby the ultimate judgement of quality and worth is whether the undefinable 'magic' can be found or not, which in itself is dependent on the tastes and perceptions of the individual fan. Despite the leap from the first serial 'An Unearthly Child' in 1963 to the final regular series storyline 'Survival' in 1989, there is little question of their authenticity or connected nature in the eyes of the majority of fans. However, this is, of course, a constructed history, retroactively created by fan perception and reinforced through official guides, magazines and fan lore. Alan McKee has discussed the value judgements inherent within fandom, and has explored how judgements of value made towards certain stories and periods of Doctor Who by the early gatekeepers of fandom became engrained, and learned by rote by the later generations (2001, p.15-16). McKee argues that whilst a consensus about what is 'good' and 'bad' Doctor Who does exist, it is "an unstable and a changing thing" (2001, p.17) and that fan rhetoric also emphasises the importance of nostalgia, suggesting most fans' preference for the Doctor they watched as a child (2001, p.33). However unstable, though, there are certain fan consensuses and in conducting polls and surveys, if specific stories "didn't appear high up in the final results, then a fan's first instinct might be to question the methodology of the survey" (Parkin, 2007, p.246). These are stable aspects of the fan narrative of how Doctor Who was watched, and how fans continued to perceive it, that judgements of value could be influenced by your age, the consensus of value could alter, but that it is all ultimately part of the same, far-reaching series and thus must be judged as a singular text.

Ross P. Garner has examined the nostalgic return of the character of Sarah Jane (Elizabeth Sladen) to the new series of Doctor Who, suggesting it could potentially be criticised with "the character's return being taken to represent the postmodern inability to conceive of new narratives articulated with contemporary experience, or as the failure of producers to create characters responding to the postmodern world". However, Garner argues, this dismissal fails to account for "intertextuality, cognition, and affect" and he argues that the return of the past can create pleasures that "stem from recognising that one belongs to an imagined community of knowledgeable fans" (2013, p.199). Her return tied into fan and cultural discourses of quality, as she was the companion at one of the show's high points of popularity, alongside Tom Baker's Fourth Doctor. Garner highlights that fans referred to her as the "Officially Best Companion Ever" and the wider press echoed this, "suggesting that the character has become part of generational and/or televisual popular

memory" (2013, p.193). Some fan nostalgia then, does crossover into the mainstream, likely when tied to eras that are more memorable within popular culture, although this does not make it any less a constructed narrative. Sarah Jane may be, by a majority consensus, the best Companion, but this is still contested and not universal. Her return, however, is arguably based in the nostalgia the fan-producers shared for her era and her status as the best. Thus fan-received wisdom, popular cultural memory and the fan-producers are all complicit in allowing the initial return of Sarah Jane to the series, reintroduced for a new generation of fans.

The temporal consistency of an ongoing show at the very least draws a line through several decades that is called into question by the sixteen-year gap, television movie aside, before the launch of the new series episode 'Rose'. This divide is all the more ambiguous when considering the final episode of the classic series, 'Survival' – in this narrative the Doctor (Sylvester McCoy) brings his companion Ace (Sophie Aldred) back to her home in Perivale, London. Ace encounters her old friends, in and around the suburbs of London and notably on a housing estate that is not entirely dissimilar to Rose Tyler's home on the Powell Estate. The narrative focuses on Ace's own emotional journey and history of her turbulent relationship with her unseen (other than as a baby in the previous serial) mother. With its focus on emotional realism and action based around the idea of the alien encountering the mundane world of Council Estates, 'Survival' has more thematic connections to the revived series than the twenty-six years of narratives that preceded it. Despite these strong narrative connections, and thematic precedence, the nostalgic construction of the past, as has been discussed, creates a lasting impression of a clear distinction between 'old' and 'new' Who. This is not to say there is no change, as the new series, especially at its inception, utilises discourses of 'quality' television in order to remove itself from the negative popular culture memory of the show as cheap, camp and dated, and thus inherently distances itself from the classic era (Hills, 2010, pp.150-152). Yet, Hills also acknowledges that it could be argued that the new series "is a continuation of the same series that ran from 1963 to 1989, not just in name, but also in terms of diegesis" (2010, p.4). The important considerations are that strong links can be drawn between 'classic' and new Doctor Who, despite the apparent divides between the two, and that the 'classic' series is only unified as a singular, consistent programme through artificial historical narratives, often constructed from within fandom.

It should also be noted that whilst the show did take sixteen years to revive as a regular series, these 'wilderness years', to use the fan expression, were not devoid of content that equally works to progress from the events of 'Survival.' The 'New Adventure' line of original novels was a key feature in the development of Doctor Who, and they are addressed further on in this chapter. There were also various spin-off productions produced, most notably the Big Finish audio plays, as previously mentioned, that reunited many of the original cast members of the series. Whilst catering to a minority audience, for those that did purchase and follow these ranges, these plays were generally perceived as following on from the television series. Despite any stylistic changes, and a shift in format, the audio Doctor Who of Big Finish still carried a sense of authenticity for many fans. James Chapman suggests the importance of these texts is not whether fans considered them 'canon' or not but that they kept the 'brand' alive in the imagination of its fans (2013, p.186). This 'brand' however, is intrinsically linked to the 'classic' series, and thus forms part of an on-going fan narrative and perception of what Doctor Who should be.

There is then, perhaps, an inherent contradiction in the relationship of classic Doctor Who and the spin-offs, in that they are at once distinct from each other, and yet also the same. Despite their differences, there is very little questioning of their allegiance to the 'classic' format, whereas New Who, despite sharing a televisual format, is judged as more distinct. As we have seen, Hills describes Big Finish's output as having a "televisuality without television", an apt description that again positions them as an explicit continuation within the 'classic' brand. The spin-off material, then, forms a sort of coda to the existing fan narrative that had been constructed. Twenty-six years of television Doctor Who is followed by various spin-off material that evokes those twenty-six years, before the new series creates a clear, distinct reboot of this narrative, and of the 'brand'. The divisions perceived between old and new by certain subcultures within fandom, then, are not influenced by narrative or style necessarily, but perhaps more by the overall leap in production, the way the series is produced and even the audience being addressed. The division between 'classic' and 'new Who', as discussed by fans, is based around a constructed, nostalgic narrative of the past. Whilst changes in the 'brand' of the series have occurred with the advent of the new series, the relationship and influence of the classic series to both the reboot and to the fan-producers, whose fan identities are tied to this history of nostalgia, cannot be overlooked. Fan-constructed narratives, whether accepted or ignored, play a key role in both how the fan-producers position

themselves, and how they revisit the past in newer episodes, as will be discussed in more detail further on.

Fan Perceptions of Authorship.

I will now move on to address the fan approach to authorship, and how the classic series has often been understood in relation to key figures of its production throughout its history. As Matt Hills identifies, the revived show is more distinctly authored than previously, albeit in a problematic way. The rhetoric surrounding the show is both multi-authored, something connected more strongly with the classic series, but there is also a central author figure in Russell T. Davies, later to be replaced by Steven Moffat, who in turn will soon be replaced by Chris Chibnall. Whilst notable figures, both producers and script writers, can be found in the classic series, they arguably lack the same author-function of Davies or Moffat. James Chapman argues that the resurrected show seeks to emulate American 'quality television' through the appointment of Davies as showrunner, and illustrates how Davies himself has stated he used <u>Buffy the Vampire Slayer</u> as a key influence (2013, p.190). Hills suggests that Davies's authorship is best understood as a (de)materialising auteur – present and absent, simultaneously displaced in favour of other production team members, and solidified via specific, queered meanings and readings' (2010, p.26). Hills's argument is that Davies's authorship is materialised in the text through identifiable trademarks and themes that occur throughout the series, and in his other work (2010, p.34). What is of more importance here, however, is to consider why Davies works to dematerialise his authorship to begin with, and what discourses are used to do this.

<u>Doctor Who</u>'s lack of a singular creator has been discussed in previous chapters, as have fan approaches to authorship, but it is worth re-emphasising certain points. Firstly, the series has transformed under the management of numerous teams of producers and script-editors, and secondly, fan discourses create specific 'eras' of the show, depending on the combination of those individuals occupying these two positions. This is not strictly based on producer, as John Nathan-Turner produced the show throughout the eighties, and whilst his era does have strong connections, there are also distinct differences dependant on the script editor working alongside him at the time. Dave Rolinson argues that, in the early days of fandom, "fan writers sought out contributors whose work was distinctive, within a production format which appeared to stifle individual creativity" (2007, p.177). They often elevated these contributors to the series, and constructed a history of a multi-authored series that

saw the different contributors as equally vital to the show's successful continuation. Davies picks up on this history, suggesting that the early seasons of the revival should "be known forever as the Phil Collinson Years", a turn of phrase that also echoes fan discourse and the titles of video release compilations on the series, which included 'The Tom Baker Years' or 'The Pertwee Years' (quoted in Hills, 2010, p.28). The multi-authored nature of Doctor Who has carried through into the Moffat era and Will Brooker has discussed how notable guest writer Neil Gaiman has also brought with him a history of authorial style. Brooker looks at two separate interviews and suggests that "the voices of Who showrunner and guest author overlap with and echo each other", arguing that the myth of Doctor Who as a text supersedes the individual writers (2013, p.87). As Hills notes, "multi-authorship discourses derived from fandom are thus woven into the new media strategies of new *Who*" (2010, p.29). Further to this he states that the series "carries a fan-cultural, egalitarian approach to authorship back into its official discourses", refusing to limit authorship to a singular vision, although the media industries themselves resist this in asserting Davies's authorship over the text (Hills, 2010, p.30). Thus it is the format of a 'showrunner' at the head of the production team that first provides a clear distinction in the way new Doctor Who is perceived. Yet, at the same time, this is diffused and resisted by the showrunner, Davies himself, in an attempt to echo and continue long-standing fan narratives that see the show as defined by its producers, but with an overall diffused sense of authorship. Davies's, and others', fan stances clash with both mass media and his own authorial voice, but neatly illustrate the inherent contradictions that are bound up in the figure of the fan-producer.

It is the fact that both showrunners, and many others on the production, are fans of Doctor Who that provides an influential narrative shift in the ethos and presentation of the show and its central characters. Bourdieu argues that "a field is a dynamic concept in that a change in agents' positions necessarily entails a change in the field's structure" (Johnson, 1993, p.6). The fan-producers have shifted the fan perspective of Doctor Who from one of unofficial practices to official production, and even ideas and concepts that may have been considered non-canon or debatable canon through their inclusion in spin-off media are now reconfigured as inherently more worthy ideas, more likely to be canon. The power relations between fans and the producers are inherently changed, especially in regards to fan culture and subcultural capital within it. It is possible, that whilst the fan-producers clearly have greater authority within official culture, within the subculture of fandom, official

production may in fact be seen as less authentic. Unlike the original series producers, the fan identity may in fact lead to a rejection of the new series by some fans, and spark further debate within fandom as to the effectiveness of having fans in charge of the show. The fan identity of the show's producers also informs the types of relationship that fans will have with the text, and with the producers.

I will argue then that the shape of Doctor Who, as both a television series and a wider franchise was irrevocably altered by the changing positions of fans from predominantly consumerist positions, to taking up the position as the central authority over the text itself. I would suggest that the distinctions between 'classic Who' and 'NuWho' are as much a result of this shift in positions as it is due to any temporal divides. The fan voice is prevalent throughout the new series, both in obvious ways through the deification of the Doctor as a character, through less obvious choices such as a mix of textual styles and decentralised authorship, but perhaps most of all, through a vision of the show that stems from a fan perspective of successes and failures of various spin-offs and reboot attempts within the wilderness years off the air. The next section, then, will deal directly with the fan-producers, looking at the contemporary media landscape, and examining how they reached this point through a case study analysis of nineties Doctor Who narratives.

Fan-producers and Super-Fans.
I have previously made mention of 'received wisdom' and super-fans and it is at this point that I feel it is important to discuss the emergence of these notions into Doctor Who fandom, as they are vital in appreciating the fan culture as it entered the nineties and faced a future with no new series. Jancovich and Hunt identify how cult fandom is "ridden with factional animosity" and how there are constant attempts "to protect internal purity by identifying inauthentic outsiders" as well as other inauthentic fans (2004, p.28). They argue this creates a "policing of the boundaries of the subculture", and I suggest that it is the older fans of Doctor Who, those with the longest experience, that often carried the authority, these are the super-fans of the series (2004, p.28). The super-fans became the gatekeepers of Doctor Who fandom, deeming what was considered good and bad, right or wrong, and making sure that newer and younger fans would follow the established 'received wisdom'. Repeat broadcasts were rare events in the eighties and commercial releases of episodes were only beginning to appear and older fans, who had been able to see older episodes when broadcast, had a greater hierarchical position within fandom. These fans often took on a role akin to 'insiders', discussed by Milly Williamson,

publishing fanzines, books or working on the official magazine and having the 'correct' knowledge and views on the series (2005, pp.130-135).

Ian Levine is perhaps the most infamous super-fan, and an examination of comments attributed to him reveal a number of key points about a particularly common attitude amongst some areas of fandom. Levine complained that producer Graham Williams "didn't care that a fact that had been established one year should be adhered to the following year… it is that sort of non-attention to the series that gives me no regard for Graham Williams at all" (quoted in Tulloch & Alvarado, 1995, pp.65-66). Tulloch writes that Nathan-Turner was "careful to consult the facts to make sure that he is not clashing with anything" and that Levine "helped out the *Doctor Who* office with continuity errors and continuity problems" (1995, p.150). In these cases Levine is positioning himself as an authority on the series, someone to whom even the producers would turn, and who had the right to judge the quality of a production based upon its relationship to the series continuity. Fiske suggests that "the accumulation of knowledge is fundamental to the accumulation of cultural capital" and that "collecting is also important in fan culture… fans with high economic capital will often use it, in a non-aesthetic parallel of the official culture capitalist, to accumulate unique and authentic objects" (1992, p.44). Levine, as a successful record producer, had sufficient influence to obtain this position, along with access to the BBC vaults, viewing older episodes, something extremely exclusive in the pre-video era, contributing to his wealth of knowledge. His economic capital thus added to his cultural capital and authority within Doctor Who fandom, based around his encyclopaedic knowledge, relationship to the production team, status of having been a fan since the programme's beginning and reinforced by a high-profile and expansive collection, including then-rare episodes. Levine is an uncommon example of someone able to wield cultural, subcultural and economic capital, but super-fans may simply obtain their status through their knowledge, age and ability to have their opinion heard, especially in a pre-internet age.

Even if less well-connected than Levine, "senior fans do have *discursive* power in establishing the 'informed' exegesis for their subculture of fans. Thus they establish and control an important reading formation" (Tulloch & Jenkins, 1995, p.150, emphasis in original). Tulloch and Jenkins cite fanzines as having "an important agenda-setting function" and, once again, this is representative of the way in which fan hierarchies are constructed, with published material giving writers and editors both a platform from which to express their views and an additional sense of

authority (1995, p.150). <u>Doctor Who</u> forum member 'Guy Leopold' describes what he believes to be the process whereby a particular story gained a bad reputation:

> By the late 70s when fandom became fully fledged, *The Gunfighters* was remembered as one of the less interesting serials and, to back up this idea that it wasn't much good, research showed that it had had the lowest viewing figures of any *Doctor Who* serial up to that point. So Jeremy Bentham who wrote a lot of articles for DWAS publications and the early *Doctor Who* Weeklies/Monthlies perpetuated this idea that *The Gunfighters* wasn't much good. Younger fans like myself, at the time, had never seen so much as a clip from the story, had no Target novelisation and nothing other than a few stills and the writings of people like Bentham to base our opinions on. So for many years I too believed *The Gunfighters* was naff even though I'd never seen it. Only in the '90s when the story re-surfaced on UKGold were mainstream fans able to reassess it. Obviously some still won't like it, but I think it's won over a lot of people.[58]

This is evidence of not only the way early <u>Doctor Who</u> fandom developed, but also how it has now evolved to recognise its own hierarchical structure, with the poster notably distinguishing between Bentham and 'mainstream' fans. Levine and Bentham were both 'insider' fans who were in a position to dictate to younger fans and, just as Williamson notes Anne Rice fandom divided into separate groups, <u>Doctor Who</u> fandom began to reject the 'received wisdom' of the super-fans, despite their position in fan hierarchy (2005, pp.134-135). By the nineties, <u>Doctor Who</u> fandom was being changed by these increasing divides in opinion and approach, which were aided by the availability of episodes on video and digital channels, allowing many to see them for the first time.

This is another example of the fractured nature of fandom, that can also be divided into 'supporters' and 'detractors' of certain super-fans; Ian Levine certainly remains a controversial figure within <u>Doctor Who</u> fan circles. Levine's controversial and often volatile relationship with members of various <u>Doctor Who</u> production teams, including the fan-producers, has made its way into the text of the series itself. It is the open secret of fandom that the Abzorbaloff character portrayed by Peter Kay was heavily influenced by Levine, and the episode the creature features in, 'Love & Monsters' is a deliberate address to the series' fandom. The narrative, written by Davies, had the working title of 'I Love the Doctor', and features a group of people who meet to discuss the Doctor, investigate him and find out who he is. The group become firm friends, and enjoy each other's company until Victor Kennedy (the Azorbaloff's human disguise) appears and transforms their work into a serious, re-organised group hunting the Doctor. This metaphor for the Super-Fan removing the

---

[58] http://www.gallifreyone.com/forum/showthread.php?t=89495&page=5&highlight=Gunfighters, accessed 3rd August 2008.

fun and energy from fandom, has been discussed by Matt Hills as actually representing a more general "bad, deviant fandom", and he suggests that it shows "fandom as powerless duality rather than powerless elite" (2010, p.216). The duality, which in reality is even more fractured than just a good/bad binary, is an important point to highlight, the comparison of the 'good' character of Elton as the normal fan in opposition to Super-Fan Victor Kennedy is also an important aspect of the narrative. As it is written by a fan-producer, who wants the viewer to side with Elton and 'good' fandom, it is inherently an attack on Super-Fans by the fans who have 'made it' in the industry. It is clear that Super-Fans are not necessarily the same as the fan-producers, and both groups may conflict with each other, as well as conflicting with other factions within fandom. Super-Fans such as Levine highlight the multiple paths fans can take, and whilst he held an 'unofficial' advisor role for some time in the eighties, including potentially co-authoring a script[59], the new series openly mocks this perceived brand of 'bad fandom', despite Levine's strong economic and subcultural capital. The 'Love & Monster' narrative highlights the problematic conflicts occurring between different fan positions within the field of cultural production, and certainly not just between those with and without high levels of capital.

The distinctions between the different roles of producers, fan-producers, fans, Super-Fans and even the more casual viewing audience is one that cannot then be easily discussed, and certainly not in terms of any binaries of the powerful and the powerless. Alan McKee makes the challenge clear when he asks "at what point do we draw the line, claim here is production, the industry, and here are fans, the powerless, those who may produce, but do not really produce?". He suggests we must "find other ways than such binaries by which to distinguish between cultural objects produced by different people", a point made all the more integral by the increasing visibility of fan-producers (2004, p.175). In regards to Web 2.0, it can be argued that what has been constructed is "a situation where digital populists applaud fans' web 2.0 creativity by marginalizing issues of skill, competence and (fan-)cultural distinction, whilst digital elitists seek to emphasize questions of skill and competence in order to bolster a reactionary re-installation of professional/amateur" (Hills, 2013, p.131). Hills warns against simply celebrating user productivity, and also utilised Paul Booth's work to emphasise the problems

---

[59]   The authorship of the story 'Attack of the Cybermen' is a matter of debate. It's credited to Paula Moore, the then-girlfriend of script editor Eric Saward. Fan lore, and interviews suggest the episode was co-authored by Saward and Levine although there has been some hostile debate over to what extent different parties contributed to the final work.

with the concept of Web 2.0 itself; that its suggestion of a move from 'static' to 'dynamic' does not "engage with how the web is actually used" and does not account for the history of fan creativity (2013, p.131). Thus the difficulty is in negotiating a fan experience that is fragmented between different distinctions and desires, different hierarchies of authorship and authority, and conceived of through problematic ideas of passive/active audiences. The fan-producer cannot sit outside of these debates, classified as the oppositional producer, but is inherently part of fan position-taking, fan judgements and hierarchies. That they also have institutional hierarchies to contend with only problematises their positions further.

As I have illustrated, the figure of the fan-producer, and specifically the fan-producer of <u>Doctor Who</u>, is inherently tied to the debates surrounding convergence, participatory cultures, fan expression and the ideology of Web 2.0. The fan-producer is now a pivotal figure and it is time to approach understanding her or him as a fan taking a position, to discuss their fan identity and fan trajectory into the world of production and then try and understand how the different forces of industry, and experiences of fandom can shape their own actions and opinions, and influence how they engage with fans from their new authoritative position.

Doctor Who Fandom: The New Adventures.

The fan-producers that are of primary interest to this study are specifically those producers of official <u>Doctor Who</u> narratives who have identified themselves historically as a fan, and who have a history of involvement in fandom. Official narratives do not just encompass the television show itself, but numerous spin-off materials including comics, films, games, most notably books and audio adventures. Indeed, many of the fan-producers that will be mentioned and discussed started out as authors for either one or both of the novel and audio ranges of <u>Doctor Who</u> merchandise, the vast majority of which were produced during the years the television show was no longer in production. I have discussed this briefly in Chapters Five and Six, but for the sake of clarity, I will briefly elaborate on how these ranges related to the series and the BBC as an organisation.

The first original, full-length novel range was published by Virgin Publishing and was entitled '*Doctor Who*: The New Adventures', referred to by fans and here as NAs, and were released bi-monthly for two years before switching to a regular monthly schedule. These stories were said to continue on from the end of the series, featuring regular characters The Seventh Doctor and Ace, although the blurb

claimed stories were "too broad and deep" for television, and the range would feature increasingly adult material including graphic sex, violence and language. This stemmed from both a desire by the range editor to create more challenging science fiction texts that would not be placed in the children's sections of book shops, and also because Doctor Who fandom was generally ageing, with a core audience of older readers and it needed to speak to this audience (Smith, 2007, p.273). Generally 25,000 copies of the NA books were printed, a fraction of the audience of mainstream television show, and yet their influence on fans and the future fan-producers would eventually be felt in the revival of the series (Smith, 2007, p.269). They were soon joined by a 'Missing Adventures' range (the MAs) which told stories with the previous six Doctors in much the same style and tone, although more likely to try and evoke a particular historical era of the show. This reiteration and attempt to echo the past also ties into my previous discussions of nostalgia in relation to Doctor Who and fandom. Within the first two years of the range, the NAs featured four books published by authors who had worked on the television show, albeit three who were involved at the time of its cancellation, and four books by three authors who would go on to write for the series once it returned to television[60]. These authors would later be joined by further names, notably an NA from Russell T. Davies that has a notably more adult tone than his television version but still showcases a number of his recurring thematic approaches.

The Virgin Publishing license came to an end when the Fox-co-produced TV Movie starring Paul McGann approached release, and the BBC decided to not renew the contract. Instead, they began publishing their own ranges of stories to the same pattern, albeit only distinguished by the fan labels: The 'Eighth Doctor Adventures' (EDAs) and the 'Past Doctor Adventures' (PDAs), the latter now encompassing the seventh Doctor as well.

It was around this period that the company Big Finish Productions, formed from many notable Doctor Who fans, approached the BBC about obtaining a license for original audio plays but were turned away. With the Doctor Who TV Movie failing to produce a series, however, Big Finish eventually obtained a license and in 1999 began production of monthly full-cast plays, many of which again saw familiar names as the authors. The book ranges eventually ended when the television series

---

[60]   Terrance Dicks, Marc Platt, Ben Aaronovitch and Andrew Cartmel had all worked on the television show before writing for the books. Paul Cornell, Gareth Roberts and Mark Gatiss would all go on to do so in the future.

returned, replaced with new tie-in fiction, whilst Davies has recently revealed that he took responsibility for the Big Finish licence to make sure the audio plays continued despite the shows relaunch[61]. In Davies's opinion, had the new series brand manager taken note of Big Finish, he would not have renewed their contract and it is interesting that as the audio plays continue they do not keep step with the overall branding of the new series. Indeed, as I have already discussed, they are often seen as more in line with the 'classic' era than the new series, although this is perhaps a point for future debate.

It is worth considering how and when these texts were being produced, and how they essentially existed as the contemporary expression of Doctor Who at a time when a new regular television series seemed an impossible dream to many fans. Whilst they were sold as an extension of the television series, Dale Smith has illustrated that their lineage can be more closely related to the later Target published novelisations of the television series, that had already begun to explore the characters, the worlds, and the emotional impact of the series in greater depth than what was seen on television at that time (2007, p.268). The relationship between Doctor Who as written text and the television series is an interesting one and Lance Parkin has highlighted where the supposedly non-canon text of the early novelisations has in fact fed back into the television series itself. He states that the first mention of the Sontarans as a race of clones comes from the Target version of the story and does not appear in the television series until years later, by which time it is also a part of established fan lore (2007, p.249). The influence of written Doctor Who on the series, then, has a visible history and thus, once the fans begin writing the official novels that aim to continue the series, it should come as little surprise when ideas and themes created in this period feed back into the resurrected television version.

The nineties were also a time when many fans had the opportunity to write officially licensed material for the very first time, arguably pushing them further along the trajectory that would lead many to eventually write for the television series itself upon its return. Dale Smith has examined how the NA novels were not only a gateway into writing Doctor Who but, for many young authors, one of the few available avenues into the world of publishing at all. He cites the NAs' original editor Peter Darvill-Evans as suggesting that he deliberately went after fan writers due to

---

[61] http://observationdeck.kinja.com/the-return-of-doctor-who-almost-killed-off-big-finishs-472233820, accessed January 16th 2014.

commercial imperatives. Fan writers would not only be eager, and know the source material, but many were not represented by agents and were essentially cheaper and easier to negotiate with. Of benefit for the fans, however, was the open submissions policy which at the time was a rare approach in the publishing industry. The NA novels, then, were an encouraged gateway from fan production into a form of official production that not only allowed fans to mingle with writers of the television series, several of whom contributed to the range early on, but to gain an official publication that led several to careers within the media industries (Smith, 2007, pp.271-272).

To give an idea of the extent of the fan-producer involvement, what follows is a list of names of writers who had previously worked in Doctor Who spin-off fiction before writing for the revived television series, or one of its spin-offs; Russell T. Davies, Mark Gatiss, Robert Shearman, Paul Cornell, Steven Moffat, Matthew Jones, Gareth Roberts, Joseph Lidster and Clayton Hickman. Most notable aside from these writers is David Tennant himself who, prior to taking the lead role, had worked in a number of Big Finish audio productions in a variety of roles, as well as providing a voice for the online animated story Doctor Who: The Scream of the Shalka. Peter Capaldi is now starring in the series as the Twelfth Doctor, taking over the role in the 2013 Christmas episode, and as well as appearing in the series previously, he is a noted lifelong fan of the series, who once even attempted to be made head of the official fan club by contacting the producers of the time[62]. This is only a fraction of the overall fan involvement, and consists of examples of the least ambiguous fan-producers. Whilst we can question, at times, the proclamation of fandom and wonder how much is purely an exercise in public relations, the histories of these individuals are ones that are a matter of public record, and illustrate a complete engagement with fan culture.

Paul Cornell as fan-producer.
Paul Cornell makes for a particularly interesting case study in tracing the development of his work from fan production to official production. Cornell's novel Timewyrm: Revelation was his first professionally published work and it marked the beginning of a successful career, with his books consistently being fan favourites; his development from fan to producer is, in part, the result of fan engagement and activity. McKee uses the fan debates surrounding canonicity to demonstrate the flaw

---

[62] http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2386587/Young-Peter-Capaldi-obsessed-Doctor-Who-badgered-staff-constantly.html, accessed 19th august 2013

in positioning fans as 'powerless' by highlighting the difficulty in defining what constitutes the official text, i.e. what counts as 'canon' (McKee, 2004, p.181). In doing this, he also highlights an important stage in the development of Doctor Who's fan-producers, the ability to write what was the only ongoing Doctor Who text during the nineties, albeit outside the context of television production.

Cornell's first novel was based on a previously existing fanfiction, entitled 'Total Eclipse', that was serialised in a fanzine called Queen Bat. The original fanfiction utilised a different Doctor (the Fifth, as portrayed by Peter Davison on television) and featured numerous differences in the plot and characters. However, it served as the basis for a novel that was considered both ground-breaking and innovative amongst fans, coming after three previous novels in the range that were far more traditional. Cornell claimed in a 1996 interview that it was his "version of mainstream fan fiction! The fan fiction of the time was very radical indeed, and, in context with that, *Revelation* would seem relatively tame" (Scoones, 1996).

Thus Cornell sees his fanfiction text re-purposed for mainstream publishing, made less radical but still different enough to arguably shape the direction of the NA series of novels from that point on. His fourth novel, Human Nature, featured the equally radical notion of The Doctor becoming human and falling in love and yet this was eventually adapted into two episodes of the new series (Cornell, 2007).[63] The radical fan text has, through a period of almost two decades, shifted to radical and bold episodes of the series itself, an example of the thematic and narrative shifts that are implicitly linked to the fan-producers' origins within fandom and their fan activity. Cornell moved from fan to producer, from writing 'unofficial' stories to 'official' ones with no clear-cut divide, and the shift between the positions was also tied into these ideas of canonicity. Not all fans consider the novels 'canon'; they question whether they are authentic texts because they are licensed by the BBC or are they disregarded as they are not broadcast television? The subsequent 'remaking' of texts, both Cornell's Human Nature novel and Robert Shearman's Big Finish audio play Jubilee, renders the point even more unclear. Even the medium is important within fandom; there appears to be a hierarchy of importance that is topped by the television series itself, and reveals a complex relationship with Doctor Who in all its iterations. A possible fan perspective could be that Cornell moved from the position

---

[63]   Cornell's first novel was Timewyrm: Revelations. The novel Human Nature was adapted by Cornell himself as Series 3 Episode 8, 'Human Nature' and Series 3 Episode 9, 'The Family of Blood'. Both novels were published by Virgin Publishing.

of fanfiction writer, to the writer of authorised but inauthentic texts to eventually writing authentic texts.

However, this would not address the impact of fan ideology and radical ideas that were brought with him and with the other fan-producers and incorporated into the television text. Hills identifies how certain tropes of Davies's own early television work can be found in his later Doctor Who novel, and then how these ideas in turn have been re-presented in the television series under his direction (2010, p.39). Moffat's early published short story is entitled 'Continuity Errors' and deals with the form of temporal twisting he would first utilise in his Comic Relief spoof 'The Curse of Fatal Death' and eventually in the series itself. Indeed, the narrative of 'Continuity Errors' would be re-purposed for Moffat's 2010 Doctor Who Christmas special, 'A Christmas Carol.' Both narratives see The Doctor travelling into an individual's past in order to change events so they become a kinder individual who is able to help, rather than oppose, the Doctor in the relative present. Whilst Hills is right to discuss the authorship of Davies, and implicitly Moffat later, as an important factor, the influence of their fandom on their writing is something neither has denied. Gatiss perhaps puts it best when describing his work as writing that was inspired by the texts he grew up with and loving, and he is explicit about the influence of Doctor Who on his career path, stating "Doctor Who has been the spine of my career. It got me interested in writing and acting. I filled copious exercise books with my own story lines and drawings, and would write the ending first because that was the exciting bit" (Albiston, 2007).

There have been a variety of examples presented here, from childhood writing, to fan fiction, fan publishing and licensed materials. At many points, texts, narratives or ideas that the writers had as fans, and utilised in fan-centred texts have been re-purposed into the narrative of the series itself, and in the eyes of many within fandom, thus been rendered 'true canon'. What I believe this to highlight is that when we talk about fan-producers, it is not even simply a case of a fan who has made a leap into a separate role of production, nor a producer who is just aware of fandom and many of its controversies and attitudes. The fan-producer is wholly influenced not only by fandom but his own personal history as a fan, by the trajectory of writing and creativity that has led to the production role, and his fan status is felt through textual influences and the impact on the television show's production itself. Whilst fans and fan-producers can clash (discussed previously), this conflict does not negate the fandom, fan origins and fan influence of the

producers. In the figure of the fan-producer, the reader and writer are intrinsically combined and this implicitly affects every aspect of the franchise's development in the current era.

Conclusion.

The fan-producers can be understood through several approaches, then. Firstly, and most visibly, they are individuals who were <u>Doctor Who</u> fans before eventually coming to produce and write for the series itself. The fan-producers have a shared history of fandom, and this fandom inherently influences both their own writing, and the ways in which head writers such as Davies and Moffat have organised and presented their visions of the show. The fan-producers both claim an individual authorship for their work whilst denying any ability to control or 'own' <u>Doctor Who</u> as a whole, and actively solicit fandom to engage in creative activities that they are aware of, and have been complicit with, in their past fandom. They draw from the entire history of the show and the rhetoric of fandom in their vision and engagement with the text, and with ideas of a 'multi-authored' approach. Ideas of canon and authenticity are rejected, to an extent, and the text left deliberately open, which is a combination of the historical context of BBC policy (see Chapters One and Six) and their experiences of fandom's general attitude to canon. In short, the fan-producers represent the full spectrum of fan experience and desire, implicated in the heart of television production, and thus both influenced by industrial pressures and compromises, by a history of fan knowledge, and engagement. This is not always necessarily a positive move; it is important to try to avoid constructing binaries in discussions of how much of a 'true' fan Davies or Moffat might be. Instead, it is more useful to engage with the idea that they are undeniably fans, and then question why fans might criticise each other, how they might engage with other fans lower in the hierarchy of fandom, and how different pressures from being a celebrity fan-producer might influence their decisions and actions.

When the series was off-air, as McKee states, the fans were ultimately the purveyors of canon and authenticity within the worlds of <u>Doctor Who</u>. These fans include many of the fan-producers who would go on to work on the new series, as I have already discussed. Many of these individuals had worked in the television industry as professionals already, but this is still distinct, in many ways, from their work on Big Finish audios or books. The study of Paul Cornell has already highlighted how texts can be re-purposed and utilised across different media; the texts moving through Wolf's "circles of authorship" along with the authors, perhaps?

Christopher Marlow has examined how Doctor Who has adapted material from its own canon in order to adapt to "current socio-cultural contexts" (2009, p.46). Marlow suggests that the revived series could be perceived as, not an adaptation of the 'classic' series, but of the "alternate media between the years 1989 and 2003" (2009, p.47-48). A situation forms, then, whereby "the first (canonical) run of the series was folded into its non--canonical or at least non-televised presence in alternate media, which was itself then re-folded back into the televised canon" (2009, p.48). The fan-producers were industry professionals who worked in television, and they were fans who wrote for relatively low-paid spin-off material. When the series was revived, was Doctor Who taken away from the fans? Was it folded back into official production and these issues of canon and authenticity claimed again by the BBC and the show's producers? Perhaps, but not in any way that is as simple or divisive as this sounds. Marlow examines the way Robert Shearman adapted his Big Finish audio drama Jubilee into the television episode Dalek, noting how he shifts the "context of his narrative from a world where it is impossible to avoid knowledge of the Daleks to one where it is impossible to achieve it" (2009, p. 49). This mimics the way that the audio play was written for fans who would have presumed intimate knowledge of the Daleks, whilst the episode was directed at a wider and new audience who may have little to no knowledge, and thus would need to be introduced to the aliens as if they were new. The fan-producers' identities as industry professionals and fans are also folded together; they become clear fan-producers of new and original texts. But as they were already part of the television industry, in many ways it is their fan identity, and their approach to writing Doctor Who itself, that is now being added to the mix. This distinction, whilst not immediately clear, I believe is important. The fan-producers working on Doctor Who have brought their fan authority with them. They had a fan authority over the text through various spin-off texts, and thus it is counter-intuitive to say they have lost this in favour of an official authority, which they also already had in regards to their previous industry work. Fan authority is folded into the text itself, and this is clearly seen in the depiction of The Doctor and the form of Doctor Who presented in the new series. The influences of six years of fan canon and ideas can be found throughout the new series, and the fan experience is one that is central to the fan-producers' approaches, especially those of Davies and Moffat as the showrunners. Whilst they may attempt to separate out their identities, this is an impossibility, and thus it is also equally impossible to try and study the fan-producers as ever speaking with a solitary or exclusive industry voice. The argument can be made for romanticising the fan-producers, and repeating the problems that Jenkins had with

the celebration and elevation of fandom. But Jenkins's approach was necessary at the time, due to strong negative thinking towards fans and fan cultures, and helped open up potential for more negotiated and nuanced discussion. Now the risk is that the fear of echoing overtly sentimental approaches to fandom means we are too quick to judge the fan-producers as producers first and foremost, and their relationship with fandom is questioned, often in a negative light. Not that this is not necessary at times, but it is important to do this in the context of the fan-producers being equally able to draw from their producer identities and fan identities at all times. The question should not be about whether Davies is speaking as a fan or a producer, at any time, but how he is drawing from both experiences, and both sets of pressures, in order to navigate the space between official producer, and fan engagement.

Conclusion.

The rhetoric of resistance within fan studies often comes with either implicit or explicit readings of the cultural industries as inherently monolithic organisations. They exist to be resisted, and have been rarely looked at in the same detail as fans themselves. Fans are increasingly looked at as fractured communities, rife with infighting and contradiction. However, rarely has the same treatment been given to the forces of production, which have predominantly been presented as a monolithic, or predominantly antagonistic, force that either opposes or exploits audiences. This is changing however, as the different aspects of the forces of production are now being discussed in more detail, such as with Christine Cornea's analysis of Russell T. Davies as showrunner. Cornea examines how Davies establishes his position both within the Doctor Who production team, but also positions himself in the landscape of UK television. The persona Davies has created "operates in conjunction with efforts to attract a local audience... at the same as it opens up its "content" to an international audience" (Cornea, 2009, p.117). Cornea's writing thus contributes to the increasing body of work that examines not only the specific details of production, but places them in wider global media contexts. Other work includes John Tulloch's and Albert Moran's study of some Australian soap A Country Practice, Dean J. DeFino's examination of HBO, and Amanda D. Lotz, whose work on industry-level studies of television offers "scope and context that complement the insights gained from both the more macro national and international political economy level and the more focused study of individual productions" (2009, p.36). Those within the production industries are also cultural actors who "shape and refashion their identities in the process of making their careers in industries undoing political transitions and economic reorganizations" (Vicki Mayer, Miranda J. Banks and John T. Caldwell, 2009, p.2). I contribute to this body of work, addressing tensions and conflicts within productions, but I also examine how this echoes the conflicts within fandom, and how fan-producers emerge from fandom and their position-taking in regards to their professional and fan identities. John Thornton Caldwell has addressed the importance of not only examining these industries, but understanding the role of film and television within them, emphasising that they are "but one stratum in a complicated multimedia industrial marketing and consumption scheme" (2008, p.307). Caldwell argues that "a script also functions as a financial prospectus, a detailed investment opportunity, and a corporate proposal" (2008, p.232). His suggestion that "all screenplays are also business plans" draws attention

to the importance of understanding the different interests involved with media production, including financial, industrial, and creative contexts, amongst others (2008, p.232). This thesis seeks to expand this body of work with its case study of the BBC, which also works to examine how hierarchies and conflicts in production, if not mirror, at least echo those that occur within fandom. The BBC is an organisation that is far from monolithic, and which has as many contradictions, internal struggles and layers of authority and power as the fandoms that supposedly resist it. The public service nature of the BBC potentially adds further political and cultural considerations to the process of media production, as the corporation negotiates utilising the more overt commercial approaches discussed by Caldwell. I have made use of ethnographic work by Tom Burns and Georgina Born throughout this thesis in order to discuss the difficulties faced by the BBC across its history, and provide a broader context for my discussions of the contemporary fan-producers of Doctor Who. I have set out to bring to light the various issues and controversies that surround an organisation such as the BBC. The importance of understanding the context for a programme like Doctor Who, and the fandom that consumes it, has been under-appreciated. Through an examination of the history of public service broadcasting, it has been clear to see not only how the series stems from a public service ethos, but how this has affected production decisions and the degree to which its audience could become involved. This history reaches the contemporary period with a discussion on branding, and I consider how the need to create specific identities and values within the media culture is reflected in Bourdieu's fields of cultural production.

In Chapter One I focused on looking at the different theoretical approaches to fandom, exploring literature related to the progression of fan studies. I illustrated that despite moving forward from the somewhat basic celebratory tone of Henry Jenkins's early writings, accounts of fandom have still found the relationships between fans and producers problematic to examine. I have unpicked the binary rhetoric that is repeated throughout fan studies, and highlighted how even later approaches that either see fans as co-opted, or as implicated in the fields of official production, maintain an implicit sense of opposition between fans and producers. This opposition allows for an active, hierarchical and often conflicting fandom, but inevitably positions fans against a far more monolithic reading of the production industries. Part of this problem stems from an under-appreciation for the complexities of media production, and I argue that a more coherent picture can be constructed by examining conflicts within both official and fan culture. I also bring to

bear an historical context that illustrates how certain ideologies are repeated in regards to the evolving media industries, notably from the nineteenth century and the advent of the printing press. In Chapter Two, I set out the different approaches I utilise in order to begin this deconstruction which, as my thesis title implies, focuses on industrial, cultural and historical contexts that inform contemporary fan and producer relationships. My brief autoethnography served to identify my own fan inclinations and how these may have impacted on the focus and direction of my research. It obliged me to wonder to what extent the heavier presence of Russell T. Davies in my earlier chapters reflected the fact that when my research began Steven Moffat's era had not yet broadcast, or whether it reflected my own preference for the former's time as showrunner over the latter. Davies's time also happens to be the moment where the fan-producers stepped into the official role of producing Doctor Who, a culmination perhaps of all previous fan-producer activity. Here I also introduce the use of Bourdieu's fields of cultural production, as a valuable tool for understanding hierarchical struggles within culture. Bourdieu has too often been presented as replicating the monolithic notion of the forces of production, and I note how Milly Williamson has worked to illustrate the struggles between different poles in the field. At times Bourdieu does appear to support the more simplistic readings of fandom and producer relations, suggesting social problems "emerge from the confrontation between two groups, two systems of antagonistic interests and theses" (1993, p.83). He emphasises that those with power seek to maintain a status quo, "maintaining themselves and the principles on which their dominance is based" (1993, p.83). However, this is not a struggle between consumers and producers, but different forms of producers, and it is not passive. The status quo may be maintained, but only through struggle, and it can and does change, through the legitimating of different cultural objects and their subsequent commercial expansions. These ideas are explored notably in Chapter Three, where I explore the evolution of authorship, and trace its lineage to contemporary ideas of branding. In each case, these are symptoms of the constant struggle, not between the powerful and oppressed, but between those with different forms of capital, and with different interests, each seeking a dominant position, or even to expand into generating new forms of capital.

The authority of fan-producers as members of official production, but with a history of fan production, is tied up in notions of authorship. There is often an inherent authoritative voice given to authors, and I highlight Barthes's criticism that "to give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to

close the writing" (1958, pp.128-129). The fan-producers resist this limiting of the text, whilst also still maintaining something of their own authority, which is tied up in maintaining a brand image for the series, and its fans. The negotiated authorship, and the dilemma of how to position the fan-producers actually highlights the unstable nature of the 'author' as a concept. Chapter Three looks at the history and development of the 'author' concept, and the historical relationships between publishers and authors around the nineteenth century, tracing the lineage of the contemporary showrunner figure. I argue that the elevation of the author became a necessity in negotiating different political and commercial issues, such as the copyright and ownership of texts. I also briefly touch on how the problematic 'genius' idea of a single author is transferred into screen media as a method of legitimising early film, and how it continues to cause difficulties in studying the increasingly blurred lines between fans, producers and fan-producers. Utilising the work of Michael Z. Newman and Elana Levine, I discussed how the showrunner exists as a legitimating force for television, acting in much the same way as auteur theory had for the film industry. This chapter, then, explores the historical nature of the author figure and expands on the contexts for the contemporary showrunner that Newman and Levine touch upon. As the fan-producer is representative of the ultimate fan engagement with the text, taking up a more dominant position within the field, I have also explored more fully the history of engagements between producer and consumer positions. Chapter Four, then, looks at the history behind audience and text interactions and I argue that, whilst these relationships can be found throughout media history, we see prominent peaks of activity surrounding the development of new technologies. The printing presses of the nineteenth century, the expansion of scrapbook production around the turn of the twentieth century, and the digital internet age all mark strong examples of expanding consumer-driven interactivity and use of media. I also argue that the publishing industries, as well as specific authors, have always engaged with interactive audiences, and illustrate how readers were able to have a variety of impacts on ongoing texts. This discussion highlights a need for a stronger awareness of audiences and fan-producers through history and that contemporary developments are perhaps another leap forward due to the digital revolution. Equally, it suggests that producers and consumers have always been bound up in the same struggles, across intersecting fields, and that fandom and fan-producers are a contemporary iteration of the continuous struggles for position.

Central to this argument was highlighting the different forces that come into play when dealing with media industries, and especially in regards to the BBC that is

obliged to negotiate its commercial interests with its public service responsibilities. Thus I examined the BBC as an organisation in order to question the inaccurate assumptions that see corporations as homogeneous entities that can or must be resisted. Henry Jenkins repeatedly returns to this rhetoric, even within the digital age, suggesting that media industries "understand that culture is becoming more participatory" but that few companies "are willing to take what may be seen as substantial risks... fans' desires and corporate interests sometimes operate in parallel, yet they never fully coincide" (Jenkins, Ford and Green, 2013, p.35). Whilst fan groups are afforded a variety of ideologies and approaches, the media industries remain the ever-present enemy, the complexities of media producers not fully appreciated. To rectify this, I have charted the BBC's trajectory from its public service origins to its contemporary existence as a global organisation exploiting its properties and generating profits from merchandising. I have related this development to Doctor Who and highlighted the programme's role in moving the BBC in this direction. Discussions have dealt with how the BBC has come under pressure from different forces, including commercial rivals and government agencies, and its struggles and negotiations to justify itself and adapt to the modern multinational world. Chapter One explored these contexts in some detail, and highlighted specific periods of change within the BBC. Whilst commercial pressures and criticism from successive governments and private interests were always present, I have shown how the Thatcher era accelerated these processes. By the nineties, the BBC was undergoing huge changes, with a focus on business and commercial exploitation, and with Doctor Who off the air, the fan base would begin to have a greater sense of ownership over the series through its spin-off merchandise. Doctor Who and the BBC have a shared history that goes beyond simply producing the show. It was the success of the series, and, more importantly, the Daleks, which initially obliged the BBC to more fully engage with commercial markets. This is not to say that the BBC did not have previous commercial interests, some of which I illustrated, but it was during the period of 'Dalekmania' that I discussed in Chapter Six, that this expanded rapidly. I have also demonstrated how the shared copyright with Terry Nation played an important role in the BBC's earliest exploitations of the series, and how the corporation rapidly grew far more protective of its copyrights. Chapter Seven continues this trajectory through the next three decades, charting the evolution of both Doctor Who's fandom and the BBC's relationship with it. I highlighted how increased fan involvement with the production team can be traced through the seventies and eighties. Further context is given by contrasting this with the issues that the BBC faced in these eras, as highlighted in

Chapter Five. The emergence of BBC Enterprises and then BBC Worldwide occur during a period of instability within the BBC, as it attempts to engage with commercial systems and justify its own cultural significance. By the nineties, Doctor Who spin-off merchandise, notably the 'New Adventures' novels, which were the only officially licensed continuation of the series at the time, featured a combination of Doctor Who television writers and first time fan authors collaborating on the range. It is with the 'New Adventures' novels that we see the political pressure on the BBC, its changing organisation, increasing commercial interests, public service ideology and the interaction of fandom intersecting most prominently. The nineties would see the rise of the fan-producers, and whilst it is a little beyond the scope of this writing, it would make fascinating and important additional research to examine in more detail the television careers of the fan-producers such as Russell T. Davies and Steven Moffat in this era, and the influences of Doctor Who on their work. As I previously noted, Miles Booy does address this to an extent, highlighting the series' influences on two of their most notable early works, but there is arguably room for a more detailed account (Booy, 2012, pp.142-145). Doctor Who fandom does not exist in a vacuum, and is bound up in the history of the BBC; arguably, so is the series itself, especially in relation to the corporation's commercial activities. The BBC struggles against different social, cultural, economic and political forces, and is forced to engage with often contradictory ideological practices in justifying its own existence. A change in BBC policy, and the radical restructuring discussed in Chapter Six, means that Doctor Who no longer has a producer directly employed by the corporation, with John Nathan-Turner being the last staff producer to hold the role. Nonetheless, the fan-producers hold a specific position relative to the organisation as a whole, even whilst employed on a freelance basis. Thus their relationship with fans must be understood in the context of their own responsibilities, their representation of the programme and the BBC, even as freelancers, and relationships with the BBC's own politics, both internal and external. In Chapter Eight, I discuss the contemporary branding of the series, which shows a marked change from the early sixties, and emphasises notions of quality and authorship, established earlier in Chapter Three. I also demonstrate how the branding of the new series has led to more potential conflicts between the fans and the fan-producers, as the latter try to control leaks of information and future plot points, whilst also acknowledging the fan desire to seek out news regarding the series. Primarily, however, I highlight how branding in itself is a struggle for position, and brands exist with multiple purposes as part of the tactics of position-taking within the fields of cultural production. Brands, and the showrunner brand explored in the

following chapter, highlight the importance of perception of value in maintaining and legitimating positions of power and authority. Understanding the historical background of fandom and organisations is vital if there is to be a more thorough understanding of contemporary fan culture. The fan-producers and other fans emerge from the same processes that have helped shape the BBC, and the series now is more directly shaped by its fans than ever before. It is worth returning to Alan McKee and when he suggests we must question what is happening when everyone begins proclaiming their fandom? As previously illustrated, McKee suggests we must "find other ways than such binaries by which to distinguish between cultural objects produced by different people" (2004, p.175). It is perhaps the phrase "cultural objects produced by different people" that is the most descriptive of how the fields of cultural production operate. They have taken on a legitimate position of authority, but one that comes with its own struggles, and whilst their fan nature gives them capital amongst fans, their personal brands can have a greater impact on wider culture and the industry. Having explored the historical and commercial contexts of the BBC, this thesis then looked at the history of authorship, and audience interactions, in order to emphasise the notion that these practices have historical precedent and represent the contemporary evolution of historical discourses.

With the nineteenth-century historical research there is certainly room for further expansion, and no doubt both discussions have the potential to be developed into a thesis project of their own. I have only highlighted a number of central ideas, figures, and events, to illustrate an important historical context for the contemporary fan-producers, one that complements the existing work on the showrunner and branding that I have explored. It would be fascinating to look in detail at changes in the publishing and commercial media industries throughout the last two centuries, and a wider examination of the BBC in the context of other international media companies. Equally, an examination of less well-known names and authors may offer some further insights into the developing commercial industries of the time, and give a stronger idea of how widespread audience engagement may have been. I had certainly not anticipated quite the range and wealth of material available in looking at these histories, and I suspect a wider examination of historical ideas of authorship, and how the commercial industries made use of authorial figures, would also add much more context to contemporary understandings of authorship and branding. In trying to construct a historical context for the fan-producers, I was obliged to look at both their history within fandom, the history of the BBC as the corporation they were

a part of, the history of the concept of 'authorship' and a history of audience interaction. Whilst I believe this creates a strong framework, it opens up numerous other avenues. I focused on the merchandising of Doctor Who at a key historical point, in the early sixties, but much more could be discussed around how this developed in the seventies and eighties, something I only touched upon, mostly utilising the work of Miles Booy. There is room to explore in more detail who exactly the audiences were that purchased the excessive quantities of merchandise in the sixties. What the contexts I address serve to do, however, is broaden the debate surrounding fan-producers, and fan studies in general, and highlight the different historical pressures that lend their weight and impact to contemporary issues.

My final chapter addressed the fan-producers directly, and examined how they can be understood as having clear fan identities alongside their 'producer' roles. I discussed how they articulate their own fandom, on one hand, and yet come into conflict with other fans on the other. I suggest this must be understood, not just as producers versus fans, but in the context of a fractured and often conflicting fandom in general. Whilst Hills is right to point out how they can "oscillate between fan discourses and media professional production discourses", I argue that these are rarely clearly defined, and in the majority of cases, fan-producer discourses can be said to have been influenced by both their fan and producer identities. Bourdieu's fields of cultural production are the ideal arena for mapping these interactions, but only as long as the conflicting elements at the dominant end of the field are acknowledged. Removal of monolithic discourses is vital in fully exploring the relationships between different forces of production, the constructing of brands in collaboration with audiences, and the fans that shift between consumer and producer roles. The fans of the series do not instantly disengage with their fan identities when becoming fan-producers; they are neither co-opted nor are they an oppositional force. Rather, they are obliged to negotiate not only the different communities and factions within fandom, but the commercial interests and conflicting hierarchies within the worlds of official production as well.

Over the course of my research, the number of academic works on the series has grown rapidly, with Matt Hills directly addressing the growth of Doctor Who studies as its own discipline. He discusses the academic possibilities but also the problems in discussing the series, especially as aca-fans and the risk of contributors writing "across each other, rather than building this shared, communal project" (2013, p.3). I have worked to offer a history which I believe can help bring together different

threads of academic study - not only fan studies, but a wider look at questions of authorship, public service broadcasting, and pressures of capitalist society. I have utilised a number of different scholars' work in drawing on themes such as commercial exploitation, public services, branding, the legitimating of television, authorship, and media history. Hills's further concern is that "fans and academic who love 'The Show' might focus solely on its production details, and narrative worlds rather than placing it in industrial, cultural, intellectual, generic, technological, transnational, audience and other contexts" (2013, p.4). Whilst I have perhaps not covered all these areas, my research has contributed towards this unification that Hills is looking for across <u>Doctor Who</u> studies. Contextualising a show like <u>Doctor Who</u> is vital, as it has been running for half a century, alongside all manner of changes in industry and culture and, as I have shown, the theorisation of authorship and audience interactions equally has a long, complex back-story, which converges in contemporary media culture. The fields of cultural production are rife with position-taking and conflict, where the struggle for legitimation, authority and the various forms of capital this entails, can be found at all corners. Whilst the intersecting of different fields is a possibility not made clear by Bourdieu, he does not dispute it, and I have illustrated throughout various chapters the ways that influences beyond the cultural industries themselves can have an important impact. Hills argues that the horror genre is "not only commercial... it also has its own autonomous/subcultural pole of cultural production and consumption" and emphasises the difficulties this brings to Bourdieu's 'two-pole model' (2005, pp.169-170). Whilst this is convincingly the case for horror, and likely many other genres, it is still an example of the constant vying-for-position within the field itself. The fields are never static, but in constant struggle, as this is what drives them, and as I have suggested elsewhere, the status quo is only ever maintained through constant negotiation and change elsewhere. With the BBC's licence fee renewal approaching once again, it will be fascinating to see how branding and cultural values are utilised in justifying its status. More importantly, it will be fascinating to see how newspaper journalism and the wider media engage with this, and work to influence decisions that ultimately will have far-reaching political, social and cultural impacts in Britain.

Ultimately, what should be embraced is both fans and fan-producers having to negotiate their identities and position-taking within the fields of cultural production. Fans exist in a complex web of relationships and communities, and fan studies have discussed this in some detail, but the same contextualising must be applied to the fan-producers. They exist in a network of fan, commercial, and capitalist interests,

as part of tiered hierarchies both within fan communities and the BBC itself. Unpacking the fan-producers' position-takings, and the history of the space they occupy, allows us to move beyond monolithic understandings of the media industries, and the reductive ideology that sees fans and producers as both conflicted and oppositional. The fan-producers, especially those acting as showrunners, contribute to various forms of branding, whether the commercially focused brand of BBC Worldwide - the symbol of British culture that supports the public service status of the BBC - or the legitimising brand of the showrunner as a symbol of quality. Brands and branding, as I have illustrated, are inherently bound up in issues of commercial exploitation, and quality television. They are constructed for utilisation in navigating spaces in the fields of cultural production, and are not always created from a coherent or united endeavour from the culture industries. The Doctor Who brand must do different things for different companies, and, in turn, the alternative brands of its fan-producers will have different impacts on the programme itself. Focusing on Doctor Who as a case study is beneficial, not only due to its long history and public service background, but because, in many ways, its embrace of fan-producers presaged developments in other media texts. As I established in my introduction, the fan-producers of Doctor Who stand out because of the clear trajectory between positions, from within the series' own fandom. I suggest that this is a continuing process that is becoming increasingly visible across a number of media franchises, including the hugely successful Star Wars film series. Mark J. P. Wolf has discussed the importance of the authorship of George Lucas as the creative force behind Star Wars, stating that "the highest degree of canonicity" comes from "the innermost circles of authorship, which surround the originator and main author of a world" (2012, p.271). Yet this may no longer be the case, as Lucas sold his company Lucasfilm to The Walt Disney Company, who proceeded to create a new entry in the Star Wars series without the involvement of the original creator and, by Lucas's own accounts, ignoring his story ideas and suggestions. Director J. J. Abrams has a long record of genre programming and films, notably Alias, Lost and Fringe, and would have been a teenager at the time of the original Star Wars film trilogy. Abrams also worked on the rebooted Star Trek film, a series with a dedicated fan base and a narrative based on time travel and alternative universes, woven so as to connect the new film with existing media. To what extent we can see Abrams and others like him as fan-producers requires further research, but I argue the generational shift from original creators of texts to younger producers marks an increasing blurring of traditional separations between production and consumption. Doctor Who and its fan-producers are arguably at the vanguard of the future

developments within transmedia franchises, and I would suggest that the movement of previous generations of fans into official production will continue to increase. The history of the BBC has been tied into the histories of authorship, and the legitimating of different media, and audiences, and the ways they have interacted with texts. The history of <u>Doctor Who</u> fandom is one of a shift between consumer and producer positions, but this has gone hand in hand with the evolution and construction of a <u>Doctor Who</u> brand that has been heavily influenced and shaped by fandom, conceptualised in the notion of a 'fanbrand' by Matt Hills (2010: 66-77). The fan-producers are therefore to be understood, not as co-opted fandom, or as symbols of fan authority and power, but instead in relation to the ways that Bourdieu's fields operate: not simply as a resistance between production and consumption, but a constantly evolving arena of position-taking. This position-taking, and the movement of fans into the arena of official production, is an increasingly visible and influential aspect of the contemporary global transmedia environment.

Bibliography.

Abercrombie, N. and Longhurst, B. (1998) *Audiences.* London: SAGE Publications.

Albiston, I. (2007) 'The world of Mark Gatiss, actor and writer.' Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/3666235/The-world-of-Mark-Gatiss-actor-and-writer.html. [Accessed 17th May 2013].

Asimov, I. (1987) 'Introduction', in Greenberg, M. H. (ed.) *Amazing Science Fiction Anthology.* Lake Geneva: ISR. inc.

Arvidsson, A. (2006) *Brands: Meaning and Value in Media Culture.* London: Routledge.

Bacon-Smith, C. (1992) *Enterprising Women: Television Fandom and the Creation of the Popular Myth.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bacon-Smith, C. (2000) *Science Fiction Culture.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Barthes, R. (1958) 'The Death of the Author', in Burke, S. (ed.) *Authorship from Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.125-130.

BBC. (2011a) 'About the BBC.' Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/aboutthebbc/purpose/. [Accessed 12th January 2011].

BBC. (2011b) '*Doctor Who* boss 'hates' fans who spoil show's secrets.' Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-13353367. [Accessed Thursday 6th June 2013].

BBC. (2014) 'BBC Three: From digital first to online only.' Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-26452235. [Accessed 25th October 2014].

Bicego, N. (2016) 'Why I'm Not Optimistic about Chris Chibnall taking over'. Doctor Who TV, 29th Jan. Available at: http://www.doctorwhotv.co.uk/why-im-not-optimistic-about-chris-chibnall-taking-over-79692.htm. [Accessed 12th July 2016]

Bignell, J. (2007) 'The Child as Addressee, Viewer and Consumer in Mid-1960s *Doctor Who*', In Butler, D. (ed.) *Time and Relative Dissertations in Space.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.45-55.

Booth, P. (2010) *Digital Fandom: New Media Studies.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Booth, P. (2014) 'Periodising *Doctor Who*', *Science Fiction Film and Television,* 7(2), pp.195-215.

Booy, M. (2012) *Love and Monsters: The Doctor Who Experience, 1979 to the Present.* London: I.B. Tauris.

Born, G. (2004) *Uncertain Vision: Birt, Dyke and the Reinvention of the BBC.* London: Secker & Warburg.

Bourdieu, P. (1979) *Distinction: A Social Critique on the Judgement of Taste.* Padstow: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Britton, P. D. (2011) *TARDISbound: Navigating the Universes of Doctor Who.* London: I.B.Tauris.

Brooker, W. (2013) 'Talking to the TARDIS: *Doctor Who*, Neil Gaiman and Cultural Mythology', in Hills, M. (ed.) *New Dimensions of Doctor Who: Adventures in Space, Time and Television.* London: I.B.Tauris, pp.71-91.

Brough, M. M. and Shresthova, S. (2012) 'Fandom meets activism: Rethinking civic and political participation', *Transformative Works and Cultures*, 10. doi:10.3983/twc.2012.0303.

Brower, S. (1992) 'Fans as Tastemakers: Viewers for Quality Television', in Lewis, L. A. (ed.) *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media.* London: Routledge, pp.163-184.

Burke, S. (ed.) (1995) *Authorship from Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Burke, S. (2008) *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*. 3rd edn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Burns, T. (1977) *The BBC: Public Institution and Private World.* London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Buscombe, E. (1973) 'Ideas of Authorship', in Caughie, J. (ed.) *Theories of Authorship*. New York: Routledge, pp.22-34.

Cain, J. (1992) *The BBC: 70 years of broadcasting.* London: BBC Books.

Caldwell, J. T. (1994) *Televisuality: Style, Crisis, and Authority in American Television.* New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

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

Chandler, J. (2008) 'Foucault and Disciplinary Authority', in Donovan, S., Fjellestad, D. and Lunden, R. (eds.) *Authority Matters: Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Authorship*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp.47-63.

Chapman, J. (2006) *Inside the TARDIS: The Worlds of Doctor Who.* London: I.B.Tauris.

Chapman, J. (2013) *Inside the TARDIS: The Worlds of Doctor Who.* 2nd edn. London: I.B.Tauris.

Cherry, B. (2013) 'Extermin...Knit!: Female Fans and Feminine Handicrafting', in Booth, P. (ed.) *Fan Phenomena: Doctor Who*. Bristol: Intellect, pp.106-115.

Cherry, B. (2014) 'Oh, no, that won't do at all... It's ridiculous!': Observations on the *Doctor Who* Audience', in O'Day, A. (ed.) <u>*Doctor Who*</u> *- The Eleventh Hour: A Critical Celebration of the Matt Smith and Steven Moffat Era*. London: I.B.Tauris, pp.204-227.

Clover, C. J. (1992) *Men, Women and Chain Saws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Collins, R. and Murroni, C. (1996) *New Media, New Policies: Media and Communications Strategies for the Future.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cook, P. (1978) 'The point of self-expression in avant-garde film', in Caughie, J. (ed.) *Theories of Authorship*. New York: Routledge, pp.271-281.

Cooper, S. and Mahoney, K. (2011) *Steven Moffat's <u>Doctor Who</u> 2010: The Critical Fan's Guide to Matt Smith's First Series (Unauthorized).* London: Punked Books.

Coppa, F. (2014) 'Fuck yeah, fandom is beautiful', *Journal of Fandom Studies*, 2(1), pp. 73-82.

Cornea, C. (2009) 'Showrunning the *Doctor Who* Franchise: A Response to Denise Mann', in Mayer, M., Banks, M. J. and Caldwell, J. T. (eds.) *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, pp.115-122.

Corrigan, T. (1991) *A Cinema Without Walls: Movies and Culture after Vietnam*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Cornell, P. (2007) 'The Twelve Blogs of Christmas: Eight.' Available at: <u>http://paulcornell.blogspot.com/2007/12/twelve-blogs-of-christmas-eight.html</u>. [Accessed 12th January 2008].

Coughlan, S. (2012) 'Shakespeare's 'co-author' named by Oxford scholars.' Available at: <u>http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-17828729</u>. [Accessed 25th April 2012].

Cox, L. (2013) 'BBC wanted to exterminate the Doctor, 14.' *Daily Mail*, 8th August, Available at: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2386587/Young-Peter-Capaldi-obsessed-Doctor-Who-badgered-staff-constantly.html. [Accessed 19th August 2016].

Crisell, A. (1997) *An Introductory History of British Broadcasting*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Cubbison, L. (2012) 'Russell T Davies, "Nine Hysterical Women", and the Death of Ianto Jones', in Williams, B. T. and Zenger, A. A. (eds.) *New Media Literacies and Participatory Popular Culture Across Borders*. London: Routledge, pp.135-150.

Cull, N. J. (2006) 'Tardis at the Ok Corral: *Doctor Who* and the USA', in Cook, J.R. and Wright, P. (eds.) *British Science Fiction Television: A Hitchhiker's Guide.* London: I. B. Tauris, pp.52-70.

Davies, R.T. (2004a) 'Production Notes #1', *Doctor Who Magazine,* 4th March, p.50.

Davies, R.T. (2004b) 'Production Notes #2', *Doctor Who Magazine,* 1st April, p.50.

Davies, R.T. (2004c) 'Production Notes #4', *Doctor Who Magazine,* 27th March, p.50.

Davies, R.T. (2004d) 'Production Notes #9', *Doctor Who Magazine,* 14th October, pp.50-51.

Davies, R. T. and Cook, B. (2010) *Doctor Who: The Writer's Tale – The Final Chapter.* London: BBC Books.

Davis, A. (2013) *Promotional Cultures: The Rise and Spread of Advertising, Public Relations, Marketing and Branding.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Trans. Rendall, S. California: University of California Press.

DeFino, D. J. (2014) *The HBO Effect.* New York and London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Dicks, T. and Hulke, M. (1976) *The Making of Doctor Who.* London: Target.

Dobranski, S. B. (2008) 'The Birth of the Author: The Origins of Early Modern Printed Authority', in Donovan, S., Fjellestad, D. and Lunden, R. (eds.) *Authority Matters: Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Authorship.* Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp.23-45.

Doctor Who Forum. (2008) Available at: http://www.doctorwhoforum.com/showthread.php?t=201878. [Accessed 27th October 2008].

Doctor Who's Cuttings Archive. (1960) Available at: http://www.cuttingsarchive.org.uk/cut1960.htm. [Accessed 29th July 2008].

Feintuck, M. and Varney, M. (2006) *Media Regulation, Public Interest and the Law.* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Fiske, J. (1987) *Television Culture.* London: Routledge.

Fiske, J. (1992) 'The Cultural Economy of Fandom', in Lewis, L. A. (ed.) *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media.* London: Routledge, pp.30-49.

Forde, T. (2013) ''You Anorak!': The *Doctor Who* Experience and Experiencing *Doctor Who*', in Booth, P. (ed.) *Fan Phenomena: Doctor Who.* Bristol: Intellect, pp.62-71.

Foucault, M. (1969a) 'What is an Author?' In Burke, S. (ed.) (1995) *Authorship From Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.233-246.

Foucault, M. (1969b) 'What is An Author?' In Faubion, J. D. (ed.) (1994) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984: Volume 2: Aesthetics.* London: Penguin Books, pp.205-222.

Freund, K. (2013) ''We're Making Our Own Happy Ending!': The *Doctor Who* Fan Vidding Community', in Booth, P. (ed.) *Fan Phenomena: <u>Doctor Who</u>*. Bristol: Intellect., pp.96-105.

Gallifrey Base. (2013) Available at: http://gallifreybase.com/forum/showthread.php?t=174298&page=2. [Accessed September 2013).

Garner, R. P. (2013) 'Remembering Sarah Jane: Intradiegetic Allusions, Embodied Presence/Absence and Nostalgia', in Hills, M. (ed.) *New Dimensions of <u>Doctor Who</u>*. London: I.B.Tauris, pp.192-215.

Garvey, E. G. (1996) *The Adman in the Parlor: Magazines and the Gendering of Consumer Culture, 1880s to 1910s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garvey, E. G. (2003) 'Scissorizing and Scrapbooks: Nineteenth-Century Reading, Remaking and Recirculating', in Gitelman, L. and Pingree, G. B. (eds.) *New Media 1740-1915*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute for Technology, pp.207-227.

Garvey, E. G. (2008) 'The Power of Recirculation: Scrapbooks and the Reception of the Nineteenth-Century Press', in Goldstein, P. and Machor, J. L. (eds.) *New Directions in American Reception Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.211-231.

Garvey, E. G. (2012) *Writing with Scissors: American Scrapbooks from the Civil War to the Harlem Renaissance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geraghty, L. (2014) *Cult Collectors: Nostalgia, Fandom and Collecting Popular Culture.* Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Goodwin, P. (1998) *Television under the Tories: Broadcasting Policy 1979-1997.* London: British Film Institute.

Gray, J. (2010) *Show Sold Separately: Promos, Spoilers, and other Media Paratexts.* New York: New York University Press.

Gray, J., Sandvoss, C. and Harrington, C. L. (2007) 'Introduction: Why Study Fans?' In Gray, J., Sandvoss, C. and Harrington, C. L. (eds.) *Fandom: Identities and Communities in a Mediated World.* New York: New York University Press, pp.1-16.

Gunn, J. (1982) *Isaac Asimov: The Foundation of Science Fiction.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gwenllian-Jones, S. (2003) 'Web Wars: Resistance, Online Fandom and Studio Censorship', in Jancovich, M. and Lyons, J. (eds.) *Quality Popular Television*. London: British Film Institute, pp.163-177.

Gwenllian-Jones, S. (2004) 'Virtual Reality And Cult Television', in Gwenllian-Jones, S. and Pearson, R.E. (eds.) *Cult Television.* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, pp.83-97.

Hadas, L. (2009) 'The Web Planet: How the changing internet divided *Doctor Who* fan fiction writers', *Transformative Works and Cultures*, 3. doi:10.3983/twc.2009.0129

Hadas, L. and Shifman, L. (2012) 'Keeping the Elite Powerless: fan-producer Relations in the "Nu Who" (and New YOU) Era', *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 30(4). doi:10.1080/15295036.2012.676193.

Harrington, C. L. and Bielby, D. D. (2007) 'Global Fandom/Global Fan Studies', in Gray, J., Sandvoss, C. and Harrington, C. L. (eds.) *Fandom: Identities and Communities in a Mediated World*. New York: New York University Press, pp.179-197.

Hawthorn, J. (2008) 'Authority and the Death of the Author', in Donovan, S., Fjellestad, D. & Lunden, R. (eds.) *Authority Matters: Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Authorship*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp.65-88.

Hayward, J. (1997) *Consuming Pleasures: Active Audiences and Serial Fictions from Dickens to Soap Opera*. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.

Hefflinger, M. (2007) 'BBC Adds Content to YouTube, Won't Remove Existing User Clips.' Available at: http://www.dmwmedia.com/news/2007/03/02/bbc-adds-content-to-youtube-wont-remove-existing-user-clips. [Accessed 25th August 2008]

Helfand, J. (2008) *Scrapbooks: An American History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hellekson, K. (2013) ''*Doctor Who* Unbound', the Alternative History and the Fannish Text', in Booth, P. (ed.) *Fan Phenomena: Doctor Who*. Bristol: Intellect, pp.128-135.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2006) 'Bourdieu, the media and cultural production', *Media Culture Society*, 28, pp.211-231. doi:10.1177/0163443706061682

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2007) *The Cultural Industries.* 2nd edn. London: SAGE.

Hills, M. (2002) *Fan Cultures*. London: Routledge.

Hills, M. (2005a) *The Pleasures of Horror*. London: Continuum.

Hills, M. (2005b) 'Patterns of Surprise: The "Aleatory object" in Psychoanalytic Ethnography and Cyclical Fandom', *American Behavioral Scientist,* 48(7), pp.801-21. doi: 10.1177/0002764204273169

Hills, M. (2007a) 'Televisuality without television? The Big Finish audios and discourses of 'tele-centric' *Doctor Who*', in Butler, D. (ed.) *Time and Relative Dissertations in Space: Critical Perspectives on Doctor Who*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.280-295.

Hills, M. (2007b) 'Media Academics as Media Audiences: Aesthetic Judgements in Media and Cultural Studies', in Gray, J., Sandvoss, C. and Harrington, C. L. (eds.) *Fandom: Identities and Communities in a Mediated World*. New York: New York University Press, pp.33-47.

Hills, M. (2010) *Triumph of a Time Lord: Regenerating Doctor Who in the Twenty-First Century*. London: IB Tauris.

Hills, M. (2013a) 'Fiske's "textual productivity" and digital fandom: Web 2.0 democratization versus fan distinction?' *Participations: Journal of Audience & Reception Studies*, 10(1), pp.130-153.

Hills, M. (2013b) 'Introduction: *Doctor Who* studies?' In Hills, M. (ed.) *New Dimensions of Doctor Who: Adventures in Space, Time and Television.* London: I. B. Tauris, pp.1-16.

Hills, M. (2015) 'Rebranding *Doctor Who* and Reimagining *Sherlock*: 'Quality' Television as 'makeover TV drama', *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 18(3), pp.317-331.

Hills, M. (2015b) *Doctor Who: The Unfolding Event – Marketing, Merchandising and Mediatizing a Brand Anniversary.* New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hof, K. (2006) 'Something you can actually pick up: Scrapbooking as a form and forum of cultural citizenship', *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3), pp.363-384.

Holt, D. B. (2006) 'Towards a sociology of branding', *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 2006(6), pp.299-302.

Howe, D. J. and Blumberg, A. T. (2003) *Howe's Transcendental Toybox.* 2nd edn. London: Telos Publishing.

Humpherys, A. (2011) 'Victorian Stage Adaptations and Novel Appropriations', in Ledger, S. and Furneaux, H. (eds.) *Charles Dickens in Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.27-34.

Irvine, M. and Tucker, M. (2011) *BBC VFX: The Story of the BBC Visual Effects Department.* London: Aurum Press Ltd.

Jancovich, M. (2000) '"A Real Shocker": authenticity, genre and the struggle for distinction', *Continuum*, 14(1), pp.23-35.

Jancovich, M. (2002) 'Cult Fictions: Cult Movies, Subcultural Capital and the Production of Cultural Distinctions', *Cultural Studies*, 16(2), pp.306-322.

Jancovich, M. and Hunt, N. (2004) 'The Mainstream, Distinction and Cult TV', in Gwenllian-Jones, S. and Pearson, R.E. (eds.) *Cult Television.* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 27-44.

Jancovich, M. and Lyons, J. (2003) 'Introduction', in Jancovich, M. and Lyons, J. (eds.) *Quality Popular Television.* London: British Film Institute, pp.1-8.

Jenkins, H. (1992) *Textual Poachers: Television Fans & Participatory Culture.* New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, H. (1998) 'The Poachers and the Stormtroopers: Cultural Convergence in the Digital Age.' Available at: http://web.mit.edu/~21fms/People/henry3/pub/stormtroopers.htm [Accessed on 11th May 2010].

Jenkins, H. (2006) *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide.* New York: New York University Press.

Jenkins, H. (2010) 'Henry Jenkins and Camille Bacon-Smith at Gaylaxicon 1992 (Part One).' Available at: http://henryjenkins.org/2010/02/gaylaxicon.html. [Accessed 11th May 2010].

Jenkins, H. (2012) '"Cultural acupuncture": Fan activism and the *Harry Potter* Alliance,' *Transformative Works and Cultures*, 10. doi:10.3983/twc.2012.0305.

Jenkins, H., Ford. S. and Green, J. (2013) *Spreadable Media: Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture.* New York: New York University Press.

Jenkins, R. (1992) *Pierre Bourdieu.* London: Routledge.

Jenson, J (1992) 'Fandom as Pathology: The Consequences of Characterisation', in Lewis, L.A. (ed.) *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media.* London: Routledge, pp.9-29.

Johnson, C. (2012) *Branding Television.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Johnson, C. (2013a) '*Doctor Who* as Programme Brand', in Hills, M. (ed.) *New Dimensions of Doctor Who: Adventures in Space, Time and Television.* London: I. B. Tauris, pp.95-112.

Johnson, C. (2013b) 'From brand congruence to the 'virtuous circle': branding and the commercialization of public service broadcasting.' *Media Culture & Society*, 11(2), pp.315-331.

Johnson, D. (2007) 'Fan-tagonism: Factions, Institutions, and Constitutive Hegemonies of Fandom', in Gray, J., Sandvoss, C. and Harrington, C. L. (eds.) *Fandom: Identities and Communities in a Mediated World.* New York: New York University Press, pp.285-300.

Johnson, R. (1993) 'Editor's Introduction', in Bourdieu, P., *The Field of Cultural Production.* Cambridge: Polity Press, pp.1-25.

Johnston, C. (2015) 'Doctor Who writer Steven Moffat denies he has made the show more misogynist.' *The Guardian*, 28th November, Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/media/2015/nov/28/doctor-who-writer-steven-moffat-denies-misogynist-claims. [Accessed 11th August 2016]

Jones, P. (1998) 'The Technology is not the cultural form? Raymond Williams's Sociological Critique of Marshall McLuhan.' *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 23(4), pp.423-54.

Kitten Board, The. (2012) Available at: http://www.thekittenboard.com/board/. [Accessed 4th May 2012].

Lopes, P. (2009) *Demanding Respect: The Evolution of the American Comic Book.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lotz, A. D. (2009) 'Industry-Level Studies and the Contributions of Gitlin's *Inside Prime Time*', in Mayer, M., Banks, M. J. and Caldwell, J. T. (eds.) *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge, pp.25-38.

Lury, C. (2004) *Brands: The Logos of the Global Economy.* New York: Routledge.

Marlow, C. (2009) 'The folding text: *Doctor Who*, adaptation and fan fiction', in Carroll, R. (ed.) *Adaptation in Contemporary Culture: textual infidelities.* London: Continuum, pp.46-57.

Mayer, M., Banks, M. J. and Caldwell, J. T. (2009) 'Introduction: production Studies: Roots and Routes', in Mayer, M., Banks, M. J. and Caldwell, J. T. (eds.) *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge, pp.1-12.

Mcgrath, C. (2006) 'And They All Died Happily Ever After.' *New York Times,* 2nd July, p.WK12. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2006/07/02/weekinreview/02mcgrath.html?_r=1&oref=slogin. [Accessed 20th June 2008].

McKee, A. (2001) 'Which is the Best *Doctor Who* Story? A Case Study in Value Judgements Outside the Academy.' *Intensities: The Journal of Cult Media*, 1. Available at: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/41991/ [Accessed on October 2nd 2014]

McKee, A. (2004) 'How to Tell the Difference between Production and Consumption: A Case Study in *Doctor Who* Fandom', in Gwenllian-Jones, S. and Pearson, R.E. (eds.) *Cult Television.* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, pp.169-179.

McKee, A. (2007) 'The Fans of Cultural Theory', in Gray, J., Sandvoss, C. and Harrington, C. L. (eds.) *Fandom: Identities and Communities in a Mediated World.* New York: New York University Press, pp.88-97.

McMurria, J. (2003) 'Long-format TV: Globalisation and Network Branding in a Multi-Channel Era', in Jancovich, M. and Lyons, J. (eds.) *Quality Popular Television.* London: British Film Institute, pp.65-87.

Mittell, J. (2015) *Complex TV: The Poetics of Contemporary Television Storytelling.* New York and London: New York University Press.

Monaco, J. (2010) 'Memory work, autoethnography and the construction of a fan-ethnography.' *Participations: Journal of Audience & Reception Studies*, 7(1), pp.102-42.

Neale, S. (1990) 'Questions of Genre.' *Screen*, 31(1), pp.45-66.

Nesbit, M. (1995) 'What Was an Author?' In Burke, S. (ed.) *Authorship From Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.247-262.

Newman, M. Z. and Levine, E. (2012) *Legitimating Television: Media Convergence and Cultural Status.* [Kindle Edition] UK: Routledge. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.co.uk.

O'Day, A. (2013) 'On Speed: The Ordering of Time and Pace of Action in *Doctor Who*', in Hills, M. (ed.), *New Dimensions of Doctor Who*. London: I.B.Tauris, pp.154-173.

Outpost Gallifrey. (2008a) Available at: http://www.gallifreyone.com/epguide-dw7.php. [Accessed 6th January 2008].

Outpost Gallifrey. (2008b) Available at: http://www.gallifreyone.com/forum/showthread.php?t=28314&page=3. [Accessed 25th July 2008).

Outpost Gallifrey. (2008c) 'Ratings information.' Available at: http://www.gallifreyone.com/epguide-dw4.php. [Accessed 1st August 2008].

Parkin, L. (2007) 'Canonicity Matters: defining the *Doctor Who* canon', in Butler, D. (ed.) *Time and Relative Dissertations in Space: Critical Perspectives on Doctor Who*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.246-262.

Perez, N. (2013) 'Gif Fics and the Rebloggable Canon of *SuperWhoLock*', in Booth, P. (ed.) *Fan Phenomena: Doctor Who*. Bristol: Intellect, pp.148-157.

Plato (1995) 'From *Ion*', in Burke, S. (ed.) *Authorship from Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.13-18.

Porterfield, C. (1970) 'Books: Boz Will Be Boz.' *Time Magazine.* 28th Dec. Available at: http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,944281,00.html. [Accessed 2nd July 2008].

Robb, B. J. (2009) *Timeless Adventures: How Doctor Who Conquered TV.* Somerset: Kamera Books.

Robinson, J. (2015) 'How *Doctor Who* Delivered a Righteously Feminist Finale.' *Vanity Fair*, 6th Dec. Available at: http://www.vanityfair.com/hollywood/2015/12/doctor-who-finale-feminist-clara-tardis. [Accessed 15th August 2016]

Rolinson, D. (2007) ''*Who* done it': discourses of authorship during the John Nathan-Turner era', in Butler, D. (ed.) *Time and Relative Dissertations in Space: Critical Perspectives on Doctor Who*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.176-189.

Russell, G. (2008) 'Discussion.' Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/doctorwho/classic/ebooks/scalesofinjustice/notes/page1.shtml. [Accessed on 5th August 2008.]

Sandvoss, C. (2005) *Fans: The Mirror of Consumption*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sandvoss, C. (2007) 'The Death of the Reader? Literary Theory and the Study of Texts in Popular Culture', in Gray, J., Sandvoss, C. and Harrington, C. L. (eds.) *Fandom: Identities and Communities in a Mediated World.* New York: New York University Press, pp.19-32.

Sarachan, J. (2013) '*Doctor Who*, Slactivism and Social Media Fandom', in Booth, P. (ed.) *Fan Phenomena: Doctor Who*. Bristol: Intellect, pp.106-115.

Scannell, P. (1989) 'Public service broadcasting and modern public life.' *Media Culture & Society*, 11(2), pp.135-166.

Scannell, P. (2007) *Media and Communication.* London: SAGE Publications.

Scannell, P. and Cardiff, D. (1982) 'Serving the Nation: Public Service Broadcasting Before the War', in Waites, B., Bennett, T. and Martin, G. (eds.) *Popular Culture: Past and Present.* London: Routledge, pp.161-188.

Schlicke, P. (2011) 'Popular Culture', in Ledger, S. and Furneaux, H. (eds.) *Charles Dickens in Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.91-97.

Schroeder, J. E. (2010) 'The Artist in Brand Culture', in O'Reilly, D. and Kerrigan, F. (eds.) *Marketing the Arts: A Fresh Approach.* New York: Routledge, 18-30.

Schweizer, F. (2011) 'Authorship and the Professional Writer', in Ledger, S. and Furneaux, H. (eds.) *Charles Dickens in Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.117-124.

Sconce, J. (1995) ''Trashing' the academy; taste, excess, and an emerging politics of cinematic style.' *Screen*, 36(4), pp.371-393.

Scoones, P. (1996) 'Paul Cornell Interview.' *Time Space Visualiser* 48. Available at: http://nzdwfc.tetrap.com/archive/tsv48/paulcornell.html. [Accessed 9th May 2013].

Segal, P. and Russell, G. (2000) *Doctor Who: Regeneration.* London: HarperCollins.

Shimpach, S. (2010) *Television in Transition: The Life and Afterlife of the Narrative Action Hero.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Smith, D. (2007) 'Broader and Deeper: the lineage and impact of the *Timewyrm* series', in Butler, D. (ed.) *Time and Relative Dissertations in Space: Critical Perspectives on Doctor Who*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.263-277.

Sutherland, J. A. (1976) *Victorian Novelists and Publishers*. London: Athlone Press.

Taylor, G. (1999) *Artists in the Audience: Cults, Camp, and American Film Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thornton, S. (1995) *Club Cultures: Music, Media and Subcultural Capital.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Tracey, M. (1998) *The Decline and Fall of Public Service Broadcasting.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tulloch, J. and Jenkins, H. (1995) *Science Fiction Audiences: Watching Doctor Who and Star Trek.* London: Routledge.

Tulloch, J. and Alvarado, M. (1983) *Doctor Who: The Unfolding Text.* London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Tulloch, J. and Moran, A. (1986) *A Country Practice: Quality Soap*. Paddington: Currency press Pty Ltd.

Tulloch, J. (2000) *Watching Television Audiences: Cultural Theories and Methods.* London: Arnold.

Tushnet, R. (2007) 'Copyright Law, Fan Practices, and the Rights of the Author', in Gray, J., Sandvoss, C. and Harrington, C. L. (eds.) *Fandom: Identities and Communities in a Mediated World.* New York: New York University Press, pp.60-71.

Vlock, D. (1998) *Dickens, Novel Reading and the Victorian Popular Theatre.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace, R. (2013) 'Joint Ventures and Loose Cannons: Reconstructing *Doctor Who*'s Missing Past', in Booth, P. (ed.) *Fan Phenomena: Doctor Who*. Bristol: Intellect, pp.28-37.

Weber, T. (2007) 'BBC strikes Google-YouTube deal.' *BBC.* 2nd March. Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/6411017.stm. [Accessed 25th August 2008].

Williams, R. (1958) *Culture and Society.* Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Williams, R. (1961) *The Long Revolution.* Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Williams, R. (1974) *Television.* London: Fontana.

Williams, R. (1977) *Marxism and Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, R. (2010) 'Good *Neighbours*? Fan/producer relationships and the broadcasting field', *Continuum*, 24(2), pp.279-289.

Williams, R. (2011) "'This is the Night TV Died": Television Post-Object Fandom and the Demise of *The West Wing*.' *Popular Communication,* 9(4), pp.266-279.

Williams, R. (2013a) 'Tweeting from the TARDIS: Interaction, Liveness and Social Media in *Doctor Who* Fandom', in Hills, M. (ed.) *New Dimensions of Doctor Who*. London: I.B.Tauris, pp.154-173.

Williams, R. (2013b) 'Tele-Branding in TVIII: The Network as Brand and the Programme as Brand.' *New Review of Film and Television Studies*, 5(1), pp.5-24.

Williams, R. (2015) *Post-Object Fandom: Television, Identity and Self-narrative.* London: Bloomsbury.

Williamson, M. (2005) *The Lure of the Vampire: Gender, Fiction and Fandom from Bram Stoker to Buffy.* London: Wallflower Press.

Wolf, M. J. P. (2012) *Building Imaginary Worlds: The Theory and History of Subcreation.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Young, E. (1759) 'Conjectures on Original Composition', in Burke, S. (ed.) (1995). *Authorship from Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.37-42.

Zeller-Jacques, M. (2014) 'Don't Stop Believing: Textual Excess and Discourses of Satisfaction in the Finale of *The Sopranos*', in Stewart, M. (ed.) *Melodrama In Contemporary Film and Television.* New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.114-133.

Zubernis, L. and Larsen, K. (2012) *Fandom at the Crossroads: Celebration, Shame and Fan/Producer Relationships.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Filmography.

Alias (2001-2006) Bad Robot Productions

Buffy the Vampire Slayer (1997-2003) Mutant Enemy

Doctor Who (1963-present) BBC Wales

Fringe (2008-2013) Bad Robot Productions

Lost (2004-2010) Bad Robot Productions

The Sarah-Jane Adventures (2007-2011) BBC Wales

Torchwood (2006-2012) BBC Wales