Ecologies of Cultural Production
Career construction in Irish film, TV drama and theatre

Report for the Creative Ireland Programme
Ruth Barton & Denis Murphy
Acknowledgements

This project could not have been completed without the support of a network of organisations and individuals. In the first place, we would like to thank the Creative Ireland Programme. Not only did they fund the research that went into this project, including the workshop held to present our preliminary findings in September 2019, but they also provided advice and mentorship at key moments in the evolution of the project. We are indebted to the Trinity Long Room Hub, and in particular to their Research Programme Officer, Maureen Burgess, for her assistance with preparing our application, and to the Hub staff for their help with the workshop organisation. When we were planning our application, we were enormously lucky to be able to call on the advice of Professor Geoffrey Crossick, Distinguished Professor of the Humanities in the School of Advanced Study at the University of London. Professor Crossick was also an invaluable contributor to the workshop, and Chair of the presentation of the initial findings of the survey.

We would like to thank all those who participated in the workshop – our industry panel of Anne Clarke (Landmark Productions), Ed Guiney (Element Pictures), and Willie White (Dublin Theatre Festival) – our keynote speaker, Dr Caitriona Noonan, School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies, Cardiff University and Chair, Dr Phil Ramsey, Centre for Media Research, Ulster University. We were delighted that so many members of the Film, Television, and Theatre communities attended the workshop, and contributed so generously to the discussions. A full recording of the workshop can be found on the Ecologies of Cultural Production Website: https://www.tcd.ie/creative-arts/research/projects/ECP.php.

We would like to thank Kerry McCall Magan for advice on setting up the project; Mary Doyle for help with organisation and presentation of our findings; Gillian Doyle for comments on the draft report. We are very grateful for the additional research conducted by Conor Murray on individual careers in Film, Television and Theatre. We would also like to thank Imogen Pollard, administrator of the Department of Film, Trinity College Dublin, for her assistance with setting up and organising the project.

Without the generous responses of the 82 individuals to our requests to complete the questionnaire, this research could not have been conducted; we are deeply grateful to them for taking time out of their professional lives to respond to our questions.

Finally, this project was made possible by the advice and professional assistance of Professor of Economics, Emeritus, John O’Hagan, of the Department of Economics, Trinity College Dublin. Professor O’Hagan was an equal participant in Ecologies of Cultural Production and is as much an author of the final outcome as are we.
I couldn’t have lived without the Arts Council bursary. You’re in college every day, all day, Monday to Friday, then at weekends you’re working on lines and parts, it’s really impossible to get a job to sustain oneself, so really the funding was a lifesaver.

(Actor A)
# Table of Contents

| Acknowledgements | 1 |
| Executive Summary | 5 |
| Aims and objectives | 5 |
| Key findings | 6 |
| Key Policy Implications and recommendations | 7 |
| Introduction | 9 |
| Background | 9 |
| Overview (Irish government and Arts Council policies) | 9 |
| Pay and casualisation in the creative sector | 12 |
| Research Design | 17 |
| Defining ‘prominence’ | 18 |
| Building a sample of stage and screen workers | 18 |
| Fieldwork and analysis | 18 |
| Ecologies of Cultural Production Public Workshop | 21 |
| Panel discussion | 21 |
| Keynote address | 22 |
| Presentation of preliminary results | 23 |
| Industry Overview | 25 |
| Film and Television | 25 |
| Theatre | 26 |
| Survey Findings | 29 |
| A. Sample description | 29 |
| A1. Award Sector | 29 |
| A2. Gender | 29 |
| A3. Age at first award | 31 |
| A4. Country of birth | 32 |
| A5. Occupation | 32 |
| A6. Work breakdown: time divided between sectors | 33 |
| B. Education and training | 36 |
| B1. Education | 36 |
| B2. Professional training | 37 |
| B3. Formative experiences | 39 |
| C. Funding and subsidy | 41 |
| C1. State grants and bursaries | 41 |
| C2. Career stage (public funding) | 44 |
| C3. How helpful? (Public funding) | 45 |
| C4. Private grants and bursaries | 46 |
| C5. Career stage (private funding) | 47 |
| C6. How helpful? (Private funding) | 48 |
| C7. Career breakthroughs | 49 |
| C8. Awareness of public funding | 50 |
| D. Geographic location and mobility | 51 |
| D1. Residential country | 51 |
| D2. Residential locality | 52 |
| E. Career mobility | 54 |
| E1. Theatre and career start | 54 |
| E2. Importance of theatre experience for Film/TV career | 56 |
| E3. Persistence in theatre | 58 |
| E3a. Why film/TV workers remain in theatre | 59 |
| E4. Work in both TV drama and film | 59 |
| E4a. Why work in both film and TV drama? | 60 |
| E5. Working in multiple sectors: disadvantages | 61 |
| E6. Importance of subsidised theatre for film/TV sector success | 62 |
| F. Supplementary work | 63 |
| F1. Advertising work | 63 |
| F2. Advertising work: reliance | 64 |
| F3. Advertising work: creative content | 65 |
| F4. Music video work | 66 |
| F5. Music video work: reliance | 67 |
| F6. Music video work: creative content | 67 |
| F7. Other work | 67 |
| F8. Other work: types | 68 |
| F9. Other work: creative content | 69 |
| G. Networks, professional connections, impact of others | 70 |
| G1. Early family/personal connections to Film/TV Drama or Theatre? | 70 |
| G2. Network origins | 71 |
| G3. Did the network help to develop your career? | 73 |
| G4. How networks help | 74 |
| G5. Are you in close geographical contact with others in the sector? | 75 |
| G6. Do work relationships extend beyond work? | 76 |
| H. Clusters | 77 |
| Conclusion | 81 |
| Our Findings | 82 |
| Policy Implications and recommendations | 84 |
| Select Bibliography | 87 |
| Appendices | 91 |
| Appendix I: Survey questionnaire | 91 |
| Appendix II: Awards systems used in sample construction | 97 |
If casting people think you live or are based outside the area, they’re less likely to consider you for a role, even if you have accommodation. No one wants to pay the per diems. (Actor B)
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Executive Summary

The survey

This research was funded for a 15-month period by the Creative Ireland Programme. It was co-authored by Associate Professor Ruth Barton and Research Fellow Dr Denis Murphy of the Department of Film, School of Creative Arts, Trinity College Dublin.

Aims and objectives

The objective of the report was, through conducting interviews and gathering data on prominent individuals – writers, directors, and actors – in Irish Film, Theatre, and Television Drama, to establish what part state subsidies played in career construction in these creative sectors. The purpose was to generate original data that would inform decision-making on public policy in the area of arts funding. A further objective was to establish a methodology that could be applied to all sectors of cultural production. Additionally, we proposed to examine the evolution of creative clusters and analyse the geographic distribution of workers in these specific occupations. Of further interest was the breakdown of occupation by gender and education.

Conduct of research

The team established viable parameters to the research by restricting it to ‘prominent’ individuals. These were selected on the basis of awards in their respective occupational categories. To be included they had to have won an Irish Times Theatre Award or an Irish Film and Television Academy (IFTA) award, or they had to have been nominated for a non-Irish award (such as a Tony, Olivier, BAFTA or Academy Award). These awards were chosen as they are the major domestic and international awards for the respective sectors (see Appendix II). The timespan for the awards was: Irish Times Theatre Awards (1997-2018); Olivier Awards (1990-2018); Tony Awards (1990-2018); Academy Awards (1990-2018); BAFTAs (1990-2018); IFTAs (2003-2018).

This resulted in a list of 206 prominent individuals. We included multiple award winners or nominees only once in the sample (for instance, one actor with 14 wins/nominations appears in the sample only once). The nomination process for these awards includes an element of peer selection as well as industry recognition and thus was considered a viable methodology. Information on incomes was not sought in the survey, as its inclusion might have deterred participation. Instead, questions were asked about the extent and nature of supplementary work undertaken. The researchers devised a questionnaire, and invited responses. Every individual was approached either indirectly or through their representative. Overall, 82 completed the questionnaire (a response rate of 40%) through a process of one-on-one interviews. Partial information on the remaining 124 individuals was gathered through online searches. All responses were anonymised.

We also hosted a public workshop with invited speakers from industry and academia in order to discuss issues relevant to the research project. The outcomes of this workshop are reflected in the research findings and policy implications below.
### Key findings

#### Public Subsidy
- More than two thirds of prominent creative workers receive public subsidy in the form of direct grants or other financial supports (e.g. social welfare). Writers and directors are especially dependent on public funding.
- Prominent creatives acknowledge the importance of public funding to career development. Writers and directors are particularly aware of the necessity of this subsidy for their careers.
- The Arts Council and Screen Ireland (and their equivalent agencies in Northern Ireland and the UK) are the major public funders, accounting for two thirds of all sources mentioned. Private funding sources are far less important than public sources.

#### Gender
- The gender breakdown of prominent creatives is 60:40 male to female. This disparity is due to low levels of female representation in the director and writer categories.
- The major public funding sources benefit men more than women.
- Women are more likely to engage in training and development at all stages of their careers.

#### Education
- Creative workers are well educated, with more than 70% possessing either a primary or postgraduate degree.

#### Training
- The professional training sector, which is not always subsidised, provides a significant entry point to the creative industries.

#### Geography
- One third of prominent Irish creatives have a primary residence outside of Ireland. Women are more likely to live abroad.
- Almost two-thirds of prominent creatives live in Dublin and/or London.

#### Career Mobility
- Creative workers demonstrate a high degree of mobility between sectors (film, TV drama and theatre). For workers who operate mainly in film and TV drama, there is little distinction between these two sub-sectors and a very high degree of mobility between them. Half of these ‘mainly film/TV’ workers began their careers in theatre.

#### Supplementary Work
- Despite their prominence, more than two thirds of creatives report a dependence on supplementary work. The main sources of alternative income are the advertising industry, followed by the education and training sectors.

#### Networks and Clusters
- Networks are important for career development, finding work, generating ideas, and moral support. These networks are formed very early and often last throughout careers.
- Clusters emerge out of third level education institutions and certain production environments.
**Key Policy Implications and recommendations**

**Public Subsidy**
- While effective at present, our findings indicate that adjustments that promote stronger female representation in senior and strategic roles would deliver additional benefits.

**Clusters and networks**
- To unlock the sector's potential for growth we need to facilitate affordable living and working spaces in selected urban centres.

**Education and Training**
- We need to encourage development of the creative skills of the future by embedding creativity in the school curriculum, and funding career development training targeted at increasing diversity and mobility across all sectors.

---

Source: Abbey Theatre, photo by Ros Kavanagh
If you’re pitching something, there’s no substitute for just going (to LA). But doing two or three trips in a year is very manageable, and you still have your life here. And it’s hard to know where you’re going to be shooting anyway. If you move to LA, not that much stuff gets shot there. You might end up spending half your time in Canada. (Film director G)
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Introduction

Background

This research project takes place against a background of public and sectoral interest, both locally and internationally, in the development of the creative industries. Here, we concentrate specifically on workers in theatre, film and television drama, questioning how public funding contributes to careers in these sectors.¹

To address this, it is important to understand the creative industries as functioning as an ecology, rather than as a set of distinct occupations, with personnel moving fluidly between them. By analysing how workers in these occupations construct their careers, we demonstrate an economy of movement backwards and forwards between the state-subsidised sectors – theatre, public service broadcasting and independent film - and the commercial sectors – commercial cinema, commercial television and the advertising industry. By further analysing career construction, we address questions such as training and education, the formation of clusters, spatialization, and gender differentiation.

Overview (Irish government and Arts Council policies)

In Ireland, state policies on the creative industries are still relatively undeveloped. The subsidised arts and culture sector has suffered from austerity measures and fears over the economic implications of Brexit. Anxieties clearly exist about committing public money to the arts; in a market-driven economy, there is the further question as to whether governments should support the arts, or whether the arts should adapt to commercial 'realities' to survive. Some research has been conducted on the importance of developing the creative industries in general, of the spatialization of these industries, and on employment conditions in the particular sectors covered in this report. However, there is no consensus as to what constitutes the creative industries in Ireland, where many of the players are software companies attracted to the country through financial incentives. Nor is there one single government department with overall responsibility for the Creative Industries. The Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht is responsible for the sectors discussed here with the exception of television drama which also falls under the Department of Communications, Climate Action & Environment. The Indecon Assessment of the Economic Impact of the Arts in Ireland estimated that the creative industries in total (including software development, publishing and other cultural and creative sectors as well as film, theatre and television) contributed a total of €4.7 billion in GVA terms during 2010. This was equivalent to approximately 3% of Irish Gross Domestic Product (GDP) during that year. The report estimated the number of direct jobs supported by the creative industries in Ireland to be 49,306 during 2010, with a total of up to 78,900 direct, indirect and induced jobs supported in aggregate terms by the creative industries in this period.

In 2015, Minister for Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, Heather Humphreys, published a discussion document, Culture 2025 (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, 2015), to set out a national cultural policy for Ireland. Following a round of consultations with stakeholders, and submissions from cultural bodies, local authorities and government departments, the draft framework policy, Culture 2025 - Éire Ildánach, Framework Policy to 2025 (Department of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs, 2016) was submitted to the Joint Oireachtas Committee on Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs. It should be noted that the report covered areas not relevant to this study such as built heritage and biodiversity. It also drew on the ‘Ireland 2016 Centenary Programme’ as a model for participation in cultural activities. This new document proposed that:

■ Culture should be accessible to all;
■ Culture had an important role in social integration;
■ Cultural participation can enhance the wellbeing of communities in rural and urban areas;
■ Culture helps promote Ireland in the international context and is crucial to the development of the tourism industry.

The report noted that ‘various public bodies and organisations already provide significant direct and indirect supports to our artists and other creators. Many artists and creative workers, however, still struggle to make a living’.

In terms of how these objectives were to be achieved, the Framework Policy noted that the government was committed to progressively increasing funding to the arts and the cultural sector as the economy improved. It also noted that public funding must be prioritised and used in the most efficient and effective way possible. In July 2017, the Joint Committee on Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs published their Report on Culture 2025 - Éire Ildánach, Framework Policy to 2025 (Joint Committee on Arts, Heritage, Regional Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs, 2017). The report placed greater emphasis on the artist as the locus of cultural expression, and recommended that the rights of the artist should be:

■ The right to choose such a life and the right to create the art that one needs to create, through whatever medium or form;
■ The right to be recognised and supported by the institutions of the State and not to be discriminated against by it;
■ The right to have one’s individual and collective contribution to the overall cultural expression, to the community and to the economy acknowledged, supported and correctly valued;
■ The right to fair and equitable remuneration for work, when employed or commissioned, and the right to control, dispose of, or licence copyright as one sees fit, in accordance with copyright legislation and the various international agreements pertaining to artists.
Amongst its recommendations was the establishment of a Department of Culture; it also recommended that creativity be an informed part of every Government department (to be reified in the appointment of an artist-in-residence in each department and in each local authority). It made a number of recommendations on how further monies should be raised to deliver these supports. The Framework Policy was updated and relaunched in January 2020.\(^2\)

This increased focus on the artist, and the particular acknowledgement of the artist’s right to proper working conditions, including renumeration, is also reflected in the Arts Council’s policy document Making Great Art Work (Arts Council, 2015). This identified two priority areas for policy: the artist and public engagement; and three priority areas for planning and decision-making: investment strategy, spatial and demographic planning, and developing capacity. The document notes that: ‘it is an abiding concern of the Arts Council that the generally low level of renumeration of many artists constitutes a significant hidden subsidy of the arts.’ In response to this situation, it undertakes that:

- We will place emphasis on the fair and equitable renumeration of artists in our overall investment strategy and its funding programmes and schemes, and in our partnerships and working relationships.
- We will make demonstrated commitment to this objective central to our funding agreements with arts organisations.
- We will make information on the living and working conditions of artists an important feature of our advice and advocacy programmes as well as of our partnerships.

Reviewing these iterations of a public policy document on the arts and culture, one can trace a greater shift in understanding that the arts can only thrive with support. It is hard to see any real willingness to put in place a robust financial plan for the sector, other than via funding of the Arts Council and other existing bodies such as Screen Ireland. There remains no dedicated Department of Culture. The exception has been the recent announcement (in July 2019) that the Welfare Scheme for artists, which was already being piloted for writers and visual artists, was to be extended to other self-employed artists from September 2019. Under the scheme, artists can receive Jobseekers’ Allowance and focus on their creative work for a year, without having to take part in non-artistic jobseeker activities.
Pay and casualisation in the creative sector

While our report is not specifically concerned with pay, it is important to understand that it was undertaken against a background of discussions around pay and casualisation in the arts. Evidently, casualisation, the ‘gig’ economy, is not restricted to the arts, but it is closely associated with a creative career. In Ireland, the publication of the Central Statistics Office (2018) figures to the third quarter of 2018 showed that average national hourly earnings were €22.62. The lowest earning sectors were the accommodation and food services sector with average hourly earnings of €12.89 and the arts, entertainment, recreation and other service activities sector with a rate of €17.12. However, average weekly earnings had increased in all 13 sectors of the economy. The largest percentage increase was 7.2% in the arts, entertainment, recreation and other service activities sector where average weekly earnings rose from €461.95 to €494.98.

Ireland was one of a number of European countries included in Behind the Screens, European survey on the remuneration of audiovisual authors (FERA, 2019) which covered directors, screenwriters and ‘other audiovisual authors’ in the screen industries. Its main findings were:

- In all three professions the gender distribution is tilted towards male, and this gender gap is less pronounced in the younger age groups.
- All three groups tend to be highly educated (the majority hold a degree in higher education).
- Work satisfaction (the intrinsic qualities) tends to be high.
- Satisfaction with the extrinsic qualities (pay, benefits, security etc.) of the job tends to be much lower. Only 27% of the audiovisual authors are satisfied with the remunerations they receive for projects as an audiovisual author and 44% are explicitly dissatisfied. Job security proves to be an even stronger issue: only 17% of the audiovisual authors are satisfied with this aspect of their job. 66% are explicitly dissatisfied.
- The median income for an audiovisual author is around €19,000 a year. Most have to supplement their work with income from other sources (for example, employment outside the audiovisual sector).
- Income patterns are irregular.
In January 2019, the Irish Theatre Forum published a report entitled Review of Pay and Conditions in the Performing Arts in 2018 (Irish Theatre Forum, 2019). The results were based on a survey designed to gather information on pay and conditions in the performing arts to which 144 artists and creative practitioners and 97 arts organisations responded.

Key findings include:

- One third of artists and creative practitioners earned less than the 2018 National Minimum wage of €9.55 per hour.
- 60% of PAYE jobs in performing arts organisations pay less than the average national annual earnings across all sectors in 2017 of €35,365.
- Four fifths of jobs in the performing arts are precarious.
- 74% of performing artists and creative practitioners rely on other sources of income.
- 48% of performing artists and creative practitioners were unable to make any PRSI contributions between August and October 2018.

The report engendered some considerable public discussion. This was further fuelled by a controversy that arose, also in January 2019, around the production policies of the Abbey Theatre, Ireland’s national theatre. In an open letter to the Abbey Board, the Arts Council, and the Minster for Culture and Heritage, the theatre community claimed that the theatre was staging too many outside productions or co-produced work, saying this has had a serious impact on employment prospects at the Abbey and on rates of pay.

These two events – the publication of the report and the Abbey controversy – reflect a wider debate around precarious employment in the creative sector. While artists were not the specific focus of the 2018 TASC (Think-tank for action on social change) report, Living With Uncertainty, The Social Implications of Precarious Work, the authors noted that occupations such as hairdressers, sports facilities workers and art workers were the only sector to score highly in all three categories of precarious work: part-time with variable hours, temporary, and solo self-employment (TASC, 2018). The TASC report spelled out the implications for this kind of low-paid, irregular employment, notably:

- Inability to pay for healthcare cover; inability to take time off for illness.
- Inability to purchase housing, inability to pay rent in a high-rental environment.
- Inability to plan for a family; inability to afford childcare.
These findings chimed with the public airing of individual experiences by creative workers of low pay, precarious employment, and the challenges of finding accommodation within the rental sector. Thus, for instance, in July 2018, singer/songwriter David Kitt gained some considerable media coverage when he announced that he was quitting Ireland because it was too expensive to live in Dublin any longer. On his Facebook page, Kitt explained that he was being forced out of his house as it was being sold to a consortium of European investors:

> It will be sold or rented no doubt to someone working for Amazon on a base salary of 70k while the people who make this city what it is are forced out to the suburbs or to a city (where) they can afford a reasonable quality of life and where their level of income doesn’t make them feel like a complete failure (in Boland, 2018).

Ironically, that putative Amazon employee might well have been considered a member of the creative economy were they, for instance, working in software development.
When you’ve been in a successful international TV drama, people want to cast you. This is about castability, being able to say, ‘We have people from “Series Name” in this. There were lots of offers after that. Marketability, castability – people want actors like that in their project, makes it seem more valid. (Actor D)
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This research was funded by Creative Ireland and conducted by the Department of Film, Trinity College Dublin. The focus was on career construction in the film/TV drama and theatre industries, with a particular interest in the role of public subsidy.

To that end, a survey of ‘prominent’ creative workers was designed, in order to:

- understand how creative workers in film, television drama and theatre enter the sector and progress their careers;
- examine the role of public cultural subsidies in career development;
- illuminate the extent of career mobility between the film, television and theatre sectors;
- examine the evolution of creative clusters (e.g. drama societies, production companies, theatre groups, regional broadcasters, etc.);
- examine the extent to which creative workers in these sectors must supplement their incomes from other sources.

The purpose of the project is to provide data on career construction so that an informed debate on public policy on arts funding can take place. Our approach reflects new directions in international research on the effectiveness of arts policy. Where previously, researchers measured success through analysing cultural consumption (e.g. through audience research), now the focus has shifted to cultural production and the interdependencies between cultural outputs. We are also cognisant of the need to complement findings on the economic impact of cultural production with complementary methodologies, such as those developed here. Ecologies of Cultural Production is therefore the first survey of its kind in Ireland, taking a ground-breaking approach to analysing the long-term effects of arts policy.

The research commenced in November 2018 with sample construction and questionnaire design. Fieldwork was carried out between February and June 2019, in the form of an interview-based survey of prominent creative workers in order to build a dataset based on real and ongoing career experiences. This survey was supplemented with additional online research. In addition to the survey, a one-day public workshop was held in September 2019. The event brought together industry practitioners, academics, and policy makers in a series of panels and Q&A sessions. A presentation of initial findings was included, to initiate discussion specifically related to the research questions. The content of the panels and ensuing discussions were then incorporated into the subsequent interpretation of final survey results and this report.
Defining ‘prominence’

As one of the purposes of the project is to establish a methodology to be used in future research into additional occupations and adjacent cultural production sectors, it was decided to focus in this initial phase on ‘successful’ careers. While success can be measured in alternative ways, including financially, it was felt that a focus on major film and theatre industry awards, which are substantially based on peer recognition, would be more conducive to securing cooperation with the survey. ‘Prominence’ was therefore defined based on winning Irish awards or being nominated for major awards overseas (the nomination considered a sufficient marker of prominence due to the more competitive nature of the major international awards).

Building a sample of stage and screen workers

To build a sample of prominent Irish film and theatre workers by this method, we focused on individuals winning awards for acting, directing and writing, considering these occupations to represent a viable, if hardly exhaustive, portion of ‘creative’ workers in these fields. For theatre workers, we compiled a list of winners of Irish Times Theatre Awards, since their inception in 1997, and nominees for Olivier Awards (UK) and Tony Awards (USA). For film workers, we chose the Irish Film and Television Awards (again since their inception, in 2003), BAFTA awards (UK) and Academy Awards (USA). (Appendix II contains more information about how these awards systems are organised.)

Awards records were examined back to 1990. The lengthy timeframe allowed us to capture a wide selection of film and theatre workers whose careers, while still mostly active, would have progressed into late-career in some cases. This would allow the examination of a very wide range of career development. The process produced a sample of 206 Irish individuals, all of whom were approached, either directly via telephone/email or through their agents, requesting an interview. In order to maximise the response rate, subjects were assured of anonymity. 82 individuals agreed to be interviewed, a response rate of 40%.

Fieldwork and analysis

The interviews were structured around a questionnaire designed to elicit data about education, training, geographic location, access to funding, professional achievements, mobility between stage and screen, and professional networks (see Appendix I). The interviews were generally carried out either face to face, usually in a mutually convenient café in greater Dublin, or via telephone or skype if more convenient (due to residence or work commitments abroad, for example).

In addition to the interview data, information was collected on the remaining 124 individuals via online sources, allowing us in some cases to base findings on the entire sample. All data was anonymised and compiled into an Excel database for analysis.
Source: Screen Ireland
The hidden subsidy in the theatre is massive. Every single person working at every level in the business subsidises their art, whether they’re actors or producers or technicians, and unless you can afford to do that, it’s really hard to sustain a career, to have children, to have somewhere to live. At the moment, I think we have quite an unequal business.

(Producer E)
As part of this funded project, the research team held a public workshop in Trinity College Dublin’s Long Room Hub on Monday 2 September 2019. The workshop consisted of three events: a panel discussion on career construction in the creative arts; a keynote address; and a presentation of initial findings from the researchers.

**Panel discussion**

Ed Guiney (Element Pictures), Anne Clarke (Landmark Productions) and Willie White (Dublin Theatre Festival).

The panel discussion included:

- How the panellists started their careers
  - Barriers to entry: all three panellists agreed that there were considerable barriers to entry and that while the discussion around female participation had helped to change attitudes, new voices from immigrant groups and working-class backgrounds were not being heard and that interventions were needed to enable this. One issue (as the research for this project also identified) was that many careers started at third level and that, in terms of class and opportunity, this worked as a filter. It was suggested that encouragement to pursue a career in the creative field needed to start much earlier, at school-age. The panel agreed that all sectors needed more support and incentives to broaden entry.
  - New audiences – the panel agreed that if people can see their stories on stage, they will attend. Greater diversity of creative workers will therefore create greater diversity of audiences. Thus, there is an economic advantage to a more inclusive industry.
  - Sustaining careers: the panellists agreed that sustaining careers was very challenging particularly for certain kinds of creative workers. Time spent in training, in writing funding applications, and between projects all made it very difficult to sustain a career, particularly for directors and writers. Many creative workers were forced to self-exploit. In film, owing to the current boom in production, on the other hand, there is consistent well-paid work for freelancers, particularly in below-the-line work.
  - Career mobility: the panellists discussed career mobility as being more often from theatre to the better-paid world of film and television, with work in advertising and voice-overs being crucial to subsidising careers in theatre.
Keynote address

Dr Caítriona Noonan, Senior Lecturer in Media and Communication in the School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies (JOMEC) at Cardiff University.

In her keynote, Caítriona Noonan addressed the issue of sustainability in the creative workforce. A workforce that is fit for purpose, she argued, should be flexible and mobile, contributing locally but also globally. The insistence on meritocracy means that, in theory, working hard and having talent will be enough to get you a creative career. But academic research points to structural inequalities. Researchers have concluded that there are fundamentally different outcomes for women, for workers from minority cultures, and workers from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

Education

Noonan noted that most people who work in the creative sector hold third level degrees. Not having the networks that come from that education, or the soft skills that education provides, are a disadvantage to those who are not accessing third-level education. There is also a responsibility for educators to ensure student diversity, and a diverse curriculum. Third level also needs to be a space to allow experimentation without fear of failure.

Interventions and solutions

Dr. Noonan’s own research has concluded that balance is key – that a healthy creative ecology should include both international productions (such as Game of Thrones) and also an indigenous sector, with a strong public broadcasting culture. Unlike many transnational corporations, public service broadcasters can be made accountable to the sector, in terms of diversity for instance. In particular, she highlighted the importance of long-running productions, such as soap operas, that allow for talent to develop over time. The other area that needs support are mid-level careers and particularly below-the-line workers (technical staff). She further argued that there are intangible rewards for public and private investment in buildings and infrastructure, studios, and performance centres. These physical structures create clusters that facilitate mobility through information sharing and build a critical mass of expertise. The dangers are those of all clusters, that they risk being closed to new voices.
Presentation of preliminary results

Introduced by Professor Geoffrey Crossick, Professor of the Humanities at the School of Advanced Study, University of London.

Introducing the presentation of initial findings by Ruth Barton and Denis Murphy, Prof Crossick discussed the tendency to distinguish the subsidised from the commercial arts. In order to defend subsidies, the sector has tended to rely on economic arguments around impact. While these arguments are important, this is not, he argued, what the arts exist for. Considering the arts as an ecology – embracing subsidised, commercial and amateur production – allows a far deeper understanding of the flows between the subsidised and the commercial. These flows include ideas, talent and finance. The subsidised sector, for instance, allows for risk-taking. It allows for the development of skills in acting, directing, producing, lighting, and sound. It supplies actors, writers, and technicians to the commercial sector. These are not, however, linear flows, but, as the research in this project demonstrates, a circuit of movement.

Following an introductory address by Prof Ruth Barton outlining the background to the survey, including the current climate in Arts funding and some recent related research, Dr. Denis Murphy presented some key preliminary findings. There then followed a discussion of these results with those attending.

A video recording of the workshop can be accessed at: https://www.tcd.ie/creative-arts/research/projects/ECP.php.
I do any work as it comes along, if I can afford to do it. It’s not like I’ve had so many job offers that I’ve said, I’ll park theatre now for a year, because I can’t afford to do that. I didn’t pursue any of the jobs that I got, I would do whatever comes along. I didn’t have a plan or ambition to get into film, things just fell in my way.

(Actor F)
The film, television drama and theatre sub-sectors of Ireland’s creative industries have evolved over time, fulfilling important roles in Irish cultural life. At various times central to the production of national narratives and the construction of Irish identity, these industries have been of considerable interest to the State, which has provided most of the important capital infrastructural elements for establishing film (Ardmore Studios), television (RTÉ and its studio production complex) and theatre (the Abbey and several regional Arts Centres). While these institutions have always operated semi-independently of the State, they have nevertheless been heavily reliant on the ministries responsible for cultural and industrial policy for their fiscal viability. There follows a brief overview of the current structure of the Film/TV and Theatre industries in Ireland, to set the scene for the later consideration of our findings in relation to actors, writers and directors working in and between these sectors.

Film and Television

Film and television drama forms part of the overall ‘live action production’ sector of the audiovisual (AV) industry in Ireland. According to the recent Economic Analysis of the Audiovisual Sector in the Republic of Ireland, a report commissioned by the government from the consulting firm Olsberg SPI, direct employment in that wider AV industry is 10,560 full-time equivalents (FTE), about half (5,430) of which is within the film/TV Live Action and Digital production subsectors. Within that group, the independent production sector accounts for 3,260 FTE employment.

Much of this latter employment is freelance or self-employed, as film crews, actors, directors and other personnel are hired on a per-project basis by the production company making a film or television drama. It is not possible to quantify the exact number of these production companies, although the Audiovisual Strategic Review Steering Group’s 2011 Creative Capital report estimated the number of AV content production companies at about 500. Most independent production companies are small, employing a handful of production, development and/or administration staff, hiring on demand from the freelance community as projects move into production. For freelancers themselves, including the actors, writers and directors with which this research is concerned, employment can therefore be precarious, affected by the individual’s talent and reputation within the industry, but also conditioned by the extent of their personal and professional networks, as crews are often assembled by ‘heads of department’ (Director of Photography, Art Director, Location Manager etc.) out of their own contacts, based on past experience as well as the specific demands of the production.
As the film and TV drama industry has cultural and commercial sub-sectors, within and between which cast, crews and production companies operate relatively seamlessly from project to project, funding comes from a variety of public and private sources. The commercial sector, largely comprising incoming films like Star Wars (USA) or TV dramas such as Ripper Street (UK) or Nightflyers (USA) bring their own mix of private/public funding from the country of origin, but such productions can access additional subsidy through Screen Ireland and especially the Section 481 tax credit incentive, which effectively refunds up to 32% of the Irish production cost to the producer. Depending on the scale of the budget, indigenous film and TV drama may also access the tax credit, in addition to development and production finance from Screen Ireland and the Broadcasting Authority of Ireland. Much of this finance is relatively free of risk, such as ‘soft’ production loans that are only fully repayable in the infrequent event that an indigenous film or TV project should turn a profit from box office admissions or international sales. Additional funding (albeit for smaller projects like short films) may be available from city and county councils. many of whom operate film schemes as part of their overall arts policy, a feature of local authority activities throughout Ireland.

The combined total of these funding incentives is difficult to quantify precisely, largely because information about Section 481 funding to private production companies is considered commercially sensitive, but it is safe to assume an industry subsidy of at least €100 million per annum, the vast majority of it coming through the Section 481 tax credit.

Theatre

According to the now quite dated Arts Council report, Socio-Economic Conditions of Theatre Practitioners in Ireland (2005), the Irish theatre industry employs about 900 people overall. As in the film industry, much of this employment is freelance and project-based, the longer term ‘ensemble’ employment offered by organisations like the Irish Theatre Company and the Radio Eireann Players having long vanished. Actors, directors, writers and other theatre practitioners, like their film industry counterparts, thus rely on their own reputations, resources and networks to gain employment and commissions from theatre production companies.

It is not clear how many production companies are active at present. The Abbey Theatre, funded by the State since 1925 when it became the de-facto National Theatre, remains the dominant organisation in the sector. Over time, however, significant regional companies have emerged, partly as a result of funding policy. The most notable of these is Druid, first funded in 1976. Further diversification occurred in the 1980s, when more ‘independent’ theatre companies – e.g. Red Kettle in Waterford, Rough Magic, Pigsback (now Fishamble), Passion Machine (Dublin) – began to flourish, partly in response to a period of relative stagnation in the National Theatre, but also due to a rise in corporate sponsorship. While the Irish Theatre Institute, a Dublin-based
resource organisation, lists 126 production companies in its database, many of these may be defunct or only occasionally active. The Irish Theatre Forum, the main representative body and lobbyist for the theatre sector, lists a much lower number, with only 28 active production company members. This number may be not altogether representative of the industry, but the disparity between the two sets of listings suggests a decline in overall activity in recent years.

Although there is a small commercial theatre sector, much of it centred in Dublin’s Gaiety and Bord Gais theatres, the majority of theatre activity is within the subsidised cultural sector. The Arts Council is the main source of such subsidy, allocating about 23-25 percent of its overall arts budget to the theatre sector, according to research by the Theatre Forum (Bell, 2015). In 2019, this amounts to about 17 million euro. The Abbey Theatre remains the single largest recipient of Arts Council funding, receiving €7 million and thus dominating the sector with some 40 percent of total theatre funding. The theatre sector is also supported by local authorities, which contributed €34m per year to arts funding in 2017 (Arts Council 2018). It is unclear how much of this goes to theatre, but if it is in line with Arts Council proportions, it amounts to about €8 million per annum. A further source of public subsidy is Culture Ireland, which subsidises the international touring costs of Irish theatre companies. Culture Ireland’s total budget for supporting such activities has been in decline in recent years, averaging less than €1 million per annum since 2015. At a rough estimate, therefore, public funding of theatre (excluding the cost of tax incentives) amounts to about €26 million per annum in 2019.

In order to receive Arts Council funding, theatre organisations are required to register as charities. An additional benefit of achieving charitable status, under Section 848A of the Taxes Consolidation Act 1997, is that a theatre company becomes more attractive to corporate and individual donors, who can receive tax relief in return for their patronage. There is a downside to maintaining charitable status, however. In order to remain eligible, companies must submit to regulation of payroll, tax, insurance and legal practices – leading to increased administrative costs and thus further dependence on the funding ecosystem (Troupe, 2018). The system has traditionally favoured the annual funding of a group of ‘major’ production companies (e.g. Fishamble, Corcadorca, Rough Magic, etc.) that receive regular funding. Again echoing the film sector, these companies tend to consist of one or two creative directors and an administrator or small administrative team.
The distribution of money needs to be less concentrated in big monolithic institutions. We’re reducing diversity because it’s all being focused into organisations that are under the control of very specific individuals, a handful of them. So you’re not getting the great panoply of work you were getting 10 or 15 years ago, that was actually very well received outside the country. (Theatre director C)
A. Sample description

The sample comprises 206 individuals, of whom 82 agreed to be interviewed (a response rate of 40%). In addition to these interviews, we collected information on the other 124 individuals from online sources. It is thus possible (for some questions) to report results based on the Total Group (TG, n=206). For most, however, results are based on the fine details reported by the Interview Group (IG, n=82). Some of these latter results are supplemented with data from the Online Group (OG, n=124).

A1. Award Sector

The total sample is based on awards won in two sectors: Film/TV Drama and Theatre. As Fig. A1 shows, the number of individuals is divided quite evenly between the two sectors: 119 from Film/TV Drama and 117 from Theatre, with 30 individuals winning awards in both sectors. The interview group (IG) is more skewed towards Theatre.

A2. Gender

As Fig. A2a shows, the number of individuals is divided quite evenly between the two sectors: 119 from Film/TV Drama and 117 from Theatre, with 30 individuals winning awards in both sectors. The interview group (IG) is more skewed towards Theatre.

3 Individuals winning multiple awards/nominations were counted only once.
4 Due to this overlap, the sum of these numbers is greater than 206.
The nature of the sampling method – externally selected via award wins/nominations – means that any gender bias in the awards system would tend to carry through to our sample. As Fig. A2a illustrates, the method produced a Total Group that is 60% male. While no attempt was made to adjust for this, the Interview Group (57% male) is slightly more gender balanced than the Total Group – due partly to the larger proportion of respondents from the theatre industry, where awards are slightly more evenly distributed, at least among the occupational categories we looked at – actors, writers and directors.

The gender breakdown of the sample’s occupational categories is shown in Fig. A2b. Actors comprise the most gender-balanced group (46% female), and directors the least (29% female), with writers (31% female) in between. Our study therefore confirms for Ireland the under-representation of women directors in other European countries, although the share is slightly above the European average of 24% observed by the European Women’s Audiovisual Network (EWA, 2015).

The gender breakdown of the sample’s award sector categories is shown in Fig. A2c. Theatre has a relatively even gender split, while Film / TV Drama has a higher proportion of males.
The findings show that those winning awards for Theatre (‘Theatre specialists’) are more gender balanced than those winning awards for Film/TV Drama (‘Screen specialists’).

In the pages to follow, findings are presented first in overall terms, and then broken down, where relevant, by Occupation, Award Sector, and Gender (the ‘OSG groups’). Any interpretation of these results must take this observed gender imbalance into account.

**A3. Age at first award**

For both the Interview Group (IG) and the Online Group (OG), year of birth was determined via the questionnaire or online research. Some did not reveal this information, and reliable online information was not always available; however, year of birth was determined for 191 of the 206 individuals. We were then able to correlate this information with award years to determine the age at which individuals first reached ‘prominence’ by winning an award.

The average individual in our sample reached prominence at the age of 39, demonstrating a need to sustain quite a prolonged career before such peer acknowledgment is attained (Fig. A3). There is little evidence of much variation among Occupations. Theatre awards appear to be won at a slightly earlier age than Film/TV awards. In relation to Gender, our sample suggests women achieve prominence a few years earlier than men – although this could be also construed as reflecting more career longevity for men.5

---

5 Occupation and Award Sector categories include ALL individuals, including those in two or more categories – e.g. data from a writer/director is included in both occupational groups; data from an individual winning awards in both Theatre and Film/TV is included in both sectors. Lincoln (2007) suggests that women win awards earlier because female nominees, like female actors in general, begin their acting careers at younger ages than men.
This method generally excludes people of Irish extraction whose formative and early career years were spent in their birth countries, but includes some people born overseas, moving to Ireland during early years and building careers here.

**A4. Country of birth**

The sampling method was designed to deliver a selection of ‘Irish’ creative workers, whether Irish by birth, citizenship, naturalisation or (for those born overseas) through spending formative years (education, early career) in Ireland. As Fig A4 demonstrates, the great majority (92%) were born on the island of Ireland. Of those born in Northern Ireland (14%), there appears to be a greater concentration in the theatre sector, where they make up 18% of those active – possibly a reflection of the less developed film and television drama sector in that region. There do not appear to be any meaningful differences based on Occupation or Gender.

**Fig. A4**
Country of birth, with Sector breakdowns (TG, n=206)

**A5. Occupation**

**Fig. A5a**
Total Group (TG, n=206) by Occupation
Breaking down the sample by Occupation (Fig. A5a) reveals the large proportion of actors in our sample, as they are represented in more award categories than other occupations (e.g. lead and supporting actor of both genders vs. typically only one award for ‘best director’). The number of actors is especially large when we consider the amount of ‘multi-tasking’ among these prominent individuals (Fig. A5b). Fully 144 (70%) of the sample are actors in some capacity when multiple occupations are taken into account (100 or 49% are Actor-only). Therefore 44 of 144 actors (31%) are multi-taskers. There is an even larger proportion ‘multitasking’ among the other occupations. 68 of 85 (80%) writers are multi-taskers, as are 49 of 65 (75%) directors (Fig. A5b).

This reinforces the need to treat analyses of the creative industries as always interlinked, as an ecology, rather than as discrete sectors. In terms of this study, it illustrates how subsidies as not limited to the sector to which they are awarded but also underpin other interdependent sectors. For instance, individuals working in subsidised theatre transfer their skills to television and film, in what may be wholly commercial ventures. As this report will further indicate, these subsidies also extend to advertising, where many of the interviewees also work (See F, below).

**A6. Work breakdown: time divided between sectors**
It was only possible to answer this question based on interview data from the IG (n=82). Overall, time spent working on Film (24%) and TV Drama (18%) is equal to time spent working in Theatre (42%) (Fig A6a).

The overall amount of time spent on ‘Other’ paid work (16%) is notable, and this other work is also explored below in Section F. Breaking down by Occupation (Fig A6b), actors tend to spend more time on Theatre work than do the other occupations. Writers spend proportionally less time writing plays than screenplays.

Fig. A6c
Work breakdown, by Award Sector (n=82)
Breaking down by Award Sector, perhaps unsurprisingly, Theatre ‘specialists’ (i.e. those winning theatre awards) spend about twice as much time working in Theatre as in Film/TV Drama (Fig. A6c). This specialisation is even more marked among Film/TV Drama specialists, however, who spend four times as much time on Film/TV Drama as they do on Theatre work – perhaps reflecting more opportunities to work on more highly paid screen projects.

![Fig. A6d](image-url)

**Work breakdown, by Gender (n=82)**

Breaking down by Gender (Fig. A6d), women spend less time doing ‘Other’ paid work than do men. (Note, however, that our study made no attempt to capture time spent doing unpaid domestic work, and it is possible women do more of this than men, and are therefore less available for ‘Other’ paid work.)

These findings again demonstrate occupational mobility between these sectors, and the need to regard them as interdependent.
B. Education and training

B1. Education

Creative workers are well educated, with more than 70% possessing either a primary or postgraduate degree (Fig. B1a). We did not observe any major variances from the overall levels based on Award Sector or Gender. In relation to Occupation, however, there are some differences. Directors are more highly educated, with 23% possessing postgraduate degrees. Actors, on the other hand, are less likely to have a postgraduate degree, and less likely overall to have attended college (Fig B1b).

These findings underline the wider availability of actor training courses outside the third level sector, such as the Gaiety School of Acting. They also demonstrate the extent to which the third level education sector can be considered to subsidise the stage and screen industries. This question is explored further below in relation to clusters.
When asked to choose among a number of early and mid-career training sources, the Interview Group reported a high level of participation in youth theatre, professional school attendance, and ongoing training through workshops, short courses and other development activities (Fig B2a), indicating the importance of training and training organisations in the cultural production ecosystem.

Youth theatre involvement was more marked among actors than the other occupations. ‘Other’ activities, such as on-the-job or experiential training, Fás and VEC courses, and internships, were less likely to be cited by writers than the other occupations (Fig B2b).
Breaking down by Award Sector, Theatre specialists were more likely to have participated in youth theatre and attended professional schools (Fig. B2c), indicating the importance of professional training providers for this sector in particular. The Gender breakdown reveals a striking result, with women engaging more than men in all training activities listed, except short courses and workshops, where participation was equal (Fig. B2d). This indicates that women are more likely to engage in training and development at all stages of their careers. It is not clear why this gender difference exists, pointing to the need for further research in this area.

---

**Sources of training, by Award Sector (IG, n=82)**

*Fig. B2c*

**Sources of training, by Gender (IG, n=82)**

*Fig. B2d*
Formative experiences

As asked to specify early formative experiences, prominent creatives reported high levels of involvement in school plays, local (amateur) drama, university filmmaking or drama societies, and other sources (Fig B3a).

Actors were especially likely to have been involved in school plays and local drama, while university societies emerged as particularly important for directors (Fig B3b), reflecting the generally lower levels of participation in third level education among actors.
Breaking down the data by Award Sector and Gender, school plays emerged as especially formative for Theatre Specialists and women (Fig. B3c). Many ‘Other’ experiences were reported by all sub-groups, especially directors. The most frequently recurring ‘other’ experiences are tabulated in Fig B3d. While the numbers are small, a ‘sympathetic’ home environment, perhaps through parental interest or profession, was listed by 16% of respondents. Access to cameras and other equipment (in the case of some who ended up making films for a career) emerged as the next most important factor (9%). Given the relative availability of inexpensive cameras, smartphones, editing software and other equipment, this finding may be specific to the age cohort.

The findings again underline the contribution made by the education sector – and in particular the primary and second-level sector’s drama activities – to the cultural production industries. It is also clear that the family as an incubator of talent is an important aspect of career construction. This is explored further below.
C. Funding and subsidy

Interviewees were asked to list the main sources of public and private subsidy (if any) in the form of grants or bursaries received during their careers. They were also asked to specify at what stage of their careers they were subsidised, and how helpful they felt these funding sources were in progressing careers.

C1. State grants and bursaries

More than two thirds received direct grants or subsidy (i.e. where the individual was a named recipient of the funding), underlying the extremely high importance of cultural funding in creative careers (Fig. C1a). When these figures are broken down by Occupation, it becomes clear that writers (88%) and directors (90%) are especially dependent on public funding. Actors are less dependent, as they are less likely to be recipients of direct funding. They do, of course, benefit indirectly through employment on publicly funded projects. Multitasking actors may also access funding in their capacity as writers or directors, as the funding structure in both Theatre (project-based funding) and Film/TV drama (project and development funding) actually motivates multiple occupations (see also A5, above).

There is little evidence of differences based on Award Sector, with Theatre and Film/TV Drama workers reporting very similar levels. We did not, however, attempt to quantify this funding.

When broken down by Gender, men appear to benefit more than women from public funding opportunities, partly, perhaps, a reflection of the gendered nature of the more highly funded writer and director occupations (see A2, above).

When asked to specify the main public subsidies received, the 57 funded individuals in the Interview Group listed a total of 132 funding sources, broken down as indicated in Fig. C1b.
Clearly, the Arts Council, Screen Ireland (and their equivalent agencies in Northern Ireland and the UK) are the major sources of grants and subsidies for Film/TV Drama and Theatre practitioners, accounting for two thirds of all sources mentioned. The ‘Artists’ Exemption’ (tax incentive), which potentially applies to all writers of plays and screenplays, on the other hand, was not mentioned by anyone at all – suggesting either a lack of relevance, or perhaps that it is taken for granted by those to whom it applies.

Fig. C1c details the percentages of actors, writers and directors that benefitted (at least once) from each of the funding types. Note that (a) as some individuals benefit from more than one funding type, and others from none at all, the numbers do not add up to 100%; and (b) the number of individuals in some of these sub-categories is very small.
It is clear from Fig. C1c that certain funding types are more important than others when examined in this way. Writers and directors benefit (at least directly) far more than actors from Arts Council, Screen Agency, PSB and EU funding sources. The only category that appears to particularly benefit actors more is the area of Education grants/scholarships.

By Award Sector (Fig. C1d), it is unsurprising to see that Theatre specialists benefit primarily from Arts Council funding and Film/TV Drama specialists from Screen Agency and Public Service Broadcaster schemes. Funding from the EU Creative Europe schemes also benefits Film/TV Drama workers more, the low take-up among the Theatre sector perhaps reflecting a difficulty among Irish theatre companies to fulfil the administrative requirements of such funding (see Troupe 2018).

Looking at Gender differences (Fig. C1e), the major funding sources benefit men more than women. The finding that women benefit more from education grants reflects the bigger uptake of education and training courses, as discussed in B2b above.
C2. Career stage (public funding)

This question underlines the importance of public funding sources for helping prominent creatives become established, as more than half of the IG accessed these funding sources early in their careers. Almost half continue to access public funding in mid-career. This echoes comments made by keynote speaker, Caitriona Noonan, in the public workshop around the importance of supports for mid-career creative workers. Public funding is less important in late career (Fig. C2).

Looking at Award Sectoral differences, Film/TV Drama specialists enjoy relatively higher levels of mid- and late-career support than their Theatre counterparts. Gender differences were less apparent, although women attract more late-career public funding than men (Fig. C2).
There is no doubt about the perceived importance of public funding to those receiving it, 79% of whom report public funding to have been Extremely or Very helpful for career development (Fig. C3a). Again, these figures skew higher for writers and directors, who access this kind of funding more directly (Fig C3b).

There are no particularly notable variations based on Award Sector or Gender.
C4. Private grants and bursaries

Private funding sources are far less important than public sources, with only around a third of the IG (29 individuals) reporting any experience of this kind of assistance. Of those who do enjoy private funding, writers and directors again seem to benefit more. Men benefit more than women. There were no observed Award Sectoral differences of note (Fig. C4a).

The 29 interviewees who did enjoy private funding listed a total of 41 sources, indicating an average of just 1.4 per respondent. The main private sources listed were subsequently categorised as follows (Fig. C4b):
The numbers are too small to draw too many conclusions, or to break down into the OSG sub-categories. The number of private TV commissions is low, reflecting both the predominance of public funding in TV development (accessible by both public service and private broadcasters via the BAI Sound & Vision Fund). It also reflects the nature of this funding, which usually flows through producers and their production companies rather than the occupations chosen for our study. Company sponsorship, much of it relatively small and piecemeal, represents the largest tranche (24%) of private funding sources. Crowd funding, generally enabled through the Business2Arts Fundit platform, is an interesting development, attempting as it does to exploit social media traffic and promotion opportunities. Philanthropical sources, which fund schemes such as the Booker Prize and the Costa Book Award, with only six cases mentioned, are perhaps surprisingly low, given the high media profile enjoyed by such awards.

C5. Career stage (private funding)

For those enjoying private funding sources, this type of funding appears particularly useful at the outset of one’s career (Fig. C5), as was also evident for public sources. Although the numbers are small, early career directors appear to leverage this kind of support particularly – perhaps through finding private sources for funding short films and modest theatre pieces.
C6. How helpful? (Private funding)

Although relatively rare, private funding is considered important by those enjoying its benefits – 69% of recipients consider it Extremely or Very Important, a figure that rises to 86% when including the remaining ‘Somewhat’ Important category (Fig C6a). Women value private funding more (90% Extremely/Very Important) than men (58%) (Fig. C6b).

There are no particularly notable differences based on Occupation or Award Sector.
C7. Career breakthroughs

When asked to name (up to three) career breakthrough incidents, interviewees listed a variety of roles, projects, career events etc., that were subsequently classified as follows:

Publicly funded theatre was the largest category, followed by publicly funded film and then publicly funded television. In total, publicly funded projects accounted for 76% of all mentions, underlining the clear role of film, TV and theatre subsidy in launching prominent careers (Fig. C7). This finding reinforces the above findings highlighting the centrality of public funding to career construction.

We then looked at the number of individuals benefitting from each type of breakthrough project/event (Table C7). Publicly funded theatre was the largest category, providing breakthrough moments for almost two thirds of prominent creatives, underlining the importance of this sector regardless of whether the individual ended up working in theatre or the screen sector. This finding reflects the interdependence of the Film/TV Drama and Theatre sectors in the cultural production ecology. The importance of subsidised film and theatre is also clear, accounting for far more breakthrough moments than the private sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakthrough</th>
<th>Indivs.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A (all)</th>
<th>W (all)</th>
<th>D (all)</th>
<th>Theatre (all)</th>
<th>Film/Drama (all)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly funded film</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly funded TV</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly funded theatre</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately funded film</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately funded TV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately funded theatre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful career event</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Individuals</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C7
Career breakthroughs classified by type (IG, n=82)
Looking at Occupation, actors are especially reliant on public theatre for career breakthroughs. Writers and directors benefit a little more from public Film/TV Drama, with television especially providing opportunities for writers. The numbers for the private sector are small, but directors report a slightly higher proportion of breakthroughs from private film funding, most likely associated with short film projects. Helpful career events (such as meetings, making particular decisions, winning particular awards or prizes, etc.) were cited by 28% of prominent creatives, and appear less important for Writers and for Film/TV Drama specialists (Table C7).

Award Sectoral differences are unsurprising, aligning with same-sector public funded projects (theatre specialists benefitting from publicly funded theatre projects, film/TV drama specialists from publicly funded film and television) (Table C7).

The Gender breakdown reveals that women enjoy fewer breakthroughs than expected from public Film and TV drama, the latter to a greater extent (Table C7). Women report more breakthroughs in public theatre. This demonstrates that the screen industries are more important for launching the careers of men than women, reflecting recent concerns about gender imbalances in Screen Ireland-funded projects. In general, the numbers for private Film/TV/Theatre are too low (22 individuals, or 27% benefiting) to make inferences.

C8. Awareness of public funding

Prominent creatives are highly aware that their industries are publicly funded. Awareness of tax-break and tax-credit funding (85%) is slightly lower than the awareness of direct grants (98%), but still very high (Fig C8a). Few creatives are in any doubt about the importance of public funding to their respective industries, with very high appreciation across all categories of the value of such funding (Fig C8b).
A third (34%) reported that their primary residence is abroad, with 7% reporting dual residence both inside and outside Ireland (Fig. D1). Actors (42%) are more likely to be resident abroad, with directors (75%) most likely to reside in Ireland. While there were no remarkable deviations from these proportions based on Award Sector, the Gender cross-reference reveals that female workers (39%) are more likely to reside overseas. This suggests that women need to be flexible about working overseas in order to maintain a successful career.
Looking at residential locality (Fig. D2a), the dominance of Dublin and London is striking. The two locations account for 62% of all locations listed, reflecting their importance as centres of both film and theatre production in Ireland and the UK. It is perhaps surprising that so few individuals are based in the USA, given the importance of Hollywood and Broadway in their respective sectors, and the long tradition of Irish creatives working there. Only 11% of prominent creatives live in the USA, with some notable variances based on Occupation (Fig. D2b) (more actors) and Award Sector (Fig. D2c) (more Film/TV Drama specialists).

Being based overseas, and particularly in London, appears particularly important for actors (over half with residences outside of Ireland; 28% in London) (Fig. D2b). Writers and directors are more heavily concentrated in Ireland, in Dublin particularly. London and USA residence seem less important for directors. Directors, while concentrated in Dublin, are also more likely than writers and actors to live elsewhere in Ireland. These figures suggest that directors find it less necessary than other occupations to be based abroad in order to work.
Breaking down by Award Sector (Fig. D2c) reveals that Belfast is a viable residential location for theatre specialists (8%), but no film/TV specialists live there, suggesting that the larger screen sector in the Republic draws Northern Irish film workers south. This finding reflects the findings on country of birth (A2, above), where Northern Ireland natives are more concentrated in theatre. Theatre specialists are also drawn to London, while the USA is more attractive for film/TV drama specialists.

Breaking down by Gender (Fig. D2d), London is an especially important location for women, with 30% residing there – reflecting its status as a production centre. For people based in Ireland, men are more likely than women to be based outside of Dublin or Belfast, again suggesting it is more important for women to be resident close to the work location.
E. Career mobility

This section is based on interview data provided by those working mainly (i.e. more than 50% of their time) in film/TV drama. This group comprised 34 individuals (41% of those interviewed), who break down as shown in Fig. E.

As the question deals with film/TV drama work, the large proportion (66%) of film/TV drama specialists is to be expected. It is notable that writers (54%) are over-represented in this group, suggesting this occupation is the most ‘portable’ between sectors. No notable Gender variations were observed.

E1. Theatre and career start

As the question deals with film/TV drama work, the large proportion (66%) of film/TV drama specialists is to be expected. It is notable that writers (54%) are over-represented in this group, suggesting this occupation is the most ‘portable’ between sectors. No notable Gender variations were observed.
50 percent of individuals who end up working mainly in film/TV drama started their careers in theatre (Fig. E1a). The number is much higher for actors (70%). Writers and directors who work mainly in film and TV drama, however, are less likely to have started out in theatre (Fig. E1b). Young actors, therefore, are well served by the theatre sector in developing skills that allow them to achieve prominence in film/TV drama, while there is no similar progression for writers or directors, who therefore are more dependent on sector-specific experience early in their careers.

Award Sector differences are as expected, with a theatre career start far more common among Theatre specialists (Fig. E1c). Many interviewees noted that success in film/TV can now be achieved while bypassing theatre entirely.
The Gender breakdown (Fig. E1d) reveals that women in this group are a good deal more likely than men to have started out in theatre, suggesting either that theatre is particularly useful for developing women's film/TV drama careers, or perhaps alternatively that men enjoy more early opportunities outside of the theatre sector, presumably in film/TV drama. Again, as in the career breakthrough discussion above (E8), this points to the possibility that the screen industries provide more opportunities for young men than young women.

**Fig. E1d**

‘Mostly Film/TV’ workers with theatre career start, by Gender (n=34)

**E2. Importance of theatre experience for Film/TV career**

*Fig. E2a*

Importance of theatre experience (n=34)
While relatively few (12%) thought it essential, more than 60% of those working mainly in film/TV drama felt that stage experience was important in some way for helping build a screen career (Fig. E2a). This suggests that the film/TV drama sector benefits substantially from the theatre sector, drawing on it as a source of well-trained drama professionals.

 Actors in this group value their theatre experience more than writers and directors do (Fig. E2b), reflecting actors’ particularly fluid mobility between these sectors, as demonstrated also in E1 (above).

---

Fig. E2b
Importance of theatre experience, by Occupation (n=34)

Fig. E2c
Importance of theatre experience, by Award Sector (n=34)
Perhaps unsurprisingly, theatre specialists are more appreciative of the value of their stage experience than are film/TV drama specialists (Fig. E2c). Gender differences on this question are quite minimal, although women are more adamant than men that theatre experience is NOT important for their film/TV drama careers (Fig. E2d).

![Fig. E2d](https://example.com/image.png)

**Fig. E2d**
Importance of theatre experience, by Gender (n=34)

---

**E3. Persistence in theatre**

Screen workers remain quite loyal, with almost half still working on the stage to some extent (Fig. E3). This figure is much higher for actors (70%) and former theatre ‘specialists’ (80%). It is also higher for women (60%), who are more committed to the stage than their male colleagues. Given the poorer pay available in theatre, it follows that this loyalty can be understood as a form of subsidy of the theatre sector by screen workers – although it could be argued also that this ‘subsidy’ repays a training debt, in the case of those who started out in theatre (see E1 above).

![Fig. E3](https://example.com/image.png)

**Fig. E3**
‘Mostly Film/TV’ workers who still work in theatre (n=16)

---

11 Note the small size of this group (n=16), a subset of the ‘Mostly Film/TV’ subset (n=34) of the Interview Group (n=82)
E3a. Why film/TV workers remain in theatre

'Mainly Film/TV Drama' workers who still work in theatre were asked to indicate why, by choosing from a list of options describing aspects of theatre work. The live performance aspect of theatre work, along with the diversity of roles and stories available, appear particularly appealing (Fig. E3a). Given pay levels available, income is less of a draw. 75% of respondents indicated other reasons, citing among these reasons: collaboration with certain writers and other actors; control over performance; and the intrinsic quality of the medium itself. This finding underlines the importance the theatre as an experimental space, and as a source of creative workers for other sectors, resonating with comments made by Prof. Geoffrey Crossick at the Ecologies of Cultural Production workshop.

E4. Work in both TV drama and film

'Mostly Film/TV' workers: mobility between film and TV drama (n=34)

Fig. E3a
Why ‘Mostly Film/TV’ workers still work in theatre (n=16)

Fig. E4a
‘Mostly Film/TV’ workers: mobility between film and TV drama (n=34)
For workers who operate mainly in film and TV drama, there is little distinction between those two sub-sectors and a very high degree of mobility between them, with 91% of workers operating in both. This high mobility was observed among all the OSG subgroups (Fig. E4a).

Data on this latter question was also collected for the entire sample group, through an examination of film and theatre credits as well as interview questions. The results here confirm the high mobility between film and television drama, suggesting that the lines between these two screen sub-sectors are quite blurred as these industries converge. The generally lower numbers for the larger group suggest that the more one works in the screen sector, the more mobility one enjoys between the film and TV drama sub-sectors (Fig. E4b).

It was not possible to determine this data for 24 individuals.
The ‘Mainly Film/TV Drama’ workers were asked to choose among reasons for working in both film and TV, i.e. reasons for this high mobility between the sub-sectors. A large majority (76%) listed income as one of these reasons, reflecting generally good levels of pay, especially compared to the theatre sector. Diversity of roles was cited by 71%, suggesting that all occupations enjoy the different opportunities offered by working in different sectors (Fig E4c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>A (all)</th>
<th>W (all)</th>
<th>D (all)</th>
<th>Theatre (all)</th>
<th>Film/Drama (all)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputaion</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E4
'Mostly Film/TV' workers: why Film AND TV? (n=34)

The numbers in the OSG sub-groups are too small to extrapolate with confidence. There were few observed differences between Genders or among the different Occupations, although directors appear a little less driven by income and diversity, while men seem more concerned with the reputational difference between film and TV drama work (Table E4).

E5. Working in multiple sectors: disadvantages

When asked whether work mobility between the various stage and screen sectors presented any disadvantages, there were mixed results. Actors especially are inclined to cite disadvantages, mainly relating to the time commitment involved in theatre work, which sometimes prevents them taking up more lucrative offers in the screen sector. Writers (the only occupational group not obliged to be on the set or in the theatre) see fewer disadvantages in such mobility. Women, however, are twice as likely as men to cite a mobility disadvantage (Fig. E5).
Respondents who spend more than half their time working in film and TV drama were asked whether they thought the subsidised theatre sector was important for the success of the screen sector. 59% feel it is definitely important, with only 12% feeling it was not important (Fig. E6a). This suggests that the well-funded film/TV drama sector is further subsidised by the theatre sector. Actors, the most mobile occupational group (see E4 below), are more likely to cite the importance of theatre funding (Fig. E6b). There were no notable differences based on Award Sector or Gender.

**Table E6**
How film/TV drama sector benefits from theatre sector (n=34)
When asked to specify why a subsidised theatre is important for the screen sector, respondents (i.e. those working most of the time in film and TV drama) pointed to the theatre sector as a place for actors, writers and directors to learn their craft (Table E6). Other notable reasons include the possibilities offered by theatre for experimentation (seen to deepen occupational skills); a place to earn a modest living when learning the craft; and a place to showcase talent and present it to agents, casting directors etc. While the numbers in the OSG sub-groups are too small to extrapolate with confidence, the training ground aspect appears less important for writers. Theatre specialists are also less likely to specify this aspect of theatre, perhaps being more appreciative of its intrinsic artistic merits. Men are more appreciative of the employment continuity offered by theatre (no women felt this was an important aspect, suggesting their employment is perhaps more precarious).

F. Supplementary work

Aware that many creative workers supplement their income with paid work outside the primary occupation, we asked interviewees whether they had engaged in such work. Specifically aware of Advertising and Music Video as subsectors of the audiovisual industries that can provide opportunities for supplementary (and somewhat related) work, we purposely asked about those subsectors, before asking interviewees to list any additional paid work and to rate all of this work for its creative content.

F1. Advertising work

The advertising industry is indeed popular as a source of extra work, with almost two thirds saying they have worked on advertisements at some stage of their careers (Fig. F1). This industry is especially valuable for actors (81%). Award Sectoral differences are not apparent. Women are more likely than men to be reliant on advertising work. So overall there is little doubt that the advertising industry provides valuable income opportunities during the course of building prominent careers. The advertising industry is thus an important part of the cultural production ecology, helping to sustaining creative careers, while also drawing on the skills and creativity of theatre and film/TV workers.
Of the 53 who work/worked in advertising, about a third reported being greatly dependent on this work for income, another third were somewhat dependent and the final third only a little dependent (F2a).

Looking at Occupational differences, actors (surprisingly, considering the numbers doing such work) were a little less dependent on this income than directors and writers (F2b).

Looking at Award Sector differences, theatre and film/TV drama had similar patterns of reliance on advertising income (F2c).
Although film/TV drama specialists report doing slightly less of this work than their theatre specialist counterparts (Fig. F1), they appear more dependent (Fig. F2c). This is counterintuitive, considering the generally lower rates of theatre industry pay (although this pay difference is mitigated by the amount of mobility between sectors). On the other hand, long project development cycles in the screen industries may mean longer periods between projects for directors and writers, making them more available for well paid advertising work.

Women are more likely than men to be greatly dependent on advertising for supplementing their income (Fig. F2d). It is not clear why this is the case. Radio voiceovers, for example, may allow women – especially prominent women – to prolong careers or work longer through periods of pregnancy, primary parenting etc. Advertising work may offer a more structured working day, allowing for more flexibility around caring duties, which are still predominantly carried out by women. On the other hand, it is also possible that advertising offers more work for females of all occupations and backgrounds, both on- and off-screen.

F3. Advertising work: creative content

Respondents were asked to rate the creative content of their supplementary work, in comparison to their main occupation (Fig. F3a). While very few (4%) found advertising work to be ‘just as’ creative, a majority (58%) found such work ‘somewhat’ creative, as it generally draws on some aspect of their performing, creative or technical competencies. This is especially true for directors (72%, Fig. F3b), and for men in general (Fig. F3c).
Music video work is less important than advertising work as a source of income, with only 21% reporting doing paid work in this area (several respondents reported doing unpaid work in this area, however, to help out musician friends etc.) As paid work, music video appears more important for film/TV drama workers, and to men in general (Fig. F4).
F5. Music video work: reliance

Of the small number who work on music videos for pay, very few report any real dependence on this sector for meaningful income generation – the large majority (88%) reported only ‘little’ dependence, with no real OSG differences worth considering (Fig. F5).

F6. Music video work: creative content

Of those who do engage in music video work, it is clear that they find it to be creative, with only an 18% minority reporting it as having no creative content and almost 60% finding it just as creative as their main work (Fig. F6). Indeed, working on music video was generally considered similar to other kinds of film/TV drama work.

The numbers doing paid work in music video are too small to draw any meaningful conclusions for the OSG sub-groups.

F7. Other work

Of the small number who work on music videos for pay, very few report any real dependence on this sector for meaningful income generation – the large majority (88%) reported only ‘little’ dependence, with no real OSG differences worth considering (Fig. F5).

F6. Music video work: creative content

Of those who do engage in music video work, it is clear that they find it to be creative, with only an 18% minority reporting it as having no creative content and almost 60% finding it just as creative as their main work (Fig. F6). Indeed, working on music video was generally considered similar to other kinds of film/TV drama work.

The numbers doing paid work in music video are too small to draw any meaningful conclusions for the OSG sub-groups.
In addition to advertisements and music videos, respondents noted a high degree of supplementary work in “Other” areas, with 72% doing paid work in some capacity elsewhere (Fig. F7). This is about equally true for all Occupations, Genders and both Award Sectors. It is clear from this finding, and those covering advertising and video work, that supplementary work of one kind or another is very common even among prominent creative workers, clearly reflecting the non-continuous nature of creative employment, where gaps between projects allow for paid employment in other areas, whether by necessity or design.

**F8. Other work: types**

We classified the ‘other’ work reported during the survey, and found it divided into several main categories – about a third find other paid work in a different occupation in the same industry (e.g. a director working as a camera operator). Almost 40% find paid work in formal education, usually lecturing or giving masterclasses relating to their main work. Another third found income conducting training sessions or workshops for other theatre/film clients (e.g. amateur drama groups) (Fig. F8).

### Table F8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specify</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>A (all)</th>
<th>W (all)</th>
<th>D (all)</th>
<th>Theatre (all)</th>
<th>Film/Drama (all)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate consulting, training</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other occupation in sector</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education teaching</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, workshops</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General arts work</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and hospitality</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As some respondents listed more than one type, the sum of all categories exceeds 100%*
There are some interesting variations among the OSG groups (Table F8). By Occupation, writers (47%) are more likely to supplement their income with related work in their sector, while directors are least likely to pursue other work in this category (25%). Directors, on the other hand, are the most likely to be involved in the formal education sector, with 61% of them active in this area. Directors are also heavily involved in giving training sessions and workshops. Thus directors, whose work is highly specialised and involves a large degree of coordination of the work of others (technicians, actors, craftspersons) are in demand to teach these skills to others, suggesting a high degree of dissemination and a high demand for teaching/training of this nature.

Analysing by Award Sector, film/TV drama specialists are more likely to pursue other work in the same sector, while theatre specialists are more involved in conducting training courses and workshops. The only notable Gender-related difference is that women are more likely than men to work in retail and hospitality.

F9. Other work: creative content

In general, respondents felt the “Other” work they do is creative, with over 80% rating it as creative in some capacity (Fig. F9a). Writers and directors are adept at finding supplementary work that they consider equally creative to their main occupation, indicating that the large amount of work they do training and educating others is highly satisfying (Fig. F9b).
Women are less likely, however, to rate their Other work as creative, perhaps reflecting the lower degree of supplementary work related to the primary occupation, as work noted above (Fig. F9c).

![Fig. F9c](image)

Other work: creative content, by Gender (n=59)

**G. Networks, professional connections, impact of others**

**G1. Early family/personal connections to Film/TV Drama or Theatre?**

![Fig. G1a](image)

Family connection to industry (n=82)

About a quarter of the respondents reported having a family or close personal connection to people working in the industry (Fig G1a). This suggests that, overall, family/personal connections are a fairly important, although hardly determining, factor in occupational choice. Of the connections listed by the entire group, about half were close relatives (parent or sibling), and about half were more distant relatives or family friends (Fig. G1b).

![Fig. G1b](image)

Types of family/personal connections Fig. (n=19)
There were some interesting variations according to Occupation and Gender, however. As Fig. G1c illustrates, writers have fewer family and personal connections to their respective industries, suggesting that this occupation is less susceptible to family/personal influence.

Women report a much higher (34%) number of connections than men (15%), however (Fig. G1d). This finding clearly indicates that women are more effective at leveraging these connections in career building.

G2. Network origins

Fig. G2c
Family connection to industry, by Occupation (n=82)

Fig. G2d
Family connection to industry, by Gender (n=82)

Women report a much higher (34%) number of connections than men (15%), however (Fig. G1d). This finding clearly indicates that women are more effective at leveraging these connections in career building.
Respondents were asked to consider their network of important professional contacts within their respective sectors. When asked to consider the origins of these networks, 90% cited important relationships forged during their early careers. These would be distinct from college-formed relationships, which are still an important group (40%). 62% of respondents cited important recent career relationships, demonstrating the value of ongoing networking activities (Fig G2a).

There were some notable deviations in the OSG subgroups. Actors’ college networks are less important (33%), whereas this category is more important for directors (55%). On the other hand, actors cite more connections through their professional training networks, while directors find these less important. Writers value recently forged relationships more highly than actors and directors do (Fig G2b).

Fig. G2b
Network origins, by Occupation (IG, n=82)

Fig. G2c
Network origins, by Award Sector (IG, n=82)
Like actors, theatre specialists value relationships forged through professional training more highly than do their film/TV drama specialist counterparts (Fig G2c). There were few obvious Gender differences on this question, although women appear more likely than men to value relationships forged during professional training (Fig G2d).

**G3. Did the network help to develop your career?**

Networks are very important for career development, with over 70% regarding them as greatly or very important, and only 7% rating them as not important (Fig. G3). These findings are consistent across all the OSG categories.

**Fig. G3**
Extent to which the network helps career (IG, n=82)
When asked to choose from a list of things the network helps with, respondents valued all of the choices – jobs, ideas, moral support – highly (Fig. G4a).

It is worth noting some variations among the subgroups. Film/TV specialists were slightly less reliant on their network for job opportunities or new ideas (Fig. 4b). It is not clear why this might be so, but it suggests that, even though the network is still highly important for help of this type, screen specialists are slightly more self-reliant in this area.

Looking at variances by Gender, women are considerably more reliant on the network for moral support than are men (Fig. G4c). This is consistent with earlier findings that women’s careers are more precarious, and also suggest a greater willingness for women to turn to their networks for help with career difficulties and other challenges.
With regard to the ‘Other’ category, some interesting reasons were presented, such as helping with the filming/editing of audition self-tapes, which came up repeatedly as an important activity, as audition processes evolve with digital production/distribution technology.

G5. Are you in close geographical contact with others in the sector?

We noted earlier (D2) the geographic clustering in locations like Dublin and London, which are major production epicentres for both the Film/TV Drama and Theatre sectors. In response to this question, 73% reported living near their networks and their work locations – again with a lot of consistency across the OSG subgroups (Fig G5a).

When asked whether this geographic proximity matters, respondents believe that living close to the industry is important for professional success, 72% saying it matters somewhat or very much (Fig G5b).
While there wasn’t much variation to this number by Occupation or Award Sector, a Gender difference was observed: 83% of women rate geographic proximity as ‘very much’ or ‘somewhat’ important (Fig. G5c). This finding is consistent with the findings above in relation to moral support, and suggests that such support is related to physical rather than virtual contact with the network. This finding also correlates with findings about choice of residential location (see D2).

**G6. Do work relationships extend beyond work?**

When asked if work relationships extend beyond work and into the social and personal domains, 85% of respondents said ‘Yes’, revealing how ‘invested’ creative workers can be in the relationships that are forged in Irish film, television drama and theatre environments (Fig G6). These relationships were equally high among all OSG groups. ‘Anecdotal’ examples revealed a high number of marriage/partnerships, very close friendships, house sharing, social rituals such as best man, godparents, bridesmaids, and so on. This again points to potential for exclusion that close professional/personal networks amongst creative workers can cause, with implications for class and ethnic diversity.
H. – Clusters

Certain questions (e.g. B2, G2) revealed respondents’ attachment to ‘clusters’ such as theatre companies, third level institutions, schools, etc., and these were captured for analysis. Fig. Ha classifies these clusters into ‘types’. It is clear that within the Irish film, TV drama and theatre industries, current and historical relationships with particular theatre companies and educational institutions are important, driving network formation and delivering the benefits of those network affiliations throughout one’s career. It is clear from the above that relationships with theatre production companies are very important – much more so than relationships with film and TV production companies, suggesting a clear structural difference between the stage and screen sectors in terms of career construction: relationships with individual screen production companies are far less important.

15 No attempt was made to measure a cluster’s relative influence over a respondent’s career, however.
Looking at the frequency with which individual clusters are mentioned, we can clearly see the importance of attachment relationships to certain types of organisation, with the larger theatre companies (Abbey, Gate, Druid) especially important to prominent careers (Fig. Hb). Being a TCD alum appeared to loom large, especially in the theatre sector, with the Gaiety School important in the Professional School category. Connections to specific Film and TV production companies are less important – Treasure Entertainment is the most cited at four, far less than theatre companies such as the Abbey (21), Gate (10) and Druid (9). Looking at TV organisations, the BBC was cited as often as RTE (and TG4), although in general relationships with specific individual companies/organisations outside of the big theatre and Education/Training Institutions do not appear to be very important.

As the research was carried out at TCD, it is possible that TCD alumni were more likely to respond to the survey, thereby skewing these findings.
I got paid 12 grand for writing and directing the film. That takes three years of your life. 4 grand a year. People on welfare are better off than you. Meanwhile you’re travelling around the world, you’re winning awards, and you’re literally the poorest person in the cinema. If they weren’t giving food for free, you wouldn’t be eating. That’s the reality. (Film director K)
Conclusion

This report has focused on career construction in film, television drama and theatre, asking how people enter the fields of filmmaking, television drama and theatre-making, and how they build and develop their careers. The impact of cultural subsidies and other forms of public spending on career development has been of particular interest, as has the degree to which the film, television and theatre sectors function together as part of the overall cultural production ecology. Together, these separate areas of activity, each with their own unique creative challenges, funding mechanisms, audiences and markets, provide opportunities for mobility and advancement, helping to nurture and sustain careers.

We have demonstrated the symbiotic relationship between the film, TV drama, and theatre sectors, each of which provides training and development opportunities from which the others benefit, in that all sectors draw on a shared, largely freelance, talent pool. We have demonstrated the important role of the education and professional training sectors, both in skills development and in building professional networks, on which practitioners draw throughout their careers for employment, creative development, moral support and other benefits. We have categorised and identified the most important creative ‘clusters’ – production companies, theatre groups, broadcasters, education institutions, and others – from which creative workers emerge and with which they continue throughout their careers. We have also demonstrated the extent to which creative workers – even the prominent individuals revealed by our sampling method – are dependent on supplementary work, both related and unrelated to their main activities, in order to make a living.

These findings highlight an important truth about the arts economy in Ireland: that the funding mix, comprised of direct grants, tax credits, license fees, corporate sponsorship, box office returns and other forms of commercial exploitation, is insufficient in itself to sustain the careers of the creative people at the centre of the arts and cultural production ecology. This supports the observation that the arts are thus partly funded by arts workers themselves, with important implications for gender, class and ethnic diversity in the sector. This calls for a coordinated approach to developing the creative industries. We recommend that the Department of Culture be a single entity with sole responsibility for the cultural industries. This would recognise the importance of these industries to the wider economy and allow for a co-ordinated approach to funding and delivering appropriate supports to this sector.

It is important to acknowledge that this survey, while the first of its kind in the Irish cultural industries, is necessarily limited by constraints of time. We are confident that our methodological approach can be applied to other cultural sectors, and also to other occupational categories in the sectors examined here. Such a project would provide a more rounded picture of career construction across all sectors of the creative industries.
Our Findings

Public Subsidy

- More than two thirds of creative workers receive public subsidy in the form of direct grants or other financial supports (e.g. social welfare). Writers and directors are especially dependent on public funding. Actors are less dependent, as they are less likely to be recipients of direct funding. They do, of course, benefit indirectly through employment on publicly funded projects.
- Prominent creatives acknowledge the importance of public funding to career development. Again, writers and directors are particularly aware of the necessity of this subsidy for their careers. Few creatives are in any doubt about the importance of public funding to their respective industries, with very high appreciation across all categories of the value of such funding.
- The Arts Council and Screen Ireland (and their equivalent agencies in Northern Ireland and the UK) are the major public funders, accounting for two thirds of all sources mentioned. Private funding sources are far less important than public sources, with only around a third of the creatives reporting any experience of this kind of assistance.

Gender

- The gender breakdown of prominent creatives is 60:40 male to female. This disparity is accounted for by low levels of female representation in the director and writer categories.
- The major public funding sources benefit men more than women.
- Women are more likely than men to engage in training and development at all stages of their careers. This may be because women find it more difficult to maintain their creative careers and need to upskill. (For instance, this may relate to the finding that women enjoy fewer career breakthroughs in the better paid film and TV drama sector.)

Education

- Creative workers are well educated, with more than 70% possessing either a primary or postgraduate degree. Certain professions particularly benefit from connections made at third level. Education therefore must be seen as providing a subsidy to the formation of creative careers.
Training

- The professional training sector, which is not always subsidised, also provides a significant entry point to the creative industries.

Geography

- A third of prominent Irish creatives have a primary residence outside of Ireland. Women are more likely to live abroad, suggesting a greater need to emigrate to maintain their careers.
- Almost two-thirds of prominent creatives live in Dublin and/or London. This reflects the clustering of creative industries in major urban centres. Sustaining a career requires a high level of mobility. However, women report more difficulty in achieving this mobility.

Career Mobility

- Creative workers demonstrate a high degree of mobility between sectors (film, TV drama and theatre). For workers who operate mainly in film and TV drama, there is little distinction between these two sub-sectors and a very high degree of mobility between them. Half of these ‘mainly film/TV’ workers began their careers in theatre, demonstrating the importance of the stage sector for developing screen careers.

Supplementary Work

- Despite their prominence, more than two thirds of creatives report a dependence on supplementary work. The main sources of alternative income are the advertising industry, followed by the education and training sectors.

Networks and Clusters

- Networks are important for career development, finding work, generating ideas, and moral support. These networks are formed very early and often last throughout careers.
- Clusters emerge out of third level education institutions and certain production companies. This has a filtering effect on entry to the creative industries, given the importance of networks to the construction and maintenance of careers.
Policy Implications and recommendations

The policy implications and recommendations below are categorised in line with our major findings. However, as we are conceptualising the cultural industries in ecological terms, where sectors overlap, activities interact and subsidies in one area deliver benefits to others, there is an element of crossover in each of the following:

Public Subsidy

■ Present levels of funding are evidently enabling careers in the creative industries. However even the prominent individuals on which the study is based are dependent on supplementary work, and inequality of access persists. All funding programmes must therefore include specific provisions to broaden access and increase diversity.
■ There is a need to reduce barriers to entry to the creative industries by incentivising entry to training programmes outside of third level, in all regions. This would counterbalance the current clustering of creative workers in third level institutions, improving access and diversity.
■ Very little funding is currently coming from private sources/philanthropy to support career development. Consideration needs to be given to restructuring the tax system to further incentivise sponsorship and investment.
■ Creative workers require stronger state supports in order to be less dependent on non-creative ancillary income.

Gender and Diversity

■ It is important to incentivise more women, through training programmes and mentorship, to apply for funding in order to address current gender imbalances.
■ More women need to be encouraged to become directors and writers. While the relevant agencies and commissioning bodies have taken steps in this direction by implementing policy changes aimed at increasing women’s participation in the industry, further interventions and supports are necessary in order to promote inclusivity at an earlier stage.
■ We recommend that funding bodies require, as a condition of funding, the creation of stronger roles for women on stage and screen in order to reduce the need for women to travel for work and/or reside outside of Ireland.
■ Recent measures to reduce gender disparity provide evidence that funding bodies respond to pressure. Therefore, advocacy on behalf of excluded groups based on class, ethnicity, ability, etc. is needed to increase diversity in the creative industries.
Education

- Creativity needs to be embedded in the school curriculum, and in teacher training, in order to inspire young children of all backgrounds to consider a career in the creative industries.
- Third level education needs to be a space for experimentation and a conduit to the creative industries, and we recommend closer connections between third level providers and the creative industries.

Training / Career Mobility

- There is clear evidence that the theatre sector benefits the film and TV drama industry as a source of writing, acting and directing talent. To recognise this form of cross subsidy, additional funding must be allocated to training programmes that benefit both industries.

Geography

- We recommend the creation of affordable creative living and working spaces in the principal Irish urban centres, given the evidence that creative workers cluster in large metropolitan areas where the creative industries are centred.

Supplementary Work

- Implementation of the above policy changes in the areas of public subsidy, gender and affordable living should eliminate the need for creative workers to engage in supplementary work.

Networks and Clusters

- Greater investment in accessible training programmes is needed to counterbalance the current clustering of creative workers in third level institutions and improve access and diversity.
There was the shed at home – from the
time I was about seven, we had our own
little theatre, my brothers and sisters and I,
we built it. We all acted in plays, wrote
little plays. We had it all raked, we had
bicycle lamps, we had curtains, planks laid
over the turf for a stage, nylons over our
faces, costumes. (Playwright J)
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Subsidised theatre is where people cut their teeth. It’s where we get our writers and directors and actors growing and being dangerous. Without subsidised theatre, you don’t get Mark O’Rowe, you don’t discover Cillian Murphy. Subsidised theatre is like the labour ward for film and TV. (Actor H)
Appendix I: Survey questionnaire

Department of Film Studies, Trinity College Dublin

Career Development in the Irish Film/TV-drama and Theatre Sectors:

Questionnaire

Please note

- The group chosen for this Questionnaire survey consists of prominent directors, writers and actors in the Irish Film (i.e. feature drama, feature documentary and feature animation), Television Drama and Theatre sectors. Included are Irish winners of IFTA and Irish Times Theatre awards since their inception in 2003 and 1997 respectively, and Irish nominees for BAFTA, Olivier, Tony and Academy Awards between 1990 and 2018. These criteria produced a list of c.200 individual practitioners. Given the constraints of time and finance, it was decided to start with this group and, if possible, extend it in time to others active in the Irish film/TV-drama and theatre sectors.

- All individual data will be treated as strictly confidential, and only aggregate results for the whole sample will be made public. We fully appreciate that you might not be able or wish to answer some of the questions. Please respond to as many as you can though as the findings of this study may shed valuable light on the film/TV and theatre sectors, both for public agencies and for those employed in these sectors.

- Your participation in this survey will provide us with valuable information. We will record each interview with a smartphone with your consent. These recordings will be stored on an external hard drive. This will be password-protected and only accessible by the lead researcher. All hard-copy surveys will be stored in a password-protected file in the School of Creative Arts. All data will be destroyed after ten years, following Trinity’s Good Research Practice. Should you wish to withdraw at any stage, you are free to do so and any information you have supplied will be destroyed. All data collected will be anonymised before publication and nothing will be included in the report that can identify you. However, we may ask for your permission to include you in a case study within the report.

- The project has been funded by Creative Ireland and is being undertaken by three very experienced cultural researchers in Trinity College Dublin, two in the Department of Film Studies and one in the Department of Economics.

  - Ruth Barton (Principal Investigator), Associate Professor, Department of Film Studies, School of Creative Arts, Trinity College Dublin.
  - Denis Murphy, (Lead Researcher), PhD and Research Fellow, Department of Film Studies, School of Creative Arts, Trinity College Dublin.
  - John O’Hagan, (Co-investigator) Professor Emeritus, Department of Economics, School of Social Sciences and Philosophy, Trinity College Dublin.
### A  
**BASE INFORMATION**

1. ID code:  
2. Year born:  
3. Country of birth:  
4. Nationality:  
5. Occupation (tick all that apply):  
   - Director  
   - Actor  
   - Writer  
6. Residential location:  
   - Ireland chiefly, County?  
   - Outside Ireland chiefly (please specify):  
   - Both?  
7. Over the past 3 years, how has your time been divided between the following paid activities?  
   (Note that numbers entered should add up to 100%.)  
   - Film  
   - TV-drama  
   - Theatre  
   - Other  

### B  
**EDUCATIONAL/PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND**

1. Formal education (highest level achieved):  
   - Second-level  
   - Third-level  
   - Postgraduate  
2. Relevant training/experience (tick whichever boxes apply). If appropriate, indicate where:  
   - Youth theatre  
   - Professional schools  
   - Short courses  
   - Other (please specify)  
3. First exposure to participation in drama, TV, video or filmmaking:  
   - School play  
   - Local drama group  
   - University societies  
   - Other (please specify):  

---
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### C Individual Exposure and Attitudes to Funding

1. Have you received any individual state financial grants/bursaries? (i.e. You were a named recipient of the funding.)
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   
   a. If yes, please specify the main ones:
   - [ ] i.
   - [ ] ii.
   - [ ] iii.

   b. If yes, at what stage of your career? (Please tick whichever boxes apply):
   - [ ] Early
   - [ ] Middle
   - [ ] Late

   c. If yes, were they helpful in progressing your career?
   - [ ] Extremely
   - [ ] Very
   - [ ] Somewhat
   - [ ] No impact
   - [ ] Not sure

2. Have you received any individual non-state (private) funding? (i.e. You were a named recipient of the funding.)
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

   a. If yes, please specify the main ones:
   - [ ] i.
   - [ ] ii.
   - [ ] iii.

   b. If yes, at what stage of your career? (Please tick whichever boxes apply):
   - [ ] Early
   - [ ] Middle
   - [ ] Late

   c. If yes, were they helpful in progressing your career?
   - [ ] Extremely
   - [ ] Very
   - [ ] Somewhat
   - [ ] No impact
   - [ ] Not sure

3. Are you aware that film/TV/theatre gets state assistance?
   - Direct grants?
     - [ ] Yes
     - [ ] No
   - Tax Breaks?
     - [ ] Yes
     - [ ] No

   a. How important are these measures?
   - [ ] Extremely
   - [ ] Very
   - [ ] Somewhat
   - [ ] Not at all
   - [ ] Don’t know
### D  Professional Achievement

1. Which role/project/event would you consider to be your most important career breakthrough (please list up to three)? (Note: this information will be not be used to identify you personally.)

   I.  

   II.  

   III.  

2. If you have won or been nominated for any major awards, did this make any difference to your career?

### E  (If you work mainly in TV drama or Feature Filmmaking (including feature documentary or feature animation) - Mobility between Film/TV-drama and Theatre)

1. Did your career start in theatre?  
   - Yes  
   - No  

2. How important do you think some experience in the theatre industry is to a career in film/TV-drama?  
   - Essential  
   - Very important  
   - Important  
   - Not important  
   - Don’t know  

3. Do you still work in theatre?  
   - Yes  
   - No  

   a. Why?  
   - Income/work  
   - Diversity of roles/projects  
   - Live performance  
   - Reputation  
   - Other (please specify):  

Cont…. 
4. Do you or have you worked in both TV-drama and filmmaking?
   - Yes
   - No
   a. If yes, why both?
      - Income/work
      - Diversity of roles/projects
      - Reputation
      - Other (please specify):

5. Is there any disadvantage to working in different mediums?
   - Yes (please specify):
   - No

6. Do you think that the subsidised theatre sector is important to the success of the film/TV-drama sector?
   - Yes, definitely
   - Yes maybe
   - No
   - Not sure
   a. If yes, in what way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WORK OUTSIDE FEATURE FILM, TV-DRAMA AND THEATRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Have you ever relied on the following to supplement your income? (Tick as appropriate.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music Video?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>If yes, how creative do you consider your commercial advertising work to be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>If yes, how creative do you consider your music video work to be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Do you undertake other paid work, apart from above, outside your work in film/TV-drama and theatre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, how creative do you consider this work to be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### G  NETWORKS (PROFESSIONAL CONNECTIONS AND WORK RELATIONSHIPS) AND IMPACT OF OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early family/personal connections on a professional level (if any) to film/TV-drama and theatre? (Please elaborate.)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Do you have a network of long-term working relationships? When were these relationships initially formed? (Tick all that apply.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How do you feel your networks have helped develop your career?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How do/did these networks help? (Tick as many as appropriate.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Are you in close geographical contact with other people in the sector?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Does geographical proximity to others matter?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Do your work relationships extend beyond work? Any anecdotes or examples? (e.g. became partners in later life, godmother, best man, moved location of work together, meet regularly socially, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- At College. Where?
- At professional training school. Where?
- During your early career. Where?
- More recently? Where?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With jobs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|   | Yes, very much. |   |
|   | Yes, somewhat |   |
|   | Not really |   |
|   | Not sure |   |

If yes, why?
Appendix II: Awards systems used in sample construction

**Theatre awards**

**Ireland**

The Irish Times Theatre Awards (ITTAs) represent the Irish theatre sector’s most prominent recognition system. First awarded in 1997, ITTAs are awarded to theatre companies, individual productions and practitioners in 13 categories, subsequently expanded to 14 in 2009 and 16 in 2017. In recent years, nominations have usually been announced in January for productions taking place in the preceding year, with the awards taking place in February at a ceremony in Dublin. In addition to The Irish Times, the event is usually sponsored by a named company, originally ESB and most recently Tilestyle. Each year, nominations and awards are finalised by a panel of three judges, drawing on theatre practitioners, producers, critics, academics and other experts. The survey sample includes Irish winners of ITTAs granted between 1997-2018.

**United Kingdom**

The Olivier Awards, inaugurated in 1976, are conferred by the Society of London Theatre (SOLT), a trade group of producers, theatre owners and managers operating in both the commercial and subsidised sectors of the London theatre industry. Awards are presented at an annual (usually April) televised ceremony for productions taking place on the London stage during the previous year. Nominations and winners are chosen by an expert Theatre Panel comprising journalists, casting directors, arts administrators and publishers, finalised annually by the SOLT chief executive and an advisory group. The awards process has two stages. In the first stage, a long list of nominations is compiled by the Theatre Panel, and voted on by SOLT members. SOLT members may also vote ‘outside’ this list, except in the four Actor and Supporting Actor categories, where they are restricted to individuals on the (sometimes very) long list. This initial process results in a shortlist of nominees, which is then voted on by SOLT members and the Theatre Panel to determine the winners. The survey sample includes Irish nominees (if any) for Oliviers granted between 1990-2018.

**USA**

The Tony Awards are organised by the American Theatre Wing (a cultural theatre funding body) and The Broadway League (a New York theatre trade association comprising theatre owners, producers, managers and suppliers). Inaugurated in 1947, the awards are presented annually to eligible productions, practitioners and performers in a televised June ceremony, following the previous year’s June-May Broadway ‘season’. Nominations are selected by a committee of at least 15 individuals with professional and educational theatre experience. Committee members must commit to seeing every eligible production, and must not be media members (electronic or print). Nominations are then voted on by members of the relevant Actor, Dramatist, Director, and Scenic Artist unions/guilds, as well as up to 75 ‘voting members’ designated by the Wing and League, members of the Nominating Committee, members of the New York Drama Critics Circle and some other organisations. The survey sample includes Irish nominees (if any) for Tonys granted between 1990-2018.
Film and TV Drama awards

Ireland

The Irish Film and Drama Awards (IFTAs) are presented annually in 30 categories, voted on by members of the Irish Film and Television Academy (IFTA). The Academy claims approximately 1,000 members in 14 ‘Chapters’ or professional categories. The awards process has two rounds. In Round One, nominees are compiled through a combination of general voting and special juries formed to nominate in specific categories. In Round Two, shortlists are voted upon by the Academy’s voting members, including the Round One jury members. Some winners (e.g. Lead and Supporting Actor/Actress) are chosen by general membership; others (e.g. Director, Script) by their own relevant Chapter members only. The awards are presented in a televised February ceremony following the year of eligibility. The Academy has been presenting these awards since 2003. The survey sample includes Irish winners of IFTAs awarded between 2003-2018.

United Kingdom

The BAFTA awards, in existence since 1949, are presented annually by the British Academy of Film and Television Arts. Awards are granted in separate awards ceremonies for Film, Television (since 1954), Games, and Children’s Media. For film, the awards process has two rounds. In Round One, some categories (including Lead and Supporting Actor categories) are open to all Film members, while others (including Director and Screenplay) are restricted to members of their relevant ‘Chapters’ or peer professional groups. In Round Two, most categories, including the actor, director and screenwriter categories, are then voted on by the general membership to produce a winner. The Film awards are presented in a televised February ceremony following the year of eligibility. Television members may vote in as many TV categories as they wish. The Television awards are presented in a April or May ceremony following the year of eligibility. The survey sample includes Irish nominees (if any) for BAFTAs awarded between 1990-2018.

United States

The Academy Awards (Oscars) have been in existence since 1928, and currently award Oscars in 24 categories. Nominees and winners in most categories – including the actor, director and writer categories with which we are concerned – are selected by the immediate peer group only: actor branch selecting actors, director branch selecting directors, writers selecting writers, and so on. (Best Picture is voted on by members in all branches). The Oscars are awarded in a televised February ceremony, following the year of eligibility. The survey sample includes Irish nominees (if any) for Oscars awarded between 1990-2018.
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