

Editorial

TV Formats: History, Theory, Industry and Audiences

Andrea Esser

Concurrent with the acceleration of the TV format trade in the new millennium, scholarly interest in television formats has grown. ‘Format research’ began in the 1990s,ⁱ but it took almost 20 years and a booming trade before this field of study attracted broad academic attention.ⁱⁱ Format scholarship is international in outlook, following earlier research concerned with the global flow of audiovisual programming.ⁱⁱⁱ Initially this flow was described and criticised as one-way, from the United States to the rest of the world.^{iv} Developments in international TV markets and television research in the 1990s led to a revision. Scholars such as Joseph Straubhaar,^v John Sinclair,^{vi} Elizabeth Jacka and Stuart Cunningham^{vii} highlighted the rising significance of ‘geocultural markets’.

The TV format business raises again the question of transformations in the patterns and flows of the programming trade. As Paul Torre has aptly noted, ‘new players, new markets, and new dynamics are combining to reformat global media economics’.^{viii} Moreover, an additional aspect now demands attention: adaptations’ local-global texture. TV formats are sold in the form of a ‘production bible’, spawning numerous local productions—three on average, but in a growing number of cases over 20, 40 or even more different local versions.^{ix} The ways in which, and the extent to which these productions differ from one another;^x how ‘the local’ finds expression;^{xi} how the socio-cultural, political and industrial contexts impact on formats and vice versa;^{xii} and how to evaluate adaptations^{xiii} are all issues that have attracted scholarly interest in recent years.^{xiv}

The aspect of localisation has been the focus of the AHRC-funded *Media Across Borders* network (www.mediaacrossborders.com), 10 of whose members have contributed to this issue. Reacting to the notable increase in localisation practices in the audiovisual media, the network aims to illuminate meanings and processes of localisation. It brings together international scholars of television, film and video games, of translation studies, as well as media professionals working in the field. The trend towards targeting the international market with localised products is common to the various audiovisual industries. Moreover, in the digital era the once highly distinct and separate media are converging, so it is sensible to adopt not only an international outlook but also a multimedia, multi-platform approach.

This themed issue of *Critical Studies in Television* is the outcome of the network's first activities. Building on some of the papers and ideas presented at the inauguration conference in June 2012 and subsequent communication between network members engaged in television research, it takes up some of the yet underexplored themes and areas in TV format scholarship. Most notably it turns the attention on audiences (both as viewers and as target groups), neglected television regions (Central and Eastern Europe and Africa) and genres (cooking formats), as well as the role of public-service broadcasting in relation to format use and production.

Befitting the issue's introductory contribution, eminent format scholar Albert Moran traces the development of cross-border television adaptation from the 1930s until now, dividing formats' trajectory into four phases: early 'trailblazing' programme imitations (1935-55), 'casual exchange' (1955-80), 'the becoming of the format business' (1980-2000) and formats as a 'significant worldwide business' (2000-present). With this article Moran adds to the as yet small number of

publications dedicated to historicising format research.^{xv} Moreover, he deliberately broadens the format definition to include non-traded programme adaptations. Moran, it is commonly accepted, defined the field of format scholarship with his ground breaking, extensive research. His originally trade-based format definition and approach were widely adopted by format researchers around the world. But scholars like Straubhaar,^{xvi} and Tasha Oren and Sharon Shahaf^{xvii} have rightly highlighted the significance of generic adaptations (including textual characteristics, production practices and audience address). Only by adding these generic adaptations to franchised formats, as well as affixing early (mostly unpaid and unacknowledged) imitations of programme ideas and contemporary unlicensed (but close) adaptations, can we achieve a more nuanced historical and theoretical understanding of content adaptation and imitation in television.

Tasha Oren in her 2012 collection (with Shahaf) advocated the considerable theoretical gain the conceptual broadening would accomplish.^{xviii} In her contribution for this issue, Oren explores the history of US food television to illuminate changes in cooking formats^{xix} and exemplify format's theoretical utility. Tracing the general but radical move from female-domestic instructional cooking programmes to competition shows—characterised by professional, high-stakes performance, criticism, stress and risk—Oren demonstrates how specific conventions ('format types') develop over time. She argues that innovation within convention is 'the primary logic of television' and that the medium therefore produces the format 'as its most native, natural and ready-made product'. The more global television becomes, the bolder this logic grows. Instructive for cultural theory, on the other hand, she says, is the dialogic relationship between (cooking) formats and (food) culture.

The next essay by Miriam Stehling, an investigation of viewers of the internationally successful *Next Top Model* format, addresses a considerable gap in format research: audience and reception studies.^{xx} Stehling's findings, based on extensive focus group research in the United States and Germany, suggest that viewers of different local adaptations can nonetheless negotiate genres, values and themes in markedly similar ways. Stehling concludes that Straubhaar's text-based subcategories of 'cultural proximity'^{xxi} should hence be expanded to encompass reception processes; and that localisation at audience level, at least in this case, is better understood as 'translocalisation' (i.e. localisation that exists *beyond* or *across* cultures). The still often adopted conceptual dichotomy between the local and the global, she rightly argues, leads researchers of localisation to place too great a focus on difference, with the result that transcultural aspects remain invisible.

This transcultural blind spot is also accentuated in Jean Chalaby's reflection piece, written after his participation in a roundtable discussion on 'The Universal and the Local' with Stehling, Simone Knox and Elke Weissmann (see below) during the *Media Across Borders* conference. Chalaby, who has extensively published on TV formats in recent years,^{xxii} aptly notes how formats make 'the local visible and the global invisible'. He also highlights the significance of localisation though, arguing that '[f]ormats are successful internationally only if they resonate with an audience in each and every market in which they air'^{xxiii} and that they can have genuine local impact.

Several of the aspects raised by Chalaby and Stehling are also taken up by Martin Nkosi Ndlela in his exploration of *Big Brother Africa* (2003, 2007-2012); he, too, emphasises the need for localisation, the 'duality of glocality' (i.e. the simultaneity of localising and globalising forces, homogenising and heterogenising

processes)^{xxiv} and the significance of considering the audience in localisation research. Ndlela contends that, at the textual level, in order to achieve the desired audience appeal, localisation needs to address cultural factors—something that is clearly happening in the case of *Big Brother Africa*, as his textual analysis and interviews reveal. Cultural factors are not only national though, but even more so regional and intra-national. Primarily, localisation in *Big Brother Africa* means tailoring the show to a target audience that is English speaking and transnational (based in Southern Africa, East Africa and West Africa). But because *Big Brother Africa*'s target audience is found on multiple platforms, including mobile, internet and social media sites, further localisation then occurs on the different platforms, taking into account differing cultural sensibilities. Again, many of the additional platforms are not confined to national, or in fact any geographical space, and neither are the cultural sensibilities catered for with this second order localisation. The latter, like the 'gossip communities' that Ndlela identifies as crucial in creating 'local meaning', are marked by 'transculturality'—like the reception in Stehling's *Next Top Model* focus groups.^{xxv}

Elke Weissmann's reflection (like Chalaby's, a result of the above mentioned roundtable discussion) corroborates the gain in carefully studying audiences, and how this reveals that transnationalisation takes place not just at the textual but also at the audience level. Drawing on her research of online discourses of drama formats and her extensive research of the internationalisation of American drama more generally,^{xxvi} Weissmann highlights how an increasing number of television viewers use their 'transnational knowledge' of TV programmes to discuss and evaluate adaptations. Moreover, her careful exploration of audiences' views of non-domestic content reveals a second important, yet underexplored aspect, the complexities of

‘local appeal’. Weissmann justly warns that we should not ignore the appeal of ‘*the other local*’ in television and localisation research. The recent international success of Swedish and Danish crime fiction (at least amongst certain demographics) supports her argument.

Like the essays by Moran and Oren, the contributions by Weismann, Ndlela and Stehling are important in advancing format research. Television audiences have been neglected in format research and as a result, too often are still simply taken to be national audiences—usually with an unwavering preference for local content.^{xxvii} The three contributions demonstrate that we must carefully dissect and define audiences on a case-by-case basis if we want to understand the appeal of the ‘local’ and what exactly it is that ‘the local’ signifies.

Like audience studies, elite interviews with television professionals are indispensable for format scholarship, albeit a limited number of scholars apply this method. In the Oren and Shahaf collection, for instance, it is very much absent. As research by Ndlela (in this issue), Moran,^{xxviii} Chalaby,^{xxix} Hill and Steemers,^{xxx} and myself^{xxxii} reveals, such interviews can illuminate both the intricacies of format adaptation and the reasons for it in the first place, in general as well as for concrete decisions and changes within a particular adaptation. Sylwia Szostak’s contribution in this issue, an interview with Polish TV fiction writer Agnieszka Kruk, adds to these industry-gained insights. In particular, Kruk’s account of adapting *Na Wspólnej* (2003-present), a soap opera based on the FremantleMedia format, *Between Friends*, highlights the benefits of ‘knowledge transfer’^{xxxii} implied in licensed format adaptation. It also reveals the possibility of a welcoming, appreciative attitude. Kruk’s highly positive account is something Szostak also encountered in earlier interviews she carried out with Polish television executives. German producers, interviewed by

myself,^{xxxiii} on the other hand, had much more mixed feelings about the consultancy service offered and at times, it was felt, imposed by format licensors, some of whom were perceived as believing they knew everything better than the consultants.

Interviews with professionals thus have also revealed the importance of the industrial context in influencing television executives' perception of their encounter with other production cultures. The notable difference in the above accounts highlights the necessity for format research to take both a comparative and a 'cosmopolitan approach'.^{xxxiv} We need to include large and small countries,^{xxxv} developed and developing television markets, format import countries (like Poland, Russia and Turkey, which are all under-researched) and format export countries (notably, Japan, the United Kingdom, Argentina and the United States),^{xxxvi} nations that share a language with a larger neighbour or several other countries, and regions like Africa and the Middle East, where English and Arab-language channels respectively create transnational audiences.

The essay by Pia Majbritt Jensen takes up the aspect of formats' impact on the local production industries, raised in Szostak's interview with Kruk. Jensen takes a close look at the public-service broadcasters in Denmark, where DR and TV2 still command the majority of the Danish audience and have a substantial share in domestic production. Both PSBs adapt international formats on a regular basis. Based on a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the two broadcasters' use of formats, Jensen discusses whether PSBs' use of formats is in the public and national interest—making this research of particular relevance to policy makers. Two concerns raised by scholars^{xxxvii} are addressed: whether adaptations of international formats have sufficient 'national cultural substance'; and whether the use of imported formats has a detrimental impact on the national production industry. Jensen contends that both

worries are unfounded. However, in the past 10 years, the Danes have relied exclusively on the big format nations (notably, the United Kingdom, America and the Netherlands) and their Scandinavian neighbours. For a truly cosmopolitan outlook, Jensen says, Danish broadcasters should be expected to consider the wider international market.

In the final contribution Simone Knox defends the cosmopolitan outlook, concluding the issue with a persuasive argument for an engagement with the ‘universal’. The prominence of formats in today’s television, Knox argues, suggests that the time is ripe for cultural theorists to give up their resistance to the concept of the universal and collaborate with scholars from the numerous disciplines for which the universal has long had validity and pertinence. I can only wholeheartedly agree and hope that the inter-disciplinary, international *Media Across Borders* network can contribute to this. As John Tomlinson has astutely remarked,

culture is associated with difference only contingently and not necessarily... the important point is that this difference does not arise as the telos of cultural practices, but simply as its consequence. Cultural work may produce difference but this is not the same as saying that culture is founded in difference.^{xxxviii}

I would like to thank the AHRC for their financial support in setting up the *Media Across Borders* (MAB) network, and also my wonderful colleagues and network co-founders, Iain Robert Smith and Miguel Á. Bernal-Merino, without whose tireless input the network activities and website presence would not be possible. Further thanks go to Irene Artegiani, who was of enormous help in co-ordinating the

network's activities in 2012, Jeanette Steemers, who proved wonderfully supportive throughout the year, and all our other network members who contributed to making the three launch events such a success. Finally, I would like to convey thanks to the reviewers who have given generously their time and expertise to review submissions and provide constructive feedback for this issue, and to everybody involved in *Critical Studies in Television*. The admirable effort of the editors in particular needs a mention here. Without Janet McCabe and Kim Akass the *CST* journal and website would not be what they are today.

The journal receives financial support from the Cardiff School of Creative and Cultural Industries at the University of Glamorgan and the editors would like to extend thanks to them for continued assistance.

Notes

ⁱ Michael Skovmand, 'Barbarous TV International: Syndicated "Wheels of Fortune",' in Michael Skovmand and Kim Christian Schrøder, eds, *Media Cultures. Reappraising Transnational Media*, Routledge, 1992, pp. 84-103; Anne Cooper-Chen, *Games in the Global Village: A 50-Nation Study*, Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1994; Albert Moran, *Copycat TV: Globalization, Program Formats and Cultural Identity*, Luton Press, 1998. If we adopt a broader definition of format and not-yet labelled as such, we can go back even further: see for example, Alessandro Silj, ed, *East of Dallas: The European Challenge to American Television*, BFI, 1988. Also see, Andrea Esser, 'The Transnationalization of European Television,' *Journal of European Area Studies*, 10, 1, 2002, 13-29.

ⁱⁱ Two edited collections in particular, bringing together researchers from across the world, need mentioning here: Albert Moran, ed, *TV Formats Worldwide: Localizing Global Programs*, Intellect, 2009; Tasha Oren and Sharon Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats. Understanding Television Across Borders*, Routledge, 2012.

ⁱⁱⁱ A second strand that some format research has developed from is that of reality TV, the most formatted genre. Attention to the international format aspect in seminal anthologies, such as Su Holmes and Deborah Jermyn, eds, *Understanding Reality Television*, Routledge, 2004, and Susan Murray and Laurie Ouellette, eds, *Reality TV. Remaking Television Culture*, 2nd ed., New York University Press, 2008, is very limited though.

^{iv} For example, Kaarle Nordenstreng and Tapio Varis, *Television Traffic: A One-Way Street? A Survey and Analysis of the International Flow of Television Program Material. Reports and Papers on Mass Communication*, UNESCO, 1974; Daniel Biltereyst, 'Language and Culture as Ultimate Barriers? An Analysis of the Circulation, Consumption and Popularity of Fiction in Small European Countries,' in *European Journal of Communication*, 7, 4, 1992, 517-540; Els De Bens, Mary Kelly and Marit Bakke, 'Television Content: Dallasification of Culture?' in Karen Siune and Wolfgang Truetzschler, eds, *Dynamics of Media Politics*, Sage, 1992, pp. 75-100; Els De Bens and Hedwig de Smaele, 'The Inflow of American Television Fiction on European Broadcasting Channels revisited,' in Denis McQuail,

Peter Golding and Els De Bens, eds, *Communication. Theory & Research*, Sage, 2005, pp. 36-52; Andrea Esser, 'Audiovisual Content in Europe: Transnationalization and Approximation,' *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 15, 2, 2007, 163-184.

^v Joseph Straubhaar, 'Beyond Media Imperialism: Asymmetrical Interdependence and Cultural Proximity,' *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 8, 1, 1991, 39-59.

^{vi} John Sinclair, 'Geolinguistic Region as Global Space: the Case of Latin America,' in Georgette Wang, Jan Servaes and Anura Goonasekera, eds, *The New Communications Landscape Demystifying Media Globalisation*, Routledge, 2000, pp. 19-32.

^{vii} John Sinclair, Elizabeth Jacka and Stuart Cunningham, 'Peripheral Vision,' in John Sinclair, Elizabeth Jacka and Stuart Cunningham, eds, *New Patterns in Global Television*, Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 1-15.

^{viii} Paul Torre, 'Reversal of Fortune? Hollywood Faces New Competition in Global Market Trade,' in Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, p. 186; also see Jean Chalaby, 'At the Origin of a Global Industry: the TV Format Trade as an Anglo-American Invention,' *Media, Culture and Society*, 34, 1, 2012, 36-52; Andrea Esser, 'Television Formats and Commercialisation,' in Karen Donders, Caroline Pauwels and Jan Loisen, *Private Television in Europe: Content, Markets and Policy*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, pp. 151-168.

^{ix} Andrea Esser, 'The Format Business: Franchising Television Content,' *International Journal of Digital Television*, 4, 2, 2013, 141-158.

^x For example, Lothar Mikos and Marta Perrotta, 'Travelling Style: Aesthetic Differences and Similarities in National Adaptations of *Yo soy Betty, la fea*,' *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 15, 1, 2012, 81-97; Bianca Lippert, *Telenovela Formats. Localized Versions of a Universal Love*, SV Sierke Verlag, 2012; Edward Larkey, 'Transcultural Localization Strategies of Global TV Formats: *The Office* and *Stromberg*,' in Moran, ed, *TV Formats Worldwide*, pp. 187-201; Sharon Sharp, 'Global Franchising, Gender and Genre: The Case of Domestic Reality Television,' in Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, pp. 346-365; Amir Hetsroni, 'The Millionaire Project: a Cross-Cultural Analysis of Quiz Shows from the United States, Russia, Poland, Norway, Finland, Israel, and Saudi Arabia,' *Mass Communication & Society*, 7, 2, 2004, 133-156.

^{xi} For example, Fien Adriaens and Daniel Biltreyest, 'Glocalised Telenovelas and National Identities: A "Textual Cum Production" Analysis of the "Telenovela" *Sara*, the Flemish Adaptation of *Yo soy Betty, la fea*,' *Television & New Media*, 13, 6, 2012, 551-67; numerous contributions in Janet McCabe and Kim Akass, eds, *TV's Betty Goes Global. From Telenovela to International Brand*, I. B. Tauris, 2013; Neiger, Motti, 'Cultural Oxymora: The Israeli Idol Negotiates Meanings and Readings,' *Television & New Media*, 13, 6, 2012, 535-550; in Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, 2012, see, Joost de Bruin, 'NZ Idol: Nation Building Through Format Adaptation,' pp. 223-241; Erica Jean Bochanty-Aguero, 'We Are The World: *American Idol*'s Global Self-Posturing,' pp. 260-81; and Lauhona Ganguly, 'Global Television Formats and the Political Economy of Cultural Adaptation: *Who Wants to be a Millionaire?* in India,' pp. 323-45.

^{xii} For example, Eggo Müller, 'Unterhaltungsshowshows transkulturell: Fernsehformate zwischen Akkomodation und Assimilation,' in Andreas Hepp and Martin Löffelholz, eds, *Transkulturelle Kommunikation*, UVK, 2002, pp. 456-473; Marvin Kraidy, 'The Social and Political Dimensions of Global Television Formats: Reality Television in Lebanon and Saudi Arabia,' in Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, pp. 285-305; Martin Nkosi Ndlela, 'Global Television Formats in Africa: Localizing *Idol*,' in Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, pp. 242-259; Pia Majbritt Jensen, 'How National Media Systems Shape the Localization of Formats,' in Moran, ed, *TV Formats Worldwide*, pp. 163-186; Gabriele Cosentino, Waddick Doyle and Dimitrina Todorova, 'Tearing Up Television News Across Borders: Format Transfer of News Parody Shows between Italy and Bulgaria,' in Moran, ed, *TV Formats Worldwide*, pp. 203-220; Ted Magder, 'Television 2.0: The Business of American Television in Transition,' in Murray and Ouellette, eds, *Reality TV*, pp. 141-164; Xiaolu Ma and Albert Moran, 'Towards a Cultural Economy of *Chou Nu (Nu) Wu Di*: The *Yo soy Betty, la Fea* Franchise in the People's Republic of China,' in McCabe and Akass, eds, *TV's Betty Goes Global*, pp. 126-142.

^{xiii} For examples see, Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, 2012, including Vinicius Navarro, 'More than Copycat Television: Format Adaptation as Performance,' pp. 23-38; Eddie Brennan, 'A Political Economy of Formatted Pleasures,' pp. 72-89; and Michael Keane, 'A Revolution in Television and a Great Leap Forward for Innovation? China in the Global Television Format Business,' pp. 306-23. Simone Knox, 'Reflections from Media Across Borders: The Creative Potential of Adaptation,' 2012, <http://ftreading.wordpress.com/2012/09/12/creative-potential-of-adaptation/>,

accessed on 28 September 2012.

^{xiv} Also of interest here is a special issue on ‘cultural adaptation’ that Albert Moran and Michael Keane edited for *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 23, 2, 2009. Although not focused on TV formats, the issue is highly instructive for format scholars.

^{xv} See in particular, Jean Chalaby, ‘The Making of an Entertainment Revolution: How the TV Format Trade Became a Global Industry,’ *European Journal of Communication*, 26, 4, 2011, 293–309; Jérôme Bourdon, ‘From Discrete Adaptations to Hard Copies: The Rise of Formats in European Television,’ in Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, pp. 111–127.

^{xvi} Joseph Straubhaar, *World Television. From Global to Local*, Sage, 2007; Joseph Straubhaar, ‘Telenovelas in Brazil: From Traveling Scripts to a Genre and Proto-Format both National and Transnational,’ in Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, pp. 148–177.

^{xvii} Tasha Oren and Sharon Shahaf, ‘Introduction: Television Formats – A Global Framework for TV Studies,’ in Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, pp. 1–20; Tasha Oren, ‘Reiterational Texts and Global Imagination: Television Strikes Back,’ in Oren and Shahaf, eds, *Global Television Formats*, pp. 366–81.

^{xviii} *Ibid.*

^{xix} Cooking formats have not received much attention to date, but scholarship in this area is growing with at least two other network members, Marusya Bociurkiw and Kathy Bowry, now working on this genre.

^{xx} A notable exception is the *Big Brother* collection, Ernest Mathijs and Janet Jones, eds, *Big Brother International. Formats, Critics and Publics*, Wallflower Press, 2004.

^{xxi} Joseph Straubhaar, *World Television*, 2007.

^{xxii} Jean Chalaby, ‘The Rise of Britain’s Super-Indies: Policy-Making in the Age of the Global Media Market,’ *The International Communication Gazette*, 72, 8, 2010, 675–693; Chalaby, ‘The Making of an Entertainment Revolution,’ 2011; Chalaby, ‘At the Origin of a Global Industry,’ 2012; Jean Chalaby, ‘Producing TV Content in a Globalized Intellectual Property Market: The Emergence of the International Production Model,’ *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 9, 3, 2012, 19–39.

^{xxiii} In the video games sector, *Media Across Borders* member Kate Edwards, Executive Director at the International Game Developers Association and Geographer & Principal Consultant at Englobe Inc., has been highlighting the need for localisation for years. See, for example ‘Content Culturalization and the Battle for Public Mindshare,’ Conference Paper at the *Media Across Borders* conference, University of Roehampton, 8–9 June, <http://mediaacrossborders.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Edwards-culturalization.pdf>, accessed 23 April 2013.

^{xxiv} The term ‘duality of glocality’ was introduced by Roland Robertson to clarify his earlier concept of ‘glocality,’ often wrongly equated exclusively with heterogenisation. See, Richard Giulianotti and Roland Robertson, ‘Recovering the Social: Globalization, Football and Transnationalism,’ *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs*, 7, 2, 2007, 166–186.

^{xxv} Cf Amos Owen Thomas, ‘Adapting Global Television to Regional Realities: Traversing the Middle East Experience,’ in Moran, *TV Formats Worldwide*, pp. 149–161.

^{xxvi} Elke Weissmann, *Transnational Television Drama: Special Relations and Mutual Influence between the US and UK*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

^{xxvii} My own research has also revealed interesting facts in this respect. For instance, for several years now German fiction has not been as popular with German audiences as American fiction. Another example comes from Britain, where the audience of *America’s Next Top Model* is slightly larger than the audience for *Britain’s Next Top Model*. For further detail see, Andrea Esser, ‘Television Formats and Commercialisation,’ 2013; Andrea Esser ‘Television Formats: Primetime Staple, Global Market,’ *Popular Communication*, 8, 4, 2010, 273–292.

^{xxviii} Albert Moran with Justin Malbon, *Understanding the Global TV Format*, Intellect, 2006; Albert Moran, Anthony Fung and Michael Keane, *New Television, Globalisation, and the East Asian Cultural Imagination*, Hong Kong University Press, 2007

^{xxix} Chalaby, ‘The Making of an Entertainment Revolution,’ 2011.

^{xxx} Annette Hill and Jeanette Steemers, ‘Big Formats, Small Nations: Does Size Matter?’ in Gregory Lowe and Christian Nissen, eds, *Small Among Giants: Television Broadcasting in Smaller Countries*, Nordicom, 2011, pp. 201–215.

^{xxxi} Andrea Esser, ‘Interviews with TV Executives Involved in the German Adaptation, *Verliebt in Berlin*,’ in McCabe and Akass, eds, *TV’s Betty Goes Global*, pp. 72–82.

^{xxxii} The important aspect of knowledge or ‘technology transfer’ in the TV format trade was highlighted by Keane, Fung and Moran in *New Television, Globalisation*, 2007.

^{xxxiii} See Esser, 'Interviews with TV Executives,' 2013. Instructive here was also the interview with, Holger Rettler, at the time CEO of format production company Tresor TV, 'interviewed by Andrea Esser,' at Tresor TV, Cologne, on 29 May 2008; and it is interesting to note that all scholars who have raised concerns about the possibly detrimental effect of format production on local production industries study advanced television markets (see endnote 32).

^{xxxiv} Ulrich Beck, *Cosmopolitan Vision*, Polity, 2006.

^{xxxv} For format development in small versus large countries see in particular, Hill and Steemers, 'Big Formats, Small Nations?,' 2011.

^{xxxvi} Elfi Jäger and Sonja Behrens, *The FRAPA Report 2009 – TV Formats to the World*, FRAPA, 2009.

^{xxxvii} For example, Gundhild Agger, 'Format Trade and TV Drama: Friends for Life,' in Lennard Højbjerg and Henrik Søndergaard, eds, *European Film and Media Culture*, Museum Tusulanum, 2005, pp. 179-203; Yngvar Kjus, 'Fabricating Cultural Events,' *MedieKultur*, 47, 2009, 92-105; Pia Majbritt Jensen, 'Danish and Australian Television: the Impact of Format Adaptation,' *Media International Australia*, 124, 2007, 119-133; Albert Moran and Michael Keane, 'Joining the Circle,' in Albert Moran and Michael Keane, eds, *Television Across Asia*, Routledge, 2004, pp. 197-204.

^{xxxviii} John Tomlinson, *Globalization and Culture*, The University of Chicago Press, 1999, pp. 68-69.