

## Entertainment Industry versus Culture Industry: Designers of Consumption Society

GÖZDE YİRMİBEŞOĞLU\*

### Abstract

Media constructs social reality by influencing public opinion by referring to the dominant ideology while evaluating the daily activities and events and perceiving the realities. In this context, the role played by media in the creation of the culture industry concept developed by the Frankfurt School thinkers is important. Specifically, the concept of culture industry generated by Adorno and Horkheimer argues that movies, television series, pop music or radio are produced in order to be used by people to spend time in their free time when they are not occupied by work.

This study investigates the birth of entertainment industry, a concept developed along with the concept of culture industry within the scope of Fordism and Post-Fordism. It aims at investigating the relationship between the entertainment industry and culture industry within the context of the Frankfurt School thinkers by means of the method of literature review. The main scope of the study is to analyze the relationship among culture industry, mass consumption and entertainment industry. Thus, this study determines that culture industry and entertainment industry are effective in the rise in mass consumption and the intensification of consumption society within the context of spare time activity by the use of a variety of means of communication and media.

**Keywords:** Entertainment Industry, Culture Industry, the Frankfurt School, Consumption Society

---

\* Assoc. Prof., Akdeniz University

## Eğlence Endüstrisi veya Kültür Endüstrisi: Tüketim Toplumu Mimarları

GÖZDE YİRMİBEŞOĞLU\*

### Özet

Medya gerçekliğin algılanmasında ve hayatın olağan akışı içerisinde yer alan etkinliklerin değerlendirilmesinde egemen ideoloji çerçevesinde bakış açılarını yönlendirir ve toplumsal gerçekliği oluşturur. Bu bağlamda Frankfurt Okulu düşünürleri tarafından geliştirilen kültür endüstrisi kavramının oluşumunda medyanın oynadığı rol önemlidir. Özellikle Adorno ve Horkheimer tarafından ortaya atılan kültür endüstrisi kavramı, en temel şekliyle filmler, televizyon dizileri, pop müzik ya da radyolar gibi kitlelerin çalışma dışında kalan zamanlarda vakit geçirirken kullanmaları amacıyla üretilmiş ürünlerden oluştuğu savını ileri sürmektedir.

Bu çalışma, kültür endüstrisi kavramına eş olarak ortaya çıkan eğlence endüstrisi kavramının doğuşunu Fordizm ve Post-Fordizm çerçevesinde ele almaktadır. Çalışmada amaç, eğlence endüstrisi ve kültür endüstrisi arasındaki bağlantıyı Frankfurt Okulu düşünürleri çerçevesinde ve literatür taraması yöntemiyle yapmaktır. Çalışmanın temel amacı tüketim kültürü, kitlesel tüketim ve eğlence endüstrisi arasındaki ilişkileri analiz etmektir. Sonuç olarak bu çalışmada, çeşitli medya mecraları aracılığıyla kültür endüstrisi ve eğlence endüstrisinin boş zaman aktiviteleri kapsamında, hızlı tüketimin sağlanması, kitlesel tüketimin artırılması ve tüketim toplumunun pekiştirilmesinde ne kadar etkili olduğu saptanmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Eğlence Endüstrisi, Kültür Endüstrisi, Frankfurt Okulu, Tüketim Toplumu

\* Doç. Dr., Akdeniz Üniversitesi

## 1. Introduction

Consumption is an important economic action taking place at the final step of economic activities in which there is a process of scarce resources transformed into goods and services offered to individuals. In this final step of the economic action, goods and services are available to people who are willing to use and consume them. Economics, a science dealing with the rational behavior of individuals, perceives the attitude of consumers rather reasonable and free from social influences. For instance, utility theory depicts the logical behavior of individuals instead of revealing their choices related to their social and environmental settings. It suggests an incorporation of the individual's behavior and decision by considering the possible risks. In his explanation on utility theory, Fishburn assumes that "preferences, to a greater or lesser extent, govern decisions and that, generally speaking, a decision maker would rather implement a more preferred alternative than one that is less preferred (1970)". Briefly, the individual shows a tendency towards a more favored alternative while making a decision among the choices. March and Olsen state that "Classical theories of choice emphasize decision making as the making of rational choices on the basis of expectations about the consequences of action for prior objectives (1986: 11-35)". Such approaches stressed by the leading thinkers of economics leave out a good deal of important factors which require investigating.

One of such factors, entertainment industry and its impact on the decision of the individuals living in the consumption society is the main focus of this study. Presently, the way people can and do make decisions varies considerably since they are significantly surrounded by the artifacts of the manufactured goods and services. Consumption is one of the key terms for many areas of scientific research. Economics deals with this term specifically and since Adam Smith, it has been a prominent issue for the wealth of nations. Discourse underlining the significantly important role of consumption in the economy of a nation supposes that the secret of the way economy functions lies in the final demand for goods and services. As Smith said, "consumption is the sole end and purpose of all production and the welfare of the producer ought to be attended to, only so far as it may be necessary for promoting that of the consumer" (1937: 625). Starting with the emphasis of Smith in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, consumption and consumer satisfaction has been the ultimate economic goal. Accordingly, the rise of consumption society and the stress on consumer society has been an issue of debate for not only economics but also for many academic fields, one of which is the communication studies. Thus, in this research paper, the meaning of consumption society will be discussed in terms of the studies within the communication area with regards to the discussions on culture industry and entertainment industry.

### **1.1. Aim of the Study**

This study aims at investigating the role of entertainment industry in the perpetuation of consumption society. Within this scope, arguments related to culture industry and its theoretical framework is one of the main debate areas of this study. Therefore, before discussing the forces initiating the entertainment industry, this study deals with the role of Frankfurt School and the works of the academicians debating the relationship between consumption and culture industry in addition to Fordism and Post-Fordism leading to the development of entertainment industry.

### **1.2. Methodology**

Methodology of this study is literature review and most of the renowned work of the academicians and researchers is evaluated and discussed in this research aiming at analyzing the role of entertainment industry and its impact on consumption society. What has been published on a specific topic by distinguished academicians and researchers is the key component of the literature review. Therefore, this study frequently refers to the works of the scholars who have dealt with the topics such as consumption society, entertainment industry and culture industry.

## **2. Consumption Society**

### **2.1. Birth of Mass Consumption**

During the early 1920's, there was over-production in the American markets and the reason for recession was deficiency in consumer demand. Imbalance between the rising production and the consumption customs was apparent. In other words, more goods were being produced than a population with "set habits and means" could consume (Cross, 1993: 38). Two distinct schools of thought worked on the issue of such an imbalance. One of them argued that work hours should be decreased in order to stabilize the economy. This was a way to meet the present needs. In that case, an increase in leisure time was expected. The second view held that the problem of over-production could be solved by expanding consumption, which would cause an economic growth.

However, with the miserable impact of two important events in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, depression of the 1930's and World War II, Western world, specifically the United States, went into a deep and extensive economic depression. A sturdy and strong economic recovery was the expectation of the U.S.A., a leading country trying to ensure peace and prosperity. This involved the production of new types of products and introduction of such products to a huge variety

of markets. A transition towards mass consumption was taking place and a huge variety of interests became the central issue of the economic activity.

In order to guarantee huge number of production, assembly lines were built into factories. Mass consumption society was promoted because it was required. Naturally, individuals were aware of the fact that they were required to consume. However, they were cautious while taking decisions and spending their savings accumulated during the war conditions. By the end of the war, the message of the leading businessmen, government institutions, advertisers, mass media and other suppliers was that mass consumption was not a personal extravagance. On the contrary, it was a responsibility for the public good so as to improve the life standard of the American people, the most prosperous people playing a critical role to turn the cycles of economy by creating an ever increasing demand for production.

Thus, greater demand meant creating employment, most of which was offering better salaries. A better level of income meant affluent consumers who were able to consume and turn the wheels of economy rapidly than before due to their significantly rising purchases. Moreover, the situation of women changed after the war and they were declared to be the most welcomed consumers of the nation. They gained a kind of political power because they were identified as the potent identities behind consumption.

Extensively growing consumption was the requirement of the period in order to generate new markets. "Ironically this required the nurture of qualities like wastefulness, self-indulgence, and artificial obsolescence, which directly negated or undermined the values of efficiency" (Marchand, 1985: 158). Furthermore, the pledge of this mass-consumption-driven economy promoted during the post-war period was the upsurge of both political and economic democracy. Similarly, during the years following World War II, the Western society, the Americans in particular, was convinced to lead a more prosperous life resulting in a more democratic society.

Therefore, in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the submissive customer dedicated to consume eternally was also a good citizen who performed successfully while consuming and contributing to the economy of the country. Consequently, the requirement of the marketplace was to create citizens chasing new personal wants. Within this perspective and the historical context, the role played by mass media became greater.

## **2.2. Mass Media, the Tool to Create Masses of Consumers**

With the rise in advertising, the dream of mass media of the 20<sup>th</sup> century came true. People, especially the American people, spent more and worked more in

order to mend the deficit in their budget. They did not think of the side effects of the consumerism, but they worked harder and longer so as to be able to buy their artificial needs. Besides longer and harder work hours, an ideological aspect of consumerism was discussed in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. For instance, Robert Lane states in his book on Political Ideology:

The more emphasis a society places upon consumption-through advertising, development of new products, and easy installment buying-the more will social dissatisfaction be channeled into intraclass consumption rivalry instead of interclass resentment and conflict... the more will labor unions focus upon the 'bread and butter' aspects of unionism, as contrasted to its ideological elements (1962).

Hence, the individuals became increasingly dependent of the products. In addition, they were so deeply attracted into the consumption culture that they forgot to criticize the negative aspects of their work environments. The more the individual became addicted to the product, the more the exploitation of the workers was observed in the Western world. Accordingly, trade unions did not help their members to solve their dependence on products. The imaginary world offered in the advertisements by the mass media aimed at disguising the unpleasant characters of work and distracting the attention of the workers from the atrocities at work. Consequently, it is possible to argue that the attention of the individual was put under the exploitation by means of mass media.

Meanwhile, the meaning of mass media has been a topic to be discussed since its birth. There is a variety of definitions identifying the meaning of mass media and most of them are quite similar to one another. For instance, Hibbert states that "mass media is all part of television, radio, Web sites, newspapers, magazines and books. They deliver information to the public" (2006: 6). Therefore, since people can understand and shape their society by means of media, its cultural impact as an agent of entertainment is apparent.

Mass media plays an important role in creating and strengthening the modern consumer culture. It is a major contributor while producing unlimited quantities of goods. It promotes obsolescence, improvidence and inefficiency. It encourages waste of goods and material as well as waste of time. In the modern world, people are persuaded to work efficiently and consume extensively by means of mass media. In other words, in this new type of culture, people are well-trained to be competent workers and docile consumers.

Television is still the major and most influential instrument of mass media when the impact on societies and their culture is studied. In particular, cultivation theory studies media effects on societies. Cultivation theory is originally dealt by G. Gerbner and later expanded upon by Gerbner & Gross in the seventies (1976). Both writers started their research in the mid-1960s. Their attempt was to ex-

plore media effects, particularly whether watching television affects the audiences, idea and their insights in their regular routine. If this was the case, their second question was how the audiences were affected. They state the role of television:

Television is a centralized system of storytelling. Its drama, commercials, news, and other programs bring a relatively coherent world of common images and messages into every home. Television has become the primary common source of socialization and everyday information (mostly in the form of entertainment) of an otherwise heterogeneous population.

Briefly, cultivation theory stresses that high frequency viewers of television are more prone to media messages. Besides, those writers believe that such messages are real and valid. That is the reason why, the impact of television, advertisement and entertainment industry working through television audiences will be the focus of this study.

Consequently, consumption culture is promoted by the first and most important agent, and this is advertising, which is introduced to public mainly by means of television as a democracy of goods. In fact, it is the tool to create passive individuals of the consumption culture. With the manipulative impact of advertising, the financial supplier of mass media, individuals show tendency towards becoming greedy consumers while entertained particularly by means of television. Naturally, "advertisers seek to redefine people's needs, encourage their wants and offer solutions to them via goods produced by corporations" (Ewen, 1976: 70). Consumerism offers individuals an impression to lead a good life. Individuals of the modern times are surrounded by the computer, television, stereo, goods in which they fall into a state of dream and forget the difficulties that they face all day long. Meanwhile, advertisers continuously dictate them what to buy, what to think and how to think.

### 3. Culture Industry

Societies which went through a period of change in the nineteenth century dealt with the issues such as cultural production and commercialization which intensified in advanced industrial societies at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Bourdieu, 1996). Since then, the terms such as culture and cultural industry have been discussed by many thinkers. In the daily use, the concept referring to culture is vague. It often refers to intellectual or spiritual activities taking place in arts or science. However, it indicates an assembly of traditions, values, rituals, institutions, customs and meanings in a specific society.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the German philosopher Georg Simmel elaborated a comprehensive understanding of culture and defined all culture as

human self-creation in the context of cultivating things, or self-cultivation in the process of endowing the things of nature with use and meaning (Habermas, 1996). Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a number of philosophers noticed this vagueness of the term culture. In fact, the thinkers of the Frankfurt School were the well-known scholars who were able to discuss the issue and invent to term culture industry.

The Frankfurt School, born in 1923 in Frankfurt Germany, is the original source of critical theory. It is a social and political philosophical movement of thought aiming at developing Marxist studies. The thinkers of the school moved to the United States and carried out their academic work at Columbia University when the Nazis forced it to close in 1933. The School is mainly involved in a critique of modern societies and capitalist society. The philosophers of the School dealt with social emancipation and pathologies of society. In their theoretical framework, they propose a detailed interpretation of Marxist philosophy, in which they interpret economic and social concepts such as commodification and critique of mass culture.

The first and renowned thinkers of the Frankfurt School, Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse and Benjamin concentrated on culture industry. They produced a critique of mass culture from a radical rather than a conservative point of view, demonstrating the crucial significance of the media in forming social consciousness and defining the limits of social change under late capitalism (1979). Later Pollock, Lowenthal and Fromm followed the first generation and kept on studying the concept. The second generation, starting with Jürgen Habermas, is still focusing on the issue, but they mainly emphasize the arguments about speech and a democratic public sphere.

The members of the first generation of the Frankfurt School, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer discussed their legendary notion, “culture industry” in their book titled “Dialectic of Enlightenment”, published in 1944. In the chapter of the book, “Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception”, they perceive capitalist society where culture industry is a major element of late capitalism. In such a mode of production, popular culture functions to satisfy the rising needs of the consumers who are the masses, consumers for entertainment. According to Adorno and Horkheimer, while the consumers are satisfying their needs, they identify themselves as a part of the cultural product. Both writers state that:

Real life is becoming indistinguishable from the movies. The sound film, far surpassing the theatre of illusion, leaves no room for imagination or reflection on the part of the audience, who is unable to respond within the structure of the film, yet deviate from its precise detail without losing the thread of the story; hence the film forces its victims to equate it directly with reality (2002).

Thus, in their study, the two thinkers of the Frankfurt School underline that culture industry is based on a production-line system while producing cultural products. All the films and television programs seem to be different, but they are similar in reality as it is the case in the consumer goods of capitalist society. The products of the culture industry give the impression that there is a variety but in fact all variations are of the same thing. The particular characteristic of the culture industry is that all its products are easy to read and the consumer does not need to spend energy to absorb it.

Adorno and Horkheimer discover a link between culture industry and mass culture. They assert that there is a connection between the rise of cultural industries and mass culture. They claim that the masses are not able to satisfy their needs. In fact, they are objects of manipulation due to culture industry, which transform individuals into passive and subordinated subjects. That is the reason why subjects of the culture industry are not able to develop critical thinking. They also add that if individuals take part in the system, they voluntarily contribute to the maintenance of the system. This requires critical thinking, the key element of democracy. Both writers criticize the way culture industry works. They affirm that all products of the culture industry are profit oriented goods which are closely linked with the interests of money. Art is not autonomous because works of art are turned into a consumer good by means of capitalist ideology, which leads to the commodification of culture.

Walter Benjamin, a famous writer of the Frankfurt School and a colleague of Adorno, emphasized the aura of the art object and its erosion in contemporary culture (1970). He stressed advance in new technology and cultural elements. He believed that media can lead to create critical individuals who are able to evaluate their culture. He tried to benefit from media since he believed in its role as a means to cause social progress. He admitted that “progressive cultural creators should ‘refunction’ the apparatus of cultural production, turning theater and film, for instance, into a forum of political enlightenment and discussion rather than a medium of culinary audience pleasure” (1999). Hence, he believed in the progressive effects of culture.

Nonetheless, Horkheimer and Adorno replied his optimistic investigation of culture industry in their book *Dialectic of Enlightenment* by asserting that cultural production is dominated by film, radio, newspapers and magazines, which served the submission to create subservience to the system of consumer capitalism. They contradict Benjamin by asserting that media industries exert power over audiences and help produce thought and behavior that conforms to the existing society.

Another thinker of the Frankfurt School, Herbert Marcuse, who had similar ideas with Adorno, criticized Western democracies. In fact, at one point, he was different than him because he did not oppose popular culture as completely as Adorno (Agger, 1995). According to Marcuse, an ideology to keep the society under control was perpetual in the late capitalist society. In his view, the powers of reason and freedom are declining in "late industrial society" (Kellner, 1991). He did not emphasize culture to meet ideological purposes, which makes him different than the other writers of the Frankfurt School (Reitz, 2000: 144). In his famous work, *One-Dimensional Man*, he supports that social control mechanisms provides the entire integration of the individual into mass society.

Created false needs integrated the working classes into the dominant systems of production and consumption by means of mass media, whose role is to eradicate any forms of opposition against the system. Moreover, Marcuse supports that "technology in the contemporary era constitutes an entire mode of organizing and perpetuating (or changing) social relationships, a manifestation of prevalent thought and behavior patterns, an instrument for control and domination" (1941). Thus, he argues that technology is the creator of mass culture, an agent to orient societies to acknowledge the dominant thought, which leads to a prevailing social control and domination.

Critical theorists of the Frankfurt School analyzed cultural industries in a political sphere. Their focus was the integration of the working classes into capitalist environment. They were the first neo-Marxian thinkers who explored the influences of mass culture and expanding consumer society on working classes. In addition, they investigated how culture industries and consumer society strengthen late capitalism, which as a way of rethinking Marxian theory. Therefore, the main question of Frankfurt School was how technology was becoming a major force of both, production and social organization.

To conclude, the concept culture industry has been a major issue of the critical theory since the 1940s. It emphasized the role of mass media along with ideology. Culture industry underlined the role of motion pictures made by large companies. In addition, it meant that radio is controlled by a few number of companies. Television also is related to radio and newspapers. Hence, the philosophers of the Frankfurt School are the inventor of the concept culture industry and they aimed at discovering the link between mass media, culture and consumption society.

#### **4. Entertainment Industry**

Since there is a close link between culture industry and entertainment industry, the role of Frankfurt School and their concept of culture industry have been ini-

tially discussed in this study. The argument of this study is the impact of culture industry on the birth of entertainment industry, so the connection between the two terms will be dealt with in this section.

The first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century welcomed a new regime in manufacture industry, leading the system to mass production. This was namely Fordism, which refers exactly to mass production and consumption in the developed countries of the Western world. Both mass production and mass consumption were the keystones of a sustainable economy and reliable growth. Nevertheless, the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was different from the first half in that the economic picture was a more pessimist one. There was a slower growth and rising income inequality.

In the first half, Henry Ford became a prominent figure of the change from agricultural society to industrial society in addition to the mass production through mass consumption economy. Fordism represents not only the transformation in the production era but also in the cultural era. Womack, Jones, and Roos (1990: 31) underline this alteration in both spheres as follow:

Twice in this century the auto industry has changed our most fundamental ideas about how we make things. And how we make things dictates not only how we work but what we buy, how we think, and the way we live.

Therefore, mass production created a market of scale economy, a new type of labor division and production line organization based on huge capacity of output. Polanyi explains this transformation and warns about an imminent danger:

The transformation to this system from the earlier economy is so complete. Machine production in a commercial society involves, in effect, no less a transformation than that of the natural and human substance of society into commodities. The conclusion, though weird, is inevitable; nothing less will serve the purpose: obviously, the dislocation caused by such devices must disjoint man's relationships and threaten his natural habitat with annihilation (2001: 44).

The result of Fordism was the exiled worker spending a huge part of his daily life on the assembly line of the factory, which lasted until the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. With the start of the Post-Fordist era, the exiled worker demanded exit from the factory. In the 1950's, following the severe years of the war, a rise in service sector, in media industry and especially in entertainment world was observed in the West. Meanwhile, the stiff working hours and locations of the Fordist era eroded, which resulted in flexible work atmosphere for the workers in the new Post-Fordist era.

Since the emphasis on the work on assembly line diminished in Post-Fordism, the individual, the worker, of the new era started to enjoy a totally different type

of work atmosphere, whose most significant characteristic was flexibility. Hence, Dawson elucidates the new work environment clearly. He argues that “flexible labor arrangements, encourage workers to become entrepreneurs of their own skills and labor time, flexible leisure ideals invite them to become entrepreneurs of their own leisure” (Dawson, 2008: 231).

Thus, this new change in the world of the individual, particularly the worker of the Post-Fordism, who is the central debate area of this study, is worth discussing as the topic of entertainment comes on stage with this noteworthy transformation in the lives of the Western individuals. Related to this transformation, the concept of culture industry also has shifted swiftly towards a new concept, entertainment industry. The individual of the modern capitalist society is presently forced into the entertainment world, which is the creator of unconscious individuals living in an atmosphere of extreme fun. As Alway declares, “capitalist production and the tremendous wealth that resulted from it formed a “system of repressive affluence” that kept elements of society satisfied and quiescent (1995, 83). Living in the quiescence, modern individuals forget all the social and economical problems that they have to face with in their daily life. This serenity of the modern society is made available by means of the entertainment industry born out of debates concerning culture industry.

Culture industry, was the concept of a new system, monopoly capitalism, which was based on total control of masses. For instance, Adorno clarifies it by equating the American culture with European Fascism (Huysen, 1986). The worker of Fordism who was used to be totally integrated into the industrial mechanism, is now a modern worker who has the leisure time and flexibility to organize it by consuming the elements of media playing a new role, to entertain.

The philosophers of the Frankfurt School were interested in the concept of entertainment and leisure while analyzing culture industry. Adorno investigated popular music, television and a variety of other fields such as astrology columns to fascist speeches (1991, 1994). Horkheimer and Adorno studied mass culture and culture industries (1972 and Adorno 1991). Herzog carried out research on soap operas (1941). Lowenthal analyzed popular literature and magazines (1961). They were all among the first theorists debating on the reproduction of contemporary societies by investigating culture industries and criticizing mass culture. They claim that communications and mass culture are the origins of leisure activity. Furthermore, they argue that they can be regarded as basic foundations of modern societies in terms of their role as an agent of socialization, influencing the political realm.

For instance, the movies are the best examples of entertainment industries. The individual going to the movie sees the whole outside world as an extension

of the movie. As a result, the movie does not let the audience imagine freely because it forces them to equate the film directly with reality. The individual is naturally confused with reality and worries about the concept. Entertainment industry plays an important role in organizing the worried individual of the modern world who is living in a stressed way of life. During discusses the role of entertainment sector:

The might of industrial society is lodged in men's minds. The entertainments manufacturers know that their products will be consumed with alertness even when the customer is distraught, for each of them is a model of the huge economic machinery which has always sustained the masses, whether at work or at leisure – which is akin to work" (1999: 35).

Similarly, the philosophers of the Frankfurt School discuss the social impact of the films and broadcast programs and underline their resemblance. They assert that the individual is consistently reproduced in every product of the culture industry. They summarize that all the representatives of this industry pay attention to the reproduction process and mental development. For instance, according to Marcuse, it is not possible to distinguish information and entertainment aspect of mass media as he believes that they are not entities separate from the dominant ideology (1991).

Furthermore, Adorno and Horkheimer add that culture industry removes independent thinking and criticism. It is the source of entertainment absorbing the masses. They assert that culture industry shapes the reality and the way people experience reality. Due to culture industry, workers are always busy since entertainment and amusement become an end for the labor.

Another contemporary thinker, E.P. Thompson raises an important question about the leisure activity of the present workers:

If we are to have enlarged leisure, in an automated future, the problem is not 'how are men going to be able to consume all these additional time-units of leisure?', and a second question: "What will the capacity for experience of the men who have this undirected time to live?" (1967: 95)

As Thompson underlines the specific characteristic of the individual of the Post-Fordist era, undirected time to live, the way to consume this leisure time has been a significant issue for the producers of the consumption society. On one hand the individuals were provided with a great capacity to select and consume by the leisure industry. However, they are implicitly surrounded and detained by the limited choices supplied by the producers of the entertainment industry. Horkheimer and Adorno explain this characteristic of the individual by underlining this embedded captivity:

The man with leisure has to accept what culture manufacturers offer him. The industry robs the individual of his function. Its prime service to the customer is to do his schematizing for him. This inescapable force is processed by commercial agencies so that they give an artificial impression of being in command (1944: 42).

Thus, the writers following the Frankfurt School have been expressing their approval on the arguments of the School. They accepted the criticism of the Frankfurt School against the different means of media, film, radio and television in particular. One of them, Graham Potts, for instance, touches upon the reality shown on television:

The dominant producers and managers of technocracy attempt to convey to the audience a conception of reality that is 'honest' because it is 'unscripted', and which can therefore be trusted as more 'real' than the honestly fictitious scripted program. Nothing could be further from the truth. Reality television is most often nothing short of a conceptual and practical lie (2007: 1).

Naturally, television is still the most popular means to spend time for individuals no matter how old they are. Nevertheless, it does not only provide leisure. It has a political duty while affecting individuals by presenting fiction to entertain them by presenting an activity during their leisure time. Time is the very substance of freedom; it is in and through time that we develop our capabilities for exercising critical thought and meaningful action. That is the reason why leisure has a role in political sphere. The political nature of leisure is rarely examined or explained, but leisure is the very antithesis of the logic of capitalism because it rejects the very ideas and values that sustain capitalism, that is, constant productivity and efficiency in the name of profit (Shippen, 2014: 181). Thus, the close connection between leisure time, culture industry and entertainment industry has been on the agenda of the political sphere.

## 5. Conclusion

The final step of the economic action, consumption, has been an area of significant interest for the economists in the last decades. It is not a debate question only for the economists. It is also discussed by the thinkers of political science, communications and media studies. In fact, the thinkers of the Frankfurt School contributed the issue by researching the link between consumption and culture. They contributed to the issue by inventing the term culture industry, a term emphasizing the link between consumerism and culture.

The representatives of the Frankfurt School such as Marcuse, Horkheimer, Adorno, Benjamin and Habermas emphasize the function of culture industry by criticizing the role played by mass culture producing masses of individuals. The role of Fordism is undeniable in the creation of masses since it meant a model for

mass production. This was a strategy of organization to meet the demand of mass consumerism and emerging working class spending the whole day for an incessantly busy type of work.

Post-Fordism, on the other hand, left some extra hours to spend for the workers and this was called the leisure time. Therefore, culture industry provided the necessary ground for the entertainment industry to supply the individuals with the necessary tools to spend in their leisure. Thus, entertainment industry was born out of the term culture industry and its products exist in any means of media, especially on television.

### References

- Agger, B. (1995). "Marcuse in Postmodernity", in *Marcuse: From the New Left to the Next Left*. (Eds. J. Bokina and T. J. Lukes). University of Kansas Press, Lawrence, 27-40.
- Alway, J. (1995). *Critical Theory and Political Possibilities: Conceptions of Emancipatory Politics in the Works of Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and Habermas*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.
- Andrae, T. (1979). "Adorno on Film and Mass Culture The Culture Industry Reconsidered", *A Review of Contemporary Media*. no. 20, pp. 34-37.
- Adorno, T. W. (1991) *The Culture Industry*, Routledge, London.
- ..... (1994). *The Stars Down to Earth and Other Essays on the Irrational in Culture*, Routledge, London.
- Benjamin, W. (1970). *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. (Trans. Harry Zohn). London: Fontana.
- ..... (1999). "The Artist as Producer", in *Walter, Collected Writings*. Volume II, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Cross, G. (1993). *Time and Money*, London: Routledge. p. 38.
- Dawson, B. M. (2008). *TV Repair: New Media "solutions" to Old Media Problems*. ProQuest Dissertations.
- During, S. (1999). *The Cultural Studies Reader*, Psychology Press, New York: Taylor & Francis. p. 35.
- Ewen, S. (1976). *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill. p. 70.
- Fishburn, P. C. (1970). *Utility Theory for Decision Making*. New York, London: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Gerbner, G. and L. Gross. (1976). "Living with Television: the Violence Profile", *Journal of Communication*. 26(2).
- Habermas, J. (1996). "Georg Simmel on Philosophy and Culture: Postscript to a Collection of Essays", *Critical Inquiry*. (Trans. Mathieu Deflem). 22(3) Spring.

- Herzog, H. (1941). "On Borrowed Experience", *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*. 11, pp. 65-95.
- Hibbert, A. (2006). *The Power of the Media*. London: Franklin Watts. p. 6.
- Horkheimer, M. and T. W. Adorno. (1972). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, Herder and Herder, New York.
- ..... (1944). "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception", in *Cultural Theory: An Anthology*, Wiley-Blackwell, West Sussex. (Eds. Imre Szeman and Timothy Kapo-sy). p. 42.
- ..... (2002). "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception", in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, (ed.) *Gunzelin Schmid Noerr*, (trans.) Edmund Jephcott, Stanford University Press, Stanford California, p. 94
- Huyssen, A. (1986). *After The Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture and Postmodernism*, Macmillan, London.
- Kellner, D. (1991). "Introduction", in *One-dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, (Ed. H. Marcuse). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Lane, R. E. (1962). *Political Ideology: Why the American Common Man Believes What he Does*, New York: The Free Press. p. 80.
- Lowenthal, L. (1961). *Literature, Popular Culture and Society*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey.
- March, J.G. and J. P. Olsen. (1986). "Garbage Can Models of Decision Making in Organizations," in *Ambiguity and Command*, (Eds. K.G. March and R. Weissinger-Baylon). USA: Longman Inc. pp. 11-35.
- Marchand, R. (1985). *Advertising the American Dream: Making way for modernity, 1920-1940*. Berkeley: University of California Press. p.158.
- Marcuse, H. (1941). "Some Social Implications of Modern Technology", *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*. IX(1). 414-439.
- ..... (1991). *One-dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Polanyi, K. (2001). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Potts, G. (2007). "Adorno on 'The Donald': Reality Television as Culture Industry", *Problematic Issue*. (11) Spring, p. 1.
- Reitz, C. (2000). *Art, Alienation, and the Humanities: A Critical Engagement with Herbert Marcuse*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Shippen, N. M. (2014). *Decolonizing Time: Work, Leisure and Freedom*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan. p. 181.
- Smith, A. (1937). *The Wealth of Nations, Modern Library edition*. New York. p. 625.
- Thompson, E. P. (1967). "Time, Work-discipline, and Industrial Capitalism", *Jstor*. (38) p. 95.
- Womack, J. P.; D. T. Jones and D. Roos. (1990). *The Machine that Changed the World*. New York: MacMillan Publishing, Rawson Associates.