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**Cultural organisations and the emotional labour of becoming entrepreneurial**

**1. Introduction**

This article examines the increasing significance of entrepreneurialism within UK cultural policy and the related implications for cultural organisations and workers. In January 2020 Arts Council England (ACE) published their 2020-2030 strategy, *Let’s Create*. The strategy included four investment principles: dynamism; ambition and quality; inclusivity and relevance; environmental responsibility. These investment principles are designed to deliver the three outcomes of the strategy: creative people; cultural communities; a creative and cultural country. “Dynamism” is specifically relevant for identifying the increasing significance of entrepreneurialism:

Cultural organisations will need to become more entrepreneurial and develop business models that help them maximise income, reduce costs and become more financially resilient

(ACE, 2020a: 49)

The principle of dynamism set out in ACE’s *Let’s Create* strategy connects with a number of well-established currents in funding for culture[[1]](#footnote-1) around becoming entrepreneurial, becoming resilient, and developing business models and diversifying income (see Rex, 2020, for analysis of the terms employed within the *Let’s Create* strategy; see also Holden et al., 2020).

This article examines how the entrepreneurial orientation set out in cultural policy and encouraged by national funding bodies depends on emotional labour. Emotional labour does not feature in cultural policy reports and the associated business skills training designed to support entrepreneurship. This article will show however that it is an integral part of what is involved and required for cultural organisations to become entrepreneurial. Through analysis of empirical research with cultural organisations based in England (UK), this article addresses the emotional labour in becoming entrepreneurial in relation to two themes or sets of relationships: the emotional labour of sponsor relationships and the emotional labour of audience relationships. The analysis of these themes examines the emotional labour being undertaken and related the implications and consequences of the increasing demands on what cultural organisations and workers are expected to do.

This article presents new insights into the practices through which cultural organisations generate income to sustain their operations. In doing so, it argues that the emotional labour of those working for cultural organisations is required to realise the entrepreneurial orientation to diversify income streams. Whilst presented as a solution to addressing the challenges of funding and income diversification, becoming entrepreneurial rests upon the emotional labour of cultural workers

**2. The emotional labour of becoming entrepreneurial**

This section outlines the entrepreneurial agenda shaping the direction and operation of cultural organisations and how this can be examined through the concept of emotional labour.

*2.1 The entrepreneurial orientation for cultural organisations*

Existing research on funding for cultural organisations has focused on the rationale for why and how public funds should be used. Several aspects of funding have been well-considered, including within this journal - discourses of arts funding (McDonnell and Tepper, 2014) and emerging forms of funding (Swords, 2017). However, the practices through which cultural organisations generate income to sustain their operations has received less analysis. This fundraising/development work can include identifying funding sources, completing and submitting applications, building donor relations, and arranging sponsorship. Following McGuigan (2010, p. 373), this can be understood as ‘ancillary cultural work’ which makes ‘significant contributions to the operations of “the art worlds”.’ This fundraising/development work and the future for cultural organisations is increasingly entwined with ideas of entrepreneurship.

Extant literature on entrepreneurship and cultural organisations has shown how in times of competition, economic and entrepreneurial rationales are internalised as guiding principles (Norbäck, 2019; Storey, Salaman, and Platman, 2005). Entrepreneurialism is an increasingly important guiding principle shaping how cultural organisations operate. This priority has been recognised and elaborated on in several cultural policy reports, including DCMS (2016), Harvey (2016), Bazalgette (2017) and ACE (2020a), which set out the importance of moving away from public funding as the primary income. Becoming entrepreneurial is bound up with a wider set of priorities and visions for how cultural organisations relate to themselves and others. More specifically, becoming entrepreneurial is inextricably part of political and ideological debates around the creative economy (see Oakley and Ward, 2018, for discussion of the creative economy’s paradigmatic discourse). For example, Newsinger (2015) addresses how private sector values and practices have impacted on organisation and management within the cultural sector, and Luckman’s (2018) research shows how Australian government creative industries policy justifies funding cuts to the cultural sector by emphasising the need to become more entrepreneurial.

McCullagh’s (2017) essay for *Art Fundraising & Philanthropy*, an ACE sector support organisation, identifies this encouragement for art fundraisers to adopt an entrepreneurial approach. McCullagh (2017, p. 6) considers entrepreneurship as both a ‘survival tactic in difficult times’ and as a way to ‘keep up with innovative changes.’ As Fenwick (2008, p. 327) cautions, enterprise is a fluid object and ‘what appears to be an object such as the enactment of enterprise is held stable in a network of relations only through a great deal of effort.’ Fenwick (2008, p. 326) elaborates on the ways in which enterprise has been used and stabilised as ‘an economic arrangement’ and as a ‘work structure and process.’ For this article, becoming entrepreneurial is conceptualised through bringing together Fenwick’s (2008) wider reflections on enterprise and McCullagh’s (2017) specific reflections on arts fundraising. Becoming entrepreneurial involves changes in work structure and processes (innovative change) to facilitate an economic arrangement centred on diversifying income (survival tactic).

To pursue these activities, cultural workers and cultural organisations must develop new competencies and build working knowledge and experiences of entrepreneurialism (ACE, 2020a; McCullagh, 2017; Sood, and Pharoah, 2011; Walmsley and Harrop, 2015; Warwick Commission, 2015). In response to cultural policy that enacts and stabilises (Fenwick, 2008) an entrepreneurial orientation, such as *Let’s Create* (ACE, 2020a), there is a pressing need to understand and critically reflect on what is implied and required in cultural organisations becoming entrepreneurial. The emphasis on diversifying income and entrepreneurialism found in cultural policy reports are now everyday matters for cultural organisations. The task remains however to address the specifics of what becoming entrepreneurial involves and what the implications of this are for cultural organisations and their collaborators, audiences and participants.

*2.2 Emotional labour*

As this article will show, emotions are essential for understanding cultural organisations and the call to become entrepreneurial. Emotions can be identified in relation to cultural organisations in the way cultural workers express belief in the transformative power of the arts (Durrer and O’Brien, 2014) and how cultural workers legitimate working in the arts as a non-profit career (Mize-Smith et al., 2006). A further example and perspective can be found in research by Jones and Warren (2016) and Newsinger and Green (2016) which identify the emotions expressed by cultural workers as they attempt to navigate funding schemes. These existing perspectives provide insight into the emotion and passion (Hermes, 2015) associated with working for cultural organisations and how these connect with questions of funding and an organisations’ survival and sustainability.

This article engages with the concept of emotional labour to advance a critical understanding of what becoming entrepreneurial means for cultural organisations, their employees and those they work with. Emotional labour was introduced by Hochschild (1983) to examine emotions as a commodity and the implications of this for a person’s sense of self as it is formed in workplace settings. For Hochschild (1983, p. 7), emotional labour ‘requires one to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others.’ As Kang (2003) notes, whilst Hochschild develops this concept with reference to flight attendants, it has become a widely generalised definition for caring and attentive service. For this discussion of cultural organisations, it is important to then highlight studies examining emotional labour in the cultural and creative industries. These include talk show producers (Grindstaff, 2002), TV talent show workers (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2008; 2011), music studio engineers (Watson and Ward, 2013), and artists’ use of crowdfunding platforms (Davidson and Poor, 2015). To address the specific emotional labour contexts, practices, and consequences relevant to cultural organisations, the following review brings together analysis focusing on the cultural and creative industries with reflections from other sectors (Olsen and Bone, 2009) and broader conceptual responses and revisions (Bolton 2005; 2009; Harding and Pribram, 2009). The following three sections on contexts, practices and consequences provide the points of reference for the subsequent analysis.

*2.3 Emotional labour contexts*

Context, as Grossberg (1997, p.255) writes, ‘is not merely the background but the very conditions of possibility of something.’ Returning to the above point on the generalising use of emotional labour, Kang’s (2003) analysis of nail salon services and body labour shows how the specificity of context is essential. As Kang sets out, this can be the specific site of the emotional labour practices (e.g., the nail salon) and the wider relationships and contexts (e.g., ‘low-wage service work performed by immigrant women of colour’, Kang, 2003, p. 836). Looking at how emotional labour has been used more generally in academic research helps to emphasise its value for understanding broader trends and shared societal-wide contexts and factors – namely for this discussion, austerity and entrepreneurship.

Olsen and Bone (2009) examine emotional labour in relation to health care, and their particular interest with ‘rationalising organisations’ and changes in ways of operating based on fiscal pressures resonate with the experiences of cultural organisations. As they go on to outline, Hochschild’s concept of emotional labour, ‘empirically demonstrated and theoretically outlined the impact of culture and economic orientation on emotion and expression or lack thereof of emotions deemed appropriate to realise entrepreneurial economic interests’ (Olsen and Bone, 2009, p. 128). As the accounts from research participants discussed in this article will show, the entrepreneurial orientation coming from government and sector bodies intimately connects with the expression of emotions and emotional labour.

Harding and Pribram’s (2009) summary of cultural studies approaches to emotion also helps in locating individual expressions of emotion within social contexts. Harding and Pribram (2009) highlight the limitations in drawing a distinction between commodified emotion in a public job and a private, authentic self. Specifically, they critique accounts which retain a notion of ‘authentic emotional experience in the individual’ (Harding and Pribram, 2009, p. 11). They conclude by setting out their approach to ‘investigate emotions in the contexts of more widely felt, commonly shared collective spheres rather than in a realm in which only individual identities are produced’ (Harding and Pribram, 2009, p. 12). In the analysis of the emotional labour involved in becoming entrepreneurial, Harding and Pribram’s intervention is important for understanding how cultural workers’ practices in generating income is constructed and constituted in relation with several social formations, including cultural organisations, the cultural sector, and local communities.

*2.4 Emotional labour practices*

Watson and Ward’s (2013) review of emotional labour sets out how research interests have addressed two broad approaches - workers’ attempts to manage emotions and, as is the case for this article, emotional labour and particular occupations. For this analysis of cultural organisations’ entrepreneurial activities, emotional labour is used to emphasize the motivations and practices associated with building relationships. Following Watson and Ward’s (2013, p.2905) engagement with Korczynski’s classification (2003), this emotional labour can be understood as ‘empathetic emotional labour […] intended to produce a positive emotional state in others’ (compared to antipathetic/negative and neutral/suppression emotional labour – see Watson and Ward, 2013). The principal aim of emotional labour as it is entangled with the entrepreneurial orientation for cultural organisations is the diversification and growth of income through different funding sources involving specific relationships. In their work for cultural organisations, cultural workers use their emotional labour to cultivate the ‘proper state of mind in others’ to facilitate the generation of income.

Central to the emotional labour practices that Hochschild (1983) describes are ‘feeling rules” that guide emotional exchanges. Wingfield (2010, p. 252) summarises feeling rules as ‘the norms and guidelines that govern emotion work or emotion management.’ They are ‘individual’s efforts to achieve the appropriate emotional state’ and are ‘structured by the environment in which they are enacted’ (Wingfield. 2010, p. 252). Wingfield’s specific analysis addresses how black workers follow these rules in racialised environments. In relation to cultural policy contexts, the emphasis on entrepreneurship is precipitating significant changes in the practices of cultural organisations and cultural workers. To explore the nuances of these feeling rules and changes shaping cultural organisations and workers, the following draws on Bolton’s (2005; 2009) typology of emotion management.

Bolton (2005; 2009) looks at how ideas of emotion has been employed in relation to a range of sectors and develops a typology of emotion management in work. As Bolton outlines (2009), Hochschild’s (1983) articulation of emotional labour is valuable for understanding how emotion is used as a resource, but it cannot capture the complexity of all emotion work. As Bolton and Boyd (2003, p. 296) establish, this typology ‘recognizes that only a small proportion of feeling rules and associated motivations come under the “sway of large organizations” and are governed by a corporation’s profit motive.’ This is particularly important for cultural organizations which can vary in size (Camarero, Garrido and Vicente, 2011; Chang, 2010) and where a range of motivations come to the fore (Durrer and O’Brien, 2014; Mize-Smith et al., 2006). The typology that Bolton (2005) proposes helps to address the issue raised by Kang (2003) around the generalising use of emotional labour. Whilst some studies of emotional labour have addressed emotional labour *within* organisations (Wingfield, 2010) and relationships *with customers,* the emphasis for the cultural organisations in this study is on developing existing and new relationships with *external* individuals and organisations for the purposes of generating funding income. As Bolton (2009, p. 554) states, motivations are ‘firmly embedded in social situations and relationships which, in turn, are wedded to broader frameworks of action that include an acknowledgement of institutionalized practices, hierarchical power relationships and social positioning.’ Rather than trying to understand the emotional labour of cultural workers in generating funding income in the same way as trying to understand workers interacting with customers in exchange for wages, Bolton’s (2005) typology opens up a range of motivations that intersect with becoming entrepreneurial (as, to use Bolton’s phrase, a framework of action).

Bolton (2005, p. 93, table 5.1) identifies four types of emotion management: pecuniary, presentational, prescriptive, and philanthropic. Pecuniary emotion management refers to ‘imposed rules of conduct that that have been developed mainly out of commercial motivations’ (Bolton, 2005, p. 100). Prescriptive emotion management also relates to instrumental motivations but feeling rules are connected to membership of a professional body. In contrast to pecuniary and prescriptive emotion management as instrumentally motivated emotion management driven by commercial and professional feeling rules, Bolton (2005) introduces philanthropic emotion management which is gift motivated and driven by social feeling rules. Bolton (2005, p. 139) defines philanthropic emotion management as the freedom to ‘give that little extra’ and a way to address how ‘extra effort has been invested into offering a sincere performance as a gift.’ Bolton (2005, p. 140) suggests that caring professionals are the most obvious occupational group as they ‘allocate themselves the time to offer extra emotion work as a gift to consumers of care.’ The final type, presentational, is also associated with social feeling rules. Bolton (2005, p. 97) sets out the presentational emotion management stating how workers can ‘establish new, or fit in with existing, ways of being in the organisation’ as a means to create a sense of security and stability. As Bolton (2005) makes clear, all forms of emotion management can be performed and effortlessly moved between. For this article, Bolton’s typology helps for understanding the issues of context (section 2.3 above) and the specific practices, motivations and feeling rules distinctive to cultural workers as they undertake different types of emotional labour.

*2.5 Emotional labour consequences*

Existing analysis that focuses on emotional labour and the cultural and creative industries is particularly relevant for examining the working practices and relationships of cultural organisations and workers, and for highlighting the implications and consequences that researchers, practitioners and policymakers should be alert to. Firstly, Grindstaff’s (2002, p. 133) analysis identifies workers ‘performing emotional labor while simultaneously struggling to distance themselves from its emotional effects [and] to make it just another aspect of the job.’ Secondly, Hesmondhalgh and Baker’s (2008, p.114) findings suggest that emotional labour be understood as part of the ‘precariousness and insecurity faced by cultural workers.’ Thirdly, Watson and Ward’s (2013) emphasis on the importance of context for understanding the particular performances of emotional labour (Watson and Ward focus on spatial context; see also Kang, 2003, in relation to racial and class context).

These three points on contexts, practices and consequences set up the examination of cultural workers and organisations in relation to emotional labour. The two themes examined in this article, sponsor relationships and audience relationship, have to some extent featured in existing analysis. For example, relationships between cultural producers and sponsors can be considered through long existing dynamics of patronage (Swords, 2017, in this journal for an overview; see Banks, 2019, in relation to philanthropy and diversity). Likewise, the relationships with audiences are a long-standing aspect of how many cultural organisations operate (see Walmsley, 2016 in this journal for an overview). This article argues that in responding to and meeting the call to become entrepreneurial, relationships with sponsors and audiences are pursued and developed through emotional labour.

**3. Methodology**

Understanding what is involved in becoming entrepreneurial requires going beyond looking at policy, training and workshops. As the following empirical research with cultural organisations will explore, entrepreneurship (understood as diversifying income sources as a survival tactic and innovative change in work structure and processes) relies on emotional labour. Watson and Ward (2013) in their article on emotional labour and music studio engineers offer helpful reflections on designing and undertaking analysis, noting how emotions and feelings can be messy and tricky to work with (see also Bondi and Davidson, 2011) and requires careful attention in finding clues about emotional content in exchanges with research participants (see also Anderson and Smith, 2001).

This article presents findings from a study with cultural organisations examining experiences of and approaches to generating funding income. Focusing on a range of cultural organisations in the South West area of England area as defined by ACE, the project was designed as a form of intensive research aiming to ‘investigate how processes work in a small number of cases, seeking explanation of the production of certain objects, events and experiences’ (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, p. 15). The macro level addressed national policy, the meso level focused on cultural organisations, and the micro level focused on those working within cultural organisations.

At the macro level, document analysis (Bowen, 2009) was undertaken of cultural sector reports and policy, including those cited in part one (ACE, 2020a; Bazalgette, 2017; DCMS, 2016; Harvey, 2016; Sood, A. and Pharoah, 2011; Walmsley and Harrop, 2015; Warwick Commission, 2015). Bowen (2009, p. 27) reflects on extant literature that sees documents as ‘social facts’ which are ‘produced, shared and used in socially organised ways.’ This perspective resonates well with accounts within cultural policy research. Bowen (2009, p. 30) summarises that documents ‘provide background and context, additional questions to be asked, supplementary data, a means of tracking change and development, and verification of findings from other data sources.’ Within this study, documents were used for the first (context), second (questions) and fifth (verification) purposes.

The meso and micro levels involved a series of a series of research visits with eleven cultural organisations in the South West of England. The research took place between February 2017 and August 2018 and overlapped with the application and decision stages for the ACE National Portfolio Organisation (NPO) 2018-2022 stage. The status of all participating organisations was established with reference to ACE’s NPO scheme. Six organisations had been funded in the 2015-18 round. Three organisations were NPO funded for the first time in the 2018-22 round. One organisation had applied for funding from 2018-22 but was not funded, and one organisation had not applied for the 2018-22 round but intended to in the future. Whilst undertaking research within a specific period of time, the research design and analytical process considered the longer histories that emerged via participants’ accounts.

The sample involved variety in terms of different disciplines: music, theatre, visual arts, and combined arts. Whilst the term “cultural organisations” has been adopted in line with ACE’s (2020a) collective reference to “culture”, it should be noted that research visits were not undertaken with libraries and museums. The sample also involved a variety funding levels. This sample ensured that the different organisational structures and dynamics could be examined. From the eleven cultural organisations, thirteen cultural workers were interviewed. This included a mix of: creative director/chief executive for established organisations (5/13); creative director/chief executive that founded the organisation (4/13); and specialist fundraising/development managers (4/13). There were 7 male participants and 6 female participants. There were 12 White participants and 1 Black Minority Ethnic (BME) participant (following the demographic categories used by ACE). Whilst opening up significant insights into cultural organisations and cultural work in England, this sample has limitations.

The composition of the sample reflects wider issues around diversity in the cultural and creative industries (Saha, 2018) and within cultural organisations (ACE, 2020b). A related limitation then is the extent to which ‘racial imbalances’ (Wingfield, 2010, p. 265) can be examined. Future research extending the sample (geographic area and the cultural organisations within this) would no doubt open up the possibilities for a much fuller engagement with the intersectional analysis of emotional labour in terms of race, gender and class (Kang, 2003; Wingfield, 2010). A second limitation was the focus on organisations compared to the experiences of freelance cultural workers. To gain some understanding in this perspective, a wider range of observations were undertaken. These included participating in online courses and training days. Also, the experiences of cultural workers participating in funding courses were addressed through a parallel study. Whilst not part of the data examined in this article, the observations at funding training and networking events helped to build an understanding of cultural workers’ experiences that help for understanding the data that was generated with organisations.

Dialogue on the design, operation and outcomes of the study was sought from cultural organisations from the outset. A focus group with five of the participating organisations was insightful for identifying the areas of enquiry relevant to the participants and, assumedly, elsewhere across cultural organisations in the UK. The focus group discussions were not structured to produce co-created questions, but they were certainly important for understanding how to develop the later research questions and design (see Greene et al., 2016). For each participating organisation, there was a research visit consisting of two parts: the career biography interview (Gill, 2009; Taylor and Littleton, 2012) and the object interview (Woodward, 2016). The career biography interview was a semi-structured interview addressing: career background; current role; organisational context; wider sector and policy context; and arts funding experiences and practices. The object interview was a semi-structured interview using a range of funding application forms as discussion prompts. Alongside the requested funding forms, a variety of materials were introduced in an ad hoc way by participants. These included programme brochures; organisational diagrams; financial spreadsheets; partner letters; funding letters; evaluation reports; project activity books (see also McDonnell and Tepper, 2014 on the value of examining internal documents such as strategic plans, advocacy documents, fundraising letters, and board minutes). In this respect, access to ad hoc documentation was beneficial in terms of further insights and working across macro, meso and micro levels.

For both types of interviews conducted during the research visit, data was recorded using a digital recording device. For the object interview, analysis moved between the recorded voice interview and annotations and notes on the forms. In the presentation of findings within this article, each organisation is given an identifying code (i.e., O1 to O11) and each speaker from that organisation is given an identifying code (i.e., S1 or S2). As the selection of pseudonyms was not discussed with participants, the more general identifying code “S” for speaker was deemed more appropriate than creating and exchanging names (see Allen and Wiles, 2016). Thematic analysis was used for all the methods employed (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006). The codes developed from the document analysis where a point of reference in the coding of the interviews (Bowen, 2009). The following themes were identified in coding the document analysis and research visits with cultural organisations: Contexts; Roles and responsibilities; Working practices; Application processes; Relationships with funders and sources of funding; Relationships with audiences and beneficiaries. The following sections engages with this data in examining the call to become entrepreneurial.

**4. Findings: The emotional labour of sponsor and audience relationships**

The following findings section examines relationships with sponsors and relationships with audiences. Cultivating these relationships is integral for cultural organisations pursuing an entrepreneurial orientation. The dominance of this entrepreneurial orientation was highlighted in comments by a participant questioning the room for manoeuvre they were left with in being able to respond. For this participant, it was a case of following the preferred direction of funding bodies: ‘If the Arts Council are saying, “we think that everyone should go to an enterprise model”, we would be stupid not to show them that we're trying to go to an enterprise model. So, there is strategic and political thinking within it as well’ (O6; S1). These comments echo with the earlier consideration of how entrepreneurship is increasingly positioned and stabilised in cultural sector policy and reports as a guiding principle (Fenwick, 2008). They also resonate with a wider concern made by participants evaluating as limited their ability to negotiate, evaluate and explore alternatives to entrepreneurship. The following explores the work of generating funding income within this entrepreneurial context and examines the specificities of the emotional labour required in becoming entrepreneurial through Bolton’s emotion management typology (2005, p. 93, table 5.1).

*4.1 The emotional labour of sponsor relationships*

Sponsorship is increasingly important for cultural organisations as they attempt to develop new business models and maximise income. Sponsorship can involve the creation of income streams *and* a strategic reorientation across an organisation. For one organisation (O3; S1), this reorientation manifested in the ‘everyone's a fundraiser mantra’ and ‘everybody advocating for the organisation.’ This meant promoting an understanding and ethos to all members of the cultural organisation so that a thorough working knowledge of the organisation’s funding income schemes and initiatives could be drawn on when needed in conversations with potential funders. As noted in the methodology section, there was a mix of job type and status. For those working in specific development roles, the engagement with sponsors was an explicit part of their role. For the other organisations, it was often the case that this role was part of future plans for recruitment. For the four organisations where the research participant was the creative director/chief executive that founded the organisation, multi-tasking and multiple role-holding was the norm - a finding that is in keeping with the general observation that cultural organisations have limited resources. Aside from this point on the size of organisations and the existence of different roles, there was no difference based around seniority or status on who would and would not be expected to undertake the work of generating funding (cf. Wingfield’s, 2010, account of Pierce, 1995, showing the gendered expectations associated with different roles in the legal profession). Similarly, the composition of the sample made it difficult to determine whether feeling rules and the demands of emotional labour are selectively applied in relation to race (Wingfield, 2010; Banks, 2019). The following findings do show the emotional labour and emotion management undertaken for cultural organisations as they build sponsor relationships.

The development managers and creative directors whose work substantively involved generating income shared a range of scenarios demonstrating their emotional labour. In the following, the participant (O2; S1) describes a general orientation and some specific scenarios and interactions:

I’ve always said people need to like the fundraiser as much as they like the organisation (O2; S1)

I will just pop in and have a coffee with them; you go and see them in the sort of cafe beforehand, just say ‘hello’, and just to try and make them feel special (O2; S1)

It’s all those little things where we sort of say, without saying, that we care [and] it’s those things that don’t necessarily cost a lot of money but make people feel special […] making things as personalised as possible (O2; S1)

I just went along to offices with a big hot chocolate, popped in and said, ‘I’m just passing. I brought in your favourite drink. Did you have five minutes?’ (O2; S1)

Similar points were made from participants from different organisations in terms of ‘stewardship’ and accompanying donors during programmed events (O1; S1 and O3; S1). The experiences described above feature within sector guidance and training and are recognised and advanced as important techniques. For example, the evaluation of the ACE *Catalyst* scheme, highlights ‘the importance of the personalised touch in fundraising’ and that ‘cultivating donors is more successful when relationship management is tailored to their individual interests and preferences’ (Traverso, Naylor and McCormick, 2017, p. 40). This advice indicates how emotional labour is a growing part of what is expected in the work of generating funding income. The findings from this study go further in presenting a number of examples in which emotional labour is evident. For example, these experiences of buying drinks and accompanying potential donors show the kind of ‘warmth’ described by Hochschild (1983). Whilst there is no doubt some degree of social rapport going on here, the timing and location of these encounters (weekends and evenings at performances and exhibitions) more clearly show it is not just a chance social meeting but a strategy connected to feeling rules relevant to generating funding income.

Examining these interactions in terms of emotional labour and becoming entrepreneurial opens up the implications of the demands placed on cultural organisations through these seemingly straightforward top tips and best practice for offering a “personalised touch”. The successes and failures of funding can be understood as the personal successes or failures of cultural workers based around the “warmth” that they generate. For cultural organisations, these interactions can be as important as the funding applications and matching of assessment criteria set out by ACE and charitable trusts and foundations. The enterprise context that directs efforts to private giving and donor relationships has implications for how those working in the cultural sector must develop their skills and reserves of emotional labour. To frame it another way, emotional labour is a significant but unrecognised part of the assessment criteria by which private and corporate sponsors may make their decision to support a cultural organisation.

Focusing on the work of generating funding income provides insights not just into the fundraising and development roles, but also how the emotional labour of creative practitioners feed into this. For example, a participant (O2; S1) shared their experience of how artists/performers would participate in funding pitches to corporate sponsors and interact with audiences as donors. The addition of “as donors” is significant because these interactions go beyond the behind-the-scenes visit designed to enhance audience experiences. Rather this is emotional labour whereby the experience facilitated by the organisation might translate into measures of enjoyment and satisfaction upon which future donations and recommendations to potential donors might hinge. Bolton (2005, p. 151) notes how on ‘many occasions informal practices are adopted by organisations [and] what were once emotion management performances according to social feeling rules become dictated by organisational rules.’ The courting of donors exemplifies the adoption by organisations of informal practices and relationships towards the goal of generating income.

Perhaps given the relative newness in undertaking this emotional labour of interacting with sponsors and donors, the participants’ accounts and the findings did not show up issues of alienation, distancing or empty performances that Bolton (2005) identifies with pecuniary emotion management. The hot chocolate visits and exhibition tours were recounted by participants as sincere performances and were not established as organisational procedures and processes identifiable with prescriptive emotion management. The data presented here can then be most accurately understood with reference to philanthropic emotion management in which workers are ‘giving that little bit extra’ (Bolton, 2005, p. 139). Moreover, Bolton (2005, p. 97) refers to Hochschild’s (1983) ‘economy of gratitude’ to suggest that ‘the giving and receiving of philanthropic emotion management helps to [establish] a precedent of reciprocity.’ Bolton’s highlighting of reciprocity further helps to draw out how the emotional labour taking place through hot chocolate visits and exhibition tours is imbricated in producing ‘the proper state of mind in others’ relevant to increasing income through donor and sponsorship relationships.

The significance of Bolton’s (2005) typology is twofold: understanding the specificities of emotional labour and in seeing the transition of workers’ motivations and practices between types. Ongoing examination is required as sector and organisations’ expectations on cultivating sponsorship relationships increase, and commercial feeling rules grow to influence interactions and relationships. In this respect, future analysis of the work of cultural organisations in generating funding should address how the emotion management of relationships with sponsors might shift from philanthropic (giving that little extra) to pecuniary (instrumentally motivated and cynically performed) or prescriptive (as set out in sector guidance, as Traverso, Naylor and McCormick, 2017, indicate; see also Walmsley and Harrop, 2015 in relation to arts fundraising courses and organisations).

*4.2 The emotional labour of audience relationships*

Consultation with audiences and potential participants and beneficiaries was identified by participants from all organisations. Typically, this would involve workshops, focus groups and consultations in which the aims and plans for potential projects were discussed with potential audiences, participants and beneficiaries. Details of this process and the feedback involved would then feature within the funding application. Emotional labour is employed to establish meaningful relationships which can underpin funding applications.

These following comments highlight both the importance of audience relationships for these purposes and some of the inherent tensions. The following participant addressed what consultation as part of a funding application might mean for consultees: ‘you don’t want to disappoint them and you don’t want to have to take them through that very stressful journey of fundraising. You have to find that balance’ (O6; S1). Another participant (O9; S1) also expresses what this might be like from the perspective of those being consulted: ‘people are always asking what we want, and then we never see them again.’ They then go on to elaborate their position: ‘I find that to be a real sort of bugbear; there’s a lot of consultation and then people go away, and then it might actually happen a year later, but people have moved on or it’s a different vibe’ (O9; S1). The highly valued, and sometimes required, input into funding applications to public funding bodies and charitable trusts and foundation is enabled and facilitated by the emotional labour of establishing and maintaining the consultation/relationship with audiences and potential participants and beneficiaries.

These audience relationships can be understood as philanthropic emotion management in which the emotional labour performance is sincere and cultural workers emphasise the artistic project and activity. There was no indication that the consultation involved explicit appeals for participation based on the importance of getting funding to meet the needs of the organisation. Philanthropic emotion management is evident in the way cultural workers are not negotiating an imposed identity or instrumental motivation (as would be evident in pecuniary emotion management) and instead seek to fold established methods and motivations for engaging participants into changing funding-related aims. The emotional labour in maintaining these relationships and undertaking these activities as related to funding seems to be commensurate with existing aims and motivations around engaging audiences and participants. That ‘little bit extra’, which distinguishes philanthropic emotion management, is required by cultural workers to ensure that these relationships are formed and maintained in the face of resource challenges (more on this in the next paragraph). As with section 4.1 and the discussion of sponsor relationships, future attention should consider how emotional labour moves across emotion management types and/or is performed as different emotion management types. Specifically, establishing multiple audience relationships for the purposes of several ongoing funding applications might shift these relationships and consultation activities into prescriptive emotion management shaped by more instrumental funding and entrepreneurial motivations.

A related point around the emotional labour of audience relationships concerns sustainability and the failure to secure funding to maintain existing or develop new projects. As the cultural workers undertake emotional labour to generate audience input into funding applications, they also have to manage the decline and end of projects:

I’m definitely over-stretched on stuff, but we’ll work with them for a year, that funding will run out, we’ve not got any other funding in, so we’ll kind of just keep working with them anyway, expecting to hopefully get some funding in because we know that kind of work is really important. If we were to pull it and people could literally die from not having something like that to engage in. It’s that important to people. So yeah, sometimes we just have to do stuff because we care about it, and we’re in a position where we can do it (O9; S1)

In this scenario, cultural workers are at the interface between: their current and potential audiences, participants and beneficiaries; the funding bodies; and the wider context of austerity. As England and Farkas (1986, p. 91 cited in Watson and Ward, 2013, p. 2910) assert, emotional labour involves ‘efforts made to understand others, to have empathy with their situation, to feel their feelings as part of one’s own.’ This is an undertaking that resonates with Bolton’s (2009, p. 556) finding that ‘nurses and teachers use their emotion work to paper over the cracks of failing public services.’ The emotional labour of cultural workers is required to explain and mend relationships with audiences and participants when funding for proposed and discussed projects does not come through. These comments also show how the ‘giving a little extra’ of philanthropic emotion work that was expended in the consultation stage has ongoing implications. There is an ongoing commitment and obligation which, in this instance, was met by overwork when the funding ended. Maintaining support was underpinned by a wider set of resources – partly using central and unrestricted funds (i.e., types of income not linked to a specific project, but coming from other forms of centrally held income generated through, for example, donations) and partly through the unpaid time of those working for the organisation. As the following discussion now turns to, the emotional labour of becoming entrepreneurial has significant implications to understand and address.

**5. Discussion: Increasing income and diversifying demands**

The above examples, and the data generated more broadly, show that the increasingly dominant enterprise orientation is leading to new but under-evaluated demands on cultural organisations and workers. These findings reveal some of the changing work structures and processes. Whilst innovative change is an explicit part of the steer for cultural organisations as they diversify income, the analysis undertaken in this article shows that emotional labour is a necessary but largely hidden and under recognised part of becoming entrepreneurial. In the above findings, there are several instances where the ethos of the cultural organisations and their employees need to coalesce. These include: adopting the mantra the everyone is funder; performing in corporate pitches; meeting with audiences; sharing a gallery viewing; and buying hot chocolates and coffees. The emotional labour evident here cannot be explained by, as Harding and Pribram argue (2009, p. 12), focusing on the ‘interiority, depth and individuality of emotion.’ Rather, we need to look to the ‘shared collective spheres’ that Harding and Pribram (2009, p. 12) emphasise when they suggest that emotions are ‘constitutive of individuals *and* cultural communities, practices and beliefs.’ An understanding is required of ‘social formations – including social structures, patterns of organisation and power relations’ (Harding and Pribram, 200, p. 12). The examples of emotional labour shared are not just quirky techniques or extras at the margins. They show the emerging expectations and ways of operating for cultural organisations. Using Bolton’s (2005) typology helps in identifying, firstly, the emotional labour being undertaken and, secondly, that the philanthropic emotion management and social feeling rules analysed in relation to the data might shift or transform into pecuniary and prescriptive emotion management as the demands of ‘becoming entrepreneurial’ increase.

The prevalence of emotional labour in relation to organisational values and aims has been well-considered in relation to range of industries (for example, Wingfield, 2010; see also, Dowling, 2007, for a discussion of core values in restaurants). This article shows how becoming entrepreneurial is reconfiguring the relationships between cultural workers, cultural organisations, potential sponsors, and project audiences and participants. Becoming entrepreneurial may help a cultural organisation develop funding resilience to mitigate precarity and ensure their artistic mission and autonomy, but there are questions of sustainability that emerge when recognising the emotional labour involved.

The first issue to address is how becoming entrepreneurial might lead to artistic autonomy, for example in the kinds of activities and programmes a cultural organisation might pursue, and how emotional labour underpins this. In their research on German theatre, Eikhof and Haunschild (2007) analyse how economic and artistic logics operate in the cultural and creative industries. They show how cuts in public funding have ‘stimulated discussions about efficacy and efficiency’ and that economic logics have become explicit at the organisational level, but that ‘due to the public funding system German theatres still face little economic pressure from the product markets’ (Eikhof and Haunschild, 2007, p. 527-528). For several of the cultural organisations participating in this study, the ACE NPO funding similarly provided autonomy, most obviously through goal 1 of the 2010-20 strategy - “excellence” (ACE, 2010). As Eikhof and Haunschild (2007) argue, the autonomy relating to artistic logics is underpinned and enabled *by workers*. Eikhof and Haunschild (2007) make the important observation that economic logics play out in the context of work and employment, even when the market and the production of market-orientated output do not feature. Specifically, the autonomy that the organisation is able to enjoy is underpinned by the decision-making and actions of actors in their daily lives. In brief, Eikhof and Haunchild’s (2007) analysis is important for suggesting how artistic logics are sustained by workers and their economic logics.

When it comes to the work of generating funding income explored in this study, I argue that the artistic logics and autonomy of cultural organisations are in-part sustained by the emotional labour of their workers. For example, the creative practitioners who deploy their energies and emotional labour in interactions with “audiences as donor”. This is not to assume or dismiss these interactions as difficult or unwelcome for creative practitioners, but to stress that this stream of income diversification relies on their emotional labour and this is not recognised in the strategies and approaches for developing new business models and ways of working. Where autonomy for cultural organisations to pursue artistic logics is enabled through the diversification and maxmisation of income, there must also be recognition of the emotional labour involved. To reiterate, emotional labour is a necessary but largely hidden part of how becoming entrepreneurial is manifested.

The second issue to address is how becoming entrepreneurial might mitigate against precarity and the role of emotional labour within this. As indicated, becoming entrepreneurial is partly a ‘survival tactic in difficult times’ (McCullagh, 2017). In analysing emotional labour and precarity, Veldstra (2018, p. 4) suggests that the ‘stakes of the implicit demand for emotional labour are highest at its intersection with precarity.’ This clearly resonates in this research with cultural organisations as they respond to the call to become entrepreneurial and diversify and increase income. Veldstra (2018, p. 4) raises for discussion the issue of ‘benefit [to] the bottom line without necessarily improving the worker’s quality of life.’ In relation to this research, the funding income generated through donor giving and sponsorship underpinned by emotional labour may improve an organisation’s income but does nothing to address the constant and growing demands required in the work of generating funding income and becoming entrepreneurial. Rather, as Forkert’s (2016) account of ‘austere creativity’ shows, it is the resourcefulness and ingenuity of cultural workers that is constantly relied on. Related to this, the emotional labour of maintaining audience relationships that are important for funding implications places further demands on cultural workers. Research, development and consultation might be costed into a funding application budget, but if it is not or if the project is not funded then this activity can only be maintained by overworking and continued emotional labour.

The consequences of emotional labour are particularly pronounced for the nature and longevity of the relationships being cultivated. On this Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2008, p. 110) connect Hochschild’s analysis with the experience of working in TV production: ‘the management of emotions involved in emotional labour “affects the degree to which we listen to feeling and sometimes our very capacity to feel” (Hochschild, 1983, p. 21).’ More specifically, Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2008, p. 110) give an example of how TV production workers’ enjoyment in working with contributors to a programme could break under pressure. This observation resonates as cultural organisations strive to become entrepreneurial and the emotional labour of cultural workers is deployed to cultivate relationships. Some participants in this study focused on the professional challenge and appeal of exploring and applying new funding techniques and approaches. As with participants in Hesmondhalgh and Baker’s (2008) study, participants in this study described pleasure and enjoyment in their relationships and exchanges with sponsors and audiences. There were however also considerable consequences for cultural workers. Firstly, the pressures placed on these relationships and exchanges as the outcome of increasing funding becomes more important. Secondly, the resourcefulness and ingenuity of cultural workers cannot always be channelled to innovation and novel ways of generating funding; it is often necessary in dealing with the shortcoming, rejections or failures that are the outcome of larger social formations such as funding decisions and donor pledges. Similar to Hesmondhalgh and Baker’s (2008) TV production workers, the emotional labour demands of becoming entrepreneurial might take cultural workers to a breaking point.

**6. Conclusions**

In concluding this article, the priority is to reflect on what now follows for cultural organisations and workers. The following question posed by one participant (O6; S1) summarises a concern shared by participants across the study – ‘what is the future going to be?’ Reflecting on austerity, funding cuts, and the impetus for cultural organisations to develop new ways of working, they responded to their own question remarking, ‘the only option really is to become more enterprising’ (O6; S1). As this participant also suggests, there is a need to pause and reflect: ‘it's almost too fast to change the whole sector into becoming entrepreneurial’ (O6; S1).

As part two addressed, becoming entrepreneurial is a priority direction for cultural organisations. Much of the emphasis on diversifying income and becoming entrepreneurial has centered on developing business skills (McCullagh, 2017; Sood, and Pharoah, 2011; Traverso, Naylor and McCormick, 2017). Becoming entrepreneurial relies on cultural organisations developing in-depth understandings of what the funding sources are, how to access them, and how to combine them. The findings from the study analysed in this article however show that diversifying income goes beyond identifying and engaging with different funding sources. Entrepreneurialism is not simply slotted in next to existing ways of working. Becoming entrepreneurial is reconfiguring how cultural organisations imagine and attempt to manage their futures. Becoming entrepreneurial places demands on cultural organisations that need to be understood not just from the position of policy and reporting, but from a more open and reflective position. As Belfiore (2016) reflects, the impact of cultural policy research can be conceptual - formulating problems and challenging existing notions. Moreover, as Belfiore (2016, p. 213) suggests, impact is ‘a collaborative, collective effort on the part of the scholarly community, rather than the almost miraculous, forceful and planned effect of a single piece of research on individuals and the world.’ This article aims to open up collective efforts by cultural researchers, policymakers, organisations and workers to understand and question what becoming entrepreneurial means.

This article has examined changes in funding for culture through empirical research with cultural organisations and workers. The contention has been to go beyond the top tips and best practice offered in business skills training and workshops to understand the importance of emotional labour. Whilst the techniques associated with emotional labour might feature in some guidance materials (for example, cultivating private donor relations), it is not understood in the way that analysis by Hochschild (1983), Bolton (2005) and Harding and Pribram (2009) can be used to open up. As understandings of entrepreneurship for cultural organisations continue to be stabilised, it is vital that a range of theoretical and empirical perspectives and insights are used to unravel the implications of the entrepreneurial direction for cultural organisations. The descriptions and experiences of participants included in this article show that emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983) and emotion management (Bolton, 2005; 2009) are hugely significant parts of the everyday working experiences and practices of cultural organisations as they generate funding income. The exploration of commonly shared collective spheres (Harding and Pribram, 2009) prompts us to go further and make sense of these individual stories and specific project experiences as part of an overall historical context and an orientation for cultural organisations towards entrepreneurship.

As this article has shown, emotional labour runs throughout the efforts to become entrepreneurial through diversifying income and changing ways of working. Specifically, this was evident in the emotional labour of sponsor relationships and the emotional labour of audience relationships. The examination of emotional labour shows what is at stake in: the hospitality of buying a potential corporate sponsor a coffee; the sociality of personally accompanying a donor around a private viewing; the performances of creative practitioners in funding pitches; the cultivation of audiences for funding application consultation. It is through exploring emotional labour that the organisational and personal costs of long-term relationships jeopardised through precarious funding become clear. The implications of these practices were addressed in two ways. Firstly, by connecting with existing analysis of artistic and economic logics and the cultural and creative industries (Eikhof and Haunschild, 2007) to show how cultural organisations’ artistic autonomy is underpinned by their workers’ emotional labour. Secondly, by connecting with existing analysis on emotional labour and precarity (Veldstra, 2018) to show that entrepreneurship as a response to the precarity an organisation faces does not equate with benefits to workers within those organisations and there are associated issues of overwork and sustainability.

The significance of this article is twofold. Firstly, in identifying the importance and ubiquity of emotional labour within the daily practices of cultural organisations and workers. Secondly, for understanding how emotional labour is essential in realising entrepreneurialism - the dominant funding future of cultural organisations. Becoming entrepreneurial when conceived as a set of business competencies and skills that can be gained through workshops, does not attend to what is demanded of cultural workers and cultural organisations and the associated implications. As the accounts shared in this article show, becoming entrepreneurial is not without costs. In terms of cultural workers, these implications can be seen in the attempts to manage emotional labour. In terms of cultural organisations, there is an obfuscation in which an entrepreneurial approach is seen to *increase* and *diversify* income but the emotional labour of workers is not accounted for. An entrepreneurial approach *might* be able to increase diversify income, but it also increases and diversifies the demands on cultural workers. Becoming entrepreneurial cannot be positioned as a solution for the sustainability of cultural organisations when it makes unsustainable demands on the emotional labour of cultural workers. For cultural researchers, policymakers, organisations and workers, identifying and addressing this is essential.
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