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Abstract

This thesis examines the role of personal agency in the cultural worker’s experience of entrepreneurship. The thesis is a response to a call for further empirical studies capturing the lived experience of cultural work and of entrepreneurship (See Banks, 2006; Gill and Pratt, 2008; Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011; and Steyaert and Hjorth, 2006). I am inspired by an emerging literature which seeks to re-invent entrepreneurship by placing it within a social context, including being ‘enterprising’ for counter-cultural activities or for ‘good’ work (morally, ethically and practically), and female entrepreneurship. I draw on the academic disciplines of cultural studies, cultural policy studies and entrepreneurship studies as a context for this empirical research.

By exploring the lived experience of cultural entrepreneurship I focus on the worker’s position and personal agency within a milieu. Day-to-day activities reveal a pragmatic approach to managing the challenges of cultural work, and the possibility for ‘rethinking cultural entrepreneurship’ (Oakley, 2014). The cultural entrepreneur’s capacity for reflexivity emerges as a means of subverting or negotiating entrepreneurial modes of work. Identity and myths are challenged by discussing ideas of performing the entrepreneur, or counteracting popular stereotypes. My research approach encourages individuals to construct their story within this dynamic context, a space they shape as well as being shaped by it.
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Introduction

This thesis examines the role of personal agency in the cultural worker’s experience of entrepreneurship, against the backdrop of contemporary developments in cultural policy. My intention is to explore entrepreneurial practices through an analysis of the cultural entrepreneur’s personal narrative. I investigate cultural workers’ pragmatic approach to entrepreneurial modes of work revealing methods for managing personal and professional values, motivations and relationships. This is revealed through a playfulness with identities and a measured attempt to balance career goals with personal aspirations.

The notion of cultural entrepreneurship is a contested issue bringing to bear concerns with ‘good’ and ‘bad’ work, inequalities and insecurities in cultural work (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011). Advocates of the freelance and self-employed nature of cultural work celebrate the opportunity for autonomy, freedom and creative fulfillment. In response, critical commentators have sought to draw attention to poor working conditions (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011), levels of self-exploitation (McRobbie, 2011), gender inequalities (Gill, 2002) and the idea of ‘forced entrepreneurship’ (Oakley, 2014).

The environment for cultural entrepreneurship, such as the relevant public policies, are considered as part of the space in which workers negotiate their identity and their approach. The framework for this research is the dichotomy between on the one hand, over optimistic policies which have encouraged
entrepreneurship in the cultural industries, and on the other hand, a critique of cultural work and cultural policies from scholars such as Gill and Pratt (2008), McRobbie (1998, 2002a, 2011) and Oakley (2011, 2014). The policy context is predominantly based on cultural policy developments under New Labour’s time in office, in particular, as applied to a city/region such as Birmingham. As McGuigan notes, ‘cultural workers have never had it easy’ (2004, p.10), but the emphasis on the sector during this period, and a focus on entrepreneurial modes of work, has provoked a critical discourse. More recent cuts in public funding have created new challenges for cultural workers, and an opportunity for academics to reflect on New Labour’s cultural policies.

My study addresses the need to consider the lived experience of cultural entrepreneurs as a means of reviewing the nature of cultural work, and the challenges, alongside the possibility for good work. Taking a critical perspective, I acknowledge the concerns with cultural work and attempt to broaden the debate by revealing a range of experiences, motivations and positions. Ultimately, the research reveals complex identities and some of the processes for managing life as a cultural entrepreneur, offering some positive possibilities. Operating within a social context, cultural entrepreneurs demonstrate the ability to adapt to their circumstances, despite the ambivalences of cultural work. Cultural entrepreneurs work within a policy context specific to their environment, in this case Birmingham’s cultural milieu, and broader discourses relating to national policies and industry debates. It is within these structures that I find possibilities for agentic actions through individual endeavors and collaborative initiatives. I employ Chell and
Karataş-Özkan’s (2010) framework of the micro, meso and macro environments to reinforce the significance of workers functioning within a context.

By exploring the cultural entrepreneur’s motivation, identities and opportunity for personal agency, I am responding to a call for further empirical studies capturing the lived experience of cultural work and of entrepreneurship (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011; Banks, 2006, 2007). If the idea of ‘good’ work is to be a possibility, it is important to investigate current practices through the cultural entrepreneur’s account. A micro approach addresses the need to understand the processes which might bring about good and bad experiences of cultural entrepreneurship.

Furthermore, I am inspired by an emerging literature which seeks to re-invent entrepreneurship, including for instance being ‘enterprising’ for counter-cultural activities or for social good (morally, ethically and practically) (Hjorth and Steyaert, 2006). I draw on the academic disciplines of cultural studies, cultural policy studies and entrepreneurship studies to contextualise interviews with Birmingham based cultural entrepreneurs.

My starting point for this study is my own experience as an entrepreneurial textile designer in the 1990s, based in Birmingham’s Jewellery Quarter. As an art and design graduate, I found a lack of job opportunities led me down the familiar route of part-time teaching and starting my own small textile enterprise. During the ten years I ran my textile business I became familiar with the ups and downs of self-employment, including a portfolio approach to my career. Subsequently, I have worked as a lecturer, teaching enterprise to
arts and media students on vocational courses at a ‘new’ university. Combining my first-hand experience as a cultural worker with my educational role, I have had the opportunity to reflect on the practice of cultural entrepreneurship (Carey and Naudin, 2006, Naudin, 2013). As Ashton and Noonan (2013) point out, there is a tension in teaching for the realities of cultural work (employability and entrepreneurship) and highlighting critical debates such as issues of social justice. As an educator, this has compelled me to reflect critically and to address my own assumptions of cultural entrepreneurship. O’Brien notes: ‘The naïve utopianism of the policy-maker becomes most obviously visible when one reflects on how the creative workforce will be educated’ (2014, p.85). This has continued to be an important personal rationale for undertaking this study, as part of my own professional and intellectual development. My observations have motivated a deeper interest in the milieu in which I manage relationships within education, local industry networks and personal friendships. In pursuit of unique insights, a relative closeness to the subject of my research is a feature of this study.

A second rationale was born from a level of frustration with the bleak picture of cultural work painted by critical theorists, who, generally, seem more concerned with a critique of neo-liberalism in cultural policy than with the experience of cultural entrepreneurs themselves. Notwithstanding the important contribution made by scholars such as Angela McRobbie in highlighting the challenges of cultural work, many scholars focus on a critique of policy rhetoric (see Belfiore, 2013; Hesmondhalgh and Pratt, 2005; McGuigan, 2004). Yet cultural policies are only an aspect of the cultural
worker’s environment, an important element, but not the whole picture. I argue that a broad critique of cultural entrepreneurship, as an aspect of neo-liberalism in modern policy, can lack the detailed specificity necessary to comment in a meaningful way.

As Oakley (2014) points out, the idea of the cultural entrepreneur combines specific policy aspirations as an aspect of growing the creative economy, but it is deceptive. In practice, it is often difficult to know exactly who can be defined as a cultural entrepreneur. Which sub-sector of the cultural industries do they work in? Is the cultural entrepreneur driven by commercial ambitions or forced into entrepreneurship?

To come back to my personal rationale, I did not identify with the workers described in much of the critical discourse of entrepreneurial practice. Aware that my personal viewpoint would be based on my subjective experience and therefore likely to be ‘opaque’ (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011), I investigated the academic and policy context alongside the lived experience of cultural entrepreneurs. My position has motivated me to persist with the idea of the specificity of the worker’s experience and to make the voice of the worker, his or her personal narrative, central to this study. In that sense, my approach owes much to the work of Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) who, in their study of cultural labour, have analysed the worker’s experience in detail, although I focus on the notion of entrepreneurial cultural work.

**Outline and structure of the thesis**

The thesis is organised in six chapters, with the empirical work in the last four chapters. The first chapter outlines the policy context and the academic
literature, before presenting the conceptual framework for the research. I begin by presenting definitions, suggesting some of the challenges and key themes to be explored in the literature. The cultural policy context is briefly historicised drawing predominantly on O’Brien (2013), Hesmondhalgh (2008) and McRobbie (1999, 2002b, 2011). This includes critical observations of entrepreneurship and neo-liberalism in cultural policy which I shall refer to as the ‘critical theorists’. This is not to suggest that others are not critical, but it is simply a means of clustering broadly similar critical positions in relation to a critique of neo-liberalism in cultural policy.

The conceptual framework develops my analytical approach to theorising experience based on the cultural workers’ narratives. I propose that cultural entrepreneurs construct the story of themselves in a social context, by comparison with others, thereby establishing the notion that identity is not fixed. I draw on Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s (2010) framework of the micro, meso and macro levels, an adaptation of Bourdieu's theoretical construct, to investigate personal agency within a social structure. I argue for an exploration of the embedded nature of cultural entrepreneurship, the place, its networks and relationships, to investigate how individual workers position themselves and act out individual and collective identities as cultural entrepreneurs.

Chapter two develops the methodological approach by presenting the nature of the relationship between the participants and the researcher as a distinctive element of the research method. I present the context as a relatively small cultural industries community in Birmingham; a community in which I have been immersed for a number of years as a cultural worker.
myself. I discuss my local knowledge of people, networks and my personal experience of entrepreneurship. This enables me to encourage a ‘gossipy’ and informal context for the interviews, encouraging value judgements and comparisons with others as a means of eliciting the participant’s own position. The method is designed to expose the complexities of cultural work and the role personal agency plays in the worker’s day-to-day experience of entrepreneurship. I finish chapter two with a brief explanation of practical considerations including methods for managing and analysing the data.

The subsequent chapters focus on the analysis of the interviews, developing themes which emerged from the literature and from the cultural entrepreneurs’ accounts.

In chapter three, the cultural entrepreneur’s capacity for reflexivity emerges as a means of subverting or negotiating entrepreneurial modes of work. I explore self-management and self-exploitation to reveal pragmatic mechanisms for dealing with risks and the challenges of cultural entrepreneurship. I address issues of choice pertinent to Oakley’s (2014) assessment that most cultural workers are ‘pushed’ into entrepreneurship. In some cases this is linked to female entrepreneurship and choosing a balance between family life and work, a reality for most working women. I find cultural entrepreneurs to be aware of the limitations and problems associated with precarious work and diverse responses to how these might be avoided or managed. The cultural entrepreneurs’ accounts include many contradictions as they try to make sense of their work, choices and identity.
Identity and the notion of performance in ‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur is explored in chapter four. Myths such as the bohemian artist or popular depictions of entrepreneurs reveal ways of constructing and rejecting the cultural entrepreneurs’ characteristics. By being immersed in a highly networked social context, cultural entrepreneurs do not construct their identities in a vacuum, but perform their sense of self within Birmingham’s cultural milieu. In some cases, individuals draw on the media, celebrities and their peers, adopting certain traits to present themselves as cultural entrepreneurs. Others create their own definitions of entrepreneurship, rejecting the idea or adapting it to suit their personal aspirations. Many cultural entrepreneurs see their work as closely relating to a DIY (Do It Yourself) approach and identifying with alternative cultures. This is often supported by others within Birmingham’s cultural milieu, creating a micro culture in which individuals encourage and support each other’s practice.

Chapter five addresses the significance of place in providing a milieu, a relational space, as a backdrop to individual entrepreneurship. Place, in this case Birmingham, also suggests structure in the form of local policies, institutions, key people and resources; the meso level in Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s (2010) framework. I offer a snapshot of key priorities in Birmingham and how these relate to the activities of cultural entrepreneurs. I find some parallels between the policy aspirations of the city and the independent actions of cultural entrepreneurs. The idea of an ‘enterprise culture’ appears to have been assimilated into everyday activities, although on closer inspection, social and personal values are at least as important as commercial goals. The realities of tackling cultural work in a changing policy
context, when funding is dramatically reduced, inspires pro-active attitudes as a means of managing changing circumstances. The social glue which I find in Birmingham’s cultural milieu is further explored at a micro level by investigating relationships between actors, in the final chapter.

Chapter six begins by outlining the role and nature of networks including the various forms of capital which support complex and messy relationships. I find that relationships are a significant factor in revealing the cultural entrepreneur’s experience as they are integral to shaping professional identities. Depending on the entrepreneur’s stage in their career, or if they are re-starting a new venture, relationships are handled differently. Instrumental motivations are evident as part of the cultural entrepreneur’s attempt to get on, yet the notion that friendships are purely instrumental is too reductive. In comparison with other studies, it is difficult to see to what extent there is direct correlation between cultural capital and one’s ability to find work, as suggested by Blair (2009) and Lee (2011). There is evidence, as Scott (2012) suggests, that many entrepreneurs operating with few resources exchange capital by doing work for free and helping each other create a ‘buzz’ about their cultural activities. Networks and relationships are a resource which combine instrumental motives with genuine support and within fields such as web design, where female cultural entrepreneurs are underrepresented, relationships become an important support mechanism. In exploring positioning within a changing economic and policy environment there is evidence of loyalty and ongoing support amongst cultural entrepreneurs. Whilst Blair (2009) and Lee (2011) paint a very pessimistic picture of networks and relationships in the UK film and independent
television industries, I find a different community in an environment such as Birmingham. I argue that meaningful relationships are possible and that cultural entrepreneurs are fully able to differentiate between different types of relationships. Individuals are proactive in creating relationships and personal agency plays a role in shaping the environment, a dynamic space which is fluid and influenced by many factors.

Finally, I summarise my thesis by suggesting that while critical theorists are right to address questions of self-exploitation, insecurities and inequalities in cultural work, there is a need to examine the lived experience and different contexts. My approach encourages individuals to construct their story within a space which they shape, as well as being shaped by it (Czarniawska, 2004). By exploring identity and revealing the role of personal agency in a milieu such as Birmingham, I argue that entrepreneurship can present opportunities for 'good' work. The social contexts in which entrepreneurs operate enable reflexivity and the potential for re-inventing cultural entrepreneurship. This study is engaged in 'unmasking the [cultural] entrepreneur' (Jones and Spicer, 2009) to reveal complex identities and motivations for cultural work in a social space.
Chapter 1: Context and conceptual framework

Introduction

This chapter outlines the theoretical and policy context for an exploration of entrepreneurial models of work in the cultural industries. I draw on the academic disciplines of cultural studies, cultural policy studies and entrepreneurship studies to situate empirical research within a contemporary discourse.

Cultural entrepreneurship is a contested subject dominated by polarised positions characterised as either a celebration of entrepreneurial modes of work, or a critical perspective concerned with the concept of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ work (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, p.2). Critical theorists have exposed evidence of precariousness, gender inequalities, self-exploitation, and high levels of stress associated with the insecurities of cultural work (Gill, 2002, Gill and Pratt, 2008; Lee, 2011; McRobbie, 1999; 2002a, 2002b; Oakley, 2014). In this context, cultural policies which have embraced entrepreneurship are viewed as evidence of neo-liberal capitalism at play, demonstrating little understanding of the challenges faced by cultural workers (Ellmeier, 2003; Forkert, 2013; McRobbie, 2002b). In contrast, policymakers and academics advancing the idea of cultural entrepreneurship embrace the opportunity to consider new working practices and support mechanisms for the sector (Flew and Cunningham, 2010; Leadbeater and Oakley, 2001).
The academic field of entrepreneurship studies further illuminates these debates by introducing different perspectives, rarely discussed in cultural studies and cultural policy studies research. Given the emerging critique of entrepreneurship from within the field, I have found value in bringing together diverse viewpoints to advance knowledge and understanding of cultural entrepreneurship.

The literature associated with these debates informs the context for this study, and as Hesmondhalgh and Baker explain:

…neither the celebrants of creative labour nor the critical pessimists have been sufficiently clear about what constitutes good work and bad work, and this has inhibited debate and understanding about the meaning of contemporary creative labour. (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, p.7)

To further inform the debate, I focus on the possibility for ‘good’ work within entrepreneurship by exploring agency and identity in cultural work. My research does not seek to celebrate entrepreneurship per se, nor does it dismiss the critical analysis of those who have sought to demonstrate the paradox between both the pleasures and insecurities of cultural work. Rather, I focus on the potential for reassessing the cultural entrepreneurs’ experience by investigating personal agency within the context and structures of a UK city such as Birmingham. Inspired by Banks’ research into Manchester-based cultural entrepreneurs, I seek to reveal the complexities of cultural work through a study of identity and personal agency.
While there is a wealth of evidence to suggest that cultural work is increasingly subject to the disaggregating and corrosive forces of the global economy, it is also the case that the possibilities for reaffirming individual choices are opened up as workers are forced to shoulder the burden of responsibility for the ‘career path’, as well as other non-economic aspects of the personal biography. These cultural entrepreneurs are pursuing careers underpinned by a diverse assemblage of motives and moral principles, and as such, contrast markedly with the dissocialized drones distinctive to the fatalist critique. (Banks, 2006, p. 456)

Choices and motivations are based on individual preferences, personal circumstances and the social dynamic specific to Birmingham. I investigate the potential for managing the challenges of entrepreneurial modes of work, revealing alternative positions and approaches.

In this chapter, I outline my theoretical framework for an exploration of subjective narratives, contextualised within the structural framework of recent cultural policies and, in particular, of Birmingham’s cultural milieu. I begin by examining definitions and terms such as cultural entrepreneurship and cultural entrepreneur.

**From the ‘creative’ to the cultural industries**

First and with reference to critical debates, I clarify my definition of key terms to position this study within a wider academic discourse. It is now well documented that the term ‘creative industries’, as used by the UK’s Department for Culture Media and Sports (DCMS), is problematic
(Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, Oakley, 2011, Flew and Cunningham, 2010). Hesmondhalgh (2008) rejects the label ‘creative industries’ arguing that the term ‘cultural industries’ is part of an important theoretical tradition which seeks to demonstrate ‘contradiction and complexity’.

My main claims are that the term ‘creative industries’ represents a refusal of the forms of critical analysis associated with the cultural industries approach, and that unqualified use of the former now signals a considerable degree of accommodation with neoliberalism. (Hesmondhalgh, 2008, p.552)

With this in mind, I use the term ‘cultural industries’ as my study does not seek to fit neatly into the DCMS creative industries definition and because I wish to associate my work with the theoretical paradigm described by Hesmondhalgh (2008).

It is also important to note that DCMS definitions tend to lag behind the realities of media work which are more fluid. As Flew (2004) suggests, new media activities are developing faster than policymakers and academics can create definitions. Since the original DCMS definition of the creative industries was introduced in 1998, terms such as ‘knowledge economy’, ‘creative economy’ and ‘digital industries’ have also been widely used with overlapping definitions and meanings. Moreover, the sector has changed since its earlier incarnation due to the growth of web-based media and cultural production, introducing new job roles such as blogging and social media consultancy (Naudin, 2013). Banks and Deuze (2009) describe the blurred lines between amateur producers and professionals in co-creation.
practices, further disrupting the characteristics of the ‘creative industries’, particularly in relation to debates of labour, professionalism and entrepreneurial work. It is worth noting, however, that the term ‘creative industries’ is recognised internationally, although it tends to be associated with the more commercial aspects of cultural production (UNESCO, n.d.).

Inevitably, there are problems when many sub-sectors are brought together under one label, predominantly for policymakers and with little bearing on the cultural worker’s actual practice (for instance, a photographer will describe herself as a photographer rather than a creative industries entrepreneur). Yet, as this study is situated within a specific policy and academic framework, I have opted for ‘cultural industries’, in keeping with Hesmondhalgh’s (2008) theoretical tradition. Having established the sector description, I now consider the use of the term ‘cultural entrepreneur’, an emerging title for cultural industry workers.

**From cultural worker to cultural entrepreneur**

Cultural entrepreneurs are described in *The Indepe**ndents* (Leadbeater and Oakley, 1999) as individuals who are self-employed, freelancers and owners of micro-enterprises or who have a portfolio career. Although they are often ambitious, their focus is rarely commercial success, as might be expected of many conventional businesses.

> These new Independents are often producers, designers, retailers and promoters all at the same time. They do not fit into neat categories.  
> (Leadbeater and Oakley, 1999, p.11)
The description fits well with my interviewees who tend to run small businesses with a few employees or are self-employed, undertaking freelance work or selling their services or products, often a combination of these. It is difficult to make a clear distinction between individuals who are freelancing and running a business alone. In relation to this study, freelancers might be described as ‘work-for-hire’ rather than engaged in pro-actively developing and selling their own services or products. The cultural entrepreneurs I interview tend to be micro-businesses rather than freelancers, but they do occasionally undertake freelance work, as a means of generating an additional income.

As Ellmeier suggests, the shift from ‘cultural worker’ to ‘cultural entrepreneur’ is problematic in that it erodes the distinctions between worker and entrepreneur as part of a transformation from a ‘Keynesian welfare state to a Schumpeterian performance state’ (2003, p.3). The language of entrepreneurship is filled with opportunity, creativity, self-reliance and risk-taking, exemplified by Leadbeater in his book, *Living on Thin Air: The New Economy* (1999). In this context, the term cultural entrepreneur is laden with political debates which form much of the critique (Ellmeier, 2003; Oakley, 2014; McRobbie, 2008). Like scholars such as Banks (2006) and Scott (2012), I focus on entrepreneurial behaviours to explore issues of identity and agency in individuals whose cultural labour can be broadly described as self-employed and enterprising, although it does not always result in economic capital.

When exploring ‘cultural entrepreneurship’ I find little use of the term other than in relation to development work, which takes a broad view of culture, for
instance, the work of the Global Centre for Cultural Entrepreneurship which encourages innovation and entrepreneurship in local communities with a focus on social objectives. Indeed, ‘social’ and ‘cultural’ entrepreneurship are sometimes confused as an online discussion on Fenton’s blog suggests (2012). The definition by Anheier and Raj Isar (2008) encompasses some of these qualities, resonating broadly with the idea of the cultural entrepreneur, but combining that with economic values.

Cultural Entrepreneurs are cultural change agents and resourceful visionaries who organize cultural, financial, social and human capital, to generate revenue from a cultural activity. Their innovative solutions result in economically sustainable cultural enterprises that enhance livelihoods and create cultural value and wealth for both creative producers and consumers of cultural services and products. (Anheier and Raj Isar, 2008, p.96)

Academic institutions including Goldsmiths University, Harvard University, University of Warwick and Birmingham City University have started to use cultural entrepreneurship as a descriptor for specific courses which encourage enterprise education in cultural subjects. This is not without criticism, which, as O’Brien (2013) points out, demonstrates the lack of connectivity between education policies which encourage entrepreneurship and the critical discourses I have mentioned (O’Brien, 2013, p.89.). It is against this background that Ashton and Noonan (2013) have interrogated the subject of cultural work and higher education in relation to professionalism, entrepreneurship and identity. As I have stated, the
educational issues raised here are also pertinent to my professional practice as an educator.

Finally, it is important to note that the lack of academic work which explicitly makes use of terms such as cultural entrepreneurs and cultural entrepreneurship does not necessarily reflect a lack of research into the subject, but indicates an issue with terminology. Researching ‘creative industries entrepreneurship’ reveals a range of articles predominantly from entrepreneurship and business disciplines, while cultural studies and cultural policy studies tend to avoid the terms ‘enterprise’ or ‘entrepreneur’ altogether. In entrepreneurship and small business literature there are two types of research which explore the cultural sector. The first is dominated by the Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship conference (ISBE conference) which has included a strand on Creative Industries Entrepreneurship since 2009. In the main, papers explore ways of supporting the sector to become more commercially successful (see Fuller, Warren & Norman, 2009). Research of a more critical nature, from scholars seeking to advance entrepreneurship studies, draws on the cultural industries to investigate alternative forms of entrepreneurship (see Chell & Karatas-Özkan, 2010; Hjorth & Steyaert, 2006).

Within this context, fixed notions of the entrepreneur are problematized, drawing on alternative practices, social entrepreneurship and female entrepreneurship. As Chell (2008) notes, it is unlikely that theorists would ever agree on a definition of the entrepreneur or entrepreneurship. Indeed Hjorth and Steyaert (2009) find more differences than similarities between entrepreneurs, their activities and the organisations they run. Unsurprisingly
perhaps, I find these ambiguities helpful as they present a disputed terrain in which an exploration of cultural entrepreneurship can contribute new perspectives.

In summary, my aim has been to clarify my own use of terms for the purposes of this study but also to highlight some of the issues which frame cultural entrepreneurship, and which will be developed throughout the thesis. The next part of the chapter is split into three sections beginning with an analysis of key debates from cultural policy and cultural studies. The second section is an overview of entrepreneurship studies, followed by an introduction to the conceptual framework which underpins my empirical research.

**Part one: UK cultural policy and cultural entrepreneurship**

Having established some definitions in the first part of the chapter, I now turn my attention to the policy context and to academic literature in the field of cultural work.

A starting point for investigating entrepreneurship in the UK is the surge of activity in government policies and initiatives witnessed since the 1980s. Entrepreneurial activities took place before Margaret Thatcher came into power in 1979; however, her focus on the economy and the development of an enterprise culture, set a precedent for the next 30 years of UK policies. Thatcherism embraced the notion of an enterprise culture and simultaneously cut back support for the arts, which had been focused on the traditional or 'high' arts (Deakin and John, 1993, Abercrombie et al., 1991; Hesmondhalgh, 2008). Yet it was Thatcher’s Enterprise Allowance Scheme
(EAS) which gave many artists and cultural workers the opportunity to set up businesses and develop their work (McRobbie, 1999, p.4).

Alongside the EAS, the idea of including a broader range of cultural production is developed, enabling ‘a more democratic spreading of arts funding’ (Hesmondhalgh, 2008, p. 555). Consequently, the connection was made between cultural policy, and economic and social policies (O’Brien, 2014, p.71). For the left-wing Greater London Council (GLC) the democratisation of cultural policy initiated support for entrepreneurial activities within the cultural industries (Hesmondhalgh, 2008). Influenced by Nicholas Garnham’s paper, Cultural Industries, Consumption and Policy (1985), GLC policy shifted from support for artists to a focus on distribution and exhibition of cultural goods (McGuigan, 2009).

One of Garnham’s most significant findings was that the media sectors were far more important in the UK as employers of labour, objects of consumption, and areas of public intervention, than the traditional performing and visual arts, defined as those which received support through Government arts funding. (Flew, 2002, p.11)

The GLC policies were instrumental in encouraging enterprising approaches to culture work, of which, ironically, some can be characterised as a reaction to the capitalist and entrepreneurial society of the Thatcher period. Cultural workers saw an opportunity to democratise culture by engaging in entrepreneurial activities working outside mainstream institutions and involved in producing, exhibiting and distributing works. Furthermore, the blending of social and cultural policies resulted in the setting up of small
community-based arts organisations. These organisations were often politically motivated, confronting inequalities and critical of the Thatcher government, yet liberated by it (Mulgan and Worpole, 1986).

For McRobbie (2002a), this consolidates an economic environment in which an ‘enterprise culture’ is characterised by self-reliance and non-dependency on the state thereby reducing social bonds between individuals. Drawing on McRobbie’s work, O’Brien (2013) charts the rise of cultural entrepreneurialism in three movements, approximately from the post-Thatcher period to New Labour’s policies. Firstly, O’Brien (2013) presents the first wave of cultural entrepreneurs as involved in post-punk sub-cultural scenes linked to media products such as fanzines and micro fashion enterprises. O’Brien (2013) differentiates the second wave as being deeply rooted in club-cultures and the night-time economy, typified by multiple jobs and the cultivation of the self.

Cream in Liverpool and Ministry of Sound are good examples of this second wave, which starts as clubs, essentially spaces for people’s mates to go to, and clothing and running bars, all of which are characterised by a network of freelance work underpinning the limited number of business owners. (O’Brien, 2013, p.81)

This is captured in the aforementioned publication, The Independents, which bridges O’Brien’s (2013) second wave with the third wave, associated with New Labour policies and the much criticised idea of ‘Cool Britannia’.

Under New Labour, the newly formed DCMS’s first task was a mapping exercise to establish the specific industry subsectors to be included within
the so called ‘creative industries’, their characteristics and economic contribution. This enabled the sector to be reviewed, to be taken more seriously, and eventually became the rationale for more public funding through the DCMS and other departments such as business and education (Hesmondhalgh, 2007). Within this context, aspects of cultural work is presented by New Labour as independent from the state, relying instead on a network structure to pursue creative and entrepreneurial ambitions.

There has subsequently been much criticism of New Labour’s cultural policy, including concerns over how cultural policy overlaps with other areas of public policy such as education and social policies. Scholars have analysed the instrumentalism in public policy revealing problems with an impact agenda and in relation to notions of cultural value (Belfiore, 2009). Others have questioned the exaggerated claims for the economic importance of the sector (Heartfield, 2005) and the expectation that the cultural industries will deliver unrealistic economic goals such as the culture-led approach to regeneration (Stevenson, 2003, McGuigan, 2004). Embedded within much of the critique is a condemnation of neo-liberalism within New Labour’s cultural policies (McGuigan, 2004). The link between entrepreneurship and neo-liberalism informs a critical perception of cultural entrepreneurship as individualistic, self-reliant and opposed to state intervention (Hesmondhalgh et al., 2014). In the second part of this chapter, I focus on the cultural policy critique and the prospects of undertaking 'good' work.
Cultural policy critique

The utopian view of cultural labour, articulated in New Labour’s cultural policies, is found to be problematic as it overlooks the difficulties and insecurities of freelance work. Accounts of creative work are explored by Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2010), McRobbie (1998,) and Gill (2002) who offer an important and detailed insight into the conditions of contemporary cultural work. Ellmeier (2003) highlights policymakers’ lack of concern with the living and working conditions of cultural entrepreneurs. The opportunities and risks attached to such work demonstrate the precarious economic situation of many cultural workers and their capacity for self-exploitation. As McRobbie analyses:

The majority of the young fashion designers I have interviewed would earn more as temps or secretaries but their commitment to notions of personal creativity provides them with a utopian idea of breaking down the distinction between dull work and enjoyable leisure. If paid employment is no longer secure, then self-employed but ‘creative’ insecurity is often more appealing than uncreative job security in a large company or corporation. (McRobbie, 1999, p.27)

Many cultural workers have always been self-employed, artists for instance, but in certain subsectors of the cultural industries such as film and television workers had hitherto been unionised and offered permanent employment (Blair 2001). In their study of media workers (mostly journalism), Baines and Robson (2001) investigate individuals who have left secure employment to return as a self-employed consultant, suggesting a kind of enforced
entrepreneurship. This presents a bleak picture of the self-employed media worker, who according to the authors, suffers from high levels of competition, from isolation and a lack of business knowledge. Yet these issues were largely ignored by New Labour, who preferred to focus on the optimistic rhetoric of influential commentators such as Leadbeater and Florida.

‘New economy,’ writers such as Charles Handy (1994), Charles Leadbeater (1999) or Richard Florida (2002), as we might term them, have tended to portray cultural work as a harbinger of the way that work in general is changing. Whether it is talk of ‘portfolio careers’, the project lifecycle company or the importance of networks, these writers have drawn attention to the ways in which ‘cultural’ ways of working are filtering out into the rest of the economy and to other countries. (Oakley, 2009, p.27).

Banks and Hesmondhalgh (2009) propose that cultural work was presented as an example of ‘good’ labour as well as making economic sense, with implications for the wider labour market as creative work started to be seen as an example of ‘good’ work practice. As Oakley (2011) argues:

The belief in the inherently democratic nature of small business ownership and the liberating power of entrepreneurship, meant not only that the public paid little attention to the sometimes exploitative conditions of creative labour markets, but when it did so, the policy responses proposed were inadequate for the scale of the problem. (Oakley, 2011, p.287)
Ultimately, Oakley (2011) is concerned with the contradictions between social and economic imperatives in New Labour cultural policy and the fact that these tensions were rarely acknowledged until the Creative Britain document in 2008. Oakley’s criticism is that the realities of cultural labour markets demonstrate inequalities particularly for women, ethnic minorities and young people. Low wages and precarious employment make work in the sector difficult to sustain if one does not have some other form of financial support. Ignoring these issues, the ‘positive’ image of cultural labour is connected to creativity and social policies. For instance, Neelands and Choe (2010) explore this by analysing New Labour’s Creative Partnerships (CPs) programme.

CP’s growing focus on developing market-orientated creative skills closely corresponds to New Labour’s political objective of encouraging ‘self-actualisation’ responsibilities for the disadvantaged individual and community so as to enable them to overcome dependency on the state. (Neelands and Choe, 2010, p.292)

There is an implicit trust that creativity will deliver results which are good for the economy but also good for social cohesion. McGuigan (2009) argues that New Labour’s vision was a neo-liberal strategy disguised by a commitment to social inclusion through work. For McGuigan, the essence of the problem was the influence of neo-liberalism in cultural policy, and, indeed, in all aspects of New Labour politics.

The shift from Fordist organisation and job security to flexible labour markets and complex networks in a global economy are characteristic
of the neoliberal restructuring that has been so consequential over the past 30 to 40 years. There has been at least a partial reversion to nineteenth-century principles of laissez-faire, including economic internationalism, minimal state intervention, the immiseration of the weak and enrichment of the strong. (McGuigan, 2009, p.182)

McRobbie (2002b) makes the case that since the Thatcher period, the devaluing of the public sector and social services have contributed to individualized lifestyles, focused on self-advancement. McRobbie considers this through the celebration of rags-to-riches stories, such as JK Rowling, as an illustration of New Labour’s promotion of ‘the new opportunities of the talent-led economy for individuals who demonstrate capacities for inexhaustible resourcefulness, resilience and entrepreneurialism’ (McRobbie, 2002b, p.100). Similarly, Banks and Hesmondhalgh (2009) suggest a link to a celebrity culture and a sense that individual achievement is measured against success stories. They refer to individuals such as Bill Gates and Steve Jobs and ‘media entrepreneurs and the like’ (2009, p.418), identifying the focus of attention on individual success and creativity. Importantly, it is the discrepancy between celebrity cultural entrepreneurs who are perceived as role models for the sector and the real world of micro cultural entrepreneurs which is criticised. In chapter five, I refer to documents produced by Birmingham policymakers which illustrate the point, drawing from celebrities to support local cultural entrepreneurship. The concern here is that this leaves little room for the inevitable ups and downs in entrepreneurial practices. The realities of cultural work are hidden behind celebrity stories.
At the heart of McRobbie’s (2002b) argument is a critique of the way in which society is changing and the impact this will have on ideas of class, gender and ethnicity. For McRobbie this is epitomised in the work of Charles Leadbeater, who ‘wants to make entrepreneurs of us all’ (McRobbie, 2002b, p.106), suggesting that the blurred lines between work and home life are depicted as examples of the breakdown of society.

It is a wholly individualized image of work, with little or no place for loyalty, association, never mind trade unionization. Instead it is about personal brilliance and the values of perseverance. (McRobbie, 2002b, p.107)

McRobbie argues that individuals are coerced into thinking that this is the nature of work. Although scholars acknowledge high levels of satisfaction by cultural workers, this should not be confused with good working practices (Oakley, 2009, Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, McRobbie, 1999). Du Gay (1996) argues that entrepreneurial approaches to work have seeped into all aspects of work, with an impact on personal and professional identity.

This idea of an individual human life as ‘an enterprise of the self’ suggests that no matter what hand circumstance may have dealt a person, he or she remains always continuously engaged (even if technically ‘unemployed’) in that one enterprise, and that it is ‘part of the continuous business of living to make adequate provision for the preservation, reproduction and reconstruction of one’s own human capital’ [Gordon, 1991:44]. (du Gay and Hall, 1996 p.157)
Individuals become responsible for their career, for their successes and failures and the impact on their sense of themselves. The concept of the highly individualised person, the cultural entrepreneur, threatens meaningful social interactions.

As self-reliance becomes a way of being, a means of conducting the self, ideas of the social become emptied of meaning. (McRobbie, 2011, p.32)

McRobbie (2011) finds this idea of the self-sufficient and pro-active entrepreneur to be cleverly blended with the autonomous artist. Here McRobbie finds the opportunity for subverting neo-liberal values through collaborative activism such as the work of the Carrot Workers Collective and Making a Living (2011, p.33). Although critical of entrepreneurship, McRobbie (2011) does convey the opportunity for critical engagement with politics, through autonomous and/or entrepreneurial actions. For instance, the counter culture work from the 1960s and 70s, led by radical groups such as feminists and groups working against racism. Indeed, McGuigan (2009, p.23) refers to Schumpeter who remarked that the very nature of capitalism creates societies in which individuals can be both supported by the system and critical of it, in particular artists and writers.

McGuigan draws on the work of Boltanski and Chiapello to explore how notions of autonomy have seeped into contemporary capitalism, in the context of a post '68 France but with relevance beyond French society (2009). McGuigan (2009) discusses this tension between art and business, artists and the economy, tracing the issue back to the Romantics and the
decline of the artist’s relationship with rich patrons, when we see a shift
towards the role of artists as critics of society, of politics and of the market.

... while creative work has traditionally drawn much of its talent and
ideas from radical or counter-cultural groups, neo-liberal incitements
to entrepreneurial initiative have been skillfully tailored to fit with the
still-resonant autonomy of artistic labour. (Banks and Hesmondhalgh,
2009, p.418)

However, Banks and Hesmondhalgh (2009) make a distinction between
autonomy, which is linked to artistic critique, and a general sense of
oppression, highlighting that the autonomy of entrepreneurial artists will not
necessarily address social problems such as gender inequalities or poor
working conditions.

The arguments presented so far assume an understanding of
entrepreneurship as inevitably linked to neo-liberal capitalism,
individualisation and negative aspects of self-employment. But, as Banks
(2007) suggests, cultural workers may present a different version of
autonomy and entrepreneurialism.

What if artistic and creative cultural work contains within it the
possibility of another kind of freedom? A freedom that seeks to
moderate or challenge market culture rather than simply reinforce it?
(Banks, 2007, p.95, italics in original).

Firstly, the emphasis on a critique of neo-liberalism is problematic, as the
practices of neo-liberalism differ and the term is often either simplified or
misused (Hesmondhalgh et al., 2014, p.2). Secondly, as Davies argues
‘Entrepreneurs might be seen as an example of individuals who operate between or outside of existing conventions’ (2014, p.12) suggesting that within a capitalist neo-liberal structure, entrepreneurs may not be conformists. In other words, it may be worth exploring cultural work in detail to evaluate the nature of autonomy and entrepreneurship in the everyday experience of cultural workers. For instance, the manner in which cultural workers operate in an entrepreneurial context, might present alternative models and positions.

Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) identify positive aspects of professional autonomy in their study by drawing on Pierre Bourdieu and Raymond Williams.

… this sees autonomy as contradictory and ambivalent, and that means that in spite of the many problems associated with it, we should not lose sight of the aspiration to human freedom that it embodies. That aspiration is linked to the social value of culture and communication. If we lose sight entirely of that potential in the name of anti-romanticism or some kind of populist anti-elitism, we risk a crude reductionism. (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, p.65-66)

This ambivalence is illustrated when Hesmondhalgh and Baker demonstrate how workers can welcome a sense of self-organisation as an aspect of autonomy, which is perceived as synonymous with pleasure and advantage. Yet, as the authors suggest, this type of autonomy is easily undermined by the constraints of everyday work activities, such as the ‘choice’ to work late. Nevertheless, the positive side of autonomy chimes with descriptions of self-
efficacy, as an individual’s capability and motivation to exercise personal control through a specific course of actions (Bandura, 1995). Yet agency is not understood as purely intrinsic, and I discuss how it is situated within a milieu, an environment which includes personal and collective discourses. In this context, autonomy suggests a level of freedom which might challenge assumptions that cultural entrepreneurship is always going to lead to ‘bad’ work.

The possibility of doing good work

According to Ross (2008), the nature of cultural labour did not receive much attention until the emergence of creative industries policy and a critique of its over celebration as described earlier in this chapter. Ross (2008) historicises explorations of changes in work practices, identifying a shift from repetitive Fordist modes of production to the introduction of some levels of participation and decision making amongst the workforce. For Ross (2008) these changes are characterised by the introduction of risk and in contrast with security and the benefits of long term employment. Yet, Ross states that it is possible to find ‘meaningful, stimulating work’ (2008, p.39) in autonomous and entrepreneurial cultural practices if there are forms of support within a flexible labour market. It is this possibility which is important to this study.

For Hesmondhalgh and Baker, ‘the possibility of doing good work’ (2011, p.77) is central to their research into media work, as an aspect of social justice. The notion of ‘bad’ work explored in their research is testing ideas of self-exploitation and reconsidering ‘pessimistic accounts’ of cultural work.
The authors draw on Banks’ research into cultural entrepreneurs to highlight different perspectives:

...[Banks’] contribution is a valuable one, because it suggests the possibility of a more balanced appraisal of the relationships between subjectivity and creative labour than that provided by the cultural studies critics. (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, p. 76)

Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) find more optimistic perspectives in studies by both Banks (2006) and Born (2004), who propose the opportunity for ‘good’ work, by exploring personal agency, reflexivity and moral systems at play. In particular, Banks’s (2006) work is highlighted for developing the argument that the possibility of a ‘moral economy’ with notions of values and ethics can exist in cultural entrepreneurship. Banks identifies individuals ‘self-consciously engaged in forms of practice that contain ideas about what is ‘good’ (and therefore bad), exhibit moral ways of acting towards others and negotiate the balance between holding instrumental and non-instrumental values.’ (2006, p.456). While acknowledging the difficulties with cultural entrepreneurship and the limitations of his own study in terms of the size of the sample, Banks argues for the need to collect further empirical data to reveal the complexity of cultural work including the motivations which support cultural entrepreneurship. His study demonstrates what he describes as ‘the existence of morally progressive, non-instrumental rationales in what was previously thought to be a morally abject and apolitical sector’ (Banks, 2006, p. 467). This is critical to this study which intends to reveal in detail the subjective experience of cultural entrepreneurs to explore personal motives, actions, contexts and identities.
McRobbie’s (2011) recent work makes positive suggestions for cultural workers and academics to ‘subvert or ‘re-territorialise’ neo-liberal tendencies. For McRobbie, the radical work of the 1970s which addressed issues of racism and gender inequalities can act as inspiration, making use of cultural workers to support social programmes.

I would like to propose a renewal of radical social enterprise and co-operatives. Such self-organised collectives would also be a way of providing comparable working structures across diverse occupations such as social worker/community workers and artists. Already many artists and creative people are working in communities and on social projects… In addition, the politics of local democracy might well also be resurrected through such activities. (McRobbie, 2011, p.33)

This fits well with Banks’ description of enterprising activities developed for non-economic purposes such as the work of social entrepreneurs which demonstrates ethically motivated activities (Banks, 2006, p.458). Here, we find the possibility for agents to subvert or re-invent the identity of the cultural entrepreneur.

Banks argues that, contrary to the views of critical theorists, the process of individualisation may offer the opportunity for reflexivity, self-organising and an ‘alternative’ economy (Banks, 2007). Drawing on Lash and Urry, Banks indicates the role of enhanced communication as providing further opportunity for self-reflexivity and for the creation of new social structures. Furthermore, Banks argues that critiques of entrepreneurial modes of work have been too quick to assume that this automatically translates into a need
to be business-like and to make money. Rewards for cultural work can be internal and are evidenced by Banks in practices such as the creation of ‘authentic’ cultural goods (artisan-produced and organic products) as well as ‘ethical’ modes of cultural entrepreneurship (communal and collective practices). Self-reflexivity within a social context enables the development of the self, of one’s identity, by recognising the value of social relationships. Individualisation can be part of the process of creating ‘alternative’ politics and ‘alternative’ models of work such as social enterprises (Banks, 2006).

As discussed earlier, critical positions in relation to entrepreneurialism and cultural work identify the problems with ‘bad’ work (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011) and in undertaking this study, I do not seek to reject the problems with cultural work, such as gender inequalities, issues of self-exploitation and the fetishisation of freedom (McRobbie, 2002b). However, I hope to advance our understanding of cultural work through the prism of entrepreneurship, to re-define cultural entrepreneurship in all its complexity.

I argue that the critique of cultural work is directed at the language of cultural policy and neo-liberalism rather than the lived experience of cultural entrepreneurship. The overly positive and celebratory tendency of commentators such as Leadbeater and policymakers who seek to encourage entrepreneurship is presented as naïve and as an aspect of neo-liberal capitalism, with little relatively attention to cultural labour.

Studies of the lived experience, such as the detailed empirical work of Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) offer a more balanced view. Importantly, they reveal new insights into cultural labour, raising our awareness of
contemporary cultural work in television, magazine journalism and music. Exploring creative labour in craft activities based in rural or regional setting, Luckman (2012) also focuses on the potential for ‘good’ work. Luckman emphasises the importance of both historical context and the emotional relationships to place, paying attention to the specific environment in which cultural work is produced. Addressing ‘the gap in critical approaches to cultural work identified by Banks’ (Luckman, 2012, p.5), craft work is explored beyond the economic development discourses.

While these studies explore cultural labour, the specificity of ‘good’ or ‘bad’ work in entrepreneurial modes of work is rarely problematised in detail, with the exception of Banks (2007). By drawing on opposing perspectives of cultural labour, Banks ‘explores both the ‘regressive’ and ‘progressive’ features of cultural work’ (2007, p. 15), assembling a more balanced viewpoint, particularly in comparison with studies which cannot reconcile the idea of ‘good’ work within a capitalist society (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, p.49). In chapters which explore more positive accounts, Banks describes potentially ‘progressive’ forms of cultural labour, as driven by a range of motives: aesthetic, socially embedded, non-economic and irrational. In contrast, ‘bad’ work tends to be considered in relation to globalisation, precarious labour markets and values of self-interests. Furthermore, this environment links entrepreneurship and cultural labour to du Gay’s notion of the ‘enterprise of the self’ (1996, p.181), a situation in which individuals are isolated and responsible for their self-management as well as personal failures.
There are several elements to what we might identify as ‘good’ work based on an understanding of labour conditions and approaches to cultural production. The potential for addressing issues of social justice is demonstrated in examples of solidarity and activism described by Ross (2008) and McRobbie (2011). The opportunity to display moral values and ethical positions in working practices as described by Banks (2006, 2007). The relevance of place in sustaining an affective relationship with one’s practice, connected to place and heritage offers a notion of ‘good’ work as described by Luckman (2012).

In this thesis, I investigate a version of ‘good’ work which might not be ideal work but which introduces the possibility for entrepreneurial practices to incorporate qualities such as good social bonds, experimental and fulfilling work practices and diverse personal values. Furthermore, I argue that personal and collective agency enable cultural entrepreneurs to find meaning in entrepreneurial activities, motivating individuals to negotiate a version of ‘good’ work, within visible and invisible structures.

In the next part of this chapter, I introduce concepts from entrepreneurship studies to broaden the discussion.

**Part two: Entrepreneurship**

This section starts with a brief overview of aspects of entrepreneurship research to historicise the discipline and as an introduction to more recent developments in the field. Entrepreneurship research has tended to be dominated by US academics and to either focus on the economic benefits of entrepreneurship or on the entrepreneur’s character and personal attributes
(Jones and Spicer, 2009, Hjorth and Steyaert, 2009). There is an assumption that entrepreneurship is a force for good, with little critical debate of the academic discipline or of the practice. Hjorth and Steyaert (2009) suggest that a Schumpeterian-style ‘creative destruction’ might enable us to explore alternative models of entrepreneurship from established schools of thought. They suggest an opportunity to re-imagine what entrepreneurship is or could be, particularly within the context of Europe as opposed to US models. My aim is firstly to capture the discourses which influence our thinking about entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur, and then to reveal new perspectives to inform cultural entrepreneurship.

**Entrepreneurship research**

The study of entrepreneurship has historically been dominated by western theories of economics, situating the entrepreneur within an economic landscape, analysing the dynamic impact of his/her role. Classical economic theory attempts to find an equilibrium in the economy and while it understands that issues such as politics and the environment contribute a level of disruption, along with entrepreneurs, it does not recognise this as the ‘norm’. According to Kirby, the central principle is that ‘the economy can be modelled as a system in which equilibrium is attainable’ (Kirby, 2003, p.14). This equilibrium assumes that economic forces are balanced; that supply and demand are equal in a free market economy with no external forces unsettling this balance. Economic theories are based on observing evidence and projecting potential trends as a result. However, it is now recognised that there are limitations to approaching entrepreneurship from a purely economic
viewpoint, and new perspectives are emerging. The two important strands of entrepreneurship which relate to an understanding of cultural entrepreneurs are the way in which entrepreneurship has seeped into professional work generally, and the idea of the entrepreneurial identity.

Starting with the well-known management guru, Peter Drucker, entrepreneurship was redefined for a broad range of environments, within institutions or through individual endeavour. Drucker (1985) suggests that examples of entrepreneurship are found in employees and employers, small and large, private or public. He argues that innovation and entrepreneurship are disciplines to be developed systematically in an organisation for development and survival. His approach to entrepreneurship is as a discipline which can be learned and can be made to be systematic and part of the management process. It is not about luck or genius. Drucker represents an aspect of entrepreneurship literature at a point of convergence with strategic management which tends to be focused on large corporations. But, entrepreneurship in corporate management is very different from small business practice (Rae, 2007, p.174). Entrepreneurship in management is less about the type of ‘disruptive’ practice described by Schumpeter and more focused on the development of management theory and practice discussed in Boltanski and Chiapello’s work.

Schumpeter’s model of the entrepreneur is that of an innovator, one who disrupts the general equilibrium and in so doing, opens up new markets, captures a supply source and develops a new business, organisation or even industry (Kirby, 2003). The entrepreneur is seen to be deliberately innovating to create strategies for growth and profit, and ultimately playing a key role ‘as
Schumpeter has been highly influential in associating innovation with entrepreneurship and the idea of creative disruption, creating the context for work such as *The Innovator’s Dilemma* by Clayton Christenson. Schumpeter’s theory is dependent on the individual entrepreneur’s ability and personal traits leading to the notion of the characteristics of the entrepreneur as risk taker.

So far, I have presented two different models of entrepreneurship, Drucker’s model for corporate management and Schumpeter’s maverick entrepreneur. The notion of an individual who embodies entrepreneurial attributes is also popular in academia with implications for those studying to become entrepreneurs of the future.

The literature focused on personality traits has played a role in creating the popular image of the entrepreneur understood as being a particular ‘type’; for example celebrities such as Richard Branson, Bill Gates and Alan Sugar. Kirby’s (2003) definition combines management and individual attributes providing an idealised version the entrepreneur.

An entrepreneur is an individual who establishes and manages a business for the principal purposes of profit and growth. The entrepreneur is characterised principally by innovative behaviour and will employ strategic management practices in the business. (Kirby, 2003, p.10)

While personality and behavioural definitions for entrepreneurship are attractive as a means of describing a complex activity, this can be reductive and, as Kirby argues by quoting Lessem: ‘there is, in fact, no such thing as
an entrepreneur – no single individual who displays, in equal degree, the full range of entrepreneurial attributes’ (Kirby, 2003, p.11). Rae (2007) describes a tension between positivist ideologies of entrepreneurship, seeking to demonstrate ‘truths’, and the interpretive approaches which explore subjective experience and social context.

Dominant models of entrepreneurship have been useful to governments and policymakers but they do not reflect the lived experience. The pressures of allocating resource leads to generalisations for the sake of decision making and offers little consideration for the subjective and lived experience of entrepreneurship, leading to a tendency to over simplify entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur, producing a single perspective (Rae, 2007).

More recent entrepreneurship research has taken a broader view, from different disciplines, taking into account the context for entrepreneurship within personality and behaviour-based theories. Jones and Spicer (2009) invite us to consider the idea that the reason why academics have found it difficult to categorise the entrepreneur in a definitive way is not necessarily a failure on their behalf (on behalf of the researchers), but because it has evolved in academia or as a concept rather than reflecting lived experience. Provocatively the authors propose the idea that 'entrepreneurship discourse does not exist' (Jones and Spicer, 2009, p.38), opening up the opportunity to reflect on who is an entrepreneur.

This perspective invites an exploration of entrepreneurial activities from marginalised groups, for instance from women and from ‘informal' entrepreneurship (forms of illegal entrepreneurial activities) (Webb et al.,
2009). Certain activities and individuals have largely been ignored overlooking many positive and negative impacts including for example the emancipatory role of entrepreneurship as an act of social change (Al-Dajani and Carter, 2010).

Although the academic subject is being reviewed, popular assumptions about the entrepreneur are pervasive across the media including television shows such as The Apprentice and Dragon’s Den. The work of Couldry and Littler (2011, p.265) suggests that this tends towards seeing the entrepreneur as having a fixed identity, perceived as a set of attributes defined by the narratives associated with the celebrity entrepreneur and characterised by internationally recognised individuals, Richard Branson for instance. In that context the identity of the entrepreneur is described as an individual’s life story, often achieving entrepreneurial success in the face of adversity, thus creating a strong association with the innate attributes of the entrepreneur acting as an autonomous ‘free agent’, and often against all the odds. It is these images of the entrepreneur that most of us, including policymakers, cultural entrepreneurs and academic scholars refer to when discussing entrepreneurship. The critique of neo-liberalism and entrepreneurship appears to adopt the generally accepted notion of the entrepreneur, such as being flexible, passionate, a risk taker and so on (Robinson, 2014). The key question is that while policymakers are encouraging conventional ideas of entrepreneurship, does the lived experience resemble this mythical figure of the entrepreneur?

through their study of Michael O’Leary, Chief Executive of the airline Ryanair. O’Leary is described as actively performing the maverick entrepreneur, utilising this role as a means of generating support from consumers.

…O’Leary has skilfully promoted his budget airline by drawing down the ideology residing in entrepreneurial discourse. His rhetoric resounds with the implicit logic of creative destruction: innovation; change and value creation for the customer. (Warren and Anderson, 2009, p. 161).

Performance suggests acting a part, the part of the stereotypical entrepreneur. In the television show The Apprentice, Couldry and Littler (2011) find a playfulness with the ‘reality’ of enterprise as normalised through the contestants’ performance on screen, emphasising values such as passion and competitiveness as positive and highly desirable. An interesting contradiction is revealed when the idea of the ‘free’ or maverick entrepreneur is linked to the notion of performing the entrepreneur through a set of behaviours normalised by popular myths and narratives. Through these studies it appears that the mantle of the entrepreneur is a form of work identity which is certainly not core to a person, and which individuals adopt when and if necessary. To further illustrate the point, albeit from a different perspective, Smith’s (2009) work highlights how narratives of an entrepreneurial identity can be performed and potentially subverted.

The Diva storyline does appear to be an alternative social construct of female entrepreneurship through which women can engage with the
troublesome masculine construct that is entrepreneurship. (Smith, 2009, p.14)

According to Smith’s research, typical entrepreneurial attributes demonstrated by celebrity female entrepreneurs demonise women as ‘divas’ (2009) in popular media, in stark contrast with male counterparts who tend to be celebrated. The media propagates restricted depictions of the entrepreneur as acceptable, and in this case the performance takes on a ‘diva storyline’, adapting the conventional male model of the entrepreneur.

Although entrepreneurship theories based on personal traits and the idea of the ‘born’ entrepreneur narrative are problematic, the resulting construct, the fixed identity of the entrepreneur, has the potential to inform this research. The entrepreneur becomes an identity which can be borrowed, adopted, or rejected, knowingly or not.

Chell’s (2008) research into the entrepreneurial personality compares, for instance, entrepreneurs with non-entrepreneurs, distinguishing between intentional behaviour and outcomes. Nascent entrepreneurs and serial entrepreneurs are also compared, revealing differences in behaviour between the two, based on their experience, their approach to searching for information and recognising opportunities. For Chell (2008), the tension between behaviour and personality traits raises a chicken and egg question: does the personality dictate certain behaviours or do certain behaviours (which could be learned) lead to the development of certain personality trait? Furthermore, even when learned, entrepreneurial traits do not become fixed, they can be rejected in certain circumstances. By contextualising the
entrepreneur, Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010) suggest that insights into the relational and societal aspects in entrepreneurship formation offer alternative entrepreneurial identities.

Steyaert and Hjorth have played a significant role in encouraging alternative narratives through their series of books, *Movements in Entrepreneurship*, developed from workshops and events specifically aimed at advancing entrepreneurship research. The authors brought together academics and collaborators to initiate a disruption of the existing paradigms in entrepreneurship theory. Unconventional examples of entrepreneurship introduce the experience of non-traditional business models such as that of the Hultsfred rock festival (Steyaert and Hjorth, 2006).

Besides the call for more attention to multi-paradigmatic and multi-disciplinary issues, Steyaert and Katz [2004, p. 181] suggest that entrepreneurship should be studied as a societal phenomenon rather than purely as an economic reality with a view to the generation of practical knowledge. (Chell and Karataş-Özkınan, 2010, p. 26)

In areas such as social entrepreneurship, Steyaert and Hjorth (2006) describe the academic literature as slow to catch up in comparison with policy on the subject and the practice of social enterprise itself. In their research into indigenous communities, for instance, Anderson et al. offer a perspective on social entrepreneurship by suggesting that it consists ‘not only of economic prosperity, but also includes collective cultural and social identity and well-being’ (Anderson et al., 2006, p.75). In this context, entrepreneurship can be community based and is part of the established field
of ‘development studies’. It is perceived as an ‘equalizer in a meritocratic universe’ supporting social, cultural and economic development as depicted in Al-Dajani and Carter’s research into female entrepreneurship in Jordan (2010). The voice of ‘the other’ in the form of indigenous entrepreneurs depicted as ‘barefoot entrepreneurs’, from marginal and poor backgrounds, offers different identities and challenges the purely economic concept of entrepreneurship (Imas et al., 2012). Entrepreneurial behaviours and identities can emerge through the interplay between agency and structures (economic, legal and political), a space in which collectively, actors shape their environment and challenge normative behaviours. These challenges can fundamentally change the lives and economic prospects of groups of people, such as the case of the ‘barefoot entrepreneurs’ (Imas et al., 2012) or in more subtle ways, as presented in Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s study of nascent entrepreneurs (2010).

Adding to the critical debate is the work of researchers exploring gender and entrepreneurship which has tended to cluster around the International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship and, in the UK, Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship and Gender and Enterprise Network (ISBE GEN). Surprisingly, given the amount of gender and feminist research in other disciplines, within entrepreneurship theories there has been a paucity of research until the mid 2000s (Brush et al., 2009; De Bruin et al., 2006).

This focus on entrepreneurship as ‘desirable’ economic activity, perceived unquestioningly as positive, obscures important questions: of identity, phenomenology, ideology and relations of power. Few studies have aimed at ‘peeling away’ such ‘layers of ideological
obscuration’ [Martin, 1990] to engage openly with the dark sides – the contradictions, paradoxes, ambiguities and tensions at the heart of ‘entrepreneurship’. (Tedmanson et al., 2012, p. 532)

Gendered viewpoints contest dominant personality-based theories predominantly by making use of a social constructivism to investigate new narratives (Brush et al., 2009, p.16). This agenda also seeks to reveal inequalities in the research and in practice, by analysing gendered stereotypes in which women are constructed as ‘deviant from the (male) norm’ (Tedmanson et al., 2012, p. 534).

A gendered perspective on self-employment raises relevant questions for the cultural sector, such as the need for a less simple dichotomy between ‘forced’ and ‘voluntary’ entrepreneurship (Hughes, 2003, p.450). For instance, those initially pushed into self-employment who have little interested in being an employee again, or those who might consider employment but only on certain terms (Hughes, 2003). As Oakley (2014) points out, in the cultural sector there is a level of ‘forced entrepreneurship’ but this is not unique to the cultural sector.

In her analysis of gender and contemporary work practices, Adkins (1999) suggests that individualisation is perceived as relieving people from the constraints of traditional roles as how they relate to gender and labour markets. However, Adkins argues that ‘far from being transgressive of the social categories of gender, individualization may re-embed ‘women’ in new socialities’ (1999, p.136). By describing the ‘retraditionalization of gender’ (1999, p.129), Adkins suggests in individualised work, gender demarcations
might be just as significant. For instance, instead of the 'glass ceilings' of traditional organisations, Ezzedeen and Zikic (2011) describe women experiencing opposition based on the challenges of managing a work-family balance and levels of resistance from others in accepting women as entrepreneurs in male dominated sectors.

Campbell argues that much entrepreneurship theory focuses on the study of growth-orientated technology based enterprises and therefore tends to exclude female entrepreneurship which exists in many other areas (Campbell, 2009, p.194). By using Foucault’s concept of discourse, Campbell suggests that discourses of entrepreneurship are systems of rules for what can be said, when and by whom. In other words they are restricted by the language and published material on the subject of entrepreneurship. Campbell (2009) states that this is where the ‘power’ lies and can distort a narrative or present a narrative as seen through the lens of that place of power. If we accept Foucault’s theory on discursive practices, the implication from a feminist perspective is that entrepreneurship theory is gender biased and describes norms and concepts relating to male orientated entrepreneurship.

As I have demonstrated, dominant discourses are being questioned by entrepreneurship studies scholars who seek to broaden the field of study, exploring, for instance, gendered perspectives. From a critical perspective, the divergent experiences of women and men present new problems for entrepreneurship studies. For my study of cultural entrepreneurship, this offers critical insights and an opportunity to re-think entrepreneurship.
Entrepreneurship research in the Cultural industries

New perspectives can also be found in literature which investigates entrepreneurship in the so-called ‘creative industries’, predominantly research from business or entrepreneurship scholars. The literature I draw on has focused on the sector as a result of recent cultural policy emphasising the nature of enterprise practice in the cultural sector, including ways in which this could inform entrepreneurship studies.

The critique of cultural entrepreneurship, such as that described in the first part of this chapter (see for instance McRobbie, 1999; Gill and Pratt, 2008), is rarely discussed or acknowledged in studies which are predominantly from a business studies perspective. Instead, there is a tendency to view the cultural industries as being in need of support, to encourage entrepreneurship in particular through curriculum development (see Mason et al., 2012). This type of research has not embraced the idea of a critique of entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur (see Jones and Spicer, 2009 and Hjorth and Stayaert, 2009), preferring to accept entrepreneurship as a given paradigm.

Typical of the non-critical literature are the following books: *Entrepreneurship in the Creative Industries; An International Perspective* edited by Henry (2007) and more recently *Entrepreneurship and the Creative Economy: Process, Practice and Policy* edited by Henry and De Bruin (2011). Both publications assemble authors investigating the economic significance of the sector and observing specific characteristics of cultural entrepreneurs. For instance, De Bruin (2007) observes collaborations between state and
entrepreneurs in New Zealand’s film industry as evidence of entrepreneurship with policymakers. While this challenges the assumption that entrepreneurs do not need state intervention, it nevertheless tends to celebrate the potential of entrepreneurship.

Rae (2007) sees cultural entrepreneurs as trend setters and gatekeepers of cultural products who at times might struggle for financial success and may not be perceived as professional. Rae (2007) concedes that it can be a challenge transforming creative ideas into viable enterprises and that New Labour policies created high expectations for the UK’s cultural industries.

The tension between artistic aspirations and business is discussed by Beaven (2012) in her study of nascent music entrepreneurs from a conservatoire in the UK, as the ‘tactical’ and ‘pragmatic’ intent of music students. Beaven (2012) argues that nascent music entrepreneurs display ‘tactical’ intent where ventures are established to support their artistic goals and ‘pragmatic’ intent where they disregard ventures which turn out to not support artistic goals. Beaven’s findings suggest that:

...whilst the literature might suggest that the entrepreneurs would take sequential paths in fairly straight lines through the nascency journey, rather like the metaphoric climbing of a ladder, they did not. Instead movement through a set of complex “journey shapes”, sometimes over an extended period, was observed in the participants. (Beaven, 2012, p.12)

Observing the non-linear entrepreneurial process contributes to the body of research which seeks to reveal complexity in entrepreneurship. This is a
perspective which suggests unconventional entrepreneurial actions based on values other than growth and business success. Fuller et al. (2009) see an opportunity to explore new methodologies for capturing ‘value creating systems’ in cultural entrepreneurship. In this context, the cultural industries are perceived as offering challenging and multiple contexts for entrepreneurship, hence the perceived need for Creative Methodologies for Understanding a Creative Industry (Fuller et al., 2009).

Shaw et al. (2010) find the role of networks in embedding entrepreneurship in cultural industry firms offers insights into the social and context specific dimension of entrepreneurship.

...by revealing that a strong network orientation combined with a portfolio of strategically targeted networking activities are integral to this process, we provide deeper understanding of the role of agency and use of networks as embedding mechanisms. (Shaw et al., 2010, p.2)

Shaw et al.’s (2010) empirical research attempts to capture the richness of personal agency within networks drawing on the individual entrepreneur’s cultural capital. The case study approach provides detailed evidence and insights into the nature of entrepreneurial agency when an entrepreneur is embedded within the cultural industries (2010, p.9). This approach reveals the importance of detailed studies to understand the specificity of cultural entrepreneurship.

Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010) combine the micro-individual level of human agency with meso and macro environments. The importance of this method
is that it does not isolate individual agency from the industry context and external factors such as market forces and a general enterprise culture. A multilayered understanding of entrepreneurship embeds cultural entrepreneurship in a socio-cultural and economic milieu, enabling a better analysis of social and cultural capital (Chell and Karataş-Özkan, 2010, p. 213).

It is these new aspects of entrepreneurship research which offer the most fruitful opportunities for a study of cultural entrepreneurs. An exploration of the relationship between personal agency and the social, political and economic context suggests a dynamic milieu for research. I argue that a study of the lived experience reveals levels of personal agency within a relational context. Entrepreneurial modes of work are too often viewed as fixed and based on popular myths and dominant discourses. The question for this study is how do cultural workers perform the role of entrepreneur? Can dominant and popular notions of the entrepreneur be subverted? Is it possible to be entrepreneurial and demonstrate moral and social objectives as part of one’s working practice? And finally, can actors working within a milieu such as Birmingham, shape structures and create a space to stimulate alternative models of entrepreneurship, individually and collectively? In the final part of this chapter, I explore identity and cultural entrepreneurship to set out a framework for the research.

**Part three: Identity, agency and structure**

Considering alternative forms of entrepreneurship creates an opportunity to question assumptions and discover new insights for an understanding of
cultural entrepreneurship. In the final part of this chapter, I argue for a study of the lived experience of cultural entrepreneurship, framed by theories of identity and set within a social, relational context. My approach draws on research influenced by the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu but it does not aim to test or apply a strict Bourdieusian methodology. Rather, it is inspired by Bourdieu and scholars who have utilised his framework to explore cultural entrepreneurship within a social context. My aim is to present a contextualised experience of cultural entrepreneurship, drawing on notions of identity, or identities, as emerging from the tension between personal agency and structure.

Identity

There has been a significant growth in research into identity from a range of academic disciplines including the human and social sciences (du Gay, 2007). As a means of challenging social norms, in particular western notions of identity, cultural identities such as gender, race, ethnicity or sexual orientation, are explored and contested. For this study, I begin with the field of cultural studies, historicised by Ann Gray through its association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham (Gray, 2003).

Gray describes the CCCS as bringing together academics from different disciplines, who were critical of existing conventions and wanted to connect with cultural politics outside of the academy. Of particular interest for this research is the idea that they were concerned with the lived experience of producing culture and notions of resistance and power. Ultimately, key
figures at the CCCS such as the late Stuart Hall sought to reveal the inequalities resulting from capitalism through the exploration of popular culture. In problematising this dynamic, Hall and other cultural theorists adopted an anti-reductionist method, linking subjective experience with wider social structures (Gray, 2003). The result of these investigations, set in a specific social context, reveal the processes by which identity, meaning and culture are produced.

The value of the concept is that it avoids a deterministic and mechanical model in which powerful social structures and ideologies shape who we are. Rather, it enables an exploration of the relationships between subjects and different, if powerful, discursive elements. In the more deterministic models of ‘individual’ and ‘society’ there is little space for the active human agent as one who can operate within particular contexts and through which specific articulations of subjectivity and identity can be constructed. (Gray, 2003, p.32).

Similarly, Burr (1995) argues that knowledge is constructed between people within a historical and cultural context. A shift away from static personal traits, emphasises a dynamic process rather than a fixed structure (Burr, 1995, p.8). According to Burr, this approach is partly based on Foucault’s work, which stresses the ‘constructive power of language’ and the impact on creating historically and culturally specific knowledge. Burr rejects the idea of pre-determined characteristics, favouring ‘a multiplicity of potential selves which are not necessarily consistent with each other’ (Burr, 1995, p.29).
When considering the notion of performing the identity of the entrepreneur, this ‘act’ is only one facet of a person’s identity.

Furthermore, individuals can play an active role in re-shaping themselves and their world, as Holland et al. (2003) explain. This is explored by revealing the dichotomy between humans as products of social discipline and the producers of the social worlds in which they live. Holland et al (2003) conceive of individuals as having no fixed identity but, rather, as having contradictory identities. Drawing from Bakhtin and Vygotsky, a distinction is made between exploring identity through social structures such as gender, and the ‘grounding of cultural identities in the specific worlds of which they are a part’ (Holland et al., 2003, p.7).

I make a parallel with the world of cultural workers, a socially constructed world which could be defined as the world of Birmingham-based cultural entrepreneurs. In explorations of identity, there is a tendency to focus on behaviours which follow cultural principles or norms. For instance, some ethnographic research will identify cultural patterns and behaviours in an attempt to reveal the ‘culture’ of a group of people. As du Gay (2007) suggests, this can lead to predetermined outcomes. What is more, problems arise when behaviour is not predictable and exceptions to the ‘rule’ are too frequent (du Gay, 2007). Holland et al. (2003) present the idea of ‘improvisation’ as demonstrating behaviour which sits outside the norm or which is not culturally predictable. It is suggested that specific social circumstances can have a significant impact on an individual’s actions: a need to fit with social norms or to subvert them, rejecting the expected behaviour in favour of an alternative attitude. For instance, in this study it
would be too easy to draw on common characteristics of the cultural entrepreneurs as ‘creative’, ‘informal’ and ‘networked’, anticipating a version of these characteristics to depict an established cultural identity (Bilton, 1999). Following du Gay and others, I describe a range of experiences and identities which allows for the possibility of revealing ‘improvisations’ or ‘alternative’ perspectives. As Hall (1996) emphasises, identity is constructed across different contexts, positions and discourses, and presents itself as unstable.

Although western theory has undervalued the lived experience, the inclusion of previously unheard voices as testimony alone does not in itself radically challenge existing paradigms (Hall, 1996). Gray refers to Probyn to help clarify the importance of an analytical mechanism to engage theoretically with accounts of the lived experience (Gray, 2003, p.32). In other words, a critical and analytical approach should present new epistemological positions to contest conventional wisdom. As discussed earlier, the critical debates emerging in entrepreneurship theory, for instance female entrepreneurship and social enterprise, offer new insights into social and political discourses within entrepreneurship as well as new models for the elusive entrepreneur. The balance between researching the lived experience and critical theories is debated by du Gay (2007) who states that theoretical positions can dominate and not allow the research to reveal new insights. In particular, du Gay has been critical of aspects of identity theory which he describes as running ‘out of steam’ (2007, p.1).

‘Social’ constructionism, or ‘theoretical’ identity work, dictates its conclusions in advance, and also dictates the reaching of the same
conclusions in all cases. It substitutes philosophical, preponderantly metaphysical, argument for empirical description. (du Gay, 2007, p. 7)

In other words, du Gay (2007) suggests that an emphasis on a philosophical point of view and a lack of attention to empirical data results in predetermined research. The process illustrates a lack of respect for the individual being researched by applying, as du Gay (2007) implies, a patronising critique of the subject being researched. Instead, du Gay suggests the need to shift away from purely theoretical accounts of identity and subjectivity, towards a ‘historical and sociological understanding of the specific forms of personhood that individuals come to acquire in distinctive settings’ (2007, p.13).

Scholars need to demonstrate a level of respect for the individual being researched without imposing on him or her predetermined theories (du Gay, 2007). Drawing on Rorty’s work, du Gay argues for a:

…strongly contextualised approach, with its privileging of description rather than theoretical colonization or (social) reconstruction; an approach that refuses to provide a general answer to the question: how are entities identified across contexts? Instead it accepts that since these questions and contexts are particular ‘all the way up and all the way down’ [Rorty, 1998:8], questions about identifying entities across contexts are themselves given their sense and direction by the context within which they arise. (du Gay, 2007, p.12)

The distinctive setting of an organisation is important because it has a history and particular ethics. The idea of the banal and the significance of invisible
detail can contextualise the qualities of a person. Individuals acquire specific capacities to project distinctive personae and assume a role which they can perform in a work context. The embeddedness of the cultural entrepreneur can act as a framework for specific types of work and values (Banks, 2006, p. 466). Du Gay’s (2007) concept of personhood is instructive for investigating how individuals can assume certain attributes, become a certain kind of person, within a context such as work. Du Gay describes his approach as involving:

A shift away from general social and cultural theoretical accounts concerning the formation of ‘subjectivity’ and ‘identity’ towards an understanding of the specific forms of ‘personhood’ that individuals acquire as a result of their immersion in, or subjection to, particular normative and technical regimes of conduct (du Gay, 2007, p.11).

As discussed earlier this is important because it does not assume that an individual has a fixed identity; rather, it suggests that within a particular milieu, a person can adopt certain behaviours, for instance, that of being a typical entrepreneur. An examination of the context in which this ‘becoming’ or ‘acquiring’ takes place is explored by incorporating the everyday along with the broader issues. So, in this study, the cultural entrepreneur’s milieu comprises of personal circumstances which are given equal significance to his or her working environment and broader policy issues.

My research attempts to do this by exploring a range of contexts for individual narratives: the personal stories and broader policy situated within Birmingham’s cultural milieu. Taylor and Littleton (2013) argue that these
contexts are multiple and identities are continuously negotiated and constrained by the contemporary cultural worker.

A creative identity is not a simple self-categorization and nor is it adopted ‘once and for all’… who people are, and who they can become, is understood to be shaped by larger social contexts including through the way these people are positioned by others, the cultural or discursive resources available, and an ongoing project of self-making which is both active and constrained. (Taylor and Littleton, 2013, p.158-159)

As Gray (2003) suggests an articulation of the lived experience enables an exploration of the relationships between subjects and different, discursive elements. Importantly, from a cultural studies perspective, theorising experience, as a space in which identities are ‘shaped and constructed’, informs broader political and critical debates (Gray, 2003, p.25).

It is this context-specific approach which I seek to pursue when investigating the cultural worker’s experience of entrepreneurship. I argue that this articulates the theoretical framework of the thesis, in which I seek to develop the notion of identity as a means of exploring cultural workers as active agents, albeit within restricting structures. Interviews with cultural entrepreneurs create a vignette into their experience, drawing on self-efficacy and personal agency as expressed in that moment. Drawing on all aspects of their experience, cultural entrepreneurs negotiate identities and tell their ‘story’ or ‘act out’ a subjective position through the process of the interview or the ‘talk’ (Taylor and Littleton, 2013, p.159). The narrative they
convey borrows from fixed and popular identities such as that of the entrepreneur or the bohemian artist. Taylor and Littleton (2008) refer to a similar process as ‘repertoires’, recognised clichés, which can be agreed or resisted when a participant talks about themself. Using these ‘characters’, participants are playful with their own identities, often describing their sense of themselves in relation to others.

For this study, the social contexts in which cultural entrepreneurs work, Birmingham’s cultural milieu, is the space in which these identities are performed and tested. They need not be static and are likely to adapt as the landscape around the cultural entrepreneurs changes, for instance, through policies or as they progress from nascent to established cultural entrepreneurs. In the next section, I propose that social dynamics and the embedded nature of cultural entrepreneurship creates the opportunity to consider diverse versions of the entrepreneur. The notion of agency is further explored to articulate its use and value for the study of the lived experience of cultural entrepreneurship.

**Context: agency and structure in entrepreneurship**

In advancing entrepreneurship studies, Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010) draw on sociology to establish the notion that human beings are social and they influence the social world in which they are active. This commitment to the multiplicity of actively constructed personalities or realities counteracts preceding positivist theories found in dominant entrepreneurship research. This creates the opportunity to explore the lived experience of individuals who negotiate and manipulate their reality (Chell and Karataş-Özkan, 2010,
p. 59). It takes into account human agency as part of the description of entrepreneurship, operating within multiple contexts, allowing a more holistic representation of entrepreneurship, favouring the entrepreneur’s experience. This approach is underpinned by Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s (2010) adaptation of Bourdieu’s theoretical construct.

As Hesmondhalgh (2006) describes, Bourdieu is particularly useful for explorations of cultural labour because he asks us to investigate the context in which cultural workers are formed as well as the processes they use. Bourdieu reveals the hidden structures behind cultural production; the limited possibility of individual workers acting autonomously. This takes us away from the notion of the genius artist, by theorising the interconnectedness between the environment, the position and level of autonomy of individual actors (Hesmondhalgh, 2006, p.212).

The great effectiveness of Bourdieu’s sociology of cultural production stems from the balance achieved between, on the one hand, the emphasis on the drive for autonomy characteristic of the field of cultural production from the early 19th century onwards, and, on the other, his stress on the interconnectedness of the field of cultural production with other fields, especially the economic and political fields constituting the ‘field of power’, but also the educational and intellectual fields… What is more, Bourdieu’s model of the two sub-fields, mass and restricted production, offers the potential to make sense of a whole series of everyday actions and discourses in the making of symbolic goods. (Hesmondhalgh, 2006, p. 217).
The notion of a relationship or tension between the milieu in which cultural entrepreneurs work and personal or collective agency is particularly appropriate for a study which seeks to take account of both individual experience and the broader context for cultural entrepreneurship.

In table 1, I interpret their model for this study, identifying ‘levels’ in relation to Birmingham’s cultural entrepreneur and the milieu in which they work. The milieu depicts the structures (macro and meso levels) encompassing formal institutions, policies and key people, in which agents works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bourdieu’s Conceptual tools</th>
<th>Interpretation to this research project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-individual level</td>
<td>Cultural entrepreneurs’ biographies, capitals, dispositions, and entrepreneurial motivations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions, capital, position-taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso-relational level</td>
<td>Cultural industries community in Birmingham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourdieu's 'habitus'</td>
<td>Individuals operating within a network of cultural entrepreneurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients, mentors, suppliers, Arts Council England officers, Business Link officers, regional creative and cultural industry officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socially acceptable ways of undertaking cultural work in Birmingham’s cultural milieu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-contextual level</td>
<td>A post-Thatcher enterprise culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Bourdieu’s conceptual framework, initially adapted from Chell and Karataş-Özkan and reworked for this study (2010, p.87).

As the table demonstrates, the micro-individual level includes personal motivations and Bourdieu’s capitals (social, cultural and symbolic) which I shall return to at the end of the chapter. This context relates to an understanding of relational interactions, positions and possibilities for the individual cultural entrepreneur. Agentic roles can emerge through comparisons with others in the network, antagonistically or in keeping with social norms.

Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010) describe Bourdieu’s notion of habitus as the meso level: the collective ways of thinking and acting, consciously or not. The individual’s habitus, or meso-level, is characterised by multiple social engagements within the field, which for my research tends to be specific to Birmingham’s cultural milieu. Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010) make a distinction between ‘culture’ and ‘habitus’ suggesting that habitus, as a concept, takes account of ‘the individual’ to a greater extent than ‘culture’.
The role of individual history and human agency is acknowledged and combined with a system of meanings, beliefs and perceptions to form common experiences, and informs individual behaviour. Habitus embodies certain principles such as ways of behaving which can be developed through formal environments such as professional training, or through less formal relationships with peers, which are acceptable or considered to be the ‘norm’ within that context. Habitus can be seen as the professional environment in which cultural entrepreneurs operate, such as co-working spaces, cafés in cultural quarters and at networking events. In summary, for Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010), Bourdieu’s notion of habitus is made up of three elements: firstly, knowledge based on our belief system; secondly, disposition to certain attitudes based on our values; and thirdly human agency acting in the moment by, consciously or not, making practical choices (2010). The implication for this study is that it is in the metaphorical space between structure and agency, as articulated in the cultural entrepreneur’s narrative, that identities are formed.

The macro-level reflects key policies and the broader field of practice, both cultural work and entrepreneurship, embodied by relevant institutions, individuals and policies (2010, p.27-28). Bourdieu describes the field as the ‘space of possibles’ (1993, p.179), a space in which cultural producers have a common system of references or a common framework, more or less understood by all actors within the field. For this research, the field includes dominant ideas of the entrepreneur as well as identities such as the bohemian artist (Taylor and Littleton, 2013).
The theory being developed by Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010) is that personal agency plays a role in creating the structure and that structural frameworks influence agentic possibilities. In other words, the context in which an individual operates and in which they create their identity is, at least partly, filtered through their own actions. This position is akin to Bourdieu’s version of a strategic individual, motivated by ‘capital accumulation’ (Adkins, 2004, p.11). Instead of being passive, cultural entrepreneurs can choose how to conduct themselves and can revise or influence the entrepreneurial context in which they work, for their commercial advantage.

In Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s (2010) interpretation of Bourdieu, agentic actions are discussed as an entrepreneurs becoming pro-active, using diverse forms of capital to enhance opportunities for work, learning and development.

…nascent entrepreneurship is a social process whereby nascent entrepreneurs create a new venture to actualise their ideas for a product, service or process by relationally and relentlessly pursuing business opportunities; and by developing their agentic and performative capacity as entrepreneurs so that they can engage in strategic exchange of relationships. (Chell and Karataş-Özkan, 2010, p. 191)

Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010) discuss this in relation to opportunities for the entrepreneur through his or her embedded position within a social and economic structure, but they do not seek to be critical of entrepreneurship or entrepreneurial modes of work, as part of their study. This is an important
distinction between Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s (2010) and the position taken by critical theorists, which tends to suggest more limited opportunities for contesting the challenges of entrepreneurship (McRobbie, 2002 and Oakley, 2014).

Adkins (2004) and McNay (2004) argue that this is potentially in conflict with an interpretation of Bourdieu’s idea of an individual as being confined to a particular social world. The possibility for agentic action is limited and defined by a relatively narrow context.

[Bourdieu] significantly underestimates the autonomy of agents because of the tendency to reduce symbolic relations to pre-given social relations. This is evident in the conventionalism of his work on the performative – that language derives its symbolic force from the surrounding context – which underplays the extent to which the autonomy of language means that it can be used as a tool to subvert dominant power relations. (McNay, 2004, p.182).

Consequently, this denies social actors their capacity for reflexivity, suggesting that individuals are trapped within structures (McNay, 2004, p.178). Skeggs describes this as both the use and limits of Bourdieu, in particular his emphasis on order and structure, omitting the personal experience and values such as ‘altruism, integrity, loyalty and investment in others’ (2004, p.29). In her article, McNay (2004) finds that by exploring subjective experience within relational social contexts, it is possible to strengthen the concept of agency. Drawing on Skegg’s study of working class women, McNay (2004) finds that an exploration of the way in which
actors negotiate their position and power relations within a milieu, can only be achieved through an analysis of experience. In analysing pro-active and entrepreneurial cultural workers, Skegg’s critique might offer room to manoeuvre rather than the notion of being trapped within a rigid milieu. A study of mundane day to day experience might demonstrate diverse potential behaviours and actions as an aspect of managing entrepreneurial labour and professional identities.

Here, I draw on Banks (2006) who finds reflexivity in cultural entrepreneurs as potentially leading to new ‘moral’ values rather than strategically focused on commercial gain as Bourdieu contends. He states:

I argue that the blurring of boundaries between work and non-work (often seen as a detrimental impact of the new economy) can also provide conditions for the increased and overlap of hitherto separate realms of obligation (moral and contractual) that can interact to effect forms of workplace identity that exhibit morally complex characteristics, some of which are translatable into socially useful actions. (Banks, 2006, p. 461)

I seek to explore both the possibility and nature of agentic actions to enable alternative or less dominant positions to emerge, pushing the boundaries of our understanding of cultural entrepreneurship. Yet, as McNay states, ‘the understanding of social experience does not offer us a complete perspective in itself’ (2004, p. 184) but contextualising these unique perspectives uncovers the structures and powers at play. This position accepts the complexity of interactions and relationships in a social context, in which
cultural entrepreneurs respond to a continuously changing and evolving milieu. For this study, the agentic actions of cultural entrepreneurs involve more than a simple question of whether or how people control their actions through their personal determination. Agency suggests the possibility for intervention as cultural entrepreneurs move in and out of sites of power, both within their own personal worlds and within the broader milieu in which they work. The extent to which they can participate and negotiate a milieu based on the ‘structured mobility by which people are given access to particular kinds of places, and to the paths that allow one to move to and from such places’ (Grossberg, 1996, p.101-102).

In the final part of this chapter, I draw attention to methods for examining relational aspects of the research; the connections between cultural entrepreneurs and the context in which identities are formed.

**Networks and relationships**

Within a social context, relationships between individuals play a significant role in determining possibilities and restrictions for agentic actions. Yet, as discussed earlier, the networked aspects of entrepreneurship which have been much criticised by critical scholars.

For Oakley (2011), one of the failures of New Labour’s cultural policy was to over-emphasise the networked aspects of cultural work.

> We can see here New Labour rhetoric about entrepreneurship as distinct from the Thatcherite version, in its stress on the importance of collaborative networks [Bevir, 2005]. (Oakley, 2011, p.282)
In Oakley’s (2011) critique, collaborations and networks are part of New Labour’s efforts to develop adaptable and self-reliant individuals. Beyond this analysis of New Labour’s cultural policies, is it possible to find non-instrumental relationships, collaborations and networks amongst cultural entrepreneurs? Others argue, more optimistically, that people often use networks to re-invent and re-establish bonds of sociality. Despite the pressures on the precariously-employed to use relationships instrumentally, individuals are able to distinguish between market-governed relationships and social relations. Instrumental actions hide diverse motivations and rationales which need not exclude loyalty to others and a shared ethical stance towards work. As Banks argues, ‘progressive’ tendencies are ‘more prevalent amongst small, independent firms, artists and entrepreneurs, operating outside or at the margins of the conventional capitalistic cultural economy’ (Banks, 2007, p.101). How do cultural entrepreneurs perceive themselves within a small network such as Birmingham’s cultural milieu? How do they present their story in relation to others within the milieu? Are cultural entrepreneurs instrumental in their relationships, seeking what Bourdieu describes as ‘game-playing’ to further their personal ambitions? I explore the relational characteristics of cultural work with reference to Granovetter’s (1973) strong and weak ‘ties’ and to Bourdieu’s forms of capital.

Cultural entrepreneurs are deeply immersed in a network culture often described using Granovetter’s ‘weak ties’ and ‘strong ties’ (Lee, 2011, Oakley, 2009). Strong ties are based on bonds, forged around community, family and geography, which are close, intersecting and multi-functional.
Conversely, weak ties are based on the thin, impersonal trust of acquaintances. These are loose networks, which mean a shift from the ‘getting by’ dynamic of ‘bonding’ social capital to the ‘getting ahead’ culture that comes out of ‘bridging’ social capital (Lee, 2011, p. 554).

Oakley explores how strong and weak ties are employed as part of the production process, suggesting that strong ties are important at the early stages of a process when trust is key, while weak ties might offer more opportunities once an idea has been developed (Oakley, 2009). A strategic cultural entrepreneur will make use of weak ties to enhance his or her profile and gain new market opportunities. However, strong ties have an important role to play in a context such as Birmingham’s cultural milieu, a relatively small world in which many cultural entrepreneurs know each other. In a sector characterised by its informality, the nature and significance of strong and weak ties may reveal motivations and positioning within a network. I investigate strong and weak ties as a means of defining relations within a network but I also contest fixed notions of how relationships operate.

Granovetter’s (1973) theory provides an important function for observing instrumental motivations within networks, but is it too restricting as a means of gaining insights into the complexity of relationships?

Further insights into the importance of the relational aspects of cultural entrepreneurship are explored using Bourdieu’s forms of capital: cultural, social and symbolic. Lee (2011), Blair (2009) and Scott (2012) make use of the concept of capital to explore cultural networks and, in the case of Blair and Lee, specifically to expose the limitations and inequalities in highly networked activities such as film production (Blair, 2009; Lee, 2011). Being
‘in’ or ‘out’ of the network is dependent on one’s cultural and social capital which, as Lee (2011) explains, can result in discrimination for those without the appropriate capital. In informal networks, relationships and opportunities are shared through ‘word of mouth’, often leading to a lack of transparency. Lee’s (2011) research into the UK’s independent television industry demonstrates the lack of transparency in work which is facilitated by highly networked labour markets. Lee’s (2011) analysis draws on the significance of cultural and social capital as a person’s resource for succeeding in their career. Critically, he notes that:

One’s attitude towards networking and entrepreneurialism is to a certain extent determined by personal attributes, class, cultural capital and social position.’ (Lee, 2011, p. 562)

This, Lee (2011) argues, advances a particular style of production and importantly, demonstrates inequalities in the cultural industries. Lee (2011) draws on Granovetter’s notion of strong and weak ties to investigate the positioning of individuals within the network. Using this approach it is possible to examine relationships between cultural entrepreneurs; the jostling for position as articulated in the interviewees’ narrative. Lee’s (2011) study is across one industry sub-sector, independent television based in London, and his findings are pessimistic, limiting opportunities for work to those with the appropriate social and cultural capital. As with Banks’ (2006) work in Manchester, is it possible that in a city such as Birmingham, in which sub-sectors are networked, relationships are based on a range of different motivations? In this study, the complexity of relationships will be considered
in order to reveal how cultural entrepreneurs manage barriers and challenges associated with a critique of cultural industries’ networks.

Scott’s research into DIY music production applies Bourdieu’s theory to ‘interpret cultural entrepreneurs’ general economy of practices’ (2012, p. 238) but also revealing important social bonds. Scott (2012) describes ‘buzz’ as an important part of the necessary social, cultural and symbolic capital for cultural entrepreneurs to operate. Disentangling ideas of ‘buzz’, ‘alternative’ and ‘independent’ in the context of Bourdieu’s framework may offer insights into how cultural entrepreneurs negotiate entrepreneurial modes of work. Typically, the DIY producers described by Scott (2012) have low levels of economic capital but high levels of symbolic capital which they translate into ‘buzz’ and which may lead to economic capital, in due time. As Scott argues, by examining ‘buzz’ or the manner in which cultural entrepreneurs generate interest in their activities, he reveals ‘non-instrumental orientations’ (2012, p.251). In other words, and without diminishing the potential hardship resulting from a network culture, it may be possible to consider the relationships described by Scott (2012) as a source of support, pleasure and as identity enhancing.

The DIY producers described by Scott operate in a field of music production where cultural intermediaries, such as agents, facilitate entry to markets (2012). In Scott’s (2012) account, cultural entrepreneurs catch the attention of cultural intermediaries, to create a ‘buzz’ generated through social, cultural and symbolic capital. Cultural intermediaries are the brokers or gatekeepers between the cultural entrepreneurs and the market opportunity although the role of the cultural intermediary is increasingly blurred with that of the
entrepreneur. As Bilton (1999, p.29) argues, the cultural entrepreneurs are pragmatic individuals who work across networks and in multiple roles and are not confined to specific tasks. Significantly, being pragmatic need not be equivalent to acting in purely instrumental ways. The cultural entrepreneur’s actions, motivations and moral values will be determined by a range of factors, including their personal circumstances such as caring for a family or their background and family history.

The ‘buzz’ created through social and cultural capital can generate symbolic capital such as recognition through awards, prestige, winning talent competitions and being invited to take part in significant events or debates. Scott (2012) stresses Ellmeier’s (2003) idea of cultural entrepreneurs working ‘sans’ capital; in other words, with no or very little financial backing. Social, cultural and symbolic capital have a use-value in building a person’s identity and can go on to develop an exchange-value in systems of economic and symbolic capital. For instance, a cultural entrepreneur’s identity is part constructed by his or her ability to make use of the symbolic capital he or she generates through social and cultural capital. Drawing on Skegg, Scott states that:

[Skegg] argues that a defining feature of contemporary capitalism is how social, cultural and symbolic capitals have a use-value in building a person’s identity and an exchange-value in systems of economic and symbolic exchange. (Scott, 2012, p. 246)

Thus, Scott (2012) reflects on the idea that by increasing one’s social, cultural and symbolic capital, one creates a resource of oneself. In the case
of Scott’s (2012) research, the use-value which can be a poster or a website does not have the same potential as the symbolic capital generated by these commodities which might convert to economic capital. Collaborations and favours done for free can support a cultural entrepreneur’s sense of self, his or her identity as a cultural worker, building confidence. Taking for example the capital associated with a graphic designer producing a poster for a cultural entrepreneur’s music festival, the graphic designer, who is also a cultural entrepreneur, can convert the social and cultural capital invested in the music festival into symbolic capital for his/her own entrepreneurial activities, to get his or her next job. Given the connections and close relationships which can exist in a city such as Birmingham, Scott’s (2012) emphasis on how different forms of capital can be exchanged is important. The Birmingham-based cultural entrepreneurs I interview operate in a ‘small world’; a world in which capital and relationships are important for work but also as part of their identity and as a support system. Often, they are building their small enterprise through the symbolic capital and ‘buzz’ which they generate by doing unpaid work, favours for friends or through activities estimated to be good opportunities. A chance to shine, to win an award or to network with the right people might be perceived as part of building one’s cultural and symbolic capital for future (potentially paid) work. Equally, it is a space in which the embedded nature of work enables cultural entrepreneurs to shape and organise their work, despite structural confines and perhaps because of the relational aspects of their work. In his study of place and cultural ‘clusters’ in Manchester, Banks indicates ‘the renascent possibilities for alternative economies to flourish in discrete, and often marginalized,
urban milieus – ones populated by workers committed to a diverse array of aesthetic, communitarian and ethical (non-economic) values’ (Banks, 2007, p.14). The exchange of capital within these clusters is complex but by drawing on the cultural entrepreneur’s narrative, I hope to gain insights into the significance and function of different forms of capital within a specific urban milieu. Do relationships reflect the individualisation and lack of social bonds described by McRobbie (2002a)? How are relationships described and negotiated by cultural entrepreneurs?

Scott’s (2012) research draws attention to the link between identity construction and the cultural entrepreneur’s appropriation of symbolic capital. Scott (2012) also suggests that important social bonds are established between cultural entrepreneurs who support each other when working with few resources or funding. Like the barefoot entrepreneurs described by Imas et al. (2012), cultural workers are sometimes at a disadvantage and their survival tactics may have less to do with neo-liberalism than with a determination to change their community and challenge the status quo.

Birmingham’s cultural milieu creates the framework or structure in which the exchange of capital supports the ‘buzz’ generated by cultural entrepreneurs, but it also underpins support systems and relationships. Cultural workers do not operate in a vacuum but in a space with possibilities for individuals to perform diverse roles; sometimes for pragmatic reasons and at other times motivated by personal values. Embedded within a social context, there is the potential for cultural entrepreneurs to incorporate diverse rewards for their work. Empirical research based on Birmingham-based cultural entrepreneurs offers the chance to explore these questions.
Conclusion

I argue that it is important to ascertain the possibility of doing ‘good’ work from the perspective of demonstrating moral and ethical values (Banks, 2006) and in terms of fulfilling labour (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011). My research approach does not seek to avoid the important critique of cultural work which has sought to counteract an overoptimistic view of entrepreneurship. As Hesmondhalgh and Baker argue, ‘Underlying our research is the political principle that work needs to be made better, for more people’ (2011, p.10). I share this view and seek to make my contribution by analysing the personal accounts of individuals within a relational and societal context. An overview of research into cultural work has demonstrated the detailed analysis of some scholars, but also the lack of empirical data, specifically on cultural entrepreneurs. As du Gay (2007) argues, exploring the lived experience offers an opportunity to challenge assumptions and to uncover new ‘voices’.

From the perspective of entrepreneurship studies, this research reflects a growing appeal for non-conventional aspects of entrepreneurship to be studied as a means of developing a closer understanding or even ‘surprising’ the academic field of entrepreneurship studies (Steyaert and Hjorth, 2006, p.3). A critical perspective on current depictions of entrepreneurship can act as a catalyst for seeking new narratives. Steyaert and Hjorth’s (2006) book includes a study by Anderson et al., (2006) of indigenous people from deprived communities who change their socio-economic circumstances by rebuilding their community through entrepreneurial practice, thereby
demonstrating their ability to control their future and challenge dominant views of their socio-cultural identity.

As I have demonstrated, aspects of identity theory support the notion of individuals manipulating and negotiating identities within a specific social context. Mechanisms of personal agency can be determined by a belief in one’s ability to organise a course of action through some level of control and autonomy. The tensions and contradictions between agency and social structure can be explored by a deeper understanding of the relationship between individuals, the immediate environment in which they work and a wider discourse.

Bourdieu and the work of scholars inspired by his conceptual framework provide a method for investigating relationships within Birmingham’s cultural milieu. Within a relational context, different forms of capital and ties form part of an important exchange value, potentially based on more than instrumental rationales.

Critical debates inform social injustices but they also help to problematise entrepreneurship by contesting established and often dominant discourses. By drawing on both frames of reference, entrepreneurship studies and critical theories from cultural studies, I present weaknesses and strengths from both discourses. This position enables me to have an open mind towards my empirical research, by drawing on different perspectives and allowing the interviewees to speak for themselves.

My aim is to uncover new insights by connecting the narratives of Birmingham-based cultural entrepreneurs with the debates presented in this
chapter. My approach is based on an informal and ‘gossipy’ style of interview, with individuals I know. This will be discussed in the next chapter, which explains my method, including practical tasks and a reflexive account of my position within the research.
Chapter 2: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodological approach taken in this thesis to address the research question ‘what role does personal agency play in the cultural worker’s experience of entrepreneurship?’. The chapter contributes to an exploration of appropriate methods for capturing the subjective experience of entrepreneurial modes of work by individual cultural workers. The process seeks to re-imagine the cultural entrepreneur by recognising the role of reflexivity and the possibilities for agentic practice within a specific context, namely, Birmingham’s cultural milieu. I aim to reveal highly personal experiences and subjective positions set within the relatively small cultural industries community in Birmingham. This work will further enhance current academic debate specifically in two disciplines: first, scholarly work engaged with advancing the European tradition of entrepreneurship studies which seeks to explore entrepreneurship from broader perspectives and challenge dominant notions of the entrepreneur. Second, I aim to inform scholarship in cultural policy and cultural studies by further developing critical perspectives through empirical research. The distinctiveness of the approach rests on bringing these two different disciplines together and on the process for collecting the cultural entrepreneurs’ accounts. Du Gay (2007) states that capturing the lived experience may enable us to contest dominant positions, but how can researchers explore the day-to-day practice of being a cultural entrepreneur?
I am taking a qualitative approach, in which the emphasis is not on the researcher attempting to be a detached observer; rather, I am fully implicated in the research process. My closeness to the subject has led to a gossipy style of interview, presenting particular kinds of insights. In this chapter, I outline the specific processes, connecting the conceptual framework with the practicalities of undertaking research interviews. I discuss some of the ethical challenges and limitations of the study, as well as describing the method of collecting, managing and analysing the data. There is a reflexive element to this chapter, presenting my role as embedded in the community which I am researching.

**Conceptual framework**

The methodology seeks to illuminate what is particular rather than universal; the version of events as constructed by individual cultural entrepreneurs within their specific context. As Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010) explain, relational and societal aspects of entrepreneurship create the context for micro level research including personal capital, motivations and biographies. Individuals may reveal unexpected or unpredictable outcomes as a result of speaking from their unique perspective (Gray, 2003). This will include significant yet seemingly banal activities as part of everyday practice and in relation to a wider environment. The research and analysis draws together three key elements. Firstly, the cultural and entrepreneurship policy context, particularly as it applies to Birmingham-based cultural workers. Secondly, the academic literature combining critical perspectives with alternative viewpoints to examine cultural entrepreneurship. Finally the subjective
experience of individual cultural entrepreneurs and the role of personal agency. In other words, the nature and provenance of cultural entrepreneurship is explored within a societal context. Yet, it is the individual actors performing the role of cultural entrepreneur who illuminate the specifics of that role: the contradictions, the strategies, and the complexities of entrepreneurial work in the cultural industries. By acknowledging complexity, the research reveals highly subjective methods for managing a career as a cultural entrepreneur, and the possibilities for ‘good’ and ‘bad’ work as articulated by Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2010).

I focus on identity as articulated by cultural entrepreneurs in an attempt to reconceptualise the cultural worker, by bringing the individual’s subjective experience to the fore and enabling a reflexive discussion to take place through the interview process. As discussed previously, the entrepreneurial identity is mythologised in popular media through depictions of the entrepreneur as a performance, such as the case of Michael O’Leary (Warren and Anderson, 2009). How we construct our sense of self and our identity can be explored through the narratives we tell ourselves and others. The environment in which we tell the ‘story’ of ourselves is a significant aspect of how we choose to articulate our experience. As Banks argues, investigating the embedded experience of individuals and taking note of the potential for self-reflexivity challenges our assumptions beyond a ‘caricature’ of a cultural entrepreneur (2006, p.466). The cultural entrepreneur’s ability to reflect and actively engage in the environment in which he or she works offers the opportunity for choices and a level of freedom. Banks draws on the work of Giddens and Beck amongst others to examine critical self-reflexivity
and the possibilities for alternative or ‘progressively, liberal-democratic possibilities of individualization in cultural work’ (2006 p.122). Critical theorists argue that individualisation results in a reinforcement of neo-liberal values, but Banks (2006) suggests that social interactions and reflexivity may lead to alternative cultural work.

As noted in chapter one, I investigate the context for cultural entrepreneurship by adapting Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s (2010) interpretation of Bourdieu: the micro, meso and macro levels. This approach enables me to draw on relevant contextual details such as the geography of Birmingham, the specific institutions, key players and relationships. This is not approached as a mapping exercise which might attempt to offer a full picture of the environment, mapping all institutions and relationships as far as it is possible. Rather, I start with the cultural entrepreneurs, and work outwards from them, discussing relevant policies, places, individuals and so on, based on the discussions with the interviewees. The relevance of contextual elements emerges through the interviewee’s narrative, leading to policy documentation, networks, events and individuals. This will be developed in chapters five and six, when I identify relational issues of significance such as the formation of new and informal networks or the contribution of key individuals within Birmingham’s dynamic cultural milieu. Relationships and structures are analysed to reveal positions of power as well as individuals subverting dominant attitudes. The cultural milieu is not static and can be influenced or altered through new power relations provoked by individuals, organisations, and the relational dynamics between them.
By referring to documents which reflect Birmingham’s cultural policy over the last 10-15 years, I provide some insights into the local enterprise culture as it relates to cultural work in Birmingham. Furthermore, organisations set up by cultural entrepreneurs are analysed in relation to policy documents, creating the space in which cultural workers operate. As discussed in chapter one, there is some debate about the nature of this ‘space’ which for Bourdieu appears to be limiting in terms of the opportunity for agency. However, Banks (2006) suggests that Bourdieu overlooks the idea that individuals might operate in a non-instrumental fashion.

Bourdieu portrays a social world driven by individualistic instrumentality, albeit within the shared confines of class and habitus, his analysis does tend to overlook the ways in which actors may possess values or follow courses of action that are not automatically geared to enhancing status or reinforcing social position. (Banks, 2006, p.458)

This is critical to my study as it offers the possibility to challenge assumptions about cultural entrepreneurship. These assumptions are based for instance on myths, such as the notion of the ‘bohemian’ artist or the ‘entrepreneurial’ personality as fixed entities. It is possible to question the type of entrepreneur or the style of bohemian portrayed by cultural entrepreneurs. The idea of performing these identities, subverting them, negotiating individualised versions of them, reveals entrepreneurs as possessing agentic qualities rather than being trapped within a structure. The storytelling or interview process facilitates the articulation of identities as expressed, for
instance in comparison with others working in the milieu; or by referring to common notions of entrepreneurship.

In summary, the conceptual framework draws on the cultural entrepreneurs’ lived experience, their reflexivity and the notion of performing identities, as depicted within a dynamic social milieu. The agentic actions of individuals demonstrate the manner in which cultural entrepreneurs operate and experience this milieu.

In the next section, I focus on practical issues to discuss how I went about collecting the cultural entrepreneurs’ stories, with the aim of gaining new insights and contributing to methodological debates.

**Approach**

As with much qualitative research, I seek an insider’s view of the world, in this case, the world of cultural entrepreneurs. This type of research emphasises interpretation rather than manipulation of data. It can appear to be ‘messy’ and does not offer universal meanings, but the flexibility of the approach responds well to unanticipated findings (Bazeley, 2013, p.27-28). Precisely because I seek to illuminate the cultural entrepreneur without a preconceived idea of his or her identity, the research presents distinctive perspectives. The findings are more likely to reveal contradictions and ambiguities based on an attempt to contest the dominant position presented in my review of the literature on the subject. While it is not exhaustive, I hope to generate an in-depth study which considers key themes in the literature review through the voice of individual cultural entrepreneurs and the context in which they work.
As Bazeley discusses, qualitative analysis can be a ‘recursive process’ (2013, p. 12) evolving through different stages, sometimes backwards and forwards. This description reflects my own experience of collecting and designing the data which involved the following steps taken in a non-linear journey. The steps include designing the method for data collection, testing the method, reflecting, coding, refining, re-designing the method, describing and comparing, reviewing, reading, writing and defending the approach. The experience involves learning by doing, thereby avoiding procrastination and the sense of doubt which can cripple the inexperienced researcher. But it is also fitting due to the nature of a methodology which is not an existing process being tested, but rather a creative engagement with techniques deemed to be appropriate for capturing the experiences of cultural workers.

The research includes an analysis of relevant documentation such as regional policy reports, but the main focus is interviewing cultural entrepreneurs. Significantly, the process involves a level of trust and intimacy with the participant, as an aspect of the methodological approach described below. The dynamics of everyday interactions, relationships, behaviours and attitudes become important features of the cultural entrepreneurs’ narrative.

For the interviews, a semi-structured approach has been used with a focus on autobiographical and narrative approaches to elicit the interviewees’ experience, self-expression and the process of individualization (Steedman, 1999). This method is deemed to be particularly appropriate for this research as it encourages the notion of self-discovery and attempts to give voice to the interviewee. The cultural entrepreneurs’ stories are then contextualised
through the study of relevant regional policy documentation and academic
literature.

The researcher and interviewee relationship

As discussed in my introduction, my subjective experience as a cultural
entrepreneur has enabled me to question academic studies of cultural work
which seemed far removed from the lived experience that I have
encountered. My position as a researcher is close to Skeggs, who in her
ethnographic work with young women has looked for ‘the view from below’
(cited in Gray, 2003, p.64). I have not undertaken an ethnographic study, yet
I am not a researcher parachuting into a context that I have no experience of.
Rather, as is often the case with cultural studies, I am part of the world I am
researching, although I acknowledge that I now also inhabit the world of the
researcher (Gray, 2003, p.65). I consider this a privileged position and argue
that both my experience as a cultural entrepreneur and relationship with the
interviewees gives me particular vantage points from which questions of
professional identity can be discussed. During the ten years I ran my own
small design business I was close to many cultural workers, at trade events
when dealing with clients, as part of networking groups, informally meeting
for lunch and discussing the daily grind of work. My own experience
combined with my knowledge of others, has given me a level of empathy
with the day-to-day as well as the outward personae cultural entrepreneurs
present as part of their ‘brand’. Considering my closeness to the subject, as
a researcher I have had to make the familiar strange again (Gray, 2003,
p.64), through the process of immersing myself in a range of academic
literature, enabling me to approach the subject anew. As a result, my aim is to take on board the critical discourse but to bring a different perspective thereby advancing debates about cultural work.

I am interviewing people I know, who are likely to be at ease in my presence and who are prepared to share their feelings about the ups and downs of cultural work. I seek to gain specific insights as a result of the relationship I have with the participants which permits a dialogue based on a shared understanding and the potential for more intimate reflections. I aim to encourage a level of informality and intimacy to give the interviewee the confidence to express her or himself with some level of shared understanding. The experience is close to that of two friends gossiping but with a focus on one person. Meyer Spacks (1985) talks about ‘serious’ gossip and describes it in the following way:

Its participants use talk about others to reflect about themselves, to express wonder and uncertainty and locate certainties, to enlarge their knowledge of one another... The relationship such gossip expresses and sustains matters more than the information it promulgates; and in the sustaining of that relationship, interpretation counts more than the facts or pseudo-facts on which it works. (Meyer Spacks, 1985, p.5)

She suggests that gossip is almost always serving an instrumental purpose. In the case of the interviews for this research it can be seen in different ways. It is partly a means of developing the relationship with the interviewer and a chance for the participant to position themselves in relation to others within the milieu. I argue that gossip offers the possibility for a particular type of
information, pertinent to the exploration of the subjective as part of the process of constructing the cultural entrepreneur’s identity. There is an extent to which the interviewees let their guard down when they express how they feel about their work, their peers and their position within the local cultural industries community.

Definitions of gossip vary greatly yet, popular understandings of gossip describe a ‘conversation about social and personal topics’ (Foster, 2004, p. 80) and is generally about daily life. Typically, gossip will be about the exchange of information regarding a third party, not usually present. Indeed, gossip only became part of my research as I tested my methodology with two interviewees and realised the potential of gossip as part of the process. Yerkovich (1977) suggests that the situation plays an important part in creating the opportunity for gossip; a congenial situation which can be described as intimate. The situation can bring people together through the gossiper’s confidence in the recipient, and so in this case the cultural entrepreneurs feel able to share subtle social meanings with the researcher. The process can engender a level of fun and entertainment, expressing a wish to create a bond of friendship. Forster (2004) draws on research by Rosnov to explain that the appearance of casual conversations is deceptive in gossip. Gossip enables a story to be told, the creation of a narrative containing judgement which can be both positive and negative. There is an implied or explicit evaluative component to gossip. As Meyer Spacks (1985) suggests, intimate talk about others can challenge assumptions of the powerful. In this case, could it be a means for the interviewee to impose her
or his authority or to subvert dominant views? Is this an opportunity to present their version of events, their perspective on a subject?

Theories of gossip have supported an interviewing process which seeks to elicit comments reflecting a moral dimension. As Suls (1977) states, this need not be evaluative but may simply describe behaviour as interesting or significant. For example, this might include the way in which a third party has supported an individual and is perceived as key to the success of various local cultural entrepreneurs. The approach encourages participants to describe their work in relation to others or in comparison with expected norms. The cultural entrepreneurs I interview are grappling with their ‘story’ and make use of relationships with others, often people that we both know, to illustrate their narrative.

The reflexive project of the self consists of biographical narratives which are continuously revised; permanently open to adjustments (Giddens, 1991). In his research, Forster includes the work of clinicians Medini and Rosenberg from 1976 which suggests that when clients make important revelations about themselves, it might be defined as ‘gossip of the self’ (2004, p. 81). In other words, the environment I am creating in the interview process offers the possibility for self-evaluation within a social context which invites a mechanism for sharing information about themselves. Drawing on Yerkovich, Forster (2004) proposes the idea of the ‘thrill’ of revealing information, which could be about oneself or others. While the gossipy style of interview stimulates the prospect of gaining important insights, it potentially provides a cathartic space for the cultural entrepreneur. Disseminating information suggests a powerful position, and my interviewees are unchallenged (by me,
the researcher) as they present their story, their version of the ‘truth’. The pilot interviews revealed a strong sense of wanting to present their version of events, their motivations and their personal values within a confidential context. Given the approach, the researcher/interviewee dynamic is delicate, particularly when discussing personal and sensitive details. This was carefully thought through and will be discussed as part of ethical considerations for this study.

In the interest of transparency I make my position clear, by making the most of the fact that as a researcher I am already immersed in the world of Birmingham-based cultural entrepreneurs rather than a detached observer. Reflexivity in the researcher becomes an important aspect of the process in articulating the relational process of discovery. By choosing to encourage personal narratives and gossip, I also need to be sensitive to the situation and to the interviewee; knowing when to probe for more details and when to refrain from interfering in the interviewee’s story. My own experience and knowledge cannot disappear but I am consciously careful to refrain from offering advice, making a judgement or comparing the participants’ narrative with my own experience. For instance, one of the interviewees discussed being invited to a Christmas party held by one of the key players in Birmingham’s cultural milieu, a person we both know, and he asked me if I had attended the party. My response needed to be genuine in order to maintain the trust and gossipy nature of our conversation, but ambivalent enough so as not to reveal my feelings about the person concerned. There is a tension between my embeddedness, my position within the network, and my role as researcher aspiring to facilitate the cultural entrepreneur’s
narrative with as little direction from me as possible. As I have stated, I am not seeking a ‘true’ narrative of the cultural entrepreneur’s experience, but I am conscious of my own position within the interview process.

In explaining reflexivity as part of my methodology, I am inspired by the approach of feminist theoreticians who have challenged dominant discourse in entrepreneurship studies by drawing on their personal experience, as a starting point.

…drawing on personal knowledge, in the light of feminist theory, allows women to express their experiences of living gendered lives in conditions of social inequality. (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2004, p. 52)

My first-hand knowledge and experience of cultural work, as someone who ran a small textiles business based in Birmingham’s Jewellery Quarter, informs my position but need not define it. It is a starting point, enabling me to listen more carefully to aspects of cultural work based on my own perspective. However, this is refined through the literature on the subject and the chance to interview cultural entrepreneurs. As Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) suggest in describing their approach, a level of immersion in the subject being studied over a period of time enables the researcher to use their judgement in response to the interviews. As a researcher my position is determined by a range of roles, both current and past, as researcher, acquaintance and former cultural entrepreneur in Birmingham.

Furthermore, the dynamic between researcher and interviewee is based on a shared and acknowledged understanding that the researcher is ‘one of us’
rather than an ‘objective’ observer. This context creates the space for gossip, much like two colleagues, rather than the potentially unequal relationship between the interviewee and the academic researcher. The idea that I know how it feels to be involved in cultural work, to some extent, removes the opportunity for exaggeration or for excessive invention from the interviewee. They know that I know. This is not born from a sense that cultural workers will ‘lie’ but rather that, in my experience, they often talk up their work and experience in an environment in which the individual worker is often the ‘brand’ and where they are continuously selling themselves. Instead, a more relaxed and chatty style is adopted. Yet, this is not to say that the gossipy style of the interview is more ‘truthful’ than any other approach. It prompts a particular performance and creates a space where subjective experience is articulated through a range of devices such as by evaluating oneself in relation to others and within a social milieu that we both inhabit. However, I argue that my approach presents an opportunity for a level of honesty about personal circumstances such as the cultural entrepreneurs’ financial situation, their family context and relationship to peers in the milieu.

Within the local creative industries network, my position is linked to colleagues, friends and my film producer husband. As I stated earlier, it is a small world and for some of my interviewees my husband’s work is at least as important to them as my role as an academic and researcher. Indeed, this was apparent when interviewing film makers, which created a sense of ‘the elephant in the room’. Although I offer relatively little information during the interview, focusing on the participant, the gossipy nature of the process requires a level of commitment to the conversation. I cannot act as a
completely passive and uncongenial participant. As described in Yerovich’s study, part of the process is about updating our relationship in terms of recent activities and social interactions (1977). This might include sharing information about whether I attended a certain party or local event, followed by an evaluation of the event and its significance for the social group in which we both belong.

While my own experience as a researcher is not as extensive as that of Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011), my combined experience as a practitioner (as a cultural entrepreneur) and as a researcher exploring issues of cultural work and entrepreneurship underpins a transparent and scholarly methodology. I argue that this distinctive position illuminates the role of agency in negotiating identity and presenting alternative models of cultural entrepreneurship.

**Process**

The process of collecting primary data combines three elements: the policy documentation relevant to Birmingham; interviews with cultural entrepreneurs; and to a lesser extent, data from relevant social media platforms and websites.

The approach does not make use of computer-based content analysis techniques such as NVIVO, but I have used the online platform Evernote to organise material. I am influenced by Gray’s cultural studies methodology which emerges from working closely with the material and an awareness of theoretical contexts. In other words, I do not follow the rigid rules of an existing methodology, but I am more concerned with ‘continuous
interpretation’ (Gray, 2003, p.147). My approach does not shy away from being experimental and can be shaped by different analytical strategies, as I shall discuss below.

The sample

The sample includes 14 cultural entrepreneurs working across art, design, media and performance in a variety of different roles including those involved directly in the creative process such as an artist and those in more administrative tasks such as project managers or film producers. In chapter one I refer to the challenges of defining cultural entrepreneurs as oppose to freelance cultural workers. Several individuals in my sample undertake freelance work, yet in the main, they are engaged in developing micro-businesses. They present themselves as a small enterprise, developing their own products and services rather than as a freelancer available for work within an organisation.

All interviewees are based in Birmingham, the UK’s second largest city after London and situated in the heart of England. In addition I interviewed one Birmingham based former policymaker and now cultural industries consultant, Chloe, and I refer to key figures (see appendix G for Cast of characters) including their comments from websites and blogs.

I have undertaken pilot interviews with two cultural entrepreneurs to explore and reflect on the process including the methods for analysing the material, developing themes for a more focused approach and to test time management issues. Furthermore, the pilot interviews had a significant
impact on developing the methodological framework, as initial findings revealed the importance of my relationship with the participant.

The age, gender and education was noted but was not a defining factor in selecting the full sample. Although ethnic background and gender were not significant in the selection of interviewees my findings suggest that this could be a focus for further research.

As I have stated, all the interviewees are friends or acquaintances of mine and this, at least partly, determined the sample. As interviewees are part of my network, the opportunity for individuals to know others in the sample was increased, enabling me to have a better overview of Birmingham’s cultural milieu and relational dynamics. However, I also attempted to pick a mix of acquaintances so as to encourage a diversity of experiences and perspectives. To broaden an understanding of cultural entrepreneurship, I selected individuals whose narratives each tell a different story.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Artists and social entrepreneur</td>
<td>BA Fine art / MA Fine art &amp; curating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Freelance creative industries consultant</td>
<td>BA Business and sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Digital media consultant</td>
<td>BA Philosophy / MA Online journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Web designer</td>
<td>BA Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Publisher and events co-ordinator</td>
<td>BA Media and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Digital media designer and consultant</td>
<td>BA Visual communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Jewellery designer-maker</td>
<td>BA &amp; MA Jewellery design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Freelance arts project manager</td>
<td>BA English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Curator</td>
<td>BA Fine art and MA Visual Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Artist and curator</td>
<td>BA Cultural Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Digital media consultant</td>
<td>BA International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Film and arts festival organiser</td>
<td>BA Film and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Magazine publisher, enterprise consultant and social entrepreneur</td>
<td>No HE qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Film producer</td>
<td>No HE Qualification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2:** The participants’ details including basic information as a brief overview of the interviewees (for further details about the interviewees see appendix H).

**Managing the data**

The data has been collected and managed using simple tools which include an app on my IPhone and Dropbox to store the recordings and Evernote for
the analysis. I personally transcribed half the interviews and paid for a transcriber to write up the rest of the interviewees’ accounts verbatim (see appendix I for an example of a full interview script). As Gray (2003) states, transcription can seem an onerous task but it has the advantage of engaging the researcher in a profound way with the material. Indeed, Gray (2003) suggests that detail such as voice qualities and pauses in the conversation can be significant for the interpretation and analysis. Furthermore, Gray’s (2003) approach enables the emergence of certain themes and ideas to develop as part of the transcribing process.

In this way analysis and interpretation became part of the process of research. This is when I was able to use my imagination, being sensitive to the material and experimental in my analysis. (Gray, 2003, p. 149)

**Describing, comparing and theorising**

Gray (2003) encourages a strategy for organising material, ideas and further reading material. Gray (2003) suggests filing systems (which she prefers) or computer files for each broad theme. The themes will have emerged partly from the literature but also from the initial pilot interviews. As each interview is transcribed, it is possible to pull out specific sections of the interview and organise it under the appropriate theme. The process should encourage flexibility allowing for new themes to emerge. The purpose is to be able to think across different interviewees rather than focusing on individual responses allowing for a comparison of responses, looking for similarities
and differences. Yet, it is important not to lose the individual stories which also address the broader research question.

Following Gray’s (2003) methodology, I have created themes based partly on the entrepreneurs’ stories but also as a result of key issues from the literature. For instance, table three illustrates the type of themes used with three participants, Emma, Paul and Sadie. Sections from the transcripts are collected under each theme to enable me to see each entrepreneur’s articulation of the theme together; these can be compared and contrasted in relation to each other and to the literature. For the analysis, the themes were collected on the online platform Evernote (see appendices A and B). Using Evernote, each theme had further ‘tags’, a facility within Evernote, to enable me to add more themes (see appendices C and D). The flexibility of Evernote was particularly helpful, enabling me to work in an intuitive manner, reacting to emerging themes as they came up. This further enhanced the opportunity to give the subject a voice, allowing the cultural entrepreneur’s scripts to add new ideas rather than pre-empting themes. This compelled me to move backwards and forwards between the literature and the interview scripts.

The categories for filing different parts of the interview transcripts were created as I analysed the transcripts and so they are similar but not exactly the same for each person (see Table three). The tags enabled me to break that down even more, by adding sub-themes such as ‘coffee and chat’ or ‘key people’. Some tags were used repeatedly when categorising all the interviews in Evernote and therefore became significant themes in my analysis. My aim was to combine the issues raised in the literature and the
themes which emerged during the interviews, and the words or phrases listed in tables three reflect this. For instance, it is unlikely that ‘coffee and chat’ would have been used to analyse the interviews if it had not emerged as important to the interviewees’ narratives. Equally, the term self-exploitation would not be raised by cultural entrepreneurs but it is important in some of the literature about cultural work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emma</th>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>Sadie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being different</td>
<td>Moral / ethical approach</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham network</td>
<td>Reflecting on working life</td>
<td>Self-employment or salaried position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers and competition</td>
<td>Family and working patterns</td>
<td>Community work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Working day</td>
<td>Definition of cultural / social entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing learning</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Planning and saving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of working</td>
<td>Connection and social capital</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting out</td>
<td>Relationships and people</td>
<td>Working patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual professional development</td>
<td>Networks in Birmingham</td>
<td>Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of activities and skills</td>
<td>Processes and managing the business</td>
<td>Networking and contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earnings, managing the business</td>
<td>Daily routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>Interesting things</td>
<td>Background / family context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background / education</td>
<td>Tinkering with the internet</td>
<td>What I do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude to money</td>
<td>Choosing a job</td>
<td>Family life and starting a business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role models and crazy ideas</td>
<td>Networks and getting started</td>
<td>Self-employment / role models / entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting people</td>
<td>Motivation and being unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>Politics and motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaving salaried position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3:** Themes used in Evernote for analysing Emma, Paul and Sadie.

Utilising the tags in Evernote enabled me to draw out several themes within short sections of the transcript. Some themes have a different title but the content might cross over with other themes which can be pulled together through the tags. For instance, all sections in Evernote, from different interview scripts which were tagged ‘social enterprise’ can be selected. The
advantage is the ability to see all the content tagged a theme such as ‘social enterprise’, making comparisons easier.

I have found using Evernote productive in terms of efficiency as all the content can be copied and pasted back into a word document (for evidence of the use of Evernote see appendix A, B, C and D). But, importantly, it has not been restricting or required high levels of training such as sophisticated software programmes (e.g. NVIVO). In many ways, the use of Evernote has functioned in a more intuitive way, accommodating for the flexibility and open mind to the potential relations between themes advocated by Gray (2003). It has been possible to keep the individual narrative rather than a system which might break down the content so much that individual ‘voice’ becomes lost. Evernote supported an experimental approach with few technical restraints. Complementing the gossipy nature of the interviews, the use of Evernote enabled me to make connections across different conversations, without losing the cultural entrepreneur’s narrative. The method and the findings required an open-minded approach, evolving through the process rather than being predetermined.

By utilising the method described above, the analysis and interpretation of the interviews starts during the process of organising the material. Throughout, I was aware of Foucault’s discourse theory of power structures as a process for critical analysis (Gray, 2003, p.164). This study takes note of dominant voices and power dynamics without making explicit use of Foucault’s discourse analysis model. Aspects of the enquiry involve an awareness of dominant debates to pick up on themes such as the notion of
being an entrepreneur, how comfortable participants are with the term or the extent to which they reject it.

Scholars such as Fairclough (1991) have explored the ‘enterprise culture’ by analysing Thatcher’s speeches to critically discuss the pervasiveness of language in establishing powerful positions. By analysing speeches of the day, Fairclough (1991) showed how this proposed change in the socio-culture was being carefully engineered through an interplay of political power, opening minds to new socio-economic practices such as self-employment and entrepreneurship (Chell, 2008, p.56). As Deacon et al. state, Fairclough’s work is motivated by wanting to reveal unequal power relations in society and in social institutions (2010). An awareness of this approach has guided my reading of policy documentation and reports which form part of Birmingham’s structural framework.

Yet, it is important to note that my approach has not been to test specific methods, rather I have been inspired by them, as part of devising my own appropriate methodology. My focus has been to research cultural entrepreneurship rather than testing an existing method. But all frameworks have their strengths and weaknesses, and in the next section I describe some of the challenges I have encountered in particular in relation to ethical considerations.

**Ethical considerations**

Ethical issues such as the interviewees’ anonymity have been carefully managed throughout the process. Given my relationship to the individuals being interviewed and the fact that I live in Birmingham, it has been
particularly important to be clear in my communication. All those interviewed received a written email to explain the process, the anonymity and how the research would be used, including potential publication within academic journals.

My experience has been very positive with most interviewees expressing pleasure in telling their story to an interested listener. As stated earlier, this is sometimes a gossipy process given that I know my interviewee and we know people in common. My observations through the pilot interviews revealed the thin line between encouraging a person to talk openly while holding back from commenting and gossiping along with the cultural entrepreneur, as if I was having a casual conversation rather than interviewing someone.

Clearly, I have had to strike an important balance between responding ‘naturally’ in that context, while not slipping into actual gossiping and contributing too much. Empirical work can change people’s lives; through the process of talking and reflecting on their story, we force interviewees to review their life. While my research does not reveal highly intimate details about a person’s life, it does leave a person questioning some of their life choices. For example, one of the cultural entrepreneurs I interviewed started to have mixed feelings about the fact that she had not had a holiday for a long time. Admitting this out loud to me was slightly uncomfortable and it appeared to make her confront something that until then, she had tried to ignore. I am not here to offer counselling and I had to carefully manage my response. As Gray (2003) states, we should have some level of humility and we should not make the assumption that we have a right to interview people.
Ethical challenges have emerged after the interviews took place, as I became aware that comments on social media platforms could make a useful contribution to the data collected. Activities and discussions taking place on social media platforms contributed to descriptions of the relational context and positions of power amongst cultural entrepreneurs. Public spaces such as websites, blogs and twitter make it difficult to safeguard the anonymity of both interviewees and the key characters I refer to in the findings. I have tried to accommodate this as effectively as I can to make use of the material without compromising anonymity. Yet, how far can one go when researching a relatively small network in a city such as Birmingham? The names of some organisations has not been changed, for instance, publicly funded organisations such as Business Link, but I have changed business names. I am aware that it is possible that individuals and businesses would recognise themselves if they read this thesis. However, the anonymity of individual interviewees should safe from others recognizing them.

Robustness of the research and defending the process

This research is not concerned with notions of ‘truth’ which have long been dismissed by most social research. However, I aim to demonstrate the validity of this research by demonstrating its robustness and validity within a scholarly context. The quality of the study is accomplished through the following four elements inspired by Bazeley (2013, p. 402):

1. **Reflection:** the importance of demonstrating a reflexive dialogue articulating the method, conclusions and significance of the study;
2. **Blog:** a transparent audit trail of ideas and reflections articulated in my research blog (see appendix F);

3. **Data:** examples from the data collected including the interview recordings and scripts (see appendix I);

4. **Literature:** the use of evidence from the data compared with the literature discussed throughout the study.

Dealing with subjectivity is relatively new in entrepreneurship studies, in comparison with cultural studies. I hope this research, which to some extent straddles the two disciplines, can contribute to current methodological developments and debates. My approach is very different from studies of entrepreneurs which seek to identify certain characteristics, behaviours or motivations to make general comments. The focus is subjectivity shaped by relationships within a specific milieu.

**Conclusion**

The issues raised in chapter one point to the need for an in-depth and qualitative study of entrepreneurial cultural work. Drawing on Banks (2007) and Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011), I suggest that the dichotomy between critical views of entrepreneurship in the cultural sector and the disregard for the challenges it involves should be explored. The cultural entrepreneur’s personal narrative is presented through a reflexive and informal interview process. I see my closeness to the interviewees and the wider Birmingham context as an opportunity not afforded many academic researchers. For me, this is the distinctive element of the research; the social distance between the interviewee and the research is minimised, enabling the participant to
share knowledge and express evaluative concerns such as ways of acting and interacting. The gossipy nature of the interview invites value judgements, revealing as much about themselves as they do about others. There is an emphasis on the individual story but this is contextualised within a framework adapted from Bourdieu’s concept of fields, habitus and individual capital. The cultural entrepreneur’s narrative is central to the research, and will be prominent in the following chapters. The aim is to unearth the complexities of cultural work and the role personal agency plays in the lived experience of entrepreneurship, within a relational context. As a mechanism for contesting established paradigms, my methodological approach offers the possibility to examine social relations and complex identities in cultural entrepreneurship.
Chapter 3: A ‘can do’ attitude: The motivation for
cultural entrepreneurship and processes for self-
management

Introduction

A ‘can do’ attitude is associated with positive descriptions of the entrepreneur; a ‘go get it’ and proactive individual personified by global celebrity entrepreneurs such as Donald Trump. It is this notion of the American dream, intertwined with the idea of the adventurous and optimistic entrepreneur, which dominates our understanding of entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurs embody the strength and character that help make our country great. (Savardi, 2005)

The neo-liberal ideologies depicted in this image of the entrepreneur are at the core of a critique of entrepreneurial modes of work. For critical theorists, the discourse of entrepreneurship is over-optimistic, demonstrating little regard for the harsh realities of being self-employed. In particular, McRobbie (2011) identifies issues of precariousness in entrepreneurial cultural work and the competitive environment in which flexibility and self-reliance are key attributes.

Yet, a ‘can do’ approach to work is an inevitable aspect of self-employment and of the freelance or portfolio careers typical of the cultural industries. Cultural workers have a pragmatic response to managing work, including conflicting priorities such as the challenges in balancing work and family
commitments. Increasingly, these tensions are symptomatic of contemporary working life, whether one is in a salaried position or engaging in entrepreneurial work (Ciulla, 2000; Guest, 2002).

Banks states that ‘contemporary capitalism is a sufficiently imperfect operation to accommodate a broad range of moral values that will potentially effect a diversity of outcomes at the level of practice’ (2006, p.456). In exploring the experience of cultural entrepreneurs and their ‘can do’ attitude, I seek to reveal a different perspective based on personal accounts. As I have argued, this is not to dismiss the significant contribution of those who have sought to uncover inequalities and difficulties in cultural work; rather, I attempt to go ‘beyond the caricature of the individualised, de-socialised creative’ (Banks, 2006, p.466).

So, how does a ‘can do’ attitude manifest itself while cultural entrepreneurs negotiate the precarious nature of their work through everyday actions? How do cultural entrepreneurs manage risk and plan personal and professional life? Does this environment encourage highly individualised and competitive workers?

In this chapter, I explore three aspects of a ‘can do’ attitude which characterise the pragmatic approaches necessary for cultural entrepreneurship. First, cultural entrepreneurs present a range of techniques and tools for managing their work. Second, I discuss personal preferences and the choices individuals make, such as methods for balancing family and work. Thirdly, I identify the cultural entrepreneurs’ values and the potential for
what Banks describes as ‘morally progressive, non-instrumental rationales’ (2006, p.467) for cultural work.

The ‘can do’ approach highlights both the difficulties in entrepreneurial modes of work and the many ways in which individuals overcome them. The chapter highlights the role of personal agency in shaping alternative models of work.

I question descriptions of the ‘professed pleasure’ (Oakley, 2014, p.151) of cultural work which suggests that cultural workers are incapable of assessing their situation. I have found that cultural entrepreneurs demonstrate an awareness of the challenges they face. As Banks and Deuze state, critical theorists have tended to position themselves as the all-knowing scholar with the ability of ‘seeing through the charade and identifying the ‘real’ nature of the unfolding relations’ (2009, p.425). This conveys the idea that only scholars are capable of ‘uncovering’ creative labour through their interpretation and analysis. In contrast, Banks and Deuze (2009) favour an understanding of accounts of creative labour as diverse, contradictory and complex.

I argue that critical theorists have rightly focused on the negative aspects of cultural work in order to counteract the over-celebratory rhetoric of New Labour policymakers, academics (see Florida, 2002; Howkins, 2001) and influential commentators such as Leadbeater. However, there is a risk of overlooking the specificity of cultural entrepreneurship as it is negotiated by individual cultural entrepreneurs, and the opportunity for agentic action in everyday experiences. As Banks suggests, it is possible to ask a different set
of questions and to explore personal agency and reflexivity as positive aspects of individualisation.

But what if artistic and creative cultural work contains within it the possibility of another kind of freedom? A freedom that seeks to moderate or challenge market culture rather than simply reinforce it? (Banks, 2013, p.95)

In this chapter, I explore personal agency by revealing highly personalised work patterns which pay attention to individual circumstances, industry demands and personal commitments. Through in-depth interviews, I have encountered individuals whose narratives can be contradictory, but also reflexive about their circumstances, and thoughtful in their approach. Working within a social context, Birmingham’s cultural milieu, enables cultural entrepreneurs to reflect on their practice, consider their position and adjust their approach. Cultural entrepreneurs reveal their attitude towards self-management through their personal family background and through their interactions within a social milieu. Family responsibilities are managed, sometimes awkwardly, but in some cases family life is prioritised and dictates work patterns. There is evidence of satisfaction drawn from the ability to manage oneself, balancing work, social and family commitments to suit individual needs and preferences, despite the obvious pressures of having to be flexible and available for work.

I gain insights into the cultural entrepreneur’s techniques for self-efficacy in several ways. First, the interview method invites reflection and comparisons with others in Birmingham’s cultural industry milieu. Second, I encourage a
highly personalised narrative including the cultural entrepreneurs’
background, family commitments and personal values. Finally, I draw on the
significance of mundane, day to day management of time, tasks and
contacts, to uncover tools for self-management and for personal agency. I
am grateful to the interviewees for being so generous in discussing highly
personal matters, particularly when they relate to personal finance and family
issues. The detailed subjective experience of cultural entrepreneurs reveals
personal motives, actions, identities and moral systems at play.

This chapter is split into three sections, starting with exploring choices and
personal rationales, followed by a description of day-to-day management,
finishing with an assessment of personal and professional risk. By exploring
personal rationales, I discuss individual motivations for cultural
entrepreneurship including the importance of belonging and the diverse
aesthetic and social dimensions of cultural work. In managing day-to-day,
mundane daily schedules, complex negotiations and tools for self-
management are explored. Risk, a commonly accepted characteristic of
entrepreneurship, reveals attitudes to personal and professional
development including insights into financial risks.

Although I do not seek to glamorise a ‘can do’ attitude to work, I find that
cultural entrepreneurs are measured and thoughtful in their approach to
work.

**Choices, personal rationales and techniques**

The idea of ‘choice’ is part of the language associated with individualisation,
autonomy, freedom and neo-liberal politics (Larner, 2000). Rather than being
constrained by social or other structures, it suggests that individuals choose a certain lifestyle; for instance, to become a cultural entrepreneur rather than being ‘pushed’ as argued by Oakley (2014). In this chapter, I find that ‘choice’ is based on a trial and error process, and on personal circumstances. It is perhaps not an unlimited freedom of choice, yet small personal decisions and preferences enable the cultural entrepreneur to choose his or her approach to cultural entrepreneurship. The result is both liberating and restricting. The freedom to choose a certain path may result in the freedom to fail (McRobbie, 2002). In a ‘can do’ approach to work, I find cultural entrepreneurs adjusting their mode of work in a fluid manner. Instead of the binary positions of failure or success, everyday decisions and processes suggest small choices for managing cultural work. I explore the notion of ‘choice’ in the cultural entrepreneur’s narrative in two ways. First, the decision to undertake ‘interesting work’ including aesthetic decisions and being involved in innovative practices. Second, to belong to a specific community as part of the cultural entrepreneur’s identity.

The idea of doing ‘interesting work’ is revealed in different narratives. For some it is to do with artistic decisions linked to the type of work they want to produce, particularly for curators such as Liz and Roger. For Emma it is the excitement of experimenting and of being involved in non-conventional practices. For instance, Emma described how she is keen to work with Dave, a prominent figure in Birmingham’s cultural milieu. Emma appreciates Dave’s ‘can do’ attitude and expresses the wish to belong to a community of practice who indulge in ‘crazy ideas’.
I like people like [Dave] because [Dave] has these big ideas and he’s got the skills to do it. ‘Let’s have this thing and there’s a video you can go to’ and these crazy [ideas]! And you think how’s that going to happen, and he manages to make it happen! (Emma, 2012)

At one point in the interview, Emma describes herself as having always been a ‘geek’, enjoying the idea of combining technology and creativity. As someone involved in a relatively new area of work, social media and data visualisation, Emma is negotiating a difficult space in which there are few practitioners such as herself. In the process of inventing her job, she is inspired by characters such as Dave. Similarly to the co-creators in Banks and Deuze’s study, this is an emerging field which ‘sits uncomfortably with our current understanding and theories of work and labour’ (2009, p. 419) due to its unconventional nature. In that sense it is important for Emma to connect to others in Birmingham’s cultural milieu, in order to collectively establish ways of working.

But despite her enthusiasm for Dave’s ad-hoc projects, Emma is not naïve and in our conversation she identifies Paul (another interviewee) as influential and describes him as working ‘on a more sensible level’.

[Paul] is doing really good things. So yeah people like that. I like the fact that people like that exist in Birmingham and it is small enough to know them all. (Emma, 2012)

For Emma, the collegiate atmosphere is clearly important, alongside the idea of being part of something innovative and new. As Banks (2007) states, this
may be indicative of an interest in practices that seek to combine different motivations.

At the early stages of her career, Emma was involved in many different and often unpaid projects. Emma explains that her work ethic is based on her father, who emerges as an important role model in her attitude to work:

My dad worked for himself. As long as I can remember he worked from home so he always had a desk, he always had an office – he was a consultant engineer so – he was always travelling quite a lot. I remember him getting back from Germany Friday night, working till 1 in the morning. And mum was his secretary so it was very much a family business and working till the wee small hours in the morning.

(Emma, 2012)

Thinking about her own work patterns, Emma laughs at herself when describing that she spends her time staring at screens:

[I spend my] entire life staring at a screen and I caught myself the other day and I had the TV on, I had my laptop and I had my iPad and my phone next to me! I was like a command centre!! Tweeting from this and that [laughs]. And watching TV! (Emma, 2012)

As part of laughing at herself Emma reveals an awareness that this might not be good, or that others in more conventional work might not understand her approach to work. But Emma says she enjoys her work stating, ‘I do, I really do’, despite being conscious of her irregular working practices. Emma can see the problems with the intensity of her style of working. She expresses
this dilemma by saying ‘Maybe it’s convention that makes me think maybe I shouldn’t work like this?’.

In contrast, critical debates tend to assert that the attraction to cultural work is linked to creativity and the possibility for self-expression; often this refers to a bohemian, artistic notion of self-expression. McRobbie finds that the ‘passion’ associated with self-expression conceals levels of self-exploitation.

…’creativity/talent’ has recently come to represent the most desired of human qualities, expressive of, indeed synonymous with, an ‘inner self’, and hence a mark of uniqueness, and particularly resonant for young people poised to enter the labour market. (McRobbie, 2002b, p.110)

I find a scenario in which the cultural entrepreneur’s narrative suggests a genuine engagement with managing personal motivations alongside the challenges of cultural work. In Emma’s case, I argue that her motivation for working all hours has little to do with expressing her ‘inner self’ and more to do with her upbringing. Rather than merely tolerating difficulties, cultural entrepreneurs express their awareness and their frustrations but they are also pro-active in finding ways to counteract difficult working conditions.

Emma cannot see herself following a more conventional career path. She articulates this when describing a recent meeting with old school friends. A simple comparison with her old friends confirms her sense that she is doing something ‘interesting’ rather than a traditional job.

Yeah, I met up with some old friends from school at Christmas and they had no idea what I do. For them social media is just facebook.
They all have normal jobs. Teachers, working in banks, you know that traditional job. And I like that I can sit down with someone and have an interesting conversation with someone about the death of myspace etc. [laughs] I like that. (Emma, 2012)

Like Poettschacher’s research with creative businesses, ‘the others’ are considered as those who ‘would do everything for money’ or ‘created products without any spirit’ (2004, p.181). Emma positions herself as different in relation to conventional businesses similar to Banks’ idea of ‘alternative’ production created through the milieu in which cultural entrepreneurs negotiate and re-invent conventional business models and practices.

Emma also acknowledges that she doesn’t have a work-life balance, but when I ask her how that affects her home-life she laughs and says:

He’s [Emma’s partner] as bad as me. When he’s not at work he’s on his laptop. We are like each at one end of the sofa pretty much texting each other! (Laughs). But someone said the other day – I haven’t had a holiday for years – just because of working and money. I did have a holiday a couple of years ago but then I did my MA and money wasn’t around for a holiday. And I’ve often thought, what would I do for a holiday? I like city breaks. Because I can get wifi – and that’s my first thought! …I love the fact that I can stay in cafés, with my laptop, blogging about Paris! For me that’s a holiday – just doing what I do in a different place. (Emma, 2012)
Emma’s choice to work is relevant to the nature of her work, which includes activities such as blogging, using social media and creating content which includes self-started projects as well as work for clients. Emma presents a positive scenario which she manages successfully, to suit her needs. She acknowledges that she has had little money or time for a holiday, but this does not detract from her enjoyment of work and experimenting.

For Paul, his preference for certain types of work has led to the development of a set of criteria which illustrate his decision making process. Paul is committed to certain personal values and is keen to undertake projects which reflect his principles and which make good business sense.

Yes, and it boiled down to, and I've encouraged others in a similar position to approach it this way because it worked for me, I quite quickly realised, because I tried a couple of things that went wrong, it boiled down to three ingredients which tended to work for me. 1. Am I interested in what you are asking me to do? 2. Can I help you, in other words, can I actually be useful to you - not just can I do something but can I add something? 3. Do I like you? And when those three things were there we tended to do something worth doing, especially when the last one, do I like you, wasn’t there - things usually went wrong. So am I interested, can I be useful, do we like each other? And that was it - that's what made me decide to say yes or no to things. (Paul, 2012)

So motivation is often to do with people and with a sense that the activity will be of interest either due to the innovations involved or the sense of creating something new and different. This attitude towards work is an aspect of
being a pro-active individual, looking to make a positive contribution.

Connected to this, is a sense that the individuals are potentially ‘choosing’ certain projects because of the associated pleasures, which again, are highly personal and diverse. For Emma and Jack this is linked to technological developments and opportunities for innovating.

Yes, I think there is a lot of that. Like the European project [an EU funded project Jack’s company is developing], it’s quite exciting. Like the Azure TV stuff, a lot of it is about exploiting new technologies.

...So the content of the show is live and it has been completely stirred by the audience as an interactive thing. And that’s really interesting.

(Jack, 2011)

Being at the forefront of technological developments is part of the enjoyment of his work as well as being a competitive advantage for Jack’s enterprise. Jack is very clear about his efforts to be commercially sustainable and he is not generally fussy about the type of client he works with, as long as the ‘margins’ are good. Like Paul, he has a three point criteria for choosing certain projects.

... it’s about where you can get the work. You look for the margins on stuff. ...part of that is Pleasure, Profit and Portfolio. The three Ps that you base projects on. You have to have a couple of the Ps. You sometimes get one, you rarely get all three, but if you are not getting any of those then you are just not interested. (Jack, 2011)

So, a combination of what makes good business sense and, whenever possible, ‘pleasure’ plays a role in the decision to take on a project or client.
It should be noted that Jack and Paul are examples of cultural entrepreneurs who can afford to choose, in that they are relatively established and financially successful.

Alongside Emma’s desire to undertake ‘interesting’ work, she states ‘I love learning - I could be a student forever’. Learning and ongoing personal development are significant motivators (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, p.127) and for Alison, this is about exploring new ideas.

I think it’s just about having ideas and about things in the world. And learning. Learning about things I don't know anything about. I really like that. (Alison, 2013)

Furthermore, a motivation for entrepreneurship can be a lack of career progression and opportunities for professional development. For instance, Alison went from working full time at a non-commercial gallery to setting herself up as a social/cultural entrepreneur partly because of the lack of opportunity for ‘learning anything new’:

Cos it's not like there was anything, you couldn't move up or anything or get new responsibilities or new… It wasn't like, 'oh you've been here a couple of years, now would you like to be curator? (Alison, 2013)

Here a ‘can do’ attitude required a positive ‘pull’ into entrepreneurship, as a means of ensuring personal and professional development, in a way that is satisfying to the individual. Becoming a cultural entrepreneur, is partly the result of being dissatisfied with a lack of opportunities in employment. In this context, the cultural entrepreneur is characterised by the motivation to do
something different rather than remaining in full-time employment. This is echoed in Beavon’s study of nascent music entrepreneurs whose ventures are established to support their artistic goals (2012). A pragmatic choice based on a need to fulfil their personal ambitions.

At the early stages of entrepreneurship, Joanna gave up full time employment to set up her arts project management business and despite the risks, Joanna feels that self-employment is helping her become more confident.

I think I’m a different person. Yes. When I was in my full time job I was very much wanting to please people who were managing me, get it right for the people managing me, I wanted to stick to the rules a little bit. And that’s how I am in employment I think. For my own business I just kinda let things happen to see where they take me… But I like the control over what I can choose to do. (Joanna, 2011)

The need to be a ‘different person’ is part of Joanna’s sense of identity during a period of time in her life when she no longer wants to ‘stick to the rules’. Banks argues that individualisation can enable individuals such as Joanna to ‘obtain the life they crave’ (2007, p.98). In her late 20 s at the time of the interview and with no major responsibilities such as a mortgage or children, Joanna has the freedom to test self-employment as part of a personal experiment. Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010) present the idea of ‘becoming’ in nascent entrepreneurship, through interactions with others within a specific milieu.
Their entrepreneurial experience is characterised by developing meanings, sharing understandings and pursuing their business ideas through various vehicles in interaction with numerous stakeholders. (Chell and Karataş-Özkan, 2010, p. 193)

Emma and Joanna’s experiences have some resonance with Bjursell and Mellin’s (2011) study which makes use of fictional narratives to explore entrepreneurial identities in female entrepreneurs. The ‘Pippi Longstocking’ narrative represents ‘independence, control and an outsider position in terms of not accepting the dominant norms’ (2011, p. 225). In his research with students, Ashton argues that real world contexts enable individuals to position themselves and reflect on what that professionalism means. He describes the students preparing themselves for a career in the media and creative industries as ‘workers-in-the-making’ (2011, p. 558), highlighting this idea of ‘becoming’ as a process in early stages of professional work, employment or entrepreneurship. Similarly, cultural entrepreneurs operate in a fluid space in which their identities as workers are not fixed and they are ‘becoming’ or learning to be cultural entrepreneurs. In this context the choice or opportunity to experiment with their career aspirations can be more important than security or financial rewards. Rather than being simply forced into entrepreneurship, cultural workers appear to be both ‘pulled’ and ‘pushed’. ‘Pulled’ because they are pro-active and keen to determine their own opportunities for development but also ‘pushed’ because self-employment is the only way to achieve this.

Choosing entrepreneurship does not negate the cultural workers’ awareness of the precarious nature of their work, as Liz demonstrates here.
I’m a precarious worker some would say…some of my friends are in Precarious Workers Brigade. (Liz, 2013).

Even in the more commercial context of web design, Hannah is mindful in her approach to working with freelancers, perhaps due to her background as a human resource manager, and uncomfortable with the precarious nature of entrepreneurial work. Hannah has created a formal arrangement with six individuals who she calls ‘associates’, and explains the importance of creating a team rather than a loose arrangement. Hannah undertakes a ‘proper recruitment process’ rather than jobs for her friends.

I have team meetings with them and we like keep them updated on what’s going on in the business and that sort of thing. So it’s like, it’s all the benefits of actually being part of team and working together and getting to know each other and learning from each other, but without the commitment of actually employing people. (Hannah, 2012)

Paul’s experience is also as someone who has been employed (including working for the BBC) and who came to entrepreneurship relatively late. Here Paul’s narrative demonstrates how he continuously re-evaluates and questions his decision.

Yes, why are you doing it? And I know the business does what it does and I know why I care about it professionally but you know, what am I trying to do? Am I trying to just have a tick over income so I can be happy at home? Am I trying to get really rich because we want a house in the Maldives? What is it that you are doing it for? And if your
relationship is in a mess that can get very confused about your motivations. (Paul, 2012)

As Paul explains, this is partly due to a difficult period in his life when he split up from his long term partner and inevitably started to question himself and his aspirations. Here we see that a cultural entrepreneur is not only socially embedded within the Birmingham cultural milieu but also within his personal family context.

Hannah considers her personal aspirations and why the decision to set up her enterprise is the best outcome for her and her family. Hannah’s situation is based on an arrangement with her husband and the way in which they have negotiated their life as a family. As a couple, their priorities are to support Hannah’s wish to pursue her career aspirations, with the expectation that she earns from the business, but that her salary does not need to be ‘mega bucks’. As Hannah describes herself as a feminist and is one of the most organised cultural entrepreneurs I interview, I cannot imagine her settling for ‘pin money’. Hannah is pro-active in defining the parameters for her enterprise in relation to why and how she chooses to work. Hannah had enjoyed a full time salary but changes within the company made her re-think her position.

I could have moved to the Solihull office but for me to get to Solihull around my child care is very touch and go with the traffic. It would have been difficult and it would have meant every night turning up at the child care like on the dot worrying about getting there late… So I thought probably about 18 months before it all actually happened and
they did the restructure and everything, I could see that things were starting to change. So I started thinking about what my options were and what I could do in terms of career change because I didn’t want to just go and get another job… (Hannah, 2012)

As many researchers of female entrepreneurship have noted, self-employment seem to be the best option when parents are attempting to balance work and family life. Here the notion of being ‘pulled’ into entrepreneurship is characterised by Hannah as an attempt to manage what could be conflicting priorities, the demands of work and family life. Mirchandani draws on the research by Goffee and Scase who find that female entrepreneurs run their businesses in ways which are compatible with domestic obligations (1999, p.226). Furthermore, the lack of mobility in traditional corporate sectors motivates women to become entrepreneurs as a way of balancing work and family (Ezzedeen and Zikic, 2011; Mattis, 2004; Mirchadani, 1999). In her study of women in management, Mattis states that about half the women entrepreneurs ‘reported they wanted more flexibility, citing this as a primary reason for leaving their companies’ (2004, p.158).

Alongside family concerns, in subsidised cultural enterprises such as those run by Liz, Roger and Alison, cultural entrepreneurs have strong aesthetic concerns which they have to balance with other priorities, often financial constraints. For instance, Liz is a mature and experienced curator, who has a family and was working in a full-time position as the director of a small arts organisation before recently becoming self-employed. Liz expresses the importance of her personal vision as a driving force which counteracts the lack of financial reward.
Well, it makes, I mean on one level it makes me think, you know, it’s, sometimes I think it’s a little bit of a waste of my energy to have to work so hard to get so little in terms of financial return, you know, it’s a huge amount of energy. But I know in terms of, I’ve always had a very clear idea of my vision as a, you know, artistic producer, curator, whatever and I know, you know, my terms are the terms. So I would rather take the lack of financial security on board rather than just to carry somebody else’s vision out. I mean I think I’m probably not someone that can go and work for somebody else at this stage in my career. (Liz, 2013)

Liz’s account is not that of a naïve recent graduate, given that Liz is a mature working mother, with a mortgage to pay and a husband who also works freelance in the film industry. From our discussion, I sense that Liz and her husband have jointly decided to pursue their personal professional interests, cutting back on costs where possible (they don’t own a car for example).

Roger has similar professional motivations as Liz, yet he comes across as very frustrated by his financial predicament. He is determined to keep developing his festival but he is also exasperated that he has to do it on such a tight budget and earning so little. Despite this, he describes how he does not care about money.

I really don’t. I do think I’m sick of being bloody skint sometimes but I’m not looking at somebody else and thinking… I think that’s a kind of disease really across the board really, the “Why haven’t I got as much as that person? I want their iPad,” or whatever, you know, that kind of
evil eye envy is something I try and avoid really. But I do get annoyed with having such a tight margin on everything and having done it for so many years and to quite a high standard I do sort of think… You know, there was a period when I thought I would just cash in eventually. All this great reputation that we’ve built up, I’m bound to find a really interesting job that I can walk into, and I’ve sort of less belief in that happening now in a way. (Roger, 2012)

There is no doubt that Roger is very torn between his personal vision and his need to earn more in order to support his family (Roger has two young children and his partner is studying to be a nurse after having worked with him on the festival team for several years). Despite expressing his exasperation with financial issues, the alternatives are not of interest to Roger.

After two or three telly jobs I just thought, most telly is rubbish and lots of people involved in telly are arseholes, and… I just knew that the chances of me doing the kind of work that I wanted to do were really slim and I just got more interested in events really. (Roger, 2012)

In exploring issues with balancing financial insecurities with the motivation to do ‘interesting’ work or to fulfil one’s vision, I find that even those who are more commercially successful come across as the antithesis of the money-grabbing entrepreneur. Paul has many ways of demonstrating a sense of a personal moral compass when making important professional decisions.

Somebody extremely senior in the council said to me after I resigned, why did you do that? Cos the turnover was about 1/4 million a year
and I said cos we were wasting 1/4 million pound a year' and they said
' for me 1/4 million pound is nothing' but to me, to me, it was
thousands of license fees... it mattered individually to lots of tax
payers. (Paul, 2012)

My participants are not inexperienced nor do they appear to have a utopian
idea of cultural work (McRobbie, 1999, p.27); rather they are motivated by a
personal rationales. Liz expresses a similar outrage with wasting money
from her experience of working for Birmingham City Council’s arts team for a
short period of time, which discouraged her from working for large
organisations. In particular it was the attitude of her colleagues who unlike
her, did not prioritise the art work or artists they should have been
supporting. This experience ensured that Liz would want autonomy, partly for
the freedom to undertake the work she wants to do, but also because of her
frustration and horror that money, time and energy could be so easily
wasted.

Yeah and I think also they came, I mean there is no sense of
entrepreneurship, I mean they, you know, a lot of people came from,
just came from an LA [local authority] structure and maybe moved
across departments. It’s like in-fighting, budget wrangles and no
understanding of the art for, I mean that is what absolutely staggered
me! … Oh yeah, within sort of four, five months, I was, just thought,
okay I know I can do this for a bit but if I stay here, just looking around
me, it’s just, it’s not going to be good for my mind. (Liz, 2013)
In Paul and Liz’s case, the public sector is perceived as not delivering and as wasting time and money. For Tom, financial reward is perceived as greedy. Tom defines himself as motivated by the contribution he feels he can make to Birmingham’s film making and cultural industries community.

I think it just sort of because me and my business partner are not in this to make money, not in this to build an empire. We are not a Richard [a local TV entrepreneur]. We are not trying to build a media empire by any stretch of the imagination. There is very much a sense that we are driven by a sense of what we want to be involved in has an element of goodness through the relationships we have with other people. So we do a lot of mentoring and lot of supporting other people often at our own expense and cost because that's just a really important way in which we work. So often decision to do and make things isn't just monitory, it is for all sorts of other reasons, albeit, knowing that we've got bills to pay. We have to balance that out. You know, you could argue that if all of that energy had gone into business, we could be another AzureTV but it's not what we want to be. (Tom 2012)

By comparing his own ambitions with that of another cultural entrepreneur, Tom articulates a disdain for a more commercially-orientated business, as represented by Richard of AzureTV. For Tom, and this may relate to his experience in youth community work, being embedded in Birmingham’s milieu and making a difference is an important rationale.
Belonging to a community and being involved with ‘like-minded’ individuals is a means of distinguishing oneself from others who do not share the same values. Whilst discussing problems with getting work as a cultural industries consultant, Elise states that she has looked at diversifying into other sectors, but that ‘my main love and passion is the creative sector’ (Elise, 2013). When I ask Elise if that is to do with the nature of the work, the people or anything else, she replies:

Yes, yes, all of that - the people I think, especially. As a sector I think we are very left wing and as a child I was very militant in my family, I was very left-wing in my family, that drove me. (Elise, 2013)

After a degree in business and psychology Elise has chosen an environment in which she identifies with members of the community and which suits her sense of politics and identity. The decisions made by cultural entrepreneurs are far from easy but nor are they in any way naïve. Rather, it is through personal agency that individuals are able to formulate a version of cultural entrepreneurship which suits personal aspirations and specific social context. Diverse motives play an important part in the decisions they make and in the manner in which they choose to run their enterprises. Drawing on Keats, Banks articulates the tension between practice and making money:

As Keats observes, firms and organisations may well act as profit-satisfiers rather than profit maximizers, and entrepreneurs and workers may be more strongly motivated by internal rather than external rewards, not lest by the love of the practice, respect for
others and the concomitant sense of well-being and security that practice-like activities can potentially generate. (Banks, 2007, p.113)

In the next section, I focus in particular on social objectives as a rationale for undertaking certain kinds of activities. Cultural entrepreneurs demonstrate their values in subtle actions, illustrating a commitment to others and to personal values.

**Moral and ethical work**

In this section, I investigate the manner in which cultural entrepreneurs communicate moral, ethical and aesthetic reasons as an important aspect of their work. Banks finds evidence of ‘non-instrumental moral values’ (2006, p. 465) in his research into Manchester’s cultural entrepreneurs and reveals how ‘alternative’ cultural production can initiate the possibility for ethical work (2007, p.96). I argue that socially embedded cultural entrepreneurs exhibit social values through their entrepreneurial practice. The ethical dimension to cultural work is revealed in different ways. Sometimes it is explicit and very deliberate, but it can also be found in small gestures such as the support Isabella offers to students starting new cultural enterprises. It is important to note that apart from Elise who states that ‘as a sector we are very left wing’, all the cultural entrepreneurs shy away from the notion of being overtly ‘political’. As Banks argues, alongside the process of individualisation we can see the rise of more issue-based alternative movements (2007, p.119) rather than traditional links to mainstream politics.

The most obvious example of an enterprise motivated by moral and ethical issues is the entrepreneurial work undertaken by Sadie, who runs a lifestyle
magazine and delivers media and enterprise training, as a social enterprise. Aimed at supporting young people, particularly from black and minority ethnic communities, Sadie’s work is associated with community development. Sadie is driven by clear social objectives, yet she does not mention politics explicitly during the interview. Rather, she focuses on her background, as the narrative for initiating social action, also discussing the fact that her personal circumstances have changed. Sadie is a single mother with a son aged two (at the time of the interview) and she has had to adapt her life accordingly.

It’s definitely shifted. I mean, what I did ten years ago I was 20-21, I was young, and based on my personal experience and my background I had a lot of empathy working with the young people that were my age and slightly older. Now my life has moved on so much. So before then what defined me, I was an ex-offender working with young people, giving back to the community…and now it’s very much, okay, well, my mindset has changed from thinking more operational, I think more at a strategic level, from, kind of, going to youth meetings and being around the table with the police and the council about, on a more reactive level about what’s happening. I’m going to meetings and sitting with people like the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce and things are more on a strategic level. (Sadie, 2013)

Sadie’s initial motivation for setting up a social enterprise creating media content and training opportunities was for moral reasons: wanting to make a difference in her community. Sadie was close to the two young women, Charlene Ellis and Letisha Shakespeare, who were murdered after being caught in a crossfire as they left a New Year’s eve party in 2003. As an ex-
offender, Sadie has changed her life around through the process of working with her community and, over time, she has established a reputation for her work and become a role model, in particular for young black women. Now, she finds that while she still wants to be actively involved in supporting her community, she also needs to develop a more strategic role. So motivations alter depending on the entrepreneur’s circumstances and the environment in which they work. After the events of 2003, Sadie had a specific and important social role to play; now that has shifted to establishing a more secure career path, building a future for her family.

For Paul, family circumstances cannot be separated from his enterprise; they inform each other through a reflexive process and have a moral dimension.

…so that when we did split [with his wife], I knew that I was going to struggle and I went to a very close friend and said, I’m about to hit a brick wall, can I employ you and pay you to come into the business… And that was entirely about trust and about realising what was going to happen to you [Paul]. And I think that having a sense of how you feel is quite important if you are going to run a company. (Paul, 2012)

Paul does not run a social enterprise and describes himself as ‘not really political’, yet he has many social objectives embedded in his enterprise and was one of the founders of an award-winning social media activity (Big Society 2012 award), helping charities and other voluntary groups to make the most of social media to support their work. That sense of the local community and one’s role within it is something Paul feels very strongly
about. Paul uses words such as ‘caring’ and being a ‘good citizen’ as a key driver for his work but also as a reason for why projects are successful.

And the truth is when things go wrong, it tends to be because we weren’t trying to make something better. We weren’t behaving like citizens, in other words, we weren’t caring and weren’t thinking - that’s usually one of the things which goes wrong. But also, especially with big organisations, you can make things like the things they want to buy and you can sell them to them. But that is not the same as caring. It’s not the same as trying to make something better and it’s not thinking. You really can spend lots of time not really making anything much better. There is no satisfaction in that. (Paul, 2012)

In socially embedded practices, commercial and ethical dimensions of work can converge, potentially re-defining cultural entrepreneurship. Cultural entrepreneurship begins to challenge myths depicted by corporate entrepreneurs in popular media or so called ‘macho entrepreneurs’ (Steyaert and Hjorth, 2006). As Stryjan argues, it can be the ‘mode of action’ rather than action’s social objectives which help to reconceptualise entrepreneurship as social change (2006, p. 35). The manner in which entrepreneurs go about their business is motivated by the impact of their actions on others, without being overtly political.

So far, I have tried to demonstrate that cultural entrepreneurship is motivated by a range of factors, including both personal narratives and social milieu. Individual actions are driven by a complex set of issues, some of which are specific to the cultural practice, while other reasons might link to a person’s
circumstances. The cultural entrepreneurs’ stories reveal two important matters: firstly that cultural work cannot be defined entirely in terms of its precariousness, and secondly, that the study of entrepreneurial work has much to offer conventional entrepreneurship studies. There is a possibility for cultural entrepreneurs to create different, and potentially better models for society. Although the social and political impact of the cultural entrepreneurs should not be over-emphasised, I have found evidence of individuals generating work for social and political benefits.

The rethinking of entrepreneurship through the lens of socially-driven entrepreneurship resonates with the actions of cultural entrepreneurs such as Tom, Paul and Sadie. I argue that this starts to demonstrate progressive approaches to entrepreneurship, and a rejection of purely capitalistic practices. A blend of business, personal and social motivations offer different perspectives on entrepreneurship (Banks, 2007, Campbell, 2006). In the next section, I explore how entrepreneurship is achieved in practice, despite the pressures of contemporary life.

**Tools and techniques**

In this section I explore how cultural entrepreneurs manage their everyday schedules and workflows. All the cultural entrepreneurs I interviewed were able to articulate a sense of a working pattern, even if that was relatively fluid depending on the nature of a specific job or other commitments. No one seemed to suggest that they work ‘when the muse takes them’, in the way that we might typify a bohemian or artistic approach to work. Working styles in terms of location, times and resources differed greatly but there is a sense
of wanting to be professional and organised. Cultural entrepreneurs create bespoke working patterns to accommodate a range of priorities, including family. Managing family life is a complex issue with an emotional impact, as working parents feel torn between their entrepreneurial venture and being a parent: an issue which is not unique to cultural entrepreneurs but which exposes personal agency in negotiating these difficulties.

In managing working hours, cultural entrepreneurs have different expectations and use different methods. Emma simply admits that she is ‘A workaholic – definitely a workaholic’. Emma explains her personal work pattern, knowing how different her style of work is to the conventional working day.

Other people say, why are you working at night? But I just tend to work when I work and I maybe work slower but I work all day. Like from 7 in the morning till 10 or midnight. (Emma, 2012)

Emma manages her day by using her most productive time to work but also taking full advantage of being self-employed by taking a break after lunch for food shopping, doing the washing or simply having a rest.

Hannah’s working pattern is dictated by her responsibilities as a parent. She describes her work as full time but not necessarily a 9-5 schedule.

… my typical day is I get woken up by the kids, come down, make breakfast, get everybody ready and out to school, take them to school. We all go on our bikes, me and the boys, Pete’s already got to work by that point. So I take the boys to school on their bikes and then I often go for a bike ride myself for half an hour or so. Just start the day
off with a bike ride and then come back and sit down and plan my day although I sometimes do that when I'm having breakfast, and then work through until, depending on whether it's a day when they’re at after school club or not, work through until about 17:00 or 15:00, depending on whether I’ve got child care after school, and then go and pick the boys up and make the tea and do bed time and then sit down in front of the telly. (Hannah, 2012)

Hannah is highly organised and manages weekly tasks by breaking them down into daily activities. This way, she balances her weekly activities between designing, meetings and business administration.

So Monday morning, hopefully I get it all done in the morning, I do all of my invoicing and budgeting and the sort of day-to-day planning and then occasionally I’ll spend a bit of time doing a longer term plan, I have to do a business plan for the next year this week on Monday. And then the middle of the week tends to be client work. I also do quite a lot of writing because I’ve had a book published, a web design book. And I write quite a lot of articles so there will be a mix of client work and writing and talking to my freelancers and my associates about what they’re doing and communicating with them about potential jobs, current jobs and so forth so the project management side of it. And then Thursday and Friday, I sort of look at my posting and that sort of thing. That is if there isn’t still client work to get finished by the end of the week. (Hannah, 2012)
This approach is not echoed by all cultural entrepreneurs, and is perhaps a reflection of Hannah’s personality and previous experience, in a corporate business culture. Sadie’s schedule is more erratic and it is predominantly dictated by her young son who has food allergies and who has to attend regular hospital appointments for various health issues.

He goes to a play group around the corner but that involves me actually being there as well. So, yes, I mean, to be quite honest a typical day is mornings is his time, Friday mornings we just try and chill out and not do much. But most mornings he’ll go to play group, come back, we’ll have lunch and then he’ll have his nap and while he has his nap I’m on the computer doing my work. Then in the afternoon he’ll just usually, we’ll get all his toys out, all his painting and his colours and he’ll paint and do stuff while I’m here going, ‘Oh, that’s great, that’s wonderful.’ And sit here. (Sadie, 2013)

Managing unconventional work hours are particularly important to Sadie whose work relies heavily on her personal profile, herself as a brand. Sadie talks about having to adjust her plans depending on what opportunity comes up.

Yes, originally I said I was going to have … well, what it was, when I was eight months pregnant I got approached by Levi Campbell to be a part of one of their campaigns. So officially I was working when he was four weeks old and he was in the board room with me in London. So I did that, a global ambassador for them for 18 months, but it was freelance. He was born September 2010 and I didn’t really get back
into the magazine until February this year. So a good 18 months.
(Sadie, 2013)

Sadie describes this as a fantastic opportunity, enabling her to keep her profile and be paid quite well as a freelancer for relatively few hours work. She has found a way of making it work by being able to rely on her family, her mother and sister. Sadie has enjoyed a good support system around her, her mother and her sister help with her toddler and enable her to pursue her entrepreneurial ambitions. Mirchandani refers to Morokovasic’s research which finds that the barriers faced by women because of their ethnicity as well as gender results in them relying on ‘family member, kin and community to set up and operate their businesses’ (1999, p. 233). This may be the case for Sadie who is the only cultural entrepreneur who refers to her wider family as offering such hands on practical help. Indeed, as her son has had various medical issues since he was born, Sadie has had to rely on her close family.

After her second child and since becoming self-employed, Liz has had to adjust her schedule to be able to spend more time with her daughter.

…I mean that is the pattern, then you look ahead where that pattern might fall out of place then we bring in extra childcare. So I have some childcare, we share some childcare, some is paid, some school and then we have to work around the holidays. I mean for instance I won’t be running a programme, I don’t run a programme in August now and I won’t be running a programme in December and January because that is going to be research time. (Liz, 2013)
As Mattis’ research suggests, women who become self-employed are not necessarily looking to reduce their hours; rather, ‘they are seeking more control over the hours they work’ (2004, p. 159). The planning and techniques to manage their time is sometimes precarious but it also allows for more flexibility which cultural entrepreneurs use to their advantage. Jackie, who at the time of the interview has a toddler, communicates a sense of control characteristic of methods for self-efficacy.

Because my days are very focused, so I get home, I’m going into the workshop, I’m working all day, I’ve got to get this done and I don’t want any distractions, so it works for me. (Jackie, 2012)

Elise suggests proudly that she plans all aspects of her life, even having a baby, to accommodate peaks and troughs in her work.

Potentially, I have to say that since I've been freelance it’s been great - but then at the beginning of 2011, I decided to get pregnant because I could see - I knew - three of my clients were going to go under. They had already decided that they were going to cease trading so I thought this is the best time for me to try and get pregnant and thankfully we got pregnant first time and we were very lucky that it all fitted very well and that my last contract finished a week before I went on maternity leave…So I thought because there isn't going to be much work anyway I might as well do it now. And also because I'd had quite a few clients, I'd built up quite a significant amount of savings so I was able to cash-flow that anyway. (Elise, 2013)
Cultural entrepreneurs want different things at different times. For instance, in her previous work Liz found that she did not want to mix home and work.

I couldn’t talk about home, I mean I don’t know… I don’t want to talk about it… I didn’t go to any mum things from school, I think I went to one and all they did was talk about their children and talk about when they were younger. And I was like, oh god, I don’t care, I just don’t care and I didn’t go to another one… (Liz, 2014)

Now, like Hannah and Sadie, Liz works from home not only to reduce costs but also to cut out commuting time and to spend more time with her daughter when she is more available. Similarly, Roger’s festival requires long working hours some times of the year but much less at other times, which he also uses to spend more time with his two children.

Yeah, so around January/February it’s much longer working hours and it’s slightly all-consuming and I’m much more likely to be in here [office] at weekends and stuff. (Roger, 2012)

In contrast, Jack sticks to a more conventional working pattern.

Yes – typical day: leave the house at 8, get here before 9, typically leave here between 6-7 (10½ hour day), no lunch break, get home for 7:30-8. Not untypical. Working week is probably 50 hrs but I don’t have to do so much at weekends. (Jack, 2011)

For Jack, this is because he wants to identify with a traditional business style of working, disassociating himself with the idea of irregular working hours often associated with cultural workers. Elsewhere in this study I refer to
Jack’s sense of himself as a ‘northerner’, with a work ethic which suggests the antithesis of the bohemian or media worker.

In order to manage day-to-day tasks, cultural entrepreneurs use various methods to organise themselves and their workloads. Increasingly they make use of online tools, many of which are free. Hannah has the added benefit of having learned various organisational skills from her previous work in the corporate sector.

I think most people I know use tools because we’re all into our apps and things and we’ve all got something. Because I've, I mean I spent a lot of time, when I was working at the TSB I spent a lot of time developing databases for other people, that was part of my job. I did a stint working in what was then called Manpower Planning, Workforce Planning, where we had to build databases. So I've built this database myself. So I'm probably a bit more organised than most people I know… (Hannah, 2012)

Tom has good intentions to be organised but here he admits that he does not necessarily stick to his plans.

Well yes I think it just comes in flows, it depends upon the season and yeah, so, it is a balance. I'm a great one for lists - I love lists! I love mind maps. I develop systems and then I go with systems and then I forget about systems! Then I go back to them. You know I'm one of the world's worst journal writers. I'll be really passionate about writing a journal and then I've not written something for eight months, you know… (Tom, 2013)
Again, I find an openness and awareness of the problems with cultural work in the entrepreneurs’ narrative, suggesting an ongoing project. Working patterns and techniques are tested and reviewed. For some the difficulties are more challenging to surmount but for others such as Hannah and Jackie, an ability to plan and manage their time efficiently has given them the control they are after.

For Hannah, being employed was the best option during her maternity leave but self-employment has given her flexibility now that she has two small children.

> It’s the one where you don’t have to get formal qualifications and with a young family, I didn’t want to take a couple of years out to be studying… You can work from home. So I started building up my business in my own time in the evenings, I was working most evenings and some weekends. (Hannah, 2012)

The cultural entrepreneurs articulate ‘choosing’ this approach and that they design their work pattern to suit them, whether they have other responsibilities such as children, or not. Tom articulates this by stating:

> We are constantly deconstructing what it is we want to do and why we want to do it and where the stresses are and why the stresses are there. Well we don’t want to do that so say no. So we, its very dynamic, very organic, very relational, very counter cultural to the way business is often done. But at the same time, our bank manager and accountant they love us and they think we are really interesting in the
way that we work and we’ve always managed to keep paying the bills. Keep at it through quite difficult times. (Tom, 2012)

An awareness of the precariousness of entrepreneurial work is apparent in Tom’s narrative. There are, undeniably, insecurities but there are also tools and techniques for managing these. This is not to underestimate the many difficulties expressed in the interviewees’ accounts, but perhaps they are not specific to cultural entrepreneurship. Rather, they are the problems of contemporary working life.

Are some of the tensions with managing family life for many of the female cultural entrepreneurs any different to that of employed women? For some, it seems that the flexibility to ‘control’ working patterns, and a ‘can do’ attitude typified by methods for organising one’s life and work, have some benefits.

**Risk: Managing risk in business & personal planning**

In the final section of this chapter, I explore the resourceful manner in which cultural workers manage the inevitable risks associated with entrepreneurial work. There are both personal and business risks, which in small enterprises tend to be inseparable, and often relating to financial matters. Cultural entrepreneurs exhibit different levels of personal agency in their attitude towards managing and mitigating against certain risks. Personal circumstances and the industry context in which they work play a part in contextualising individual approaches. Furthermore, cultural entrepreneurs make comparisons with others in the milieu, either reinforcing their decisions or in contrast with others.
A ‘can do’ attitude is tempered by limited resources and realistic assessments of what can be achieved, often due to external circumstances. However, there is evidence of planning one’s life and working in thoughtful, reflexive and pragmatic ways.

The most challenging risks are concerned with long term financial planning such as saving for a pension or an exit strategy for a business. These are long term goals which loom across the horizon but tend to be too far into the future to be prioritised.

In terms of ambitions to grow their businesses, the most commercial and successful enterprises tend to be the most strategic. On the whole, the more successful the cultural entrepreneur is, the more risk averse he or she becomes, as the risks are higher. The responsibility for staff and a sense that the basic sustainability of the business is a priority, makes risks associated with growth less relevant. Moreover, cultural workers are concerned that growth will result in compromising basic values revealing tensions in their strategic development. Conventional enterprise practice assumes that growth is the inevitable goal of all businesses, but the cultural entrepreneurs in this study are hesitant, preferring to nurture rather than expand their businesses. As demonstrated by research into female entrepreneurs, entrepreneurship allows for different business models with varying priorities and goals (Campbell, 2006).

**Innovation and growth**

I begin by exploring ways in which cultural entrepreneurs present their potential for innovation and growth in relation to risk. Cultural entrepreneurs
convey some of the tensions in developing an enterprise by articulating their plans and reflections. It is important to note that entrepreneurial innovation in the cultural industries does not take place in a vacuum and is embedded within the field. Gatekeepers to funding, suppliers, customers, and the clustering of the cultural industries in Birmingham’s creative milieu play a part in enabling innovative practice, which I will discuss in chapter five. Cultural entrepreneurs such as Jack, whose new media enterprise has the potential to grow, suffer from a failure of policy to support them adequately. The link between publicly funded policy and entrepreneurial development is often misunderstood and certainly underestimated (Mazzucato, 2013). An example of this is De Bruin’s (2005) research into the relationship between New Zealand’s film policies and the film maker Peter Jackson which demonstrates the importance of state intervention in the entrepreneurial process.

In the case of UK film companies, it is well documented that the business model based on a project-by-project approach, makes it very difficult for most small independent film production companies to survive, as echoed by Tom’s narrative.

    Because the pressures come when you just need more people and when you are juggling so many different projects and they break down into essentially two things: one where there is work that's coming through different partnerships, its commercial work, we create films for people and they pay us. So those bits of work are coming in, you invoice, you deliver the work and that pays the bills. Then you've got the development of projects which takes years. Our first feature film took us 10 years to get off the ground. We are currently working on
three others. Two of which are already into their 2nd and 3rd year of developing, finding partners and taking that next step forward. You know, none of those are earning you any money at that point. They are just eating up resources. So, so yes the reality is that I'd be lying to say that I've totally sussed that out. (Tom, 2013)

An understanding of specific production processes and markets is necessary to fully explore entrepreneurial potential within the sub-sectors of the cultural industries (Brandellero and Kloosterman, 2010). Specificity is revealed in the way in which cultural entrepreneurs describe their enterprise and its potential for growth based both on external issues as well as internal values, resources, networks and ambitions. The struggle described by Tom is to some extent specific to his industry sector. As Oakley (2014) reminds us, each sub-sector of the cultural industries is very different. Conventional business models fit awkwardly with the project-driven film production process which creates many risks for a small enterprise in terms of cash-flow. There is no blueprint. Each cultural entrepreneur tests their version of a business model, managing risks in a context where public policies can dramatically alter a company’s position. Tom is both reactive to short term opportunities and pro-active in his approach to planning long term film projects.

Jack and Paul's enterprises are potentially the most commercially successful, but there is no sign of being able to sit on their laurels. Jack explains the pressures of having employees and the balance, as a business, between growth and stability.
Because at the end of the day there is always a wage bill which is now £40k a month and you do feel a certain amount of responsibility. You want enough resources in the bank to be able to ensure you can hit a dry spot and can make sure you can pay everyone and have a sort of contingency and sort of a lifeline. And also you just think well you don’t want to turn down opportunities because that could lead to new clients so it’s very difficult line to toe. But we are starting to look at doing that now in terms of another possible plan. It’s like we live in an industrial mechanism at the moment that each employee can generate X income based on X and these are all finite working hours and hourly rate, gross and then net based on the overheads and all the marketing and investment that goes into actually how much you gain and how much they can generate and how much they can produce, all that sort of stuff. And if you think about that as a model, that’s very industrial. How much can you produce and how long does the machine take to ... and so you start thinking about software development, which is you build a product once and then your job is sales and marketing. And to get entry into the market and to be visible, so you need a product which is either a bit better or better marketed. If you haven’t got the money to do something you can market better because enterprise level software is extremely cutthroat. There are people doing things on all sorts of levels – people giving stuff away. People doing open source level...But again, all these things are hard because you have to do the day to day, of commitments and current projects you’ve got on. And can’t waste
some time that you are not billing internal projects ... rather than wait until you get the job and then do it... Or you actually say on the outset of the year, we are going to aim for this turnover and accept that there will be £100k net less profit and we are going to invest that in time. (Jack, 2012)

In our discussion it becomes evident that Jack and his business partner have discussed their options, including an exit strategy, as an opportunity to sell up and reap the rewards of their investment. The problem for Paul's enterprise is one of scale and what the company might lose or gain by growing.

…which is part of the reason why we are thinking carefully about our values and when you get bigger, how do you carry on being MediaMash rather than the thing that we don't want to be? (Paul, 2013)

Paul reflects on his values as part of a discussion about growth and innovation, acknowledging that the company’s identity will change as a result of expanding, perhaps not for the better. His approach is thoughtful, managing risks by tentatively developing in collaboration with his team.

…at the moment I'm trying to get the people who work with me, of allowing me to be way up there strategically, about key relationships, and I've grown much more confident so I'm happier trying to chase a piece of business that could double the size of the company overnight, than I was a year ago because I can deliver those and I know the other people around me can deliver those, so yeah… (Paul, 2013)
Paul’s approach is perhaps indicative of a post economic bubble era, but also seems to be driven by not wanting to lose sight of his values. As I described earlier, Paul’s values are closely linked to the idea of being a ‘good citizen’ and based on his relationships with clients, peers and collaborators. In this context, business risks are evaluated as part of a range of priorities including Birmingham’s cultural milieu and Paul’s personal identity within that space.

This is an issue pertinent to Isabella’s enterprise, whose experience of growing the business by receiving venture capital funding was unhelpful and discouraged her from this type of support. Isabella’s business publishes magazines and runs cultural events, both of which are reliant on her local networks and the particular style associated with her brand. This is chiefly achieved through the magazine which appeals to the youth market with an interest in ‘alternative’ fashion and music. Here the ‘alternative’ element does not reflect any alternative political stance but rather a trend or a certain kind of cool. Isabella found that the conventional business support alongside venture capital funding (local venture capital through public funding) was not compatible with her aspirations and her in-depth understanding of her market. This reiterates the importance of the specificity of cultural enterprises when weighing up risks and opportunities. In Isabella’s case, the key to her enterprise is a business model based on her contacts and her reputation.

…it’s up and down so who knows. But I’m confident in our range of skills and our network that at least for the next twelve [months], I mean I’m getting enquiries about work next July… And if I had enquiries about producing work nearly a year in advance and I’m like,
well that’s quite nice that someone wants to book us for that time and that we can then forecast what we know we’ve got coming in as well.

(Isabella, 2013)

The relevance of networks and social capital will be further explored in chapters five and six but in relation to taking risks, sustainability based on an in-depth understanding of the cultural enterprise may be more relevant than growth.

Some cultural entrepreneurs are prepared to explore opportunities for growth, but this is a tentative process. Rather than a confident ‘can do’ attitude to risk taking, my study reflects a measured approach. As Jack explains, ‘sometimes just keeping going is a success story’ (2012).

**Personal risks and lifestyle**

As many of the cultural entrepreneur I interview are either very small businesses or freelancers, business and personal risks tend to merge. Financial risk taking is closely associated with entrepreneurs but, as I have argued, entrepreneurship cannot be reduced to the rhetoric associated with popular stereotypes or conventional trait-based theories. The risks associated with cultural work are more often associated with a lack of security in a freelance working culture (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011). In cultural entrepreneurship, I find approaches to managing personal financial risks in the planning and organisational skills of individual workers who perhaps have a little more control over their work than freelancers dependent on an employer. Like Hesmondhalgh and Baker, I find that cultural workers
know the risks they are taking although some find long term planning quite challenging (2011, p.121).

While making money or getting rich is not a core motivation, in all cases the entrepreneurs are at least attempting to make their cultural work their main source of income. This is negotiated in different ways, but unlike Forkert’s (2013) London-based artists, my interviewees are not involved in other paid work to sustain cultural activities. For example, without giving me her exact salary, Hannah and her husband have planned their joint income to suit them as a family. Hannah does rely on his support financially, just as he relies on her ability to be more available for the children.

    Yes, I mean my husband pays the regular bills because he’s got a regular salary, so all the standing orders and that sort of thing, and then I pay for the food and the odd holidays and things like that.

    (Hannah, 2012)

Hannah explains that her salary is less because she is building up the business and because, until recently, she has worked part-time (about three days a week). Some of her payments are erratic but as long as her husband’s income is there as a back-up plan, they can manage. This is a partnership and as a couple they accommodate family and individual career aspirations.

    So, and also over the holidays, I took most of the summer holidays off. Luckily I had my advance from my book, so it’s very varied. (Hannah, 2012)
The arrangements discussed by Hannah are not so dissimilar to many couples who manage their finances and family commitments interdependently to make the most of their resources and suit their preferences. While some may consider this a lack of independence in a traditional heterosexual couple, a similar arrangement for supporting each other financially is negotiated between Luca and Ted, and is surely an aspect of contemporary life.

Luca does not have any children but he takes care of his 82 year old mother which he describes as ‘quite a responsibility’. Luca is in a long term relationship with his partner Ted (23 years together) and as a couple, they have supported each other over the years.

But I think Ted’s role is important so I think because unless I knew, in terms of risk taking, because I know that, I think I’ve had to do it once where I’ve had to say, “Ted, I haven’t got the money just at the minute to do that,” once in five years which is amazing, and Ted’s role is important because what I do is pay half of everything but I don’t pay for the extras, so when we go away Ted has to pay so actually all the extras and the special things, and Ted will tell you this, but he’s happy to do that because the converse of that, and it is an important part of the story, is that Ted was studying full-time when I first met him and I supported him through, not his first degree because he got a grant for that, but I was always like, not the breadwinner that’s the wrong word, but the income, the regular income person, right until Ted got his PhD or his first job, really. So that changed and so there was always that reciprocity. (Luca, 2013)
Luca is well aware that without the support from his partner he would not have taken the risk: ‘If he wasn’t there, I probably would have not held my nerve and taken a part-time job doing participatory engagement officer somewhere’ (Luca, 2013).

Despite being the sole breadwinner and with three children, Tom has a fairly philosophical view in relation to the financial risks he takes. He discusses his business partnership and the implications for his family.

Yeah. And I think there is a bit of a healthy sense of how bad can it be? So we look at it and go well if we both had to walk away from this and close the company down and had £15,000-20,000 debt between us it doesn’t mean we are going to go to prison. Or live in a tent somewhere. (Tom, 2012)

The comment may seem naïve, but it does indicate an awareness of the risks and an open discussion between Tom and his business partner.

Liz talks about acceptable risk by referring to her father. She explains that although her mother was a nurse, her dad, originally from Pakistan, was self-employed for 15 years and always encouraged his daughters into self-employment. Liz’s sister is also self-employed, running a successful casting agency in London.

No, my dad was a good risk taker, goodness, you know, so really big risk taker compared to, much more so than I would and sometimes I think maybe that was a bit of a risk but that would have been encouraged. He’s like yeah you should try it, what is, you can only
Liz takes a pragmatic view saying ‘I’m not living hand to mouth’. Here she describes in more detail what she can and can’t afford; the lifestyle that is acceptable to her and her family:

No you can’t with two kids, no so we kind of, you know, I’ve got enough, you know we’re kind of, we’re okay, we’re not going to starve, you know, we can clothe our children in Boden [laughs]. But there is no extravagance in our lifestyle whatsoever, but of course that is the norm because, that is my network I mean… (Liz, 2013)

Unpredictable circumstances such as a couple separating will change financial planning and alter the risks associated with entrepreneurial activities. As Paul’s life has changed when he separated from his long term partner, he has had to adapt to a different way of managing his finances.

And since me and my partner split up, the business was always doing fine but I would leave a lot of money in the business to help the business, and now, I have to take more money out and manage life. So, but that's fine, but that's just a more mature relationship [with the business] which is absolutely fine. (Paul, 2013)

Being able to compare with others helps some cultural entrepreneurs to make a decision, either in opposition to others or it boosts their confidence. Given the recent changes in funding and governments, I ask Liz whether she has experienced a shift in attitude amongst her peers.
I mean it’s interesting because my kind of, I suppose my cohort, you
know, they are all sort of, it’s a whole group of people now in their late
30’s, early 40’s, all graduated at the same time, have come through
the structures at the same time. And no one has slowed down, and no
one has moved on to big organisations or gone, they’ve all wanted to
head up their own thing. (Liz, 2013)

This suggests a level of comfort drawn from the idea that ‘heading up your
own thing’ is common, along with the precariousness associated with cultural
entrepreneurship. It also indicates a period of time in which the concept of an
‘enterprise culture’ has perhaps become more acceptable, particularly as
Liz’s social circle includes London-based artists from her student days.
Entrepreneurial modes of work can seem more acceptable if they are the
norm, yet this does not reduce the risks. As I have argued earlier, Liz is not a
young entrepreneur with a ‘gung ho’ attitude. She takes her responsibilities
seriously and has thought this through.

I was given advice really, really early in my career by a film producer,
independent film producer in the UK who was a friend and who told
me to just keep my overheads down as low as possible at all times.
And I’ve absolutely stuck by that. Luckily I have a partner who thinks
exactly like that, if not more so, so [I’ve] never committed to huge
overheads. (Liz, 2013)

A sense of the risks involved can be relative, depending on the cultural
entrepreneur’s social circle, arrangements with their partner and the nature
of their work. A significant feature here is how risks are managed at the level
of the couple, something which is common in modern life yet rarely explored in discussions of cultural work and precarity. In comparison with working freelance, the cultural entrepreneurs I interview are proactive in developing work opportunities, perhaps enhancing their chances to control and manage their work. I am not suggesting that there are no risks, but rather that they may be in a better position to shape the relationship between work and life. I discuss this further in the final section of the chapter but focusing on future planning.

Planning for the future

In an unstable economic context it is difficult to make plans for the future, particularly financial plans. When I ask Hannah about financial planning for her future, she admits that she has not been able to organise this yet.

I don’t. I had a private pension when I was employed before but it was for life and it became worthless. So I sort of got stung a bit with that. So I don’t, occasionally I think, “I really ought to get a pension.”

(Hannah, 2012)

For someone as organised as Hannah this surprises me but it also confirms how difficult it is to plan far ahead when there is so much to do in planning short term goals. In contrast, Alison does have a pension but she explains that she hardly pays anything into it because she doesn’t feel that it is the best way to save for her retirement. Alison tells me that her parents find it ironic that with the little she has, she is much better at managing her finances than her brother who is a successful accountant.
Yes, I've got one with £2,000 in or something and at first I was paying more into it but like the returns are so rubbish that actually I'm better off buying a house basically... I've got a mortgage. That's more stable and secure than putting things into a pension which you have no control over in the future really. (Alison, 2013)

Interestingly, Alison also buys art works and rare books as an investment, but then she admits that she would probably not want to sell them.

Not that I'd want to sell them but in a way I'd rather do that than put it into some sort of a plan that I have no understanding or no - I'd rather buy an art work and hopefully it will be worth it. (Alison, 2013)

Jackie, who is good at organising her time, reflects on the difference between her planning for her maternity leave arrangements and pension plan in comparison to other designer makers she knows.

Having spoken to a lot of other people and seeing what my peers do, I think actually, I'm probably in a much better position than they are. (Jackie, 2012)

Since having a child, Sadie has thought about her and his future, but like Alison, she does not trust conventional pension plans. Sadie explains how this fits into her ambition to leave the UK, and perhaps move to Jamaica:

...but even with the pension thing, only because of what I've seen and experienced, you know, I've decided I'm not going to invest in a pension. I'd rather put that money in a bank and save my own unofficial pension kind of thing. Only because I've seen what people have ended up with... they've been getting less money and it not, kind
of, working out. Then I thought, “Well, if I’m not really planning on staying here until 60-65 what is the point of me, kind of like, having a pension here? But I do have a savings fund, he [her son] has a savings account separately which regardless of what my income is, I do still pay a minimum in every month and his dad pays money into his savings account as well on a regular basis. So there is that plan. I don’t actually plan to buy here in the UK. (Sadie, 2013)

It is evident that long term financial planning is difficult, although some thought has been given to this, even if not acted upon. More interestingly, there is a mistrust of conventional ways of planning, which is shared amongst several of the cultural entrepreneurs. It is difficult to know if this is a result of the current economic climate or a more personal viewpoint.

Of all the cultural entrepreneurs I interview, Elise is the most efficient in terms of managing her finances. Elise explains that she was saving ‘30% of everything’ she earned as part of her financial planning.

Well, that covers my tax and my national insurance and then leaves about a grand (£1,000) and then on top of that I was saving about £300-400 a month additionally for four years. (Elise, 2013)

This level of planning demonstrate that a level of control can support self-realisation and a balance between managing life and work. There are significant dimensions to self-employment which leave cultural entrepreneurs in vulnerable positions, such as changes in government policies and personal circumstances. Yet I find reason to be optimistic about the cultural entrepreneur’s ability to manage their situation and in developing potential
new models of work. Firstly, the cultural entrepreneurs I interview are thoughtful in their approach to personal and business planning taking only considered risks. Secondly, it is difficult to plan and there is a mistrust of conventional approaches to business and to financial planning. Instead, I find evidence of being resourceful and living within your means. Finally, the issues associated with the precariousness of cultural entrepreneurship are managed in ways which appear to be common to many workers. Situations are not fixed, responsibilities change and many individuals manage their situation as part of a couple, negotiating the best options for their circumstances.

In the final section of this chapter, I have discussed financial plans and quite sensitive issues as a means of investigating both the personal and professional experience of cultural entrepreneurship. I am very grateful for the generosity of my interviewees who have divulged personal details, and in so doing, have assisted me in presenting a more holistic picture of cultural entrepreneurship.

**Conclusion**

The precariousness of cultural entrepreneurship is not in question here, indeed, my interviewees’ accounts support many of the issues raised by critical theorists. However, I seek to enhance the debate by exploring reflexivity and self-management based on the lived experience and personal narratives of Birmingham cultural entrepreneurs. I have found evidence of what Ross (2003) calls the ‘hidden costs’ of cultural work in the long hours and commitment expected of self-employment. Yet, I reveal personal choice
and agency as playing an important role in managing this commitment and negotiating individual positions. Despite the many problems cultural entrepreneurs face, a ‘can do’ attitude is revealed through various techniques. There is a level of choice and freedom found in the cultural worker’s decision making, which offers the prospect of alternative forms of entrepreneurship. Personal narratives highlight not only the industry specificity of cultural work but also the personal context and expectations of cultural entrepreneurs. I consider the lived experience of the interviewees, and seek to respect these stories as the entrepreneurs articulate them, without presuming that they over or understate their experience. I have contextualised the cultural entrepreneurs’ accounts by situating them within a social milieu and within their individual background stories.

Despite not having specifically pursued ethical businesses, in the first part of this chapter I have found discrete moral and ethical practices similar to Banks’ Manchester-based cultural entrepreneurs (2006, 2007). Thoughtful and reflective in their approach, cultural entrepreneurs are able to articulate specific values and beliefs as motivation for their work. Here, individualisation offers the opportunity for personal agency, to test or create one’s own version of cultural entrepreneurship.

I find that through descriptions of relatively mundane, day-to-day details, I have depicted rich narratives, for instance, Hannah’s highly structured routine as part of balancing family life and work. Individual stories such as Hannah and Sadie, have many qualities which I have rarely come across in academics studies of cultural work. Their backgrounds and motivations seem far removed from descriptions of cultural entrepreneurs as art school
graduates, seeking to pursue their creative aspirations and identifying with a bohemian lifestyle (Forkert, 2013).

Oakley suggests that cultural entrepreneurs are pushed into setting up businesses because that is the easiest way to carry out their practice: ‘They get premises because they need to work away from the kitchen table’ (Oakley, 2013, p. 145). But I find evidence of choosing self-employment for a myriad of reasons including managing family life, wanting to do ‘interesting work’ and the opportunity to live by certain values. The bravado which might be associated with a ‘can do’ attitude to precarious work is not underestimated and there is both a ‘push’ and ‘pull’ into entrepreneurship. I encounter perceptive and pragmatic individuals who tackle risks and uncertainty in distinctive ways, to suit their needs and circumstances.

Finally, by exploring different types of risk in cultural entrepreneurship, I draw attention to how business and personal risks converge. Opportunities for growth are limited and cultural entrepreneurs do not generally embody the popular myth of the risk-taking entrepreneur. Decisions to grow are carefully considered, revealing entrepreneurship to be a trial and error process rather than unthinkingly eager to pursue all commercial opportunities. Along with the recent economic crisis, cultural entrepreneurs operate in volatile markets, often reliant on trends which are difficult to predict (Oakley, 2014).

I reveal some real challenges and a sense that planning for financial security is one of the hardest aspects of cultural entrepreneurship. Assuming that individuals take that on board, I find evidence of a relatively healthy relationship between insecurity and self-management. Again, a ‘can do’
approach does not overlook difficulties but shows a determination to achieve personal goals within a specific context. As Forkert (2013) suggests, financial constraints make a difference and there is evidence that a supportive framework has advantages. Roles are negotiated with partners, offering opportunities for development and support for entrepreneurial practice.

As Banks writes, investigating the embedded experience of individuals and taking note of the potential for self-reflexivity challenges our assumptions beyond a ‘caricature’ of a cultural entrepreneur (2006, p.466).

Individualisation enables cultural entrepreneurs to have the freedom to choose their mode of work, even if this freedom is complex and does not shelter them from precariousness.

There is the possibility for individuals to devise their own business models, make personal choices and re-invent professional identities. As I discuss in the next chapter, identities are complex but cultural entrepreneurs are playful in constructing their sense of themselves. In ‘becoming’ cultural entrepreneurs, identities emerge through a dynamic social context.
Chapter 4: The entrepreneurial, bohemian, cultural worker

Introduction

In this chapter, I explore the notion of performing the cultural entrepreneur in the context of popular myths about entrepreneurs and cultural workers. I find that myths are important in the creation of professional identities. Characteristics associated with entrepreneurs and with bohemia are used, rejected or adapted to suit the individual cultural worker’s sense of themselves. Complex identities emerge in a social and relational context. First, through the cultural workers’ accounts, the narratives he or she tells themselves and others. Second, the cultural workers’ actions and decision-making processes. Third, the cultural workers’ personal circumstances and preferences. By questioning critical perspectives of cultural entrepreneurship I reveal different ways in which entrepreneurial identities are actively formed in a professional context.

I identify two versions of the cultural worker in critical discourse which I want to explore in this chapter. I question the notion of the impersonal, individualised cultural entrepreneur (McRobbie, 2002b) and I explore the artist, bohemian or cool cultural worker (McGuigan, 2009). How do cultural entrepreneurs use the characteristics associated with these identities? Do they present a kind of ‘pick and mix’ of identities to justify and support the cultural entrepreneur’s practice?
I find cultural entrepreneurs to have a playful approach to these characters, revealing complex identities through their ability to be reflexive. I focus on how cultural entrepreneurs test professional identities within the boundaries of the bohemian and of the entrepreneur in order to develop their own sense of purpose. I find stereotypes to be both valuable and contested. They act as anchors for specific attributes which the cultural entrepreneur can manipulate; almost a menu from which one can choose a set of behaviours. I argue that agency reveals itself in the reflexive space in which the cultural entrepreneur tinkers with his or her professional identity, adjusting it to suit his or her personal narrative. At the end of the chapter, I investigate emerging discourses in entrepreneurship studies which consider diverse characteristics for the entrepreneur, and the cultural entrepreneur.

**Performance and identity**

I begin with a discussion about the relevance of myths, performance and identity. As discussed in chapter one, identity can be understood as much by what is left out as what is revealed. Cultural entrepreneurs develop the ability to project certain characteristics depending on the social context and the individual’s personal motivations. Multiple identities can be presented by cultural entrepreneurs, as part of asserting a sense of themselves, in a given situation.

In *Organizing Identity*, du Gay proposes ‘an understanding of the specific forms of ‘personhood’ that individuals acquire as a result of their immersion in, or subjection to, particular normative and technical regimes of conduct’ (2007, p.11). Du Gay does not suggest that individuals are ‘free agents’, but
he proposes that as a society, we organize identity as if we were ‘free agents’ (2007, p.21). For instance, du Gay (2007) argues that in relation to our legal system or in our understanding of education, we act as though individuals are more or less free. As such, we are responsible for our actions rather than pawns in a game. This implies that in many circumstances we are perceived as autonomous individuals, with the potential for adopting certain characteristics in a given context, such as a professional context. Du Gay draws on Elias to suggest that interdependency is key to the dynamic relationship between persons and their networks, ‘social relations and individual identities generate one another’ (2007, p.26). In other words, identities are reliant on both the relational dynamics and on societal expectations, which might be dictated by a specific job role or typical characteristics associated with a professional position.

Du Gay continues his argument with reference to an article by Bourdieu in which the sociologist explores the idea of a person’s ‘life-history’. Here he discusses how the process of telling one’s story, a method used in this research, reflects ideas of storytelling and the novel. In other words, recalling one’s experiences for the purposes of an interview for instance, can enable a ‘mechanism for producing the experience of self’ (2007, p.27). Cultural entrepreneurs in this study articulate their sense of self through their narratives and by drawing on a range of possible characteristics associated with their professional milieu. Storytelling suggests a level of reflection as part of the sense making process. As I have argued, my interview method attempts to create a space in which the cultural entrepreneur tells his or her
story in an environment which is relatively intimate, encouraging an unguarded and gossipy discussion.

Forkert states that in the process of interviewing Berlin-based artists, some interviewees present ‘tedious performances similar to rock stars’ interactions with journalists’ generating perhaps less ‘genuine’ accounts of their experience (2013, p.134). I recognise this behaviour, and as Forkert (2013) notes, performing the figure of, in this case, the bohemian, is a ‘professional requirement’ for artists who use this identity as part of their brand. I argue that what Forkert calls ‘self-mythologizing’ as opposed to an ‘honest discussion’ (2013, p.134) is an integral part of all professional identities, whether bohemian, entrepreneurial or other. Self-mythologizing may be distasteful when it comes across as showing off or has the rock star qualities Forkert experienced, but it is surely a process performed in many interviewees, indeed, by all of us, to a lesser or greater extent.

To further explore the notion of performance, I draw on James Donald’s notion of ‘acting out’ an identity. For Donald, the appeal of O. Henry’s *Man About Town* embodies ideas of both image, how others see us, with self-image, how we see ourselves (1996, p. 171).

> Being a citizen, being a Man About Town, being a person – these are not identities, they are performances. (Donald, 1996, p.185).

Donald argues that ‘performance’ allows individuals to ‘masquerade’ in public spaces, but also to subvert normative behaviours through the possibilities of cross dressing, for instance (1996). I consider mythologising and the idea of performing a particular character, such as an entrepreneur or a bohemian
artist, as the ideal space for revealing a genuinely complex narrative rather than a true or fixed identity. Birmingham’s cultural milieu acts as a public space in which cultural entrepreneurs can perform, masquerade or, indeed, subvert conventional identities. Through performance, what aspect of the entrepreneur is contested, rejected or adopted? How is bohemia appropriated or subverted as part of a production of the self?

In this chapter I argue that the process of self-mythologising reveals ways in which cultural entrepreneurs manage their professional identities. Furthermore, in a relational context, cultural entrepreneurs adopt, reject and refine these identities as part of the process of ‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur. As discussed in the previous chapter, ‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur is a process which takes place within a complex framework including personal choices as well as the professional expectations associated with a cultural milieu. Despite the seemingly fixed identities of both the entrepreneur and the bohemian artist, I argue that personal agency is evident in the manner in which these roles are performed in a social milieu. In other words, performing the cultural entrepreneur is not a passive act, it is in and of itself agentic.

The chapter is organised in three parts, commencing with the entrepreneur as an identity, followed by the idea of the bohemian or cool worker. I finish by exploring alternative entrepreneurial identities which are starting to contest the fixed western characteristics of the entrepreneur.

**The entrepreneur**
As Jones and Spicer discuss in their book ‘*Unmasking the Entrepreneur*’, there is a tendency both in entrepreneurship studies and popular discourse to see the entrepreneur as having a fixed identity. As I have stated, it is common to focus on personality traits personified by celebrities such as Richard Branson, Bill Gates, Alan Sugar and the panel of entrepreneurs who take part in BBC2’s programme, the Dragon’s Den.

Although academics do not agree on a specific definition of the entrepreneur (Chell, 2008; Hjorth and Steyaert, 2009) there are common attributes which are deemed to be important in western characterisations of the entrepreneurial type.

Drawing on Kirby (2003) I list below some of the common attributes which might define an entrepreneur or which suggest the qualities one should acquire to become an entrepreneur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The entrepreneur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive to achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal orientated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to deal with failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and ability to inspire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Characteristics of the entrepreneur from Kirby (2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks for opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that these are very much disputed, between the trait model or the behavioural descriptors, and that, as Kirby (2003) states, few entrepreneurs possess all the characteristics above. Despite this, the notion of the entrepreneur is persistent in popular discourse and in entrepreneurship studies which as du Gay argues, was strengthened in the UK by the emergence of an enterprise culture in the 1980’s and 90’s (2007, p.165). A combination of entrepreneurship as embedded in our work cultures, and the enduring idea of the entrepreneur, contributes to an acceptance that entrepreneurial traits and modes of work are part of normative practices. As Couldry and Littler state, ‘certain norms of performance at work’ reflect neo-liberal values and ‘naturalize’ certain behaviours in the workplace (2011). This leads to a sense that we all need to be entrepreneurial, whether we are self-employed, working in a small firm, in the public sector or in large corporate company. Indeed this is welcomed by many theorists and policymakers, who argue that entrepreneurial modes of work fit with artistic sensibilities and are appropriate for the cultural industries (Hagoort, 2003). This is precisely the type of argument which concerns Oakley when she states that the ‘term “entrepreneur” ill-fits those who have never expressed any desire to be self-employed but have simply had to
adapt’ (2014 p.149). But what definition of the entrepreneur is Oakley referring to? And, how is the role of the entrepreneur performed by cultural workers?

The entrepreneur as jester

As discussed in chapter one, Warren and Anderson’s (2009) study of the ‘aesthetic performance of an entrepreneurial identity’, presents the entrepreneur as jester based on Michael O’Leary, who exposes his ability to use entrepreneurial rhetoric as a means of challenging the structures which stand in his way. According to Warren and Anderson, O’Leary is empowered by performing this role and employs the character of the entrepreneur to meet his business needs in a competitive marketplace.

But O’Leary’s jestering acts as and provides an emotional shortcut, where the ‘people’s champion’ narrative amplifies the ascribed values of being enterprising from a valuable personal identity into an enterprising corporate identity for Ryanair. (Warren and Anderson, 2009, p. 149)

The authors argue that O’Leary’s narrative fits with the notion of entrepreneurship as ‘creative destruction’ based on innovation and change. In this case, O’Leary makes use of the media to communicate the story of change as better value for the general public, namely cheaper flights, and in opposition to larger, established companies who are his direct competitors. This is achieved through humorous and emotive behavior by O’Leary, who performs ‘selected components of the munificence of entrepreneurial identity’ to appeal to potential customers (2009, p.161). Warren and Anderson also
describe how this instrumental approach to adopting an entrepreneurial identity and endearing himself to the general public backfires on O’Leary, when his meanness towards his staff is exposed by the media (2009). Having adopted a particular entrepreneurial identity, this can become fixed in the milieu in which a person works, and difficult to relinquish.

O’Leary’s story is acted out in a public sphere; his style is depicted as adversarial and provocative. My interviewees are not generally interacting with the media to the same extent, but their public space is Birmingham’s cultural milieu, a space in which they jostle alongside their peers to perform their role. For instance, and as discussed in chapter three, Tom presents his entrepreneurial character as being driven by social objectives rather than purely focused on financial gain. Tom describes how his entrepreneurial activities have to have ‘an element of goodness through the relationships we have with other people’ (2012). In his story and actions, Tom performs the ‘good guy’, a person who should be perceived as the antithesis of the money-grabbing entrepreneur, Richard, who he describes as: ‘you know, he’s a serial, power-hungry person’ (2012). Tom’s dramatic language (power hungry) ensures that he is positioning himself in direct opposition to Richard within Birmingham’s cultural milieu. Certainly, the idea that Richard is influential in Birmingham very much chimes with other accounts which either mention Richard, his company, his position on various boards or in association with key people in Birmingham’s cultural milieu. Yet, there is a contradiction in Tom’s story as he too seeks leadership roles through his position as the chief executive of the local support network for film producers, a platform from which he addresses local policies and works with the city
council, universities and funding agencies. Contradictions of this type demonstrate the ambiguous identities of cultural entrepreneurs. Tom attempts to reject the ‘power hungry’ aspects of his entrepreneurial role but with the film producers’ network, Tom’s role demonstrates entrepreneurial traits such as being pro-active and strategically building social capital for future opportunities, a way of working similar to that of Richard. We might reflect that this is simple jealousy, but the result has a powerful impact on Tom’s sense of himself as he negotiates his position locally. I argue that it is precisely these details which offer insights into understanding the nature of the entrepreneurial personality as it relates to cultural workers in a specific social milieu.

From a different perspective, Elise, who has worked closely with Richard, perceives him as someone who ‘would put whatever hat needed to be put on at whatever time’; a strategic and adaptable identity (2013). Ultimately, Elise finds it difficult to pin Richard down in relation to the label of the entrepreneur and she states:

I dont think that's big enough for what he does, in my mind, because he is the man with many fingers in many pies. And yes, I dont know what his focus is - he is quite broad. I think an entrepreneur might be more focused. (Elise, 2013)

For Elise, a means of describing Richard’s reach and involvement in a range of activities places him beyond the role of the entrepreneur. For herself however, Elise sees something in the words cultural entrepreneur that she recognises for her own position but is clear that she would never use the
term, for herself or others, stating ‘no, its not in my language’. But when prompted to think about someone who would describe themselves as a cultural entrepreneur, Elise does not hesitate to name Dave, explaining that ‘he’s far more commercially orientated’ (Elise, 2013). I find this account matches that of Jack who I interviewed two years earlier and who also names Dave as a ‘typical’ cultural entrepreneur.

Yeah, he would have a badge with it on – a badge that tweets!


The idea of visual images such as ‘a badge’ or ‘tweet’ draws on the idea of a public space in which one can act the role of the cultural entrepreneur. When I ask Jack if he describes himself as a cultural entrepreneur, he comments by stating that as a company, ‘well I know that we tick all the criteria’ before going on to reject the idea of himself as a cultural entrepreneur (Jack, 2011). Dave represents a particular kind of myth which Jack wants to distance himself from, describing his role and work in a different way. It is often in relation to others that we are able to identify our own behaviour. By gossiping about Dave, Jack imagines how he wants to be portrayed or how he wants to be viewed by others. Jack articulates an awareness of Dave’s performance associated the bohemian and typical entrepreneur, preferring to be identified as a designer.

Design is the actual rigorous application of trying to do something creative, on time, on budget, to meet client expectation – it is a really difficult job and you know, you try to satisfy you own expectations and needs and aspirations and preferences but really you are trying to do
something that is always, I think it is far more like an engineering process than an art related one. Art being at the opposite end. Art being a pure form of creative personal expression. (Jack, 2011)

Since his company has grown, Jack has moved on from being involved in the creative process and is now starting to see himself as a manager, involved in telling people what ‘to do, in the right order, at the right time and being a lot more organised’ (2011). Jack is keen to describe his work as a set of tasks which are process driven and managed rather than the entrepreneurial style epitomised by Dave. For Jack this is more than a reaction to Dave, it is also about his other relationships with friends and family. In this statement, I find Jack to be very thoughtful about his work, how it has changed and how it compares to others.

Yes, it is ambivalent because, partly it just feels like ok, when it was a creative role you just think, I think I always had a sense that you were not taken as seriously. I don’t think that people in the creative industries are. Like my two best friends, one is a consultant psychiatrist and the other is a human rights lawyer. And you know, amongst my peers, I always thought I ought to get a proper job sometime. And I never regarded what I was doing that seriously and it’s also parental expectations. Having done serious things, it was always kind of well this is fun, but it’s not actually that fun, there is quite a lot of stress as you know, to do with design rather than being ‘creative’. (Jack, 2011)
Jack is only too aware of the idea of the entrepreneur or the creative person, and the performative aspects of this role, but chooses to distance himself from that persona. His ability to do that appears to rest on his social circle and his family context, enabling him to objectify the idea of the cultural entrepreneur by drawing on a range of other experiences.

The notion of observing and rejecting entrepreneurial characteristics is echoed in some of the findings from Couldry and Littler in their research into the show *The Apprentice* (2011). Couldry and Littler (2011) investigate the ‘reality’ of work in an environment in which enterprise is normalised through the contestants’ performance on screen, emphasising values such as passion and competitiveness as positive and highly desirable. Although Couldry and Littler (2011) are critical of the programme, suggesting that it offers a narrow view of entrepreneurship for both audience and participants, they suggest that viewers have the possibility to reject this reductive depiction of the entrepreneur. The stylised documentary approach creates a distance between viewers and the entrepreneurial norms being presented, offering some room for agency. In other words, the very limitations of the programme point to choices we have as viewers. From our perspective as viewers, we can encounter the performer/contestant with the ability to make our own minds up as to how we view their entrepreneurial ‘performance’. Similarly, Jack can laugh at or reject the cultural entrepreneur as performed by Dave.

Despite his rejection of the ‘caricature’ of a cultural entrepreneur represented in Dave, this does not stop Jack from working with Dave who he says was ‘on our books’ although this was kept quiet. This is partly because Jack’s
analysis is that Dave is good at performing the entrepreneur but that ‘he’s an entrepreneur of all sorts, but never made any money out of anything’, making him a potential business liability (Jack, 2011). The disclosure that Dave’s entrepreneurial capabilities rely solely on his performance rather than his ability to ‘make money’ serves Jack to present his own professional identity as serious and commercially successful. As Hall (1996, p.15) describes, identity is as much about describing difference, what we are not, rather than communalities.

In contrast to Jack, Luca identifies with some entrepreneurial traits and explains his position from a very different perspective. Luca could be described as an artist, but when I ask him about being a cultural entrepreneur, he states ‘That’s what I am. That’s how I describe myself.’ (Luca, 2013). He elaborates by stating:

Minimum resources, maximum output. That’s what I’m interested in. Anyone that’s worked with me will tell you how much you get from working with me, and what I would generate as an output. I often think that I’m really lazy and don’t generate a lot of stuff, whereas most people around me think I generate loads. So for me, entrepreneurship is about looking at maximising resources, and I think I do that really well… (Luca, 2013)

Luca is drawn to the ideas associated with the entrepreneur; a self-reliant individual and in particular this sense of achieving a lot from few resources. As we discuss this further during the interview, Luca reveals a disapproval or
dislike of being reliant on public funding, a position which is common to many artists.

So this will come from nothing. I will go for very little public funding if any at all. What I won’t do, which I think is not anti-entrepreneurial but lots of people invest lots of their time in writing funding applications and going through administrations and bureaucracies around I need £500, and they’ll probably waste £1000 of their time generating £500, and I’m just thinking, just use the resources you’ve got, your time. (Luca, 2013)

The role of the enterprising individual suits Luca as he distances himself from artists who he perceives as more reliant on public subsidy. In the previous chapter, I presented Luca’s position as an artist who currently relies on his partner for a level of financial support. Luca borrows entrepreneurial characteristics to suit his narrative because that justifies his preferred style of working and enables him to come across as a ‘doer’, yet this is only possible because of the support he has from his partner. I am also aware that in the past Luca has benefitted from public funding for much of his work. The significance here is that the identity that Luca seeks to portray, is relevant to his current narrative, his sense of himself at the time of the interview.

The attraction to the entrepreneur, for Luca, is that it represents an attitude that seems to be about self-reliance and change. As a means of distancing himself from the identity of the poor artist, Luca adopts the identity of the entrepreneur, for him it is ‘the DIY culture approach to the entrepreneurial that interests me, but it’s about making money and it’s about maximising
resources’ (Luca, 2013). Like Luca, Alison could be described as a full time artist, and her response to the term cultural entrepreneur is equally positive.

… because I think that’s the way the cultural industries have got to move in their thinking. In an entrepreneurial way. About looking outwards into the world rather than looking inwards. And I think that’s what entrepreneurs do more. So I think it is actually quite healthy to think of culture as being enterprising and all the things that they bring to our world and our communities. (Alison, 2013)

Although Alison explains her perception of entrepreneurship in a different way from Luca, they are both positive rather than rejecting entrepreneurship. Neither of their work could be described as particularly commercial as both of them deal with socially-engaged projects and interact with community groups in non-conventional settings. Yet, both Alison and Luca embrace a connection between enterprise and change; perhaps similar to Schumpeter’s ‘creative disruption’, although the outcomes are not necessarily economic change. Alison explains that she does not know any formal definitions of enterprise but that for her it suggests having a lot of ideas.

Someone that sees something or makes connections between things in the world. Sees something that maybe other people don’t see or sees a solution, more of an idea or something that’s gonna help and yeah, something like that. And then puts it into practice. (Alison, 2013)

I also ask Alison how she would describe herself other than as an artist and she states ‘Probably as a social entrepreneur or as a creative entrepreneur’, suggesting ‘Yeah there is that other side to what I’m doing as well.’ (Alison,
2013). Alison would also use the term ‘curator’ but she explains that she does not find definitions very useful, acknowledging that they might be for other people, but not for her. As with Richard, it seems that the ability to wear many hats, depending on which one seems most appropriate or helpful, is something Alison is used to doing.

Du Gay argues that individuals are capable of adopting certain habits through immersion in a specific context: ‘the practical means through which individuals are equipped with the capacities to conduct themselves as particular sorts of persons (2007, p.23). These attributes can be tested to see how they ‘feel’ and they are not fixed and learned by an individual coming into this milieu, but fluctuate both in form and dynamics.

The figuration, in other words, does not connect persons with already established identities but, rather, it provides those persons with their very dimensions or characteristics. The persons, their characteristics, what they are and do are all dependent upon the relations in which they are involved. (du Gay, 2007, p.26)

The language and characteristics associated with the entrepreneur can be adopted as a means of presenting a version of oneself or to explore new territories. It can help individuals project how they want to be perceived in a social milieu, for instance as pro-active or what they are not, such as Tom who does not want to appear as ‘power hungry’.

As I have argued, personality traits inform popular notions of the entrepreneur which permeate many aspects of contemporary work. Rather than contesting the mythical figure of the entrepreneur, I have positioned the
entrepreneur within this discussion. So far, I have found little resistance to the idea of the entrepreneur other than as the character is depicted in specific individuals such as Dave. Entrepreneurial behaviour tends to not be associated with capitalism per se but with a positive attitude, with change and innovation.

By paying attention to the active contests around enterprise discourse we begin to become aware that the entrepreneurial subject is not simply given – rather it is a terrain of struggle, resistance and power. (Jones and Spicer, 2009, p. 25)

As the authors suggest, enterprise can be met with ‘ritualised humour and cynicism’ in certain work cultures. For instance, the type of response articulated by Jack when describing Dave as having a badge that would tweet ‘cultural entrepreneur’!

In the next section, I explore the ‘cultural’ aspect of the cultural entrepreneur’s identity. I find the ‘bohemian artist’ offers a platform from which cultural entrepreneurs can perform their role, adapting and negotiating their identities.

**The bohemian artist, the radical artist and the cool worker**

In the first part of this chapter I discussed the way in which cultural workers interact with the popular notion of the entrepreneur and I connected this to the idea of performance. Similarly, the bohemian identity of the artist can also be adopted and manipulated to suit the cultural entrepreneur. In this
section, the cultural aspects of the cultural entrepreneur’s identity are explored.

Isabella states that it is ‘really nice if someone says you are an entrepreneur’, but she is keen to add that being a cultural entrepreneur is an appropriate way of differentiating her practice from other industries.

They’ve got a business or an idea and they’ve made it work and they’ve been successful with it. So I wouldn’t mind being put in that kind of little label. That’s fine with me. Yes, so I don’t have an issue with it and then adding the cultural onto the entrepreneur kind of gives it I would say, it’s not entrepreneur light but it kind of gives it some kind of like a bit of a twist. It’s about maybe just being more creative with your thinking. It’s not like entrepreneur of nuts and bolts and manufacturing, you know what I mean? (Isabella, 2012)

This distinction between any entrepreneur and the cultural entrepreneur illustrates the important specificity of cultural work, as being linked to a lifestyle and a different way of working. As Bilton suggests, artists such as Salvador Dali performed the self-conscious and dramatic rendition of ‘the artist’ through his dress and mannerism (Bilton, 2007, p.17). As with the character of the entrepreneur, it is this narrow view of the artist or cultural worker which is significant in exploring identities in cultural entrepreneurs. Personal agency is revealed in the manner in which cultural entrepreneurs rebel against or embrace established identities.

It is no secret that artistic identity is bound up with ideas of the romantic bohemian character who is thought to be a critic of society, an image which
still prevails, at least in the west (McGuigan, 2009, p. 49). McGuigan discusses this tension between art and business tracing the issue back to the Romantics and the decline of the artist’s relationship with rich patrons when we see a shift towards the role of artists as critics of society, politics and the market (2009, p.45). An alternative lifestyle is associated with what McGuigan describes as ‘that of a bohemian, an autonomous rebel living in a space separate from mainstream’ (2009, p.49). Bourdieu suggests that bohemia was a ‘society within a society’, associated with artists and writers, broadly during the mid-nineteenth century. Bourdieu’s bohemia is presented as a lifestyle, ‘a bourgeois dilettante who wrote as a pastime or hobby, or a frivolous, impoverished bohemian’ (Bourdieu, 1993, p.277).

McGuigan connects this to the twentieth century when alternative lifestyles became fashionable, often resulting in the gentrification of certain neighborhoods. In Birmingham evidence of this can seen in certain areas such as the Jewellery Quarter, which will be discussed in chapter five. McGuigan (2009) argues that movements such as bohemia eventually become incorporated into the mainstream, and are adopted by capitalism becoming a marketable trend. Forkert connects this to the 1960s US art scene which becomes attractive to businesses, interested in aligning themselves with the avant-garde and innovation (2013, p.20). Forkert notes that some radical groups emerge during this period including the Art Workers Coalition and Guerilla Art Action Group (2013, p.21). According to McRobbie, the tradition of cultural work as counter culture prevailed in the 1960’s and 70’s, led by radical groups such as feminists and groups working against racism (2011).
In the late 80s, McGuigan identifies groups such as the Young British Artists (YBAs) who emerged predominantly from the fine art course at Goldsmiths University of London, and embraced entrepreneurial approaches in order to sell their art work. Although McGuigan does not make a direct link between bohemian and cool, he suggests that cool cultural workers are those who encapsulate aspects of the bohemian lifestyle combined with entrepreneurial attitudes (2009).

Young British Art represented an attitude rather than a movement: an attitude that was cool with capitalist accumulation and the seductions of consumer culture; an attitude that imagined no alternative…As they grew older, the YBAs defined the new role of the artist as entrepreneur and flippant provocateur – embodied especially by Hirst – for aspirant young artists seeking to repeat the trick. (McGuigan, 2009, p.81)

Many of the cultural entrepreneurs I interview for this study could be described as following the YBA generation, and may be influenced by their approach. McGuigan’s cool cultural worker suggests a contemporary, entrepreneurial character rather than the poor bohemian.

It is this notion of bohemian as a lifestyle that is exploited by Florida in his analysis of the creative city (2002). Florida argues that in order to attract the right kind of talent, a place or city needs to be attractive to the potential workforce and he develops a set of indexes to measure the attractiveness of a community to new recruits. He includes a Bohemian index which is described as a measure of artistically creative people (such as painters,
musicians, performers, designers etc.) in a given area, as contributing to his 3T's criteria for economic development: technology, talent and tolerance (Florida, 2002, p. 249). As Banks notes, this can lead to gentrification, pushing out some of the very individuals who first create the distinctive bohemian character of certain areas such as New York's Soho for instance (2007). Space and bohemia are intrinsically linked given the aesthetic qualities of alternative lifestyles depicted by the bohemian. From Baudelaire's flaneur, to the artists of the 60s, it is possible to identify specific aesthetic qualities in their dress, interior décor, and particularly in the style of derelict buildings in urban environments. Ironically, the sense of ‘authenticity’ which bohemian artists embody is utilised in instrumental policies to produce the right environment for business and economic development, following models such as Florida’s. The idea of ‘alternative’ is an important ingredient in the cultural entrepreneurs’ sense of themselves, but this does not suggest a need for overtly radical cultural work such as that associated with the Paris Bohemians of the 1850’s or radical art movements of the 1960s and 70s (McRobbie, 2011).

Using these three identities: the bohemian, the radical artist, and the cool worker, I explore the cultural identity within the cultural entrepreneur. As Taylor and Littleton (2013) propose, the study of identity is not a means to categorise cultural entrepreneurs, rather it offers the space to explore conflicting narratives and complexity.

A creative identity is not a simple self-categorization and nor is it adopted ‘one and for all’. Rather there is an always incomplete project of identification as a constrained and negotiated ongoing process.
involving conflicts and dilemmas around the multiple sites and meanings in play. (Taylor and Littleton, 2013, p. 158)

This has already been evident in the first part of this chapter when I discussed the entrepreneur as a category which is both complex and contested. For instance, Liz now describes herself as a curator, but her initial experiences as a fine art graduate reflect the pull towards ‘acting’ like an artist, even twenty years after graduating. Poettischacher discusses the importance of early mythologies in cultural entrepreneurship as significant aspects of the company’s dynamic style of business (2005); here the company is the individual cultural entrepreneur.

All these scripts have their origin in the foundation phase of a business and are tied to specific ‘creation legends’. (Poettischacher, 2005, p.183)

As an individual who has identified with the idea of being an artist, Liz can continue this narrative even as her work evolves and includes new responsibilities and dimensions. Here, Liz describes taking up some teaching shortly after her MA in Fine Art and the challenges of not being an artist:

… I think the habit of having a studio, you’ve graduated from art school, you go with other artists, you join a studio, that is what you do. You can’t, it takes a long time to actually pull away from that… (Liz, 2013)

As Liz says, not having a studio could be a difficult decision if you have been immersed in artistic practice, suggesting a move away from the ritual of going to a studio, the notion of being an artist, and belonging to that
community. Now a curator, Liz emphasizes her ongoing closeness to that community and the idea that she is involved with professional artists who like her, are serious about their work.

I think there are those who go and make and do it and they’re absolutely driven and those who are just enquiring, are engaged in some form of enquiry. And it’s partly about your network, you know, my network is artists, filmmakers, musicians, that is what we did. (Liz, 2013)

For Liz, it is important that she identifies with her original network of artists. Despite the precariousness of her work, Liz states that it is important for her ‘to do what I want to do; so I’d rather have that freedom’ (2013). Being enterprising is not enough in itself, entrepreneurial activities must resonate with a specific identity and with a wider artistic network which might include audiences, peers and funders. I suggest that the specificity of that identity might be rooted in Liz’s educational experience, her first network and contemporaries at art college.

As with Eikhof and Haunschild’s (2006) study of bohemian entrepreneurs, many cultural entrepreneurs have to create that bridge between the bohemian and the entrepreneur.

We argue that in order to understand how artists perceive themselves as involved in the production of art for art’s sake and at the same time manage themselves as market subjects, the phenomenon of lifestyle has to be considered. Most artists understand themselves as bohemians, living a lifestyle that is distinguished from the rest of
society, especially the bourgeoisie and business. (Eikhof and Haunschild, 2006, p.234)

Alison expresses a sense of conflict between producing her work and earning a living as an artist, and the lifestyle associated with being an artist; she states that there are ‘loads of problems!!!’ (2013). Alison’s account reflects what Taylor and Littleton (2013) present as that dilemma between being the kind of artist who sells or the type of artist who is making something different, interesting or alternative.

Umm, I mean, there are loads of problems with it, I don’t know, I think it’s really difficult the whole question of money and art. Cos essentially you’ve got two options, which is to make art that sells and that galleries are interested in buying and other people are interested in buying. Or you go the other route which is more commission based, project based, community based… Umm, I think it’s a lot simpler if you have a gallery and you just make work and they sell it for you…But is that what you want to do? Because I think that a lot of people make work because it sells and then just keep making the same work because it keeps selling but then are you really an artist who is making something that is experimental and different? (Alison, 2013)

The motivation to make something as an experiment rather than for money, is described by Banks as a ‘practice-led’ approach, motivated potentially by an ‘array of non-economic rationales’ (2007, p.113). However, not all cultural work that can be considered as practice-led and not motivated by commercial imperatives is ethical. Again, the picture is more complex as Liz
articulates when she attempts to respond to my question about cultural entrepreneurs in Birmingham. I ask her about her peers, who might be described as a cultural entrepreneur and Liz responds by talking about people involved in experimental projects.

… the way they have latched on to the handmade artisan mode. That is really, you know, that growth is really interesting and I know it’s only a, kind of a volunteer run store and a baker and an oven, but that fills that, that idea would grow and grow. I mean that is something that is sustainable, that is sustainable, that is about sort of community and self-help so I don’t, do they do it to be entrepreneurial? I don’t know. I’m thinking they came from a more social enterprise model, that is what I think is going on there. And I think social enterprise is really interesting because it’s filling, it’s about filling a need, I think the argument about creative industries is like well what need are you fulfilling? (Liz, 2013)

Liz is ‘thinking aloud’, trying to articulate what enterprise, social or cultural, might be about. I find this revealing as it suggests a potential concern with the usefulness of the ‘creative industries’ as opposed to a social enterprise, which might have a clearer set of social objectives. Banks (2007) draws on MacIntyre to show how individualisation can lead to more authentic, craft-based activity such as the artisanal practices described by Liz (the community bread maker). Liz does not relate this to her own practice but she demonstrates her awareness and questions the ethical dimensions of cultural work.
As others have argued, despite the challenges and insecurities associated with cultural work there is a strong pull to identify with what is perceived as ‘interesting’ or ‘experimental’ work, for its own sake. Liz, Alison, Roger and Luca fit into Banks’ category of the ‘aesthetic reflexivity’, a development from the bohemian or avant-garde.

In terms of the art-commerce relation, an overt emphasis on art has often provided workers with a sphere of relative autonomy where they could experiment and explore often counter-rational and radical creative impulses. (Banks, 2007 p.102)

But not all alternative practice is radical or indeed ethical. The distinction between what is purely an ‘aesthetic and reflexive’ activity and what has become the ‘aestheticization of everyday life’ is complex and ambiguous (Banks, 2007, p.105). The aesthetic of bohemian life, as a set of values and as a series of images and trends, is attractive to many people who might not engage explicitly with politics. This contradiction is also evident in Bramhall’s (2013) research into ‘austerity chic’ in which she suggests that people find themselves committed in contradictory ways to anti-austerity politics whilst finding ‘austerity chic’, appealing. It would be wrong to see the performance of bohemia as simply adopting a trend. As with the idea of the entrepreneurial identity, the bohemian concept enables cultural entrepreneurs to play with aspects of that identity and supports a sense of belonging to a particular community of workers.

Liz, Roger, Alison and Luca are immersed in bohemian and entrepreneurial work, creating cultural works as curators and artists which are closely tied
with their identities. As curators and artists, their identities have a significant impact on their success, enabling them to be known for a specific type of work, to gain recognition and generate further opportunities. There is a challenging and complex set of identities at play represented by lifestyle, alternative activities and entrepreneurial know how. As Taylor and Littleton (2013) find, an acceptable form of artistic identity can paradoxically, be that of the unsuccessful artist, in financial terms. Taylor and Littleton’s (2013) research reveals that some of the participants who, over time, became relatively successful artists, found it difficult to claim the identity of the artist. The authors describe:

…[a] tension around definition and the possibility that creativity might have taken them forward into another place and identity. We found that many of our financially successful participants had to defend their claims to be creative, to be still, say, a designer and not a manager or property developer, a painter and not a manufacturer of interior design products. (Taylor and Littleton, 2013, p.163)

Chibici-Revneanu (2012) describes how the mythical tale of the genius artist is connected with non-formulaic types of art, so called ‘high’ art. She highlights the notion of the poor bohemian artist as seen as being more serious than those who are engaged in entertaining audiences.

So far, financial success and being concerned with commercial marketability are not relevant to Liz and Roger, who rely on a substantial level of public funding for their projects (although they also look for income from box office, sponsorship, and sales of products such as books). Below, I refer to
examples taken from Liz and Roger’s marketing material, describing their projects in ways which appear to be a high art, alternative and potentially challenging artistic programmes.

We work responsively and collaboratively, and are dedicated to exploring the convergence of film, video, performance and interdisciplinary practice… The first two year programme…sees [Zeitgeist] Projects working across live and media arts, music and dirty new media. (Zeitgeist Projects)

We are firm believers in creating a sense of occasion, exploring the fertile territory where film bumps up against other artforms, and showing people things they might not otherwise have seen. (Brum Film Fest)

As I have stated, it is difficult to understand the specific nature of this ‘alternative’ work in comparison with the radical Paris-based bohemian critic of institutions and structures such as the bourgeoisie. Yet it seems bound up with the cultural entrepreneurs’ identity as artist/curator and their ability to convey the right kind of alternative cultural product. It seems that Liz and Roger have successfully gained modest, but appropriate arts funding to deliver their alternative programme of activities. In comparison, Alison’s account suggests a deeper level of complexity in managing the right kind of image as an artist/curator because, as she points out, her projects get little arts funding or exposure in arts venues. Instead, she has looked for a social enterprise, Heritage Lottery funding and other means of exhibiting or distributing her work.
Well, I was just thinking about like, why have I never really had any art work in a gallery and when a gallery or anybody approaches me it's always to do with workshops or something like what a workshop or a talk or... I don't know why. And I was thinking is it because of the way in which I'm framing the project or is it because of the way I'm getting the funding and the way it's making me think about it more. Umm or is it also partly because it is actually really hard to make the work that I make and get arts council funding for that kind of thing? (Alison, 2013)

Alison describes the ambiguity of her artistic identity as a potential problem for her in establishing herself locally, despite the success she has had with other funders. Alison’s work involves social history, interviews with community groups as well as a site-specific space for various events and activities. Could this connection with community and educational activities with schools get in the way of her artistic credentials? Her work is non-mainstream but perhaps not the right kind of alternative? I ask Alison if she might be perceived as a community artist, and she states:

Yeah, exactly it feels like that which is fine but I don’t feel like I'm a community art person… it's not like that's the prime objective of the work, but it just so happens that people are a lot more important in the work and what I'm doing. (Alison, 2013)

Within this small group, it appears that artistic identity is intrinsically linked to the way in which artists/cultural entrepreneurs are perceived and how they position themselves and, ultimately, their success. Sustaining a bohemian identity depends on another kind of structure, perhaps approval by peers and
funders. As I will discuss in chapters five and six, individual agency can only be understood within structures. It is perhaps noteworthy that of all the interviewees in this study, Alison is the only one who has stopped running her enterprise and has opted to work in secondary education, although she maintains that she still perceives herself as an artist.

Luca takes a different position by combining his artistic identity with the entrepreneur in a more direct way. Luca’s account is particularly interesting because he adopts several narratives which might be in conflict, yet he is comfortable borrowing from diverse identities to create his story.

The reason why I’ve chosen that word, there’s a thorough explanation for it. It’s because when I curate, I curate like an artist. When I do things, I do things like an artist, therefore rather than pussyfooting around, I say I’m an artist as a statement, as an act that opens up the potential of how people view me. It’s much more plural. So it’s a strategic answer, actually, because if I said I was a designer, people expect me to be quite focused on customers, if I said I was a curator, people probably think I deal with organised exhibitions, as a producer, they’d think I did theatre or film, so for me the artist just is the quickest shorthand for me to then have an open conversation. (Luca, 2013)

As Luca states, terms such as ‘artist’ are used as ‘shorthand’ but also in a leading manner, to make certain kinds of connections. Luca’s narrative combines the artist identity as a means of describing aesthetic values, but, as discussed earlier, he is also keen on the entrepreneur as a means of identifying himself as a ‘doer’, contrasting himself with artists whose work is
subsidised with public funds. More commonly, the artist and the entrepreneur are perceived as opposites. But as we see from Luca’s account, it is a
different aspects of the entrepreneur that he is interested in, the pro-active and resourceful individual. Luca is both originator of new ideas, Schumpeter’s ‘innovator’, and the person who ‘gets things done’. Luca compares his enterprising approach to the work of arts organisations as a way of demonstrating his ability to make a lot from very little.

…but honestly, I think it goes back to that thing of the independent, as give them £1000, you’ll get £3000 worth of cultural product. Give an arts organisation £1000, and you’ll get £300 worth of art project.

(Luca, 2013)

This is reminiscent of Liz and Paul’s accounts cited in chapter three, of a sense that larger organisations and the public sector might squander funds by wasting time or not focusing on the art. The suggestion being that entrepreneurial modes of work can be more effective for cultural production, more resourceful and potentially more ethical in delivering more for less. This could be linked to a neo-liberal discourse which purports that the public sector wastes resources. Yet, as I will discuss in chapter five, I find this to also be part of an approach to alternative practices, cultural workers determining their own means and ways of working outside of the formal structures of institutions and systems of grants.

Instead of a conflict between enterprise and art, Luca’s account suggests a playfulness between the two aspects of his work, a theme in his practice.
I archive everything, because I don’t see the distinction between the development of the brand and the development of the idea and the development of art as a product of what I do, so for me the business is part of the project. Because I’m fascinated by Warhol and I still think even though he’s reduced to a few pieces of work, he’s still one of the most influential artists in terms of relationship between popular culture, culture and art. (Luca, 2013)

Of all the interviewees, Isabella articulates an aspect of her identity by stating that ‘it’s all about the lifestyle’ (2012). Isabella is very proud to be associated with ‘a certain look’ which is woven into her company brand, making her products and services easily recognisable.

…someone said to us the other day, “Picked up Area Guide [magazine] and I knew that you guys had done this because no one else would have produced something like this.” (Isabella, 2012)

It would be convenient to see this as a highly superficial attachment to a lifestyle. It is possibly the type of work which McRobbie criticises as exemplified when she describes one of her students who wants to pursue a ‘shallow kind of job’ working for an events company, rather than as McRobbie suggests, ‘working with disadvantaged youths, or a post-graduate course in Community Work’ (McRobbie, 2011, p.32).

But I find in Isabella’s narrative a more complex account, in which Isabella describes her attraction to an alternative lifestyle as a result of a key influence in her life, her older cousin. To contextualise this, it is important to note that Isabella describes herself as a working class ‘Brummie’ in terms of
her parents’ occupation, their earnings and education. This is in contrast with assumptions that cultural workers tend to be highly educated and middle class.

…[my cousin is] three years older and I think it was kind of like it sounded really exciting and they all dyed their hair purple and listened to like Ned’s Atomic Dustbin and it was like, Okay, there’s an alternative world out there and I really like the sound of it. And I used to look up to her a lot and I think that it maybe was, it definitely was, I think that was definitely an influence for me… I loved being around older people that were at college and weren’t at school anymore, sounded quite exciting. So I think it was more about the lifestyle rather than the career path. (Isabella, 2012)

Isabella’s sense of the ‘alternative’ is wrapped up in her personal background as much as it might be influenced by current trends.

So far I have argued that entrepreneurial and bohemian identities are utilised by cultural workers as stories which enables a playfulness with identity. Individuals act in ways that are unpredictable and manipulate identities, revealing multiple layers of influence in a social environment. In investigating identities, I have found relatively little evidence of the overtly politically, activism that McRobbie is keen to see (2011). Presenting a politicized identity is not part of the cultural entrepreneurs’ narratives of themselves, even if some of their actions do demonstrate ethical and moral positions. I argue that a contextualised approach to exploring identity has enabled me to
analyse the entrepreneurs’ accounts as performed and negotiated within Birmingham’s cultural milieu.

Having explored the stereotypical identities of the entrepreneur and the bohemian artist, I will now focus on new identities in entrepreneurship. An emerging discourse in entrepreneurship studies is breaking down conventional western notions of entrepreneurs. This recognises that diverse entrepreneurial activities and workers offer insights for cultural entrepreneurship.

Non-conventional entrepreneurial identities

So far in this chapter, I have demonstrated that in articulating professional identities, cultural entrepreneurs make use of both popular notions of the entrepreneur and the bohemian artist. Now I would like to turn my attention more specifically to the emerging body of research which is challenging dominant ideas about entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur. Drawing on recent studies in female entrepreneurship and Steyeart and Hjorth’s series of books Movements in Entrepreneurship, I aim to investigate alternative identities for the cultural entrepreneur (Steyeart and Hjorth, 2006; Tedmanson et al., 2012). Indeed, the cultural entrepreneur is an alternative identity, in the context of popular myths and dominant academic literature.

By participating in a discourse initiated by scholars such as Steyeart and Hjorth (2006), Tedmanson et al. (2012), Jones and Spicer (2009), I hope to contribute to advancing entrepreneurship studies forward but also to make some connections with cultural studies. Steyeart and Hjorth’s (2006) publications draw together authors and collaborators from different
disciplines to initiate a disruption in entrepreneurship theory towards new narratives, notably from female social entrepreneurship and other marginalised activities.

Critical perspectives in entrepreneurship studies offer insights to challenge existing structures rather than accepting the fixed identity of the entrepreneur.

By analysing the language of media texts and teaching cases, Ahl and Marlow demonstrate how gendered assumptions underpin ‘normative’ tales of everyday entrepreneurship to reproduce a male-dominated sphere of activity. (Tedmanson et al., 2012, p.536)

As well as gendered perspectives, entrepreneurial activities at the margins are explored to highlight the work of those working in unconventional contexts, such as Imas et al.’s (2012) paper which focuses on so called ‘barefoot’ entrepreneurs; individuals working in poor and excluded places. Lindgren and Packendorff (2006, p.218) introduce non-traditional business models from the cultural sector, the Hultsfred rock festival, as representing a deviation from traditional working life for a particular town’s community. For Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2010), insights into the relational and societal aspects in entrepreneurship formation offer alternative entrepreneurial identities.

Besides the call for more attention to multi-paradigmatic and multi-disciplinary issues, Steyaert and Katz [2004, p.181] suggest that entrepreneurship should be studied as a societal phenomenon rather
than purely as an economic reality… (Chell and Karataş-Özkan, 2010, p. 26)

In the final part of this chapter, I make use of this emerging research to further explore entrepreneurial identities. I find identities which do not fit neatly into the neo-liberal economic world critical theorists sometimes refer to, instead, I reveal diverse entrepreneurial identities.

**Cultural entrepreneur**

As I stated in chapter two, academic studies of the cultural entrepreneur are an emerging field, complicated by the use of different terms to describe entrepreneurship in cultural work. Here I investigate the identity of the cultural enterprise as it is depicted by a range of scholars; in terms of his or her personal attributes and distinctive features. This promotes differences between the ‘entrepreneur’ and the ‘cultural entrepreneur’ establishing certain characteristics as pertinent to cultural enterprises.

From a business school perspective, Rae (2007) has identified five key features of a cultural enterprise. Firstly, a strong identity with individuals or brand; secondly, a creative product or service which meets a niche market; thirdly, capturing commercial value; fourthly, a discourse with audience and the use of technology for communication; finally, a distinctive language, culture, behaviour, and style of work (Rae, 2007). For Rae (2007), these qualities are not only descriptive and relevant to the study of entrepreneurship but they might offer new practices for conventional business.
The DEMOS publication *The Independents* (Leadbeater and Oakley, 1999) combines various elements of contemporary cultural work, depicting qualities distinctive to the sector as progressive features for economic and social development. Others have highlighted particular aspects of cultural work such as the importance of networks and relationships (Chapain and Communian, 2010; Shaw et al., 2010).

The importance of social and cultural capital in cultural entrepreneurship is not new to cultural studies and is discussed by Scott (2012) through his investigation of DIY music producer. For Scott (2012), different forms of capital are used by cultural entrepreneurs, specifically in a social context in which skills and reputation can be shared. The resourcefulness of cultural entrepreneurs counteracts the tendency to have to work with little financial support. The reliance on personal networks drawn from one’s friendship groups and based on trust is a characteristic of the cultural entrepreneur (see Bilton and Leary, 2002; Scott, 2012; Lee, 2011).

This fits with a model of working that is described by Alvarez and Barney’s (2007) exploration of ‘creation theory’. Encouraging a shift away from the ‘discovery and exploitation’ approach in entrepreneurship studies and practice, Alvarez and Barney’s (2007) ‘creation theory’ recognises that some entrepreneurs act first and wait to see how the market responds before adjusting their idea and acting again. The ‘creation theory’ model resonates well with the cultural sector for two reasons: firstly, as we have seen, many cultural entrepreneurs tend to be driven by a vision or motivation other than purely commercial outcomes. Secondly, the adjustments are based on social interactions within a network and a closeness to the audience or market. In a
context where workers have few resources other than, as Scott (2012) suggests, their personal social and cultural capital, the trial and error approach is a feature of the cultural enterprise.

To illustrate this I present the characteristics of the entrepreneur alongside the cultural entrepreneurs' attributes based on a range of studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The entrepreneur</th>
<th>The cultural entrepreneur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive to achieve</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal orientated</td>
<td>Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of ambiguity</td>
<td>Embraces new approaches to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to deal with failure</td>
<td><em>(importance of business culture)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Value driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Not necessarily motivated by money/growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and ability to inspire</td>
<td>Makes use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Learns through doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taker</td>
<td>Manages risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
<td>Highly networked <em>(social capital)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks for opportunities</td>
<td>Involved in production and distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>Works on projects work rather than business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Closeness between personal identity and brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close to customers <em>(involved in niche markets)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5*: Characteristics of the entrepreneur and the cultural entrepreneur adapted from Kirby (2003); Bilton and Leary (2002); Leadbeater and Oakley (1999); Rae (2007).

The non-linear or trial and error entrepreneurial processes also identified in Beaven's (2012) nascent entrepreneurs are indicative of an approach which is concerned with cultural production rather than focused on entrepreneurship. In terms of identity, this shifts the emphasis to the cultural
activity rather than the enterprise. Indeed, how many cultural workers, with the exception of Dave perhaps, would introduce themselves as an entrepreneur or a cultural entrepreneur? Most cultural entrepreneurs present their professional identity, using terms such as photographer, curator, or artist. So for instance, Hannah will refer to herself as a web designer:

Yes, it’s largely because often I meet people and they go, “Oh, I know somebody who needs a web designer.” Whereas if you say business woman they think, “Oh.” (Hannah, 2013)

The cultural entrepreneurs I interview prioritise the cultural or product aspect of their work while using the notion of the entrepreneur in a pragmatic way, as Beaven (2012) suggests. As an identity for cultural workers, the cultural entrepreneur is not rejected but it is not necessarily a useful term in practice. For academics such as Oakley, Banks and Scott it distinguishes the employed cultural worker from the self-employed cultural entrepreneur. I argue that it presents scholars with the opportunity to question the notion of the entrepreneur and the characteristics of a cultural enterprise. Attributing particular features to cultural entrepreneurship could be reductive, simply leading to a fixed set of characteristics. However, it might be a starting point for a debate, particularly if this included strengths and weaknesses as well as the opportunity to develop this further into sub-sectors of the cultural industries. As I discuss below, exploring new characteristics and identities has been useful when investigating female entrepreneurs.
Female entrepreneurship

The gendered nature of the entrepreneurship field has been widely criticised as being constructed and reproduced upon masculine terms (Mirchandani, 1999; Ahl, 2006; Bruni et al., 2004, Lewis 2006). Feminist scholars have called for the need for further feminist analysis to engage with theories of gender and the diversity of women entrepreneurs from different global contexts (Blackburn and Kovalainen, 2009; Eddleston and Powell, 2012; de Bruin et al., 2007; Ahl, 2006; Hurley, 1999; Mirchandani, 1999; Tedmanson et al., 2012).

Ahl outlines current and future research agendas, highlighting the need to expand constructionist studies to explore ‘how social orders are gendered and the mechanism by which this gendering is reconstructed’ (2006, p. 611). More recently, Hughes et al. (2012) draw upon Ahl’s (2006) work to highlight three key criticisms of the field to date: firstly, the perpetuation of an economic growth rationale, secondly the individualistic nature and thirdly predominance of an objectivist ontology. Research into female entrepreneurs shows a clear intent to broaden that gendered perspective, challenging structures and offering new identities.

In theorising more complex entrepreneurial narratives, Campbell draws on ‘ecofeminism, bioregionalism, and a survival subsistence perspective’ to investigate women gardeners and farmers (Campbell, 2006, p. 182). Campbell’s goal is to stimulate the entrepreneurial debate by connecting it with other fields of enquiry, such as ecological concerns and the natural environment. In her research she identifies new voices, articulating
entrepreneurial experiences from different perspectives. For instance, Campbell writes about a female farmer in Botswana who frames her strategy for developing her business in terms of her children eating well and other people seeing them as healthy. A hard worker, the farmer expresses pride in her independence and her ability to plan for herself.

The female experience of entrepreneurship, whether from Botswana or the UK, is diverse, and it is this variety of experiences which I seek to explore. Of the cultural entrepreneurs I interview, nine are women, and although it was not my intention to explore gender issues their experience as female cultural entrepreneurs supports the need to explore different perspectives. For instance, Hannah is not comfortable being described as a cultural entrepreneur, expressing her concerns with the gendered image of the entrepreneur.

I suppose so, it’s not a word I’d use to describe myself because I think, for me, there are connotations around it, the sort of people you’d see on TV who are like that tend to be male, they tend to be quite pushy… And I don’t see myself as somebody who is going to build up a string of businesses, that sort of thing. I mean I am somebody who comes up with a lot of ideas and tries lots of different things…

(Hannah, 2013)

Hannah seems to have no problems with aspects of entrepreneurship such as coming up with ideas, but the ‘pushy’ characteristics depicted on television shows deter Hannah from identifying with the entrepreneur. As I discussed in chapter three, Hannah has chosen self-employment as a
means of balancing work and family life; this has little in common with the
traditionally male characterisation of the entrepreneur. Chell and Karataş-
Özkan (2010) argue that social contexts can provide a rationale for female
entrepreneurs, enhancing their experience but also enabling women to fulfil
both roles as a mother and as a professional.

However, as Gill (2014) argues, the characteristics associated with cultural
entrepreneurship, the informality and flexibility of contemporary work
practices, are gendered and offer particular challenges for women. From a
feminist perspective, the precariousness of cultural entrepreneurship
described by McRobbie (2002a, 2011) and the blurring of boundaries
between work and other time (Gill, 2014), present high levels of risks. As a
feminist, Gill's (2014) key concerns are the lack of discussion and a general
reluctance to question inequalities or gendered challenges in cultural work.
As my research suggests, there is a general acceptance that the discourse
associated with a ‘can do’ attitude to work, despite insecurities and risks.

In Sadie’s case, social entrepreneurship can be seen as a means of
empowerment for a woman, an opportunity to become a role model as a
successful young black woman. Although, as Verduijn et al. argue,
entrepreneurship is a ‘two-headed phenomenon, comprising emancipation
and oppression as forces which stand in a relationship of constant tension’
(Verduijn et al., 2014 p. 100).

Women can be put off by the stereotypical entrepreneur but equally, Smith’s
(2009) study reveals problems for women who do demonstrate the
stereotypical image of the entrepreneur. The demonisation of the ‘diva’
female entrepreneur in the media suggests a broader problem with women as entrepreneurs.

Gender causes tensions in explorations of the entrepreneurial identity, leaving many female entrepreneurs either ‘divas’ or not able to relate to the macho-style entrepreneur depicted in Alan Sugar’s role in *The Apprentice*, for example.

The female entrepreneurs I interview are not particularly prominent in the media, and I find little evidence of the ‘diva’ representation. The exception to this is Sadie, who has received media attention since her MBE for her services to young people in Birmingham. However, as a social entrepreneur, Sadie’s image and identity is unlikely to be associated with a diva storyline. When I ask Sadie if she associates any negative connotations with being an entrepreneur, she explains that the opposite is true, but she does reveal problems for some female entrepreneurs known as mumpreneurs.

Oh no, I think it’s more of a positive connotation. I think when the negative has been around, words like mumpreneur and there’s been a debate around that. So I’m quite friendly with the girls that run Mumpreneur in the UK but I’ve also read a lot of magazine articles about women who are female social entrepreneurs who don’t like the term mumpreneur because they’re saying that being a mum doesn’t define me as a business woman. So there’s been quite a bit of a debate around that, why would you call yourself a mumpreneur? Do you know what I mean? That’s, kind of, been more of a thing. (Sadie, 2013)
The image of the mumpreneur is a stark contrast to the diva entrepreneur and neither identity seems an appropriate identity for female entrepreneurs. Bjursell and Melin (2011) explore more positive female identities through the use of two distinct narratives, the ‘Pippi Longstocking’ as the pro-active narrative and the ‘Alice in Wonderland’ narrative as a reactive position. By using female/girl story characters as metaphors, the authors hope to challenge male performances of entrepreneurial practices. Furthermore, the research echoes the notion of developing entrepreneurial identities as discussed by Beavon (2012) and Ashton (2011) in the process of becoming an entrepreneur.

Still, there is one similarity that we would like to bring up as relevant for identity work, and that is that the original stories of “Pippi” and “Alice” can be interpreted as metaphors for the process of growing up, something that in itself corresponds well to the development aspects of identity work. (Bjursell and Melin, 2011, p. 231)

In female entrepreneurship we find a rejection of fixed identities associated with the entrepreneur and the need for new narratives based on different structures and contexts. From a feminist perspective, work practices characterised as informal and flexible are found to reproduce inequalities. Whilst project based work and informality presents the opportunity to work from home and attracts many women, there is a contradiction in embracing work which is both liberating and enabling women to take responsibility for their work and family life (Adkins, 1999). Similarly to female entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship offers diverse perspectives based
on non-conventional experiences, presenting new narratives for entrepreneurship studies.

**Social entrepreneurship**

As Hjorth (2013) argues, theory and policy have tended to explore the economic aspects of social enterprise rather than the social. Hjorth’s recent research seeks to address this by ‘opening up to studies of entrepreneurship as a sociality-creating force’ (2013, p.35). This approach is associated with a European tradition, demonstrating a keenness to move away from dominant US models of entrepreneurship.

We need to make room for entrepreneurship as part of society and not simply the economy [Styaert and Hjorth, 2003], resonant with European history of extensive social security systems, financed via higher taxes, typified in the Scandinavian Welfare State model [cf. Henrekson and Stenkula, 2007]. (Hjorth, 2013, p.35).

For Hjorth (2013), social entrepreneurship has been too closely related to managerial interests, such as the entrepreneurial individual, and the capacity of individuals to tackle social problems. Instead, Hjorth proposes the idea of Public Entrepreneurship (PE) as a means of encouraging interactions between people in the creation of new practices.

Stressing the relational ethics of a responsibility for the public, we have opted for PE as an alternative way to describe how new forms of sociality can be created. Such creation is done by citizen-
entrepreneurship, constituted by this relational ethics, driven by desire for social change. (Hjorth, 2013, p. 47)

A good example of this is Anderson et al.’s research into indigenous communities, which suggests that it consists ‘not only of economic prosperity, but also includes collective cultural and social identity and well-being’ (Anderson et al., 2006, p.75). In this context, roles are split amongst community members and resources are shared, promoting community development rather than individual success (Anderson et al., 2006).

This model resembles the work that Paul has done in setting up the Social Media Surgeries, which enable this sharing of knowledge and bring people together. Although Paul’s core business is commercial, aspects of his work function as a socially driven model, encouraging communities to network and learn from each other for wider social good.

Sadie’s entrepreneurial endeavours combine social awareness with financial ambitions for herself and her family. Sadie expresses a sense of responsibility, and a confidence that she is well placed to initiate change within her community. Sadie describes her entrepreneurial work as both empowering but also as saving her from a potential life of crime. In an article for the Birmingham Metro Sadie says:

At the age of 21 instead of getting a degree I got a criminal record. I spent 15 days in prison for theft. I’d wanted to do law, which was impossible after getting a criminal record, so I went into voluntary
work. It was about proving myself and trying to use my experience to encourage young people. (Metro, 2007)\textsuperscript{1}

Sadie finds that being called a social entrepreneur fits with the wide range of activities in which she is involved. When I ask her how she describes herself she says:

Social entrepreneur…Yes, because I do more than one thing. So, obviously the magazine takes up quite a lot of my time but because I’m still doing public speaking, I still do some of the training stuff, it just all depends what day it is, so. It all comes under social entrepreneur. (Sadie, 2013)

Sadie follows that with a more descriptive term, explaining that she is also editor-in-chief for her magazine, a much more glamorous position. Sadie’s roles might seem contradictory but for her they are combining social objectives with commercial success. Sadie refers to several celebrities to situate her position:

But that’s when the social comes at the beginning of it because obviously the word social entrepreneur combines all the, kind of, social benefit and public good and you’re, kind of, making money. You know, and even Jamie Oliver was well renowned as a chef and now as a social entrepreneur. So obviously I sit well below the pecking chain of, obviously, Richard Branson, but he himself has done a lot of stuff around the social enterprise. (Sadie, 2012)

\textsuperscript{1} Full details are not disclosed to keep the anonymity of the participant.
As we see from Sadie’s account, she sees no contradiction between her identity as a social entrepreneur and her focus on her community. Sadie is often asked to speak at events, present prizes and so on; with an emphasis on acting the role of celebrity social entrepreneur. In the context of an increased emphasis on social enterprise during the last few years of New Labour’s government, followed by David Cameron’s Big Society, it seems that Sadie was in the right place at the right time. As with the entrepreneur, the social entrepreneur’s identity is complex and can change due to different personal circumstances and social or political developments.

For Alison, setting up a social enterprise seemed the most obvious way of developing her work based on engaging with specific community groups to create an archive of their stories, as part of an art project. With the support of UnLtd, and some Heritage Lottery funding, Alison worked for three years on this project, attempting to make it a sustainable endeavour by creating a range of events, products and educational activities. Despite her best efforts, it has not been possible for Alison to sustain the project and she has now moved on to working in education, frustrated with the lack of support for her art. As I stated earlier, Alison suggested that her lack of artistic identity, in terms of how she is perceived, has proved to be problematic.

I have already noted that Banks’ study of cultural entrepreneurs makes the link between ethical or moral values and cultural work. Banks argues that some cultural entrepreneurs are attempting to ‘re-embed and re-moralize economic life’ (2007, p.96). Yet, in most cases, cultural entrepreneurs do not perceive themselves as social entrepreneurs even if, like Paul, they are clearly engaged in meeting social objectives within their practice.
The social entrepreneurs I identify contribute diverse versions of what it might mean to be involved in socially responsible activities. It is possible for cultural entrepreneurs to perform a socially responsible role in very different ways, with different purposes, and at different times in their careers.

**Quiet entrepreneur**

I finish this chapter with stories usually excluded from entrepreneurship research, either because they seem insignificant or because they are far removed from conventional notions of the entrepreneur. The stories Imas et al. describe are of individuals’ survival tactics, reflecting everyday self-reliance, as ‘lives out at the margins of the neo-liberal economic world’ (Imas et al., 2012, p. 564). The authors present ‘barefoot entrepreneurs’, individuals who live in poverty such as the Bolivian exile entrepreneurs who create art and craft products.

In this context we see venture creation around crafting or other art forms in which, particularly women, show their skills in embroidering of garments or the creation of small sculptures made from anything disposable. (Imas et al., 2012, p. 573).

As the authors state, these stories do not seek to romanticise the view of the poor entrepreneur; rather, they seek to reveal new individual stories, far removed from the hero entrepreneur, yet still engaged in entrepreneurial activity; being resourceful and selling hand-made crafts.

The UK context cannot compare with the deprived areas discussed by Imas et al. (2012), however, what does resonate is the idea that individuals are
involved in hidden or quiet entrepreneurial activity. Of my interviewees two cultural entrepreneurs refer to the idea of entrepreneurial activity which goes on ‘quietly’ or which we don’t always hear about. Alison states that some people are ‘doing it quietly’, that you don’t really know that that’s happening, ‘like maybe Charis at Fair Play gallery’ (Alison, 2013). Liz also has a sense that some individuals are so focused on getting on with their work that they are perhaps less visible as entrepreneurs.

And probably the most entrepreneurial people are the ones we don’t hear so much about who are the ones getting the sponsorship in, branding…Yeah, Hannah Barry is really interesting person, she is not from the region she is based in London, she set up Peckham Happenings… within two years she got herself out to Venice, from a car park in Peckham and that was, you know, just about making the right connections, getting sponsors. (Liz, 2013)

This points to the lack of heroism in some people’s work, the entrepreneurial process being hidden perhaps because we don’t expect to find it. As Parker and Pollock argue in Old Mistresses (1981), some activities become marginalised because they take place in private worlds. When professional worlds are narrowly defined either in a gendered manner or in terms of certain industry sectors, discrete and different narratives go unnoticed.

**Conclusion**

In setting out to explore ‘barefoot entrepreneurs’, Imas et al. (2012) asked, who is an entrepreneur? There is no one answer to this question, rather, by exploring new narratives the mythical figure of the entrepreneur reveals the
possibility of multiple identities. Scholars seeking new identities in entrepreneurship are committed to exposing diverse methods, individuals, motivations and social contexts in order to reveal new entrepreneurs. Narrow views of entrepreneurship result in a denial of entrepreneurial activities from marginalised groups and from forms of entrepreneurship which might be hidden from dominant discourse. Unconventional sectors can open the way to new debates leading to exploring the potential for the emancipator role of entrepreneurship. In exploring cultural entrepreneurs, rather than the reductive notion of being ‘pushed’ or ‘pulled’ into entrepreneurship, a study of the lived experience offers a myriad of identities shaped by both conventional structures and alternative structures.

I argue that an investigation of the cultural entrepreneur cannot ignore stories or myths associated with the entrepreneur and bohemian artist. In relation to stereotypical identities, there is evidence that individuals perform a role, either to reveal it or to subvert it. Multiple roles are acted out, to suit specific circumstances and to project an image appropriate to a particular circumstance. There is an ambiguous relationship with the idea of being an entrepreneur and a cultural worker. As my interviewee responses have demonstrated, there is a general acceptance of entrepreneurship in comparison with critical theorists who, in some cases, associate it with capitalism and neo-liberal policies. I argue that this is because the lived experience of being entrepreneurial is not easily reduced to one way of working or one identity. The cultural entrepreneurs I interview negotiate and generate identities through social interactions as well as through their circumstances, and none of these positions are fixed. Ultimately, being
enterprising is perceived as a pragmatic solution, enabling cultural workers to have some level of agency in the work that they do. It is possible to see this general acceptance of entrepreneurship as further evidence of the how Thatcher’s ‘enterprise culture’ has seeped into all aspects of life (Fairclough, 1991). However, this does not necessarily suggest that individuals act out a fixed version of an entrepreneur, sometimes caricatured as a commercially driven, neo-liberal capitalist. There is evidence of cultural entrepreneurs seeking to distance themselves from public funding, perhaps advocating the notion that the neo-liberal state will not deliver the right support or solutions (Gray, 2010). The independence which cultural entrepreneurs seem to enjoy is partly about autonomy, but also about social justice (Hesmondhalgh and Banks, 2009).

Being oppositional is contingent on alternative structures and frameworks which cultural entrepreneurs create for themselves. The milieu in which identities are adopted, rejected and re-formed is part of a dynamic social context. In the next chapter, Birmingham as a cultural milieu is discussed as part of the framework in which cultural workers construct new identities and structures such as We Are Eastside. Within this framework, agency can be enacted.

As Bourdieu [1987] suggests, how could we understand what it means to be a certain sort of person if we do not describe the context in which forms of personhood are located and which provide them with their content – ‘who would dream of describing a journey without an idea of the landscape in which it was made?’ (du Gay, 2007, p. 30.)
Chapter 5: The significance of place

Introduction

My focus so far has been the individual cultural workers’ actions and the playful way in which identities are negotiated in relation to entrepreneurial work. In this chapter, I shift my emphasis to exploring the cultural entrepreneur within the context of Birmingham, an environment with specific structures and people who together shape Birmingham’s creative milieu.

‘Becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur is a relational process which takes place in the emerging landscape partly created by formal structures within the city but also by the cultural entrepreneurs’ actions and alternative framework.

Cities are complex spaces: imagined, mythologised and constructed through personal experiences (Stevenson, 2003). As Stevenson notes, the cultural industries are intrinsically linked to the city: ‘[its] urban landscape, economy, ways of life and aesthetic sensibility’ (2003, p.138). Cultural entrepreneurs participate in creating the contradictory elements which make up the ‘real’ and the ‘imagined’ city through their cultural and entrepreneurial work. By experimenting in the city, cultural entrepreneurs re-invent themselves and the structures in which they are immersed. Often, alternative activities are created collectively, alongside formal cultural policies and sometimes despite institutional structures. Cultural entrepreneurs add to the messiness of a city, creating opportunities within its spaces and communities (on and off-line).

Much like the identity of the cultural entrepreneur, the city embodies a disputed space at once influenced by and influencing the individuals who form its diverse communities. Individuals can shape the space through their
initiatives but they are also limited by its characteristics, and the structures which govern places. In many ways, the city of Birmingham acts as another person, with whom cultural entrepreneurs enter into a relationship as they position themselves and their practice. Yet without these structures, the official discourse, there would be nothing to react against.

As described in my methodology, Bourdieu’s framework is a useful tool for an exploration of cultural entrepreneurship in which cultural work is contextualised. Bourdieu’s ‘space of possibles’ (1993, p.179) is a space in which cultural producers have a common system of references or a common framework, more or less understood by all actors within that milieu. Following Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s (2011) interpretation of Bourdieu’s theoretical model, I aim to present an overview of contextual elements for this study.

This is presented as what Chell and Karataş-Özkan (2011) define as the meso-relational level and macro-contextual level. The meso level being predominantly concerned with Birmingham’s cultural and enterprise policies, including key players and organisations. The macro level is the broader discourse of enterprise, developed under New Labour, with the aim of achieving competitive advantages through regeneration programmes and creative economy policies (Jessop, 2013).

Together, national and local policies form part of the structures contributing to Birmingham’s creative milieu, along with the lived experience and agency of individual cultural entrepreneurs. I present a highly localised context to explore the negotiated space of power, directly relevant to the cultural
entrepreneurs I have interviewed. In chapter six I will focus more specifically on personal networks and relationships formed in Birmingham, but in this chapter I aim to reveal the connections between cultural entrepreneurs and the social, economic and cultural context in which they operate.

Meso level frameworks reveal some tensions but also opportunities for entrepreneurial action. Although Birmingham's cultural entrepreneurs do not form a homogenised group with a shared identity, policymakers will tend to treat them as a sector with common attributes. Individually, cultural entrepreneurs tend to create strategic and social bonds demonstrated through various small independent organisations, with or despite formal structures. Power struggles are evident, but not necessarily transparent, in the fluid relationship between policymakers, formal institutions and informal communities of entrepreneurial cultural workers. Individuals come together, creating a sense of belonging and shared identity to redefine geographical, social, economic and cultural space. Temporary environments such as blogs and networking groups create the possibility for experimentation in a relational space. The transitory nature of these spaces and activities is an important aspect of the process of becoming a cultural entrepreneur, a concept which is not fixed but which is continuously re-negotiated.

My own position within the milieu has given me insights into entrepreneurial activities, which reveal some of the links between cultural entrepreneurs and Birmingham as a cultural milieu. For instance, activities which have since disappeared, such as Creative Republic, present a particularly interesting interaction between policy and individual actions. Initiatives which have failed
to become sustainable reveal as much about the nature of agency in Birmingham, as those who have been more successful.

I also draw on a range of material including policy documents, commissioned research papers, websites and combine this with comments from the cultural entrepreneurs I interviewed. By referring to documents which reflect Birmingham’s cultural policy over the last 10-15 years, I provide some insights into the local enterprise culture as it relates predominantly to New Labour’s (national) policies, although, as I shall describe, this is complicated by changes in government both locally and nationally.

The chapter is divided into two sections: firstly the macro and meso level context defined by city council policies and organisations such as Birmingham Business Link. I draw on documents relating to Birmingham’s cultural and creative industry policy including Birmingham City Council policy papers and reports undertaken by consultants such as BOP Consulting and regional policy initiatives. This is not a comprehensive review of all regional policies and activities but a snapshot of policy documents and activities, indicative of Birmingham’s cultural milieu as it relates to cultural entrepreneurship. The interviewees’ accounts offer further commentary illustrating how individuals experience cultural entrepreneurship in Birmingham. The formal structures, intuitions and policies presented in this section are an important aspect of the environment for ‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur. But formal structures only depict an aspect of the milieu and in the second part of the chapter alternative activities and support systems are described. My interviewees’ play a part in articulating or contesting policies, thus creating the specificity of Birmingham’s cultural milieu. This is presented
as a range of interventions, small independent projects or events which reveal how cultural entrepreneurs negotiate structures, demonstrating personal agency. Key individuals reveal themselves as highly pro-active, leading some activities with a 'can do' approach to creating alternative spaces. There is also evidence of joint action, revealing a space in which individual identities are constructed through access to collective, temporary spaces.

To describe formal structures, I begin with national cultural policies and important priorities including the relationship between culture and cities.

**Cultural policy**

National, regional and local cultural policies impact on the individual worker in a variety of ways, directly or indirectly. Policies create a framework, in concrete terms by identifying priorities and developing specific interventions, but also by deploying a language and a set of aspirations for those involved in cultural work. The 10-15 years I focus on is a period when the cultural sector enjoyed enormous attention followed by severe cutbacks in funding, with dramatic results for some cultural workers. It is this context which I describe in the following section, to outline the key structures framing cultural entrepreneurship in Birmingham.

First, despite the fact that Birmingham has had local governments of the opposite political party from national politics, it does not operate in isolation from national and EU discourses. It is within this context that Birmingham creates its own policies, adapted to suit local agendas and priorities.
National governments develop specific policies to protect or promote British industries at national and international level partly for competitive advantage but also to protect and develop cultural goods and activities. Under the New Labour government, objectives tended to fall under the following key areas: branding, economics, social and integral value of the arts.

1. **Branding:** the cultural sector is perceived as having a role to play in defining our identity, and as a branding activity for tourism.

2. **Economics:** the cultural industries are identified as a high growth sector for the national economy. The argument goes that if we want to be competitive globally, we need to realise that one of our most important assets is us, our creativity and ability to devise new and innovative products, services, experiences and processes.

3. **Social:** the role played by creative people and the use of creativity in building social cohesion through community activities.

4. **Integral value:** art for its own sake (this last aspect being more difficult for governments to articulate).

Branding and economic imperatives are particularly important as they relate to entrepreneurial activities linked to employment, export earnings, tourism and regeneration. However, all priorities offer multiple narratives for cultural entrepreneurs to define themselves, either in opposition or by identifying with certain priorities. Individual motivations and the alternative activities discussed in the second part of this chapter are partly characterised by the discourse of branding, economics, social and the integral value of art.

The mechanisms for government intervention are through setting policy objectives for funding and ensuring that government departments deliver
against those policies. This is predominantly done through the distribution of public funding either directly from government but usually through partners or regional organisations (EU funding, Lottery, direct from the Treasury). As the BOP consulting document recommends, for the development of Birmingham’s cultural industries this requires organisations working together to deliver policies.

…the (city) council will be able to build on the strong relationships that already exist between public-sector organisations like Screen West Midlands, Arts Council WM, Business Link, the Learning and Skills Council, Advantage West Midlands and the universities. (BOP Consulting, 2010, p.41).

The policies set by national government frame local developments partly through funding priorities, but also in terms of emphasising a certain discourse; in this case, connecting culture to economic priorities and utilising it as a tool for city branding. In the early days of New Labour, re-branding was evidenced by an attempt to create the notion of ‘Cool Britannia’ and at a local level culture supports the branding of cities through cultural regeneration programmes. For micro-enterprises, regional and local policies often have a more direct opportunity to impact their work and the milieu in which they operate. Importantly, it is at a local level that cultural entrepreneurs can play a role in shaping policies by rejecting or supporting them. In the next section, I will discuss the specific cultural policies which relate to enterprise and cultural work starting with national developments since 1997.
**New Labour policies: culture-led regeneration and cultural policy**

The period of time covered in this study is predominantly influenced by the politics of New Labour and the creation of the DCMS by Chris Smith, for delivering UK cultural policy. A significant result of Smith’s mixed funding model is that the cultural sector starts to enjoy unprecedented funding, increasing opportunities for cultural entrepreneurship for the next 15 years (Smith, 2013). This elevates the status of cultural entrepreneurs, creating opportunities, sometimes in collaboration with the public sector, but at times despite state interventions, as we shall see in the second part of this chapter.

My interviews took place after New Labour had left power, as the new coalition Conservative and Liberal Democrat government was being established following the 2010 general election. Yet it is New Labour’s cultural policy, at a local level, which continued to have an impact beyond 2010. In many cases this is because funding for 2-3 year projects would have already been in place before the changes in government, but also there is a sense that the new culture minister was ineffectual and did very little to establish different cultural policies (Higgins, 2013). For Birmingham’s cultural entrepreneurs, the impact of cuts is eventually felt through the cuts set out in George Osborne’s 2010 Spending Review, which start to influence policies over the next few years. This is particularly relevant for cultural entrepreneurs whose work is linked to public funding such as Liz, Roger and Elise from 2012 onwards (BBC, 2010). However, I focus on New Labour policies as this is the period which has had the most significant influence in shaping Birmingham and its cultural entrepreneurs up to the present.
As I have discussed, the focus on business growth and entrepreneurship for the local cultural sector is also linked to the city’s regeneration and to place marketing partly through a branding exercise (see Johnson, 2004). Like many cities, Birmingham’s regeneration in that period was influenced by a ‘creative city’ discourse adopted by consultants and influential think-tanks such as Comedia, drawn together by Charles Landry in his book *The Creative City: A toolkit for Urban Innovators* (2000). The influential academic Richard Florida published his book, *Cities and the Creative Class* (2004) shortly afterwards. The two books present some of the key ideas of the time, exploring the economic, social and cultural potential of the cultural sector as part of establishing a city’s competitive advantage. Attempts to use culture as a means of creating distinction are highly criticised due to their tendency to gentrify parts of a city by increasing the market value of cheap redeveloped spaces (Zukin, 1995). In the UK, critics of New Labour’s policies suggest that culture-led regeneration is often associated with grand claims such as presenting a solution to social problems (see Cox and O’Brien, 2012; Hesmondhalgh and Pratt, 2005, Oakley, 2004; McGuigan, 2010).

Furthermore, many have questioned the weak evidence base for public investment in culture as part of urban regeneration, often linked to large scale activities such as the City of Culture programme (Stevenson et al., 2010).

Cultural entrepreneurs are perceived as playing an important role in developing city’s image, particularly at a regional level (Landry, 2000; Stevenson, 2003). Organisations such as Arts Council England, Business Links and Regional Development Agencies form part of an infrastructure
focused on delivering cultural policies to maximise the economic benefits of the cultural sector partly through the activities of entrepreneurial individuals.

Critical research specifies the need to investigate the regional dimension of the cultural industries as having specific characteristics and further investigation is needed to enable a better understanding of the relations between cities and the cultural industries (Chapain and Comunian, 2010, p. 719). The dynamic relationships between cultural workers, other actors, institutions and the importance of personal attachment to place contribute to the meso-levels which Chapain and Comunian (2010) research by exploring Birmingham and Newcastle. For O’Connor and Gu (2010) the lack of appropriate leadership regionally, due to the vast range of subsectors included in the DCMS’s definition of the so-called ‘creative industries’ is problematic. While larger cultural industry firms might have established support systems, cultural entrepreneurs, in comparison, have very little in terms of professional or industry bodies (2010). Below, O’Connor and Gu describe the complications for regional creative/cultural industries policies based on their research into Manchester’s cultural policies.

First, existing policy agencies were not clear among themselves of exactly what the “creative industries” consisted; statistical and definitional questions were the relatively easy end of a complex conceptual issue, still not resolved [O’Connor, 2007]. Second, as it involved a new policy object, existing cultural organizations and economic development agencies had to work with “intermediaries” who were relatively unknown and untested. Popular music having no local industry representatives, was notorious in this context – where
musicians (the successful and the less so) were often turned to for complex policy advice (with varying degrees of success). Third, because of the strong “cultural” dimension to the creative industries, many businesses within the sector considered themselves to be something other than “industries” subject to economic development policy; those who had fewer reservations about this aspect often saw their form of creativity to be operating in direct opposition to “policy,” “bureaucracy,” and “institutionalization.” (O’Connor and Gu, 2010, p.128)

Cultural entrepreneurs, whether in Manchester or Birmingham, have to negotiate their position with agencies and ‘intermediaries’ in this relatively experimental environment. As O’Connor and Gu observe, the complexity of supporting such a broad industry created opposition as much as it developed the cultural sector. New Labour’s emphasis on the ‘creative industries’ initiates new opportunities but, as we have seen, this is not without its problems and critics. The extent to which individuals ‘buy in’ to the local policy framework can be difficult to identify given the pragmatic manner in which cultural entrepreneurs operate. As discussed in chapter three, the needs of a practising cultural worker can be about identifying with a bohemian identity, entangled with an alternative approach, as much as they are about successfully negotiating publicly-funded commissions. What may appear to be a contradiction, is partly due to the narrow definitions policy makers establish, often without taking account of the complexity of the sector. Cultural workers navigate this environment at an individual level and
collectively, particularly when they are motivated to establish their own alternative support structures.

To understand this complex scenario in relation to Birmingham, I will now introduce key policies and the size of the cultural industries sector before presenting the manner in which cultural entrepreneurs contribute to Birmingham’s cultural milieu.

**Birmingham’s cultural milieu**

The framework which underpins Birmingham’s cultural milieu is shaped by national policies, but it is reinterpreted in the context of Birmingham’s existing resources and aspirations as a city.

Known as the so called, second city, Birmingham has been re-inventing itself following deindustrialisation, like many UK cities, with flagship projects such as the International Convention Centre (ICC) and the Symphony Hall (Henry et al, 2002). Yet, large scale projects which draw attention and tend to define a city are not always key to its success. As Henry et al (2002) explain, rather than being a problem, Birmingham’s multicultural profile enables ethnic minority businesses to connect with global networks, making it a distinctive feature of the city’s economic development. Interestingly for this study, the nature of multicultural businesses’ contribution is based on ‘bottom-up’ and largely hidden qualities rather than a policy intervention (Henry et al, 2002, Henry et al, 2005).

Birmingham’s policy priorities are set out in 2002 when Birmingham City Council publishes *Birmingham – Creative City: Analysis of Creative*
Industries in the City of Birmingham (BOP Consulting). To understand the significance of the sector, I refer to BOP Consulting’s report which presents statistical information about Birmingham’s cultural industries. The report identifies the subsectors which, according to the authors, account for around 20,000 jobs (not all jobs are within cultural industry firms); 4% of the city’s workforce and creative businesses make up 10% of the city’s total firms (BOP Consulting, 2010). The report also states that 93% of creative firms are micro businesses, employing 10 or fewer people. The cultural entrepreneurs interviewed for this study fall within that percentage and represent a growing trend. According to BOP Consulting, the number of creative businesses of 1-10 employees has grown in the period between 2003-2007 by 24.9% demonstrating that most of the growth in the sector is from micro businesses (BOP Consulting, 2010, p.21). Furthermore, micro businesses in Birmingham’s cultural industries have the largest share of employment: in 2007 that was 6,320 in total, 34% of all employment within cultural industry businesses. The report breaks down the micro businesses still further into four main categories: Audio Visual, Books and Press, Performance and Visual Arts & Design, the latter being the largest sector followed closely by Audio Visual. Of the cultural entrepreneurs I interview, the majority are within those two categories, Visual Arts & Design and Audio Visual; sectors which play an important role in Birmingham’s cultural regeneration. Overall, the report is not only a collection of statistical data about Birmingham’s cultural industries, it aims to fuel the arguments for sector support as part of Birmingham’s economic development, hence the title: Why the creative industries matter to Birmingham: An analysis of the city’s creative economy
BOP Consulting make use of statistical details gathered before 2010, presenting findings which set a challenging level of expectation if Birmingham’s economic regeneration is based on the growth potential of micro-enterprises.

Birmingham’s Creative City brand identity combines creative economy programmes with city marketing, including the distinctiveness of Birmingham as a culturally diverse city (BBC, 2003). In this context, a sense of the marketability of difference is perceived as essential to exploring Birmingham’s competitive potential, reflecting national policy priorities. Much like ‘Cool Britannia’, cities make use of local cultural events, institutions, enterprises, artists and celebrities to create their brand identity. For Birmingham this includes a shift in perception from a city traditionally dominated by the manufacturing sector, towards a recognition that the cultural and creative industries are a critical component for business development and for the tourism agenda (Parkinson, 2007). The focus on the economic importance of the sector is also presented in Urban Communication’s study, which describes an effort to ‘position Birmingham as a place where creative-based enterprises are developed and where high quality cultural activity is staged for the benefit of the city’s various communities and audiences’ (Johnson, 2004, p.4).

Of importance to cultural entrepreneurs are strategic investments in programmes such as incubation, business development and networking across the sector as well as showcasing and engaging with talent. As O’Connor and Gu (2010) indicate, these aspirations are received with
varying degrees of appreciation given the breadth of needs and subsectors in the cultural industries.

In *Remaking Birmingham* (2004), Kennedy presents the regeneration of Birmingham through its visual culture, as depicted by its artists, architects, photographers, cultural administrators and academics. Although the book offers a historical context for the concept of *Remaking Birmingham*, it essentially reflects New Labour’s optimism for rebranding cities through the use of culture. For instance, in her chapter, Balshaw draws on Florida stating that:

Birmingham is experiencing an unprecedented urban renaissance; the city of roads is racing to realize its potential as a city of culture – city of learning – city of diversity. A Creative City, to use one of Birmingham City Council’s many epithets, where the requirements of twenty-first-century creative life, from lattes to ‘authentic’ South Asian food, lively gay village, independent music and arts sectors and loft apartments are all making their presence felt and in the (post) industrial city space of Birmingham (Florida 2002). (Balshaw, 2004, p.135)

The city’s image as being culturally vibrant forms part of the overall strategic plan, linking cultural workers to the ‘creative city’ agenda. In Birmingham this is evidenced by the physical development of certain parts of the city, namely ‘Eastside’ (the rebranded Digbeth part of the city) and the Jewellery Quarter. The aspiration to be recognised as a creative city is also articulated in the two City of Culture bids. Firstly, the European Capital of Culture 2008 (bidding took place in 2003), and secondly, the UK City of Culture 2013 (bid
launch 2009). Along with key themes such as artistic excellence and the cultural diversity of the city, the creative economy is highlighted as a key asset, including Birmingham’s cultural quarters:

Birmingham’s historic Jewellery Quarter is now the largest making centre in Europe, while Birmingham’s School of Jewellery is the first purpose-built jewellery school to be established in Europe for over 20 years. We are now about to witness the regeneration of Birmingham’s Eastside, which includes a vast new creative district, a home for media companies and artists that will continue Birmingham’s great creative economy. (BBC, 2003)

During New Labour’s period in office, Birmingham policies were a combination of city and regional policies, driven by Advantage West Midlands (AWM), the regional development agency established by New Labour in 1997 but subsequently closed in 2012. AWM was keen to push the idea of clustering as part of an economic development strategy for the region (Chapain and Comunian, 2010). AWM created three clusters relevant to the cultural industries: firstly, the Digital Media cluster which included areas such as film, video, TV, interactive and communication technologies; secondly, the High Value Added Consumer Products Cluster (HVACPC) which eventually became known as the Interiors and Lifestyle cluster; and the Music Industry cluster. The original idea of clusters, as defined by Porter, suggests a geographical concentration of firms and in Birmingham, small clusters can be found in the Jewellery Quarter and in Eastside/Digbeth (Chapain and Comunian, 2010, p.720). This approach was common across different UK cities, including for instance, Sheffield’s Cultural Quarter.
No region of the country, whatever its industrial base, human capital stock, scale or history is safe from the need for a ‘creative hub’ or ‘cultural quarter’ (Oakley, 2004, p.68).

These developments were partly spearheaded by the entrepreneur Bennie Gray who in 1998 acquired both the Big Peg (a seven floor building in the heart of the Jewellery Quarter) and what was Bird’s Custard Factory (in Eastside/Digbeth), which he developed into studios, office spaces, cafés and retail outlets (Custard Factory, no date).

Spaces and places are important to cultural entrepreneurs, enabling activities to be more visible to audiences, supporters and their peers. For instance, Liz describes how and why she argued for capital funds to relocate to Eastside/Digbeth when developing and relocating her digital arts organisation.

…[we wanted to relocate] to Digbeth where there is nobody there which is more or less an enterprise and it was these zones at that point and, you know, we can work between industries so we can grow creative businesses but we can grow them by collaborating with other industries. And here we go, we can do 30 over a couple of years, but we need the resources to do it, we need some capital, we’ve got revenue, we need the capital is what we said. And they liked that, so right place, right time, and we went with the space and it just a made huge difference to our presence nationally….As well as locally because you could identify a space with a particular way of working
and the content was straight there and you could therefore go and have those conversations… (Liz, 2013)

Liz sees a chance to develop her organisation and knows that current local policies can offer her an opportunity to develop as an enterprise. This is an example of an artistic director making pragmatic decisions, not necessarily because she adheres to local policies. Liz’s tone is relatively cynical, for her organisation this is essentially opportunistic; an enterprising way of ensuring an arts organisations can have a better profile, and affordable space.

The creation of cultural or creative quarters such as The Jewellery Quarter and Eastside/Digbeth becomes important as a means of identifying Birmingham’s cultural practitioners. Liz describes how prior to these developments there was a lack of space for cultural work.

Yeah so, well I knew, I think it was clear that there is collateral in space, everyone wanted space and there was a lack of space and people would kind of be really critical about Birmingham and the lack of space and the lack of opportunity and the lack of artists’ studios, lack of artists, everyone was leaving. At that point they were going to Berlin, lots of people we knew were going to Berlin and those that weren’t going to London, Berlin was much cheaper and we thought, we’re losing all our artists, you know, we’ve been working this big European programme and the artists weren’t staying. It just felt obvious at that point that once you’ve got a space then you’ve got something of value to a broader number of people… (Liz, 2013)
As Liz states, Birmingham was in danger of losing artists to more favourable cities such as Berlin and London. It needed to replicate the environment typified by areas such as Soho or Hoxton in London, flexible environments in which clusters of cultural entrepreneurs might easily bump into each other. Yet, the economic imperative described by policymakers and consultants is not necessarily reflected in the cultural entrepreneurs’ accounts. Artists and cultural entrepreneurs such as a Liz are quick to see the importance of space to further their own goals, but not necessarily to meet Birmingham’s cultural policy priorities. Simply, Liz knows how to write funding bids to meet a set of criteria which allow her to secure the funding while supporting her personal vision. Although Liz and others appear to contribute to a policy agenda, the reality may not be so clear cut.

Newly developed spaces and places in which cultural workers can meet and become popular in Birmingham, as demonstrated by the Custard Factory and its surrounding area.

The quarters-based approach – Eastside, Jewellery Quarter and City Centre – has wide support. Clustering is seen to have worked well in practice, notably at the Custard factory and in the Jewellery Quarter. (Johnson, 2004, p. 27)

On the surface, cultural entrepreneurs are happily mingling in local independent cafés and establishing their enterprises, very much in the Florida (2004) bohemian style of city regeneration. One of my interviewees interprets this phenomena cynically, presenting his perspective.
…when we were based at the Custard Factory it seemed like everyone was treating it like some bohemian ghetto hangout, like sit around the Med bar, and we were like, they obviously don’t have enough paid work. We were always like, well I suppose that northern industrial mind-set, like you just get on and do stuff. [Laughs] (Jack, 2011)

Jack may be unique in his response to the ‘bohemian ghetto’ that is the Custard Factory but he does indicate that cultural entrepreneurs do not belong to a homogenous community. Having moved from the Custard Factory, Jack and his business partner bought a building in The Jewellery Quarter, investing in this area of Birmingham. According to Jack, in comparison with Eastside/Digbeth, the Jewellery Quarter has a more established heritage associated with the jewellery trade, perhaps bridging the gap between new business and old industry better than Eastside/Digbeth. At the very least, Jack and Liz are not passive in their choice of location, they have their own pragmatic reasons for establishing themselves in specific cultural quarters.

Most of the cultural entrepreneurs I interview are based in the Eastside/Digbeth area, some in the Custard Factory and others in an office space known as The Bond. A few are based in The Jewellery Quarter, sometimes moving between the two cultural quarters or using informal spaces such as cafés as their ‘office’, but within those areas. Cultural quarters are attractive to cultural entrepreneurs, but their reasons for being there and how committed they are to a space is dependent on many issues, including the possibility of not wanting to be in a ‘bohemian ghetto’. 
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So far, I have presented a general overview of Birmingham’s cultural policies with a focus on city marketing and growing the cultural economy. By drawing on my interviewees’ accounts I have been able to highlight the pragmatic approach taken by cultural entrepreneurs such as Liz and Jack. Regional cultural policies encourage certain developments but cultural entrepreneurs have distinctive ways of managing this environment.

In the next section, I focus more specifically on local enterprise policies and how these impact on cultural entrepreneurship.

**Enterprise policies**

In this section I describe how enterprise policies further enhance the economic argument for supporting the cultural industries, and how this is presented as a strategy for Birmingham and the region. It is important to note that enterprise policies have not always been linked to the cultural sector and so many of the programmes I describe are relatively new, initiated by New Labour’s policies. For cultural entrepreneurs this creates new opportunities for support and the prospect of being involved in shaping policy through consultation processes or by being invited onto committees such as AWM’s cluster groups. For some cultural entrepreneurs, this is an opportunity to be heard and to influence policy.

For its 2004-2010 strategic plan, AWM identifies enterprise as a key component of a strategy to develop a diverse and dynamic business base.

The strategy document sets out its five priorities, including:
The Enterprise Challenge – because an enterprise culture is critical to a successful region. This must have a strong focus on young people, as they are crucial to the future prosperity of the region. (AWM, 2004, p. 6)

It goes on to state that enterprise is a challenge for the region which at the time was ranked as fifth in the UK in terms of business start-ups and noting that self-employment is well below the national average. Over the years, various projects have been funded through AWM for partner organisations to deliver growth through programmes of activity. Within the Interiors and Lifestyle cluster successful projects include the Net Infinity and Centrepiece which encouraged business networking, collaborations and joint ventures. In the Digital Media cluster successful projects include Coventry’s Serious Games Institute and 4iP Digital Media.

According to a report for the Digital Media cluster, the approach worked well.

Overall the Digital Media cluster has delivered a successful programme of sectoral development, building links between pivotal businesses, with the knowledge base and other organisations, accelerating new product development, new market entry, and supply chain development. (Harte, 2010, p. 2)

A key element of the support from the development agency was Screen West Midlands (Screen WM), which had a significant impact on a range of cultural entrepreneurs working across disciplines from film through to digital media. However, the relationships formed between cultural entrepreneurs and various agencies, in particular the individuals involved in running cluster
groups, is short lived. Along with the end of the Regional Development Agencies, Screen WM was closed in 2011 and many of its responsibilities were handed over to Creative England, established in 2011. This also coincides with the closing of the UK Film Council, revealing the impact of national government changes on regional policy. As Shannon states in this Birmingham Post article:

> The stark issue now facing such regional screen agencies is that the two main funding pillars that held aloft this screen industry edifice have now - Samson like - been pushed aside by the Coalition’s cull: AWM and UKFC, now both binned. (Shannon, 2010)

The impact is disorientating for individuals involved in public sector processes, such as Tom through the Producer’s Forum, and can be frustrating as new governments re-establish new organisations. These agencies have since been replaced in 2010 by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), for Greater Birmingham and Solihull. Similar themes can be found in the LEP’s strategy including the development of an ‘Enterprise Belt’ with a focus on Birmingham City Centre Enterprise Zone, and a continuation of the Birmingham Creative City agenda.

The cluster approach and the role of AWM is an important ingredient in understanding the funding priorities for the region and Birmingham as its major metropolis. Working with key partners and agencies such as City Councils, Arts Council West Midlands and Learning and Skills Council, and with cultural entrepreneurs, AWM influenced many aspects of policy. The focus on economic development did leave out sectors traditionally thought of
as the ‘arts’ which did not fit neatly into the growth strategy for the region but engaged with agencies such as Arts Council West Midlands instead. In other words, at a regional level some cultural sectors are understood as commercially important while others do not fit in with conventional industry development schemes.

Birmingham policy is also influenced by opportunities through European policies, such as the Green Paper *Unlocking the potential of Cultural and Creative Industries*, published by the European Commission, an example of the themes and objectives which are likely to influence funding programmes (EC, 2012). The paper puts an emphasis on ‘spaces for experimentation, innovation and entrepreneurship in the cultural and creative sector’ (2012, p. 8) and on access to funding taking note of entrepreneurial modes of work, often consisting of one or two people.

I have presented an overview of Birmingham’s cultural milieu in terms of key policies and agencies in relation to both enterprise and the cultural sector. With hindsight, it is relatively easy to pinpoint the agencies involved; however, it is worth noting that the diverse range of agencies and policies from the EU, nationally, regionally and locally (at the level of the city) created a complex framework for cultural entrepreneurs. How do individual cultural workers navigate this context? In the next section I focus on how these policies and activities have had a direct impact on the cultural entrepreneurs I interviewed for this study but first, I explore programmes developed specifically for micro-entrepreneurs in the cultural sector.
Programmes for micro-entrepreneurs / cultural entrepreneurs

An important element of Birmingham’s policy priorities has been the various programmes and projects working directly with cultural entrepreneurs, helping them to establish their enterprise through start-up funds and ongoing support. Over the last 10-15 years there have been a range of agencies working with general small business start-ups who have also helped cultural entrepreneurs. These include The Prince’s Trust, The Arrow Fund, various Birmingham City Council initiatives and more recently UnLtd, who focus on social enterprise, of whom many are also cultural enterprises. Some cultural entrepreneurs will have also looked to the Arts Council West Midlands for investment into aspects of their enterprise including product development, marketing and personal artistic development. During New Labour’s period in office these sectors, often described as the ‘cultural’ sector rather than the more commercial ‘creative industries’, found support through agencies such as the Arts Council West Midlands (now Arts Council England), Birmingham City Council’s Arts Department and, to some extent, Marketing Birmingham.

For more commercially-minded cultural entrepreneurs such as Isabella, the support included trade missions overseas to encourage the export of cultural goods and the opportunity to network within a global marketplace. Isabella’s company plays a key role in organising these events, acting as co-ordinator for UK Trade Information (UKTI) but also broadening her company profile and networks.

And so, and again that’s down to knowledge and our audience. So we’ve worked with them on trade missions to South by Southwest
Music Event in Austin. We’ve gone to North by Northeast in Toronto and make really good connections with those people. (Isabella, 2012)

By presenting a brand which seems ‘on trend’ and having a good reputation locally, Isabella’s enterprise is well placed to benefit from public funding of this type. The type of cultural work produced by Isabella, Roger and Liz fits very well with Birmingham branding itself as a creative city with a distinctive offer. Marketing Birmingham plays a key role as a partner with several cultural activities.

Mm, yeah. Marketing Birmingham have become quite important, not necessarily oodles of money but very useful in terms of giving you good contact lists for opening receptions and hooking you up with travel press contacts and… Yeah, they have their knockers, Marketing Birmingham, but I think they’re actually… They’ve sort of cottoned on that stuff like this is an asset in a way that the City Council haven’t… The City Council is kind of out of the picture really in lots of ways. (Roger, 2013)

Roger and Isabella express their relationship with agencies from different perspectives. Roger has seen support come and go, and although he appears to be grateful for the support offered by Marketing Birmingham there is a slightly negative tone to his comment. Perhaps Roger expects better support from the city? Again, changes in policies and a lack of funding make this a challenging environment for micro-enterprises reliant on either arts funding or resources from agencies such as Marketing Birmingham.
Some of the most significant support for the sector came through Birmingham Chamber of Commerce and Business Link, through its Creative City programme, which established a sector specific, creative industries division for Birmingham (and later for the West Midlands as a whole). Under the leadership of its charismatic managing director, Chloe, this became one of the most influential cultural industry agencies in the city. As Isabella points out, the support enabled cultural entrepreneurs to start-up and develop their enterprises:

> When we started there wasn’t anything that I was aware of, there didn’t seem to be anything. I think when they started the, there was the team at the Council that Mohammed Sahir headed up and the whole creative city thing and then that linked with [Chloe]’s role at Business Link and I think that was such a brilliant time because if you were setting up business, you had specific business training for creative industries or as an artist or anything cultural just seemed to be under that umbrella. There was free training, a lot of it, it was brilliant. There were courses, there was incubation space. There was money for rent. (Isabella, 2012).

This is a period of time (approximately 2000-2010), when there are relatively large budgets to develop the cultural industries. Isabella’s company benefitted from ‘help with our website build’, an integral part of their business as they developed from a print magazine to increasing their online activity (2012).
Interestingly, Hannah did not benefit from the sector specific support; perhaps due to her background in HR she does not identify as a cultural entrepreneur and simply sought generic support from Business Link. As O’Connor and Gu (2010) find in their study, not everyone working in the sector automatically identifies with the cultural industry policies and support.

When I set up I got one-to-one advice from Business Link… And I also have been on quite a lot of their events. Not so much with a view to actually learning myself but more with a view to their events around social media and you always find there are people going, “How am I going to do this?”…So I picked up a few clients that way. (Hannah, 2013)

As discussed in chapter three, cultural entrepreneurs do not always have the characteristics associated with cultural or artistic practices. Jake distances himself more consciously from the notion of ‘bohemian’ work, but Hannah’s personal narrative is different. As a web designer and writer (of web design books), Hannah fits within the DCMS and local definition of the cultural industries, but her motivation is focused on making her career work for her and her family. For Hannah, it appears that attending business networking events is about securing more work and is not about belonging to a community. More recently, Hannah’s networking has focused on women’s groups, specifically women working in technology companies such as the digital media sector.

In general, Chloe was well-networked, collaborating with key figures from AWM, Birmingham City Council, Arts Council, ScreenWM and relevant
national bodies, in a role similar to O’Connor and Gu’s ‘intermediaries’ (2010) in Manchester. This scenario enabled a brokering approach between policymakers and the individual cultural entrepreneurs. Several of the cultural entrepreneurs I interview name Chloe, unprompted, as part of the discussion about their work. Jack describes how ‘You know, you are always going to bump into [Chloe] at some place or other’ (2011). And Sadie is more specific:

I mean, [Chloe] was very key influence at one point when she was part of Business Link but now that’s been disbanded and she’s freelance, a lot of things have changed (Sadie, 2013).

Partly due to a genuine interest in the cultural sector, Chloe became close to practitioners, small firms and individual cultural entrepreneurs. She describes her role as ‘some of it was listening to the companies and some of it was helping inform their thinking. It’s got to be a two way discussion’ (Chloe, 2012). Working within this complex mesh of policies and agencies, Chloe is probably one of the few people to speak both the language of policymakers and of individual practitioners, connecting policy aspirations with actions directly impacting on cultural entrepreneurs. My observations are that, at best, this achieves a real understanding of the specifics of cultural entrepreneurship and avoids the overly generic approach of non-sector specific agencies. Unlike O’Connor and Gu’s (2010) description of cultural intermediaries as unproven, Chloe appears to have gained the trust of institutions and cultural entrepreneurs, convincingly bridging the gap between policy and delivery. However, a critical perspective might suggest that there is an over-reliance on one agency, or indeed, one individual, in a powerful position of influence. Close relationships between individuals create
the potential for nepotism or a lack of professional transparency. Indeed, it would be very challenging to not be swayed by one’s preferences, by close friendships developed over a period of time.

How does this impact on the way in which cultural entrepreneurs position themselves within Birmingham’s cultural milieu? These questions will be discussed in the next chapter, but in relation to policies, it is important to note that written policies and reports are only part of the story. Policies are delivered in the context of social relations, framed by a wider discourse as well as by personal interactions at a local level.

A formal documentation of Birmingham’s cultural milieu, is the booklet entitled: *Creative, Cultural and Digital Industries guide* (Parrish, 2008) commissioned by Chloe and her team. Offering both advice to budding cultural entrepreneurs and highlighting success stories from the area, the publication represents key players and Birmingham’s cultural industries discourse.

The booklet was written by David Parrish, who is an established cultural industries consultant with a reputation for working with both micro businesses as well as advising governments across the world. According to his website, Parrish:

...helps creative people (‘T-Shirts’) use smart business thinking (‘Suits’), so they can achieve success on their own terms, using cool business ideas which fit with their values and objectives. (Parrish, no date).
In his work with cultural entrepreneurs, Parrish puts an emphasis on the importance of business and commercial success, even if he suggests that this is ‘on their own terms’. In his introduction to the *Creative, Cultural and Digital Industries guide*, Parrish includes a quote by Richard Branson making a clear reference to the popular concept of the entrepreneur, and further quotes from the multi-millionaire Felix Dennis, from David Packard and others clearly positioning ideas of financial success through entrepreneurship (2008). Throughout the publication, the term ‘creative entrepreneur’ is used:

> Being a creative entrepreneur brings with it many challenges as well as rewards and there are many issues to be tackled in setting up, consolidating and growing a business in the creative sector.

> Business Link are here to help you make your creative enterprise even more successful. (Parrish, 2008, p.1)

The publication profiles local creative businesses, including the experimental theatre company Stan’s Cafe and the heavy metal festival run by Capsule, a music events and arts management company. In comparison with generic business support, the document clearly sets out to demonstrate that it is aimed specifically at individuals from the cultural industries:

> Creative entrepreneurs blend creativity with smart business thinking and that is what this guide will help you to do, by providing information and examples which are relevant to your situation as a creative person in business. (Parrish, 2008, p.1)

The publication refers to examples from the local cultural industries in an attempt to make a strong connection between the support and the nature of
working in the cultural sector. A direct link between ‘you’, the cultural worker, and the image of the entrepreneur is presented throughout the document. The free publication will have been both an opportunity to celebrate the successes of the highlighted organisations as well as educating and informing others of the available support. The fact that this publication was easily available (free print version or as a PDF) is potentially important to cultural entrepreneurs in establishing the sense of an identity for the sector, at least as perceived by the author, Chloe and her team. Perhaps this was one of the aims of the document? It is a celebration of Birmingham’s talent and an opportunity to articulate key attributes both for aspiring cultural workers and for agencies wanting to work with cultural entrepreneurs. The individual cultural organisations selected are presented as ‘best practice’ and the language to describe cultural entrepreneurship articulates specific dominant ideas, blending economic success with cultural distinctiveness. In other words, this can be interpreted as part of the space where dominant voices establish the terms of engagement. At the very least, it contributes to the expectation that cultural workers should be entrepreneurial, flexible, and commercially-orientated while maintaining their creativity. With the help of specialist advisors, cultural entrepreneurs can establish their ‘Route to Success’ (Parrish, 2008, p.8). However, it is worth noting who is not included in this publication, for example, the highly entrepreneurial and commercially successful story of Birmingham’s Bhangra music industry. With internationally renowned groups, artists, recording and distribution companies it is surprising to find this cultural activity is not considered sufficiently noteworthy to be included in the publication (Henry et al, 2005).
As Henry and colleagues explain, the success of the sector is largely due to its ‘highly integrated trading community with a strong support network’ (2005, p.22) including transnational networks exploited by producers such as Bally Sagoo.

In the first part of this chapter, I have presented a close link between enterprise policies, cultural industry policies and Birmingham’s image as a ‘creative city’. Support for cultural entrepreneurs in the form of various initiatives have been delivered through a range of agencies including BCC, AWM and their partners. Since 2010 changes in government and cuts in funding have impacted on cultural work although it has taken a few years before the full impact was felt. It is worth noting that cultural entrepreneurs are very much aware of these changes, as Isabella articulates below:

> But I think always, as is with funding and probably I’m sure it’s the same maybe with, oh I don’t know about other cities, but you get these pockets and they seem to last for three years and then it stops and then there’s another pocket that comes in and helps something else and now I don’t think that there’s anything. It’s all dried up so I feel sorry for all the cultural entrepreneurs of the future who’ve got none of that. (Isabella, 2012)

So far Isabella’s business has not suffered from public sector cuts and she is confident that her strong networks will enable her to survive as a cultural enterprise. However, she is rightly concerned about future generations. For Roger the problems are ongoing.
Yeah. It’s actually become… You know, there was many years of frustration and humungous forms and moaning and mutual incomprehension and they’ve made a deliberate decision to kind of eliminate as much from their arts portfolio as they can and they’ve sort of farmed off some of the festivals to Marketing Birmingham, and long-term I don’t think that’s particularly healthy for Birmingham if the City Council has no involvement in the festival strategy but I think that’s just the way it is at the moment. (Roger)

It is perhaps no wonder that, for some cultural entrepreneurs, there is a detachment from the original policies which shaped Birmingham’s cultural milieu. More recently, cuts to the arts and culture nationally and locally limit the opportunities for implementing any major developments. For instance, cultural venues such as the Ikon Eastside have been forced to shut down as a result of cuts (Birmingham Post, 2011).

Short term funding and changes in policies create a lack of stability for some cultural organisations and the individuals running them. As O’Connor and Gu (2010) state, this is partly because of the ambiguity around defining the ‘creative industries’. Who forms part of the sector and who receives what support? Cultural entrepreneurs present a pragmatic attitude but to what extent are they willing to be flexible with their identities and ideas to fit into the current policy template? What hoops do cultural entrepreneurs have to jump through in order to secure funding? As we shall see in the second part of this chapter, it is perhaps these problems which fuel the cultural workers’ entrepreneurial initiatives.
Birmingham and cultural entrepreneurs

Having given an overview of Birmingham’s milieu, in the next section I explore more specifically the collegiate entrepreneurial actions of Birmingham’s cultural workers. So far I have described the context in terms of national, regional and city policies, acted out through funded programmes and driven by economic development initiated by New Labour.

In Birmingham, key policy initiatives included the development of creative quarters, in particular, Eastside and the Jewellery Quarter in which clusters of cultural workers can set up small independent businesses. I also highlighted important policies for cultural entrepreneurs in the setting up of a sector specific support service led by Chloe and her team. As stated earlier, much of this activity took place during New Labour’s period in office and before the 2007 economic crisis.

But policy can sometimes seem distant from individuals carving out a career in the cultural industries and too often they either don’t know of policies, they are too busy trying to earn a living, or policies don’t match individual expectations. Cultural entrepreneurs align themselves with differing policy agendas or rhetoric with which they identify. This can change over time and will depend on specific needs, social, economic or personal.

Within a structured framework, cultural entrepreneurs work in pragmatic ways, carving out opportunities and intervening through various independent activities. The relationship between institutions, their policies and priorities is not always in sync with the aspirations of cultural entrepreneurs; it is dynamic and complex. As Cumunian et al. state:
Governance also works at a multi-scale level. Creative businesses connect to and interact with local and regional levels of governance, but also affect and engage with national and international actors and policies and their respective types of governance and leadership. (Cumunian et al., 2010, p.7)

The city plays a role in framing cultural entrepreneurship, bestowing its very specific characteristics to create a unique cultural milieu to which Birmingham’s cultural entrepreneurs contribute. Each city might have its own version of these interventions, but they are likely to be subtly different. Often activities are reliant on just one or two motivated cultural entrepreneurs, but individuals who are operating within a relational milieu.

I explore the cultural entrepreneurs’ interventions within Birmingham’s cultural milieu through a set of discussion points which have emerged both from the literature and from the interviewees’ accounts. In analysing the cultural entrepreneurs’ narratives and the initiatives they set up, I focus on four issues. First, I explore evidence of resistance to structural frameworks or, indeed, a lack of resistance; what McRobbie (2011) might perceive as counter-cultural activism. Second, I investigate the extent to which Birmingham is utilised as a resource in terms of its infrastructure and facilities. Third, I investigate the cultural entrepreneurs’ allegiance to Birmingham, as a creative city. And finally, I comment on the nature of the cultural entrepreneurs’ personal agency revealed through their actions. Through these themes I find a range of sometimes contradictory attitudes to policy and structure: cultural entrepreneurs present themselves as endorsing policies, as oppositional and often pragmatic individuals.
In particular, I seek to examine the relationship between structure and agency as a localised phenomenon; a space in which cultural entrepreneurs make their mark in various ways. By observing activities at a local level, developed by communities, there is the potential to find ‘alternative’ forms of cultural activity. Certainly, I find ‘alternative projects’ which function alongside, despite, or with the support of local policies (Banks, 2007). The extent to which they are ‘alternative’ in the sense of being anti-capitalist, overtly political, or driven by social objectives is difficult to identify. However, spaces for experimentation encourage a playfulness with what it means to be a cultural entrepreneur. The projects described are a snapshot of activities which relate to my interviewees, rather than a comprehensive assessment of all initiatives.

As I suggested earlier, it is well known that Birmingham is the ‘second city’ and this is often expressed as lack of identity in comparison with cities such as Manchester, possibly due to its proximity to London. A reaction to this is Jon Bounds’ blog Birminghamitsnotshit which since 2002 has presented the ‘real’ Birmingham to counteract Birmingham’s negative image (birminghamitsnotshit.com, no date). This is important because it situates Birmingham’s cultural entrepreneurs within a national debate; an opportunity to reclaim Birmingham’s image. As Banks (2007) finds, this is not unique to Birmingham, as Mancunian cultural entrepreneurs also express an allegiance to their city. Often this is perceived in relation to not being London, known as the hub of cultural activities and geographically close to Birmingham. What binds cultural entrepreneurs together are the personal interactions, more easily possible within a geographical space which is
relatively intimate, and a milieu in which cultural entrepreneurs can become a relatively close-knit community. The tone of blogs such as *Birminghamisnotshit* offers an alternative voice, distancing Birmingham cultural workers from conventional and formal structures. Again, this enables a playfulness with identity through a collective and discursive process, reflecting on Birmingham’s brand and the cultural entrepreneur’s contribution through their individual and collective endeavours.

These activities can lead to cultural entrepreneurs trusting each other and sharing similar aspirations. For Elise it is quite simple: her commitment is local rather than trying to make connections with London or other networks:

> It's just easier. So a lot of the work that I get is through 'coffee and a chat' and ringing people up and going out. So informal, for me, that's how I like to be. (Elise, 2013)

As for cultural entrepreneurs who seek local audiences for their work, such as those running festivals or local events, Birmingham as a market place is important. Roger and Liz both discuss the city’s infrastructure or lack of activities as an opportunity for them to fill a void. Here Roger explains how he sees Birmingham:

> No, I mean, what we do is totally reflective of the city where it happens and I’m very proud of the fact that people come here and fill our events and come away with a totally different perception of Birmingham. You know, although we don’t get masses of people flying here we do get around half of the people who come for [Brum Film Fest] are from outside Birmingham, whether it’s West Midlands or
wider UK, and because we do lots of kind of digging up lost cinemas and forgotten figures from history and working with local artists and exploring different venues and all of that stuff. You could quite conceivably do something that responded to another place… And for quite a while it was the excitement of having a blank canvas when I first started. It was a very sparse marketplace for interesting cultural stuff ten years ago, leaving the festival and starting as a film night, it was… You know, we think of it as not that happening compared to London or whatever but it’s a hell of a lot more exciting and buzzy than it was. (Roger, 2013)

The sense of having a ‘blank canvas’ has perhaps helped cultural entrepreneurs sense that collectively they can shape Birmingham’s cultural milieu through their initiatives. This reflects the notion that Birmingham does not have a strong sense of identity and presence in relation to other cities. The comparison with Manchester and its music scene is an ongoing bone of contention between the two cities (Collin, 2013). However, this generates an interest in proving that Birmingham has something to offer and a motivation for supporting and re-inventing the city.

I explore this by focusing on a few projects or activities which relate to the cultural entrepreneurs I interview and because they appear to be some of the most significant initiatives in Birmingham. The projects include: Centrepiece, Creative Republic, Created in Birmingham, Birmingham Social Media Café (not an actual café but a network), The Producer’s Forum and We Are Eastside. Each project was set up independently, but they do share some common features in terms of their aspiration and impact on cultural
entrepreneurs in Birmingham. All the projects have had some public funding or support from sponsors, but they all attempt to be sustainable either through membership or due to the commitment of the cultural entrepreneurs who run them. The period of time during which the projects were set up predates 1998 (Centrepiece) and includes projects set up after New Labour’s period in government (We Are Eastside).

Centrepiece and We Are Eastside are more focused on marketing activities aimed at reaching clients and audiences. In comparison, Creative Republic, Birmingham Social Media Café, The Producer’s Forum and Created in Birmingham aim to create a network and support the sector.

**Centrepiece**

Centrepiece was formed in 1997 and is a project showcasing and selling the work of Jewellery Quarter-based jewellery designers (Centrepiece, no date). The main focus is for designers to come together to sell work locally to a high end market at Birmingham’s International Convention Centre over the Christmas period. Most of the local jewellery designers sell internationally, but in 1997 Birmingham had no gallery or contemporary jewellery shop for them to sell locally. Collaborating to sell work enables the designers to support each other and to consolidate their network, although they tend to already know each other, often sharing studios in the Jewellery Quarter. As Pollard (2007) finds in her research of financial networks, the geographical nature of these networks is an important feature of the Jewellery Quarter’s designer-maker community. Furthermore, networks are found to be highly informal yet build on habits, rules and norms which are shaped by the
designer-maker community and milieu in which they work (Pollard, 2007). Centrepiece had some public funding and support through EU funds, AWM and Birmingham City University (BCU) but is mostly supported by its members. For a few years, Centrepiece became involved with a jewellery festival set up by Birmingham City Council, Brilliantly Birmingham, set up in 1999. Jackie explains the tensions with the City Council:

There was a bit of contention there. As a project and as a festival, it was a good thing but, it was questioning what are they trying to do. What actually is the objective, are they trying to promote Birmingham as a place for people to visit or are they trying to promote what’s in Birmingham… It kind of seemed as though, actually, there were no new opportunities as a result of that festival. And you know, it was a fantastic festival to have but they just took a bit of credit for the fact that we were on their list anyway… And then you would do it, and you’d have to fill in 100 forms which they didn’t tell you about at the time. They want to know everything about your finances of your business, just because you’ve done that event. And they want to put that in as their success but actually, they didn’t make that any good. (Jackie, 2012)

Jackie’s response articulates her frustration with processes (100s of forms) and the lack of real understanding of the sector, as mentioned by O’Connor and Gu (2010). Jackie also picks up on the fact that for BCC, Birmingham’s image is perhaps more important than the jewellers’ entrepreneurial development. As Roger expressed, there is a disconnect between policymaker’s image of Birmingham and the support cultural entrepreneurs
anticipate from their city council. Pollard (2007) finds evidence that policymakers embrace the design-maker community as offering the creativity necessary for Jewellery manufacturing. Furthermore, it is anticipated that designer-makers will uplift the area and potentially attract commercial enterprises. Yet, as Hughes (2013) states, the motivations and hopes of designer-makers are often very different from those of Birmingham policy makers.

…it would be foolish to place economic hopes for renewal directly on those whose work accords with the craftswomen’s imperative that art and artisanship is more than money’ (Hughes, 2013, p.157)

On the surface, Centrepiece and BCC are collaborating, but in reality they have very different priorities. From Jackie’s perspective, the jewellers collective initiative was exploited by BCC rather then helped by it. While Birmingham’s heritage as the City of a Thousand Trades creates an opportunity for jewellery designers to market themselves as part of the city’s development, different ways of working create tensions with the City Council. The collective frustration sharpens an oppositional identity, a sense that cultural entrepreneurs operate in spite of formal structures.

**We Are Eastside**

We Are Eastside is a project co-ordinated by local music and arts events organisation Capsule with the support of BCC and in collaboration with artists groups and small independent organisations. It includes three of the cultural entrepreneurs I interview for this thesis.
As it states on the website, it is essentially a geographical area of Birmingham known as Digbeth, although re-named as the much trendier Eastside, which includes The Custard Factory and The Bond.

Like The Lunar Society all those years ago, there is a sense of a creative and productive renaissance taking place here – distinct individuals with their own research and goals, reciprocating and advancing in a common direction: outward. (We Are Eastside, no date)

It is significant in representing what could be described as the aesthetically-driven part of the cultural industries: individuals and small firms less interested in commercial goals. We Are Eastside demonstrates a commitment to developing something despite the lack of support or infrastructure in Birmingham. It perpetuates the idea of creating a ‘scene’ for audiences and practitioners alike.

I think that what they did was they actually created a “scene”, in inverted commas, and a place where people could gravitate towards and became visible and were doing things but actively thinking about their own visibility and the collective visibility of them. I think the danger of that is then, that becomes the clique, and that’s fine, because then they move on. (Liz, 2013)

This slightly contradictory comment from Liz demonstrates the dilemma between being visible and part of a ‘scene’ to gain exposure, while not excluding others.
Despite developments such as The Custard Factory and We Are Eastside, cultural entrepreneurs such as Roger feel the need for better dedicated cultural spaces.

And that’s still a bit of an issue because Birmingham still doesn’t have a creative… I don’t know if it necessarily needs to all be in one neighbourhood and be ghettoized but there’s not a kind of, you know, equivalent of the Watershed [in Bristol]… We could definitely do with something like that, that’s not totally dependent on the Custard Factory. (Roger, 2012)

We Are Eastside captures the qualities of an independent and alternative scene, but it lacks the permanence that Roger seeks; Bristol’s Watershed, for instance. As far as I understand it, the website must be the part of the project funded by BCC, while the events, activities and cultural organisations already operate separately. Unfortunately, the website (perhaps due to lack of funding?) has not been fully updated and is inaccurate in many places as small organisations have changed following recent cuts in arts funding.

This is indicative of much of the entrepreneurial activities initiated by local cultural entrepreneurs. Without the long term infrastructure, it is difficult to sustain projects, websites and activities run by independents.

In both We Are Eastside and Centrepiece I find frustrations with BCC and a tension between actions co-ordinated by cultural entrepreneurs, fuelled by a frustration with a lack of support from local government. However, the temporary nature of these initiatives does support the notion of becoming cultural entrepreneurs, as a concept which is in flux. The lack of sustainability
suggests that cultural entrepreneurs are continuously re-inventing their relationship to Birmingham and to others in the milieu. As discussed in chapter four, the lived experience of cultural entrepreneurship is complex, and new initiatives enable positions to alter and priorities to change.

**Creative Republic**

Creative Republic speaks the language of much of the policy documentation I have explored, linking the cultural industries to economic development and the creative city agenda. When Creative Republic was formed (I have not been able to establish the exact date but it is likely to have been in 2008-9), there was a sense that there would be much to be gained from pooling resources to support cultural workers and influence policy.

The aim of Creative Republic is to represent and support the needs of the creative sector in the West Midlands so if you have a cause or a project you think Creative Republic and its members can help with, please click the link above to submit your idea. (creativerepublic.org, no date).

An important aspect of the Creative Republic work is the idea of representing the sector and having a voice, particularly for lobbying larger organisations and policymakers. The website states that:

To date there’s nobody speaking for us collectively to make our opinions heard. We’d like to see that change so we’ve set up Creative Republic to be that voice. (creativerepublic.org, no date).
The idea of speaking for ‘us’ collectively is questionable as there is little information about how that kind of representation might be achieved. It is difficult to find out about the founding members as they are not listed on the website, although I find that Elise was invited on to the board by Dave, who seems to have been a key player in setting this up.

…and so I was talking to Dave about it and the work that he knew and he said have you thought about, we are trying to set up this new company, why don’t you come along, and started Creative Republic…..I was just fascinated and also because I have a real interest in supporting the creative industries in the West Midlands, that has been my work.. (Elise, 2013)

Despite the lack of transparency, there is a sense that Creative Republic is attempting to shift power from formal institutions to a collective of cultural workers. As Elise’s comment suggests, she is open-minded to what this could be and how the organisation might achieve support for the cultural sector. By cooperating, individual cultural entrepreneurs start to create alternative structures in which they can explore and articulate their version of cultural entrepreneurship and their role in shaping Birmingham’s creative milieu.

During its first two years Creative Republic ran a range of talks and activities such as the Invisible City project in 2010 (Unitt, 2010). Other events actively engaged cultural entrepreneurs to participate in policy discussions, although it is difficult to know if policymakers came along to hear these debates. However, cultural entrepreneurs did blog publicly about these activities, as
can be seen from this *Digbeth Is Good* blog post (Getgood, 2008). Furthermore, some individuals such as Dave discuss opportunities for taking the views of the cultural community to 'meetings', although it is not clear what meetings, when and where (joannageary.com, 2007). While there seems to be a flurry of activity from 2008 to 2010 there has been little news of Creative Republic since. In 2012-13 I was informally aware of a wish to see it revived but there is little evidence of leadership or funding to support this and during 2014 the website was finally closed or made inaccessible, part way through this study.

Although Creative Republic is a good example of entrepreneurial action to counteract and/or collaborate with agencies, it also illustrates a naivety on behalf of the cultural entrepreneurs involved. The sector has too many different subsectors, with diverse ways of working and different expectations from a representative organisation. I suspect that the local cultural entrepreneurs dominated by micro-enterprises, have too few resources to invest time and effort into sustaining an organisation such as this. For the individuals involved this is perhaps embarrassing or disappointing? Was this caused by a lack of leadership? It is an example of the trial and error approach, inevitably leading to some failures. However, and despite its limitations, Creative Republic can be seen as part of a range of entrepreneurial initiatives which together contribute to Birmingham’s enterprising cultural milieu. Developed as a result of frustrations with formal institutions, projects such as Creative Republic are part of a transitory landscape offering space for debate rather than merely supporting local
cultural policy rhetoric. Projects like Creative Republic represent an intention to shape the environment for cultural entrepreneurship.

**Created in Birmingham**

Alongside Creative Republic, and presented as one of its projects, the blog Created in Birmingham was created by two local cultural entrepreneurs (Created in Birmingham, no date). The original aims of the blog were firstly to help other cultural entrepreneurs find out what’s going on around Birmingham and promote it, and secondly to show that blogging is a simple and effective way of engaging with audiences online. Although the founders of the blog no longer write for it, this seems to have been a more sustainable project as it continues to exist and has managed to secure advertising. Created in Birmingham has acted as a useful tool for communication and developing a sense of what is going on in very small cultural enterprises, as well as the larger more established activities which might be reviewed on the blog. It makes cultural enterprise visible amongst practitioners and to a wider public. As with Parrish’s publication, it showcases and creates a language for discussing cultural enterprise, establishing a dominant role through its public presence (1288 subscribers and 12982 followers on twitter [accessed 2 May 2014]). Yet Created in Birmingham is significantly different from the Parrish publication because it attempts to forge a collective identity on behalf of cultural entrepreneurs rather than as presented by formal structures such as Business Link.

Created in Birmingham is a success story in the sense that it still exists and is regularly updated, keeping Birmingham’s cultural milieu in touch with a
range of activities, events and opportunities. It has successfully changed hands from its founders to teams of bloggers, and is far more transparent in explaining who is involved in its ‘about’ pages (Created in Birmingham, no date). Like Parrish’s *Creative, Cultural and Digital Industries guide*, the Created in Birmingham blog articulates what it means to be involved in the cultural industries in Birmingham through the choice of articles and reviews. There is little evidence of critique or counter cultural activity such as that discussed by McRobbie (2010). Rather this is as much about presenting Birmingham as a creative city as it is an opportunity for the writers to develop their skills and networks, leading to further work. A pragmatic outcome for cultural entrepreneurs establishing themselves and collectively presenting Birmingham’s cultural milieu. Given the fact that different people have managed the content, this also enables a variety of voices and ideas to be explored. Here, the space for ‘becoming’ is both in the opportunity to write for the blog and to be written about.

**The Producer’s Forum**

The Producer’s Forum appears to be a more formal organisation as it was started through funding from ScreenWM with the aim of supporting film makers in the region. The website states:

> We are an independent organisation serving the vibrant community of filmmakers and content producers, in Birmingham, the West Midlands and beyond. (Producer’s Forum, no date).

Established in 2003, the Producer’s Forum offers its members a range of services, from masterclasses, networking and skills workshops as well as
general support. As with Creative Republic there is a sense of representing
the industry and having a voice to influence policy or to actively make the
case for the sector. Since the demise of ScreenWM, the Producer’s Forum
works closely with other local organisations such as Birmingham City
University, Midlands Arts Centre and Creative England. The Forum has a
paid Chief Executive (a part time role), Pete, and a board made up of
industry professionals. Pete explains his role as a producer and how he uses
the Producer’s Forum as a means of supporting the producer’s role:

So I do think there is an imbalance there and I think that producers
are often very misunderstood. The role is misunderstood. A lot is
taken for granted. But then on the other side I've been heavily
involved in the Producer’s Forum and was the acting chair and now
I'm the CEO and even though its grown beyond being primarily about
producers, you know there are craft people and writers and directors,
and the landscape has changed. We still fight that corner that, you got
to get people to understand the producing process, and the elements
and ingredients within there and a lot of people are actually producing
even if they don’t call themselves a producer. (Pete, 2013)

Again, this may be indicative of the problems associated with understanding
the subsectors of the ‘creative industries’ and how best to support them. The
networking and support offered through the Producer’s Forum is sector
specific, and, similarly to Centrepiece, its focus makes it more tangible and
appropriate to its members. It demonstrates how necessary sector specific
support is important for an industry which operates internationally and in a
different way from traditional business models. Individuals working in the
UK’s film industry outside of London have a particularly difficult task. Organisations like The Producer’s Forum support the notion that there is local film industry but its very existence is precarious. Pete’s comments indicate the need to collectively defend the sector and forge an identity, as local film producers. Again, this resonates with the notion of not being London, attempting to gain recognition by creating a different identity, more specific to the West Midlands and to the individuals involved in the forum.

**Social Media Café**

Birmingham’s Social Media Café, established in 2008 by Joanna Geary who was employed by the Birmingham Post at the time, has a reputation for enabling networking across the cultural industries but also with other industries who wish to engage with the sector. Common to many cultural industry networks it has an informality about it which suggests an openness to anyone reflected in the tone of its website:

> The Birmingham Social Media Café is a place for people interested in social media to gather, get acquainted, chat, plot, scheme, and share. If you’re interested in the future of media, how we organise, share, produce and enjoy it, then come along. If you’re an artist, film maker, geek, marketer, academic, musician, designer, writer, photographer, or anything close or related, then this is the event for you! (Birmingham Social Media Café, no date).

The network meets once a month and many of the cultural entrepreneurs interviewed are either regulars or have been to Birmingham Social Media
Café. After the first event, in September 2008, Geary received many warm comments reflecting the need for the event but also the informality.

Thanks Jo for setting this up. It was great to make new contacts and network in a relaxed venue. We will definitely be coming to the next event. Friday mornings seem a good time slot too. Thanks again!

(Green, 2008)

As public funding has dwindled over the last 3-4 years, projects such as this and the Created in Birmingham blog have an important role in keeping a dialogue going across the cultural industry community. This is also echoed in the many events, such as Hello Digital (no date), aimed at the digital and cultural industries. All of these events share some common themes such as the changes in business brought on by the use of the internet and social media platforms; opportunities for networking; and skills workshops. Equally, they are important in a sector with so many micro-businesses and freelancers, as a means of sharing knowledge and gaining new business.

On a blog discussion which took place in 2007 local cultural entrepreneurs reflect on Birmingham’s cultural milieu by stating that ‘the reason Birmingham has a strong, successful and ever-growing creative industry is because it has evolved largely under the radar’ (anonymous, 2007). This exemplifies cultural entrepreneurs seeking ownership of their identity, partly in opposition and as an alternative voice. Another blogger replies by stating:

Couldn’t agree more – I call it “in-spite-of-ness”, but you do only get so far with that. Other European cities have successfully made the leap into embracing their underground to make it more successful – I think
that needs to happen in Birmingham. Not by taking it overground but by making decisions that enable it to thrive. Often that should be ‘just leave it alone’ – but even that is a decision. (anonymous, 2007).

With hindsight there is a naivety in cultural entrepreneurs considering that they can shape policy, change their city and make it more economically successful. Yet cultural entrepreneurs, with few resources other than their willingness to engage with ideas collectively, should not be underestimated in terms of their contribution to Birmingham’s cultural milieu and individual development. As I have argued, the activities discussed in this chapter represent the agentic capacities of cultural entrepreneurs within a social context. The result is a fluid, informal environment for ‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur, often in opposition to the cultural policy framework.

The type of entrepreneurial attitude expressed above demonstrates a lack of trust in the state to intervene appropriately and represents individuals carving their own way, expressing a sense of autonomy and agency.

Several years later, Roger makes a similar point:

You know, independents in Birmingham have quite enjoyed that, “Sod ‘em, we’re going to do it anyway” kind of… There’s this dogged…Yeah, there’s a lot of in spite-of-ness that happens in Birmingham, but we should probably be moving beyond that slightly. (Roger, 2012).

The perception from the point of view of cultural entrepreneurs is in stark contrast to Chloe who described a more collegiate atmosphere with herself as broker between institutions and individuals working in the cultural sector.
Yet the activities described above demonstrate some engagement with institutions, even if these are not sustainable or successful. Cultural entrepreneurs are not working in isolation; rather, they work in a social context, collaborate and connect to the city and its institutions in various ways. A key issue however is the nature of that relationship between individuals and public sector institutions. When exploring the activities of cultural micro-enterprises, it is not one of equals. An important practical difference is the fact that the cultural entrepreneurs involved in the various projects I have described commit enormous amounts of time, effort and energy in circumstances when they are also trying to sustain their own practice. Some positions are paid, such as the role of CEO of the Producers Forum, but it is unlikely that the fee covers the full commitment required for that job. Cultural entrepreneurs have a vested interest in coming together, lobbying or supporting each other, but this may not fully justify the time, effort and energy they dedicate to these activities.

I find a fluid relationship between the private sector and publicly-funded activities, with evidence of both state support and individual entrepreneurial activity. The problems with both state support and entrepreneurial activities is that they both can be inconsistent. A characteristic of New Labour’s approach was to engage with industry in attempting to shape policy and support entrepreneurial endeavours. However, given changes in resources and governments this creates a lack of sustainability for many cultural entrepreneurs who participated in these processes. Sustainability is an issue for both private and public sector initiatives, but despite their temporary
status, activities initiated by cultural entrepreneurs offer a space for engaging with each other and for contesting institutions such as BCC.

Yet there are many instances of successful partnerships between the private and public sector, such as New Zealand’s government working with the Screen Production Industry, in particular with the entrepreneur Peter Jackson (De Bruin, 2005). This level of collaboration is echoed by Mariana Mazzucato (2013) who argues that, in many cases, the innovations at the heart of many entrepreneurial companies are often developed through publicly-funded research. In a recent article, Mazzucato states:

But what if the image we are constantly fed – of a dynamic business sector contrasted with a necessary but sluggish bureaucratic, often ‘meddling’, state – is completely wrong?

What if the revolutionary, most radical, changes in capitalism came not from the invisible hand of the market but the very visible hand of the state? (Mazzucato, 2013)

According to Mazzucato (2013), many technological innovations behind products such as the IPhone, GPS, touchscreens etc. were government funded, so rather than a ‘meddling’ state, she presents The Entrepreneurial State, working in partnership with industry. The interplay between the private sector and government support in the cultural sector is spread across departments such as the arts, economic development, education and community engagement. This suggests that despite the rhetoric associated with entrepreneurship being based on private initiatives, many entrepreneurial endeavours receive public funding. An analysis of the
relationship between structures such as local governments and entrepreneurial firms reveals a complex and dynamic space. Mazzucato’s focus is technical innovation for larger firms but it helpfully questions our notion of entrepreneurship and the state. Industries such as the UK film sector for instance, tend to balance an entrepreneurial approach with public sector funding and support. In this context, becoming a cultural entrepreneur involves an understanding of public funding structures and networks. As with the role of the Producer’s Forum, there are many contradictions in seeking to benefit from public funding whilst occasionally opposing policy decisions.

Working as a collective, enables cultural entrepreneurs to gain strength and in Birmingham this seems to be further emphasised by a commitment to the city. Banks draws on Drake’s research into jewellers based in Birmingham as being committed to place and practice.

Drake thus alerts us to the important possibility that social values, expressed in the desire to participate and contribute to a specific and geographically located community of practice, have not yet been fully attenuated by the principles of neo-liberal, market-led exchange. (Banks, 2007, p. 150).

I argue that the projects initiated by cultural entrepreneurs demonstrate a commitment to place, practice and to each other. In particular, Birmingham Social Media Café and Created in Birmingham are good examples of well-organised activities which are sustaining themselves by the commitment of those involved and a sense of responsibility beyond their personal gain.
Instrumental values are combined with wanting to make a difference and maintaining a lively cultural milieu.

It is worth noting that not all cultural entrepreneurs engage with local networks and policies even if they are aware of them. For instance, Jack’s company had little to do with advocates of Birmingham as a creative city, preferring to focus on running a business. This attitude has perhaps served him well, as a means of separating himself from an identity which he associates with individuals such as Dave, discussed in previous chapters.

As I stated earlier, there is relatively little evidence of political activism directed at issues such as equality or other radical interventions (McRobbie, 2011; Miles, 2005). As an example, Miles cites the work of artists Cornford and Cross, whose public art in Stoke on Trent caused controversy but initiated discussions about ‘public spaces in the city and their neglect by the local authority’ (Miles, 2005, p.905.). For Miles, the value in this type of art work is that it ‘interrupts the flow of city-image rhetoric’ (Miles, 2005, p. 907). In Birmingham, Eastside Projects (a partner in We Are Eastside) tends to be more engaged in critical debates, such as a performance lecture by the artist Drummond entitled ‘Degeneration Versus Regeneration’.

Art never blossoms in the regenerated areas of cities. Art always blossoms in the degenerated areas of cities. City councils want to regenerate the degenerated areas in cities to becoming ‘cultural quarters’. (We Are Eastside, no date).

My understanding is that for McRobbie and Miles, art needs to be radical or counter-cultural, to demonstrate that it is not effectively colluding with
government. I find entrepreneurial activities described in the second part of this chapter to be engaging in social and political issues, but not in an explicit manner. Importantly, many of the cultural entrepreneurs are not artists and may not identify with the notion of art as a form of activism. The jewellers working together to create Centrepiece are involved in the practicalities of being jewellery designer makers, selling carefully crafted work. The budding film makers who are members of the Producer’s Forum get involved because they need to secure funding, a team and the right skills to get a film project started. And beyond pragmatism, there is an implicit opposition to official institutions and to the stereotypes around entrepreneurialism presented by formal structures such as Business Link. I question the critique of cultural entrepreneurship as an aspect of neo-liberal individualism, when presented with systems of mutual support through which individuals negotiate an entrepreneurial identity of their own. A lack of resources to sustain new initiatives is a concern but it supports the possibility for reinvigorating debates and the nature of cultural entrepreneurship.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, my aim was to highlight the context in which cultural entrepreneurs operate in Birmingham by outlining important policies and selecting key projects. I reveal significant evidence of New Labour’s influence over local cultural policies linked to both the Creative City project and the economic development of the sector, as a contributor to growth in the region. These policies are in keeping with those of many UK cities
seeking competitive advantage and looking for the cultural sector to support city branding initiatives.

Cultural entrepreneurs are not only aware of Birmingham policies, many are engaged in either constructing discussions with policymakers or delivering policy objectives through collaborations and by addressing key priorities in their projects. There are different levels of engagement depending on the type of subsector; for instance commercially-driven enterprises benefit from some funding which excludes arts organisations. Conversely, festivals and other cultural enterprises which attract audiences and tourists receive some level of support by contributing to Birmingham's brand development.

Overall, the impression is of a messy and turbulent period of time for individual cultural entrepreneurs, due to changes in government priorities and lack of resources. The language of enterprise in cultural policy does not seem to perturb individuals, but having to be sustainable in this environment can be challenging. I argue that this environment can be fertile ground for ‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur; a restlessness associated with the temporary nature of support structures, formal and informal.

The collaborative activities of cultural entrepreneurs demonstrate an entrepreneurial spirit and a wish to provide bespoke support for the sector. This might be the result of gaps in state support, or a lack of understanding of the specific needs of the cultural industries’ subsectors. Equally, it could be indicative of a confidence and pro-active attitude resulting from the general level of support for the cultural sector in Birmingham. For instance, local policies have supported spaces for cultural work and seed funding to
initiate new networks. Agentic actions are collaborative and tend to be driven by a sense of responsibility for personal advancement and for the general community in Birmingham. Yet, the structures in Birmingham both hinder and facilitate cultural entrepreneurs, as suggested in BOP Consulting’s research.

[There is a] strong sense in the interviews and focus group that Birmingham is selling itself short, and not making the most of the assets it does have. Delivery of services should be left more to the creative sector. (BOP Consulting, 2010, p.4)

The suggestion is that cultural entrepreneurs wish to be involved in influencing the support for the cultural industries, and in shaping Birmingham’s image. Creative Republic, The Producer’s Forum and to some extent Centrepiece seem to exist because Birmingham as a city has actively encouraged cultural entrepreneurship. They use the language of policy and share many of the aspirations. Yet, they can also be described as entrepreneurial interventions resulting from a lack of support; as Tom states, ‘we still fight that corner [for film producers]…’ (2012). Policy makers and cultural entrepreneurs share different aspirations yet they merge when there is a possibility for funding or other kinds of support. This is not always satisfactory, as we see in the example of the Jewellery Quarter designer-makers (Hughes, 2013). There is both an acceptance of support from the state and an opposition to policies and priorities.

Recent cuts in funding are likely to increase a reliance on entrepreneurial initiatives. The activities I describe offer much optimism on the surface, but they also depict uncertainties and insecurities for cultural entrepreneurs. In
order to address some of the issues traditionally dealt with by unions or industry associations, there is a need for better representation and support. The informality of initiatives led by cultural entrepreneurs could be problematic both in terms of the impact they have and in their ability be sustainable (for example Creative Republic has not been active for four years).

By situating the cultural entrepreneurs’ narratives within the context of Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s (2011) meso-relational level and macro-contextual level, I have observed the space in which individuals negotiate their identities. The idea of ‘becoming’ discussed in chapter four as an aspect of the cultural entrepreneur’s identity is further explored in relation to collective and individual agentic actions. Structural frameworks depicted as formal institutions and policies are evidently important in terms of offering both opportunities and limiting cultural entrepreneurship. Yet, informal structures, created by cultural entrepreneurs offer alternative positions and a space for experimentation.

The cultural entrepreneurs I am studying have to navigate this environment and interact with it in their individual ways but also as a community, benefitting from being part of a network rather than operating in isolation. Within this space, cultural entrepreneurs test both collective and individual identities, working within a structure but also creating new temporary structures of their own such as blogs and networks. A sense of place is important to cultural entrepreneurs, and I have found a real commitment to the city’s cultural sector demonstrated through engagement with cultural
policies and city developments. The cultural workers’ agentic actions shape the quality of Birmingham’s cultural milieu.

Whilst the cultural entrepreneurs in this study are rarely involved in explicitly resisting structural frameworks, it is this appearance of colluding with institutions and policymakers that perhaps fuels a critique of cultural entrepreneurship. Birmingham’s cultural entrepreneurs use the language of policymakers, broadly reflecting New Labour’s cultural policies and aspirations, but cultural entrepreneurs also use a language of defiance suggesting that they exist in spite of what they perceive as a lack of support. Of course, the flurry of projects described in this chapter are partly as a result of a very privileged period of time, pre-austerity. The landscape has changed since, particularly for those reliant on public funding such as Liz, Alison and Roger. Yet, cultural entrepreneurs ride the tides of changing policies and governments with their usual positive and entrepreneurial spirit, albeit, within an increasingly challenging context. New alliances are being formed with universities, for projects such as Liz’s exhibitions, or experiments with new sources of funding (such as crowd funding) are being explored by individuals such as Isabella, Roger and Tom, with mixed results. This will be further explored in chapter six, when I will discuss tensions, support and the manner in which relationships are nurtured using cultural, social and symbolic capital. I undertake an analysis of the nature of these relationships, including how positions of power are established, and the importance of ‘who you know’.
Chapter 6: ‘It’s not what you know, it’s who you know that matters’

Introduction

The media and cultural sectors are often described as highly networked; we’ve all heard it before: ‘it’s not what you know, it’s who you know’. Similarly, advice for entrepreneurs prioritises the ability to network as key to entrepreneurial success. In this final chapter, I discuss the impact of close networks and relationships in Birmingham as an aspect of the cultural entrepreneur’s experience. In particular, I explore how identities are formed in a relational manner, by being part of a collective system in which comparisons with others plays a role in becoming a cultural entrepreneur.

In the previous chapter I highlighted several collaborative activities undertaken by cultural entrepreneurs as a feature of Birmingham’s cultural milieu. The agentic actions of individual workers takes place in social spaces in which they respond to personal and wider needs of the cultural industry community. This process is possible due to personal interactions amongst cultural workers. The nature of relationships, including positions within a social milieu, determine entrepreneurial possibilities. For many cultural entrepreneurs, the reality of entrepreneurial practice encourages the need to develop different forms of capital, as assets for managing work and developing opportunities. But relationships are driven by varying factors, from instrumental motivations to genuine bonds, particularly amongst more established cultural entrepreneurs. As cultural workers manage these
complex relations, a connection with Birmingham remains an important ingredient in establishing a sense of self. I seek to reveal this complexity by analysing detailed and personal stories, while acknowledging a broader discourse and critique of networks and networking in the cultural industries.

Networks are increasingly thought to be a driver for economic and social development, but enthusiasm for the networked society is not without criticism (Blair, 2009; Castells, 2010; Lee, 2011). The neo-liberal politics that shaped the Thatcher and Reagan era have been characterised as liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms, offset by a notion of networks as key to ensuring collaborative and supportive working practices. Wittel (2001) argues that traditional ‘narrative sociality’ based on stability encourages shared concerns and mutuality, concerns which one might share with friends or colleagues in a conventional workplace. In contrast, ‘network sociality’ is more instrumental, friendships become resources for finding work and workers become emotionally detached from others (Wittel, 2001). As Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2010) argue, while networks can provide pleasurable social bonds, there are also negative consequences which tend to be overlooked by advocates of entrepreneurial modes of working. For McRobbie, the demands of ‘frenetic networking’ (2002b, p.104) have consequences for people’s understanding of work and leads to inequalities in the work place. My intention here is not to celebrate the so-called network society, but to offer a different perspective based on the narratives of a small group of cultural entrepreneurs in Birmingham.

As Blair (2009) explains, individuals are both influenced and constrained by social structures, without necessarily being aware of them. Although cultural
entrepreneurs shape and actively engage in networks, underlying structures such as their personal social and cultural capital, and the specific context in Birmingham (cultural policies, resources and infrastructure) can be restricting.

It is the wider structures within which they and their network of relations are situated which exerts constraining and enabling influences on those actions and which are not always transparent to actors. (Blair, 2009, p. 132.)

To investigate the dense social networks in cultural industry work, Scott (2012), Lee (2011) and Blair (2009) draw on Bourdieu’s notion of cultural, social and symbolic capitals. This develops a critical framework, revealing challenges for cultural workers, but also depicts pragmatic tools for entrepreneurial practice. As discussed in chapter one, Scott’s (2012) research places an emphasis on how networks and relationships are used to support the cultural entrepreneurs’ creative endeavours, and in establishing themselves within a network. For Scott (2012), social and cultural capital can be utilised as a means of creating a ‘buzz’, developing Ellmeier’s idea of cultural entrepreneurs working ‘sans’ capital; in other words, with no or very little financial backing. This ‘alternative’ capital supports the production of DIY cultural practices, shaping identity as a result of cultural entrepreneurs constructing themselves as a ‘subject of value’ (Scott, 2012, p.249).

Typically, cultural entrepreneurs have low levels of economic capital, but high levels of symbolic capital which they translate into ‘buzz’ and which may lead to economic capital, in due time. According to Scott (2012), a cultural entrepreneur’s identity is part constructed by his or her ability to make use of
the symbolic capital he or she generates through social and cultural capital. 

Bourdieu’s forms of capital: cultural, social and symbolic, have a use-value as part of an exchange-value system. Drawing on Skegg, Scott states that:

She [Skegg] argues that a defining feature of contemporary capitalism is how social, cultural and symbolic capitals have a use-value in building a person’s identity and an exchange-value in systems of economic and symbolic exchange. (Scott, 2012, p. 246)

Thus, Scott reflects on the idea that by increasing one’s social, cultural and symbolic capital, one creates a resource of oneself. It is in the context of social relations that this exchange takes place, facilitated by networks but within the wider structure. Scott’s study suggests that relationships are based on mutual support, enabling cultural entrepreneurs who do not have the financial resources to assist each other by exchanging alternative forms of capital. This places the emphasis on relationships as encouraging, facilitating or indeed restricting the cultural entrepreneurs’ aspirations. How are these relationships acted out in Birmingham’s cultural milieu?

The subjectivity of social relationships is a significant influencing factor in a highly context-specific space. As Bottero and Crossley (2011) argue, Bourdieu’s work emphasises the role of structure over individual interactions and relationships.

In his work on cultural production, Bourdieu [1993, 1996a] makes reference to various milieux (e.g. cafés, ateliers, salons, etc.) in which artists forge enduring connections, share resources, influence one another and more generally experiment together. He concedes that
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such ‘empirical’ contact is important in the formation of artistic conventions. Bourdieu only makes the point in passing, however, failing to draw it out and into his more abstract and theoretical formulations. He fails to fully recognize the generative role of such interactions and bonds in the constitution of field relation. (Bottero and Crossley, 2011, p.101-102, italics in original).

I draw attention to the significance and nature of relationships, including key actors, amongst cultural entrepreneurs in Birmingham. The distinction between socialising and networking in professional relationships is ambivalent, offering powerful experiences but also the potential for isolation and seclusion from one’s peers (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2010). Personal connections and preferences are difficult to define, but they appear to form the basis for certain loyalties amongst cultural workers. There is evidence of different approaches to networking based on whether cultural entrepreneurs are at the early stages in their career, or more experienced. Networks are not merely about networking for work, they are based on relationships which are complex and not fixed.

In exploring this messy terrain I draw predominantly on the voice of my interviewees and, to a lesser degree, to comments on blogs and other social media platforms to further contextualise the participants’ accounts. This study does not seek to present a network map to conceptualise Birmingham’s cultural networks, a task which would require something akin to a network analysis approach and the collection of a different type of data. Rather, I emphasise the interactions between individuals to depict the nature of relationships which form part of the informal structural framework within
Birmingham’s cultural milieu. This is not comprehensive, but it is a glimpse into the social context in which cultural entrepreneurs negotiate their personal and professional aspirations. The insights are often incidental, and at the time may have been casual comments with reference to individuals that both I and the interviewee know. Cultural entrepreneurs mention their contacts, compare themselves with others, express their views about key local actors and signify concerns in the process of discussing their interactions. The manner in which cultural entrepreneurs describe their connections indicates the value they place on certain relationships, and how these are entwined into everyday experiences. The relationships I describe are often with peers, but also with key institutions and people who influence the cultural entrepreneurs’ practice, shaping their work and the opportunities they have. Relations are created and developed in public spaces such as formal and informal events, or on various social media platforms, but much of this is also hidden and difficult for researchers to track. Ultimately, my research does not dispute the problems with networks and networking as depicted by critical theorists (Lee, 2011; Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011; Oakley, 2014), however, I hope that by capturing the lived experiences of cultural entrepreneurs I reveal a different dynamic in social relations. Entrepreneurs are capable of rejecting assumptions about the importance of networking and have a good awareness of the limitations and significance of relationships. As I have argued throughout the thesis, cultural entrepreneurs are not passively accepting bad work and poor relationships, in many cases they skilfully negotiate these challenges.
The chapter is split into three sections, each investigating an aspect of the relationships which the cultural entrepreneurs discussed during the interviews. The first part continues to draw on Birmingham as a space in which specific connections are made and nurtured, creating a sense of community with aspirations to do ‘good work’. In the second section, I argue that networking cannot be reduced to an instrumental activity. And finally, I present key individuals with prominent positions in the network to explore the character and nature of relationships, including the tensions between structure and agency. The social structures within Birmingham’s cultural milieu create a framework in which interactions come about, but cultural entrepreneurs respond in diverse ways to the necessity of networking.

**Birmingham’s social dynamic**

In this section I emphasise the interactions between individuals based on locality, building on the previous chapter which explored Birmingham and relevant policies as a context for cultural work. As Banks states when reflecting on his study of Manchester’s cultural entrepreneurs:

…localities may not only provide cultural entrepreneurs with economic advantages and/or aesthetic inspiration (as is conventionally argued), but might potentially act as a framework for the articulation of moral-political and social values in the course of cultural work. (Banks, 2006, p.466)

In chapter five, policy frameworks and entrepreneurial agency provided a context for enterprising projects such as the Social Media Café and Creative Republic. I describe entrepreneurial activities which exploit the
characteristics of networking in supporting cultural entrepreneurship in Birmingham. Collaboration, mentoring, skills development and sector representation are core aspects of these networks. But these structures, albeit a combination of formal and informal structures, are supported by fluid relationships and networks between people. In this space, values and identities are performed through dynamic interactions, with Birmingham acting as a backdrop to the cultural entrepreneurs’ stage.

Emma identifies that Birmingham’s cultural milieu includes individuals who appear to take risks and who undertake experimental projects.

Because you know, everyone is in the pub saying we could do XYZ, and there’s people like Andy and like Dave, are actually doing it. Paul – on a more sensible level – but Paul is doing really good things. So yeah people like that. I like the fact that people like that exist in Birmingham and it is small enough to know them all. (Emma, 2013)

It is interesting to note that Emma identifies the difference between activities which are exciting and experimental, and the work which she describes as ‘more sensible’. As Emma states, the Birmingham-based cultural entrepreneurs operate in a ‘small world’; a world in which social and symbolic capital support relationships and the cultural entrepreneurs’ sense of identity. As Scott states, they are building their small enterprise through the symbolic capital and ‘buzz’ which they generate by undertaking activities estimated to be interesting. Collaborations and favours done for free can lead to extending the opportunity for exploiting cultural and social capital within the field. For Paul, the capital associated with setting up the Birmingham
Bloggers Association can be converted from cultural and social capital to symbolic capital for his entrepreneurial activities, leading to a paid opportunities.

I’ve now told the story many times so I understand it. I think when, mostly through Alan blogging about all these different people, and seeing Created in Birmingham, made me realise that some of the people I knew were part of a wider thing. So he exposed it and the point at which I think I recognised what I think I was doing, was when I set up the Birmingham Bloggers Association, because I sort of thought, so the key thing here is that we connect. It doesn’t matter what we do. As long as we connect. (Paul, 2012)

This is an important aspect of how working communities can offer support and recognition, creating an identity for a particularly new way of working and effectively legitimising that work through their connection to each other. In the long term, the accumulated goodwill, connections and learning gained from this establishes Paul as one of the most successful cultural entrepreneurs in this study. Furthermore, Paul’s work is shaped by the network which influences his progress, and he identifies specific individuals who inform his entrepreneurial developments.

People like Chris, Andrew, people like Oliver and Dave were just starting off Created in Birmingham. Matt was ahead of us all with ‘Birmingham It’s Not Crap’ although interestingly he later turned that into a blog. And so I started, at the same time as I was doing this thing with the grassroots channel, in the process of doing that, I learned that
I wasn't making media but making connections. And that's what our entire business is built on. Media making is about relationships and what you can use those relationships to make happen, not about the media itself. So I was out using the channel to create relationships between me and active citizens. (Paul, 2013)

Paul presents the story of how he started his enterprise as a process of interactions with people in Birmingham’s network such as Oliver, Dave and Matt, with whom he identifies through shared values. To some critical theorists Paul’s use of language in describing his experience will resonate with commentators such as Charles Leadbeater, who is criticised for his tireless enthusiasm for entrepreneurialism, exemplified in his books We Think and Living on Thin Air (McRobbie, 2002b). But it is important to note that just as entrepreneurs adopt aspects of a prominent discourse does not always mean that they buy into the whole concept, in this instance, the type of ideas proposed by Leadbeater. Beyond his use of language, Paul articulates a set of values based on his experience and the confidence he gained from sharing his idea with others in the network. Paul’s relationships help to shape his identity as a cultural entrepreneur, and in turn have an impact on Birmingham’s cultural milieu. Whilst enabling his own activities to become acceptable or legitimate in the eyes of others within the network, Paul has an impact on the social structures in which he functions.

The sense of belonging to a network gives confidence in one’s work, particularly in precarious labour when financial rewards are not always forthcoming. Liz describes how she has ‘bounced things back and forth with the organisation Capsule for years, and been very similar, you know, they’re
kind of a year or two ahead of us in a way’ (Liz, 2013). Furthermore, Liz suggests that this would be very difficult outside Birmingham, where one’s position and relationships might not be secure.

We’ve all grown up, and we’ve nearly all done it with one organisation which is really interesting. Maybe a regional thing, I mean to an extent, you know, you kind of carve out your network and your position within that network and if you do hop then you do have to do all of that again, absolutely. And I think everybody, you know, knows that, is terrified, you know it was terrifying to come from London to Birmingham in the first place… (Liz, 2013)

Liz acknowledges that this is difficult and she suggests that it takes a long time to establish relationships. As Roger’s experience suggests, others in the network can help with the idea of a benchmark which he describes as a source of support and encouragement rather than competition. These incidents materialise by ‘nattering’ and ‘gossiping’ rather than working in isolation with no relationship to other cultural entrepreneurs.

Yeah. I mean, we got them [Capsule] to do a gig for us when I was at the Film and TV Festival which worked really well and was a bit of a prototype for a 7 Inch event in a way before Film Reel even existed, 2001, and just from sort of nattering in the pub and grumbling and the usual arts gossip. I think they’ve definitely been important to us, not just as kind of sharing ideas but also defining yourself… you know, you become… Like, for instance, Capsule and Brum Film Fest are superficially similar but also quite different and they have quite
different strengths and as you get a bit more mature and have a sense of your place in the world it’s handy to have those little benchmarks around you to make you. And it ceases to be a question of, “Oh so and so’s got funding and we haven’t, or whatever… (Roger, 2012)

From Roger’s account it seems that communication is relatively open, and not based on a competitive relationship but one which supports both ‘sharing ideas’ and ‘defining yourself’. This is in contrast to Baines and Robson’s (2001) study, which suggests that many freelance media workers (mostly London-based journalists in their study) suffer from high levels of competition, from isolation and a lack of business knowledge. Instead of portraying the potential support from networks the research suggests that ‘few people do make successful use of collaborative ties’ (Baines and Robson, 2001). As discussed in Liz’s experience, I find relatively little evidence of this in the cultural entrepreneurs I interview, which might reflect the difference between industry subsectors in the cultural industries and a difference between London and a regional city such as Birmingham. It is perhaps significant that Bank’s (2007) Manchester-based cultural entrepreneurs demonstrate similar collaborative tendencies; they work in a city other than the capital, often demonstrating a pride in their city. The lack of competition may also come from the fact that the cultural entrepreneurs do not represent the same cultural industries, although they might compete for similar funds. Ultimately, the cultural entrepreneurs’ accounts propose that there is more to be gained from supporting each other than there is from competing, suggesting that workers are not as emotionally detached as Wittel (2001) proposes.
A vital aspect of the informal networking is ‘having cups of coffee’, as Paul states; a way of illustrating the character of the meetings. Elise talks about ‘coffee and chat’ rather than networking but emphasises that this is still very much about work, however informal it might appear. In starting her freelance career, Elise asked people if they:

…want[ed] to meet for coffee and chat, coffee and chat, coffee and chat and then pretty much at events and people would go, oh how are you? And oh you’re freelance now. And people would go oh there might be something you’d be interested in here. (Elise, 2013)

When I ask Joanna if she has a mentor she says ‘no, but informally I am having coffees with Nicole’ (Joanna, 2011). Friendly and informal behaviours, as well as unconventional business locations, are not necessarily indicative of a lack of professionalism but are part of the cultural entrepreneurs’ identity. Several coffee shops in Birmingham have become hubs for a kind of co-working or an informal office, creating opportunities for people to meet and to avoid isolation. Without the expense of an office, nascent cultural entrepreneurs make use of Birmingham’s independent coffee shops to initiate new ideas, gather support and nurture contacts. The type of coffee shop is important, as the owners are usually supportive of cultural workers, encouraging them by offering free wifi and running events such as the popular ‘meet-ups’ or ‘jellies’. For instance, Paul explains that when he was starting his enterprise, he ‘basically went to the [Garden Café] and said I’ll bring a load of people here’ (2012).
Despite the predominantly supportive environment I have described, I do see tensions and competition in a few comments. For instance, Jack talks about ‘enticing’ a new member of staff from another local media company.

We’ve just nicked one of their designers. He was planning to go down to London and we have a London office so part of the way of enticing this guy to come on board was to say do you want to give it a go with us for six months and if it works out you can still move to London and you have a job sorted out. (Jack, 2012)

There is certainly a ruthlessness to Jack’s tone as he explains his actions, although this is in the context of a highly commercial sector of the cultural industries. Here, the ‘small world’ context of Birmingham’s cultural milieu echoes Lee’s accounts of London-based freelance cultural workers, in which networking is used for recruiting staff (2011).

In the previous chapter I explored some of the collective projects and networking organisations initiated by Birmingham’s cultural entrepreneurs which emphasised having a voice, training and supporting each other. I find that exploring relationships through the prism of Birmingham reveals a connectivity between individuals.

Despite high degrees of networking in Birmingham, there is little evidence that this has instigated discussions relating to issues and problems traditionally addressed by networks such as unions. National campaigns such as Paying Artists and research projects initiated by the Royal Society of Arts (RSA) and Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) are exploring how cultural workers can act together to support one another. This type of support
appears to be taking place in Birmingham, but it is not explicit and lacks co-ordination to make it effective for a wide community.

I find supportive networks which mitigate against some of the problems with ‘bad work’ without addressing them head-on. Without networks cultural entrepreneurs could be much more isolated; instead, they define themselves in relation to others.

The supportive relationships experienced by cultural entrepreneurs are not insignificant to building confidence, successful careers and a sense of identity. Much of this takes place in Birmingham’s cafés and, increasingly, localised networks are reflected online through public platforms such as Twitter (Postill, 2008). The process of articulating the cultural entrepreneurs’ varied interactions reveals a dynamic network in which there is space for agency and the potential for more evident action against the insecurities of cultural work. Recent cuts in funding may act as a catalyst for this type of activity.

In the next section, I discuss the nature of relationships to challenge the assumption that all professional relations in the cultural sector tend to be defined as instrumental.

**What motivates social relations: instrumental values or genuine friendship?**

Working within a social context, individual cultural entrepreneurs actively engage in building relationships, sometimes for strategic purposes and with specific outcomes in mind. In this section, I explore the extent to which
instrumental goals motivate cultural entrepreneurs by presenting a range of observations from my interviewees.

As others have argued, the individualisation of entrepreneurial work is problematic for social interactions, creating a blurred line between genuine and instrumental motivations for developing relationships (see Blair, 2009; Lee, 2011). Can cultural entrepreneurs be friends, support each other, but also compete for funding or for opportunities? Do cultural entrepreneurs always make use of networks and networking to enhance their opportunities? In the first part of this chapter, I found evidence that working in a city such as Birmingham could create a milieu for positive social relationships.

As with Lee’s research, Blair argues that relations tend to be focused on instrumental practices aimed at enhancing employability, contacts for work or information to develop other relationships. This argument is presented as fraught with problems for individuals, who find the line between professional and personal relationships difficult to manage. It is a highly dynamic environment in which individuals have to continually update their contacts and relationships; an exhausting activity often excluding those without the necessary cultural and social capital to participate. Like Lee’s (2011) London-based television workers, Blair’s (2009) case study is within the UK film industry which has an abundance of freelancers who rely heavily on personal networks for their next job opportunity. The networks I describe, and this is an important distinction, operate in a different way partly due to the geographical context and the nature of cultural entrepreneurs rather than freelancers. As Oakley (2014) points out, there is a need to distinguish
between types of cultural worker, by industry sub-sector and the mode of work such as freelancer, self-employed or portfolio careers.

I find Blair’s (2009) description of networks helpful in exploring the personal nature of relationships, but the cultural entrepreneurs I interview are connected for mutual support as much as for job opportunities. Instrumental approaches to networking are evident as a means of getting on, but they might be combined with what could be considered to be a genuine wish to be part of a supportive community and to identify with the local cultural milieu. To clarify, by genuine, I am not implying that this is an ‘authentic’ or ‘truthful’ account; rather, it is the story cultural entrepreneurs tell of their experience. I understand this as an aspect of the reflexive interview process in which the cultural entrepreneur creates his or her narrative.

In this section, I find that Birmingham’s cultural entrepreneurs do not have a fixed approach to networking and developing relationships; rather, their behaviour tends to be context and time specific. When discussing the nature of relationships, Elise describes the messiness and fluidity necessary to cope with changes in work:

Ummm when the situation is right they merge I think. Situations may arise that may be more beneficial for others than myself although I might want them and then they’ll go to the other person and you can’t be, argh, about that because that’s how you work, you work in an environment where it is quite informal where everything is quite flexible, that’s how we are working but then sometimes those relationships don’t continue if the work doesn’t continue. And then
when the work starts up again, or maybe when they think, oooh, and then I might do some work for them and then the relationship might start up again. (Elise, 2013)

Elise is very pragmatic in dealing with these changes, reflecting on her personal family background to explain why she feels capable of dealing with uncertainty.

I think that’s from my childhood, as well because we moved around so much I had to develop friends quickly and you could end those friendships quite abruptly and I wasn’t very good at keeping in contact. And I think people have their own lives as well so I don’t always want to keep butting in to their lives. (Elise, 2013)

From our conversation it is clear that Elise draws on her relationship with her family and her partner, perhaps enabling her to be more practical and flexible about working relationships. Elise describes how she can move on or can pick up where she left off with a work contact, without seeming to be concerned about the fragile nature of relationships. For Emma, close friendships are within her professional network and when asked if she is happy with that, she replies:

Yes, definitely. I mean I have a lot of my friends that I’ve met, 1) through the course and 2) through Daniel (partner) who are friends. [Patrick], all that group, that scene going on there. In terms of actual friends a lot of them are in radio. And a lot have moved away so actually I’d say my social circle in Birmingham is related to what I do, now. (Emma, 2013)
Given the economic crisis and recent cuts in funding, pragmatic cultural entrepreneurs have needed to draw on their ability to maintain good relationships to sustain their activities. When discussing opportunities through publicly funded projects, Isabella states:

So I think there’s been that pocket of time where you’ve really been able to get hold of it. And yes, I mean we were really aware of it. I mean again it doesn’t hurt to have friends in certain places that can just forward that information on. Yes, so there has been definitely a shift. I think under the new kind of administration at the Council, they’ve scrapped the whole department of culture. (Isabella, 2012)

Strategically, Isabella knows that the contacts she has developed since setting up her business will be useful in difficult times. In contrast, Alison paints a very different picture and is clearly uncomfortable with the ‘schmoozing’ taking place in Birmingham’s artistic circles which is mainly linked to exhibition openings and the resulting opportunities. For Alison, nepotism through social relationships is problematic, making networking an uncomfortable activity for her.

Well, I probably know the people I should be keeping up with [laughs], whether I do or not is a different thing. I do find the whole social side of it quite difficult because I am like a person that believes that quite strongly that you should get things on merit and you should get things because of how good you are and how hard you work on something. And that's not how it is. Sometimes it is but often it’s because you’ve been keeping in with the right person and you've been saying the right
things to the right people. And making the right noises and doing the whole networking thing really well and that frustrates me a lot…I mean I know all the people I should be keeping in with and I know all the things I should be doing and I do some of them but I won't like bend over backwards and make it my main priority to really go at that person to get what I want from them. (Alison, 2013)

Alison resists some of the networking despite the possible consequences for her work because she is morally outraged by the idea of gaining any favors other than through 'merit'. Sensing that she is sometimes outside the field of arts practice in Birmingham, Alison talks about the dilemma of fitting into a ‘system’ to ensure that you sell work, and she sees this as a black and white situation, expressing her frustration with the art world. Alison's work is not for galleries and her business is set up as a social enterprise. She describes herself as 'outside of them [communities] all', neither in one or another. I ask her if she chooses that position.

Yeah. In a way, that's the way I like it, like that. I can choose interesting things and I'm not getting so involved because, like, in the art world, it can be desperate sometimes and it's so incestuous sometimes and everyone knows everyone and everyone knows what everyone is doing and gossip… and things like that. (Alison, 2013)

Given the importance of networks and relationships to entrepreneurial success being ‘in’ or ‘out’ is critical, yet for Alison it is not that simple. One could argue that being out of the arts network is what enables Alison to innovate and to engage with other networks such as UnLtd, who are
providers of support for social enterprises (rather than cultural enterprises).

Although Alison identifies with the idea of being an artist, she cannot bring herself to network in the instrumental manner described by Blair (2009) and Lee (2011) as a means of enhancing her career. By associating with other non-arts networks, Alison is potentially also making a pragmatic decision, developing relationships outside the small world of Birmingham’s cultural milieu.

To some extent, this is echoed by Luca who finds the self-referential artistic scene in Birmingham problematic for his work, and he is always looking to contest that or operate beyond the tight circle dominated by Birmingham’s Ikon Gallery, the main contemporary art gallery in Birmingham. Luca states that he is ‘not interested in the audience that go there [to the Ikon Gallery] already, because they just go to each other’s shows’ (Luca, 2012).

Jack expresses anxieties relating to nepotism which he describes when discussing his business partner’s connections within the arts due to his father’s work as arts editor for a local media outlet.

I think Will would be so frightened of any kind of suggestion of nepotism or anything. You know his dad is just not that interested in that field anyway. But you know there is always that thing... I’m sure it’s like oh you are Ted Oldham’s son but that was always dependent on what he’d written about them... it could have been a mixed blessing. (Jack, 2011)
The moral values displayed by Jack and Will do not seem to be driven by anything other than their personal sense of what’s right, and do not demonstrate the ruthlessness described by Lee (2011).

Luca and Alison reveal a resistance to belonging to the ‘right’ network, contesting certain communities or practices. In their case it appears to be linked to their artistic practice, which enables them to question the nature of networks, their purpose and limitations. In his research using Granovetter’s notion of ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ ties (1973), Lee finds that:

- Strong ties are based on bonds, forged around community, family and geography, which are close, intersecting and multi-functional...
- Conversely, weak ties are based on the thin, impersonal trust of acquaintances. These are loose networks, which mean a shift from the ‘getting by’ dynamic of ‘bonding’ social capital to the ‘getting ahead’ culture that comes out of ‘bridging’ social capital. (Lee, 2011, p.554)

Weak ties, such as Alison’s connections with the social enterprise network may be more fruitful in terms of entrepreneurship. Hannah tends to be consciously strategic in her approach and describes a number of weak ties with international contacts which enable her to develop her enterprise.

Hannah is part of the Girl Geeks network in Birmingham, and other networks focused on supporting women working in technology, collaborating and sharing their experiences in a sector dominated by men.

So we started that up and then a couple of others have joined and so there’s four of us who are like the core group who organise it and we
have monthly informal meet ups and they’re for women, and we have quarterly more formal things with speakers. But they’re for women not just in IT, but science and anything geeky. And it’s industries where woman are really under-represented so it’s about increasing a woman’s confidence, giving them somewhere they feel safer in order to be able to talk about experiences and get feedback from other people and advice and share ideas and that sort of thing. (Hannah, 2012)

By nurturing weak ties, by creating a network for support, they become strong ties with the characteristics of shared concerns and of mutual benefit. This is reflected in Emma’s professional relationship with competitor, Dylan, who she met at university when undertaking an MA as a mature student, to re-launch her career. The shared experience is likely to be part of the reason why Emma can enjoy both a competitive and supportive relationship.

Certainly the people I’ve met through the course, [Dylan] I still stay in touch with. I saw him a couple of months ago – he’s doing really well. He’s just moved down to London. He was in Manchester now he’s in London with his wife – they are both freelancing. He’s doing really, really well. Social media consultancy and online journalism. So it’s nice to speak to him. We always have a bit of a, right, who have you been working for...We have always had an unofficial rivalry, in a good way. We are really good mates… (Emma, 2012)

So, strong and weak ties are not fixed, and both can be used for friendship, support and instrumental use. Oakley (2009) explores how strong and weak
ties are employed as part of the production process, noting that strong ties are important at the early stages of a process when trust is key, while weak ties might offer more opportunities once an idea has been developed. For Hannah, her networks combine gender issues relating to the industry sub-sector and support as a new enterprise but, interestingly, she is not connected to Birmingham’s cultural networks.

I'm not so sure about creative industry. I'm definitely part of a Word Press network… And I'm part of Girl Geeks. So I've got quite a strong network there. And nationally in terms of Word Press as well. I've got, through Word Count, some Word Press meet ups and things like that, I've built up a real network of people and I think through being open source, you get a great sense of community and people, you know, I've got a mate who is a competitor but that doesn't bother us, you know, we're friends and we talk to each and we share ideas and we help each other out with stuff. But it’s a nice industry. (Hannah, 2012)

Roger finds that the symbolic capital he gains from his connections outside Birmingham, which could be described as weak ties, are important now that his festival has been running for over 10 years.

...we’re on the radar. And I think the reason Creative England like us is partly because they were primed by the Independent Cinema Office who don’t give us any money at all but they’re kind of, yeah, they’re good lobbyists and because everything’s so centralised now… it becomes much more reliant on kind of networks of people and word of mouth and them sounding out people they respect. And I don’t like it
as a general system, if it was me starting out now it would be much harder. (Roger, 2013)

However, Roger is uncomfortable with the idea of a system which might be based on personal relationships and opinions established within a narrow group of people. By suggesting that it would be harder if he was starting now, he acknowledges the closed nature of these relationships, a sense that this is not fair for nascent cultural entrepreneurs. This echoes previous comments made by Isabella when she describes the changing times, reduced support for the cultural industries and the impact on newcomers.

As Lee describes, there are inequalities when the potential for being excluded from crucial networks relies on social ties achieved through casual and fragile relationships (Lee, 2011, p.555). However, I find that the notion of strong and weak ties is too crude a way of describing relationships and networks which are more complex and which can change over time. The personal and/or professional moral dilemmas in Alison and Jack’s accounts encourage what might appear to be counter-intuitive activity in the entrepreneurial context; such as occasions when they don’t make use of contacts. In that sense, the expected rationale for engaging in networking activities can be interrupted or challenged by personal agency. Cultural entrepreneurs such as Alison and Luca are less interested in forging friendships and building strong ties with local communities but are keen to move in different social circles. As with Lee’s (2011) study, weak ties support their aspirations, yet these are motivated by very different goals and are more complex than the strong/weak tie dynamic would suggest.
Drawing on Wittel’s work, Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) suggest that the commodification of social relationships is hidden and denied by workers who presumably disguise their feelings when suggesting that their experience is positive. I find in my interviewees’ accounts the possibility for strategic networking and genuine relationships to not be mutually exclusive. Individuals are able to distinguish between market-governed relationships and social relations. Liz expresses this as awareness of the different spaces in which she operates in her relationship with Chloe, by stating:

I met her here [library of Birmingham] actually but, you know, it’s, it would be a different kind of focus to meeting her at an event, for instance. We’d have a different type of conversation to kind of meeting here and, I suppose this is more meeting in my zone to her zone. (Liz, 2013)

The idea of different zones illustrates the potential for separating different contexts, in which one’s interactions might differ. Paul thoughtfully considers his relationships and position within a network when he decides to leave a public sector job after a disagreement with his advisory board.

I created a whole new network, and then I sort of disappeared and there was a degree to which what I left behind was a sort of a shell of an organisation with people for whom I'd been their boss, whose future employability depended on me keeping mine. So there was a confidence issue here. Were they going to be in work or not? I couldn’t just go to the rest of the world and say I'm gonna go because I think its shit - I had to just go [quietly]. The people who said we don’t
agree with you Paul had to be given a chance to find work for these people or prove me wrong. One or the other. So for months I had to put my head down. (Paul, 2012)

In this context, Paul was embedded in a potentially useful network but his account presents a conflict between a loyalty to certain individuals and wanting to speak up about the problems within the new organisation he had helped to set up. This seems to be the opposite of instrumental, leaving a job and keeping his ‘head down’. Subsequently, Paul rebuilds relationships and his networks over a period of time, slowly remerging to develop his new enterprise.

After a while people in the city, through other networks started approaching me going what are you doing? And they started having cups of coffee with me and then they started saying well we are doing this, are you interested? (Paul, 2012)

Rather than a strategic plan, Paul describes the process as tentative, perhaps enabling him to rebuild his confidence after some time away from the city’s networks.

Then they started thinking, what can we do together? So there’s the background of selling toys on e-bay to pay the mortgage, whilst I cleared my head and so then... And I wasn’t really sure what to do, but there were things I was saying no to, and things I was saying yes to. (Paul, 2012).

Rather than a competitive environment, I find a supportive environment in which a person can be reflexive about the relationships they develop rather
than purely instrumental. Campbell finds in her research into woman’s enterprise that female support groups cultivate supportive relationships and that collaboration is a preferred strategy, even with a competitor (2009, p. 181). Some peer-to-peer relationships can be very close, based on sharing a process with others who understand each other’s feelings about work, and who have shared values (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011, p.152).

I know the value for me is in the connections. And the value for me is not in any old connection but the connection. Do we trust each other, are we on the same wave length, when we say we are going to do something does it happen and those relationships allow you to move things on. And they also short circuit the pressures of getting work and coming up with ideas. It goes back to this business of citizenship. So running an SME, which apparently I now do, you can get three people in a room, let's say somebody from [***], somebody from another private and somebody from a public sector organisation, and whether you get to do something or not depends on whether those three people think like citizens. It really does my head in. Because we are always trying to make government work better and if they always think what's in the interest of my organisation, not what's in the interest of improving something you can’t make things happen so you are always trying to connect with people who are like minded. And it’s not a problem to not worry about the 6.99999 billion people that you don’t connect to - it doesn’t matter. You just need to connect to the people you want to, and that you want to help too. (Paul, 2013)
The idea of ‘emotional’ capital is interesting in this context where value is given to support offered from the perspective of caring about someone within a social group. As Reay (2001) states, emotional capital is described by Nowotny as a resource handed on to family or friends, people we care about. Given the close friendships between cultural workers, it is conceivable that a level of emotional capital is passed on from one person to another through supportive and often informal networks. Moving away from Reay’s gendered and family context for emotional capital, I suggest that the exchanges which take place between cultural entrepreneurs might have an emotional value, as well as instrumental incentive. Paul discusses wanting to ‘connect’ with people and wanting to ‘help’, which he does through his social media surgeries, free to individuals working in the volunteer sector. Equally, I find that Isabella is only too happy to demonstrate how proud she is of a freelance writer who started her career with her.

I mean some people have gone on to do, I mean one of our writers Amelia, she’s now assistant editor at the Hunger magazine which is a biannual, huge tome of a magazine and she works at Dazed and Confused, Dazed Towers and it’s an amazing job and then turns round and says, when we kind of just put a message on Facebook going, “Amazing Amelia, that’s brilliant, well done,” she says, “Just know that I wouldn’t have got this without you guys.” And I’m like well no, the fact that you’re super talented and a brilliant writer… (Isabella, 2012)

The sentiments expressed by Isabella are closer to that of a friend, a person one cares about, rather than a strategically useful relationship. Liz’s
description of her connections have an emotional charge, suggesting an attachment akin to friendship.

Well, I’ve made some good, you know, made some good friendships in the sector is really important and particularly people who get you and can be there, so you know, it’s great having people like [Chloe] and [Sean] who, I know I can always go to… And I do. So it’s kind of having those associates and peers who you have a personal relationship and a professional relationship with. (Liz, 2013)

Liz has had to go from being director of a small arts organisation which had to shut down as a result of recent cuts, to re-starting similar work but as a freelancer. To start her new projects, Liz relies on good will and strong relationships, build up over the last 15 years. This type of relationship reveals emotional and social capital as important to cultural entrepreneurship. Longstanding relationships within the cultural milieu enable Liz to dust herself off and start to develop new projects. The notion of being pre-embedded in a network is relevant to Liz who draws on those relationships for confidence, support and access to resources when starting a new enterprise (Shaw et al., 2010).

Elise also shifts from working for a company to establishing herself as a freelancer, making use of her reputation locally to establish herself. Elise describes her position as ‘quite lucky’ because of her good networks. When starting new ventures and particularly when working in a precarious sector such as the cultural industries, credibility is partly built through connections and recognition from peers: people who are trusted and reliable. There is no
doubt that building these relationships takes time, effort and a commitment, yet I find that the expectation to network is considered and reflected upon by cultural entrepreneurs.

Emma has ambiguous feelings about networking, communicating her dislike of networking but also her enjoyment of certain events. When I ask Emma if she likes networking I am surprised by her response, because she comes across as a highly sociable and a confident individual.

I’m terrible at it. Getting out there – I don’t mind getting out there but it’s what I do when I get there! I’m really bad at it [laughs]. I went to News Rewired the other week and that’s full of journalists. The potential to maybe not necessarily get work but, and because it’s the first one I’ve been to on my own I stood there like a lemon for most of it, fiddling with my phone. It was awful. But then if someone came to talk to me, then it’s fine. In fact there were two people I talked to for an extended period. And I find that, if I can find something, then I ‘m ok. It’s that first ‘hello’. (Emma, 2012)

Not long after Emma is very enthusiastic about attending a local event, describing it as ‘fantastic’.

I’ve started now going to the meet ups. I went to group barcamp the other day and I was asked to do a presentation about social media and from that I’ve probably got some work for a couple of months? So that’s what I’m trying to do more of. (Emma, 2012).

A less formal networking environment is less daunting for nascent entrepreneurs, who at the early stages of their career can focus on
developing local ties to generate work. As Emma’s comments suggest, she is not sympathetic to the idea of formal networking, an activity she would associate with conventional work practices, entrepreneurial or other. Networking which might result in work opportunities but which suggests a supportive context rather than a purely instrumental approach, is more appealing to Emma. With experience, cultural entrepreneurs start to be more selective about how, when and why they network, making this aspect of their workload easier to manage. Liz explains:

But on the other hand I’m not particularly… I don’t have a massive appetite for going out to loads of schmoozy events and… I think when I do go out I’m conscious of what a good reputation we have, and how well thought of we are and I think you can build that without showing your face at every single event. (Liz, 2013).

Liz is reflexive about the role of networking, admitting that it is necessary but also conveying the importance of a reputation based on the actual work, in this case, the type of exhibitions and events she runs. In other words, relationships are important but your cultural output, the quality and relevance of that work, should not be underestimated in building your reputation.

I think you get a name for the work that you do and that’s… Being not particularly good at… or not particularly drawn to networking, that’s the… our general policy has been let the work speak for itself, which is not enough, you know, you have to lobby. And you find yourself getting all sorts of interesting new contacts and work if you do make the effort but I suppose I’m still a programmer at heart so if I was
given the choice I’d rather be spending the time developing the content and making sure it was a great festival. I think that’s kind of why I need another strategic person who’s thinking more about that other side because otherwise we’d be in danger of just doing the festival on half as much money because there’s less funding around and still trying to put on a fantastic massive event. (Liz, 2013)

Liz also alludes to the idea of knowing your skills and limitations, so that if networking is not her forte she ensures that someone in the team has that skill, and collectively they manage the different aspects of cultural entrepreneurship. While Liz’s account demonstrates the importance of networking, she comes across as having a balanced approach. Tom’s experience is more intense and challenging, partly due to the film industry’s reliance on networks as a core aspect of how project-based enterprises are run (Blair, 2003, p. 678).

Constantly networking but I'm not someone who gets up and goes to a 6:30 breakfast, you can forget that. And probably there are two areas where if I was really hard-hearted about it, well maybe not hard-hearted, but I don’t know a bit wiser, there are probably two arenas I'd be, as a producer I'd be networked into much better. One is in the world of publishing, I'm far more aware of material and up-and-coming writers and good material that's coming out and having the option to maybe work with that. You create good relations with publishers who are interested in material that can be turned into film. I don't know, your husband’s been much better [laughs] at that than I am. And the other is in the high net worth business community where there are
opportunities and people you can go to and they have money to invest. And I don’t know why I struggle with those two arenas and whether for me they feel a little bit too shark-like to be that deliberate. (Tom, 2013).

Tom’s account suggests he is constantly concerned about whether he is networking with the right people or if he is being strategic enough. Tom describes several incidences when casual relationships have created opportunities such as a shared personal interest in climbing with a manager at BCU which has resulted in various consultancies and partnerships with the university.

But people at BCU, someone like James, I just happen to get to know because we were both involved in the David Putnam event because I was on the panel and James was chairing it. And then we went to the meal and we were just chatting and it was just the time when I had brought my new film and documentary on a famous artist and climber and it turned out to be someone that James had climbed with! (Tom, 2013).

This type of cultural and social capital enables individuals to connect and trust each other in a very fickle environment. Tom has to work hard at making these connections, but in environments in which he shares less cultural capital, what he describes as the ‘writers’ and the ‘high net worth business community’, one senses his nervousness. As I stated earlier, Tom is involved in the local producer’s association and in that role he has strong relationships with the film-making community. Having the necessary cultural
capital is seen as the starting point to enabling social relations and alternative forms of capital. In this study this has been difficult to ascertain, as my analysis does not specifically focus on class issues, but I do explore educational and personal family backgrounds. Tom, for instance, has no higher education degree and his parents have no connections with the cultural industries. Over time, Tom has become well-networked locally and has been good at building relationships, although they tend to be strong ties. Blair (2009) draws on Burt when she states that highly connected networks can result in the same information being shared by a large group of people, rather than diverse information within a smaller network.

…but I am strategic in that because there is only so much time in life and you could spend all of your weeks just having coffee with people and sometimes I do choose, just to have it with people, and I kind of think, I’m not sure I’ll ever talk to them again but I recognise that actually that it’s more important that they get access to me. Because actually I might be able to help but they might not be able to help me. So I do try to be altruistic in giving something back. As well as thinking is there something here we can move forward but you do have to be strategic about it otherwise it’s just constantly talking and doing nothing. And as you’ve heard already if I don’t feel I’ve achieved something in a week I’m pretty annoyed about that. (Tom, 2012)

The emphasis on cultural capital in Blair (2009) and Lee’s (2011) work as leading to enhanced capacity for social capital is not obvious in my study. Lee states that ‘one’s ability to network relates to cultural capital which is used in order to improve one’s social capital’ (2011, p. 553) indicating that in
his study of television workers, class barriers are negotiated by ‘a narrative of having made it against the odds, through pure talent and willpower’ (2013, p.205). I find that, cultural entrepreneurs such as Tom and Sadie are not rich in cultural capital but they has been able to establish a position within Birmingham’s cultural milieu.

For Sadie, a key element in establishing new contacts and in nurturing existing connections is through social media networks. All participants make use of social media platforms for marketing purposes, but also to stay in touch with various networks. The Social Media Café described in chapter five is a good example of how the offline and online communities merge in Birmingham. Some cultural entrepreneurs, such as Elise, are not avid users, preferring to use social media in a restricted way, as a means of keeping up with information. For others, such as Sadie, it is a vital tool, one which as a single working mother has allowed her to interact with others since her son was born.

A lot of it as well, I do a lot of networking social media, mainly on Twitter, I get so many contacts from that…Yes, Facebook, I mean, Facebook was kind of the main things from, like, 2008-2009/10 and then Twitter’s, kind of, taken over completely…Twitter’s been really good business wise because it’s brought opportunities to me. So, it’s like people have identified me and asked me to be involved in stuff. It’s very good for my London connections, Twitter is. (Sadie, 2013).

Connections using social media reflect real networks in Birmingham but also broader networks, which for Sadie are critical to her entrepreneurial
development. Critical theorists will note that, if she was employed, Sadie would probably be able to enjoy basic support such as paid maternity leave, but it is worth remembering that Sadie has set herself the task of re-inventing herself from being an ex-offender to an award-winning social entrepreneur.

Sadie’s tweets are about the work she is doing and contribute to building her brand as well as creating opportunities for dialogue with a broad range of contacts. She often includes photos, and, at a glance, a glamorous lifestyle is being portrayed including fashion, brands and restaurants mixed with tweets supportive comments for local artists and entrepreneurs.

Sampling the food at Bun & Bowl in The Cube (Sadie, 2014)

As part of her role, Sadie is continuously supporting and congratulating friends with a particular emphasis on women and black Afro-Caribbean women.

Congratulations to [@@*[]] super proud and happy for you!!!

#onlywinersonmyteam (Sadie, 2014)

Although my study is not focused on online activities, these comments demonstrate how one cultural entrepreneur communicates in a public space, thereby communicating her identity to others. The approach resembles that of someone developing herself as a brand, making instrumental use of communication tools, but this has to be understood within the specific context of Sadie’s life story as a young black woman trying to become a role model within her community.

I have approached the notion of instrumental networking and relationships as a complex and subjective experience for Birmingham’s cultural
entrepreneurs. In asking the question ‘what motivates social relations: instrumental values or genuine friendship?’ it seems unclear and impossible to separate different motives. I argue that it is important to explore the wealth of hidden motivations beyond the negative aspects of networking presented by scholars such as Blair and Lee. Friendships are possible, even if they sometimes blur into a professionally-useful interaction. Furthermore, cultural entrepreneurs choose to stay out of networks, to reject certain relationships or change their positions within a network over time. In the final section this is explored in more detail through the interactions between key people and cultural entrepreneurs.

It is undeniable that cultural entrepreneurs have to build relationships to support their cultural work; they do not work in isolation, and entrepreneurship is not an easy task. In a context when many cultural entrepreneurs operate on a shoestring, a person’s best assets become their social capital, particularly when it is turned into symbolic capital (Scott, 2012). Although I make use of the idea of strong and weak ties as a means of differentiating between different types of relationships, I find the description too fixed to capture the nature of relationships. As Scott states, connections are necessary for ‘exposure, experience, friendship and interest’ (2012, p. 238). Cultural entrepreneurs seem to understand subtle differences in relationships and networks in which they choose to engage.

**Positioning and connectors**

Further insights into the relationships within Birmingham’s cultural milieu can be achieved by investigating individuals with a significant local role. Through
their own agency or as part of their professional work, some people can
develop distinctive positions. Key characters can be defined as Gladwell’s
‘connectors’, individuals who know a lot of people and whose position within
a relatively small network is significant (2002). In the Tipping Point, Gladwell
argues that connectors (I shall continue to refer to them collectively as
‘connectors’) are important not just because of the number of people they
know, but because of the kind of people they keep in touch with. According
to Gladwell, they also tend to associate with other connectors and so,
because of their rich network of friends and acquaintances, connectors can
become trendsetters, or what Ellmeier has described as gatekeepers (2003).

Connectors are people who link us up with the world. People with a
special gift for bringing the world together. (Gladwell, 2002)

Critics of Gladwell question his research methods and journalistic rather than
academic approach, but I find the idea of connectors a valuable way of
conceptualising the notion of key people within a network. Scholarly research
such as that of Mould and Joel (2009) investigating connections within
London’s advertising industry also highlights key gatekeepers, or connectors,
within social networks.

...London is indeed highly connected [with a handful of individuals
holding the network together] (Mould and Joel, 2009, p. 290, brackets
in original).

Cultural entrepreneurs react to connectors by demonstrating their individual
agency in rejecting or embracing key people, sometimes in strategic ways, to
further their entrepreneurial opportunities. The hierarchies governing the
position of connectors within a network prove to be fluid and unstable. This ensures that although certain individuals can dominate a cultural milieu such as Birmingham, in time, structural developments may alter the environment.

At a simple level, knowing who is connected is part of the savvy cultural entrepreneurs’ business, to ensure that they can maximise opportunities through word of mouth. Isabella is networked with connectors to ensure her magazine gets the maximum exposure.

So there’s a key list of people that will always get our magazines and will always get correspondence from us. I do target it and I will be very specific about that. They don’t just get put on a generic list. It’s like, you’re getting this. (Isabella, 2012)

Positioning becomes significant in investigating how cultural entrepreneurs position themselves in relation to connectors, and the positions of the connectors within a network. Blair (2011) distinguishes between those networks which are dense or large, and the position of individual actors in those networks and in the social structure. But how is a person’s position determined?

For Blair (2009), social structure and a person’s relations with individuals within a given social network are both significant factors. Furthermore, these relations are not static and they are actively evolving. Blair draws on Bourdieu’s framework to conceptualise agency within certain social structures, noting the potential relevance of social class.

So for example, Bourdieu argues that members of a social class have a similar *habitus*. (Blair, 2009, p.121 author’s italics).
Individuals in Birmingham’s network seem to share a similar *habitus*, although it is difficult to establish if this is due to being members of the same social class. I have observed that, although Birmingham claims to be a multicultural city, relationships on and offline do not appear to be as diverse as they could be. At a glance, social media communications suggest that some individuals are often exchanging information, sharing likes and dislikes and collectively creating an online *habitus*. A more in-depth study of social media communications might have further insights, but this has not been the focus of this research.

In this study, the significance of positions revealed itself during the interview process, making me aware that cultural entrepreneurs referred to certain local characters, and, sometimes, the same names came up (unprompted) in different interviews (see appendix G for a list of characters). Cultural entrepreneurs discussed how key individuals are a hindrance or a help to them personally, or for the wider cultural community within Birmingham. These connectors are individuals who have already been discussed throughout the thesis, but in this section I specifically emphasise their role in relation to how and why certain positions within a network are important in shaping relations and gaining access to resources. As significant characters within local networks, connectors influence the structural framework in which cultural entrepreneurs negotiate their own positions; yet, the connectors are not necessarily in formal positions of power. Dave, for instance, is simply another cultural entrepreneur, but his involvement in initiating a range of activities (Creative Republic, etc.) has created a powerful position. Chloe, on the other hand, as the director of a public sector organisation with
responsibilities for funding cultural enterprises and developing policy, has a more obvious structural position within a recognised organisation. Richard, as one of the founding directors of the most successful television company in Birmingham, Azure TV, has made it his business to engage with Birmingham City Council, and other strategic agencies, making his position increasingly close to dominant social structures. As chair of several boards of publicly-funded organisations, his role shapes social structure and gives him access to resources, but it also influences his social relations. The nature of Richard’s social relations within Birmingham’s cultural milieu is dictated by his position and is a potentially powerful situation. In their different ways, Richard, Chloe and Dave demonstrate a dedication to developing the cultural industries in Birmingham and have played an influential role in shaping the cultural milieu. However, although their position appears substantial, their influence within the social network is not as straightforward as it might appear. Firstly, because positions within both social structures and social networks are not fixed; new people enter the network, policies and contexts change. Secondly, other actors within the social network intervene or challenge these positions, rejecting those who seem to dominate. As they jostle for power and influence, key positions are potentially important, but they are not always respected or are not always influential to all individuals within the network. I argue that social relations and social structures are continuously being disrupted and re-invented. Evidence of these subtle developments are often hidden or very subtle, presenting a challenge for the researcher.
The approach I have taken has enabled connectors to emerge from conversations, without me prompting the cultural entrepreneurs I have interviewed. I found that the names of a few people came up again and again either as influential, supportive or as well known within Birmingham’s cultural milieu. In some cases the individuals are discussed favourably, as making a positive contribution in supporting others, but the same person can also be described by a different interviewee in a negative manner. The cultural entrepreneurs’ accounts in relation to connectors range from pragmatic, ambivalent, full of praise, or sometimes contradictory. These insights are revealed through the gossipy nature of our conversations, sometimes as an aside, or to make a comparison with their own position. Elise’s reflections on the role Richard plays is strikingly different from the way in which Tom describes him in chapter four. Elise is clearly fond of Richard, and explains how she and her sister have benefitted from working with him.

Yeah, well there is always, we call him ‘daddy Richard’ cos he’s helped so many people, employing us through so many different projects. And my sister works at Azure TV and I'm actually going to go back in August and this is the first time I'm working for them for a long time. I'm really looking forward to that. But I think that Richard had a real focus on the industry, a real passion for Birmingham and the West Midlands, as far as I can see and a real passion for promoting it. And enabling young people to get into the industry so for Richard, that's just my personal experience, I don’t know how other people feel about him but for me I think he's great and I've tried to involve him in
projects I've worked on because I think he's really inspirational for some of the young people. (Elise, 2013)

Elise’s relationship with Richard is not that of equals. She is inspired by him and she knows he is crucial in creating opportunities for work. Elise admires his commitment and his values but she does hint at the fact that others might feel differently about him. Tom also mentions Richard but he is less enthusiastic.

The name that will crop up most of the time is going to be Richard because and I have a bit…I don’t know Richard at all… I mean we know one another but we kind of avoid one another. (Tom, 2012)

Similarly, Dave is a divisive character in that he is perceived as either supportive, in this case by Emma, or he is viewed unfavourably by Jack.

He’s good at self-promotion, he’s fantastic at gaining work. But just couldn’t deliver it. He basically has so many ideas. He can’t stick to one and he thinks people should pay him for being him. (Jack, 2012).

In contrast, Dave’s ability to generate new ideas and experiment is positive for Emma, who finds that creative and inspiring.

You know I’ve done a lot of work with Dave. I went to Dublin with him last week and he’s one for crazy ideas. He’s in London now but he hired me to go to London with a group of people. I like people like Dave because Dave has these big ideas and he’s got the skills to do it. Let’s have this thing and there’s a video you can go to and these crazy - and you think how’s that going to happen and he manages to make it happen. (Emma, 2013)
Elise ends a discussion about Dave by stating, ‘Yeah yeah - he's funny though’ (2013), which is an ambiguous response but perhaps confirms that Dave is at least a ‘character’ in local networks. Whatever the individual perspective, Dave is perceived as someone who engages with people and ideas to such an extent that others in the network are likely to present themselves in relation to him. In that sense, cultural entrepreneurs can measure themselves against Dave’s particular attributes, as either innovative or as someone who cannot finish a project.

Through enterprising initiatives, Dave has potentially enhanced his social capital and, in turn, his symbolic capital as a cultural entrepreneur, illustrated in an interview for The Guardian newspaper as part of a competition for the Power House. In the article, Dave states ‘I connect with as many people as possible and believe in serendipitous encounters’ (Dave, no date\(^2\)). As runner up in the competition he is praised by one of the judges for ‘his use of networks in Birmingham’ (Bartlett, no date\(^3\)). The symbolic capital Dave has gained from positioning himself as a key player locally gained him national recognition, and further symbolic capital. However, as Scott (2012) warns, this is not a simple linear process of turning cultural, social and symbolic capital, into ‘buzz’, and eventually economic capital. Alternative capitals within a social network are exchanged, and there is a ‘tacit obligation for cultural entrepreneurs to return capitals in their exchange-value dimension’ (Scott, 2012, p. 250). It is perhaps significant, then, that when working with

\(^2\) For anonymity, reference has not been added.
\(^3\) As above
Dave Jack states that this was kept a ‘secret’. This reveals the complexity of relationships and people’s position within a social network. Is Dave as influential as I expected him to be? It seems that positions are not static, nor are they interpreted in the same way by everyone in the network. Why would Jack be embarrassed to work with Dave if his social and symbolic capital is impressive to others in the network? Perhaps Dave had accumulated symbolic capital without committing to the social exchange expected within social networks? As Blair (2003) states, the power balance in social relations is not fixed.

Chloe’s position is more transparent in the sense that she was employed by a local agency and her position was, at least partly determined by that role. Chloe was responsible for managing funding and for shaping local cultural enterprise policies. However, Chloe’s position has changed to working as a freelance consultant post government cuts. Chloe is now a cultural entrepreneur or consultant, and is perceived differently.

It’s kind of bizarre for me because I’ve not really, I mean, Chloe was very key influence at one point when she was part of the business support agency but now that’s been disbanded and she’s freelance a lot of things have changed. (Sadie, 2013)

Liz describes loyalty as an important factor in her relationship with Chloe.

Yeah Chloe is, it would be, then I think a few people would mention Chloe. Absolutely passionate, loyal, I think and I would say one of the key things are those loyalties between different individuals or organisations, they are quite key. (Liz, 2013)
This loyalty has the potential to be interpreted as nepotism, and the balance between being close to cultural entrepreneurs and keeping a professional distance is very awkward. Clearly, Liz values the loyalty and ongoing support she has had from Chloe; others might see it differently. In such a close network, it is a challenge to keep to the expected levels of transparency and avoid favouring certain companies or individuals.

Over time, positions change and social relations have to adapt to new structures or indeed to less structure, if we define structural frameworks in terms of funding and policies. Some social relations can endure structural changes, and over a longer career, cultural entrepreneurs can amass an impressive range of connections. Paul describes how his previous work at the BBC can help him in his new venture, at least a decade after leaving the BBC.

And the other thing that's interesting is if, for example, I want to work with the BBC, the people I trained with I can now pick up the phone to and they are in charge! And I didn't like them because I thought they were one day going to be in charge and so it's much better to pick up the phone to them and say, I have this mad idea what do you think? And if they think it's a good enough idea or if they need to introduce me to other people they will, but what you are always taking with you is their blessing and their social capital. And you'd do the same and so to me it is about proper relationships. (Paul, 2012)

Paul’s account suggests an emphasis on relationships that are long-lasting and that this type of loyalty exists before positions of power become a factor.
in the social relation. The hierarchies within networks are not fixed, and they are perceived with varying degrees of importance by different people in the network.

**Conclusion**

As cultural entrepreneurs navigate social networks they jostle for their position and form their identities in relation to one another. Relationships between cultural entrepreneurs are complex and are motivated by diverse rationales including friendship, support and opportunities for professional advancement. On the whole, cultural entrepreneurs acknowledge the importance of networks but they also reject networks, find networking tedious, and even mock the idea of networking. Relationships within close communities such as Birmingham’s cultural milieu expose the challenges associated with the blurred lines between personal and professional worlds. Networks, in cities such as Birmingham, develop across the cultural industries’ subsectors, and in that sense they differ from the sector-specific relationships discussed by Lee (2011) and Blair (2009).

There is also a loyalty to Birmingham and to the community of cultural workers in the region who appear to encourage each other, despite being occasionally in competition. The nature of relationships depends on a person’s position and the stage in their career, which might be re-starting after a change of direction. Granovetter’s (1973) notion of strong and weak ties is a helpful way of exploring professional relationships, but it suggests a fixed position and ties are not always so distinct. Similarly, the hierarchies which exist within a network, often distinguishing those in positions of power
from others, are not permanent. They exist but they can be seen from different perspectives; they are relative to each cultural entrepreneur and to a moment in time.

Lee argues that networking is an ‘activity that you cannot opt out of’ (2011, p.560), describing it as a pressure and as often taking place ‘after-hours’. I find this to be too inflexible an argument when one considers a range of individual relations and industry sub-sectors within the cultural industries. In some cases, such as Emma and Hannah, their work in digital media is relatively new and their relationships to clients are very different from the television and film industry workers described by Lee (2011).

As I have stated, this is not a comprehensive overview of Birmingham’s cultural networks, but it is a means of investigating identities and personal agency in cultural entrepreneurs, through the manner in which they present their relationships, connections and position. The network itself is difficult to pin down, as it is a web of personal interactions within Birmingham’s cultural milieu. I focus on the way in which relationships are presented through my participants’ narratives, rather than identifying specific networks. The informality of these relationships results in a lack of transparency and highly individualised mechanisms for making and maintaining connections.

The connections created by being part of a Birmingham network are an important ingredient in creating a sense of belonging and an opportunity to stimulate particular kinds of work (experimental or other). Dominant individuals within the network appear to have important positions, usually determined by their personal endeavours. However, some dominant figures
are treated with a level of ambiguity rather than the dependency described by Blair (2003).

Although I have emphasised the supportive nature of networks, arguing that they may not be as individualized or as competitive as some critics suggest, nevertheless, I am not suggesting that belonging to an informal network offers the same level of support as a union might for an employee. Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) suggest that the collective dimension of work might improve the conditions of cultural work through unionisation, although they also point out the limitations of such structures. As Hesmondhalgh and Baker state, ‘the uncertain nature of freelance work and worries about where the next short-term contract will come from means unions are not on the radar of many creative workers’ (2011, p.119). Many cultural entrepreneurs are even less likely to have relevant unions to which they can belong, as some fields such as designer-makers or artists will not have a tradition of unionisation. I argue that social relationships can lead to collectives that might address a variety of issues and offer each other support, particularly in times of austerity (Dellot, 2014; Jones, 2014). As discussed in the previous chapter, there may be issues of transparency and sustainability in a trial and error approach to creating support mechanisms, yet, the relationships and networks I have described seem to represent the type of commitment which can foster shared identities and the potential for further activism.

According to Scott, cultural entrepreneurs’ use of alternative forms of capital is an ‘endemic feature of the celebrated ‘new cultural economy’ (2012, p.251). Various forms of ‘alternative’ capital are utilised in the process of
‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur, whether it is to create a ‘buzz’ or forms of emotional capital, this can be crucial at difficult times, even as individuals are re-starting careers, such as Liz. By discussing relationships in a more personal manner, I have revealed a socially fluid environment in which cultural entrepreneurs make personal choices. This pragmatic approach to developing entrepreneurial careers does not exclude the possibility for nurturing meaningful relationships, supported by structures which cultural entrepreneurs have had a hand in shaping.
Conclusion

The aim of this study was to contribute to debates about cultural entrepreneurship by exploring the lived experience of cultural workers within a social context. In examining the nature of entrepreneurship in the cultural industries, I hope my research has relevance for a number of disciplines including cultural studies, cultural policy studies and emerging advancements in entrepreneurship studies. For my practice as an educator and scholar, this study will aid further critical reflections addressing contemporary issues of cultural work in higher education (O’Brien, 2014).

By examining cultural entrepreneurship, I have endeavoured to recognise critical approaches to researching cultural work and cultural policy whilst seeking to reveal new insights by paying close attention to the cultural entrepreneurs’ subjective experiences. I acknowledge critical debates but I also explore different perspectives based on the experiences and narratives of Birmingham-based cultural entrepreneurs. My study contributes to ‘rethinking cultural entrepreneurship’ (Oakley, 2014) and redefining the subject in a number of ways. First, the study is grounded in the workers’ experience, contextualised by policies and other structures but nevertheless focused on the cultural entrepreneur. Second, I utilise the fixed notion of ‘the entrepreneur’ and ‘the bohemian’ to question the nature of the cultural workers’ professional identities. Third, I analyse the agentic actions of cultural workers to identify the diversity of motivations and approaches to entrepreneurial modes of work, including the possibility for ‘good’ work, in a relational context. Finally, I perceive this as a shift away from a critique
focused on the neo-liberal agenda in cultural policy. Instead, I seek a move
towards an understanding of the realities of cultural entrepreneurship as a
pragmatic response to contemporary work, as an aspect of debates about
‘good’ and ‘bad’ work. For instance, this becomes pertinent to women whose
experience of managing family commitments is driven by both personal and
professional values.

The criteria for choosing the cultural entrepreneurs was not reliant on their
professional status or commercial success as an entrepreneur, but on
individuals self-identifying as working in the so-called ‘creative industries’ and
running a micro-enterprise. Common features between them, other than that
they are all part of my personal Birmingham-based network, were that they
operate as small enterprises, and that they see themselves as professional,
full-time cultural workers. This differs from the experience of artists who
balance their practice as artists alongside other paid activities (Forkert, 2013;
Taylor and Littleton, 2008).

My approach to the research has tested a method developed to enhance
opportunities for interviewees to tell the story of themselves. Personal
narratives were analysed as subjective experiences, expressed in a
relational context in which the interviewee and researcher are embedded
within the same network. I argue that this position supported three elements
of the research. First, I was able to prompt detailed and highly personal
stories including a willingness to discuss failings and problems in a reflexive
manner. Second, I used a ‘gossipy’ approach in the interviews as a means of
eliciting comparisons with others in the network. The relational aspects
driven by comparisons with others, enables cultural entrepreneurs to explore
their professional identities. Third, my own position within the network revealed detail about informal activities and relationships, relevant to a study of everyday practice.

The interviewees’ accounts were complemented by policy papers and social media material to incorporate further contextual data. Birmingham itself appears almost as a ‘character’, with its particular structures and people, who together form Birmingham’s cultural milieu. Inspired by Bourdieu’s theory of the field of power, (field and habitus), I have adapted Chell and Karataş-Özkan’s (2010) framework of the micro, meso and macro environments, as I endeavour to link individual stories to a broader structural context. Framed by national and local policies, this structure includes informal entrepreneurial actions indicating the cultural workers’ contribution to shaping Birmingham’s cultural milieu. I find that social structures and relations between individuals are significant in creating the milieu for agentic actions. Position within an active network is important and can lead to certain advantages, but this is a fluid space in which individuals negotiate diverse priorities and values. Agency is expressed within the collective frameworks developed by cultural entrepreneurs, acting with some autonomy to shape the city’s structures and wider policy agenda. Structures are not fixed and alternative structures can be formed through agentic actions within a relational context. Individual identities are constructed and performed, drawing from the rhetoric of cultural policy and entrepreneurship but also in opposition to dominant discourses.
By utilising my position within the local network, I have sought to reveal the complexity of cultural entrepreneurship, in all its messiness. There are plenty of contradictions including both an acceptance and rejection of networking. Within the network, cultural entrepreneurs construct their personal narratives, and in doing so, they often stimulate debate, experimentation and alternative actions. Exploring the lived experience of cultural entrepreneurship, enabled me to reveal the specificity of entrepreneurial modes of work based on everyday practices, such as the manner in which cultural entrepreneurs develop routines and structure their time or the way in which family commitments are managed, making the most of the flexibility which self-employment can offer to organise childcare and unconventional working hours. I find that cultural entrepreneurs have a measured approach to managing risk, making decisions with partners and in relation to norms within their network.

In analysing the cultural workers’ motivations and approaches to work I found little evidence of them being ‘pushed’ into cultural entrepreneurship, as maintained by Oakley (2014). Instead, I have found that entrepreneurship is a chosen mode of work, for some level of self-determination. Precariousness is an aspect of cultural entrepreneurship, as discussed by critical theorists, but entrepreneurial modes of work also present individuals with certain levels of autonomy for doing ‘interesting’, or ‘socially engaged’ work. For instance, there is evidence of a frustration with local government and public sector support, and a suggestion that, by being socially embedded, cultural entrepreneurs challenge formal support. By initiating their own projects and support mechanisms, cultural workers create new frameworks and structures
in which they explore what it means to be a cultural entrepreneur. I argue that this is a playful environment for the cultural entrepreneurs’ identities to develop and negotiate their positions both collectively and individually.

In many cases, the cultural entrepreneurs’ narratives presents a reflexive individual with an awareness of their aspirations. Cultural entrepreneurs demonstrate an understanding of their position beyond the narrow confines of their cultural discipline. I have argued that this may be due to the fact that Birmingham has a smaller cultural industries sector than a city such as London, creating more communication across sub-sectors. As O’Connor and Gu (2010) point out, drawing together diverse subsectors can be problematic, but I suggest that it may also allow for a more collegiate atmosphere due to being less competitive. Individuals operating across disciplines see the value in coming together for joint ventures and to re-define possibilities in Birmingham, as an alternative to policies and projects presented by formal institutions such as Birmingham City Council.

As I have stated, this is not a comprehensive overview of Birmingham’s cultural networks, but it is a means of investigating identities and personal agency in cultural entrepreneurs, through the manner in which they present their relationships, connections and positions. The networks are difficult to pin down, as they are made up of personal interactions within Birmingham’s cultural milieu and they change over time. I focus on the way in which relationships are presented, rather than identifying specific networks. There is a loyalty to Birmingham and to the community of cultural workers in the city, who appear to encourage each other despite being occasionally in competition for talent or funding. In comparison with industry specific studies
(Blair, 2009; Lee, 2011), my findings suggest that cultural entrepreneurs are a pro-actively attempting to ‘make it’ in Birmingham, and want to be part of Birmingham’s cultural industry milieu. The nature of these relationships is not fixed and ties are not always clear, as times change, people move on, and new relationships are formed. But in some cases, loyalties based on good friendships enable cultural entrepreneurs to start new projects and find support, as they begin new ventures.

In this study, the specific policies and structures within Birmingham are significant in shaping the environment for certain kinds of actions. Cultural entrepreneurs are found to establish independent networks and projects, with ambitions of supporting each other as an industry sector and to influence policymakers. In doing so, cultural entrepreneurs actively interact with structures, redefining the landscape through their activities. The actions of cultural entrepreneurs tend to be dependent on a few key figures, who inevitably become prominent role models or ‘characters’ within the network. In the relational context for ‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur, prominent individuals influence identities, offering alternatives to the celebrity role models discussed by McRobbie (2002b). In some cases, key figures are viewed as positive role models but they are also rejected as examples of undesirable behaviour or characteristics. Identities and work ethics appear to be shaped by local structures and social contexts rather than by the celebrity entrepreneurs sometimes feted as inspirational figures by policy makers.

Although there is a sense of activism in creating alternative models and structures, there is little evidence of radical activity of the type McRobbie (2011) would like to see. Nevertheless, cultural entrepreneurs can be
conceived as contributing to policies and as engaged rather than passive recipients of local policy frameworks. Furthermore, in the current climate, independent networks provide a fundamental role in facilitating alternative forms of capital, through support and joined activities. The cultural entrepreneurs I spoke to are pragmatic about the future, realising that they can count on each other more than any policies or resources provided by the government. They present themselves as an alternative voice, attempting to shape Birmingham’s cultural milieu, insinuating that this often takes place despite formal structures. Individuals operate within a messy environment which they help to shape, as part of ‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur. Indeed, the process of ‘becoming’ indicates the opposite of a fixed identity, illustrating the evolving nature of identity construction in an environment which is continuously modified by people, resources and a shift in government policies.

The development of informal structures highlights issues of transparency and a possible lack of equality, particularly relevant in a multi-cultural city such as Birmingham. A thriving social media environment and an eagerness to support each other and to collaborate goes some way towards alleviating that, such as women supporting each other through initiatives such as the Girl Geeks network. Female networks and the specific ways in which they are configured could offer further insights into female entrepreneurship and feminist studies.

However, further studies examining relationships within a milieu may reveal broader inequalities such as the level to which Birmingham’s black and ethnic minorities are part of independent activities and networks. For
instance, a deeper examination of Afro-Caribbean women working in cultural and social entrepreneurship, such as Sadie, could be a focus for further study. The issue of inequalities and diversity in the cultural industries persists despite various initiatives including the Arts Council’s deciBel project. As well as inequalities, research may uncover hidden cultural entrepreneurs, operating outside the usual networks and not known to the main institutions such as the Arts Council England or Birmingham City Council (Steyaert and Hjorth, 2006).

Echoing emerging debates in entrepreneurship studies, I question the dominant entrepreneurial personality and behaviours to explore a wider conception of entrepreneurship, for instance addressing social issues or gendered perspectives. This opens up opportunities to explore entrepreneurial activities from broader experiences, and to review entrepreneurial identities and characteristics. Stereotypes of the entrepreneur are problematised. The hero entrepreneur is re-imagined beyond the caricature usually associated with western neo-liberal policies. While stereotypes endure and are pervasive in the discourse of cultural work, this creates a space for oppositional models and alternative structures to emerge. I highlight the quiet, social and female entrepreneur as expressing different narratives.

Yet, I have also found that popular views of the entrepreneur endure and can be useful devices in fashioning professional identities. In discussions with interviewees, caricatures of the entrepreneur and of the bohemian artist facilitate an exploration of what a cultural entrepreneur is or could be. For
some, it is a way of rejecting certain concepts, such as the notion of the ambitious, risk-taking entrepreneur. For others, it opens up the possibility of becoming change agents, of thinking creatively about work or social issues. Instead of being constrained by fixed notions of the entrepreneur, examining identity revealed playful and complex identities, a sense of performance particular to a given context. This, in turn, highlighted the interviewees’ capacity for reflexivity, demonstrating opinions and beliefs as core values which drive their entrepreneurial ventures. For instance, the role of the entrepreneur is set against that of public sector workers who are perceived as slow, and as potentially wasting resources. From this, there is a confidence in being able to perform a better job, including a more ethical role driven by personal values.

I have proposed that much of the critique of cultural work has focused on an association between cultural policies and neo-liberal agendas of various governments. The individualism associated with neo-liberalism tends to position entrepreneurs as responsible for their own careers and personal development, resulting in their de-socialisation as workers. My study depicts a more complex landscape in which diverse motivations, relationships and identities evolve in relation to each other.

In the process of ‘unmasking the [cultural] entrepreneur’ (Jones and Spicer, 2009), I reveal a messy environment in which entrepreneurial behaviours differ greatly from popular stereotypes. I argue that entrepreneurial work cannot be reduced to a narrow definition associated with neo-liberal politics. Indeed, the emphasis on a critique of neo-liberalism is problematic, as the practices of neo-liberalism differ and the term is often either simplified or
misused (Hesmondhalgh et al., 2014, p.2). In his introduction to *The Limits of Neoliberalism* (2014), Davies draws on David Stark when stating that, within a capitalist neo-liberal structure, ‘Entrepreneurs might be seen as an example of individuals who operate between or outside of existing conventions’ (2014, p.12). In other words, it may be that the entrepreneur has just the right attributes for contesting or providing alternative models, using their ‘imagination’ and ‘persistence’ (Oakley, 2014, p.157). I argue that examining the nature of entrepreneurship in cultural work may genuinely offer the possibility for rethinking cultural work. As Banks’ (2006, 2007) work suggests, there is the potential for reflection, social action and good work in cultural entrepreneurship, produced by individuals who, regardless of policies or changes in government, continue to work in the cultural industries. The diverse approaches to cultural work described in this study offer the possibility for entrepreneurship to be analysed beyond its relationship to neo-liberalism. The quality of work, whether it is ‘good’ or ‘bad’ has been questioned by many critical theorists concerned with a celebration of self-employment and entrepreneurship in cultural policies. My findings suggest that an understanding of ‘good’ or ‘bad’ work is further problematised if we consider the cultural worker’s narrative seriously, without presenting it as purely naïve.

Banks and Deuze (2009, p.425) identify that critical scholars can present themselves as the only individuals able to uncover and understand the nature of things. For Gill (2014), who seeks to reveal inequalities, this is understood as lack of critical language for engaging with issues such as inequalities relating to gender or race and an inability to contest or resist
norms in cultural work. My position is that by paying attention to the cultural entrepreneur’s capacity for negotiating complex professional positions, work is presented as not all ‘bad’ even if it is not always ‘good’. In particular, I argue that narrow perspectives of entrepreneurship misinterpret aspects of self-employment in the cultural sector. Instead of viewing cultural workers as duped into entrepreneurial modes of work I find individuals conscientiously managing risk, precarity and flexibility.

The appeal of self-employment, so pervasive, for example, in the creative sector, is a powerful draw, and it should not be conflated entirely with the neoliberal ethos of the self-absorbed entrepreneur. The market evangelism of neoliberalism has produced so many converts because it exploits the credo that individuals actually have some power over their economic destinies. Yet this belief is not the exclusive property of market fundamentalists; it can and should be shared by individuals in a vibrant work environment that is also protected from the rough justice of the market. Nor does the appetite for self-direction necessarily engender a posture of selfish neglect for the welfare of others. Autonomy is not the opposite of solidarity, as is commonly assumed. (Ross, 2008, p. 38)

Ross points to the importance of not romanticising the ‘relatively settled environment’ (2008, p.32) of the era of the Keynesian welfare state but that moving forward, flexible labour can be better managed. This is not to suggest that inequalities are being fully addressed or can be dismissed as simply an aspect of contemporary work. Rather, I argue that by paying close attention to the activities of cultural workers, we might not find the language of
resistance but may unveil some level of defiance. Opposition to stereotypes and expected norms may be concealed in subtle individual or collective activities.

The manner in which individuals function collectively may present opportunities and solutions to the inequalities and insecurities discussed by critical theorists. This necessitates an understanding of the complexity and diversity of cultural work, rather than reductive approaches based on a narrow understanding of entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur. A debate akin to the ‘cultural value initiative’ (Belfiore, 2013) involving academics, policymakers and led by cultural entrepreneurs, could facilitate productive actions. This could represent a fourth movement in cultural entrepreneurialism, a wave of activity which is entrepreneurial but socially and politically engaged (O’Brien, 2013). Evidence of this engagement between scholars and cultural workers being established in projects such as the Media and Cultural Work (http://mediaculturalwork.org/) and Precarity Pilot projects offering a better dialogue between critical discourses and the day-to-day practices of cultural workers (http://precaritypilot.net/).

A city such as Birmingham may be well-placed to initiate this type of intervention, in a climate when there are few resources from the public sector. Scholars working closely with cultural entrepreneurs have the opportunity to contribute in an important way, emphasising constructive criticism and supportive actions rather than a purely critical position, for instance, by co-producing events and content such as the work developed under the Connected Communities theme, funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council. This study is relatively small and there are
many hidden activities and new trends in cultural entrepreneurship yet to be explored.

Finally, I return to my personal rationale for researching the contextualized experience of the cultural entrepreneur. My own practice as a designer-maker, and that of many friends and students has been a source of inspiration for this study, providing an incentive for ensuring that as part of a critique of cultural entrepreneurship, different voices are examined. My re-imagining of cultural entrepreneurship reveals fluid identities within an unstable milieu, a ‘space of possibles’ (Bourdieu, 1993, p.179).
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Appendices

Appendix A: An example of the use of Evernote.

Using Alison’s interview script, the right hand side of this screengrab demonstrate a section of script in which Alison talks about defining cultural and social entrepreneurs. The left hand column demonstrates other themes, such as autonomy.
Appendix B: An example of the use of Evernote.

List of themes used in the analysis of Alison’s interview script.
Appendix C: An example of using tags in Evernote.

The tags used for this section are ‘artist’, ‘identity’ and ‘interesting stuff’.
Appendix D: An example of using tags in Evernote.

The tags used for this section are 'background', 'self-employment' and 'symbolic capital'.

**Appendix E: Full list of themes used for the interview analysis.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activism</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>AHRC</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Arty</th>
<th>Attitude to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Birmingham City Council</td>
<td>Bohemian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourdieu</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Burned out</td>
<td>Business Link</td>
<td>Business plan</td>
<td>Can do attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>Choosing work</td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Coffee and chat</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Control and freedom</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Crazy ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Republic</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Cultural Capital</td>
<td>Cultural entrepreneur</td>
<td>Cultural policy</td>
<td>Curating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custards Factory</td>
<td>Day to day</td>
<td>Deciding to be self-employed</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Ethical work</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family context</td>
<td>Feminism</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future planning</td>
<td>Geek</td>
<td>Good work</td>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Grassroots organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Holistic approach</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Industry context</td>
<td>Interesting stuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job description</td>
<td>Key people</td>
<td>Kids</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Moral economy</td>
<td>Myths</td>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>New Labour</td>
<td>Nice people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Organised</td>
<td>Overheads</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Precarious</td>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Project based work</td>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Role Models</td>
<td>Role of entrepreneur</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmooze</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Self-exploitation</td>
<td>Self-management</td>
<td>Serendipity</td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>Social enterprise</td>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Starting the business</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Symbolic capital</td>
<td>The market</td>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Walks</td>
<td>Who you know</td>
<td>Working class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix F: Research blog

http://annettenaudin.wordpress.com/
Appendix G: Cast of characters

**Chloe**

Chloe could be described as a ‘cultural intermediary’ as her work involves supporting creative industries activities in Birmingham and the West Midlands. In years associated with New Labour’s cultural policy, Chloe ran the creative industries programmes as Sector Development Director for Business Link West Midlands. Since Chloe is a freelance creative industries and digital media consultant and works in collaboration with many organisations including universities, cultural organisations and she develops her own projects and events to support cultural and digital businesses. During this project Chloe is in her forties’ and by the time of the interview, Chloe is establishing her freelance career, making use of her previous position to launch herself as a consultant. Chloe was interviewed as part of this study.

**Richard**

Richard is one of the founding director of a local independent television company, Azure TV established in 1994. Having established a strong reputation in television with a range of programmes for BBC and Channel4, Azure TV has become an important local media business. On this basis, Richard has engaged passionately in supporting local talent, working with policy makers and local politicians to enhance the profile of the local media and cultural industries. This role as an advocate for the sector has included many opportunities for leadership through his chairmanship of various committees and boards associated with the development of local media and cultural industries. In 2007 Azure TV was bought by a larger independent television and distribution company, but Richard who by now was in his late fifties’, was able to continue his engagements in support of Birmingham’s cultural industries whilst remaining involved with Azure TV. Richard was not interviewed for this study.

**Dave**
With a background as a software developer, Dave is involved in a range of activities including experimental start-up projects. Dave is now based in London, but started his career in Birmingham and played a key role in initiating a range of innovative activities including hack days, creating new creative and digital media networks, engaging with policy makers and universities. Dave seeks playful technological solutions to contemporary social, political and economic challenges. Dave started his career in 2000 and by the time he moves to London with his family, Dave is in his mid-thirties’. Dave was not interviewed for this study.
Appendix H: List of interviewees

See full list of participants below including name, gender, cultural industry sector, education, age, number of employees if any and turnover or salary if the information was available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Turnover / salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Artists and social entrepreneur</td>
<td>BA Fine art / MA Fine art &amp; curating</td>
<td>Late 20s’</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>£15,000 salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Freelance creative industries consultant</td>
<td>BA Business and sociology</td>
<td>Mid 30s’</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>£15,000 per year, Part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Digital media consultant</td>
<td>BA Philosophy / MA Online journalism</td>
<td>Mid 30s’</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Web designer</td>
<td>BA Psychology</td>
<td>Late 30s’</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Publisher and events co-ordinator</td>
<td>BA Media and communication</td>
<td>Late 30s’</td>
<td>No employees but 1 business partner (husband)</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Digital media designer and consultant</td>
<td>BA Visual communication</td>
<td>Early 40s’</td>
<td>20 employees</td>
<td>£ 860000 annual turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Jewellery designer-maker</td>
<td>BA &amp; MA Jewellery design</td>
<td>Mid 30s’</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Freelance arts project manager</td>
<td>BA English</td>
<td>Early 30s’</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>£110 per week + dividends £20,000 annual turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Curator</td>
<td>BA Fine art and MA Visual Theory</td>
<td>Mid 40s’</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Artist and curator</td>
<td>BA Cultural Studies</td>
<td>Early 50s’</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Annual Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Digital media consultant</td>
<td>BA International Development</td>
<td>Late 40s'</td>
<td>1 employee</td>
<td>£150,000 annual turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Film and arts festival organiser</td>
<td>BA Film and Literature</td>
<td>Late 30s'</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Magazine publisher, enterprise consultant and social entrepreneur</td>
<td>No HE qualification</td>
<td>Early 30s'</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Not known, but described as covering basic costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Film producer</td>
<td>No HE Qualification</td>
<td>Early 50s'</td>
<td>1 employee and 1 business partner</td>
<td>£200,000 annual turnover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Example interviewee script

Interviewee: Sadie

Key:

I: Interviewer
R: Respondent
s.l. sounds like
I: So I'll leave that there. It's not for playing with. I bet he's got all the Apps sorted on yours.

R: Oh yes, he rearranges my desktop.

I: What is it? Are you going to say something? He's teasing me. So, just briefly then, I've got a little spiel. So you don't mind me recording. You're anonymous in my research so when I write it up ... you know it's for my PhD.

R: Yes.

I: So, yes, you might become, I don't know, Kerry or something.

R: That's fine.

I: You won't become John. So I'll stick to gender but, yes, I'll change names and it may be that at some point I'll want to publish this research so it is possible that the information might be out there. I am interviewing ... I have a Birmingham focus so I am interviewing Birmingham people, so it's possible that in three years time somebody could pick this up and go, “Mmm, I reckon that Kerry looks, sounds like.” So I have to sort of, say that but, you know, academic research, it's not often picked up. You know, so it's a lot of ifs and buts, but it's just to be sure, you know, that I've let you know if you like. So, yes, we should be about an hour if that's alright but we can stop and start if you need to do something. My purpose here is very much, you know, I don't really want to tell you about my research. I'm really just trying to get you to talk. So there's no right or wrong answer. There's no sense of, you know, what does Annette want to know, what should I be
saying. You just tell me your lived experience as you see fit, as you feel like it. So, other than that, yes, one of the questions I’d like to ask as part of the background is a bit obvious really, that, you know, have you got other people that you care for, other responsibilities. So obviously you’ve got yourself and a little rascal over there.

R: A lovely little two year old little boy.

I: But you’ve just got the one?

R: Yes, just the one.

I: Okay, and, just also, just a bit of background, I know some of this I might know but, kind of, pretend I don’t. Can you just go back to your, sort of, education, because I know you didn’t do a degree but you did A-levels didn’t you?

R: I did start my A-levels but I didn’t actually complete.

I: Oh, did you not finish them?

R: No. I got accepted to do four A-levels when I left school and then I got offered a place at Birmingham City actually to do law and politics in 1999.

I: Gosh, that seems a long time ago now.

R: I dropped out a few months before I actually sat my exams so I only ended up getting, I think, an AS level in sociology and an AS level in general studies. Through the work that I’d already done that’s what I, kind of, left with. So no, I didn’t actually do my A-levels. After that I did my teachers training.

I: Oh, so you’ve done teacher training?

R: Yes, I did my 7407.
I: What's my 7407?

R: It's a stage below before you do your cert ed. So it qualifies you to teach in further education basically.

I: Yes. Okay, great. If somebody says, “What's your job?” What do you say?

R: Social entrepreneur.

I: Social entrepreneur.

R: Yes.

I: That's how you kind of ...

R: Yes, because I do more than one thing. So, obviously the magazine takes up quite a lot of my time but because I'm still doing public speaking, I still do some of the training stuff, it just all depends what day it is, so. It all comes under social entrepreneur.

I: So if your first sentence is social entrepreneur, or phrase, what's the next one?

R: Editor-in-chief. Yes, which is obviously for the City&Style Magazine.

I: So that is your main preoccupation at the moment then?

R: Yes.

I: When did you start that business?

R: City&Style started this year (2012). I did, kind of like, the pilot with Truelife Magazine in 2008 but I did City&Style this year when I decided to, kind of like, get back into work and after having a break.

I: Yes, did you have much of a break?
R: Yes, originally I said I was going to have ... well, what it was, when I was eight months pregnant I got approached by Levi Strauss to be a part of one of their campaigns. So officially I was working when he was four weeks old and he was in the board room with me in London. So I did that a global ambassador for them for 18 months, but it was quite freelance. He was born September 2010 and I didn't really get back into the magazine until February this year. So a good 18 months.

I: Yes, but you were doing that, kind of ...

R: I was still doing stuff all the way through.

I: Yes, on a freelance, kind of, basis, so you could, yes, you could manage him but do a certain amount as well.

R: Yes.

I: Okay, good, so the current company though is about a year old. Have you just got the one company?

R: At the moment, yes. We're setting up a community interest company but we're in the process of, obviously, of getting our board of directors together first. I was doing a corporate governance course and I wanted to finish doing that first because obviously it teaches you all about boards and governance and the policies and things like that so that I can recruit more effectively. I've just finished that so I'm a qualified governance practitioner. I got a B! It's my first exam I sat since I left school so, but yes, I'm setting that up as well over the next couple of months.

I: Are you also, sort of, set up as a sole trader, as a freelancer, as well?

R: Yes.

I: So that's a kind of business in a way isn't it?
R: Yes.

I: So, yes, you’ve got you as a freelancer. Then City&Style is a commercial company, a limited company?

R: Yes, it’s set up as a limited company at the moment because I wanted to get everything off the ground, and because I wanted to start doing stuff I needed to have it set up but it will be a trading subsidiary of the CIC. So at the moment I’ve got one share in it, but yes, that’s where it’s going to go over to. Obviously all my public speaking stuff and the training stuff and workshop stuff I do as a sole trader.

I: Yes, okay, fine. So, in terms of your background we’ve got the education bit and then you’ve got several things that lead up to now, really, probably specific milestones as well?

R: Sure. So, yes, do you want me to just go through what I’ve done?

I: Yes, please, yes.

R: Okay.

I: Especially the key, sort of, developments.

R: Sure. 2001 I started working in the non-profit sector working with young people, inner city young people, those affected by gang culture, what would be deemed by society as disadvantaged, hard to reach. I did that for about three years and then I worked into, went into social enterprise in 2004. I started running different creative projects around dance, theatre, music.

I: Always with young people?

R: Always with young people. I wanted to continue working with young people. Then in 2005 -2006, the Barrow Cadbury Trust approached me, they were
an organisation that used to fund the charity I used to work for, to kind of, fund some of my work I was doing around enterprise because that’s when I was getting more into delivery enterprise training. So they funded my work for three years under an organisation called Inner City Creative Media Group which was just a voluntary community organisation. I did that up to 2009 which was the last year when I did my Truelife Magazine, but I did that as a pilot because I wasn't getting any funding for it and I wanted to just see whether or not it would work. It was very well received. Obviously the downfall was that we didn’t really focus on the sales and the advertising side of things.

I: Yes, so you had a market for it in the sense that people wanted that kind of content but you didn’t have a commercial kind of, yes.

R: Module at the time. So that was great and then that's when I got my MBA, and then I got a few other rewards and then I, kind of, was involved in other different bits of projects. I was working with Big City Radio and Star City. I was doing a radio project with them, myself and Birmingham College. I was involved in the Black International Film Festival and event organiser …

I: And some of these things you get fees for and some of it you don’t and it’s a combination.

R: Yes, yes, sure.

I: I mean, do you feel that it’s, kind of, a bit 50/50 or is there a lot that you have to do that is about profile raising?

R: Yes, I think there’s a lot that you do that’s profile raising but even when you’ve raised your profile a lot of people approach you because you’re known for helping people and that they always say, “Oh, we haven’t really got any budget but this is what we want to do.” I think it’s a decision of, well,
can I afford to do it, do I want to do it and is this something that I’m passionate about and then I make a decision whether or not. Some things you have to turn down and people, obviously, sometimes take offence to it but they have to realise that if you do everything for free how are you supposed to live or survive.

I: **To ever earn a living.**

R: Exactly. So it’s more free …

I: **Because in some ways you’ve had quite a high profile before you’ve had commercial success really. So it’s not as though your high profile is on the basis of commercial success.**

R: Yes, exactly. I think that even now I don’t think I’m commercially successfully. I’m still, kind of, getting there, another twelve, a good twelve months run to, kind of, start to make some money. But, yes, and I think that’s, kind of like, once you’ve got that success or profile people automatically you’ve got that commercial success.

I: **They think it comes with money don’t they.**

R: Yes, and that you …

I: **Miraculously.**

R: Exactly, so, a lot of people seem to think I’m rich for some reason that I don’t understand. For that they automatically assume you’ve got that time to dedicate to do all the free stuff and then you end up trying to explain to them that it doesn’t go like that. But, yes, it’s like a pick and choose, so. The Black International Film Festival I got involved in it because it was exciting. It was something I wanted to do. They asked me to direct their main event which was the music we do on screen awards which happens every October on
the last Saturday in the month and it takes place at the ICC. The only reason why I wanted to do that was because I basically had done lots of events, live music events, conferencing, I’d never managed … I wanted to in the future do an awards myself, so it gave me the opportunity to, kind of, organise an award on a mass scale. 500 guests, celebrities, acts to co-ordinate, co-ordinate with the venue and the food and all that kind of stuff, and all the fringe events around it and the sponsors. So it was, kind of like, I wanted to do it for the experience, and obviously they didn’t really have an budget. They paid my expenses but that was something that I wanted to do anyway so, and it gave me the opportunity to bring other young people in to, kind of, do voluntary work but they kind of got that whole experience through it.

I: So you’re still building up your portfolio in a way, of skills, knowledge, contact and so on.

R: Yes, definitely.

I: Yes, okay, that’s great. Do you, I mean, obviously you’ve had, you’ve done a lot of work where you’ve been self employed as well as being employed. Is there any, kind of, in your background in terms of your family, is there a background of self employment, is there … is that something, are you the first one ever?

R: Oh no, in my … my mum and dad are both self employed. My dad’s been self employed pretty much since I was about ten, probably for the last 20 years. He’s worked in the construction industry. Obviously he qualified at college, you know, he got distinctions in everything he did and he was working for a lot of companies and he decided to go freelance because he was getting quite a lot of demand from big property development companies
He needed to work on projects, so then, when my parents got divorced when I was about eleven he moved to Europe. So he was based in German and Holland and that’s why I’ve got four Dutch brothers and sisters that live out there.

I: Do you know them quite well?

R: Yes. We don’t really get to see each other as much now. So he’s always been doing that and he worked a lot for a lot of the hotels out there. So he’s involved in building that. He’s involved in building the hotel as well here. He’s always been involved in the construction industry.

I: But your mum was back in Harborne isn’t it, where you’re from.

R: Yes, we grew up in Harborne.

I: How many of you are there with your mum?

R: There are six of us altogether. So she was working three jobs but she also had her business so when we were younger, on a Saturday, because there was no one to look after us, we used to spend our time in her shop. She used to have a shop on Soho Road, she was a tailor, so she used to make suits and clothes, bespoke suits and clothes. So she was in business with this Asian lady so it was called Bagan’s of London because I think the woman’s name was Anita Bagan or something. So they, kind of like, combined Asian dress with English dress as well so they used to do a bit of both. So they used to have downstairs as their cutting and sewing room so we used to just help out there basically. So my mum always had her, kind of like, business. But then, when they, kind of, parted company, she used to do that from home. So I remember a lot of people coming and getting measured up for their suits and stuff.
I: And probably working all hours to get orders done.

R: Yes, yes, because it was six of us and she obviously had to look after us and she wasn’t benefits or anything.

I: Where are you in the pecking order?

R: I’m third down.

I: Right in the middle.

R: Kind of the middle child. So what my sister never used to want to do I used to have to do all the cleaning and stuff.

I: Well, that’s your story anyway.

R: Oh yes.

I: She might have another.

R: My mum’s always worked and been self employed so she’s always done both because I remember her having, like, three jobs and still being self employed as well. But then my dad just went full time, he’s always been self employed since. He’s never gone back to work for anybody else. But he’s been quite lucky because when he came back here he was doing stuff on like, footballers house, I know he worked on Stan Collymore’s house. So, yes, he’s been quite lucky in that respect. So I’ve always, kind of, combined the two because my mum’s always said she’s never taken the risk to go self employed fulltime. She’s always, kind of, liked (multiple speakers 00.15.55).

I: So you had that as a role model, actually, in a way.

R: Yes, but she was always doing community and voluntary work. So from when I was ten …

I: As well?
R: Yes, she used to … because we did the run for Rwanda, when the Rwanda appeal back in the early nineties. So she got us all involved in that and we had to run round Hounslow. Then she was always involved in play schemes and I remember when I was fourteen I used to help her on here play scheme. Jamelia actually used to go to my mum’s play scheme when she was younger. So I remember seeing a picture of me and Jamelia when we were little kids. We were about the same age. But, yes, my mum always used to run play schemes and even now she sits on boards and she’s treasurers of committee. She does everything.

I: None stop, yes.

R: But her full time occupation now is she’s a manager at the college. City College, next to South City College. So she's a chef manager but she's got her catering business now. She's been doing that for ten years. So that's all her stuff. Most of her stuffs stored in the shed at the back. My dad does a bit of construction stuff.

I: But he’s back around?

R: Yes, he’s got a bad back and a bad knee and he lives in Harborne. Back living in Harborne. So, yes, he’s been back since, in the nineties, he’s been back a while now. When I was about fifteen/sixteen, he was back. My mum and dad, they’ve always been, kind of, quite entrepreneurial, but everybody else, all their brothers and sisters are not.

I: What about your brothers and sisters then?

R: Well my brother, he’s always been he’s worked in the music industry so he’s always been … he’s a producer.

I: Oh, so there’s crossover with you a little bit.
R: Yes. So he’s always been in the music, so he’s always been freelance. So I got him and my sister involved in the youth project I was involved in because they’ve got skills. So my sister, her background is theatre and drama and she’s a teacher, she teaches that, and my brother’s background is music so they’ve both done workshop facilitation. Yes, so they’ve always been working in the community but as freelancers and my brother does some commercial in the music industry in London.

I: So if you get around the table at your mum’s there’s a, kind of, crossover and you’re not on your own and they’re not all, sort of, teachers or something.

R: No, no, no, no. My sister, she’s just started uni. She’s 25 and pregnant with her fourth child but she works with mum as a junior chef. She’s at uni.

I: What is she doing at uni?

R: Culinary arts degree. So she wants to, obviously, have her own restaurant. That’s her aim, that’s what she wants to do.

I: So there is an entrepreneurial street, kind of, running through, which is interesting. So, let’s get to the, sort of, practicalities and the basics. Have you got a typical day?

R: There’s no typical day. He starts nursery next week, roll on! At the moment there’s no typical day because he, kind of, pretty much dictates my schedule and because he’s got food allergies and eczema he’s been in hospital quite a bit recently for tests and treatments and his eye a well. He’s got a lazy eye so he’s been in tests. So, yes, he’s been, at least once a month he’s at the doctors or the hospital.

I: Yes, so you’ve got to manage all of that, yes.
R: He goes to a play group around the corner but that involves me actually being there as well. So, yes, I mean, to be quite honest a typical day is mornings is his time; Friday mornings we just try and chill out and not do much. But most mornings he’ll go to play group, come back, we’ll have lunch and then he’ll have his nap and while he has his nap I’m on the computer doing my work. Then in the afternoon he’ll just usually, we’ll get all his toys out, all his painting and his colours and he’ll paint and do stuff while I’m here going, ‘Oh, that’s great, that’s wonderful.’ And sit here.

I: I’ve been there, yes.

R: So, I’ll do that, but then, if I’ve got meetings and things that come up, my sister, because she only works Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays, I’ll do meetings, she’ll watch him.

I: So you’ve got some help from family.

R: Yes. So, like, yesterday, I had a press day to attend at Stay Cool Apartments who are launching a pop up spa so basically she watched him then, and the day before I had to go to Bristol to pitch to an investment panel for the magazine so she watched him. So she watched then again. So it all depends.

I: But it somehow works out.

R: Yes, yes because I’ve had to be, in London in the evenings, you know, I’ve been in Bristol a few times the last few months. You know, I’ve got to go to London next month.

I: He gets used to it doesn’t he.

R: Yes, he’s used to it now. I mean, he’s been travelling since he was four weeks old, so he’s used to it. And because she’s around quite regularly …
she comes three days a week anyway because her sister’s, her daughter’s school is just down the road so she comes here for dinner and then they go home so he sees them all the time. So, yes, it’s fine, but there’s no such typical day.

I: No, that will change for you then when he goes to nursery.

R: Yes, yes, and we’re moving as well. We’re moving to the jewellery quarter. So, yes, originally, because my mum was living in Bordesley green, because she got separated from her last husband. She used to live in Kings Landing, so he kept the house while they sorted out what they were going to do regarding the mortgage. She moved to Bordesley Green and she was in, like, a three bedroom flat, maisonette kind of flat kind of thing. Then when I got pregnant my lease was coming up at my apartment, and she was like, “Well, you don’t really want to stay here, it’s not a great place to raise children.” And I was really sick as well, so she was like, “Come and stay with me.” But there wasn’t really much space so, this is a four bedroom house, because it goes upstairs as well. I found this for her, and I was like, “Okay, well I’ll stay here with you for six months.” Because she has fulltime care of her granddaughter as well, my sister’s other daughter. So, because my mum’s so busy she says, “Okay, you can stay here and obviously you can help me look after her while I’ve got to go to my meetings and work and stuff.” So I’m here when she comes from school and I was supposed to be for six months but then when my sister came up from Miami, she’s 29, she was like, “Oh, well, I’ want to live here as well.” Because everybody wants to be round mum and my mum’s a chef. So she moved in here as well, and then six months turned into a year which has turned into two years. And she was like, “Look, what do you need to get out? You need to go now.” And I was like, “Oh, I can’t, I don’t want to go!” But I need the space anyway and
I've found a live work space in the Jewellery Quarter through Midland Heart housing. It's in the same building but it's a separate unit. So it's a nice spacious three bedroom apartment so I'll be moving there hopefully at the end of next month.

I: And there's a lot more people living there now so it's not, kind of, weird and there's a supermarket and tings like that.

R: Exactly, yes. I mean, it's a complex of twelve apartments and living space and there's loads of apartments in the area and the supermarket's literally round the corner from the tram station but it gives me space to work separately from home, it is hard. Yes, and also he's nurseries up (s.l. Five Way 00.23.58) so he'll go through, kind of like, nine to six, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday for the first year and then he'll go full time next year.

I: Oh, he'll love it, probably.

R: Yes, he'll be fine.

I: My daughter did straight away.

R: Yes, so, he's going to go to nursery three days a week which gives me, kind of, 25 hours focus time. But then, because he's going to be in a structure and going to be early, that time in the evening I'll get to, kind of, yes, because my spare room will, kind of, be an office. Like, because I've got quite a lot of volunteers at the moment and people that want to come on as interns it gives me the opportunity for them to have space to work rather than be always meeting in town and stuff. So it means that work can still happen even when I'm not there.

I: It does formalise things for you a bit more doesn't it?
R: Yes, it makes things more, kind of, focused and more structured and that’s, kind of, what …

I: So you’re building up to that.

R: Yes, so it’s all, kind of, change over the next few weeks.

I: Sounds good though, sounds like you’ve got it, sort of, worked out and the timing is all, kind of, good as well. I want to ask you a little bit about your relationships and networks with people, kind of, I mean, I know a lot of it is social in this industry but obviously it’s, sort of, professional relationships. You do have a good network don’t you?

R: Yes, I think so. Yes, I mean, I’ve tried to mix, some of the, kind of professional networkings with the industry focused networking and a bit of the social networking and mix them altogether because you get bits from different things so. I mean, I started going to, I think, one of the first main network formal ones I did was quite a few years a go, was a creative networks at Birmingham City down at Millennium Point. That was all around the creative industry. Now I’ve recently joined the Birmingham Press Club I haven’t yet attended … I’ve been to one of their events. That’s good for networking, well, industry related networking for the magazine. I also go to one that’s called Nails and Networking which is a women’s networking group set up by Ed James PR which is more professional with women in business. I go to that and then I just, kind of, try and go to different events and things.

I: Things that you get invited to, yes.

R: A lot of it as well, I do a lot of networking social media, mainly on Twitter, I get so many contacts from that.
I: You do a lot on Facebook as well don’t you?

R: Yes, Facebook, I mean, Facebook was kind of the main things from, like, 2008-2009/10 and then Twitter’s, kind of, taken over completely.

I: What about LinkedIn?

R: LinkedIn as well. LinkedIn, now, has been really good on a professional basis for my basis. Twitter’s been really good business wise because it’s brought opportunities to me. So, it’s like people have identified me and asked me to be involved in stuff. It’s very good for my London connections, Twitter is.

I: Because I was going to say, you’re not just … you don’t just have a Birmingham centric kind of network. You’ve got a national.

R: Yes, a wider one, yes, because …

I: Mostly with London?

R: Yes, I mean, to be honest, mostly with London. I’ve got some things in, like, Holland as well, music stuff, and they kind of contacted me. Where did they get my details from? Because I was involved in a big huge thing over there. I think that was through, like, Facebook and Twitter. But London, like, some of the big campaigns and things I’ve done have been through Twitter, like with Levi’s, more recently I was involved in a Nokia campaign called remarkable women. That’s been all through Twitter as well, they contacted me through that. Like I’m doing some guest speaking at the National Youth Enterprise Live in October at Earls Court. They contacted me through Twitter. Speaking at a women’s even in Crewe. They contacted me through Twitter as well, so. That’s been really good for, kind of like, my networks business wide and for the magazine as well.
I: Excellent, do you find that, with the networking in Birmingham, do you find that there are, kind of, key people that you know, you know, if I had to say, “Who are the two or three key people” … is there some people that stand out to you as critical in Birmingham, in terms of the creative industries and business networks?

R: I think there are key people in terms of more on a strategic level and in terms of what I do there are key people that I’d go to. But in terms of, like, with the magazine business now my key influences and contacts are PR companies because one, they contact me in terms of brands, events and things like that, but they also, kind of, help me get the foot in the door in terms of sponsorship and advertising because those are their clients kind of thing. In terms of key individuals it’s, kind of, a tricky one because there are key influences in terms of business. Creative Industries not so much now. It’s kind of bizarre for me because I’ve not really, I mean, Lara Nataraja was very key influence at one point when she was part of Business Link but now that’s been disbanded and she’s freelance a lot of things have changed. But there are still key individuals who are on my Twitter who I would, kind of, if I was to do an event of key influences they are the ones that I would invite. Only because they make for a specific … have a high role in a specific company but they’re what I call the circle of influence. When they say things more people listen, kind of thing. They also will put me, rather than saying in terms of networking events, on a personal level I could call them up and say, “Oh, can you help me with such and such.”

I: And you know they’ll be there for you, yes.

R: Yes, so Tara Tomes who ends up all the PR at the NEC, Louise Teboul, Common Purpose.
I: Okay, I don’t know her, yes.

R: She’s a senior leader for Common Purpose. Then Ed James who runs Ed James PR and he’s a drive time for Heart FM but he’s also the chair of the press club now so he’s a key person and his wife Denise and they organise all the nails and networking events as well. So, yes, I would say there is quite a few.

I: Maybe things have changed over the last year or so but especially over the, sort of, new labour period where you get a lot of creative industries policy and a lot of funding and stuff, I suppose Birmingham started to establish a, kind of, creative industries, kind of, formal/informal kind of group. People who went to the Social Media Café, just kind of like a little that you could, everybody know three or four names. Did you feel part of that network? Yes or no, I mean, you’re certainly aware of it by the sounds of it.

R: I’m definitely aware of it and I’ve always meant to go but because the Social Media Cafe always meet on a Friday morning and I’ve got no childcare.

I: I’ve never been ever either, it’s funny that.

R: I’ve never been, I’ve always been invited but I’ve never been.

I: Do you feel people in that, kind of, gang, if we can call them that, do you think they know you and you know them?

R: Oh yes, I mean Karen Strunks the lady that organises it is constantly tweeting me and going, “Oh, I look forward to you coming to one of our events and things like that.” So she’s aware of me but it’s just from … I think with these networks you have to, kind of, want to go and be there and be involved kind of thing, and kind of, make your mark. Even with the press
club, the press club is, you know, it’s the oldest press club in the world the Birmingham Press Club is and I remember going there, probably, 2008 when I first joined the National Union of Journalists and it was very much middle aged over 45 white male. Even the women who were in senior journalists roles in Birmingham wouldn’t go. I stopped going and even recently when Ed has now become chair and he’s saying, “Look Justice, I really want to get you involved, we need to shake it up, there’s no diversity, you know, it’s very old fashioned in its ways and things like that and things need to change.” So I think they’re starting to recognise but I think it is … that’s very much an old boys club without a shadow of a doubt. I think it is, kind of like, very much networked. I mean, even like the Nails and Network, when I went to first event last December I went by myself because the person I was supposed to go with let me down and I was pretty much there by myself. I met a few contacts but it’s very much … I left early because, you know, it’s very much everybody knew each other and was in their own cliques and, “Oh, hi, how have you been.” I was sitting (multiple speakers 00.33.05) I made a few friends and then it took, like, three months, three visits before, kind of, people remembered me and recognised me and knew what I did. I think because I’m the editor of a magazine it seems cool and, “Oh, that’s really interesting, someone to know.” You know, and then they ask me about what I’ve done and when they hear about, “Oh, wow, amazing and stuff.” Then they introduce me to other people and then now obviously I go and everybody knows who I am. So it’s kind of like I’m very much a part of it now and I’m brining people and introducing people.

I: Yes, so, you’ve got a role now but it took a bit of time.

R: Yes, and now the PR company are working with me on the magazine and our awards and stuff.
I: Okay, great, so that’s interesting. That’s to do with Birmingham. I know you might not want to be absolutely straight about this, people are some people are not, that’s fine, but it’s useful for me to know what contribution your work makes to your salary. So I’m interested in to what extent is this ... it’s obviously not full time because you’re managing it, so you’re kind of, I mean, you were saying you were going to work up to about 25 hours but at the moment?

R: I mean, at the moment it’s probably about 20 hours a week but it’s mainly, like, evenings and the odd bits here and there and in those 20 hours I’m including meetings as well and travel and stuff. I mean, so already this week. I mean, when I went to Bristol that took, like, seven hours out of my time because travelling there, staying there and then coming back.

However, in terms of, kind of like, financially, I’ve realised that it’s not like working a full time job so the money’s here and there and it’s, kind of like, having to be strategic about it. So for example, I could speak at an even and they could pay me £600 and I could speak at an event and they’re only going to cover my expenses and I’m not really getting anything.

I: Yes, so it's peaks and troughs and in some ways, while you've had him, would it be fair to say that you're keeping things bubbling and maybe now that he's going to start nursery ...?

R: Yes.

I: All that's going to change slightly.

R: Yes, and I think that’s why it’s been helpful that I’ve been here because really it wouldn’t have been really affordable to, kind of, live by myself and I’ve been a very much person that I’ve been so ... I’m not really into, like, getting benefits and stuff like that so I get tax credits and stuff for being on a
low income as a self employed person. But, like, when he was four weeks old and I did the Levi’s thing. I mean, when I was eight months pregnant they approached my, kind of like, manager who’s based in London and I said to her, “No, I’m not doing it, you know, he’s going to be due in four weeks. I can’t commit, I mean, what are they thinking?” kind of thing. Then she went and told them and they were like, “No, we don’t care that she’s having a baby we’ll do everything we can to accommodate her and we’ll pay you $7000 for, like, attending two events and all the rest is online.” So I was like, “Well, okay, fine if it just means coming to London twice.” They paid all my travel, they paid for all the car to pick me up, drop me off, they paid for hotels, they paid for food. You know, they paid for someone to look after him. I was like, “Well, why not?” So, yes, I thought, well, it’s worth while because I like to literally do submit like a blog a fortnight. I do an online video blog and answer a few questions by email and to be quite honest it was great for my profile because I was in The Metro, I did the The Metro 60 second interview based off that.

I: Yes, so it was a good gig for you and the money came with it.

R: Yes, and then I got a days live gig and they paid me £500. Well, they still haven’t paid me actually, that reminds me. But, yes, so it was good for me and it meant that obviously, while I was still at home looking after him because I was officially on maternity I still had some money coming in. I had some savings but that, kind of, all went to buying all his stuff.

I: So at the moment, in a way, you’re not getting a, kind of, proper salary. It’s little bits as they come in.

R: It literally covers costs. It doesn’t afford luxuries or buying new clothes or going out socialising which is good that my job, kind of, affords those things.
So yesterday I got a free pedicure because it was a press thing. So I get that, I get to socialise; I get to go to different events and things like that.

I: **Just thinking about the future, you know, do you see yourself bubbling along like that or do you ...**

R: I mean, bubbling along, I think, for the next six months, to be realistic, because I have to, my money has to go on obviously rent, bills and then the essential things to get the magazine off the ground. But after that, because we’ve looked at the diverse income streams that are going to bring money in, not just funding because obviously the CIC can apply for funding. We’ve got advertising sales, we’ve got our membership club, we’ve got our awards, there’s sponsorship. There’s different avenues and because I’m going to be doing all the advertising for at least the first six months, you know, I did think to myself, “Well, hold on, why don’t I just pay myself a commission of all the advertising that I sell?” Usually I would have just put all the money in but I thought, “Well, now, obviously I’ve got him I’ve got to be smart about it I’ve got nursery fees to pay.” So that’s what I’m going to do, so I’ve, kind of, calculated it out balance with that what tax credits I’ll get and working tax credits and so forth it works out that I’ll be okay. At the moment I’d say, to be quite honest, the work that I do is probably, like, 30-40% of what I really need. To, kind of, live off.

I: **Yes, sure, okay, thanks. Also I’m interested in how people are thinking about their future. So, you know, and obviously you’re young you could have more children so you could be saving for further maternity leave or have you got a pension plan, you know, are those kind of things part of the way in which you’re ...**
R: Definitely. I think I definitely have to think long term. I even did before I had him. My goal was to unofficially retire at 40 but not as in not work but, kind of, like, have the freedom to do what I wanted to do. Because I wanted to write full time but I want to finish my masters. I'm not sure whether I want to go and do a PhD because I know it's a lot of hard work and a lot of time, but my long term plan was to emigrate anyway and, kind of, duplicate what I want to do overseas, and I wanted to probably leave in, like, another seven years. But I did want to have a second child when he starts school but at the moment I'm not in a relationship so how that all pans out, kind of like, is kind of like secondary now. You know, I've got one so I'm happy. He was, kind of, unplanned because I still had plans to do before I had him, you know, but even with the pension thing, only because of what I've seen and experienced, you know, I've decided I'm not going to invest in a pension. I'd rather put that money in a bank and save my own unofficial pension kind of thing. Only because I've seen what people have ended up with (00.40.08) they've been getting less money and it not, kind of, working out. Then I thought, "Well, if I'm not really planning on staying here until 60-65 what is the point of me, kind of like, having a pension here. But I do have a savings fund, he has a savings account separately which regardless of what my income is I do still pay a minimum in every month and his dad pay money into his savings account as well on a regular basis. So there is that plan. I don't actually plan to buy here in the UK. I did at one point, nearly bought an apartment here and that was literally just before the recession kicked in. I got a mortgage, it was great, I think I was going to be paying, like, £300 a month for a two bedroom apartment in the city centre and then the economy crashed. My bank, which I got my mortgage with Halifax, decided to pull all first time buyers mortgages off the market just before mine was finalised. So then I got a second offer to do one which went up to £900 a month and
because it was at 50% buy and I had to pay rent it just didn't work out.
That's when I decided to rent and then I thought, “Okay, well, if I'm not staying here why am I going to commit to a mortgage?” My mum’s got a mortgage my dad, his house he bought outright. He never believed in having a mortgage.

I:  **My dad was like that, old school. (Multiple speakers 00.41.39).**

R: Yes, and so he’s got, his house is bought outright in Harborne but he rents that out and he rents another house. So yes, so, I'm not planning on saving but I do have a plan that I want to save because I've never had that, like, most of my friends have either, they've got kids, they're in a relationship, they've bought a house, they've got a car, you know, they've got a plan. I think because of where my work has taken me I've never been able to do that but now that's, kind of, everything that I do.

I:  **How do you feel about that? Because do you look at your friends and think, you know, or …**

R: Do you know what it’s kind of a bit of both. I mean, to me, my goal was always when I was younger, before even … I was always career minded. My dad actually encouraged us all to, kind of, go for long term careers. He wanted me to be a solicitor, that’s what I was going to study, law and politics, my sister he wanted to be a doctor, something that she wasn’t’ even interested in but he always wanted us to do, like, high flying careers. Now, I mean, my cousin, for example, she works at Capgemini, she’s got a big managerial job, she lives with her partner, they’ve been together since they were fourteen. She’s the same age as me, she’s engaged to get married, she’s getting married next May, she turns 32 at the end of this month, she’s been engaged, I mean, she’s been with him for, like, fifteen, sixteen years.
They've got a seven year old son, you know, and I look at them and they're really, really happy and I think ... the only thing I missed out on really, because I always say is, you know, if I don't get money or whatever I just want to be happily married, have a kid, that's, kind of like, my goal. But like, I see people that are in that situation but unhappy with where they are with their career and then I've got my sister. I mean, she's been having kids since she was 17 but she's got a supportive partner so she's managed to have a career and go to uni and stuff. Then I've got somebody else, she's a single mum and she's, kind of, been struggling and she's not managed to get to uni.

I: So you've got all the different ...

R: Yes, you know, and I've got people that have just worked. So it's been a mix and I think it kind of works out as long as you're happy within yourself and I think that this was just the path that was meant to be because obviously they then look up to me and say, "Oh, well, you've got an MBE, you've got all these awards, you've done all this stuff, you've been in the paper." You know, I think it's different strokes for different folks really. There are things that I would have done differently more on the financial side of things. I, kind of, looked at it more on a commercial aspect but I wouldn't have, kind of, changed the journey so.

I: If somebody says to you, well, you've already partly answered the question right at the beginning but I'll just put it slightly differently. If somebody says to you, "You're a cultural entrepreneur." How do you react to that?

R: Cultural Entrepreneur? It's interesting because it's a term that I never really would associate with myself because it's not something that people have
ever called me or defined me as. Also as well, it’s like, culture, what do you define, I mean, that can be interpreted in many different ways because you look at culture, to me, is, Birmingham is a cultural city and culture could be about lifestyle and culture can be about your food, you know, it’s about the arts, it’s about your heritage, so it’s a combination. It all depends on your definition of culture.

I: **So you obviously prefer the social entrepreneur.**

R: Yes definitely, because it’s so broad, because underneath that there’s work that I do which is classed as cultural enterprise and there’s work that isn’t. So the business stuff that I do in terms of women in business has got nothing really to do with culture because it’s not like, okay, black and Asian women in business, or about African heritage or Asian heritage or Chinese heritage. It’s not thing, it’s not culturally associated that way.

I: **Sure, and you don’t have any concerns about the word entrepreneur itself? Because some people associate it, I mean, you know, who do you think of if we say an entrepreneur? Who would you think of?**

R: Just in general in society? I mean, obviously it’s somebody … it’s associate straight away with business, entrepreneur, when I hear entrepreneur I obviously think of the big names like Richard Branson would one of the main things, obviously, that spring to mind.

I: **So you how do you feel you sit in relation to that then? Obviously you’re not a man, you don’t have a beard.**

R: Sure, I’m not a billionaire.

I: **You’re missing the beard.**
R: Yes, a few billions as well. But that’s when the social comes at the beginning of it because obviously the word social entrepreneur combines all the, kind of, social benefit and public good and you’re, kind of, making money. You know, and even Jamie Oliver was well renowned as a chef and now as a social entrepreneur. So obviously I set well below the pecking chain of, obviously, Richard Branson, but he himself has done a lot of stuff around the social enterprise.

I: **So for you there isn’t necessarily a negative connotation there?**

R: Oh no, I think it’s more of a positive connotation. I think when the negative has been around, words like mumpreneur and there’s been a debate around that. So I’m quite friendly with the girls that run Mumpreneur in the UK but I’ve also read a lot of magazine articles about women who are female social entrepreneurs who don’t like the term mumpreneur because they’re saying that being a mum doesn’t define me as a business woman. So there’s been quite a bit of a debate around that, why would you call yourself a mumpreneur? Do you know what I mean? That’s, kind of, been more of a thing.

I: **Okay. I’ve done all that. I think we’ve done most of it actually. Yes, I think we have.**

R: I just want to say around the entrepreneur thing, I think that I like it more because it, kind of, validates what you do. Because I’ve been so much embedded in the community stuff, people obviously see you as a community leader and activist, ambassador for young people but adding that entrepreneur onto it makes people see you more seriously and that you’re more business like. Especially, kind of like, the background I’m coming from.
I: When you say the background I’m coming from what do you mean?

R: In terms of community background because obviously my work started off, I was more known for work …

I: And do you mean the black community in that sense as well?

R: I think the community as a whole because I think obviously my work started within the black community but was recognised across the community.

I: So young people.

R: Young people and the media. My stuff was recognised by the council. Always in the Birmingham Post but our work was associated with disadvantaged inner city kids which were primarily black an Asian but now my work is, kind of, very much across the board so I work with young people, young women mainly, of all culture background. When I did True Life Magazine, you know, it was very, very diverse. You know, there was not one ethnicity that overshadowed another.

I: Maybe if you could define it it’s probably young women a lot of the time.

R: Yes, it’s now definitely more young women as a whole.

I: Yes, or young people (multiple speakers 00.49.28).

R: Yes, and so we have quiet a diverse mix and, you know, there’s no barriers. People automatically assume when I say I’m an editor of a magazine it’s a women’s lifestyle magazine. Because I say it’s an urban chic lifestyle magazine, urban being more city and cosmopolitan, people hear the word urban and think black.

I: Yes, they associate it with the music.
R: Yes, exactly, and I’m like, “No, no, it’s not that.” I’m still, kind of, battling that whole kind of thing, yes.

I: **Just to finish off, if somebody said to you, “Oh, here’s a full time job” I don't know, like, £30,000 salary, would you go, “Oh, thanks.” Would you go for it or do you think you want to do …**

R: I think usually … I mean, with regards to the job, to be honest, I’ve looked at it because I thought, “Okay, well really, what am I doing? Take stock.” And it would be nice to have that security and that balance but at the same instance those kind of positions are still going to require a lot of work. It’s not like I can work in a call centre for a bank and just go to work, do my job and go home. It’s going to be a job that is going to require more of my time and to be honest I prefer the balance of the flexibility to be able to do things that I’m passionate about and my main thing now is Isaiah. If I didn’t have him maybe I would take the job and still be able to burn the candle at two ends but it’s physically impossible and I don’t really want to have to put him in nursery five days a week and be gone and he be there from eight until six and then to come home. There’s no way in my head I could ever give up doing what I do and not to be able to do what I do.

I: **Yes, you wouldn’t be you if you did but at the same time you want to spend time with him, yes.**

R: So, you know, I’ve even looked at part time job options but even then there is nothing really suitable for me to, kind of, do the both.

I: **Yes, can somebody employ you?**

R: Exactly, and that’s a thing. I’ve gone for work and they’ve told me that I’m too over qualified or over whatever, you know, and it’s like, I just want a job, do you know what I mean? It’s one of those things where to me it’s going to
be easier for me to just go without for a little bit longer to, kind of, make it be a success than to try and get a job and then to try and balance it all. It's just not going to work.

I: **Obviously when you first started on this kind of journey of media work, community work and stuff, you must have felt very motivated to do it. Do you still feel that same motivation of has that shifted slightly?**

R: It's definitely shifted. I mean, when I did it ten years ago I was 20-21, I was young, and based off my personal experience and my background I had a lot of empathy working with the young people that where at my age and slightly older. Now my life has moved on so much. So before then what defined me, I was an ex offender working with young people, giving back to the community.

I: **You were one of them in a way.**

R: Yes, and now it's very much, okay, well, my mindset has changed from thinking more operational, I think more at a strategic level, from, kind of, going to youth meetings and being around the table with the police and the council about, on a more reactive level about what's happening. I'm going to meetings and sitting with people like the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce and things are more on a strategic level. Even my focus work from working with the most hard to reach … in 2005 I made that decision when I decided to go into training was that all my working in terms of youth work … all the work that I did with all the youth work, kind of like, came to and end and I wanted to move more into, kind of, training and education, and then I wanted to move more into media and as you do that you move further away from (multiple speakers 00.54.17). So, my heart's still there.

I: **It's a natural progression.**
R: Yes, I mean, there’s people that I worked with from other organisations who at the time, they still do that because that’s the core of what their work is. But for myself no, it isn’t, it is definitely, definitely changed. And I think for me to build a better life for myself, you know, I’ve given mine, I’ve done my service and for me now I need to have that balance. I need to have a more, kind of, structured stable life and that’s kind of, more reactive, kind of, more emotionally charged, draining, kind of, atmosphere.

I: That’s great, that’s really good. Thanks for your generosity with your time and everything that you said.