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ABSTRACT

In 2013, Arts Council England (ACE) deviated from its tradition of predominantly supporting ‘high’ or prestigious art by launching the Momentum music fund for popular musicians. Momentum is administered by PRS Foundation (PRSF) and provides grants of £5,000-15,000 to popular musicians for recording, touring and marketing costs. ACE created Momentum amidst a political environment that emphasised narrow understandings of value, focusing on economic value or the ability to improve social issues. Simultaneously, the music industries have undergone unprecedented changes since the creation of the internet and digital technology, altering cultural workers’ practices. My research therefore aimed to develop a nuanced understanding of value at the intersection of public funding and the popular music market through the case of Momentum. This multi-perspective research drew upon ethnographic interviews with funded musicians, semi-structured interviews with artist managers, PRSF and ACE staff, observations of assessment panels, analysis of documents and quantitative analysis of application data. Here, I show that ACE and PRSF valued Momentum in terms of priorities of funding talent, excellence and increased diversity. ACE derived value from association with funding popular musicians, and PRSF integrated diversity priorities throughout Momentum’s assessment process, which bled into other PRSF funds. Artist managers were investigated as cultural intermediaries, both in helping musicians secure funding and through pivotal roles in artist development. For popular musicians, value was linked to their identities as independent or unsigned musicians, their definitions of success and whether they considered music their profession. The findings of this research present a starting point for analysing the value of funding for popular musicians, a largely unexplored area of research. As arts funding remains under threat of cuts, the findings of this research will be highly relevant to public funders and to PRSF, the Music Managers Forum, popular musicians and professionals working with them.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 POPULAR MUSICIANS IN ENGLAND

In 2012, I was sitting outside at a round picnic table on a warm March day in Austin, Texas. My companions were a Canadian three-piece indie band, whom I had just met and started a conversation with, after enjoying their performance at a free show for the annual South by Southwest (SXSW) music festival. The band members told me how they piled into an ageing minivan with their music equipment and drove nearly 2,000 miles from Montreal, Canada to Austin, Texas. Like the thousands of artists that perform at SXSW every year, they travelled for days, only to play all-too-brief sets on mostly ad hoc and often awkward stages, in makeshift, temporary venues for crowds that were sometimes tiny. Their plan was to perform several shows at the festival, but they were not getting paid. Why did they still come? Each day, they rushed across the city between gigs, all in the hope that a music industry professional in the crowd would see them perform and give them a deal that changed everything. Although this band was cynical about their future, they had come because they were hoping to earn a living from making music, and to sustain their careers. This memory stayed in my mind and has returned to me time and time again whilst working on this research.

Months after meeting the Canadian band, I moved to London in 2012 and found myself working as an intern at a music charity called the Performing Rights Society for Music Foundation (PRSF). PRSF was established in 1999 by the royalty collecting society, the Performing Rights Society for Music (PRS), to support new music across all genres. Every year, PRSF receives millions of pounds from PRS. This sum is generated from songwriter/composer membership fees and royalties collected for live performances, broadcasts and use of music in

---

1 For more information on PRSF and their funding programmes, see their website:
TV and film. Working at PRSF first exposed me to the concept of public funding for popular music.

Before I begin to describe the specifics of this research and the case it examines, I want to explain how I came to know about the Momentum music fund. My relationship to funding cycle manager PRSF began in 2012, when I became an intern for them, from October 2012 until February 2013. The internship was part of my postgraduate degree at King’s College London. It was as an intern that I first learned about the funding world and, specifically, of the Momentum fund. As my internship drew to an end, PRSF were preparing their application to manage a newly-created bespoke fund, later named the Momentum music fund, that would directly support emerging popular musicians in England using public funds. The fund was being established by Arts Council England (ACE). This is England’s foremost distributor of public funds for arts and culture, yet it is not widely known as being a funder of popular music. Two years later, I returned to PRSF in a part-time capacity, while conducting this research. At their request, I returned to provide temporary assistance to PRSF for impact evaluations for three separate funds. Some of this work involved collecting data on Momentum, enabling me to learn more about the fund and the way it is run and evaluated, and more so than I could have done from the outside. These impact evaluations occurred from July 2015 to September 2015, and again from February 2016 to April 2016. Some of the data I draw from in this thesis derived from the data collected for these impact evaluations, but I have also included many other sources to ensure the views of different actors are reflected.

When I first learned about Momentum, the notion of public funds supporting popular musicians was unfamiliar to me, as my native country America offers little national or state-level public investment in the arts in general, instead adopting a philanthropic model, where individual charities, donors and trusts provide support for certain areas of the arts. Popular musicians are mostly expected to find their own paths to sustained careers through success in the commercial market and without public or private assistance. I was, therefore, intrigued by the potential for a fund that could support artists – like the band I had met at SXSW – who were putting in the work demanded of popular musicians today but struggling to move
up or sustain themselves. With these sorts of musicians in mind, I developed questions about what value such a fund might create for musicians, as well as the people they work with, the funding organisations and those managing the fund. I wanted to know whether the funding would make a difference in popular musicians’ careers, and how these successes could be defined. I also wondered if the fact that this fund would be supported with public money might provide access to a sustained career for a greater diversity of artist types. These questions have guided this research, and I have addressed them in this thesis.

1.2 KEY DEBATES ON CULTURAL VALUE

In May 2013, ACE launched the Momentum music fund, which began as a £500,000 pilot programme to support talent development for early to midcareer artists in the ‘contemporary popular’ area of the music industry. An information sheet, written by ACE, explains what they considered “contemporary popular music” for their Grants for the Arts scheme. Those deemed to be operating in the industry include solo artists, bands, groups, labels, promoters, managers and venues (ACE, 2016a: 2). The genres they include, but do not limit the fund to, include rock, indie, alternative, electronica, urban, metal and punk (ACE, 2016a: 2).

Momentum’s focus on the ‘popular’ music genre marks a change in approach for ACE, who have primarily supported artists and artist development within the classical and folk genres, with later support for jazz. The launch of Momentum also signified a government-funded intervention in the music industry and its labour – a move not seen since New Labour’s 1999 New Deal for Musicians, which aimed to train unemployed musicians (Cloonan, 2007).

Support like Momentum makes a new case for public funding in the popular music industry. A report commissioned by the British Council and ACE to discuss the export opportunities for British musicians states that public funding “fulfil[s] a vital artist development and arts development function” (Payne and Jeans, 2010: 3 emphasis in original). If record labels have decreased investment in artist development, as ACE’s CEO Alan Davey critically remarked in 2013 when explaining to Radio 4’s ‘Today’ programme why Momentum was necessary, then a
valuable part of England’s cultural industries is at risk (Ingham, 2013). Momentum and other publicly funded support programmes seek to counteract the music industry’s apparent decreased investment, but their outcomes and resultant value remain unknown. This discrepancy is what my thesis aims to redress.

As the dialogue regarding the economic value of the creative industries remains strong among UK policymakers, the new role of public money in supporting markets, like the music industries, may not be surprising. However, cultural value debates retain their fervour (Belfiore, 2018; Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016; O’Brien, 2010, 2014; O’Brien and Oakley, 2014) and some scholars disagree over if and how economics should be considered when valuing culture (Belfiore, 2014; Belfiore and Holdaway, 2014; O’Brien, 2010; Street, 2013).

Because ACE is an ‘arm’s length’ institution designating the distribution of funds, its own valuation of the arts illuminates ACE’s motivations for the creation of this fund beyond economic discourse. Not long after Momentum was launched, ACE Chair Peter Bazalgette defined his view of the cultural value hierarchy in a piece for The Guardian newspaper in the UK. He seemed to rank, from highest to lowest priority, culture’s inherent value, societal contribution, relation to education and, finally, its economic value (Bazalgette, 2014). Such a stance on cultural value might mean the ACE’s Momentum fund should not and will not be expected to yield economic returns. While that may seem reasonable and fair, this funding is supporting emerging popular musicians working in precarious situations. Perhaps its evaluation should, therefore, be balanced with acknowledgement of other types of value the funding creates. This is where my research comes in and is why I have adopted a multi-perspective approach, incorporating the different views of value within the fund from different actors’ perspectives.

Currently, popular musicians working in England live, excluding the top performing musicians, precarious lives. In a 2016 letter to the President of the European Commission, 1,000s of artists and songwriters appealed to the Commission to cease application of “safe harbour” laws to large companies and asked them to restrict – what they regarded as – the illegal use of their music on free and non-subscription digital platforms. They claimed, “The future is jeopardised by a substantial ‘value gap’ caused by user upload services such as
Google’s YouTube that are unfairly siphoning value away from the music community and its artists and songwriters” (MMF [Music Managers Forum], 2016: no pagination). The artists present their concern that what is due to them is not being paid—a common concern for cultural workers of all varieties. Of the 1,000s of artist and songwriter signatories, many famous and financially successful names appear, including ABBA, Calvin Harris, Carole King, Coldplay, Ed Sheeran, Kraftwerk, Lady Gaga, and Sir Paul McCartney. They further argue that the lack of proper payment for the music affects, not only the letter’s signatories, but “also threatens the survival of the next generation of creators too, and the viability and the diversity of their work” (ibid.). While the inclusion of highly famous artists and songwriters may be more out of solidarity and self-preservation than driven by an urgent need to financially survive, the very existence of the letter and the mass of artists and songwriters undersigned demonstrate that, for even the most financially secure artists, the disruption caused by digital technology continues to pose a threat and a level of insecurity.

For the many artists in England starting out or seeking to move into careers as popular musicians, the potential insecurity of the profession can prove insurmountable or challenging, at the very least. Some of these challenges arise from the lack of opportunities to derive income from music sales online and physical stock. Conversely, technology can enable aspiring musicians by allowing more aspiring musicians access to digital and virtual music-making and music-sharing products. These can make music cheaper to create and easier to share. Yet, the ease of access to these production and distribution tools means that more people are able to compete in the bloated marketplace. The intense competition between those aspiring to find an audience or to break through to radio, or achieve enough Spotify plays to earn income can, therefore, be another challenge to musicians seeking to turn a hobby into a sustained career.

In some ways, musicians have lived precarious lives for many decades, with the unpredictable audience and few spots making it a competitive role. Today, however, those aspiring to become popular musicians have (what was previously unprecedented) access to digital music tools, geographically dispersed audiences and increasing opportunities to reach those audiences, both via digital platforms,
like streaming or the thriving live sector. Given that there are greater opportunities for many to create music and manoeuvre their songs out to the public, the pool of musicians seeking careers grows and the competition amongst this ever-growing pool of talent remains high (Caves, 2000). Changes in the recording industry’s income levels have led to labels investing in a smaller pool of artists. Partly because of competition for limited opportunities, aspiring musicians face varying levels of success in their careers. Other reasons include limited access to resources to grow an audience, make recordings or take a show on tour, as well as an always unpredictable audience and the different personal and professional goals musicians have.

**KEY TERMS DEFINED**

Before I outline how specific terms will be understood within this thesis, it is necessary to clarify that this thesis is sociological in approach and methodology; therefore, the way key concepts are understood and investigated may differ from their definitions within popular music studies. I will now outline some of the key terms used in this thesis that need defining in this specific context due to their fluid nature. One of the most difficult terms to pinpoint is popular music. The way popular music is understood in this thesis draws from Shuker’s definition, which “equat[es] ‘popular music’ with commercially mass-produced music for a mass market, and includ[es] the variety of genres variously subsumed by terms such as rock ‘n’ roll, rock, pop, dance, hip-hop, and R&B” (Shuker, 2005: ix). My use of the terms ‘popular music’ and ‘popular musician’ also takes into consideration the fact that some musicians in this project may be equally or more motivated to participate in music for the intrinsic rewards than the external ones of mass-producing music, referenced by Shuker. Intrinsic rewards can include the fun and joy of the music-making experience and live performance, the chance to express oneself creatively and the comradery between band members (Zwaan, 2009: 4). The musicians in this research have some intention of reaching an audience, and an aim was, for most, to make a living from the sale and performance of music.
The definition does not presume that the aims of the musicians are to reach superstar stardom, although some may hope for such heights.

For consideration of the musical sector popular musicians are operating in, I adopt the pluralistic view of there being multiple music industries, rather than one homogenous industry. This is in line with Toynbee (2000) and Williamson and Cloonan (2007). In this thesis, the singular ‘music industry’ will occasionally be used but only when in quotes, when specified as the ‘recorded music industry’, or when referring to a specific organisation. Other industries might be the promotional industry or the live industry. The term industry is understood similarly to Jones, who states:

Industry, here, will be taken to be a routinised relationship between investors in the production of music goods and forms of labour that realise profit from the sale of those goods. (Jones, 2012: 3)

In today’s digitalised music market, the sale of goods might include something more abstract, such as the use of an artist’s image to help promote a brand. The exploitation of artist’s copyright is still elemental to the recorded music industry, which includes music publishing.

At the heart of this study is analysis of popular musicians. I explain how these roles are understood and what terms I will use to describe different actors. This research does not focus on musicians at the very beginning of their careers. This is, in part, because Momentum is aimed at musicians who have already achieved some level – no matter how varied – of acclaim or success that they can build upon to start to cement a sustainable music career. Therefore, I adopt a focus similar to Jones, who clarified that “the originators of music I am concerned with are those whose efforts reach users through the intervention of investors in music as a saleable outcome” (Jones, 2012: 2). I adopt this view because the musicians in my study are trying to reach an audience and sell their music, and many of them are seeking additional workers, such as artist managers, to help them do so.

In this research, the terms ‘musician’, ‘artist’ and ‘band’ are all used. They are used to refer to the musicians, producers, emcees, DJs and other performers involved. My decision to use these terms is based on discussions, observations
and interviews with workers in the music business, the workers at PRSF and the musicians themselves. When referring to an individual, either the term ‘musician’ or ‘artist’ will be used. When there is more than one musician, the term ‘band’ or ‘artist’ will be used. In this thesis, the term ‘artist’ refers to a ‘recording artist’, the phrase the term stems from, but also acts as the most general term and will generally be used as a catch-all. I chose this term because of its broad meaning, capturing the multitude of individuals working in different capacities as performers, songwriters, lyricists and producers. Some of the artists interviewed wear many hats and may use their main artist name for a variety of roles. The term ‘musicians’ will be used in discussions of literature on popular music. Artist is preferred over musician for its broadness at times, such as when referring to an individual who does not play an instrument or write the lyrics.

When possible, I do use the three different terms to convey more specific characteristics of the musicians. ‘Musician’ is a broad term, meaning someone making, writing and/or playing music, alone or as part of a group. ‘Band’ often means a group of musicians performing under one name (e.g. The Beatles) or the musicians who support a solo performer in the studio and/or on tour (e.g. “Patti Smith and her band”). ‘Artist’ tends to refer to ‘solo-artists’ who perform alone (e.g. David Bowie) but is also useful when the number of musicians in a group is unknown, making it unclear if they should be called a ‘musician’ or ‘band’. When talking about Momentum assessment panels in the research, ‘artist’ is often used because the assessors use this term. Different people seem to have their terms of choice, with some preferring ‘artist’ over ‘band’ or ‘musician’. Some people also use the term ‘act’, but this appeared to be less common in my research and will not be used, unless quoted from speech or media.

Momentum’s focus is on musicians who have achieved some level of career success or have established themselves in some way. These measures vary, but they could include having released a record (either through self-releasing or on an independent label), having songs that had some radio play or being able to sell tickets to a tour. What is important for this study is to separate the Momentum musicians from those without any track record and little written or performed music. I should clarify that because Momentum does not fund anyone
who is not writing lyrics or composing their own music, the definitions of musicians include an assumption that for the most part, the musicians are composing their own music. Momentum guidelines specify that anyone with a major label\(^2\) deal, or a deal with one of the majors’ subsidiaries, is ineligible for funding. Therefore, in this study, those musicians who have record or publishing deals have either received them after the time of funding or their deals have been made with small and independent labels.

In Chapter 6, I create a clearer definition of the term artist manager, based on the types of managers I observed working with Momentum artists. What should be clarified is that I use the term ‘artist manager’ to refer to the individuals employed by musicians to undertake tasks typically associated with managers. However, because I observed that even individuals who may not officially be employed by musicians were also undertaking this work, I am using the term ‘manager’, in a slightly broader sense. In this way, I aim to encompass these workers who may have titles such as label manager but, nonetheless, engage in work typically associated with managers. Managerial work includes seeking deals with labels, publisher and synchronisation agents, contacting booking agents, planning tours, going on tours with musicians, managing their diaries and connecting musicians with other specialised workers, like producers. In the chapter dealing with managers (Chapter 6), I consider whether artist managers are cultural intermediaries. As that topic is only discussed in Chapter 6, I define my understanding of the term in that chapter.

1.3 THE RESEARCH SETTING

Having laid out the key terms considered in this thesis, I now turn to the site of enquiry and the major actors involved. As stated above, this study is a case study and considers Momentum funding as a site of exploration for the research questions through the collection of empirical and secondary data. All of the data

\(^2\) The major labels are Sony, Warner Brothers and Universal. Artists signed to ‘big’ independent labels are technically eligible but might be deemed to have enough label investment and not in need of public funding.
ARTS COUNCIL ENGLAND

A council for the arts has existed in some form in England since the 1940s, during World War II. The first was created as the Committee for Encouragement of Music and the Arts in 1940 by Royal Charter, and the economist John Maynard Keynes became the Chair in 1941 (ACE, 2018a). In 1946, the Arts Council of Great Britain was created under Royal Charter and began receiving government funding nationally and regionally in 1948. Stalwarts of public funding who are emblematic of ‘high arts’, such as the Royal Opera House (ROH), have been receiving funding from the arts council since the 1950s. Today, the ROH persists as a highly funded arts organisation supported with public funds. Between the 1950s and 1960s, the first Minister for the arts was appointed, a government White Paper was published on the arts and the Royal Charter for the arts council was renewed. These actions solidified the presence of the arts in government and instigated the role of policy in the arts. The modern form of the arts council was created in 1994, when the Arts Council of Great Britain was devolved, breaking into separate councils for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (ACE, 2018b). Once it became the Arts Council of England, the funding it received was adapted to include grant-in-aid direct from the government and Lottery funding. Today, ACE receives funding from the National Lottery Fund. Importantly, as noted above, ACE is known as an ‘arm’s length’ organisation, operating with government funding but intended to be outside of government influence. The English government Department for Culture, Media and Sport became the cultural arm of the government in 1997. The current name Arts Council England (ACE) was adopted in 2002 when the council absorbed English regional arts boards (ACE, 2018c).

3 The Arts Council England’s website provides information on their programmes and history: http://artscouncil.org.uk
The types of art funded by ACE have changed throughout its history, with music being an early inclusion. Others include visual arts, literature, dance, theatre and performing arts. For most of ACE’s history, the types of music were more classical in nature, with later inclusion of jazz (Banks and Toynbee, 2014). Popular musicians were only supported indirectly by organisations receiving funding from ACE. Today, ACE supports museums and libraries as well, and their website states that:

Between 2018 and 2022, we will invest £1.45 billion of public money from government and an estimated £860 million from the National Lottery to help create these experiences for as many people as possible across the country. (ACE, 2018e)

The policy guiding ACE’s investment during Momentum’s creation was the 2010 10-year strategy document Great Art and Culture for Everyone, which was revised in 2013. This document laid out five goals: 1) supporting excellence, 2) ensuring everyone has the chance to experience and be inspired by the arts, 3) ensuring arts and culture are resilient, 4) leadership and workforce are diverse and 5) all young people get a chance to experience “richness” of the arts, libraries and museums (ACE, 2013: 39).

Over time, criticism of the arts council’s distribution of funding arose, and, in 1976, Naseem Khan wrote a report called “The Arts that Britain Ignores,” advocating that the arts council was not paying enough attention to minority ethnic arts, which helped instigate the council’s concern with diversity (Khan, 1976). Khan later became the Head of Diversity with ACE, where she worked on improving cultural diversity in ACE’s funding. This legacy has carried on through ACE’s Creative Case for Diversity (CCD), originating in 2011. The CCD has been significant to the ways Momentum funding was monitored for diversity. Controversy over the regional disparities in funding distribution has periodically arisen for ACE, starting in the 1980s and occurring most recently in 2013 (Stark et al., 2013). Regional imbalance of funding became an important consideration in the Momentum fund, as this thesis will show. Chapter 4 will discuss, in greater detail, the ways that the CCD and emphasis on supporting diversity in ethnicity and region – along with gender and genre – influenced the ways Momentum funding was run and valued.
The Performing Rights Society for Music (PRS) was set up in England in 1914 by music publishers “to protect the value of copyright and help provide an income for composers, songwriters and music publishers” (PRS, 2018). PRS is a royalty collecting society that registers songwriters and composers as members and then collects royalties for them by licensing live use of their members’ music. PRS then donates a portion of their income to PRSF to distribute each year. The early form of PRSF was first established in the 1960s as a department within PRS that distributed income from royalties and membership fees through awards. Then, in 2001, a taskforce, made up of PRS staff and board members, determined that the foundation should be independent.

Today, PRSF is a separate organisation, though it is located in the offices of PRS in their central London office and receives a majority of its funds from PRS. Final funding decisions are approved by the PRSF Board, separate from the PRS Board. The PRSF organisational structure can be seen in the Appendix B, showing the small size of a very active organisation. The foundation was set up to support music creators4 across the UK and genres, and its portfolio of programmes has steadily grown (PRS, 2018). PRSF currently offers 22 funds, fellowships, awards, scholarships, bursaries and residencies for music creators and four funds for music organisations. They regularly create new funding schemes, often with different funding partners. Their list of funding partners numbers over 50 and currently includes public funders such as the Department of International Trade, ACE, Creative Scotland and the arts councils of Wales and Northern Ireland. Private funders range from foundations and trusts to private companies and include Paul Hamlyn Foundation, Esmee Fairbairn Foundation, Pledge Music, Southbank Centre and the Musicians’ Union. PRSF has distributed over £29.5 million since 2000 to thousands of artists, organisations and music initiatives.

4 PRSF define “music creators” as “songwriters, composers, artists, bands, producers or performers who write their own music,” stating they do not fund those who do not write their original music (PRS, 2018).
This research focuses on the Momentum music fund, a bespoke grant programme for popular musicians based in England. Momentum was first launched in May 2013 by then CEO of ACE, Alan Davey, and PRSF CEO, formerly known as the Executive Director, Vanessa Reed, at The Great Escape music festival in Brighton. Momentum was initially conceived in 2012 by members of ACE’s music department and Davey, following an investigative consultation into funding needs for popular musicians conducted by ACE. According to his Huffington Post blog, Davey was inspired by Canada’s publicly and privately supported funding for musicians, called the Foundation Assisting Canadian Talent on Recording (FACTOR), which he argued supported musicians’ development long-term (Davey, 2012). According to my interviews with ACE staff, the consultation identified a need for a small grants programme “for early to mid-career musicians broadly operating in the contemporary popular music sector of the music industry” (ACE, 2016b). ACE staff then drafted a document outlining a music industry talent development fund in late 2012, initiating an application process for external organisations to apply to manage the new fund. Momentum began as a two-year pilot, intended to test the effectiveness of small grants for popular musicians. In ACE, Momentum was considered a commissioned grant, which was a grant scheme that external organisations could apply to deliver where ACE had specific outcomes pre-defined. These outcomes were defined but without specific guidance on how to achieve those goals. PRSF applied and was chosen in early 2013 to manage the funding programme, and the name Momentum was chosen by ACE and PRSF.

Momentum funding provides grants of £5,000-£15,000 directly to artists based in England for costs typically associated with recording, marketing and touring. Artists applied in order to record and release a short EP or a whole album. Others applied for funding to record music videos, develop their live show and to pay sound engineers and support musicians. Between 2013 and 2018, over 273 artists were funded, with over £2.58 million distributed. Since its creation in 2013, Momentum has had several different funding partners. From 2013-2018, ACE was the primary funder, contributing an initial £500,000 over two years, and a
subsequent £1.5 million over the following three years, totalling £2 million. As of 2018, ACE is no longer supporting Momentum with funding, with support coming from PRSF, Phonographic Performance Limited (PPL), Creative Scotland and the Arts Council of Wales. No announcement was made by ACE clarifying why, but, in interviews I conducted with ACE staff, Momentum was labelled as “strategic funding.” Strategic funds were said to be funds created to address a specific problem, only to be discontinued when that problem appeared to be solved. In 2018, ACE reshuffled their entire funding ecosystem, changing one of their primary funding programme’s name and moving away from strategic funding altogether. It may seem natural that Momentum would no longer be supported in the reorganisation, but the questions this thesis will answer raise further questions. It will remain unclear why ACE, whose financial cost for Momentum was fairly low compared to the funding figures, would suddenly choose to stop supporting Momentum, despite reaping reputational benefits by association as a funder of popular musicians.

In addition to ACE funding, PRSF have contributed additional funding throughout Momentum, amounting to roughly 20% of the total funds distributed. Deezer, the music streaming company, were brought on as a digital partner in August 2013 and also ran the Deezer award that offered one winner from each round £2,500 for having the most streams on the Momentum Deezer app. Deezer decided not to continue their arrangement, and, in May 2015, streaming competitor Spotify joined Momentum. Spotify’s support is primarily through training for Momentum-funded musicians, which has helped some of them achieve coveted spots on Spotify playlists. In November 2016, music licensor PPL also joined as a funding partner by donating £200,000 per year to distribute through Momentum and PRSF’s other partnership fund, the International Showcase Fund. PPL is PRS’ counterpart in licensing, collecting and distributing royalties for the use of recorded music on radio, TV and other performances.

In 2018, Momentum entered a new era, with ACE deciding not to support any strategic funds anymore and pulling out of Momentum. At the same time, Scottish and Welsh public funders, Creative Scotland and the Arts Council of Wales, joined the fund and have opened the Momentum fund to Scottish and
Welsh artists. At no point does PRSF seem ready to end the fund and continues seeking new funding partners. Plans to integrate the Arts Council of Northern Ireland have been in production. The Momentum fund remains prominent on PRSF’s website and will likely remain functioning for some years to come.

1.4 THE THESIS STRUCTURE

The following thesis is structured in eight chapters. This chapter has introduced the topic of public funding for popular musicians in England and the problem that Momentum aimed to address, namely a lack of investment available to early career, emerging musicians. Other concerns, about the difficulty of sustaining a career as a musician and precarity, were raised. I have also introduced the key debates driving my investigation in terms of cultural value and defined terms used within the research. Finally, I provided context about the two most important organisations in this study and the Momentum fund itself. Chapter 2 presents the literature informing this study, showing how the research questions emerged and the gaps that this research fills. Considering popular music as a form of cultural production, I bring together literature around cultural value, cultural work and cultural production, positioning this study at the crossover point of all three areas. Next, Chapter 3 presents the methodology for this study, describing the choice to use a case study approach. I describe the data sources analysed in this study and the means of collection for several types of data. My approach incorporates data from observations, interviews, documents and quantitative programme data to garner distinct perspectives from the funders, funding assessors, artist managers and artists. I also address the concerns of getting access, ethics and insider research.

Chapters 4-7 present the findings of the data analysis through four perspectives and aspects of Momentum’s funding. The first considers ACE in Chapter 4, examining why they decided to create a fund for popular music, what they intended Momentum to accomplish and how they value the funding as an organisation typically seen as supporting less commercial arts than popular music. Chapter 5 examines the perspective of PRSF, as well as the external assessors
brought in to make funding decisions. The questions of how PRSF value the funding are addressed using a mix of data sources, exploring, in particular, how notions of talent, excellence, diversity and viability speak to value in the funding, assessment and evaluation process. The idea that Momentum may be designed to redress inequalities is taken up and analysed in respect to whom the fund has supported. The next two chapters move from the organisational side of the funding to the individuals applying for and using the funding. These are firstly the artist managers, in Chapter 6, who were shown in interviews to work in myriad ways for Momentum musicians, suggesting that managers are integral to artist development processes for emerging popular musicians, which create value for them and musicians. A typology of types of managerial workers is introduced to aid discussion of the intermediary roles. Finally, Chapter 7 examines the funded musicians through analysis of interviews with bands and solo-artists. The discussion of value is framed with consideration of pluralistic definitions of success, discussion of internal and external goods and autonomy. Chapter 8 concludes the thesis by considering the contribution this study makes, the wider implications for the findings and the further questions raised within the research. I now turn to the literature that informs this study in the following chapter.
2. POPULAR MUSICIANS, CULTURAL VALUE AND WORK IN THE FIELD OF CULTURAL PRODUCTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Given that public funding for the arts in England has long overlooked popular music, instead subsidising the ‘high arts’ of opera and ballet at the highest levels\(^5\), it is not surprising that there is little research on popular music and public funding. This is where this thesis makes a fundamental contribution. The Momentum fund is taken as an exemplary case of a publicly funded organisation, Arts Council England (ACE), supporting popular musicians in projects that have the potential to create multi-dimensional value for multiple actors. The lack of research exploring popular music and public funding – or funding of any kind – is partly due to a common perception that popular music belongs within the commercial sector, where the definition of ‘popular’ almost equates commercial success. As one academic exclaimed to me, when I first explained the focus of my research to him, “If popular music needs funding, doesn’t that mean it’s already failed?”

Momentum’s status as ACE’s first clear foray into the commercial music sector contradicts this assumption and is, therefore, a fascinating case to investigate because of the insights it may provide into wider issues of public funding for popular culture and music specifically. Additionally, the only research that has been conducted on popular musicians and public funding in recent years has come through the Australian Research Council collaborative project “Policy Notes: Local Popular Music in Global Creative Economies” (2013), which compared music policy in Scotland, Australia and New Zealand. Clearly, the ways

\(^5\) Chapter 4 provides a more detailed overview of the amount of funding ACE provides to classical and other ‘high’ arts organisations, such as ballet companies and royal theatre companies, each year.
that funding interact with music policy, public funders and the music ecosystem in England has been underexamined. This thesis plugs this gap.

In the previous chapter, I established what Momentum funding is and the involvement of the primary funders, ACE and PRFS Foundation (PRSF). This chapter reviews the literature in cultural work, cultural value and cultural production, which has contributed to and facilitated this research. The following sections will introduce three key areas of literature that informed this research, showing the development of the five research questions and sub-questions.

To address the contradictory and complicated relationship of popular musicians to public funding, synthesis of different streams of literature is required across cultural value, cultural work – including understanding of musicians as cultural workers – and cultural production. Figure 2.2 shows the intersection point of the three areas of literature, where work on public funding and popular music converge and my research sits.

Prior to discussing the three areas of literature, Section 2.2 begins with a review of the thesis’ overall focus on the cultural production process. This is done by establishing the relationship between forms of power and cultural production and outlining Bourdieu’s theories about ‘legitimacy’ and the interplay between symbolic capital and economic, social and cultural capital. Following this, the chapter’s next three sections will review the areas of literature that inform this project. These three sections will discuss:

I. Relevant research on popular musicians and cultural production, firstly covering popular music and the state, before moving onto extrapolate the unique structural challenges musicians face due to changes in the music industries. This section also explores the changing roles of musicians and artist managers in the age of digitalisation.

II. The second section presents literature on cultural work to situate popular musicians as cultural workers and popular music within the cultural industries. Cultural work literature is then presented in relation to key themes and the enhanced focus on inequality.
III. The third section lays out the debates about cultural value that influenced this research and contributed to the emphasis of a nuanced understanding of cultural value.

Figure 2.1 Literature Framework

2.2 POWER AND VALUE IN THE FIELD OF CULTURAL PRODUCTION

As this research focuses on popular music from a sociological perspective, it is situated broadly within cultural sociological research. Within this designation, one of the foremost scholars of the specific area of cultural production, which this thesis focuses on, is Pierre Bourdieu. For this project, the relationship between culture and power is important, in this case being between musicians and their economic, social and cultural capital. Bourdieu’s (1984; 1992) analysis and discussion of the interplay between power and capital in cultural production interprets the relationship’s dynamics. Bourdieu’s influential work *Distinction* (1984) connected evaluative concepts of ‘taste’ and ‘legitimacy’ with social class, which he viewed as different forms of capital. Building on this, but focusing on cultural production, Bourdieu’s later work (1992) *The Field of Cultural Production*
pushed these concepts further and delved specifically into the relationship between different kinds of capital (economic, social, cultural, and symbolic) and hierarchies of production. Engaging with ‘legitimacy’, with regard to taste from Bourdieu’s perspective, helps to illuminate the power dynamics at play in this field of public funding for popular music, whilst helping to develop an understanding of one way ‘success’ might be defined. Bourdieu’s work provides insight into the power imbalances within cultural production that affect popular musicians. These are examined through analysis of hierarchies in consumption, as ‘taste’, and production, as ‘a field’ influenced by spheres of power.

One unique aspect of cultural consumption, according to Bourdieu, is the way in which ‘taste’ is stratified. He asserts that ‘taste’ reaffirms class and classifies the classifier (1984: 10), and further says, of cultural goods, that “none [are] more obviously predisposed to express social difference” (ibid.: 223). At the time of Bourdieu’s writing, music was not as readily accessible as it is today, and thus knowledge of, and engagement with, the ‘higher’ realm of music, such as classical, was indicative of schooling and economic background (1984: 8). Upon seeing stratification, Bourdieu outlined three “zones of tastes” which are roughly aligned with social class and education levels: 1) legitimate taste, 2) ‘middle-brow’ taste, and 3) ‘popular’ taste (ibid.). It is only those individuals, often in the higher socio-economic or dominant class, who have access to high culture and can develop ‘legitimate taste’, providing them with greater cultural capital.

Adapting Bourdieu’s original thesis, Peterson and Kern (1996) show that the most elite consumer must now show expertise in all three zones to attain the greatest cultural capital or omnivore status. In this case, ‘taste’ becomes more complex and a less reliable identifier of class (though not necessarily less dependent on class). This is because it has less to do with possessing knowledge of a specific genre – the sort that would be gained through targeted education and family upbringing – than conveying a comfortable engagement with many genres and levels of music. Although my thesis does not intend to test the idea of the omnivore, the concept is relevant because it suggests that those with higher levels of cultural capital may also possess knowledge of, and interest in, popular music.
This idea could resonate with ACE’s decision to also fund popular music, along with ‘higher’ art forms.

Placing cultural production in the context of power and capital, Bourdieu describes a field system where the “field of class relations” encompasses the “field of power”, and nested within them is the “field of cultural production” (1992: 37). The existing hierarchies within the fields of power and class affect the hierarchy within the field of cultural production. Bourdieu describes two hierarchical principles that reflect ‘success’ in the field of cultural production. The ‘heteronomous’ principle is where success is measured through numbers or volume (sales and tickets). The ‘autonomous’ principle is where art is made for recognition among other artists, and not for economic success (avant-garde) (Bourdieu, 1992: 37). These principles appear to represent a version of the longstanding tension between art and commerce or culture and economy. While these two principles might be seen within Momentum funding and popular musicians’ work, not only is success complex to measure for popular musicians, it also fluctuates during an artist’s career. This is mainly due to the changing practices of popular musicians and the means of earning an income as a musician.

The ways in which the application form for Momentum asks musicians to articulate how their success would be demonstrated is mainly in line with the heteronomous principle of ticket sales and touring dates. Musicians funded by Momentum may, however, define success for themselves in one, both or none of these principles. This thesis aims to capture a more nuanced understanding of the various forms of value and success for popular musicians and others in the field, in line with the approach taken by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and Cultural Value Project (CVP). The CVP was a large-scale project run by the AHRC from 2012 to 2016 that provided 72 awards to scholars to either undertake research, conduct a workshop with practitioners and academics or produce a critical review. The project culminated in the publication of a report called *Understanding the Value of Arts and Culture*, which aimed to synthesise the projects, bring together knowledge about the components of cultural value and to explore and scope the methodologies used to determine cultural value. The CVP
problematised the lack of dialogue between disciplines and art forms about value and sought to highlight the value of experiences in the arts. I decided to draw upon the CVP’s approach partly because the debate around cultural value and how to evidence it was fervent at the time I set out my study’s purpose. Additionally, I chose this approach because of the intentions of some of those within the CVP to push cultural value beyond the ways it had been conceived in neoliberal political agendas. These ways were seen as limited mostly to economic metrics, lacking the whole picture:

There is, therefore, a felt need for innovation in the understanding of cultural value, the collection of cultural impact data and the ways this data is analysed, interpreted and communicated; a new methodology which is able to speak to government in a new language. There is also, potentially, a space opened up in which a new, progressive politics of cultural practice and participation might emerge, one which is conceived in opposition to the emerging norms of austerity and neoliberal capitalism. (Newsinger and Green, 2016: 383)

I was drawn to this approach because current definitions of cultural value, in relation to popular musicians and funding, had reflected limited appreciation for the complexities of musicians’ lived experiences and the difficulties of sustaining careers in music – something music funders must consider. My research considers the possible differences in value ascribed to funding for popular musicians between musicians, artist managers and funders, which relates to the primary research question: What dimensions of value might public funding for popular musicians create? The next sections will elaborate on Bourdieu’s use of ‘legitimacy’ and concepts of economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital to discuss issues of equality in cultural production and taste.

---

**LEGITIMACY**

Bourdieu’s description of ‘legitimacy’ conveys the divisions between artistic acceptance and popular approval (1992: 50). His three forms of legitimacy show similar oppositions to one another, as seen in the two hierarchical principles, but a third element is added: popular acceptance. This element is important in popular music, as the focus is on music created to appeal to many people – typically, in
the commercial market. In popular music, becoming popular and topping charts is not necessarily the end of legitimacy. For popular musicians, public funding is potentially both a form of consecration from ‘high art’ funding ACE and a hindrance to acceptance by other musicians given the ‘street cred’ that unknown, avant-garde and do-it-yourself musicians can possess. However, the financial landscape for emerging popular musicians today is increasingly one of attrition, creating an environment where receiving funding can become a badge of honour, even for metal bands.

The idea of ‘legitimacy in flux’ may better reflect the consequences for artists moving from receiving acceptance – in the realm of legitimate taste (unknown, avant-garde) – to becoming funded and perhaps ‘successful’ – economically and reputationally. Bourdieu emphasises the constant oppositions between forms of ‘success’ and ‘legitimacy’ encountered by artists. He lists oppositions between being bourgeois and being indifferent to money and power, and between accepting seriousness and indifference to seriousness (Bourdieu, 1992: 105). I argue that the interplay between ‘success’ and ‘legitimacy’ may not be so clearly opposed when public funding institutions support popular musicians.

While ‘legitimate’ art does not need to be popular to be valued, since its value is imbued by the dominant class, perhaps ‘legitimate’ art can also be popular. Musicians funded by Momentum may be striving for success via chart-topping tracks and sold-out concerts or legitimacy ascribed through being funded by ACE – or, perhaps, both. Musicians, though, cannot choose ‘legitimacy’, and the capital (social, economic, cultural) applicants bring to Momentum applications influences perceptions of their ‘legitimacy’. Importantly, how musicians, funders and music assessors conceptualise the Momentum applicants’ music is shaped by their economic, social and cultural capital. The relationship between musicians and their capital will be explored in this project to understand these processes. One of the questions driving the research is: What economic, social and cultural barriers to music making does Momentum funding attempt to redress, and does it achieve its goals?
ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ‘SYMBOLIC CAPITAL’

The powerful manner in which class impacts upon the field of cultural production runs throughout Bourdieu’s *The Field of Cultural Production* and is illustrated through the attainment of symbolic capital (1992). Symbolic capital is “economic or political capital that is disavowed, misrecognized and thereby recognized, hence legitimate, [...] which [...] guarantees economic profits” (1992: 75). Those most poised to accrue ‘symbolic capital’, according to Bourdieu, are those already in possession of extensive amounts of social and economic capital (1992: 67). Initially possessing capital provides musicians with access to other capital, and this raises questions of who Momentum funds and what capital they bring to the table.

A particular situation in the news illustrates the process to attaining symbolic capital very well. In an interview, UK Labour MP Chris Bryant named musician James Blunt as one of a ‘privileged’ set of artists and performers who, he said, have come to heavily populate the arts sector (Mason, 2015: para. 1). Blunt, in his reply, was adamantly opposed to Bryant’s assumption that Blunt’s private schooling and wealthy background helped him. He called his background a deterrent in a letter: “My background has been AGAINST me succeeding in the music business” (his emphasis Blunt, 2015: para. 4). Through the act of disavowing his economic capital, Blunt attempted to separate himself from any perceived advantage, in the hope that he will be recognised for his own skill or talent. Possessing credibility and showing that one has worked hard to earn their fame can be important for legitimacy in popular music.

This struggle for musicians to obtain the necessary symbolic capital is where class is particularly relevant. Artists with economic capital are able to take a risky position and pursue avant-garde art “because economic capital provides the conditions for freedom from economic necessity” (Bourdieu, 1992: 68). While this research is not particularly concerned with avant-garde art, the idea that musicians possessing economic capital are freer to take risks musically, to push creative boundaries and innovate, than those needing to work a day job, is an important one.
Additionally, the issue of diversity is important because those in possession of high levels of social capital, mostly held by the dominant class, gender or ethnicity, are more able to acquire legitimacy and thus symbolic capital. This brings back up the question of what economic, social and cultural barriers to music making does Momentum funding attempt to redress, and does it achieve its goals?

What Bourdieu’s analysis sometimes neglects are the diverse forms of agency that individuals have in their roles in the field of cultural production. The research on cultural work provides a more balanced analysis of popular musicians as active agents constrained by social and economic structures who seek to produce 'good work' while also accepting the often-immense sacrifices that cultural work demands. For this research, I regard cultural work research as inextricably interlinked with cultural industries research that focuses on production and consider popular music work as both cultural work and a form of cultural production. I now consider how research on popular music relates to my study.

2.3 POPULAR MUSIC AND CULTURAL PRODUCTION

While this thesis is a sociological analysis of funding for popular musicians and value, my research links closely with a few specific areas in popular music scholarship. These areas are: the politics of popular music and its relationship with the state in the UK, the effects of the digital shift on the structures in the music industries, changing practices of work for artist managers acting as intermediaries, and the changing shape of popular musicians’ careers. The following four sections will discuss each area in turn.

POPULAR MUSIC’S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE GOVERNMENT IN THE UK

This thesis considers musicians working in many genres underneath the broad term popular music, which may have had different relationships with the government historically. With this in mind, it is important to acknowledge the government’s relationship with popular music in the UK and regions of England.
At first, it might appear that popular music and government have always been antithetical in nature. Popular musicians have been known to sometimes voice opposition to political views or leaders, and the fear of censorship prevents artists and government from a harmonious existence. Despite this, in the UK, government has historically had a part to play in supporting the creation and existence of popular music, albeit in less direct ways than through a grant programme like Momentum.

During the period following World War II, important changes occurred that increased access to education for the UK’s young people. These included the 1944 Education Act, which provided free secondary education for all up to age 15, and the Robbins Report in 1963, which recommended expansion and funding of further and higher education for a greater diversity of people (Banks and Oakley, 2016: 44). One of the major forms of indirect subsidisation of popular musicians and their education came through the national and local government-funded art school system, resulting partly from the Robbins Report’s recommendations. In addition to national funding, England’s local governments, regional authorities and councils, supported a greater diversity of students to attend art schools through subsidising transport, housing and education costs and providing maintenance grants through Local Education Authorities. In the 1960s, there was “a genuine moment of social democratic progress,” where government subsidies for art school allowed “working-class people [to] enter worlds of society and work hitherto denied to them” (Banks and Oakley, 2016: 48). The subsidised art schools were seen as highly conducive to the creation of what would become some of the UK’s most famous musicians and bands (Frith and Horne, 1987) and as spaces which facilitated working-class social mobility (Banks and Oakley, 2016).

Frith and Horne’s book *Art into Pop* (1987) argues that art schools in the UK were particularly significant incubators for popular musicians and that the significance of the art school was seen in the ways that students learned art as a practice and how to *be artists* (Frith and Horne, 1987: 28). Students learned this from more than their fine art courses; they developed their creative capacities with the help of their fellow students and the freedom given to them to experiment (Banks and Oakley, 2016: 47; Frith and Horne, 1987: 84). Art school provided a
chance to pursue one’s creative interests without having to focus on a specific career pathway. This lack of pressure may have been far removed from some students’ working-class career prospects, had they not attended an art school. Considering it was widely accepted that the students attending art schools were drawn from across the economic strata of society, art schools potentially enabled processes of creative development and enhanced career prospects for students who would have otherwise been excluded from university or higher education courses (Banks and Oakley, 2016). It should be noted that, while “it’s also been widely assumed that the systematised provision of arts education and training has allowed a more socially-diverse population to obtain a career in creative industries,” the current graduates of arts programmes in the UK may struggle for employment (Banks and Oakley, 2016: 42).

The funding of educational opportunities was a significant way that the UK government indirectly supported burgeoning popular musicians, with Laing estimating that up to a third of punk musicians had been students, particularly at art schools (Laing, 1985 cited in Frith and Horne, 1987: 124). Frith and Horne listed at least 13 art schools across the UK where influential musicians from the 1970s studied (1987: 125). The city of Sheffield had one of these schools, and it serves of an example of a city where extensive funding was provided at the local level for services, despite the city undergoing a difficult post-industrial phase and the changes brought by losing major manufacturing industries. Two Sheffield bands, the Human League and Cabaret Voltaire, benefitted from a generously subsidised environment where transport was cheap, funding was available for arts programmes and higher education and housing was plentiful, although potentially in the form of squats in disused industrial buildings (Reynolds, 2009: 3327/14920). In this way, popular musicians were being supported by the government before there was an intentional policy intervention. In the 1980s, this changed when Sheffield council began to formalise its support into a cultural policy (Brown et al., 2000). By the late 1970s early 1980s, there were several bands from Sheffield that had become known and began to work with the city’s council on new infrastructure for musicians in Sheffield. These were ABC, Heaven 17, The Human League and Cabaret Voltaire (Brown et al., 2000: 440). Overall, Sheffield City Council supported the development of facilities, such as the recording studio Red Tape.
and music venue Leadmill, in the central part of the city, which they called the Cultural Industries Quarter. Sheffield also established the National Centre for Popular Music in 1999 with the hope of attracting tourists, but this closed a mere year later. While Sheffield’s strategy sought to attract any creative businesses to the newly established Cultural Quarter, music remained at the fore due to the sustained involvement of the city’s prominent musicians like Phil Oakey from the Human League (Brown et al., 2000: 440). Sheffield’s efforts to foster a creative environment were compared by Brown et al. (2000) to Manchester’s mostly organic growth of music and other cultural industries. Contrary to Sheffield council’s conscious support of a cultural policy, Manchester’s council largely left the music industries alone, listening instead to their requests for service improvements such as transport. What is important about the comparison of Manchester to Sheffield is that the music industry in Manchester was said to not want the government intervention that a defined cultural policy would entail (Brown et al., 2000: 442). Allowing such a laissez-faire relationship between the music industry and council did not hamper the industry’s growth but did create problems regarding venue licenses (ibid. 448). These types of conflicts – especially regarding licensing – between property developers and music companies persist today and can be seen in London as well as other cities. The ways that the industry resisted government involvement in Manchester are relevant given that Momentum marks a clear intervention into the music industry for emerging artists. Such a contentious view of government involvement in popular music can also historically be seen when focusing specifically on the rock genre.

In the early 1990s, a volume entitled *Rock and Popular Music: Politics, Policies, Institutions* included writing from a variety of music scholars considering how rock and the state were interacting in different countries. A section of the volume considered “governments’ wariness about including the rock industry (unlike the opera or the film industry) within national agendas for cultural or industrial policy” (Bennet et al., 1993: 9). Frith’s work points to the contradictory nature of rock whereby it is both conceived as emblematic of commercialism and the market, yet it has simultaneously maintained this image whilst being supported by the government through various means. Frith refers to the work of Street and Stanley who recognised that, at the time, local governments in the UK provided
such investment in rock through “recording studios, in venues, in concert promotion and in training schemes” (Bennet et al., 1993: 16). Frith’s chapter analyses the ways that local governments in the UK have subsidised rock in the past, arguing that the motivations are very much political and driven by two primary reasons:

First, municipal councils were by and large Labour councils. They were therefore concerned to develop alternative policies to Thatcherism but had to operate under increasingly tight political and financial constraints. Second, the pressing economic problem in the cities concerned was how to replace jobs being lost in the manufacturing industry, how to benefit from the growing service sector. (Frith, 1993: 16)

These concerns were similarly seen in the discussion above of Sheffield and its aims to replace lost jobs in manufacturing through creation of a development plan focused on creating a cultural quarter that would grow and attract businesses and jobs. The political environment in the UK today is very different, with the conservative government having put austerity measures in place following the 2008 global recession. These measures have led to decreased investment in local and regional infrastructure and the disbanding of nine Regional Development Agencies, which had been created by Labour in 1998 and were closed in 2012 by the conservative government. These agencies were established partly to offer and develop employment skills in regional areas across the UK.

Foremost within discussion of the state is Cloonan’s (2007) work on popular music and the state. Cloonan’s work is one of few pieces of scholarship which specifically considers the ways the government has supported popular musicians in the UK, particularly through employment support. Cloonan does not only consider rock in his research. Like Frith, Cloonan argues that popular music’s relationship with the state is one where musicians themselves may be oppositional to the state’s influence, due to concerns of censorship and political beliefs. Despite this, the music industries have become closer to government in the UK. Cloonan focuses on the New Deal for Musicians, an employment programme created in 1999 and aligned with the Labour government’s ‘welfare to work’ programme, the New Deal for Young People, but with a focus on musicians (2007: 103). This was called “the biggest direct government intervention in popular music witnessed thus far – costing in the region of £3 million per annum to administer” (Cloonan, 2007: 103).
The aim of the programme was to help unemployed musicians by providing UK-wide support in the form of either full-time education and training – typically undertaken as self-study – or a self-employment route that provided benefits while musicians attempted to establish as self-employed. This programme was said to help young musicians to achieve careers in the music industry by helping them access training and an industry contact (Cloonan, 2007: 105).

Interestingly, the NDfM was set up to help musicians sustain their careers in music, rather than moving them away from their creative work and into “routine jobs” (Cloonan, 2007: 104). However, it should not be ignored that the introduction of welfare to work programmes disrupted the previous status quo in the UK, whereby musicians who faced periods of no income or unemployment – as musicians continue to face – could sustain themselves, to an extent, with unemployment or welfare income without a time limit. Cloonan references Oasis and Pulp as examples of highly successful artists who had used welfare, or the ‘dole’, to sustain themselves. In the NDfM, the targeted age of musicians was 18-24, and it was best used by those who already had work experience in the industry or had a music qualification, excluding older musicians and those who were just starting out or did not study music. The programme ended in 2009, when the New Deal programme was changed to the Flexible New Deal and no longer considered the specific employment training or needs of musicians, leaving a gap in training for musicians facing unemployment.

**DIGITAL DISRUPTION AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE**

The impact of the shift to digitalisation on the recording industry has been one of disruption and slow acceptance by the industry. On the part of musicians and the populace, there has been quick acceptance of new technologies and sharing platforms. Today, we are decades on from the full integration of digital downloads and digitised music, but the music industries remain slow to adapt, leaving some space for innovative and adaptive musicians to develop their own infrastructures to bypass gatekeepers and access audiences directly. Despite this, the power imbalance remains tilted towards the recording industry’s powerful labels and
other companies, which still offer a final resting place for some of the most famous and financially lucrative artists due to their financial resources and advanced marketing machinery. In this section, I discuss the technological changes that have occurred and their effects within the structures of the music industries.

DEALING WITH UNCERTAINTY AND RISK

Cultural production possesses mechanisms and structural characteristics that have consequences for musicians, Momentum and public funding. Such mechanisms include building repertoire catalogues, acting as gatekeepers, buying out competition from independent labels, and offering restrictive options contracts to musicians. These are examined below. Gatekeepers are ‘intermediaries’ who choose from the large pool of artists often in a way that “serve[s] their own mixtures of motives” (Caves, 2000: 21).

In particular, the writing of Miège (1989) and Garnham (1990) opens up significant issues and unique risks within the process of cultural production that have implications for musicians studied in this project. Cultural production presents unique challenges not experienced in other industries, including the unpredictability of both the audience and the artist producing the cultural product. Miège and Garnham also look at the larger system of cultural production, where a pertinent concern is the instigation of the production process. Unlike other industries, supply and demand do not follow the traditional course where the existence of demand spurs the development of a product. Cultural production can instead be said to create demand, or “cultural needs”, as part of a production process (Miège, 1989: 23).

Furthermore, initial production costs (the ‘creative’ part) are higher than with non-cultural goods (Garnham, 1990: 160). Given this, some argue that public support for cultural goods is needed to ensure a “public good”, regardless of demand (Garnham, 1990: 160). Similarly, to the technology industry, for example, there is a consistent need for new and diverse goods (ibid.). Cultural goods pivot on being ‘exciting’, ‘new’ and ‘different’. Integral to this need for diverse products is a constant supply of new ‘talent’ to ensure that cultural products are not
homogenous. While demand for new ‘talent’ is high, the discussion of gatekeepers below will reveal why this does not ensure entry to the industries for individual artists.

The artist’s involvement in the cultural production process is important, yet Miège (1989) declares that it is misunderstood. One fallacy he pinpoints still persists: that of the artist as exalted creator separate from all industrial processes. This idea endangers the artist’s ability to receive fair compensation for what is now understood as creative labour. Artists and musicians are part of a chain of production:

a. Artistic production constitutes the conception phase;
b. Workers other than artists participate in production;
c. And there is a pool of talent with labour less structured than other industries, which relies on royalties and rights, tying the artist to the producer (Miège, 1989: 45).

Regarding artistic production as part of cultural production, Miège suggests that the artist possesses some agency to decide the production process, even if this is compromised later on in the process. In the case of musicians, such a role means control over song writing and perhaps production sound. Additionally, drawing from ‘c’, this constant pool of talent increases competition among musicians to get noticed or secure a record deal (and even to keep one). The royalties and rights also factor into restrictive options contracts, which allow labels to receive income from musicians’ royalties and copyright.

STRUCTURAL MECHANISMS IN CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

The structural features of the music industries and the bearing these have on musicians’ work is demonstrated in the work of Miège (1989), Garnham (1990) and Caves (2000). In research on cultural work and cultural policy, there is literature that shows awareness of funding whilst explicitly considering the value it could have to popular musicians and other actors. Garnham (1990) explained that the music industries’ hierarchies and structural features put musicians at a disadvantage.
The work of Richard E. Caves (2000), a cultural economist, looks broadly at the unique structure and mechanisms within the cultural industries. Caves' analysis of the cultural industries helps explain why Miège considers the industries to have an upper hand over the artist, whose labour is used and exploited without being able to defend his/her interests (1989: 46). Caves says the fact that artists are more invested and care more about their product changes how production is structured. While cultural products benefit from the artistic stamp, the artist’s investment means the resultant product is highly unpredictable. The level that musicians are invested in their musical product may influence their desire to pursue Momentum funding and the ways they value it. The funding can assist an artist with recording, self-production and self-releasing, if they are seeking the utmost autonomy over their work.

The unpredictable reception of cultural goods continues to elude the cultural producers, despite an increase in market testing (Miège, 1989: 44). According to Garnham, “some analysts would claim that cultural goods are pure positional goods, their use-value being as markers of social and individual difference,” but the dominant feature is unpredictable reception (Caves, 2000; Garnham, 1990: 161). Bourdieu establishes that artists are positioned within a “space of possibles,” where each new movement shifts the plane of possibles, making it hard to predict what artists will produce and impossible to anticipate reception (1992: 30).

According to Garnham (1990) and Miège (1989), another means of countering unpredictable audience reception for record labels is the “catalogue”. This lets the label cover more ground since no one can predict which record in which genre will be successful. The profit is even calculated based on a catalogue and not a single track or record, giving record companies incentive to increase output rather than ensure ‘authenticity’ is maintained (Miège, 1989: 43). Another tactic is forming a media conglomerate in order to spread the risk of unsuccessful ventures (Garnham, 1990: 163).

Possessing a catalogue of artists allows labels to better manage their risk than artists, though they remain unable to predict how audiences will respond. Being a major gatekeeper for musicians trying to enter the market, however, they have the ability to select artists who have already made themselves into a tidy,
marketable package by building their fan base through social media and self-managed tours. Holding onto their often-extensive catalogues of already successful musicians, they can also re-release records or shift resources to proven acts. Bands hoping to draw the attention of a record company may be working other jobs to finance the upfront costs while they wait for a gatekeeper’s approval, costing a courting label nothing (Caves, 2000: 35). Repertoire catalogues are a way for labels to back the safe bets, maintain control over musicians, and guarantee an income. Also, owning the copyright to a multitude of artists’ music allows labels to release huge volumes of work, a process that counteracts the unpredictability of the audience (Negus, 1992: 145). This practice still exists today.

Funding for musicians offers possible relief for musicians working other jobs by allowing them to focus on music production for a period of time. However, the expectations that music companies have for musicians to already have recorded a record before they are willing to invest creates barriers to signing deals for early career artists. Technological changes and digitalisation have made it easier to make and distribute music, but this has, in turn, allowed labels to expect more work up front from early artists, thus raising the threshold of requirements for entry to a contract. On top of that, Negus observed, even back in 1992, that being dropped by a major label might make it harder for an artist to be signed to any label in the future and that the artist or their releases could be perceived as failures (138). Contracts and other recording industry mechanisms like repertoire catalogues keep musicians in a position of minimal bargaining power. Given that Momentum provides a one-time direct grant to musicians with no repayment requirement (unlike contracts), it offers an interesting alternative for musicians and raises questions about how not being required to repay an investment might affect their careers.

The technological shifts to digital in the music industries have helped solidify major labels’ dominance and pushout independents. Rogers posits that the digital shift has given major labels even more incentive to buy out catalogue rights because digital files have made monetising such catalogues – through licencing, re-masters, re-mixes, and re-releases – cheaper and easier (2013: 134). Rogers’
interviews with music industry personnel reflect the increasing rarity of larger indie labels not controlled, in some part, by the major labels. Formerly independent labels have been taken over and subsumed as subsidiaries of major labels. Rogers attributes this to independent labels taking the main hit from decreased CD sales post-digitalisation – thus facing large decreases in income – as they lack the secured success of repertoire catalogues which the majors can fall back on. Although this situation now means that major labels own indie labels covering niche markets, Rogers (2013) claims that majors ensure their dominance by investing in their trusted catalogues rather than on new acts who might require ‘long cycle’ production investment. This idea of major labels holding control over resources for investment, including over indie markets, but choosing not to invest, is a powerful one regarding the changing nature of the music industries. If correct, such a power imbalance and lack of willingness to support early, risky musicians from the major labels would restrict opportunities, particularly for early musicians.

The increased ease of access for musicians to reach fans and ability to self-promote using social media is another possible reason that majors may be less willing to invest in new acts. Often the remit of artist and repertoire (‘A&R’) departments in labels, talent recruitment for labels has always been a risk-laden task. If musicians can market test themselves and develop loyal fan bases prior to being scouted, the label has a much stronger bet signing them. In Rogers’ interview with Damien Rice’s manager, Ben Barrett, she describes how a promotion plan was used to prove to Warner Music that Rice was a safe bet and had already been successful (2013: 150). Her story conveys how musicians and managers do the work of promotion themselves, specifically in an attempt to entice a label.

Momentum seeks to fill this apparent gap of investment in new acts possibly created by the decline of independent labels and musicians’ enhanced ability and willingness to do the digital work themselves. However, the relationship between Momentum and industries, and Momentum and musicians, needs to be explored. This research looked to determine if and how the processes in the music industries of musician recruitment and development have changed since digitalisation and to what extent Momentum has taken on this role.
This project sought to determine to what extent Momentum is a response to or result of changes in the popular music industries and musicians’ roles. Gatekeepers do remain in the assessment process to award the funding, but there are generally fewer requirements for artists in receipt of awards and no earmarking of musicians’ future income through recoupment.

**POWER IN THE MUSIC INDUSTRIES**

It appears that, with both the production process and audience reception being highly unpredictable, the cultural industries have various mechanisms in place to help limit access for would-be artists and to control the risk of unpredictable products and reception. I now turn to examine the industry mechanisms in more detail.

First encountered is the gatekeeping function. One of the major gatekeeping issues encountered by musicians is the ‘option’ structure of most contracts (Caves, 2000). Options contracts give significantly more power to the labels because they hold the exclusive rights to release musicians’ music. The traditional contract model has a new artist receive an advance for a first record to cover costs associated with production, such as studio time. Artists do not make any income until the advance is paid back through revenue like royalties, sometimes from the second record if the first did not earn enough (ibid.: 63). Beyond this, labels also sometimes put “cheats” into contracts that falsely deflate income for bands by charging a packaging fee and reducing record shipment numbers by fake donated copies (ibid.: 62). Options contracts can allow labels to delay or even withhold a release if they disapprove of the finished product. Labels can also “lose interest” as a contract nears expiration and limit promotional activity for a forthcoming record (ibid.: 64). At each stage, musicians lack the bargaining power needed to overcome the restrictions of the option contract, and this is particularly true for less established musicians who do not possess the leverage of existing record sales or charted success.
An underexplored area of research in popular music concerns artist managers and their intermediary capacity, as well as the growing role of managers in developing artists. The concept of cultural intermediation and cultural intermediaries provides a useful framework for analysing the value created in the practices of artist managers. These will be discussed in Chapter 6 on artist managers involved in the Momentum process.

The term ‘cultural intermediaries’ was developed by Pierre Bourdieu in Distinction, which examined social survey data from France (1984). Bourdieu saw cultural intermediaries as an extension of the growth of the ‘new petite bourgeoisie’, a new subsect within France’s social classes, which came to hold specific occupations involved in the legitimation processes of symbolic goods, such as art and music (1984: 359). Bourdieu’s definition also included those bourgeoisie who lacked educational capital but wished to maintain their dominant class position. His definition describes cultural intermediaries as these two types of workers who are also involved in work where they can shape symbolic goods to particular tastes and make them legitimate (Bourdieu, 1984: 359). The ways that artist managers working with musicians in Momentum might be engaged in shaping musicians’ projects and their music towards a particular taste responds to research questions about changes in the music industries.

While the concept of cultural intermediaries originates with Bourdieu, there has been an extension of the concept in the work of Smith Maguire and Matthews (2010; 2014), Negus (2002) and McFall (2014), among others. Recent work has specifically examined artist managers in the music industries as cultural intermediaries (Hracs, 2015; Lizé, 2016). Current research on cultural intermediaries often derives from economic sociology, political economic or cultural economic perspectives, and Mathews and Smith Maguire fit within this. In the Cultural Intermediaries Reader (2014), they adapt Bourdieu’s definition of cultural intermediaries into two parts. Firstly, they accept that cultural intermediaries are “market actors who construct value by mediating how goods […] are perceived and engaged with by others” (Mathews and Smith Maguire, 2014: 2). They claim that generating value and transmitting that value to others are
not enough to define a separate category of worker as a ‘cultural intermediary’. Significant to artist managers in my study, they further argue that the second aspect that makes one a cultural intermediary is a professionalisation and recognition of expertise and value within one’s field (ibid.). As I am seeking a nuanced approach to value in my research, their understanding of the role of cultural intermediaries is particularly helpful because it incorporates both processes of value generation and the recognised expertise required.

Two critiques of the concept of cultural intermediaries arise from the work of Hesmondhalgh (2006) and Negus (2002). Negus finds the definition from Bourdieu too restrictive, discounting some actors who are involved in mediation within the production process, such as accountants (2002: 6). Hesmondhalgh, contrarily, takes the position that applying the term broadly to an occupational designation and social class position overly inflates the meaning, and steps beyond Bourdieu’s definition (2006: 227). This thesis takes the position that the concept can be applied to many different roles, and the framework for considering intermediaries is more akin to the understanding of McFall (2014). Indeed, when studying artist managers within the popular music ecosystem that emerging musicians operate within, McFall’s claim that the cultural intermediary should not be considered a single link but rather as a multi-faceted set of relations between production and consumption seems clear in the case of Momentum. The actors involved in the creation of value, including musicians and the workers supporting them engaging in intermediation, are part of a web of actors, where mediation is dispersed in a network (McFall, 2014: 49).

Recently, two scholars have published empirical work on cultural intermediaries and the roles of artist managers from Toronto, Canada (Hracs, 2015) and France (Lizé, 2016). The roles of artist managers in England and the UK remains unexplored, but, despite writing from different geographic locations, both scholars introduce analyses of the ways artist managers are involved in the work of emerging popular musicians as intermediaries. Hracs observed, through interviews with DIY musicians, that even with the more entrepreneurial roles of musicians due to digitalisation, independent musicians were taking on artist managers (2015: 470). Lizé’s work examines three types of ‘interventions’ made
by artist managers, agents and *tourneurs* in artists’ careers. For this research, the acknowledgement of artist managers’ involvement in a variety of intermediation tasks, including artist development, aligns with the actions of managers in Momentum. Neither study, however, explores the ways that funding might interact with the processes of value creation.

**POPULAR MUSICIANS AND THEIR CAREERS**

The lack of a clear path to a career as a full-time musician for most popular musicians calls into question how ‘success’ can ever be defined. Many musicians remain part-time and must cover the costs of their musical activities with one or two jobs. The financial implications of popular music being so difficult to sustain a reasonable and stable living within suggest that economic barriers could be issues for many musicians. Momentum funding, therefore, not only serves as a means of financial assistance for artists wishing to complete projects to further their careers, it also serves as a catalyst for a sustained income for those musicians. This is one of the questions left open by the existing literature which my research will address through interviews with artist managers and funded musicians.

**MUSICIANS AND THEIR CAREERS**

As I have laid out above, the ways the music industries are structured impact upon the working conditions for musicians and those working with them. I now more specifically consider these conditions in respect of musicians’ careers. Jones (2012) discusses musicians and work by examining the ways that musicians are linked to the businesses in the music industry. Jones argues that musicians become wrapped up in an industrial process for three main reasons. The first is that the focus is on successfully entering the market with a musical product. The second is that particular processes of this market entry become routinised. Thirdly, despite the unusual contractual set up between musicians and companies providing investment, where musicians are not employees, these investors seek to control their investments (i.e. the musicians and their symbolic product – the
music) (Jones, 2012: 5). Jones’ work is very critical of the structures of the music industries that lead musicians into such a situation where they must work with companies that will inevitably try to control them:

The reality is that working within an industrial system means working through a system you do not control. In attempting to assert control, the musician need not always lose the struggle, but the need for such a struggle is inescapable. (Jones, 2012: 62)

What is important, however, is that, while Jones is resolute that musicians must work with companies, he is not determined that this arrangement should always be a negative one for the musicians involved.

As discussed above, musicians’ working practices have been impacted by technological change. Due to the increased amount of work musicians undertake to build their careers and sustain their fanbases, research has begun to consider whether and how musicians might be working in entrepreneurial ways. The work of Coulson (2012) drew from interviews with musicians in North East England, questioning them on whether they considered themselves to be entrepreneurs. She found that musicians acted in ways synonymous with entrepreneurs but were hesitant to adopt that self-definition. The musicians in her study engaged in networks and skills development in ways that could be entrepreneurial, yet they associated themselves more with collective working and groups than the individualistic ideals of the entrepreneur. Morris’ (2013) work draws upon a single musicians’ career, using independent English musician Imogen Heap as an example of an artist who involves her fans heavily in her work and undertakes extensive work communicating with fans. Heap is not the only artist doing this work. Amanda Palmer, an American artist, is also cited for not only engaging heavily with fans online using social media platforms like Twitter, since she also derives her income from fans in novel ways by selling her personal belongings and by setting up a crowdfunding campaign (Powers, 2015). Palmer engages in considerable work to sustain herself as a musician, showing the amount of work musicians are willing to put in to maintain connections with their fans. Both Palmer and Heap are independent musicians, who are proud to work outside of the major label infrastructures. However, as they lack immense resources, they must
undertake greater levels of fan engagement to maintain their careers. I will now discuss ideas of success in popular music that have informed my research.

SUCCESS

Assessing and understanding ‘success’ is important for this study in two ways. The first is in the ways that Momentum funding, as a publicly funded programme, will be assessed as successful or not. The second, which is addressed in the literature, is how popular musicians and their careers might be defined as ‘successful.’ I draw from two separate areas of popular music research by considering Zwaan’s (2009) and Smith’s (Smith, 2013; Teague and Smith, 2015) differing definitions. Zwaan’s work is an analysis of empirical research on emerging popular musicians in the Netherlands and draws from a career psychology framework. His definition separates objective and subjective forms of success. Objective success was defined as career success that can be outwardly observed and acknowledged, such as record sales and benefit to a label (Zwaan, 2009: 11). Subjective success was instead understood as the “individual’s feelings of accomplishment and satisfaction with one’s career” and “intrinsic indicators” (ibid.). Zwaan’s framing of success is limited by his interviews, as they were all artist and repertoire executives for record labels, which led to a measure of success against record label benefit.

Smith’s work in popular music education calls for a better understanding of success, and an adaptation of music education curriculum to reflect the diverse definitions in today’s music economy. He considers career success to be “multi dimensional” (10). Combining Zwaan’s twofold definition of success, in relation to emerging musicians, with Smith’s call for greater breadth of definition creates the framework for analysing the value of Momentum funding within the funded musicians’ careers. In popular music studies, there remains a large gap in knowledge about how to define success, and while Smith and Zwaan move us closer, the changing field of cultural production and practices of cultural work create issues. This research, therefore, intends to grapple with the difficulty in defining success through value in the case of the Momentum funding.
There is one recent study drawn from the Australian music context that considers the interplay between the idea of success, funding and independent popular musicians. Drawing from focus groups conducted in Australia, the researchers identified the traditional and contemporary ‘markers of success’ that demonstrated when a musician was successful (Hughes et al., 2013). They argued that the traditional markers – recording sales, radio plays, musical content making it onto the top music charts, and being on a most-played chart – were no longer as relevant and not the only metrics of success. They further claimed that more contemporary markers of success would need to include the understanding that many artists start off or persist – either out of choice or necessity – in a model of do-it-yourself work. This chimes with the ways that musicians take on increasing amounts of work themselves. Indeed, early career musicians often have no choice but to do it all, as they have no money or success to attract a manager or other workers. Hughes et al. considers this “success breeding success,” where, in order to get something that will help a musician progress and which might make them more successful, they need to have a certain amount of success already (2013: 73). They use the example of government grants for musicians, which presuppose a certain amount of acclaim already and are not, therefore, available to brand new musicians (Hughes et al., 2013). This was a trend across much of the research in Section 2.3, where there persists a lack of available funding or support for the earliest career musicians who may have no idea how to get started and lack the funds to begin.

Research on the cultural production of popular music presents clear relevance to this thesis in two key ways. Firstly, one of the major areas of focus for popular music research in recent years – and one of the most valuable contributions to this research – has been the ways developments in digital technology have impacted the practices of workers, including musicians, in the industries. A second area which speaks to the thesis is research around cultural intermediaries in cultural work and within the music industries. The next section explores the key work on cultural workers after first explaining the cultural industries approach, which is the context within much cultural work research should be understood.
2.4 CULTURAL WORK IN CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

Research into cultural work has grown alongside and sometimes out of cultural studies or creative industries research. This relationship is why I have considered relevant scholarly work on the cultural industries under the classification of cultural work. Cultural work literature has focused on different cultural worker roles and broad issues faced by workers seeking success in the cultural industries. Such issues include precarity and self-exploitation, but also the search for autonomy and pursuit of ‘good work’. Mark Banks is one of the key writers on cultural work and, in a summary of his recent book *Creative Justice*, he defines cultural work in relation to the cultural industries:

By cultural work I tend to mean activities of artistic, creative or aesthetic production that take place in the contexts of the cultural industries. This mainly includes the labour of artists, designers, musicians, authors etc. (Banks, 2017b: 7).

I broadly accept in this research that cultural workers are those within cultural industries and that the popular music ecosystem forms part of the cultural industries. In order to discuss popular musicians as workers, I will first explain the definition of the cultural industries and introduce the UK policy context of the ‘creative industries’, which has been significant to the ways cultural and creative workers are understood.

ORIGINS OF A CULTURAL INDUSTRY

It is important to establish the current cultural policy climate within which Momentum exists. To do so, the history of UK cultural policy is briefly traced through from the origination of the term ‘culture industry’ to ‘cultural industries’ and, finally, to today’s neoliberal ‘creative industries’ policies, which came to the fore during New Labour’s government in the 1990s. These policies still continue today, with the UK government in March 2018 creating the Creative Industries Sector Deal, where “more than £150 million will be jointly invested by government
and industry to help the country’s world-leading cultural and creative businesses thrive” (UK Government, 2018). The major distributor of government funding for research in the arts in England is the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), which also launched the Creative Industries Clusters Programme in 2017, as part of the government’s sector deal and the Industrial Strategy Fund. This correlation of arts research funded by the AHRC with the creative industries, demonstrates the ongoing emphasis by UK government policies on the cultural sector’s economic and industrial value.

Four decades before the association of culture and industry became part of British cultural policy discourses, Adorno and Horkheimer, part of the influential Frankfurt School, wrote about their concept of the ‘Culture Industry.’ They described the notion of the ‘culture industry’ in their 1944 book the Dialectic of Enlightenment, where they critiqued the mass production of culture by arguing it only produces commodities and subjugates its audience. They derogatorily termed this the ‘Culture Industry’. Modern scholars are highly critical of this pessimistic view. Toynbee (2000) suggests that, for Adorno and Horkheimer, ‘Culture Industry’ means there is no market in the traditional way because commodities are pre-selected and then imposed on the public, thereby removing the individual’s control. Toynbee questions this idea and suggests that it is possible for producers and consumers to connect in the market in less controlled ways, and that a certain institutional autonomy exists.

Hesmondhalgh (2002) focuses on the initial concept’s limitations and how the French sociologists, particularly Miège, reshaped the notion into the plural culture industries or industries culturelles, which then became the ‘cultural industries’ in current discussions. Hesmondhalgh explains the primary issues the French sociologists took with Adorno and Horkheimer’s original concept:

1) The singular ‘industry’ implied all areas of cultural production were one thing with the same rules.
2) In contrast, they saw the cultural industries as complex.
3) They disliked the nostalgic romanticism for pre-industrial art, saying the industrialisation and easy commodification actually allowed for innovation, as Walter Benjamin believed.
4) The cultural industries were not fully taken over by capitalism and there were places of resistance. (Hesmondhalgh, 2002: 16)
Thus, the plurality of cultural industries reflects the reframing of the concept to both highlight the distinctive features of such industries and to reintroduce the potential for autonomy and resistance to a top-down capitalist domination of popular culture.

**CULTURAL POLICY ADOPTS THE INDUSTRIES APPROACH**

In the 1980s, the first attempts to create a definition and framework for the cultural industries started with UNESCO, and, in the UK, the idea of formal policy intervention into the cultural sector – beyond the funding for the arts that already existed – emerged through local policy documents produced by the Greater London Council (GLC), with whom Nicholas Garnham was significantly involved, and Sheffield’s cultural policies (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt, 2005: 4). The French Ministry of Culture was also early to the cultural industries policy table, creating specific policies mainly for cinema and film that preserved national identity (ibid.). It would appear that, through this focus on ‘cultural industries’, the 1980s marked an increase in state interventions in the media and cultural sectors for Britain and France.

Beginning in the late 1990s, a political shift from ‘cultural’ to ‘creative’ industries policies occurred in the UK. Important to this shift was the Creative Industries Mapping Document published by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in 1998 that spelled out the cultural sector areas included in the term ‘creative industries.’ Creative industries were: “Those activities which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have the potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (From the 1998 DCMS document cited in Flew, 2002: 3). The document emphasised individual creativity, moving away from culture as a public good towards culture as individual creation.

Garnham (2005) and Hesmondhalgh and Pratt (2005) see the shift to creative industries as deriving from a larger political shift towards neoliberal policies. Garnham was an early supporter of cultural industries policies but
critiqued creative industries policies. Like Hesmondhalgh and Pratt, Garnham argues that the creative industries policies are focused on economics and reframe culture in business terms. In this view, Momentum would perhaps be more valued by the UK government for its economic return from increased export opportunities than promoting the ‘excellence’ in music.

There remains a debate about definition, which Garnham argues has led to the inclusion of industries that inflate the reported economic value of the creative industries (2005). The term ‘creative industries’ is used partly to delimit the most commercially profitable areas of the cultural sector, like music and games, in order to further policies that invest in economically profitable sectors. The Momentum music fund, as a publicly supported arts fund for popular music, would appear to fit well into the UK government’s sustained interest in profitable areas of the cultural sector. In this section, I considered work on the policy level regarding cultural and creative industries policies, which relate to the context Momentum was founded and exists within. Next, I discuss the micro level of the cultural industries to discuss literature on the experiences of individual cultural workers, contributing to the understanding of popular musicians as workers.

PURSUING ‘GOOD WORK’ IN THE CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

Despite the growth of interest in the cultural and creative industries after the 1998 government mapping document and ‘Cool Britannia’ policies of the Labour government in the 1990s, policymakers gave little thought to what work in the cultural industries was like. In 2007, Banks wrote in The Politics of Cultural Work that, “until recently, academics had relatively little to say about cultural work” (4). At the time, Banks saw creative economy literature as the main source of writing on cultural work and cultural workers. This has shifted greatly in recent years, with a large body of work on the working conditions of cultural workers emerging as its own field. In this section, I discuss the research that examines cultural workers and the emerging concerns which are relevant to research considering popular musicians as workers. Earlier in the chapter, I discussed literature that specifically considers musicians and popular musicians as cultural workers. Next, I focus on
key themes in cultural work research, including ideas of ‘good work’ and inequality in cultural work.

When Banks wrote about a theory of cultural work in 2007, he was attempting to provide a comprehensive summary of labour theories and cultural work, particularly in relation to empirical studies of workers. In recent years, the number of scholars studying cultural work has increased, to the point that distinct streams of work have emerged which explore the precariousness of work (Gill and Pratt, 2008; Ross, 2008) and those which focus on inequality, inclusion and diversity in cultural work (Banks and Milestone, 2011; Bull and Scharff, 2017; Malik, 2013; O’Brien et al., 2016; Saha, 2017; Scharff, 2015; Taylor and O’Brien, 2017). Banks’ 2017 follow up work Creative Justice attempts to move forward from theorising cultural work to a sort of action plan based on the research and empirical data amassed in previous years.

The reason it is important to look at work and, in my research, to consider the musicians as workers is because their work (and that of those around them) is a potential site of value creation and an avenue for exploring and understanding the other facets of value beyond the economic value created. Banks critiques a ‘creative economy’ approach to value and culture, which is linked with the creative industries policy agenda explained above, as limiting the understanding of value. That approach, Banks argues, also ignores the tensions that are implicit within the cultural value and economic value relationship. The reason these tensions are ignored is:

Because such efforts not only serve to misrepresent the foundational dynamic of the relationships between culture and economy, and narrow the debate about value, they tend also to exfiltrate the political and cultural questions that must necessarily arise in the context of any cultural industry evaluation. (Banks, 2014b: para. 5)

Banks goes onto explain that work has been the focal point of tensions between culture and economy. He argues that value can be understood in relation to the work process and we should be considering the work within the production process of culture as a potential site of value creation, and not just the consumption or economic value (Banks, 2014a). In terms of popular musicians, I consider their labour and the ways they value funding in furthering their work as a
site to explore the different tensions. For Bourdieu, as discussed above, these tensions might be represented through the autonomous and heteronomous hierarchical principles. Banks sees cultural work as the “locus” of the tensions between two types of value: economy and culture. In the case study of Momentum, which brings public funding together with commercial potential and the market, these tensions will be clearly seen. However, my research seeks a more nuanced and multi-dimensional understanding of these tensions, and I aim to achieve this through the inclusion of perspectives of value from musicians, their managers, and the funders.

The potential of ‘good work’ in cultural and creative industries is raised in the work of Hesmondhalgh and Banks (Banks, 2007, 2017a; Banks and Hesmondhalgh, 2009; Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011). They explore the potential freedoms creative work might be seen or expected to provide in the normative concept of ‘good work’:

First, creative labour has such great potential as ‘good work’, because of its orientation, at least in principle, towards the production of goods that are often primarily aimed at pleasing, informing and enlightening audiences, and in some cases to the goals of social justice and equity. In this respect, the production of art, culture and knowledge can be understood to offer spheres of relative autonomy from markets, from state power and from religious imperatives. (Banks and Hesmondhalgh, 2009: 419)

The significance of defining ‘good work’ for this thesis is not in the creation of a definition, but rather in understanding the ways that conceiving ‘good work’ speaks to the values and rewards perceived by popular musicians and other workers in popular music. Some of those rewards can come in the form of increased personal, creative and professional autonomy.

INEQUALITY IN CULTURAL WORK

Bourdieu’s work discussed above presents a prominent feature of cultural production relevant to this project: culture’s relationship to power and its association with social inequality. The concerns of inequality and diversity are significant to the Momentum case for the following reasons. Firstly, the Momentum
fund monitored ‘diversity’ and incorporated efforts to improve the diversity of funded artists, which raised the research question of whether Momentum is intended to redress barriers to music-making and how. Secondly, diversity is considered in the funding assessment process – as well as consideration of who is making funding decisions – and is linked to the ways that funders ACE and PRSF value the funding. This connects to the primary research question about the possible dimensions of value public funding for popular music can create. In this thesis I recognise the broad and vague nature of the term ‘diversity,’ and I have therefore investigated how the values are mobilised in practice without specifying a particular definition.

Along with discussions of autonomy and motivation, research into cultural work has recently turned increasingly towards questions of equality, inclusion and diversity within the cultural industries as a whole and in individual sectors, including music. Cultural work literature has been a major site of exploration regarding inequality and diversity in work in the last few years. There has been a vast array of studies, many of which are from 2014 and later, on the issues of inequality within the cultural workforce and cultural production process.

One of the scholars whose ideas are influential to the consideration of inequality in this research is Acker, who coined the term ‘inequality regimes’ in 2006. Acker writes from an organisational intersectional feminist approach.

Acker’s work brings together different individual characteristics in her analysis, rather than focusing on only class or race. Her research explores the ways inequalities are produced through work and draws from empirical research within organisations. In this thesis, I adopt Acker’s idea of the ‘ideal worker’, which is the type of worker, be it a white man or immigrant woman, that an assessor envisions for a specific role. The ideal worker is potentially enacted in the hiring process by assessors. I will consider how the ideal applicant, or ideal popular musician, might be constructed in the Momentum funding process.

Some of the current discussion on inequality occurring in cultural work literature examines talent (Eikhof and Warhurst, 2013; O’Brien et al., 2016) and is driven by a critique of the assertion that work in the cultural industries is meritocratic. In a meritocracy, the most talented, skilled and hard-working will
naturally rise to the top and be recognised. Recent research has discovered that those working in cultural fields, particularly those in the most privileged positions, often subscribe to the meritocratic ideology and perpetuate it through their own rhetoric and actions (Taylor and O’Brien, 2017). Taylor and O’Brien argue that the acceptance and perpetuation of this concept of meritocratic systems by cultural workers themselves hinders the potential for change within the cultural sphere, where the fallacies of the meritocratic idea should be acknowledged. Taylor and O’Brien also found, perhaps unsurprisingly, that those with less resources and the least rewards for their work were the most cognizant of structural inequalities in the cultural industries (2017).

Concepts of talent remain inextricably tied to ideas of meritocracy and success in cultural work. Within the UK cultural industries, McRobbie traced the proposed goal of supporting talent as a policy aim to an April 2001 UK government Green Paper:

The current Green Paper seeks instead to resurrect a traditional notion of tapping into talent. The source of such talent is of course ‘the individual’ who, if provided with the right kind of support, can then be best left alone to his or her own devices to explore personal creativity unhindered by bureaucracy and red tape. (McRobbie, 2003: no page number)

For McRobbie, talent is not only individualising, but undermines the collective work and unionisation that can protect cultural workers and help level the field for progression and reward. Talent is an important concept when determining who can and should be a cultural worker and is commonly linked to the idea of individual creativity. Both concepts have been integral to individualised conceptions of cultural workers, but their associations with cultural workers do not come without issue, as failure becomes an individual’s problem and not emblematic of greater systemic inequalities. Such passing of blame or responsibility for failure has consequences for those individuals who come to the cultural industries with less social, cultural and economic capital (Bourdieu, 1984). The organisations within the cultural industries – where or with whom individuals work – create their own hierarchies, gatekeepers, and sets of cultural values, which can reinforce inequalities. Joan Acker terms these ‘inequality regimes’, which are defined as:
[I]nterrelated practices, processes, actions, and meanings that result in and maintain class, gender, and racial inequalities within particular organizations. (2006: 443)

Subscribing to the notion of talent might serve as a practice that maintains inequalities across multiple areas, including class, gender and ethnicity. I investigated this idea through my observations of the Momentum process and interviews with PRSF staff, seeking to determine to what extent emphasis on talent might lead Momentum’s assessors to maintain inequalities within the music industries.

Talent has rarely been theorised in relation to cultural work or within the cultural industries. The evidence Banks draws from includes the work of Burke and MacManus (2009) who interviewed tutors and observed interviews with applicants to art and design departments in the UK. In keeping with the individualisation of cultural workers, both works argue that focusing on whether the individual is thought to have – or not have – talent, as well as their appearance and whether they ‘fit’ the ideal candidate, distracts from the ways that talent is constructed and shaped within society.

According to Banks, when discussing ‘talent’, “What is significant here is that social factors are often imagined to play no significant role in the definition, cultivation or recognition of what is still presumed to be inborn or pre-existing talent” (2017a: 69). He continues, “If talent is a ‘gift’, then it is one that tends to be socially inherited and institutionally made” (ibid.). In a meritocratic view, where it is believed that the most talented will inevitably rise to the top, talent is the mechanism through which inequality is excused and explained. In public funding, emphasising talent could hinder other aims that public funding might have of tackling inequalities.

Other scholars considering inequality, but within organisations, are Eikhof and Warhurst (Eikhof and Warhurst, 2013; Eikhof, 2017), who argue that diversity is an outcome or product of particular decisions made about individuals in the hiring or admissions process in the cultural sector. Eikhof’s work draws on previous research and is not able to test this theory through direct empirical work, but I have adapted her framework for analysis of Momentum’s funding and
assessment process. I have done this by considering the three elements of the
decision process she outlined in relation to Momentum’s process and adjusting
them to the specifics of the fund. These are decision points, individuals as subjects
of decisions, and the context of decision-makers (Eikhof, 2017: 293). I then
expanded consideration to include four elements of decision-making, seen in
Table 5.1 in Chapter 5, which include resources for decision-makers, resources for
individuals being assessed, objects of assessment, and discourses of decision-
making. I use the Momentum case to both test the application and strength of
Eikhof’s assumption and to understand one element of value creation within
Momentum: the relationship between unequal representation in funding
programmes of those receiving funding and those making the funding decisions.

There has been a call and response to combine analyses of inequality in
the production processes with the analysis of the consumption side and cultural
representations in the cultural industries (O’Brien et al., 2017; O’Brien and Oakley,
2014; Saha, 2017). As this thesis takes the site of production as its focus, this
work is less relevant, but the recent discussion of the role of ACE funding in British
Asian Theatre by Saha has informed the approach to analysing diversity in the
Momentum programme. Saha discusses the ways ACE’s organisational
expectations for funded organisations to create diversity in audiences actually
reinforces difference and stereotypes in the content produced by the British Asian
community (2017: 312). Saha’s critique that the response to much of ACE’s
diversity requirements becomes a matter of bureaucratic check boxes is important
when considering the aims of ACE and the execution of diversity policies within
Momentum funding in Chapters 4 and 5.

One of the most active researchers currently discussing inequality and
cultural work has been O’Brien. In several recent studies, O’Brien, whilst working
with other scholars, has aimed to expose persisting issues of inequality within the
cultural industries workforce (O’Brien and Oakley, 2014; O’Brien et al., 2016;
Taylor and O’Brien, 2017). These studies have taken the form of a review of
existing studies conducted as part of the AHRC’s Cultural Value Project (CVP), a
quantitative analysis of diversity data from the British Labour Force Survey (LFS)
2014 of the UK cultural sector and an analysis of a web survey of creative worker
attitudes, respectively. The key arguments of Taylor and O'Brien (2017) are that while the cultural industries have a persisting meritocratic myth, those most inclined to buy into the myth are those positioned to reap the most rewards, and those least likely to receive rewards are most aware of structural inequalities.

A few weaknesses exist with the approaches taken in the above research when considering popular music and public funding. Firstly, in the LFS analysis of the class, gender, race, ethnicity and pay across the cultural sectors, all workers in the popular music industry, or group of industries (Williamson and Cloonan 2007), are considered in one aggregate group as ‘music, performing and visual arts’ (O'Brien et al., 2016). Like many cultural sectors, however, there is a sizable difference in the working structures and security between different types of roles – indeed, visual artists may have little in common with popular musicians. In popular music, many of the workers are self-employed or work for very small companies. The labour survey may not even capture these individuals, much less account for the difference between the full-time salaried workers in larger music businesses and the part time label worker, the freelance sound designer, or the self-employed musician. Grouping all music industries workers together risks either ignoring important workers in that classification or losing the complexity and variation within the roles. Genre is also ignored, which, in turn, groups classical and jazz music ecosystems with the popular music genres. The lack of nuance and complexity are a concern. Therefore, my research seeks to capture the variations of experiences and valuing of public funding within the case of Momentum-funded musicians.

2.5 CULTURAL VALUE AND CULTURAL PRODUCTION

At the time that Momentum was founded in 2013, and as this research began in 2014, the AHRC were conducting a large-scale project which provided 72 awards to scholars to either undertake research, produce a critical review, or conduct a workshop with practitioners and specialised academics. This was the CVP, running from 2012 to 2016, when the report Understanding the Value of Arts and Culture was published. The CVP’s desire was twofold: 1) “to identify the various components of cultural value across a variety of contexts and within a unified
approach, and 2) “to identify and develop methodologies that might be used to assess those dimensions of cultural value” (Crossick and Kaszynska 2016: 12). The aims of the CVP and the individual projects involved formed part of the core motivation of my research, and cultural value literature forms one of the key areas of focus that has driven the project, as it considers value from multiple perspectives and allows a nuanced interpretation of value.

The understanding of cultural value in this thesis is informed by the CVP work of Gillespie et al. (2014) on the changing cultural value of the BBC World Service and the British Council. In their project, the question of ‘value for whom?’ is pertinent and helps maintain the “multi-dimensional nature of benefits” of cultural value, as understood by the two organisations (Gillespie et al., 2014: 2). The question easily applies to the case of Momentum where, like Gillespie et al.’s work, different organisations and actors within and outside of the organisations perceive different types of value. In their work, some of the foremost elements of cultural value are “the creative, communicative and connective benefits that these organisations bring to audiences and funders, as well as to organisations themselves and other stakeholders” (Gillespie et al., 2014: 2). In order to conceptualise the multiple layers of value across actors, they developed the Cultural Value Model (CVM), a constellation that aims to supersede restrictive key performance indicators and metrics often used by organisations to measure impact (Gillespie et al., 2014: 13). The work of Gillespie et al. and the CVM has provided an analytical tool to consider the multi-dimensional nature of cultural value, which informs this thesis’ analytical approach.

As my research focuses on the relationship of public funding to the cultural production process, Banks’ critical review for the CVP raises important issues about a lack of attention within debates of cultural value and cultural policy to the politics of cultural work and the worker (2014a: 4). Banks (2014a) calls for focus on production when considering the cultural value and focus given to the ‘work’ element of cultural value. Banks questions what cultural work might bring to society and suggests that its value has been limited by economic and instrumental conceptions (2014a: 4). Such a line of questioning links back to the idea of cultural work being able to offer ‘good work’ and the potential for greater autonomy, as
discussed above. The potential for public funding to enhance creative and professional autonomy for musicians represents one area of value. Taking Momentum as a case, this thesis provides an opportunity to examine how public funding can be valued for its role in the cultural work of musicians and artist managers.

Drawing from the 2016 AHRC CVP report, and the work of Gillespie et al. (2014) and Banks (2014a), cultural value in this research can be defined as the dimensions of value perceived by individual musicians and artist managers or the organisations of PRSF and ACE, which arise within the funding process, or from funding's role in the work and production of music by popular musicians.

**ECONOMICS AND CULTURE**

Several scholars (Belfiore, 2012; Flew, 2002; Pratt, 2002) note the increase in reports on the economic value of culture in recent decades, with each pointing to the significance of Myerscough’s report (1988), which initiated and solidified economic value with culture. The report entitled *The Economic Importance of the Arts in Britain* was one of the first attempts to show, using variables like employment data, attendance figures and overseas income, and the economic value of the arts. Myerscough was not intentionally initiating what is now a trend of ‘impact’ studies seeking to justify public investment in culture. He was seeking, McGuigan (2004: 94) states, to show the potential for the arts to spur regeneration and stimulate local economies in order to increase public investment, similarly to local cultural industries policies. Myerscough’s report came out during the period when old Labour was implementing cultural policies through local, progressive councils that pursued regional development, both pursuing economic regeneration and social and cultural outcomes. In contrast, current creative industries policies are often driven by a neoliberal political agenda focused on ‘investing’ in areas with high economic return in the cultural sector.

As such, it becomes almost difficult to discuss cultural policy and arts funding without discussing economic value. When the GLC drafted its cultural
industries documents, the intention was to create cultural policy that could intervene in the market in order to widen access and participation (Garnham, 1987 cited in Flew and Cunningham, 2010). This was quite radical as the traditional standpoint was that the market was not compatible with symbolic cultural products. The reasons for ACE’s intervention into the market are not clearly spelled out the way the GLC’s were, and, while ACE are evaluating Momentum against their diversity strategy, increasing access is not stated as a key objective. Therefore, an initial question for this research is why is the Arts Council England funding popular music? Given ACE’s intervention into the market and departure from traditionally funding ‘high art’, why was Momentum created?

THE ISSUE OF VALUE

The idea that the government could or should intervene in markets is highly relevant to my project because Momentum marks a publicly funded intervention into the commercial music market. The idea that the creative industries are growth engines and should be supported for their national economic potential has transitioned from a focus on local development initiatives in the 1990s to national policies aimed mainly at ‘creative’ businesses. Such national policies, now driven by the export value of creative industries, are in contrast to the cultural industries approaches taken in local development initiatives, where elected officials pursued cultural sector development to regenerate local economies. Neoliberal political shifts have moved governments towards ‘investing’ in (rather than ‘supporting’) the cultural sector. As with other areas deemed to be creative industries, UK music has been charted, measured and quantified, particularly its contribution to the UK’s GDP, its export income, and its employment statistics (DCMS 1998; UK Music, 2014). This project questions the usefulness of such metrics for understanding the value of a project like Momentum and seeks to engage with a deeper approach to valuing.

In an effort to reconcile the tensions between cultural and economic value, O’Brien’s 2010 report *Measuring the value of culture: a report for the Department for Culture Media and Sport* posits that these concepts can best speak to one
another through economically focused measures. As this report was commissioned for the government, its angle is very different from other critical analyses on cultural value. O’Brien retains some of the critical stances taken by other scholars, namely that the government needs to adopt policies that consider, and are specific to, the unique nature of cultural production. However, O’Brien argues that if the cultural sector wants government subsidy, it needs to speak the language of policymaking: economics. This position is attractive and could perhaps facilitate a better understanding of the cultural sector in the political sphere. However, focusing solely on economic methods arguably hinders policy goals of enhancing cultural value.

As the main voice arguing cultural value can, in some way, be measured by economic methods, such as cost benefit or Return on Investment (ROI) analysis, O’Brien presents some interesting considerations for my project. This research aims to develop an understanding of the value of public funding for popular music from multiple perspectives (musicians, funders, industry assessors). The perspectives will likely reflect differences in the significance attributed to economic or cultural valuation. But these forms of value may not always be in tension or conflict as the multi-perspective approach suggests. Rather, it helps pinpoint when and how the balance between these tips in one or more directions – and takes into account diverse components of value, extending beyond a diametric view of types of value. A goal of this research is to present this more nuanced account of value and in so doing to influence funders’ practices, including valuation and evaluation. Later chapters will therefore explore how PRSF identifies, prioritises and reframes value at various moments and then communicates the value of Momentum to ACE.

O’Brien notes the difficulties of ‘measuring culture’ but says the issue is “especially pressing” (2010: 13). Drawing on the Treasury’s Green Book, O’Brien asserts that the cultural sector could use stated preference measurement techniques used in other sectors to convey its value to the government. He acknowledges that this must be done in a way that reflects the different ways of narrating culture (aesthetics vs. economics) and considering cultural value (intrinsic, institutional and instrumental versus economic) (2010: 18). At the same
time, it may be valid to argue that, when the government makes policies, popular music and pop culture, more generally, may struggle to receive support if funders and scholars ignore the government’s means of evaluation and let it rest on its laurels as a unique case.

Providing a counter argument to O’Brien, Belfiore and Bennett question any benefit to using economic measures for culture. They claim that “[U]nless we see economic function as the primary purpose of the arts, then economics can have little to tell us about their intrinsic value” (Belfiore and Bennett, 2007: 137). For them, it is important that we acknowledge what economic measures cannot show, such as how culture can “enrich individuals and societies” (ibid.). My research considers the economic valuation techniques to be part of an incomplete valuation process. Economically focused methods, like Return on Investment (ROI), may be ill-equipped to assess cultural value due to the need to decipher a “whole set of notions” (Oakley, 2004: 74) tied up in cultural value. This project’s main research question emerges from this debate, as well as the project’s aim of examining multiple actors’ perspectives of value.

**FUNDING ‘EXCELLENCE’**

In keeping with a longstanding tradition, arts funding organisations allocate funding based on the priority of ‘excellence’. ACE states on its website (www.artscouncil.org.uk) that the Momentum fund falls under Goal 1 of its 10-year plan. Goal 1 is defined as, “Excellence is thriving and celebrated in the arts, museums and libraries” (ACE, 2013a: 39). A key Momentum aim is to, therefore, fund ‘excellence’.

‘Excellence’ is a term or category that links to the traditional public subsidy model of funding non-commercial ‘high art’ not otherwise sustainable in the market. Garnham critiqued the term in 2005, three years before a significant DCMS report (McMaster, 2008) solidified ‘excellence’ in cultural policy. He cautioned that ‘excellence’ is highly hierarchical and hidden yet actively deciding the value of culture (Garnham, 2005: 27). The adoption of ‘excellence’ by ACE as
a major funding goal has not elucidated any clearer meaning or application of the term. Garnham questions how public funding bodies even evaluate ‘excellence’ outside of the market, “which many hold to be the most rigorous test of excellence” (2005: 28). Funding decisions in ACE, and for Momentum, are made by artists, practitioners and funders, who must determine the highest level of ‘excellence’ between many applicants. The hierarchy of value implicit in ‘excellence’ and its retained link with ‘high art’ and non-commerciality make it a problematic way of assessing popular music aimed for the market.

This project explores the ways funding bodies, industry assessors and musicians assess popular music in relation to different frameworks of ‘excellence’, which is one of the research questions. I aimed to investigate when it might and might not be appropriate to use ‘excellence’ as a determinant for arts funding. In the case of Momentum, those assessing musicians in popular music genres may understand ‘excellence’ as a market test of quality or they may consider other factors – such as the strength of the applicant’s team – as important as excellence. I will consider what unique challenges Momentum and its assessors must overcome when funding popular musicians that might have commercially viable music.

2.6 CONCLUSION

Literature on the value of public funding for popular musicians is currently lacking, particularly in the UK or English context. While some recent projects have examined similar themes in Australia, New Zealand and Scotland, there does not currently exist any literature that examines cultural value, public funding and popular musicians together in the English context. This research brings together three primary areas of literature. These areas are research on cultural production, cultural work and cultural value. This study on popular musicians and public funding sits where these three areas of literature converge.

Bourdieu’s work provides theoretical tools to examine the research questions, specifically through his discussions of hierarchies in cultural production and the types of capital and legitimization processes (1984, 1992). The next
sections sought to examine the experiences of change in the music industries through work in popular music studies. Firstly, I examined the literature discussing popular music and its relationship to the state and state interventions, which revealed that support had been offered to musicians in England but primarily through employment training in the NDfM. This training programme was also disbanded in 2009, leaving a gap in provision. The effects of digitalisation and the characteristics of the popular music ecosystem were discussed, followed by the primary sections on the literature considering popular musicians and their work within the changing music landscape. Research on the structural features of the music industries and the impact on musicians’ practices provided context for those musicians seeking success in England. Finally, research on the work of musicians and artist managers was discussed in the contexts of cultural intermediation (Hracs, 2015; Lizé, 2016), musicians’ careers, and different definitions of success (Smith, 2013; Zwaan, 2009). These concepts were shown to be potentially useful in framing analysis of the involvement of artist managers in the artist development of popular musicians. Also, the exploration of two ways of considering ‘success’ established that a better understanding, which is context-specific, could be significant to understanding the value of Momentum funding to artists and managers.

Within this context, cultural work theory and empirical work contributes to the understanding of popular musicians as cultural workers within cultural industries that garner political attention and acclaim as being economic generators for the UK economy. Cultural work research, such as Banks (2007, 2017a) and Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011), highlight cultural workers’ pursuit of ‘good work’ and artistic and professional autonomy. Recently, research on cultural workers has shined a light on the potential inequalities and struggles for diversity and inclusion within the sectors (O’Brien et al., 2016; O’Brien and Oakley, 2014). This work raises the questions of if and how Momentum funding attempts to address barriers to music making.

The project was then situated as influenced by and drawing upon cultural value literature, specifically the AHRC’s CVP. The CVP ran from 2012-2016 and problematised existing understandings of cultural value, seeking to bring about a
deeper exploration across 72 funded projects. Gillespie et al.’s (2014) development of a multi-dimensional definition of cultural value opened up the possibility of a deeper and more nuanced understanding of cultural value within the Momentum fund, particularly asking, ‘value for whom?’ Other approaches to value, namely the economic form of value, were critiqued. The longstanding funding priority of ‘excellence’ was questioned for its obscuring nature. ‘Excellence’, while common in public funding programmes as a priority, is often left vague, leading to the creation of another research question of how excellence is understood by different actors in Momentum.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The research design of my study is a single case study of an “exemplary” case (Ragin, 1992: 2). Ragin, in *What is a Case? Exploring the Social Foundations of Inquiry* (1992), stresses the importance of asking an essential question from the outset: what is the Momentum case study a case of? Momentum is an exemplary case of public funding for popular musicians, specifically in England, which allows the study of value creation. Momentum is also a case study of the work of emerging popular musicians who seek and receive funding, and the artist managers mediating for musicians in a precarious work environment where it is difficult to sustain a living. My conceptualisation of Momentum as an exemplary case draws from Ragin (1992), Becker (1992) and Yin (2018). My study includes multiple sources of data with the aim of producing rich accounts of value from different participants’ perspectives and to bring qualitative and quantitative sources into dialogue. The primary sources of data include observations of Momentum funding assessment panels, in-depth interviews with funded musicians and artist managers and semi-structured interviews with key people involved in running and setting up Momentum. Secondary sources consisted of quantitative programme data from Momentum and documentation for Momentum, mostly produced by the funders Arts Council England (ACE) and PRS Foundation (PRS). There are five phases of data collection, with associated methods discussed for each. Getting access will be discussed in order to examine some of the obstacles to data collection encountered and the ways these impacted the study. Important issues of case study research are addressed, including quality, validity, reliability and ethics. The section will demonstrate the ways this case study has sought to enhance these important concerns of research and to provide a rich and complex story of the Momentum case through corroboration and triangulation across different sources of data and participant groups. I will then evaluate the methods used and the challenges faced through a reflexive lens. Finally, tools of analysis will be laid out to reflect how the key findings were reached.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions that guide this research are:

I. What dimensions of value does public funding for popular musicians create for different actors?

   1. Why is the Arts Council England funding popular music and why do musicians seek public funding?
   2. To what extent is Momentum a response to or result of changes in the popular music industries and the roles of musicians?
   3. How are diverse forms of value, including ‘excellence’ in popular music and ‘talent,’ understood and assessed by funders ACE and PRSF, industry assessors, artist managers and popular musicians?
   4. What economic, social and cultural barriers to music-making does Momentum attempt to redress, and does it achieve its goals?

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN: CASE STUDY

The entire premise of the book What is a Case? Exploring the Social Foundations of Inquiry derived from a symposium in 1988 at Northwestern University with the specific intention to ask, ‘what is a case?’ Defining what a case study is was shown to be a difficult task. Ragin states that:

   Comparative social science has a ready-made, conventionalized answer to this question: Boundaries around places and time periods define cases. (Ragin, 1992: 5)

Ragin continued, writing that the question remains: ‘What is it a case of?’ The approach, taken in the study of the Momentum grant programme, has been a case since the beginning, although the understanding of the boundaries of the case changed as the project developed. For the purpose of this research, the time-scale for the case of Momentum begins in May 2013, approximately at the time of the programme’s launch. As the Momentum programme remains active, a clear end point was difficult to decide, but the time-scale was decided to coincide with the available quantitative data at the time of the analysis. This includes the first
through fourth years of the fund (2013-2016). There has since been a fifth year of Momentum (2017), and the sixth is underway (2018), but these will only be considered insofar as to provide an up-to-date view of where the programme is now in this study. The data from the fifth-sixth years and any beyond are not included within the case study, partly due to time and resource limitations. The scope of the case study research includes:

1. The organisations involved and the individuals working on Momentum at these organisations, specifically the primary funder, Arts Council England (ACE), and the additional funder and manager of the programme, the Performing Rights Society Foundation (PRSF);
2. The individual musicians, artist managers and small companies, such as record labels, seeking Momentum funding;
3. The external music industries experts called ‘advisors’ who are brought in to the programme by PRSF to act as decision-makers on the funding.

The aim of case study research is to provide a rich portrayal of a situation or event, yet studying a single case could be considered a limitation. However, when the case is exemplary there may not be any comparison point or similar case. Stavraki highlights the strengths of the single case study, showing three ways interpretive single cases allow the researcher to capture rich context. Firstly, they “provide thick descriptions that illuminate the actions, narratives and voices that shape individuals' experiences,” in keeping with Clifford Geertz’s established practice of ‘thick description’ in anthropology (Stavraki, 2014: 5). Secondly, they allow one to “capture the complexities of the phenomenon under investigation,” which might be missed in a study with multiple cases. Thirdly, they “develop context-embedded accounts that reveal multiple voices” (Stavraki, 2014: 5).

Capturing and reflecting rich descriptions, complexity within the case and context is paramount to this study’s aims of understanding the dimensions of cultural value created by public funding for popular musicians. The ability to include the complexity of multiple perspectives within one investigation was a prominent reason for selecting a single case. My study also adopts an embedded single case design, which includes analysis of ‘subunits’ within the case (Yin, 2018: 52/322). To clarify through an example, the data from musicians that is gathered by PRSF
in application forms or impact evaluations is used in my research as a survey of the subgroup of musicians within the case.

Despite the strengths of case studies, there are limitations with single case studies. For example, Yin (2018) cautions the researcher to be careful of single cases because of the inability to compare across other case study sites or activities. However, the potential value of the single case is its ability to deeply illustrate social phenomenon that is exemplary, or where the case can be justified as “an extreme or unusual circumstance” (Yin, 2018: 53/322). The Momentum case, I argue, is an unusual exemplary case, in that there has not been a publicly funded grant programme providing funds directly to popular musicians in England. Momentum represents a departure, not only for ACE in supporting popular music with grants paid directly to popular musicians, but also as it is a bespoke fund that was established to meet a specific need identified by ACE, which had not previously existed. In addition, single cases can act as testing grounds for further multi-site case study research, and this study proposes this is needed in the area of popular music and public funding. The next sections will describe the primary and secondary data gathered on Momentum and driven by the research questions.

## DATA SOURCES

The data included in this case study includes both primary and secondary data types. Table 3.1 below details these types of data, broken into primary and secondary data sources. The primary focus of the research has been the perspectives of value in the Momentum fund. My approach to studying Momentum sought multiple perspectives from different actors and aimed to gather different types of data that would allow perspectives to be compared and data verified in a process of triangulation. I describe the details of the data collection later in the chapter.

The primary data sources that were consulted to answer the research questions included observations, ethnographic in-depth interviews and semi-
structured interviews with six different sources. These are seen in Table 3.1. The first source was observations of four Momentum funding assessment panels, where funding decisions are made for each round of Momentum. In each funding round, there are two separate panels divided by genres, where between 35-40 shortlisted applicants are discussed by four external advisors appointed by PRSF. In the panels I observed, three members of PRSF staff were also present. In two panels, one representative from ACE was present. These panels lasted approximately four hours each and provided invaluable insight into a funding process that, for many funding organisations, is usually obscured. I was interested in the ways value emerged during funding panels and was articulated and contested by different actors during panels and decision-making. I was also able to observe an informal shortlisting process for one Momentum round, where two PRSF staff sorted applicants by their scores and discussed the factors that could assist certain applications move to the final panel stage. The observation allowed me to watch while some direction was provided, and I could ask questions.

In-depth ethnographic interviews formed a second source, and these were conducted with musicians funded by Momentum (row 2 in Table 3.1) and artist managers working with funded musicians (row 3 in Table 3.1). Eleven interviews were conducted, including one pilot interview, nine with Momentum-funded musicians, one joint interview with two funded musicians and one interview with a do-it-yourself (DIY) musician who had not sought funding. These interviews lasted between nearly an hour to almost two hours. Fourteen in-depth interviews were also conducted with artist managers. As explained in the introduction and Chapter 6, ‘artist managers’ are defined in this thesis as any individuals working with popular musicians in a capacity where they handle multiple tasks typically carried out by artist managers, such as negotiating deals, coordinating workers and release plans, diary management and securing investment.

I sought organisational perspectives of value through semi-structured interviews with staff involved in Momentum at ACE, PRSF and one from Momentum’s funding partner, Spotify (rows 4-6 in Table 3.1). I interviewed individuals who had been involved in the origination, evolution and running of Momentum, speaking to two senior staff at ACE and two staff at PRSF. I chose to
conduct semi-structured interviews as the time available for interviews was more limited, and I sought to pose similar questions to each interviewee to allow comparison. The primary data is central to the analysis of value from the four different perspectives presented in the thesis, with Chapter 4 focusing on ACE, Chapter 5 on PRSF, Chapter 6 on artist managers and Chapter 7 on funded popular musicians.

In addition to the qualitative primary data, I gathered and analysed secondary data with the goal of gaining insight into ACE’s and PRSF’s aim’s for Momentum funding and facilitating triangulation, or verification, of other primary data with secondary data. The secondary data is listed in Table 3.1 in rows 7-9, showing that primarily data was gathered corresponding with the 1st - 15th rounds of Momentum, as time constraints required that I end the data collection whilst the 16th round was in progress. Ideally, in future research, data would be included through 2018 and beyond, as the funders contributing to Momentum changed several times6, creating distinctive phases within the funding. In some cases, documents were also gathered from the period prior to Momentum's creation to understand the context. Documents were gathered if they were created by or about ACE, PRSF and Momentum. Both external evaluations created by consultants were reviewed. I also sought data that covered as much of the funding process of Momentum, so I searched for all documents available as part of Momentum, such as assessment criteria and guidance sent to assessment advisors. By bringing together primary data and secondary data, I aimed to form a clearer picture of the entire process of assessment, from application to evaluation.

---

6 At the time of writing in 2018, the organisations funding Momentum have changed five times since it was launched in May 2013. Originally, ACE was the primary funder, with PRSF contributing and Deezer as digital partner. The first change came when Spotify replaced Deezer as the digital partner in 2014. Then PPL joined as a funder in November 2016. Creative Scotland and the Arts Council of Wales joined in 2018, and ACE ceased its funding contribution in 2018.
Table 3.1 List of Primary and Secondary Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Data</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection Method</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Observations at PRSF Assessments</td>
<td>4 Assessment panels for 2 Momentum deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Shortlisting meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethnographic Interviews with Musicians</td>
<td>11 in total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 pilot interview with a funded musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 with Momentum-funded musicians, including 1 joint interview with 2 musicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 with a DIY musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ethnographic Interviews with Artist Managers</td>
<td>14 in total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Semi-Structured Interviews with PRSF</td>
<td>2 Key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semi-Structured Interviews with ACE</td>
<td>2 Key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Semi-Structured Interview with Spotify</td>
<td>1 Staff member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Data</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection Method</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Document Search for Momentum, ACE and PRSF</td>
<td>Articles, programme documents and organisational documents from ACE’s website, PRSF’s website, Huffington Post and from staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Momentum Programme Documents</td>
<td>Applications, application and assessor guidance/criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Quantitative Momentum Programme Data</td>
<td>Application Form Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact Evaluation Form Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative programme data supplemented the qualitative and documentary data, providing insight into the results of the programme and the ways it had changed over time in ways that observations and interviews could not. This data was downloaded from PRSF’s funding system Flexigrant and exported to Excel. The different data sets of quantitative programme data analysed in this
research are listed in Table 3.2. There are six ways to categorise the data available within the raw quantitative programme data available for Momentum applications. Table 3.2 lists these categories, including the time frame they cover and the number of applications in each category, showing the possible ways the data could have been divided. It is worth noting that, while the number of applications is the total available sample for each category, different data points have varying samples, depending on how many applicants/funded artists provided answers to specific questions on the application or evaluation forms. I explain the processes I took to analyse the programme data in section 3.3, but I will now explain how participants were selected for this research.

Table 3.2 Quantitative Data from Momentum Application Forms by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 All apps. (including reapplications) Rounds 1 – 7 (part of 8)</td>
<td>May 2013 – October 2014</td>
<td>1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 All apps. unique Rounds 1 – 7 (part of 8)</td>
<td>May 2013 – October 2014</td>
<td>1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Funded apps. Rounds 1 – 7 (part of 8)</td>
<td>May 2013 – October 2014</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 All apps. (including reapplications) Rounds (part of 8) 9 – 16 (part of 17)</td>
<td>October 2014 – May 2017</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 All apps. unique Rounds (part of 8) 9 – 16 (part of 17)</td>
<td>October 2014 – May 2017</td>
<td>1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Funded apps. Rounds (part of 8) 9 – 16</td>
<td>October 2014 – April 2017</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

For the selection of primary sources and participants, this study employed an approach that is similar to purposive sampling and theoretical sampling. Purposive
sampling was used for determining which Momentum-funded musicians to interview. This is because the research questions regarding musicians require variety in the sample (Bryman, 2008: 415; Punch, 2014: 162). The project is concerned with the different kinds of experiences musicians have with Momentum funding and the multitude of ways of valuing – no ‘kind’ of experience is elevated above another. Purposive sampling can help obtain perspectives of certain kinds of musicians – for example, non-London based musicians – who may be underrepresented in the funding pool. Due to difficulties accessing musicians, because of non-responses and time constraints, a purposive sampling approach was helpful in attempting to target specific types of musicians that I had not interviewed yet. Purposive sampling was also used to select the key staff interviewed at ACE and PRSF and the Momentum assessment panels for observations. McCall (1984: 265 cited in Lee, 2000) makes the statement that “observation is always selective and purposive” (1984: 270 cited in Lee, 2000: 44). Researchers make decisions about factors including the subject of study, where it occurs and what time. I chose to focus on musicians who had received funding, and this was purposive. These decisions were all made within the case study framework and around the research questions identified in Chapter 2. It should be noted that purposive sampling can risk bias on the part of the researcher. I attempted to mitigate this by also contacting funded musicians randomly. Relying on purposive sampling techniques was somewhat successful with musicians, but randomly contacting funded musicians was the most helpful in acquiring participants. There are limitations to the data: there may have been individuals who were less visibly involved in Momentum at ACE or PRSF, who I was not able to speak to, and who cannot include their views. While I knew that the serendipitous moments of data collection sometimes come from surprising places, I was limited in my ability to cast a wide net with musicians, as my professional networks were mostly within the funding world. This means that this research cannot include the perspectives of musicians whose managers applied to Momentum for them but were minimally or not involved in the funding process. Musicians who applied many times and were never successful are also not reflected. Future research would benefit from greater input from musicians less involved in large urban music scenes, such as those living in more rural areas.
Effort was made to include the greatest variety of funded musicians, though representation of all regions, genres, funding levels or ethnicities within Momentum was not possible due to time limits and difficulty getting responses. The spread of the data can be viewed in Appendix A.

Sampling was also considered when acquiring secondary data. Documents were selected for analysis primarily based on theoretical sampling, which emphasises an on-going data collection and analysis process. Theoretical sampling is “the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes and analyzes his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges” (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, cited in Bryman, 2008: 415). The collection of documentation occurred throughout the phases and had no finite barriers. This is the theoretical sampling model. Selected documents spanned the Rounds 1-15, as these were the funding rounds that had occurred when data collection began to wrap up. Similarly, quantitative programme data was collected for Rounds 1-15, with 16 partially completed. It was decided that, as 16 was in progress, no meaningful analysis could be comparatively made to the rounds that had already occurred. The research questions and theory relevant to this project (see Chapter 2) will initiate the first sample.

D ATA COLLECTION: PHASES

The research project examined multiple actors through several overlapping phases of data collection. Approximately five overlapping stages of data collection occurred within the 2015-2016 period (see Table 3.3 for a timeline). These phases were: 1) Observations at Momentum advisor assessment panels organised by PRSF and where funding recipients were determined; 2) semi-structured interviews with Momentum-funded musicians and artist managers working with Momentum musicians; 3) semi-structured interviews with key staff at PRSF, ACE and funding partner, Spotify; 4) collection of programme data and statistics for the Momentum programme and grantees; and 5) document collection and analysis. Table 3.3 below provides details of the phases and their timelines.
The five phases of collection ran in an overlapping fashion from November 2015-December 2016 until the data amassed seemed enough to “provide confirmatory evidence (evidence from two or more different sources) for most of [the case study’s] main topics” (Yin, 2018: 112/322). I determined that enough material had been gathered from different sources – primary and secondary and qualitative and quantitative – to allow triangulation of analysis and data sources.

Table 3.3 Phases of Data Collection November 2015 – December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Collection</th>
<th>Data Collection Focus</th>
<th>Time Frame Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Observations at Momentum advisor assessment panels organised by PRSF and where funding recipients were determined</td>
<td>2015 - 2016&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In-depth interviews with Momentum-funded musicians and artist managers working with Momentum musicians</td>
<td>Jan. 2016 – Nov. 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Collection of programme data and statistics for the Momentum programme and grantees</td>
<td>Dec. 2016 (for 2013-2016 data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Programme documentation collection</td>
<td>Periodically throughout late 2015 - 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>7</sup> The specific dates of the observations cannot be revealed in order to maintain anonymity of the artists discussed and the external advisors present.
1. OBSERVATIONS OF MOMENTUM ASSESSMENT PANELS

During the first phase, I conducted two observation periods of Momentum’s assessment panels and an observation of the shortlisting process for applications in one round. The Momentum assessment panels occurred after specific funding deadlines, of which there are typically four per year, and consisted of panel meetings where the applications were discussed and funding decisions made. Access was granted in 2015 to observe panels for two funding deadlines. Due to the need to maintain anonymity of the advisors in attendance and the applications discussed, I will not specify the exact rounds or dates. This is intentional, since it enabled me to make the best use of time and resources, and to allow the collection and initial analysis of different datasets to inform the further collection process. The research aims to maintain consistent reflexivity. Being a reflexive researcher requires the researcher to be tuned into her own values, predispositions, context and biases, and how these can impact the research (Bryman, 2008: 682). In practice, I have reflected and taken an iterative approach during the data collection, analysis and writing up processes to understand my situated knowledge and its implications for my research. The overlap of actors and collection methods sought to facilitate this. Also incorporating a reflexive approach in observations, I will now describe the simple or ‘unobtrusive’ observation method employed within Momentum assessment panels, whilst also incorporating a reflexive approach in observations.

UNOBTRUSIVE OBSERVATIONS: SIMPLE OBSERVATION METHOD

Unobtrusive, or non-participant observation, was suitable within the case study design, and I determined that unobtrusive observations would be the most suitable option for gathering data on Momentum decision panels. Unobtrusive research aims to limit reactivity, which is “the extent to which the presence of an observer affects the behaviour of those observed” (Lee, 2000: 47). While potentially unavoidable, having a high degree of reactivity on my part as an observer in the Momentum decision panel would have severely limited the reliability of the data collected. One reason for using unobtrusive observation methods, instead of
interviews or questionnaires, is “because respondents commonly try to manage impressions of themselves in order to maintain their standing in the eyes of an interviewer,” and it is thought that impression management may be harder to maintain in non-participant observations (Lee, 2000: 34). This is twofold, as Lee explains:

Some writers have suggested that the situational demands facing participants in some contexts are sufficiently engrossing to override a subject’s awareness that an observer is present. On the other hand, maintaining a pattern of activity designed to present to the observer a sanitized view of what goes on in a setting requires considerable effort on part of those observed. In many cases the effort becomes too great after a time or those observed simply forget about the presence of the researcher. (Lee, 2000: 47)

In the Momentum panels, the demands placed on advisors and PRSF staff are great. Staff must play sound and video clips submitted with applications, take notes on the advisors’ comments in order to feedback to applicants and chair the panel, keep it running on time, and help advisors to reach clear decisions. Panels lasted roughly four hours, with seven or eight artists selected from a pool of 75-80. Typically, there is little room to consider what an observer is writing8, which I have experienced when I chaired and ran assessment panels for other funds. The advisors, on the other hand, are trying to remember what they liked or did not like about applications and negotiating their opinions with those of others.

I chose to use unobtrusive methods because I wanted to discover the ways in which decisions were made and how the dynamics of the room and interplay between advisors related to the conversation topics and funding decisions. Interviews or other self-reporting means would not provide the best means of capturing interactions between individual advisors (Lee, 2000: 34). Neither questionnaires nor interviews could provide me with insight into the dynamics of the room. Sitting in the panels allowed me to see how a decision not to fund an application might be made initially in a panel only to be changed later on, spurred by the impassioned plea of one advisor. While that was rare, the dynamics of the room were important. If interviews had instead been pursued after the panels,

---
8 I was permitted to write notes during the Momentum assessment panels but was not allowed to record audio.
there would be a risk of advisors misremembering these occurrences, like stating they had always supported the funding of a particular application when, in the panel, they had originally been reticent. These occurrences all have implications for questions of value and the ways that value is expressed and defined within decision panels. From an access perspective, unobtrusive observations of decision panels provided the easiest access to participants and allowed the participation of all of the members of the panel, whereas pursuing interviews or sending out a questionnaire could have led to limited responses and a less holistic picture of the decision-making process (Lee, 2000: 4). The aim of the observations was also to limit advisors’ reactivity to me, the researcher, and unobtrusive methods provide a suitable means of achieving this.

My approach to unobtrusive research did not include researching participants in public or covertly, as some researchers have done. Care was taken, however, to limit reactivity and the impact of my presence on the Momentum assessment panels being observed. During panels, I sought to make myself one of the group but in a passive way and without being too uninvolved as to appear conspicuous (Lee, 2000: 46). I sat with the group but did not speak during the decision-making. In order to limit my conspicuousness, I did partake in conversation during breaks and prior to the panels. Having a working relationship with those in the observation can be thought to lower reactivity, and the trust in my professional relationship with the PRSF staff present mostly allowed me to quietly write without having attention drawn to me.

Above, I stated that unobtrusive observations were suited to case study research. One prime reason for this is the expectation that unobtrusive observations are one of several methods a researcher might engage in during research. Lee shows that some of the first users of unobtrusive observations, such as Webb et al. (1966 cited in Lee, 2000), saw a particular need for the use of multiple methods of data collection to correct any issues created by participant reactivity to the researcher (Lee, 2000: 8). Case studies also often employ multiple types of collection methods. Unobtrusive observations of Momentum assessment panels were used in this research, together with the four other types of collection methods described above. The aims of employing and collecting the different data
types was to both capture different views of value from participants, and to triangulate and verify the findings between participants.

The style of observation used in the Momentum panels is also important. Simple observation is “focused on situations in which the observer has no control over the behaviour or sign in question, and plays an unobserved, passive and nonintrusive role in the research situation” (Webb et al. 1966: 112 cited in Lee, 2000: 33). Simple observation is different from observation that uses video or film coding because it happens “contemporaneously” (McCall, 1984: 265 cited in Lee, 2000: 33). Important for the data collection process, simple observation also has “systematicity,” meaning there is a more systematic approach to the note taking and of what is observed (Lee, 2000: 33). Lee summarises the Webb et al. (1966) approach to simple observation into the five topics:

1 exterior physical signs
2 expressive movement
3 physical location
4 what might be called ‘in situ conversation’, which involves the recording of randomly selected overheard conversations
5 behaviour associated with time (Lee, 2000: 34)

Let us consider each one:

(1) In the Momentum panel observations, the exterior physical signs of the advisors – in terms of body language and verbal interactions – and the staff in the room were noted when possible, but emphasis was not placed on physical appearance as much as verbal and physical interaction.

(2) Expressive movement was useful in observing the ways advisors interacted with the music samples that were played, and notes about the body language and motions of advisors were noted when possible. Nonverbal cues were not noted or analysed in depth, but consideration was given to the ways and frequency that certain advisors spoke, considering whether they were likely to interrupt or talk over other advisors. For the panels, advisors bring their top eight choices into the meeting. I was interested in whether those who spoke more had more success than those who spoke less with having their top choices funded.
(3) Physical location was noted at times, especially if the environment seemed to intervene, as when the room the panel was in became so hot it solicited unanimous comment. Such acknowledgement of the oppressive temperature by the panel might derail discussion or reinforce a camaraderie between advisors.

(4) As the panels are limited by time, lasting approximately four hours, and because they only occur once with the same advisors present, \textit{in situ} conversations were noted as observed but these were limited in number. In some ways, the time-restricted nature of the Momentum panels shaped the observations and what was observed to include time-related behaviour. Time was a consideration because final funding decisions need to be made within the allotted time and negotiating during the last half to hour of the panel is driven by this then-urgent need.

(5) Behaviour associated with time was not specifically noted in length, as in how long something occurred, but notice was made of whether a particular person spoke longer or more often. Time spent in the panels was noted if it seemed to affect the need to make decisions more quickly, say if the panel was running over time.

Overall, effort was made in observations to minimise reactivity to my presence whilst capturing detail of the situations and decision-making process as it unfolded between advisors. Overlapping the observations, I began conducting in-depth interviews with artist managers and funded musicians, which I will now describe.

\section*{2. INTERVIEWS WITH MUSICIANS AND ARTIST MANAGERS}

Yin claims that interviews can be particularly useful in case study research to answer questions of why and how, and especially so for insights into “participants’ relativist perspectives,” such as their values (2018: 117/322). In the second phase, in-depth interviews were conducted with 11 Momentum-funded musicians and 14 in-depth interviews were conducted with artist managers between January and December 2016. Appendix A lists the participants of this study and the locations,

1. Thematizing
2. Designing
3. Interviewing
4. Transcribing
5. Analysing
6. Verifying
7. Reporting

This study sought to follow these seven stages loosely while remaining open to discovery. Decisions about the interviews and the draft interview schedules were composed and submitted to the university ethics committee prior to completion of fieldwork. This is in line with Brinkmann and Kvale’s (2015) view that the interviewer should have an overview of the entire process in mind, even at the early stages of the study. In studies involving interviews, researchers must decide whether to incorporate what they learn as they undertake research into the questioning process or to keep the questions consistent for comparative analysis purposes. Brinkmann and Kvale declare that:

The interview brings forth new and unexpected aspects of the phenomena studied, and during analysis of the transcribed interviews new distinctions may be discovered […] Thus in exploratory studies the questioning may continually improve as the researcher learns more about the topic, ideally resulting in a sophisticated form of interviewing receptive to the nuances and complexities of the topic explored. (2015: 139)

I took the adaptive approach when completing the interviews with artist managers and with musicians, as I sought to bring the knowledge I gained in the interviewing process to inform the interview questions going forward. For artist managers, taking a learning and adaptive approach to questions was particularly necessary since they had not originally been included in the research design and the nature and extent of their involvement was largely unknown. The sample size for interviews from staff was only two from ACE and two from PRSF, due to the limited number of staff with knowledge of the programme and limitations of gaining access. Therefore, questions were not adapted for these participants.

Artist managers were added to the research design in August 2015, which I explain later in this chapter, and they were interviewed before musicians, partly
because it was easier to contact them. One artist manager was informally interviewed prior to the beginning of the main phase of interviews to test the interview questions. Artist managers were interviewed depending on their availability, and this meant some had only half an hour to speak. In these instances, key questions of interest were chosen to focus on in the interview. The sample interview schedule is in the Appendix C.2.

For the musicians, I made the decision to focus on funded musicians because my questions related more to the value of the funding, as perceived by those musicians who received it. Considering musicians who had applied and not received funding was beyond the scope of this project. Those who were unsuccessful were, I thought, unlikely to reply, and discussing applying for funding they did not receive might be a sensitive subject. My research, therefore, cannot address the ways un-funded musicians, whose applications were unsuccessful, value public funding. In future, I would include the views of musicians unable to obtain funding, as speaking to unfunded musicians would help build on this study’s findings and better define what success means for different musicians. Including their views could also provide a comparative element to the findings from the funded musicians. A pilot interview was carried out informally in late 2015 to test the interview questions. Interviews sought to discuss musicians’ music, funding, support, their careers and what success as a musician means to them. The interviews were loosely structured and flexible so that musicians could raise issues important to them and discussion could emerge naturally. An example interview guide is included in Appendix C. Kvale views “discursive interviewing” as a process that “focus[es] on variation and diversity and on the active participation of the interviewer in the discourse” (2007: 114). The aim of this study to adopt the language of the participants to describe their evaluation of the Momentum funding meant that flexibility during interviews in the types of questions was important. I did not want to lead the participant nor speak for them. The interviews did seek to ascertain demographic information in line with my research questions about inequality, but questions of ethnicity and socio-economic status were not posed directly. Instead, I adopted an ethnographic interview approach to draw these aspects out naturally through questions of how they got into music, whether their families supported their music career and whether they studied a degree.
Musicians and managers were both contacted primarily through email. Some were contacted via Twitter in an attempt to broaden the sample, but this proved unsuccessful. Due to the multi-genre nature of Momentum, the sample aimed to include musicians creating music within a mix of subgenres falling under rock, pop, hip-hop, urban, metal and electronic. A breakdown of the characteristics of the musicians in the study is presented in Chapter 7. Next, I discuss the semi-structured interviews I conducted with organisational staff working on Momentum.

3. INTERVIEWS WITH FUNDERS ACE AND PRSF

Interviews with staff were also useful in providing insight into the perspectives of participants but, as they were more structured, the aim was also to ‘corroborate’ other accounts (Yin, 2018: 119/322) from documentary evidence about the decisions and changes made to the way Momentum was run. The third phase consisted of semi-structured interviews with key staff at ACE and PRSF and a worker at Spotify, Momentum’s digital funding partner. Two staff members each from PRSF and ACE (four total) were interviewed for one hour each about Momentum, their professional – and personal – objectives and assessment, as well as how they understand success for the funding and musicians. The example interview schedule is seen in the Appendix C. Interviews with PRSF were held in their offices; however, in meeting rooms and during one interview, the location had to be changed mid-interview. The lack of having a room booked reflects the sometimes-difficult line for a researcher to be treated like any other respected researcher when they are already familiar with the participants.

Although care was taken to accommodate the interviewees and hold the interviews in locations that would be comfortable for them rather than easy for the researcher, power dynamics between the researcher and the interviewee are, potentially, not equal, according to Brinkmann and Kvale:

The research interview is, however, a specific professional conversation, which typically involves a clear power asymmetry between the researcher and the subject. (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015: 37)
Interviews with elites can actually balance the typical imbalance of power in interviews (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015: 171). The dynamics in the interviews I conducted, specifically with PRSF, were complicated by the previous roles I held within their organisation – of intern and then impact evaluation analyst. By interviewing these individuals, I was adopting a new identity as researcher, and I wanted them to take the situation seriously and understand the aims of my project in comparison to their own. I felt that I benefited in a few ways from already being familiar to these individuals. Firstly, I had less need to explain my research, as they were already aware of it. Secondly, I first contacted PRSF about my research in 2014 as I was embarking on it, and, by the time of the interviews in 2016, I had already had two years of access to their files and documents for the research. They were open with me and shared many files and documents, some purely internal, without ever querying why I wanted to see them. They also provided me with administrator privileges in their grants system. These privileges were first given to me for the research and only later used in my roles working for them on the impact evaluations.

The interviews with ACE staff were held firstly in the ACE London office, using their equipment and within their space. I had previously been in their office once to meet a friend, which helped me feel slightly more at ease when I arrived to conduct the interview. However, I was unaware that the interview would be partly over video conference, with one staff member in the room next to me and the other on the screen remotely. Doing interviews remotely can create technical problems, which occurred briefly with the sound quality at times. These issues were more distracting for the staff members than me, but it created a few disjointed moments of interruption. In future, I would clarify whether all staff would be present in person prior to the interview. Possessing background knowledge and the language to intelligently discuss the topic at hand can also help balance the power dynamics when interviewing elites (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015: 171). Effort was made when interviewing PRSF and ACE staff to be as aware and knowledgeable as possible beforehand. I reviewed both organisations' websites to ensure I was up-to-date on funding programmes and terminology. With PRSF, less preparation was required as I already possessed insider knowledge from having worked for them. In some ways, my reputation was at stake if I appeared ignorant
to them in interviews, and I wanted to ensure I understood references to other funding programmes, as I knew these could come up naturally in conversation. There were interruptions during one of the PRSF interviews because the staff member being interviewed had not secured a private meeting room to complete the interview, leaving us to hunt for an empty space. We settled on a round table in a private room with a photocopier, which proved an issue when one of the Performing Rights Society’s (PRS) staff entered mid-interview to use the photocopier.

4. PROGRAMME DATA COLLECTION

The fourth phase involved the collection of quantitative data from PRSF and the external evaluator Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy (TFCC) to help build a picture of how the programme’s ‘success’ is being monitored and expressed. Next, raw programme data was downloaded for Rounds 9-15, with 16 partially completed. The data from Rounds 1-8 were sent to me by PRSF because this data had to be exported from the outdated grant management software PRSF changed from at the end of 2014. The data for Rounds 1-8 was considerably more limited in scope because the software was less sophisticated. The data on diversity characteristics of applicants and funded artists only became available after the grant software upgrade. Therefore, monitoring data is not available for Rounds 1-8. In total, data from 3,343 applications were downloaded for Rounds 9-15 with 1,546 unique applications. These were analysed using Excel functions to count the numbers and percentages of particular aspects such as genres, project type and grant amount received versus amount requested. Finally, I was involved in part of the data collection for two Impact Evaluations that PRSF ran in 2015 and 2016. The data, which I helped PRSF collect as a temporary employee, allowed PRSF to track the Momentum funding and to reapply to ACE in 2016 to continue managing Momentum. While the access to the data I was given, both as an employee and through my professional relationship with PRSF, was beyond that normally available to researchers, there are specific details of this process that need consideration. These will now be described below under the heading ‘getting access.’
BEING AN INSIDER RESEARCHER

My relationship to the fund manager, PRSF, during this research was primarily that of a PhD researcher investigating one of their funds but also as a former employee. My initial contact with PRSF came in October 2012, when I applied for an internship as part of my postgraduate degree at King’s College London. I ended up getting the post and interned with PRSF from October 2012-February 2013. Aside from a PhD researcher and former employee, at their request, I also briefly became a part-time, temporary employee in 2015 and 2016. While this research was conducted, I temporarily assisted PRSF with three separate impact evaluations. Two of these involved Momentum, but I also assisted with evaluations of PRSF funding schemes, the International Showcase Fund and Women Make Music. I worked part-time on Momentum Impact Evaluations from July 2015-September 2015 and again from February 2016-April 2016. These Impact Evaluations were conducted to collect data needed for PRSF to reapply to ACE to continue managing Momentum, which PRSF successfully did in 2016. There are two sides to this dualistic role: I was granted levels of access an outside researcher would never have been given, but I was also part of the evaluation process, in that I assisted PRSF in collecting data on Momentum-funded musicians.

When I set out on this research, I was already a former employee of PRSF and familiar to the staff, which enabled them to trust me and provide me access to participants and data with minimal issue. However, once I was temporarily working for them again, I was treated very much as one of the team at times, and this gave me insights into their working practices and many facets of the Momentum funding programme that would have otherwise remained obscured. One of my duties was contacting and gathering data from the musicians who had been funded in Rounds 1-8 and then Rounds 1-12. In this process, it quickly became apparent that artist managers were heavily involved in applying for and evaluating Momentum funding and were working with many of the funded musicians. My original research design did not account for this, as I expected most emerging musicians would not have managers and had not anticipated interviewing managers. Upon discovering the
extent of managers’ involvement, I adapted my research design. The work of Lizé (2016) and Hracs (2015) support the decision to focus on artist managers, as they both examined managers’ involvement with emerging and DIY musicians in France and Toronto. PRSF announced in 2018 that they would amend the Momentum application form to allow artist managers to include themselves in the funding. This decision was partly driven by advice from the Music Managers Forum, but the interviews I conducted with ACE staff also revealed that, during ACE’s pre-consultation prior to Momentum’s creation, artist manager training and support was flagged as a potential need.

In my role at PRSF, I primarily contacted managers and musicians through email, which had the benefit of introducing me, in some cases, to participants I would later interview, although the association with PRSF might have led some to hold back in interviews when discussing the funder. I attempted to overcome this by explaining exactly my capacity and that I was no longer working with PRSF. As some participants felt able to speak freely about their views of the funder, this appeared successful. I was careful to keep my involvement limited to collecting data, and I did not become involved in the design of surveys or analysis of the data for PRSF’s evaluation, as I wished to remain impartial and not to argue for the funding. The data for these two Impact Evaluations, which I organised into Excel files, was analysed later within the framework of this research and as a supplement to other forms of data collected in the project. There was consideration given to the conditions under which this data was collected and its level of accuracy (Yin, 2018: 117/322). I believe that the benefits outweighed any conflicts of interest, demonstrated through the example of the artist managers emerging as a key area of interest that may have been missed if I had not had insider access.

5. DOCUMENT COLLECTION

In this research, documentation was collected throughout the entire collection phase. Yin argues that, “For case study research, the most important use of documentation is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (2018: 5).
Therefore, the documentation took several forms and mostly consisted of targeted document collection and analysis. There are three main strands of documents I reviewed, seen in Table 3.1. These are: 1) Momentum applications, application guidance, assessor guidance/criteria and funded musicians’ evaluation forms, 2) news announcements about Momentum-funded musicians in DIY Magazine, M-Magazine, Music Week and Content Music Daily and 3) Internal reports and applications discussing Momentum, including the application PRSF made to ACE in 2016 to continue managing the programme.

I familiarised myself firstly with the application form and then the criteria and guidance documentation provided on PRSF’s website. I then reviewed what guidance assessors are provided and the criteria for judging applicants. The collection of press coverage and reports discussing Momentum was undertaken to supplement the other forms of collection and to see how Momentum was being presented in the press. I used materials from the press to stay informed about the Momentum fund and to gather additional views and data for context on the funded musicians. This information was helpful in contextualising the research and was not formally analysed. Key concepts arising from the literature review of ‘excellence’, access to resources (capital) and gatekeepers informed the analysis conducted on ACE documents and Momentum programme documents. These analysis processes are further discussed under 3.3 below.

**GETTING ACCESS**

Existing relationships with staff at ACE and PRSF facilitated my access to staff and assessors, as well as internal documents and programme statistics. While PRSF provided essential access to make this research possible, there remained other difficulties in attempting to recruit participants. Contact details were provided by PRSF for the funded musicians based on the application data they had submitted. Approaching the musicians and artist managers did not always prove successful, partly due to the multiple emails required to pin down a meeting. There was also a connection working for ACE that was surely a benefit to accessing staff there. I still found difficulty in setting up interviews, even with the access point, as
staff were not quick to respond, and I had to coordinate an interview date with their administrator rather than the interviewees themselves. We were able to schedule an interview, but this occurred later than I had planned.

Popular music research conferences also provided chances to network that led to contacts for participants, as some attendees had taught artists in receipt of Momentum funding at university. These conferences included the biennial International Association for the Study of Popular Music conference held in 2016 in Brighton and the Place of Music conference held at Loughborough University in 2017. Newly made connections were pursued, but it proved difficult to obtain commitment to participate in an interview for a few musicians who were originally interested. The nature of musicians’ work, involving time away touring and performing and intensive runs in the recording studio, presented difficulties in some instances leading to an inability to secure an interview. Artist managers were slightly easier to contact and pursue for interviews, and the total participants reflect this, with more managers represented than musicians. Managers were more responsive and seemed, in some cases, to be more engaged in the funding process than musicians. Managers were also typically the ones to provide funding evaluations to PRSF during the impact evaluations I participated in, which inspired their inclusion in the research. Effort was made to be adaptable to accommodate musicians’ schedules, and this worked for some but not others, for whom sitting down for an interview was not manageable. While face-to-face interviews would be ideal, many of the interviews were conducted by phone or video chat to accommodate managers and musicians’ schedules and reach geographically dispersed participants. Phone and video calls often made the most sense for participants with their busy schedules.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND RECORDING

When setting up face-to-face interviews with musicians and managers, the intention was to meet at suitably public places that would be comfortable for the interviewees. This aim presented certain challenges, with the locations typically suggested by the interviewee and thus often occurring in loud cafes with music
playing. While these environments might have made the interviewees feel more at home, they were difficult in terms of the volume of sound and the amount of people around. The noise, at times, may have allowed the participant to relax, knowing they would not easily be overheard, but, as interviews were recorded for transcription later, sound quality was negatively impacted. The result was that several of the audio recordings needed audio editing prior to being transcribed. There was also difficulty in catching every word with some of the participants’ words obscured by bass or other musical sounds, despite audio editing. In future, the potential for issues of noise should be considered when deciding locations for interviews.

QUALITY

The research design seeks to enhance the quality of research for this qualitative case study. In this project’s approach, it is not assumed that there is one true social reality, which Guba and Lincoln (cited in Bryman, 2008: 377) say traditional uses of reliability and validity standards imply. Guba and Lincoln, therefore, provide a counter argument by advocating for a different terminology specific to qualitative approaches. This study uses the traditional terms, but considers the specific nature of qualitative enquiry in defining and satisfying them.

Certain techniques can be used in qualitative research to enhance the quality in a way that suits qualitative inquiry. One way to improve the quality, as well as the credibility, of qualitative research is through triangulation (Wodak, 2001: 29). Case study research often uses triangulation of sources, and this is particularly important in a single case study such as this, so triangulation was particularly apt for this project, since it combines interviews, observations, and quantitative and document analysis. As discussed further below, case studies can present opportunities to triangulate data because of the multiple sources of information analysed together.

The question of whether qualitative interviews, and qualitative research in general, are valid arises for those who believe that a positivist approach to
knowledge and study of society is the preferred method. However, qualitative methods have strengths that make them the preferred choice for this study. The exploratory and descriptive nature of interviewing and resultant interviewee accounts allows for a rich investigation, where there is no clear hypothesis to study (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015: 198). As my research is driven by questions of value, the richness of the individuals’ accounts, which can be achieved with interviews, was a key reason for choosing them. The lack of generalisability for the interviews was not considered an issue of weakness, as the study was driven by questions which sought nuance and multi-dimensional answers. For the interviews with the staff, for example, the research question of why ACE created Momentum was one of the major questions the interviews sought to answer. The number of staff who could answer this question were too few to allow a large sample and the answers received were intended to reflect the individuals’ specific positions, not the view of a population.

VALIDITY

Questions of validity must be asked of qualitative data. Generalisability is often sought in qualitative research. This “analytical generalization involves a reasoned judgment about the extent to which the findings of one study can be used as a guide to what might occur in another situation” (Brinkmann Kvale, 2015: 297). Claims in research are based on “assertational logic,” including “arguments for generalization based on theory” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015: 297). This study, however, is seeking nuance and thus generalising is not the main aim. Yin argues that case studies find strengths in the ability to collect data from a multitude of sources and thereby create a process of triangulation where claims can be corroborated and “convergent lines of inquiry” can be developed (2018: 128/322). This ultimately raises a study’s overall quality (2018: 126/322). The case of Momentum primarily relies on the first of four types of triangulation identified by Patton, which is triangulation of data sources (Patton, 2015, cited in Yin, 2018). My study incorporates multiple types of data – both primary and secondary – and data from multiple sources to enhance the comparisons and validation between
sources and data sets. It is also important to consider ethics approval when conducting research with participants. I will now discuss this.

**ETHICS**

While material covered in interviews and observations was not anticipated to be of a sensitive nature, several aspects of this project were given careful ethical consideration. The initial risk assessment for the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) at the Open University deemed this project to be of low risk. However, as the research was conducted with human participants, care was taken to ensure that ethical decisions were made and the research design, data collection and analysis included ethical consideration. Participants were offered the choice of anonymity and the opportunity to opt out at any time from the study. Those musicians involved were originally only to be offered anonymity, but it was decided that the possibility of being named might be desirable for the musicians, perhaps even motivating them to participate. Ethical approval to offer this choice was granted by the HREC. Examples of the consent forms submitted to and approved by the HREC are in Appendix C. Choosing anonymity may have freed participants up to better discuss their true feelings, but 10 musicians chose to be named, with only one requesting a pseudonym. Artist managers were recruited before musicians and only offered anonymity, with none requesting to be named.

For the staff interviews, maintaining anonymity in a small organisation like PRSF would be very difficult. Similarly, ACE has a small team working on Momentum who would be easy to identify. Therefore, the option to speak off the record was offered to staff participants, with all opting to speak on the record and clarifying when they were speaking off the record. It was decided in the writing up process that, while stating the identities of these key staff members may help establish Momentum’s context and enhance the research, quotations taken from these staff would typically be anonymised for ethical reasons. Observations of assessment panels were kept entirely anonymous, both through the note-taking process and the analysis. All members of the panels were coded and given a letter or number at the beginning of the panel. The letters were assigned to the external
advisors and typically had some relation to their area of expertise, for example, ‘R’ for radio. The PRSF staff were coded in no specific order as 1, 2 or 3. Consent to participate was achieved from all members of the panels during the breaks or prior to the panel. It was made clear that participants would be completely unidentifiable. These extra measures were taken to ensure that all felt able to be open and honest in their opinions during the panel. This was also intended to alleviate any concern from PRSF staff that the presence of a researcher would negatively impact the panel, limiting the free-flowing speech and assessment. I was not allowed to record the panels for this reason.

When studying a publicly funded programme, there exists the potential ethical risk of discovering the case study did not fulfill its goals and might be considered a failure. In this case, the Momentum fund could be revealed as a failure, whether for musicians or a failure to achieve ACE’s goals. This situation requires honesty from the researcher to the organisation. Therefore, a reflexive, honest and transparent approach has been taken in constructing this research.

### 3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

The data from the observation and interviews was gathered and transcribed prior to analysis. This process was conducted simultaneously with document analysis and was informed by statistical analysis of the quantitative data. In this way, the evidence for the case study was analysed mostly concurrently “so that the case study’s findings were based on the convergence of information from different sources” (Yin, 2018: 121: 322). Interviews were transcribed with assistance from a transcription service, mostly verbatim. Transcripts were checked for accuracy prior to analysis. The emphasis was not on the pauses or stuttering but instead on the words used. As the study went on, the focus and research questions became clearer, which allowed some interviews to contain sections of summarised data where the discussion was not as relevant to the research questions.
The analysis of the data initially began with what Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) called ‘bricolage’ and Yin referred to as a process of “play,” where one is “searching for patterns, insights, or concepts that seem promising” (2018: 167/322). Originally, the approach to analysis drew from the tradition of Grounded Theory, as understood mainly by Charmaz (2014). The approach in this study differs from the traditional approach to grounded theory, where the end goal is theory generation and the beginning of data analysis does not start with research questions. However, the iterative process of the coding and the ways that other analytical tools come into play helped the analysis along for the interviews and the observations. Speaking about the coding process, Charmaz states:

Coding impels us to make our participants’ language problematic to render an analysis of it […] While engaged in initial coding, you mine early data for analytic ideas to pursue in further data collection and analysis. (Charmaz, 2014: 114)

Using the participants’ own language was important for this study because it aimed to maintain different perspectives and the values therein. The process of analysis started on the observations while the interviews were underway. This ongoing analysis and collection process relate to the spiralling back mentioned by Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) and O’Reilly (2009). O’Reilly raises the notion of a spiral analysis process in relation to ethnographic research, and she sees it as a flexible process.

This is because though an initial idea will inform data collection, the collected data will then raise questions about theory, which in turn leads to more data collection, analysis, writing, and the ongoing development of ideas. (O’Reilly, 2009: 15)

Effort was made throughout this study’s collection and analysis of data to bring the analysis to bear on the emerging theory and then circulate back to the data collection process. The analysis then became a more focused form of thematic analysis, which Kellehear likens to Glaser and Strauss and their grounded theory approach. Thematic analysis is concerned with meaning and usually follows an inductive approach (Kellehear, 1993: 38). Because I was concerned with meaning
in this case study, I was drawn to the loose flexibility of thematic analysis and the focus on deriving meaning.

Tactics listed by Miles and Huberman (1994) were undertaken early on to help me see themes and patterns in the data. These included using arrays to organise information and testing headings and subheadings. Matrices were also used in analysing the interview data to help categorise, and this helped lead to the development of the typology for managers and workers mediating for Momentum musicians, discussed in Chapter 6. Memos to myself, written throughout the data collection and analysis, no matter how small, were consulted in analysis. Making diagrams using Microsoft Office or pencil and a sketchbook helped me visualise linkages between themes and actors within the case study (Yin, 2018: 167/322). An example can be seen in Appendix G.

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Documents have played a significant role in how Momentum is realised, with policy shaping the programme. There are guidelines for musicians and assessors, application and evaluation forms, impact evaluation surveys and external evaluations all feeding into the programme. Analysis was undertaken in groups, with the impact evaluation data being analysed together and the two external evaluation reports from TFCC analysed separately and then comparatively. Themes and patterns were the focus of the analysis, with the research questions on excellence, talent and diversity keeping the focus to the ways those areas are discussed and the way Momentum is categorised or labelled as a fund. Particular attention was paid to how judgments are made and who has power to constrain access to the funding. Discourses emerged within analyses of documents, and these were compared to discourses emergent in the other data I collected. This included those surfacing during my observations of assessment panels for Momentum, the interviews with musicians, managers interviews, and interviews with PRSF and ACE staff. Document analysis can provide necessary information to fill in gaps, as well as provide valuable insights into how language can help sustain discourses that obscure power imbalances.
QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Of these six categories of quantitative data listed in Table 3.2, which this research draws upon, I have analysed each category separately and, when possible, together to draw conclusions about the Momentum programme. I primarily focused my analysis on all applications, excluding reapplications (referred to as ‘unique’ applications) and funded applications. I mostly excluded analysis of all available applications as it became apparent that many of the application were reapplications, where applicants apply multiple times. When trying to determine the types of musicians who were applying to Momentum, analysing the data inclusive of reapplications would have inflated the figures for those who reapplied most frequently. The main focus in my analysis was on the diversity measures (age, gender, ethnicity, disability, region, genre, sexual orientation), grant amounts sought and received and types of activity. Information from two impact evaluations was also incorporated when it helped contextualise the other programme data or where a pattern could be seen. Strict care was taken to protect individuals’ anonymity when presenting results. Much of the analysis of programme data in the following chapters focuses on Rounds 9-15 because many of the diversity measures are missing for Rounds 1-8. This was partly because PRSF utilised the grants software GIFTS, which prevented them from tracking the amount of data they were later able to incorporate when they transitioned to Flexigrant. The transition occurred between Rounds 7 and 8, preventing a clean and simple line to be drawn between data sets. Therefore, I kept data sets separate for Rounds 1-8 and Rounds 9-15 as best as possible. I have sought to keep the data of funded artists distinct for Rounds 1-8 and Rounds 9-15. When discussing all applications, however, I specify time periods and approximate rounds, as there is an overlap.

For the quantitative data, I had to first learn how to analyse such information, as I mostly possessed qualitative analysis experience. I determined that Excel provided the quickest means to analyse the data. The data was divided into two sets of 1) the funded musicians from Rounds 1-8 in one sheet and Rounds 9-15 in another, and 2) the data for all applications for Rounds 9-15. A key area of interest in analysis was how diversity factors were calculated, so calculations were done for both sets of data. In some cases, aspects of diversity
were compared (e.g. city of residence, city of origin, band or solo artist, etc.) against other characteristics of the applications, such as what type of projects were funded, or what grant amounts applicants received. This quantitative data supplemented the thematic analysis of interviews from funded musicians and Momentum panel observations. My analysis consisted of calculating totals and percentages for different values and conducting some descriptive statistics on factors such as the grant amount awarded. Ultimately, analysis of the quantitative data available allowed me to supplement the qualitative data, particularly on musicians, as there was a small number of interviews with musicians due to difficulties recruiting the participants described above. A deeper understanding of the ways the funding changed was also available through the data in a way that supported and also questioned the interviews with ACE and PRSF staff. The quantitative programme data provided a wealth of context to better understand how Momentum was run, musicians assessed and how the funding was evaluated and reported.

ANALYSIS TOOLS

The analysis of many of the interview transcripts and the observation fieldnotes were loaded into MAXQDA 12, an analysis software package, and initial read throughs were conducted with loose codes applied. For the observations, the first two were coded initially and analysed prior to conducting the third and fourth observations. This allowed a chance to enact the spiral discussed above and re-examine the ways I conducted the interviews and the aspects I noticed and chose to focus on. The interviews were also mostly coded in the software programme, which helped with the comparative process that led to the development of the managers typology. Other tools helped me gather the interview data for the musicians and staff. Word clouds were used to help highlight key terms and compare the importance of specific terms and ideas. These were only used as thinking tools and not formal analysis. Diagramming in sketchbooks and using programmes to draw flowcharts and relational maps helped reflect the embedded units within the whole case and their relationships to each other. As stated above,
the quantitative analysis was completed using Microsoft Excel. Finally, after the observations were conducted, all four were printed out and recoded using highlighters of different colours. This process helped synthesise the emergent themes of talent, diversity and excellence, within and across the different accounts.

3.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented the methodological approach of the single case study and explored the ways that the data collection was designed to account for multiple perspectives and incorporate multiple sources. The five phases of data collection were introduced and explained, and a discussion of the barriers to collection were examined. Questions of quality, validity and reliability were then addressed in the frame of a case study, and the ethics of the research were shown to consider issues of consent, anonymity and the importance of evaluating a publicly funded programme. Finally, the methods of data analysis were described and the tools used in the process introduced. It is this project’s aim to provide a critical and well-developed view of different perspectives of value at play within Momentum, and it is hoped that this research will contribute beneficial insights to both ACE and PRSF. This research may provide the opportunity to feed into ACE’s future strategic plans, as they accept public calls for evidence when redrafting their organisational strategy. For PRSF, I intend to write a report of my findings and disseminate this to them in person, in the hope that my findings could inform their future work. Such insights could inform the ways future funding programmes for both organisations are established, run and evaluated.
4. SHIFTING PRIORITIES: THE ARTS COUNCIL ENGLAND’S CHANGING FACETS OF VALUE IN FUNDING FOR POPULAR MUSICIANS

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The year 2013 marked a step change for Arts Council England (ACE), England’s distributor of public funding for the arts, when it launched the Momentum music fund, providing grants directly to popular musicians and through their intermediaries. ACE has a long history of supporting what they call ‘artforms’ that do not have commercial value, or which are seen to possess high levels of cultural capital. These may be ballet, fine art, museums or Shakespearean theatre – in music, the typical example is opera but can include music initiatives across other genres. At the time ACE decided to create a fund for popular musicians, no public investment existed in England that provided grants directly to popular musicians to execute projects of their choosing and design. It was revealed in Chapter 2 that the cultural value debate was driven by unhelpful dichotomies, such as aesthetic versus instrumental value, social versus economic value, and public versus commercial value. Beliefs by some funders and policymakers persist that commercial art and public funding are irreconcilable. The Momentum funding is, therefore, an atypical case of a publicly funded grant programme supporting popular musicians in England, and my research analyses this unique example of public funding supporting popular musicians in England.

Drawing upon interviews with ACE staff, document analysis and quantitative programme data, this chapter first sets the scene for analysing Momentum’s value by addressing why Momentum’s primary funder, ACE, started funding popular musicians through the Momentum fund. As Chapter 2 established, in recent decades, the music industries have undergone substantial changes, both technologically and within labour practices. In some ways, popular musicians have greater access to tools, enabling them to make music and access platforms to reach audiences. Musicians can even self-release material and find some level of
career success or stability by doing so, allowing them to sidestep music companies in a way they previously could not do before the invention of the internet. This chapter will explore to what extent Momentum’s creation was driven by these changes. I will then examine how the links between funding priorities of talent and excellence and ACE’s diversity initiatives, particularly its current Creative Case for Diversity (CCD), reflect competing forms of value.

4.2. ACE CREATES MOMENTUM

The following section is formed of three parts that come together to explain the origins of the Momentum fund and the reasons behind its creation. The first section will discuss why ACE decided to create and fund the Momentum fund, drawing from interviews with ACE staff and documents produced by ACE staff. I show that ACE’s CEO Alan Davey and an internal consultation led ACE to believe there was a gap in micro-finance that small targeted grants could solve. The gap existed due to the changes in the music industries around technology and the power dynamics of early career musicians, which I explore below. I argue that the second motivation for creating Momentum is ACE’s desire to be seen, both externally and within its own organisation, as a funder of popular music, despite difficulties for some staff in fully embracing the commerciality of popular music. Finally, I briefly show how ACE’s lack of experience in popular music and different assessment practices led them to select PRSF to manage Momentum.

A major assumption that underpins Momentum’s creation is one that ACE’s CEO Alan Davey held about the lack of investment by record labels in developing talent (Davey: 2012). Davey perceived that the amount of investment being offered by the major labels, in particular, had dropped off after the loss of income from record sales and other changes brought by digitalisation. Davey was inspired by a trip to Canada in 2012 to question, publicly, whether the recording industry was lacking in investment to develop artists, and he suggested there was “industry failure”. In a 2012 Huffington Post blog titled “Thinking Out Loud: FACTOR or XFactor?”, Davey identified the major labels’ approach to developing talent as one of short termism, where musicians might be dropped from their contract after a
low-performing record or not be given the opportunity to be signed at all. Davey
drew inspiration from the Canadian model of FACTOR, or the Foundation
Assisting Canadian Talent on Recordings, a non-profit organisation that provides
funding from the Canadian government through the Department of Canadian
Heritage and the Canada Music Fund, as well as radio broadcasting companies.
FACTOR provided $18,613,432 CAD (£10,877,900) to musicians and music
projects and initiatives in the fiscal year 2016-2017. Of that, $4,476,115 CAD
(£2,615,890) alone 717 supported recordings for that year (FACTOR Website,
2018). FACTOR is a large fund, compared to Momentum, and it has, in total,
provided £2,125,947 in its first five years. Davey claimed he did not wish to
replicate FACTOR’s model entirely, but he drew inspiration from it when ushering
ACE into a new phase of clear support for popular music. In Davey’s 2012 blog
post, he argues that there may be space for a public funder to get into the funding
game for popular musicians:

It's true to say though that in the past we've assumed that in genres like
pop, contemporary folk, roots or urban music, talent would be nurtured by
the record industry; something that has meant there hasn't been a pressing
need for us to act. This is changing. (Davey, 2012: para. 4)

Davey’s statement speaks to both of the reasons ACE decided to create
Momentum funding, admitting ACE’s lack of involvement in funding popular music
genres and the expectation of the market to sustain them. He further hints at the
changes in the music industries that, he believes, necessitate public intervention.
In addition, by framing the problem of lack of investment in terms of ‘talent
development’, Davey links the problem to the solution. The solution here is public
intervention in supporting talent development, which is situated under ‘Achieving
Excellence’ in ACE’s ten-year strategy plan Great Art and Culture for Everyone
(2010; 2013). Supporting and developing talent factor into the achievement of
excellence for ACE, and ACE’s stated motivation for Momentum is to support
talent development and sustained careers for popular musicians.
Before exploring how ACE decided Momentum was the right intervention into popular music, I first want to lay out the environment for popular musicians at the time and the changes in the music industries. The environment in which musicians seek to make careers today is vastly different from the situation musicians faced five, ten, fifteen or twenty years ago. Since the introduction of digital music, the music industries have seen unprecedented change. The most significant changes experienced in the industries relevant to emerging popular musicians are 1) the shift of responsibility to develop artists and financial risk away from the record labels over to the musicians and managers and 2) the decrease in investment by labels at the earliest, or ‘pre-development’ stage, to the later, ‘post-development’ stage, where risk is considerably lower.

Risk and uncertainty have long characterised the music industries, with the likelihood of having a profitable single being around one in nine, even at the height of recording sales (Garnham, 1990: 161). The popular music industries, and in particular the recorded music industry, have co-existed with a high frequency of market failure, which has resulted in restrictive practices by music companies toward artists, such as the options contract and later the 360 contract. Options contracts provide record labels with exclusive rights to release an artist’s record or songs, which they can deny while retaining the copyright to any previous releases made during the contract (Caves, 2000). The 360 deal, which has become common more recently, is so-called because it extends ownership of rights beyond the traditional exploitation of the musical copyright into areas not typical for the record labels, allowing music companies to profit from many areas of artists’ careers (Stahl and Meier, 2012). These other areas include “live performance and music publishing and increasingly incorporate the licensing of names, images, and logos (and the merchandizing of branded items), as well as other, typically new-media-enabled opportunities for monetization of the artist persona” (Stahl and Meier, 2012: para. 2). Significantly, in these deals, “rights to performers’ labour are also fundamental” (Stahl and Meier, 2012: para. 8). Where 360 deals are used, labels wield considerable power over artists, who must often engage in extensive
labour to obtain a deal in the first place, by profiting from the space of activity they undertake without needing to directly invest in such activity.

In addition to labels seeking more remit over artists’ intellectual property, the instability in the independent label scene, caused by corporate consolidation, ensured that the decision-making power remained with the labels. Rogers (2013) argues that the independent labels in the UK absorbed the main losses from physical sales in the shift to digital music, making them vulnerable to the major labels, who bought them out to grow their catalogues. Once the major labels controlled much of the independent market, they played it safe and mostly invested in the catalogues, rather than new artists, who might cost more to develop (Rogers, 2013).

When the digital transformation occurred, digital technology became relatively ubiquitous, enabling more budding musicians than ever to access music production software. Before this shift, in what might be called the ‘pre-digital’ music industries, musicians already had plenty of competition due to an oversupply of ‘talent’. While the financial and time risks of failure have largely rested with artists, record labels used to bear the main financial brunt of failure and offer greater sums of money and longer contracts to musicians, providing a sense of security. From the longer contracts, there were some controversial and high-profile incidents of pushback from famous artists wishing to break free. Indeed, Amanda Palmer, now one of the most outspoken ‘faces’ of ‘independent’ music, tweeted her ordeal with her label Road Runner Records and her elation upon being ‘released’ from the bond of her contract, which she saw as limiting her creatively and taking full ownership of her work (Powers, 2015: 123). Despite the desire to have less-controlling contracts espoused by many artists now, the large advances and sense of security available in the 1990s to a few musicians has not been replaced. Having explored the changes in the music industries, I will next briefly discuss the interviews I conducted and then move onto explain why ACE created Momentum and how it has changed.
THE DATA

According to an interview I conducted with the Senior Relationship Manager, Tim, who helped initiate the Momentum fund within ACE, there was not always recognition within ACE of the changed environment in the popular music industries and of the insecurity that now pervades many popular musicians’ careers. Part of the challenge of justifying a public fund for popular music in England was doing so to ACE’s own staff, since they could not see past popular music’s commercial nature to identify an uneven plane without the availability of sustained record deals.

So I think part of the journey with this – and this predates Momentum – has been about trying to raise awareness internally that we’re not in the 80s anymore. People don’t just turn up to a record label and walk out with a million pounds and a Rolls Royce. It doesn’t work like that anymore. There was a financial weakness in the industry and digital technology and how all of that downloading and stuff fed into that and what it was doing to the business model. And then the knock on effects of that on the talent development pipeline. (Tim)

For Tim, the ‘financial weakness’ echoes Davey’s rhetoric of ‘short-termism’ that hinders the development of talent. He is speaking about the knock-on effect of the constricted income from retail’s sales of records leading to record labels offering fewer and smaller advances to musicians when they sign a deal.

The situation in the UK music industries that Momentum was to enter into saw aspiring musicians more easily able to record and distribute their music without the intermediary of the label, but without the clear path of the record deal to aspire for and limited certainty regarding their ability to earn a living. The inability for musicians to sustain a career was one particularly important within Davey’s justification for Momentum. Part of the process of nurturing careers, according to ACE, is investing the right amount of funding at the correct time.

According to a Senior Relationship Manager, Tim, from 2011-2012, ACE was undertaking a consultation in the music industries and within its own National Portfolio Organisations (NPO). NPOs are the hundreds of organisations guaranteed annual funding from ACE for three or four years. This consultation sought to understand what kind of funding might be needed in the popular music.

---

9 ACE staff were given pseudonyms.
industries, how much and at what point it was needed most. This internal consultation would form the main basis for Momentum and shape the grants and their targeted nature. Tim remembers:

We did this internally with our research team. We went and talked to a whole breadth of people across the industry, artists, managers, labels, umbrella bodies, industry bodies, just to really kind of see what the need was and to test whether our assumptions were correct. And so on top of that we did quite a lot of interviews, and on top of that we held a roundtable event where we brought some of those consultees back and just tested out the themes that really were emerging for us through all of that. (Tim)

The four themes that ACE discovered during the consultation include the need for:

1. Small grants and small-scale finance at a particular time in an artist’s career
2. Support for artists to grow their profiles internationally
3. Support for strong local music scenes
4. Support for skills development for artist managers

Of these four themes, Tim identified number two as already being addressed through the joint ACE and PRSF fund, the International Showcase Fund (ISF), which helps UK artists attend industry-facing showcase music festivals all over the world. The ISF is not solely focused on popular genres; therefore, Momentum remains the first fund dedicated to popular music created by ACE. The third theme Tim identified was said to be addresses by the creation of the Music Venues Trust in the UK and work around music cities undertaken by the organisation Sound Diplomacy in the UK and abroad. Tim admitted the fourth theme was never taken up, which has implications for Chapter 6 on the artist managers and their role creating value for artists. As previously noted, my research found that artist managers were acting as intermediaries for popular musicians, securing financial support and contributing to artist development. ACE’s decision not to pursue support for managers therefore presents a missed opportunity within Momentum to support artist development. The first theme was identified at the time of the consultation as the main one for ACE to take up. In carrying out the consultation, ACE seemed to be asking the question of whether artists would benefit from small grants in a way that presupposed that small targeted grants would be the best solution.
When offered the chance for a new form of funding, respondents are unlikely to deny its potential effectiveness. Key to the consultation was the idea that the grants could make a demonstrable impact if they came at the right time. ACE saw their support of music development agencies Urban Development, Generator North East and Roundhouse as providing funding and support to the lowest level musicians, who are beginners or aspirant musicians. This included musicians in popular genres\(^\text{10}\). It is important to note that ACE’s funding did indirectly support popular musicians through organisations, but Momentum marked the first fund created by ACE to provide grants directly to popular musicians. Despite acknowledging the challenges in the music industries, Tim claimed that the most successful artists’ careers are maintained through the marketplace. The space in between for emerging musicians is where Momentum was targeted, with the aim to find artists who were perceived to be on a trajectory and deemed by the fund to be “label-ready” (Tim). This was where artists “had a product to sell or develop, and they needed the finance in order to either build a bigger team around themselves or to buy some proper marketing or to help with the recording costs, improve the quality... it was about finding that very specific place where that kind of money could actually make a difference” (Tim). According to ACE, the changes in the recorded music industry, along with their own desire to change their genre associations as a funder, prompted ACE to become involved in popular music through a talent development fund that became Momentum. But, given ACE’s long history of mostly ignoring and then later quietly supporting some popular musicians through organisational funding, there arose questions of whether funding popular music would be welcomed by ACE’s staff – as well as the government and the British public – and if they would possess the capacity and knowledge to manage a popular music fund.

\(^\text{10}\) The organisations Urban Development, Generator North East and Roundhouse all have programmes that work to develop artists or offer training for artists to develop themselves through creative, technical and business skills.
Since its founding in 1946 as the Arts Council of Great Britain, the Arts Council has prioritised the funding of classical genres of music. Jazz was later taken up by ACE, which Banks and Toynbee argue legitimised jazz as art, by recognising it through public funding (2014). ACE’s legacy of funding ‘high art’ and not commercial music of mass appeal is borne out in ACE’s funding practices, even as Momentum continues to run, as well as in the organisational strategy and reporting documents. A few examples demonstrate the persistent nature of the aversion. Historically, past ACE annual reports, including one from 1995-1996, make many more references to classical forms of music than other genres. In the 1995-1996 report, the single page on music funding describes how ACE supported symphonies, concert halls, commissioning and performance of classical pieces, with a few references to jazz. Clear references to popular music are absent. This absence is striking since the UK, in the 1990s, was experiencing a moment of cultural pride and recognition, known as ‘Cool Britannia,’ where pop stars – such as the Spice Girls, Blur, and Oasis – brought renewed global attention to the UK’s arts and culture. As discussed in Chapter 2, this increased attention to arts and culture in the late 1990s led Tony Blair’s Labour government to increase government investment in what were defined as the ‘creative industries.’ A more recent example can be seen in ACE’s NPO Music Narrative, a summary of ACE’s proposed NPOs spending for 2018-2022, which lays out the future plans for ACE’s funding (ACE, 2018d). The Music Narrative only mentions popular music by discussing “top selling popular artists” and only in relation to England’s national reputation, not ACE’s funding of emerging popular musicians. Perhaps most longstanding is the Taking Part survey, which aims to measure arts participation and is run by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and ACE. For 2014-2015, the survey still lists the options for the type of live music attended in the last 12 months as “opera or operetta,” “classical music,” “jazz,” and “other live music,” seemingly reaffirming the belief that popular forms of music, while highly popular and enjoyed by a great many people, are not as valuable to policymakers. Interestingly, the percent of participation for the surveyed population for these types of music were 3.7%, 7.0%, 5.2% and 31.9%, respectively (ACE, 2015e: 16-19). The survey’s lack of specificity and its lumping together of all other
forms of live performance seems to indicate that popular forms of music are less understood by policymakers and within the larger ecosystem of culture considered important in the Taking Part survey.

One area that ACE’s longstanding bias toward classical and sometimes jazz genres is clearly evident is the types of organisations that ACE selects to be NPOs. These organisations are spread throughout England, operating in all areas of the arts. Data published by ACE in 2018, on where the organisation sends a majority of its grant funding, reflect the sustained nature of what is a long-standing tradition of ACE to heavily fund the ‘high’ arts, such as opera, ballet and theatre. The data shown in Table 4.1 is drawn from ACE’s major funding for NPOs, and it shows that, from 2018-2022, the ten organisations receiving the most funding will be four opera houses, two ballet companies, two theatres/theatre companies, along with Southbank Centre and newcomer Manchester International Festival (MIF). Southbank Centre programming does include some popular music, but its remit is programming across many art forms. The situation is similar for MIF. What is significant is the top 10 highest funded organisations of the 841 funded NPOs will receive 31% of the total 2018-2022 budget of £1,632,018,956. Table 4.1 shows the funding for each of the ten organisations. While the amount of funding disproportionately received by these organisations is striking, the lack of diversity in the artforms represented is equally noticeable. The Royal Opera House (ROH) has received the highest amount of funding for all NPOs in the last three NPO periods from 2012-2015, 2015-2018 and 2018-2022, although the yearly funding amount has dropped from a peak of £25,327,084 per year for 2014-2015 to £24,028,840 for 2018-2022. Despite the slight drop in funding, ROH alone will receive 5.89% of the total £1.6billion budget for all NPOS in 2018-2022 (compared with 6.88% of the budget for 2015-2018).

---

11 The most recent NPO funding period changed to four years, covering 2018-2022.
Table 4.1 National Portfolio Funding for 2018-2022
ACE Budget for National Portfolio Organisations 2018-2022 in £s\textsuperscript{12}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Funding (\textbf{\text{\text{$}}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Opera House</td>
<td>96,115,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbank Centre</td>
<td>73,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Theatre</td>
<td>66,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Shakespeare Company</td>
<td>59,936,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English National Opera</td>
<td>49,520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera North Limited</td>
<td>41,544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIF</td>
<td>38,166,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Royal Ballet</td>
<td>31,564,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English National Ballet</td>
<td>24,856,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh National Opera</td>
<td>24,492,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Momentum’s external profile within the music industries has been improving during its life. As discussed in Chapter 7, some of the musicians funded by Momentum stated that the calibre of previously funded artists attracted them to apply. One band I interviewed specifically mentioned that their peers in other bands viewed being funded as being successful. Alternatively, I interviewed one indie musician not funded by Momentum who had chosen not to pursue funding and had set up a label that was more of a collective than money-making enterprise. The growing profile and industry respect for Momentum and the fund’s association with ACE, according to Tim, had an effect on the number of applications from popular musicians being submitted to ACE’s in-house grants programme Grants for the Arts (GftA)\textsuperscript{13}.

With a lot of the stuff that’s supported through Momentum [it] could quite easily – with a little bit of a shift in understanding internally at the Arts Council, and a shift in how people write the applications – could fit within

\textsuperscript{12} Data was downloaded from the ACE website (ACE website, 2018d): https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/national-portfolio-2018-22/more-data-2018-22

\textsuperscript{13} GftA was an “open access funding programme for individuals, art organisations and other people who use the arts in their work. It offered awards from £1,000 to £100,000 to support a wide variety of arts-related activities, from dance to visual arts, literature to theatre, music to combined arts” (ACE website, 2018).
something like Grants for the Arts. And we’re starting to see that now that
more people are applying to Momentum and recognising the Arts Council
are partner in that, and also our bigger profile in supporting work elsewhere,
we’re starting to see more people who could go to Momentum actually
coming to Grants for the Arts. (Tim)

While data is not available to clearly demonstrate Momentum’s impact on
applications made to GftAs, the value of Momentum here is in its potential capacity
to raise ACE’s profile as a funder of popular music. Additionally, the process
through which this would happen is symbolically important, as popular musicians
might be looking to public funding and ACE specifically and feel included within the
wider public funding spectrum, arguably for the first time in ACE’s history. One of
the key organisational aims of creating Momentum was to recast ACE funding as
open to popular musicians, but those initiating the fund within ACE back in 2012
saw the lack of internal capacity to do so. The next section will explore the reasons
ACE pursued an outside organisation to manage Momentum and how internal
practices and beliefs toward popular music and commerciality within ACE came
into play.

WHY ACE CHOSE AN EXTERNAL ORGANISATION TO MANAGE
MOMENTUM

ACE valued Momentum as a way to develop a reputation as a funder of popular
music while not having to develop their own internal robustness to deal with
popular music applications, as well as not being able to get everyone on board
internally. At the time Momentum was created, some ACE staff were not aware
that ACE was supporting popular music at all. This is why they sought an outside
foundation or charity to manage the day-to-day running and assessing of the
applications:

I mean there are things that PRS Foundation can do that we couldn’t do
internally around the way decisions are made. So the attraction of an
external organisation delivering this was that they could have slightly lighter
touch than we could, but most particularly they could bring in industry
expertise into that decision-making process. (Tim)

The ‘lighter touch’ mentioned by Tim refers to the difference in funding
assessment between ACE’s GftA programme and Momentum. He seemed to
consider a ‘lighter touch’ to be one where the staff have less direct input into the funding decisions. In ACE’s GftA programme, applications are assessed primarily by the application form itself and decisions are made internally by ACE staff. With Momentum, as with some of PRSF’s other funding programmes, such as their Open Funds and Women Make Music, funding decisions start with an internal shortlisting process, but this is followed by decision panels composed of external ‘experts’ that are especially chosen based on their knowledge of the represented music genres. The advisors are chosen for panels based not only on their perceived genre expertise but also their experience level and their vocational areas of expertise. Some advisors will serve on multiple panels, but they are not on more than one of the quarterly panels. In the four Momentum panels I observed, the primary areas of expertise and titles included three in radio, three in Artists and Repertoire (A&R), three were involved with labels, three were involved in festivals or musical event planning and programming, two were managers, one was in publishing, one was a DJ, and one was an entrepreneur. I list these as primary areas of expertise because several of the advisors wore multiple hats and had experience in different areas of the music industries. The expertise areas of different individuals may serve as prisms, refracting the value of the funding and the artists and applications in different ways.

The panels rotate, and advisors usually only sit on one panel per year. It is interesting that ACE recognised the benefits of PRSF’s use of external experts in the assessment process, while maintaining its internal assessments and heavy reliance on the application form. One of the problems for any grant funder hoping to ensure that “great art and culture can be presented and produced, experienced and appreciated by as many people in [England] as possible” (ACE, 2013a: 10) is making the application process accessible, transparent and capable of feeding back to unsuccessful applicants. Providing detailed feedback to all unsuccessful applicants remains a problem for ACE, with budgetary concerns limiting their capacity to deliver bespoke feedback to every unsuccessful applicant (Hill, 2014). In 2016, members of the cultural sector requested more detailed application feedback for unsuccessful applications to GftA for grants of less than £15,000, the same monetary level of Momentum grants (Romer, 2016). Given that popular music has not received significant funding from ACE in the past, and popular
musicians are less likely to have heard of or applied for grants than those in other genres, like the well-supported classical sector, application writing skills and the ability to speak the language of the funder are of paramount importance. Tim referred to the popular music sector as perhaps less experienced with purely written application forms, which is how ACE assess all musical applications for the GftAs scheme. He continued in an interview:

So a lot of our grants, for example our Grants for the Arts predominantly rest on the written application. So we don't take into consideration, in the same way that Momentum does, we don't take into consideration things like recordings and videos. It's purely down to how well they respond to the application prompts. (Tim)

The inability for ACE to consider and assess musical recordings in the application process was seen as a limitation in ACE’s funding process. Such a restriction might discourage musicians in many genres from applying. Similarly, PRSF’s capacity and experience in assessing musical recordings across genres, and in applications through their other funds, seemed to position them, according to ACE, to better assess popular musicians’ expressions. Tim said that those working in the popular music sector might be less experienced in expressing themselves purely in a written form:

We knew that we were dealing with a sector that was not used to that way of dealing with things and not necessarily skilled up to the point where it was able to address some of the things that are so important in Grants for the Arts around public benefit and how that is expressed. Again, we knew that PRSF would be a likely candidate to deliver this. (Tim)

Tim’s statement recognises that popular musicians may struggle to articulate how recording a video or doing a tour specifically creates “public benefit,” which is a key assessment factor in the GftAs scheme. If ACE had administered Momentum, they may have struggled to adapt the application process to suit the needs of the popular music sector. Being able to provide an application process better adapted to the industries that it intended to reach positioned PRSF well to take over managing Momentum. Indeed, ACE’s reliance on the strength of the application form alone may be an exclusionary practice for various musicians across genres. It remained unclear from interviews with staff why ACE had not adopted other
means of assessment, despite acknowledging the shortcomings of a form-only process.

The second part of why ACE chose an external fund manager derives from the irreconcilability of their organisational history with the commerciality of popular music. For the new Project Grants fund created in 2018 to replace GftA, ACE appears to have decided that, while they want to be seen as more of a popular music funder (drawing from the brand-new Project Grants – Music Info Sheet), they have not fully accepted the commercial side of popular music. The guidance for the Project Grants in Music emphasises their aims to support popular music:

We can support a range of musical types and genres including classical, jazz, brass bands and world music. We are also keen to support contemporary popular music genres. (ACE, 2018f: 3)

The tension with the commercial side of funding popular music arises further in the guidance. Here, activity deemed not eligible for funding is said to include “activity (such as performances or recordings) where the intention is to make a profit (i.e. from ticket or record sales)” (ACE 2018f: 4). Every budget must balance, in line with Momentum as well, but explicitly ruling out any activity intended for profit seems at odds with the popular music ecosystem and the types of measures required to help musicians have sustained careers. Senior Relationship Manager at ACE, Tim, stated that supporting musicians to have sustainable careers was one of the needs that led to the creation of Momentum.

It was also based on some of [then CEO Alan Davey's] observations of the music sector and the challenges and issues it faced that fitted with kind of what we already knew, particularly around artists and their ability to have sustainable careers, so to get beyond the first album, basically. (Tim)

For many musicians, creating an album might be a commercial activity, in that the musicians intend to sell their records for a profit, but, when it comes to public investment, the very notion of profit from the public purse is almost intolerable. When asked if there was any pushback from within ACE’s own departments to the proposition of a popular music fund, Tim pointed to commerciality:

The thing that we perhaps have always pushed against slightly, and it is internally as well, is about issues of commerciality. (Tim)
Even though the NPOs 2018-2022 Music Narrative produced by ACE to explain their music investment refers to “top selling popular artists” (ACE, 2018d: 1), ACE cannot seem to shake the dichotomy between publicly funded arts and the commercial music industries. Notions persist within the organisation, as well as within cultural policies more widely, that a clear division exists between commercial and non-commercial art and that public funding should not support art – like popular music – that is seen to be created for and exist within a market (Saha, 2018: 86). Popular music is still conceived as inherently commercial. However, as I show in Chapter 7, some of the popular musicians funded by Momentum do not intend their music for mass appeal, and some of those that hope for success do so with the aim of sidestepping the large (commercial) record labels. While this might sound counterintuitive, the vast majority of musicians operating in the popular music genres will never have their music heard by millions of fans or reach fame. This suggests that achieving mass-popularity is an unrealistic aim for some and should not be considered the major defining aspect of musicians in popular music genres. The next section will reveal what the Momentum fund’s priorities and shifts say about ACE’s changing values and how having multiple priorities – of excellence, talent development and diversity – can create a complex funding ecosystem.

4.3. FROM DEVELOPING TALENT AND SUPPORTING EXCELLENCE TO PROMOTING DIVERSITY

While Momentum was envisioned, developed, actioned and evaluated, ACE was experiencing the constant change of political whim, resulting from the revolving door of politics. I will later discuss how the changes in the UK’s political leadership influenced the organisational direction at ACE. It should be noted that the constant changes in government can mean it is difficult for publicly funded organisations to pursue long-term strategies and plans without constant adaptation. Momentum illustrates this through the ways different funding priorities played out through it. Initially, ACE considered Momentum a ‘Strategic Fund’ and placed it within the priority of supporting excellence. The need to support talent development was always part of the programme and remains so today. ACE’s 10-year strategy
raises the importance of supporting talent several times. However, larger cultural policy changes regarding diversity became core to much of Momentum’s functioning and mission after the pilot phase ended. Table 4.2 shows key events in Momentum’s chronology for the period of 2012-2014, covering the initial two-year pilot and the approximate point when ACE’s diversity monitoring policies and approaches were fully introduced into Momentum. Later in the discussion, I will further show the chronology for 2014-2017. ACE’s emphasis on the protected characteristics in the Equality Act of 2010 was seen in my observations and will be discussed more in Chapter 5. Before there was the Equality Act, there was the Race Relations (Amendment) Act of 2000 (Hewison, 2014: 81). The effects of greater monitoring of diversity are laid out in the following chapter on PRSF’s management of Momentum. Before discussing ACE’s current incarnation of diversity policy, I show how the aim to support excellence reiterates old debates of high art versus commercial art.
## Table 4.2 Chronology of Momentum and ACE 2012-2014 Pre-Pilot and Pilot

### Pre-Pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2012</td>
<td>Alan Davey writes Huffington Post blog “Thinking Out Loud: FACTOR or X Factor?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Peter Bazalgette appointed Chair of ACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td>ACE holds pre-consultations with individuals in the music industries which leads to creation of a Talent Development Fund pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td>ACE Sr. Relationship Mgr. writes ACE guidance for “Music industry talent development fund commissioned grant” which becomes Momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan/Feb 2013</td>
<td>PRSF applies to manage the fund and decide the name Momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>PRSF chosen by ACE to manage Momentum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pilot Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>Momentum launched by ACE and PRSF at The Great Escape Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2013</td>
<td>Deezer joins Momentum as digital partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2013</td>
<td>Round 1 – Momentum Year 1 begins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diversity Shift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
<td>Publication of the “Rebalancing Our Cultural Capital” report critiquing ACE’s regional funding distribution spurs national discussion of regional imbalance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>ACE commissions report “Equality and diversity within the arts and cultural sector in England”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
<td>UK House of Commons Select Committee opens an inquiry into ACE’s regional funding and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
<td>ACE respond to HOC inquiry with report “This England: How Arts Council England uses its investment to shape a national cultural ecology”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
<td>PRSF hires new staff member to manage Momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
<td>First Momentum Diversity Steering Group meeting organised by PRSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Momentum’s capability to support ‘excellence’ in popular music has been one of the key aims and benefits for ACE, according to the ACE website (2016) and the slotting of Momentum into the first priority of ACE’s 10-year strategy: “Excellence is thriving and celebrated in the arts, museums and libraries” (ACE, 2013a: 39). ‘Excellence’ has a history within cultural policy and public funding as a signifier of prestigious, high art forms, which have historically been deemed the highest quality art by those in power (Hewison, 2014). Excellence has been mobilised by funders to justify the aesthetic value of art, beyond instrumental or economic value. In turn, excellence has been factored into another aim for funding: increasing access. Increasing access is an instrumental aim, which sought to expose the least privileged to the best art – so deemed by the funder – in order to lead to self-development (Hewison, 2014).

The publication in 2016 of the AHRC-funded Cultural Value Project (CVP) report Understanding the Value of Arts and Culture was the culmination of a three-year project consisting of roughly 70 individual projects, all seeking to identify what cultural value is composed of, and how it might be measured and evaluated in a useful way, as discussed in Chapter 2 (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 6). Their report formed part of a dialogue between several camps of researchers attempting to drill down into clearer and more actionable definitions and understandings of cultural value. At the same time the CVP was running, the Warwick Commission (WC) was established as a research project within the University of Warwick in 2013 to research the future of cultural value, and published its influential report in 2014. The commission’s stated aims were “developing new policy thinking and practical recommendations that will enable the flourishing and long-term sustainability of culture and creativity in Britain in a competitive and challenging global landscape” (Warwick Commission Website, 2016). Both the CVP and WC had distinctive remits to directly influence the discussion about cultural value, which would, in turn, translate into policy change. The reason these interventions were initiated in 2013 derives from the longstanding paradoxes of defining and measuring cultural value, where different approaches can be reduced to seemingly irreconcilable dichotomies and thus stagnancy, such as intrinsic value vs. instrumental value. These dichotomies are problematic for a case like Momentum,
where public funding crosses over into the commercial popular music industries. The CVP, however, argues that public funding and commercial arts are already intertwined:

It is an error to see publicly-funded and commercial arts and culture as separate worlds, one dependent on the taxpayer and the other on the market. They operate as part of a complex ecology of talent, finance, content and ideas. (Crossick and Kaszynksa, 2016: 8)

Even though this relationship has been one of mutual support between public subsidy and the commercial sector for so long, there remains a lack of research on the points of intersection, so Momentum serves as a useful case to examine value within such a sphere.

Part of the dialogue within the cultural value literature is bringing into question the processes of evaluation, the rise of impact studies and the desire to conceive of value in ways that are measurable – often through economic means (O’Brien, 2010). The 1980s saw the growth of the New Public Management (NPM) approach, which moved cultural organisations “to modernise public sector managerial techniques through the example of the private sector, including through setting targets, monitoring outputs, and auditing performance” (Crossick and Kaszynksa, 2016: 16). The shift to NPM has been widely criticised, and the CVP’s aims as a project seemed to dig at exactly the heart of the issue: to move cultural value into a more nuanced and complex realm, away from KPIs and targets. Belfiore was an early critic in the debate and, along with Bennett, argued that the shift meant that:

... A rather simplistic debate has taken place, which has focused on measurable “impacts” of the arts and which has left a number of fundamental assumptions unchallenged. This, in part, can be attributed to the imperatives of “evidence-based policy making”, which has become something of an orthodoxy in Britain in most areas of domestic policy and which has therefore to a large extent determined the terms of the public debate about the arts. (Belfiore and Bennett, 2007: 135-136)

The arts in receipt of public funding are often pressured to demonstrate their value in some form to the government and whichever party(ies) are in power. Belfiore and Bennett articulate the ways the larger policy making environment impacted upon the way arts funding has been justified in the UK. Within that environment, arts organisations took up the mantle of economic value in the hopes that
speaking the language of the Treasury would somehow enhance their likelihood of continuing to receive government funding. Belfiore describes how the UK has come to its current state, where various sectors constantly tout their apparent economic return or GDP contribution.

The arts sector decided to emphasize the economic aspects of its activities and their alleged contribution to the wealth of the nation. This was originally a defensive strategy of survival, aimed at preserving existing levels of cultural expenditure. The hope was that, if the arts sector (now referred to as the ‘cultural industries’) could speak the same language as the government, it would perhaps have a better chance of being listened to. (Belfiore 2002, p. 95)

Time has since proven that this line of thinking is incorrect, as funding for arts and cultural organisations in the UK remains uncertain. A comment from Pauline Tambling, former Head of Research at ACE, at the 2016 event “The Arts Council at 70: A History in the Spotlight” helps provide possible insight into why this tactic has been so ineffective:

You normally get government money when there is a problem, whether that be fighting crime, tackling obesity or stopping people smoking, i.e. something that is actually dangerous to society… We have to be careful not to assume that, if we prove something is good, someone will come along and fund it. In my experience, governments only tend to fund the problems. Finding lots of problems, i.e. that no-one is going to the arts, is probably more impactful in terms of getting government funding than trying to say that everything is wonderful. (King’s College London transcript, 2016: no page)

This perspective is intriguing because it is rarely taken up clearly in the literature, but it seems to align with the way that the Momentum fund was created and justified. Momentum’s initial funding priorities were supporting talent development (an area in need of investment) and funding excellence (a focus deriving from ACE’s adoption of the 2008 McMaster report’s emphasis on funding ‘excellence’). A problem was identified and the funding was created with the intention of solving it.

Following McMaster’s report in 2008 and James Purnell stepping into the role of Culture Secretary during the New Labour period, the priority of ‘excellence’ or ‘quality’, replaced emphasis on funding targets for ACE (Hewison, 2014). This shift in policy toward the adoption was the precursor to the political and
organisational environment that allowed Momentum to be contemplated four years later. It would appear that, rather than wade through murky and contested waters of the debate between collective benefit versus individual growth, ACE responded to this particular research outcome by instead turning to take up the mantle of ‘excellence’.

Even though the Momentum fund was initially justified as the solution to a problem identified in ACE’s industry consultation and therefore allocated Strategic Funding\textsuperscript{14}, it was filed into the first priority of ACE’s ten-year plan, \textit{Great Art and Culture for Everyone}. ACE’s ten-year plan places excellence at the heart of ACE’s framework for their ten-year plan, whilst acknowledging that ‘excellence’, as a term, needs better definition and is going to mean “different things for different disciplines, organisations, and ways of creating and presenting work” (2013a: 25). Acknowledging this is problematic because ACE goes onto say that they intend to find a better definition because they will use ‘excellence’ to measure their “effectiveness” (2013a: 26). Yet, excellence still lacks a clear metric. As Hewison rightly points out, not only is ‘excellence’ an “empty category” requiring comparison between objects to derive meaning, but, in addition to this problem of definition, McMaster’s original definition from 2008 suggests instrumentalism by linking ‘excellence’ to the capacity to transform the individual (2014: 143). Excellence loses its meaning when its definition becomes dependent on another observable outcome.

In Momentum, ‘excellence’ was not clearly defined, and, in practice, each individual making assessments of applications brings their own knowledge of different genres and subgenres of popular music into play. Similar issues of definition are seen in ACE’s adoption of the Creative Case for Diversity, where complex elements of diversity monitoring overlay the issue of inequality in the arts.

\textsuperscript{14} No longer a funding stream, Strategic Funding was described as being used “to target particular challenges, opportunities or gaps in the delivery of those priorities” laid out in the 10-year strategy, \textit{Great Art and Culture for Everyone} (ACE, 2016c).
There exists an unequal dispersion of capital and knowledge of the funding ecosystem in England among popular musicians of different ethnicities, genres, genders, regions and other protected characteristics. The same unequal dispersion of resources, as well as recognition by the establishment, exists in other art forms as well. Popular music is a particularly interesting arena in which to study diversity and public funding, as the market and its respective gatekeepers might be expected to elevate the best music, regardless of an artist’s background. For music companies, the desire to minimise risk in the recording industry has meant the safer bet is still more likely to receive financial backing. Even today, this is seen through repertoire catalogues which aim to ensure profits from ownership of commercially successful artists’ copyright (Rogers, 2013). Because ACE distributes public funding from taxpayers, there is some expectation that it supports a wide array of art across England. The current policy approach at ACE to mitigating the imbalances of resources is the Creative Case for Diversity (CCD). Launched in 2011 and re-taken up in a 2014 speech by then Chair Sir Peter Bazalgette, the implementation of the CCD has pushed a discourse of diversity within ACE and the funding programmes it supports, such as Momentum. The CCD follows on from other policies and discourses of diversity that have shaped arts funding in England. Moss (2005) traced these as starting with emphasising funding for community arts, then for ‘ethnic arts,’ next for multicultural arts (tied to multiculturalism) and, finally, cultural diversity (Saha, 2017: 306). Rather than positioning the need for diversity as part of a pursuit of fairness or social justice, ACE takes ‘cultural diversity’ forward in the CCD and links diversity to creativity and success. It becomes capital for cultural organisations and, in some cases, individual artists.

An approach which emphasises creativity and innovation as benefits of diversity runs the risk of situating ‘cultural plurality’ as an economic benefit by allowing organisations to target larger audiences (Saha, 2018: 303). The value of diversity has not been explicitly laid out in the Momentum fund. Instead, monitoring and evaluation practices were implemented with the aim of tracking and demonstrating the fund’s diversity and improving it based on specified categories,
like gender. This illustrates that ACE wants to see Momentum reflect a diverse pool but without specific targets. The question arises of how much diversity is enough. My interviews with PRSF staff, observations of assessment and review of Momentum-related documents appear to demonstrate ACE’s attempts to improve the representation of minority groups and under-represented applicants, based on the nine protected characteristics in the 2010 Equality Act. It appears that representation should reach the levels that exist within the wider English population, although this has not been specifically stated. This is called:

The ‘demography and representation’ approach that underpins such policy interventions. Here, targets are set for the recruitment of women, people from racial and ethnic minorities, or with working-class backgrounds (traditionally the groups that have been most marginalised within the cultural industries), based on attaining proportional parity with their number in society as a whole. (O’Brien et al., 2017: 274).

There are questions raised by the Creative Case for Diversity (CCD) about what ACE is hoping to achieve by increasing diversity. The speech delivered by Bazalgette outlining the CCD simply claimed that it “makes diversity a key issue in relation to the programming and audiences, leadership and workforce of all our funded organisations” (Bazalgette, 2014). Nothing is said about what diversity means and how this will be measured, even though such monitoring is something that the NPM’s ways of evaluation and monitoring require.

Momentum is certainly not the only fund under pressure to perform in diversity, despite lacking clear outlines of what that means. After ACE relaunched the CCD, they began to put pressure on the National Portfolio Organisations (NPOs) they fund to demonstrate that their workforces and audiences were diverse, or risk seeing funding cuts. Writing in an ACE diversity data report from 2012-2015, ACE states:

The promotion of diversity is now a collective responsibility. This shared endeavour is at the heart of the Creative Case for Diversity, which makes diversity a key issue in relation to the programming and audiences, leadership and workforce of all our funded organisations. Diversity needs to go mainstream. (ACE, 2015c: 5)

Despite calling on the ‘collective’ responsibility, there persists a focus on the ‘talent’ that becomes almost impossible to escape in the cultural industries. In the speech where Bazalgette relaunched the CCD, he ties diversity to talent and
excellence – in the form of ‘quality’ – saying that ACE funding should be supporting “all our talent and communities. That’s how we'll ensure work of true ambition and enduring quality” (Bazalgette, 2014: para. 6) Diversity, then, might be a tool to support excellence and to unearth more talent. The pursuit of greater diversity does not stand on its own – of its own value – instead being linked inextricably to meritocratic and, at times, divisive concepts of talent and excellence.

The initial document produced by ACE that outlines the fund that became Momentum illustrates the overlapping, messy relationships between diversity, talent and excellence. The document, entitled “Music industry talent development fund commissioned grant”, sets out ACE’s aims of “supporting distinctive artistic talent in the music industry” and “attract[ing] a diverse and artistically distinctive range of applications” (ACE, 2013b). The definition of ‘diversity’, which ACE draws on, as laid out in their 2015-2018 Corporate Plan, includes diversity within:

Socio-economic class, all faiths, ages, gender including transgender, ethnicities, sexual orientations and disabled people. The geography of diversity spans England’s regions, from the most rural to the inner city. (ACE, 2015b: 2)

Their definition adopts the ‘protected characteristics’ laid out in the UK’s Equality Act of 2010. Table 4.3 below lists both the nine protected characteristics established in the law in a line-by-line comparison with the terms used by ACE and PRSF in the Momentum fund. Noticeably, religion is not tracked or considered in the Momentum process, and sexuality and gender reassignment are flattened into the single designation of gender. There seems to be no consideration of intersectional diversity in the CCD or Equality Act. An interesting aspect is the monitoring of ethnicity instead of race – race being a more political and loaded term linked more closely with social justice. ACE’s implementation of diversity monitoring in Momentum appears to illustrate the ways that underlying understandings of diversity show an assumption that “individual difference and workforce diversity” can contribute to “creativity in cultural work” (Proctor-Thomson, 2015: 140). At the same time, pursuing diversity over multi-cultural representation depoliticises racist (Saha, 2018) and I would extend sexist, transphobic, homophobic, ableist, ageist discourses which persist through the othering of anyone perceived as ‘different.’ When we examine the list of
characteristics monitored for in Table 4.3, they imply that there is a standard ideal cultural worker that is likely male, white, heterosexual and not disabled. In many ways, different music genres impact what the ideal artist could look like, but even with invisible differences like sexuality and sometimes disability, there is potential for the sectioning off and defining of difference to simply reinforce the status quo (Saha, 2018).

Table 4.3 Equality Act 2010 Terms Versus Momentum Diversity Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristics from the UK Equality Act 2010</th>
<th>Characteristics Monitored in the Momentum Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Marriage and civil partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pregnancy and maternity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or belief</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuing the CCD the way ACE has been for their NPOs and their strategic funds also elevates an idea of proportional representation for minorities and under-represented groups, drawing from the protected characteristics. It does not question the systematic inequalities that lead to under-representation of these groups across artforms or cultural sectors, nor does pursuing diversity allow space for contestations of what representation means for different individuals and groups. ACE’s approach to diversity primarily places accountability within funded organisations and programmes, including Momentum and PRSF, to prove diverse representation. The funded organisations need to report their diversity monitoring statistics to ACE quarterly. This begs the question of what diverse representation looks like and whether proportional diversity is the desired goal over elevating a range of new voices and individuals into positions of power and influence.
In 2015, ACE issued a report revealing the diversity data from their NPOs for the first time, which was integral to the challenge then ACE Chair Peter Bazalgette issued in 2014 to improve diversity figures or see funding cut. The report states: “The leadership and workforce of the arts and cultural sector, and especially the organisations that are in receipt of public money, should reflect the diversity of the society in which we live” (ACE, 2015c: 11). Similarly, in Bazalgette’s speech re-invigorating the CCD, he spoke of the need for communities to feel represented by the arts around them. Momentum poses a different kind of challenge as a centrally administered fund with the intention of its grantees representing the whole of England (and now UK). The fund is not imbedded in a specific community or music scene within England. The attempt to appeal broadly to all genres of popular music means that Momentum runs the risk of missing whole communities while over-representing others who have more capital to find funding and write winning applications. Interestingly, regarding popular music, Bazalgette’s speech seems to miss the point of a diversity initiative by querying popular music as a flat hierarchy where bedroom musicians can sidestep issues of access to power easily. They tell us to look at popular music, and think why there’s no question about diversity being an issue. It’s because resources are no issue; you can record and broadcast music in your bedroom (Bazalgette Speech, 2014: no page)

Bazalgette seems to oversimplify aspiring musicians’ ease of access to music equipment to do bedroom recording. He then follows up with a call to open up the access to top positions of power in arts and culture. This seems to relate the example of popular music to a place where the musicians are empowered to lead themselves, but the very need for Momentum as a fund to fill a gap in investment for popular musicians, and to support pathways to sustainable careers, questions the true accessibility of a popular music career. Yet, as an area of the arts, popular musicians in certain genres like hip/hop have long been more diverse in some aspects than performers and artists in other art forms. The question for Momentum funding, then, is in what ways might the funding facilitate entry to or sustain a music career for a greater array of musicians than the industries manage to attract and promote. Whether or not ACE’s Chair and the staff in the music department
agreed with each other remains unknown, but what is clear is the ways that the broader push of the CCD within ACE brought to bear on Momentum.

The trickling down of ever more emphasis on diversity within Momentum can be seen through the increased evaluation occurring in Momentum, as laid out in the timeline from 2014-2017 in Table 4.4. The evaluations are shown in italics in the timeline. Following Momentum’s initial two years as a pilot fund, the third and fourth years saw the implementation of regular external evaluations by Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy (at the end of the two-year Pilot and between Years 3 and 4) to report on the fund to ACE. The reporting process increasingly considered diversity issues, where representation of particular groups was low, and potential ways to solve them. The elements of diversity particularly important in Momentum were region, gender, ethnicity and genre, although sexuality, age and disability were also monitored. Additionally, two Impact Evaluations were run by PRSF in late 2015 and early 2016, mainly for PRSF to evidence impact of the funding (including the impact on certain groups) to ACE. PRSF was required to reapply to manage Momentum at the end of Year 3, where they reflected on the distance they had come, in terms of diversity since taking control of management in 2013. The application discusses PRSF’s aims to increase outside investment in the fund, but factors of diversity remain very prominent in their application to ACE, showing the importance ACE had placed on improving diversity within Momentum.
**Table 4.4 Evaluation Timeline of Momentum and ACE 2014-2017 Post-CCD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>ACE renews Momentum for £500k for one additional year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>ACE Chair Sir Peter Bazalgette re-establishes the Creative Case for Diversity (originating in 2011) requiring that Strategic Funds (and NPOs) improve diversity or see funding cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>In Round 8 PRSF changes grant management software allowing monitoring of protected characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>Round 9 - Momentum Year 3 begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Darren Henley replaces Alan Davey as ACE Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Spotify replace Deezer as digital partner with initial 2-year agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td>Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy (TFCC) complete external 2-year Pilot Evaluation of Momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2015</td>
<td>First Impact Evaluation completed for pilot years Rounds 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2015</td>
<td>Director of Music at ACE, Helen Sprott publishes blog initiating ACE’s music industry survey on musicians’ success and careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2015</td>
<td>Current Momentum Programme Mgr. promoted to Sr. role at PRSF and new Manager takes on day-to-day running of Momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>Second Impact Evaluation completed to include additional Rounds 9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun/Jul 2016</td>
<td>PRSF reapply to ACE to renew agreement to manage Momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2016</td>
<td>Round 13 - Momentum Year 4 begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2016</td>
<td>ACE renews PRSF as fund manager, invests £1m over 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2016</td>
<td>TFCC Interim Report summarises 2-Year Pilot (Rounds 1-8) &amp; Year 3 (Rounds 9-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2016</td>
<td>PPL joins Momentum (and PRSF fund ISF) with £200k invested per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
<td>Sir Peter Bazalgette leaves as ACE chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The practices PRSF adopted to pursue the goal of diversity in Momentum did help to increase representation sometimes and for some groups, bringing more diverse genres, like grime, into the funding. What becomes apparent in collecting and analysing data on diversity in a publicly funded programme is the danger of overly subscribing to the promise of equality implied in a pursuit of diversity. In other words, focusing on a lack of applicants from, for example, a particular ethnicity and attempting to tackle that lack by seeking out particular ethnic groups does not consider the inequalities such groups face in seeking, applying or receiving funding. Even prioritising under-served groups for funding might only provide slight benefit to individuals rather than lifting up entire groups who have previously been excluded and marginalised from the popular music industries. Malik’s (2013) work on the British public service broadcasting system and race, posits that the focus on ‘diversity’ led to a “depoliticisation of the struggle for equality” by emphasising difference and detracting from a focus on the inequality that exists (O’Brien and Oakley, 2014: 16). Rather than looking to the sources and reasons for the inequality, only emphasising the difference between the ‘typical’ artists and the more marginalised ignores the systematic racism preventing marginalised artists from fully participating.

Malik’s argument has purchase here when discussing ACE’s CCD, which pursues a diversity agenda without particularly developing a plan for supporting long term improvements to the funding system that are exclusionary. As another example, ACE includes socio-economic factors in their official definition of diversity but rarely appears to monitor for socio-economic status or background in their funds or funded organisations. ACE also does not appear to target any of the efforts toward greater diversity in Momentum to improving socio-economic representation in popular music.

4.4. CONCLUSION

This chapter has shown that the Momentum fund is an atypical example of public funding in England – and ACE specifically – funding popular musicians. Interviews with ACE staff members and analysis of ACE policy documents and Momentum
programme documents informed this chapter’s argument that Momentum was created for two primary reasons. The first reason explored was Momentum’s intention to meet a gap in investment for emerging popular musicians identified by an ACE consultation conducted with members of the music industries. Section 3.2. of this chapter explained the context of the UK music industries leading up to the decision in 2012 by the Arts Council England (ACE) to start a new fund for popular musicians. The second reason ACE decided to create a fund for popular musicians is tied up in the funder’s aims to open up public funding to popular musicians, dispelling long-held feelings, even within ACE itself, that public money isn’t for popular music. I then explored the ways that ACE funding has historically been aimed at ‘high’ art forms considered not to have commercial potential or mass appeal. ACE’s history of subsidising opera at a consistently higher level than most art forms illustrates how this pattern has persisted, despite an effort to increase applications from popular musicians. I explained how Momentum funding was justified as a necessary intervention to fill what ACE’s CEO called a gap in investing in talent development left by the commercial music industries, namely, the major labels. While this was partially successful, ACE’s involvement in Momentum did not massively change ACE’s reputation, but it did enhance knowledge of their funding of popular music. However, the legacy of this is in question, as of 2018, for two reasons. Firstly, ACE will cease to support Momentum, leaving PRSF and PPL as the main funders, with additional funds from Creative Scotland and the Arts Council of Wales. Secondly, ACE’s internal fund Grants for the Arts, often referred to in interviews with ACE staff as their main alternative fund for popular musicians, has changed to Project Grants. The Project Grants do fund popular music, but the element of commerciality in music is not fully embraced as it is within Momentum. Both of these changes are likely to have lasting effects on ACE’s reputation as a funder of popular music and may undo the very progress that Momentum helped them make.

Following from the two reasons, I then moved onto what ACE was trying to achieve with Momentum through explorations of funding priorities of excellence and diversity. With excellence, there are links between the debates around cultural value, the hierarchies of ‘quality’ and the relationship of ACE to the evaluation practices encouraged by New Public Management. Talent development was
alluded to, but it will be more specifically discussed in the following chapter on PRSF. Ultimately, I have sought to show that Momentum integrates ACE’s CCD through diversity monitoring practices, but the aims of increasing diversity (and what that means specifically for Momentum) remain unclear. There are concerns that, despite not having quotas, the approach ACE takes to creative diversity reinforces diversity as ‘demographic parity’ (Gray, 2016). The further importance of the CCD will be seen through the following chapter on PRSF and the funding management practices employed within Momentum.
5. THE FUNDING PROCESS MANAGER: THE PERFORMING RIGHTS SOCIETY FOUNDATION AND MOMENTUM

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter focused on the perspective of Arts Council England (ACE) in the Momentum case and showed how the Creative Case for Diversity (CCD) linked with the funding priorities of talent and excellence. This chapter focuses on the perspective of the funding cycle manager, the Performing Rights Society Foundation, and the assessment advisors hired by PRSF to assess Momentum applications. While some research exists which examines the ways key points, such as admission to higher education, can be influenced by who is making the decisions and perceptions of those being assessed, there exists no research of assessment processes in funding programmes for popular music. My research fills this gap in knowledge by exploring decision-making by PRSF and external advisors in the Momentum fund to show how the funding priorities of ‘talent’ and ‘diversity’ influence the creation of value throughout the Momentum funding process. I present findings from observations of the Momentum funding process, as managed by PRSF in 2015 and 2016. The observations were undertaken to trace the funding process through and determine how different applications are chosen to receive the funding. Two research questions guide this chapter: firstly, how ideas of ‘excellence’, ‘talent’ and ‘diversity’ are understood and assessed in Momentum; secondly, I examine whether Momentum is intended to redress inequalities of access to sustained careers as popular musicians. I further consider how PRSF frames Momentum’s goals, as compared with ACE from the previous chapter.

I have chosen to focus on the ways that decisions are made about applications, the criteria that are provided for assessment, and the nature of discussion in the panels. The decision-makers I consider are the PRSF staff
running Momentum, as they are integral in the shortlisting process, and the panel advisors PRSF selects who make funding decisions. The framework that this chapter employs draws from work by Eikhof (2017), who researches careers and employment for cultural workers, with a focus on gender and social inequality in the workplace. Previous scholarship identified a conflict perceived by cultural workers between supporting diversity and providing the commercial market with the best quality outputs. This was because ideas of diversity must be 'weighed up' against aims of market success, with the perception that the commercial aims might exclude positive discriminatory policies (Eikhof, 2017: 300). Eikhof's work, and the work of Wreyford she cites, suggests that there is a dichotomous relationship between the market and diversity, which is why studying the diversity decisions being made in Momentum is significant. Momentum is, in many ways, the ideal case to study the ways an organisational and operational imperative to support diversity interacts with a market-driven cultural industry like popular music. The market may be seen as the ultimate test for the quality and talent of an artist, but, as this thesis aims to show, the current relationship between musicians and the market is complex and unequal. Public funding poses an opportunity to alleviate some of the inequality for popular musicians seeking career advancement and commercial opportunities through a more considered approach, which incorporates elements of diversity, alongside traditional measures of talent and excellence.

To set the stage in this chapter, I first establish current research on inequality in the cultural industries and among cultural workers. My project builds upon this research and extends it to analyse popular musicians and the interaction with public funding. Next, I explore how decisions about individuals in key points of admission or advancement can provide a framework for analysing funding decisions in Momentum made by PRSF and external advisors. The next two sections will present the findings from observations at PRSF from the perspectives of PRSF and the advisors they recruit. Firstly, I lay out the Momentum context, including the criteria for applying, the processes of shortlisting, and details of the assessment panels where funding decisions are made. The two perspectives of PRSF and external advisors will be discussed through the lenses of four values articulated about applications: talent, excellence, diversity and viability.
Two current themes are bridging the gap between cultural policy and cultural work studies. These are the themes of ‘talent’, currently discussed through critiques of purported meritocracy in cultural work, and ‘inequality’, through critical studies of inequality in cultural work and creative industries policies. In review of the literature in Chapter 2, I discuss the current academic and cultural policy debates on talent and inequality occurring in the UK that inform my analysis of value in the decision-making process.

My empirical research draws on both the critique of talent, as part of an individualising process that persists in cultural work, and from the view that sometimes discourses of talent play into unhelpful ideas of meritocracy, which pit individual artists against one another, elevating those with greater resources, similar to Bourdieu’s (1984) concepts of social, cultural and economic capital. When an artist is labelled as talented and they find success, they may be described as possessing a natural gift, limiting acknowledgment of their own work and any advantages the individual may have experienced or help they have received. Understanding how talent, as a funding priority, influences decisions is an important concern for the case of Momentum. The funding aims to develop talent and, through the process of managing Momentum, PRSF consider talent at different points of assessment. Funders want to support talented artists, and they consider talent a “primary resource” (ACE, 2013a: 26). I next show how the principles and values underlying decisions about individual musicians can work to perpetuate inequality regimes and reinforce meritocratic ideas.

**MAKING DECISIONS: TALENT AND DIVERSITY**

Factors affecting the success of musicians applying to Momentum include not only who makes the decisions, but how applicants present themselves. Those who come to the Momentum application process with more resources and privilege are more likely to meet application criteria because they may be privileged with the knowledge, know-how, confidence, language, etc. to write effective applications.
and speak the required funding language. In order to succeed in getting funding, applicants must possess the important skill of writing convincing applications – a skill not every artist possesses, which has led to the increased intermediary role of artist managers described in Chapter 6. Momentum’s applications contain sections on the artist’s achievements, their plan for the proposed project, a detailed budget and a testimony section (See Appendix D). All of these sections would be much easier to complete if someone had access to a good manager or a team of people to help them with it. If the artist, manager or their team was experienced with funding applications for one reason or another, then they could translate the artistic aims into language more effectively. Also important, when an application comes from someone the Momentum assessors believe to have a good reputation, I observed in funding panels that this helped their case. The same was true if it was the kind of artist who would benefit from Momentum and who would in turn bring increased acclaim to Momentum. Outside factors influenced the ways the applications were perceived. Applications with problems – such as not having any team members, lacking a detailed plan, or having errors in the budget – are unlikely to make it past shortlisting, and much less to a panel for discussion. Errors in a budget might be seen as sloppiness or a lack of experience on the part of the applicant, but not being able to conceive clear and realistic budgets could result from applicants’ limited cultural and educational capital.

When organisations like ACE and Momentum create processes that ascribe talent to an individual, the rest of the story, such as the individual’s background, can disappear. The reason this is important for Momentum is not just because talent is something the funding aims to develop, begging the question whether talent—if innate—can be developed. Instead, talent is also regarded as an aspect of excellence and this, I argue, can be a hindrance to another funding aim: diversity. Competing components of value come into play in interesting ways within Momentum.

While notions of individual talent remain strongly associated with cultural work by gatekeepers and cultural workers themselves, in the popular music sector, a call for more diversity has arisen at the institutional and organisational level.
Initiatives have started like the UK music industries’ lobbying group, UK Music’s Diversity Task Force. In 2017, it declared:

The mission is to work with industry bodies and music employers to ensure that our workforce is as demonstrably diverse as the music we create and export. Every member of UK Music is putting a high priority on increasing diversity at all levels. (UK Music Website, 2017)

Over the past few years, there has been a flurry of articles in the media critiquing all areas of the arts for their lack of diversity, with a recent example being the lack of female acts performing at festivals in the UK (Sherlock and Bradshaw, 2017; Whitehouse, 2016). PRSF have attempted to tackle this lack of female representation in festivals by creating another scheme with the European Union called Keychange. Pressure remains present on the popular music industries to increase their workforce diversity, but organisational and individual decisions bring to bear on the effectiveness of diversity policies.

What interests me here is how the processes and contexts of decision-making and the characteristics of the decision-makers (both PRSF and external assessors) shape how the funding’s value is redefined and articulated. Writing on recruitment practices, Acker argues that, despite inequality regimes,

Affirmative action programs altered hiring practices in many organizations, requiring open advertising for positions and selection based on gender- and race-neutral criteria of competence, rather than selection based on an old boy (white) network. (2006: 449-450)

While such programmes targeting marginalised groups may be beneficial overall in helping overcome inequality within recruitment practices, the individuals and groups endowed with power to make decisions about the appropriateness of others do not make such decisions devoid of bias and personal context. Unconscious bias might lead individuals to make biased decisions without their awareness. Acker cautions that, “‘Competence’ involves judgment: The race and gender of both the applicant and the decision makers can affect that judgment, resulting in decisions that white males are the more competent, more suited to the job than are others” (2006: 450). It is the power to decide and the action of

15 Typically, these are called ‘positive discrimination’ programmes in the English context.
deciding that can provide an individual or a group of individuals with the ability to negate the effect of positive discrimination.

The relevance of Acker’s argument to Momentum is to highlight the potential for those assessing applications to simultaneously support efforts to overcome inequalities through a focus on diversity while, at the same time, potentially hindering such efforts by focusing on an individual’s talent. While it is possible for assessors to support both priorities of diversity and talent, as I will explain, focusing on talent can divert the attention of assessors from other funding priorities. Contextual factors – such as the atmosphere of the room or the assessment panel dynamics – can also disrupt the balance of funding priorities. Helpful to the analysis of Momentum’s funding process and decision-making is Eikhof’s framework for analysing decisions about diversity.

### A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSING DECISIONS AS SITES OF VALUE

Eikhof’s recent work posits that the problem of inequality in the cultural industries should be examined using a conceptual lens that considers such inequality as the outcome of decisions made about individuals (2017: 291). Eikhof does not explicitly mention arts funding or the potential to extrapolate parallels by examining funding decisions, but her work addresses workforces within the cultural industries. Such a conceptual framework is useful here because it breaks down the elements influencing decisions at key decision points, which Eikhof refers to as “workforce participation and advancement” (2017: 290). For popular music artists, receiving public funding is not a traditional form of advancement, but it can facilitate other means of advancement. I use Eikhof’s definition of workforce advancement: “an individual’s movement into positions that bring increased artistic or creative recognition, freedom and responsibility, enable collaborations with more reputable partners or allow better access to resources” (2017: 296).

Eikhof’s framework, presented below, has three dimensions that can shape the outcomes of each decision:
1. The decision points, that is those points at which concrete decision are made about individual workers that directly or indirectly influence these individuals’ opportunities for workforce participation and advancement in the CCI [Cultural and Creative Industry];
2. The individuals as objects of the decision making, in particular with respect to the factors that influence 
   (a) an individual’s likelihood of being considered in a particular decision process and 
   (b) what individuals present for decision makers to decide upon; 
3. The decision maker(s) and the context of their decision making. (Eikhof, 2017: 293)

In this case study, I have adapted Eikhof’s lens to apply to the ways decisions by PRSF and assessors can affect organisational agendas focusing on increasing diversity. The nature of pivotal decision points in Momentum’s process can enforce barriers while acting under the guise of increasing diversity, even when funders possess the best of intentions. Little research exists which can explore the processes of decision-making. My relationship with Momentum manager PRSF provided me with access to sites of decision-making that would typically be hidden, such as the shortlisting process and the funding panels. The ability to witness the hidden side of decision-making in the funding process allows me to adapt and test Eikhof’s framework. In this research, I considered the three dimensions of the framework as follows. Firstly, I determined there were four key decision points in the Momentum process where assessments are made. Figure 5.1 shows the relevant decision points:

1) The pre-shortlisting evaluation conducted by PRSF staff; 
2) Shortlisting where external assessors and PRSF staff score applications and music samples and view diversity data; 
3) Pre-panel assessment, where shortlisted candidates are reviewed and scored by four external advisors who will attend panels; and 
4) The panel assessments, where decisions are made about who to fund and how much to award, using advisors’ scores and the discussion.

The primary analysis in this chapter will examine the shortlisting and panel assessment processes. The pre-panel Assessment is largely hidden, as this is done by external advisors in their personal time.
Figure 5.1 Eikhof’s (2017) framework adapted for analysing dimensions of decisions that influence opportunities for advancement in Momentum funding

For the second dimension, Eikhof considers individuals to be assessed as objects in each of the decision points. In Momentum, artists are required to submit application forms and condense themselves and their music down into an online form and two musical samples, which become objects of decision-making. As discussed in Chapter 4, ACE’s application forms for other funds do not allow applicants to include musical samples, but music forms half of the total score in the Momentum application. Despite their inclusion, the application form itself is a reductionist practice which may help to perpetuate inequality regimes. To determine where individuals become the objects of decisions in Momentum, I established three aspects of the applications that assessors could make decisions about (see item 2 in Figure 5.1). These were 1) the application forms, including the project plan, budget and reported successes, 2) the two musical samples
submitted with the application and 3) the monitoring and diversity data reported about the applicant.

PRSF staff are most involved in the pre-shortlisting decisions, where applications are sifted and initially reviewed, and in shortlisting, where the 150-200 applications are whittled down to 70-80. External advisors brought in by PRSF are key deciders in the shortlisting, pre-panel assessment and panel assessment points. The pre-panel and panel assessment points involve the advisors choosing their top ten favourite applications from a shortlisted pool of about 35 applications. The panels are the major sites of decision-making where advisors come together with their top ten selections to choose an average of six applicants in each panel. The following analysis below focuses primarily on the two key points that are not hidden: the shortlisting process and the assessment panels.

My research aimed, not only to test Eikhof’s proposed framework for studying inequality and decision-making, but also to extend the framework through Momentum’s example. My analysis of observations led me to define four elements important to decision points and decision-makers in the Momentum assessment process. These are seen in Table 5.1 and include the resources available to decision-makers, the resources available to individuals about whom decisions are being made, the objects of assessment and, finally, the discourses in the decision-making. The items 2(a) and 2(b) from Eikhof’s framework map onto the two elements of the resources available to individuals and the objects of assessment. I extend Eikhof’s framework by also considering the resources available to decision-makers that help them make decisions, and the discourses present and influential in decision-making. In the analysis of my observations and interviews, I consider the four elements of decision-making I have identified and the decision points in Momentum’s process, as outlined above.
In the following sections, my analysis of the Momentum assessment panels, the programme data and the funding priority of diversity adapts the framework provided by Eikhof to the case of Momentum. All of these points are potential sites of value articulation, where those assessing make their values and what they value known and/or where their implicit knowledge and beliefs bring to bear on funding outcomes. Taking the Momentum fund as a case study of public funding for popular music allows an examination of potential sites of value articulation and the ways that decisions are made about individual artists. The following sections present the findings on value and the Momentum assessment process.

### WHO MOMENTUM FUNDS

While the fund continues to run, the decision was made to analyse the data available at the time, which included data up to the 15\textsuperscript{th} round of grantees, where 175 artists were funded in rounds 1-15 of Momentum.

The regional distribution of the Momentum fund was London-biased, with Rounds 1-8 attracting 56\% of funded applications from London. This increased to 63\% for rounds 9-12 and 56\% for rounds 13-15 (TFCC, 2016: 9). For Momentum as a whole during the first four years, “More than 57\% of the applications were made on behalf or directly by only male artists. Around 20\% were mixed music bands and another 21.7\% of the applications were made for only female artists”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Expertise</td>
<td>• Social capital</td>
<td>• Application forms</td>
<td>• Viability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implicit/Tacit knowledge</td>
<td>• Cultural capital</td>
<td>• Music samples</td>
<td>• Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taste</td>
<td>• Economic capital</td>
<td>• Diversity data</td>
<td>• Talent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience of assessing</td>
<td>• Symbolic capital</td>
<td>• The artist’s ‘image’ or ‘brand’</td>
<td>• Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(TFCC, 2016: 13). Figure 5.2 shows the gender distribution for funded artists in Rounds 1-15. In the Year 3 evaluation from Tom Fleming Creative Consultants, it was shown that gender remained an issue. For example, in round 12, there were 201 total applications, of which 141 were all male, 35 all-female and 24 mixed male and female.

Figure 5.2 Gender Distribution for Rounds 1-15

For the time period covering this research, Momentum still reflects an alternative/indie, hip/hop and other bias. In the first eight rounds of Momentum during the two-year pilot:

Almost 50% of the applicants’ music genre was distributed between ‘Rock’, ‘Indie’ and ‘Singer Songwriter’, each counting for 16% respectively. This was closely followed by ‘Pop’ (14%), ‘Dance/Electronic’ (11%) and ‘Urban’ (11%). The more ‘niche’ genres were, for example, ‘Folk’, ‘World’, ‘Metal’.

(TFCC Interim Report, 2015: 14).

Genre diversity improved over the rounds, but electronic music and alternative/indie remained dominant. Hip Hop/Rap increased and, to a lesser
extent, R&B and soul and world did too. See Figure 5.3 below for the spread of genres across all rounds.

Figure 5.3 Genres of Funded Artists Rounds 1-15

The term ‘ethnicity’ in Momentum reporting is represented through the language ACE uses to monitor diversity in their grant schemes. For a more complete discussion, see Chapter 4. PRSF adopted ACE’s language regarding ethnicity in its monitoring as of the ninth round, so data is only available for 92 funded artists. Of this 92, 42 identified as “White British” – 45.7% of the 92. The next highest groups were “Black/Black British – African” with 12 (13.04%), and “Black/Black British – Caribbean” with 14 (15.21%).

According to the interim evaluation of Momentum’s first two years, the number of applicants from solo-artists was 16%. Six of the nine funded artists I interviewed were solo-artists; the remaining three were in bands (two had four members and one had five). In the Momentum programme, the average number of

139
band members for rounds 9-15 were three, with numbers ranging from 1-14. Solo-artists made up 34.58% of the 107 (37 count). The data from all rounds 1-15 show that at the time of applying, about 33% are not signed to a label or publishing contract. Interestingly, there is great variation among those who have deals. Deals range between those with both recording and publishing contracts, or those with publishing contracts with major publishers like Sony or Universal yet no recording contract, and those on the other end possessing only short-term contracts for specific releases. The variation among types of deals and whether artists have them or not, had them but lost them, or never wanted them at all reflects the breadth of ways of working being adopted by today’s popular musicians.

5.3 MOMENTUM FUNDING ASSESSMENT PANELS DECISIONS AS SITES OF VALUE ARTICULATION

At the time that PRSF began managing Momentum in 2013, there was little in place to monitor the ‘protected characteristics’ made law in the UK’s Equality Act of 2010, which ACE set out to support across their funding programmes. By the time the fund reached the third year in 2015, Momentum was a very different programme than in its pilot phase. The terminology laying out its intentions remains similar, but the pursuit of more diverse applicants and grantees had taken hold, in some ways above and beyond and at least equally to the other priorities of developing talent and supporting excellence.

The ways that diversity became ingrained in the Momentum process range from subtle to overt changes. The most subtle and administrative process change was the switch from the outdated GIFTS grant making software to a new platform called Flexigrant. Flexigrant allowed for the closer and clearer monitoring of an array of diversity characteristics. In our interview, the Chief Executive Officer of PRSF talked about the ways that PRSF considers diversity in the management of Momentum. The CEO spoke about how Momentum has been influenced by ACE’s approach to funding protected characteristics:

From the start we have always had the aim of reaching as broad a range of music creators as possible from all kinds of backgrounds. We agreed that
with the Arts Council that we didn’t want to set a quota so that is not in place, but we have also agreed with the Arts Council that if you are at a panel discussion and there are two artists who are head to head, you would choose the one that is least represented in the overall scheme, whether that be gender etc. The Arts Council obviously have a very detailed and sophisticated overview of diversity … so we have obviously talked a lot with them and learnt with them about that, and we are doing everything we can to welcome as broad a range of applicants. (PRSFCEO)

Indeed, quotas have never been used in Momentum, but as the fund was running, pressure grew externally and internally to improve representation of certain types of artists, such as those living outside of London and those working in less well-known genres like grime. As mentioned previously in Chapter 4, ACE’s Creative Case for Diversity started in 2011 and was taken back up with zeal in 2014 by then Chair Sir Peter Bazalgette. The CCD required that funded organisation meet certain targets to maintain their funding. These requirements technically only applied to ACE’s National Portfolio Organisations (NPOs), but the environment created by the renewed CCD prioritised the pursuit of diverse funding for those organisations in receipt of ACE funding. Statements from a PRSF senior staff member about Momentum’s requirements reflect the pressure to achieve goals around three specific areas of diversity:

Ultimately we want to be in a place where there is continued ongoing long term funding there for artists and then it is just about making sure we are reaching our new KPIs and all the targets that we have around gender, ethnicity, region. (PRSFCEO)

Without having specific quotas for funding, diversity still factors into PRSF’s strategy for managing Momentum, and they focus mainly on four different areas of diversity, primarily genre, gender, ethnicity and region. Genre was an element that factored into changes PRSF made to Momentum in order to attract and fund wider genres. The focus on these four primary areas was seen in my observations of shortlisting and assessment panels, as well as the impact evaluation process.

Practical changes were made to improve regional representation by holding some of the assessment panels in cities outside of London, such as Birmingham, with the aim of diversifying the advisors in the room. External advisors for Momentum have always come from various places across the UK, but the practicality of travel to London for a one-day panel could deter some. The
atmosphere of a panel mostly or entirely composed on non-London-based
advisors could also have benefits for those artists outside London, who may not
have access to the well-defined and extensive industry infrastructure London
offers. Despite some of these efforts having taken place prior to our interview, the
PRSf senior staff member acknowledged that there was still work to be done to
improve the diversity of those being funded:

I mean the primary goal is to support an artist and their team at a crucial
stage and for that support to have a big impact on their career. That is still
the main thing we want to do, so I am pitching for future funding, that is the
headline, but the goals have shifted because we recognised in the first
three years that there are areas where we have made big improvements
but there are still things that need to be done. (PRSf staff)

The quote above summarises specific themes regarding PRSF’s view of the aims
and challenges of Momentum, from its inception in 2013 until 2016. While the
quote re-asserts the goals as supporting artists who are at a “crucial stage”, they
recognise a shift in goals. The “things that need to be done,” mentioned above by
the PRF staff member, seem to refer here to the challenges the fund still faces
regarding improving diversity all around, and the observations I conducted help
illuminate how PRSF’s articulated value of Momentum reflects both funding
diversity and talent. The next sections illustrate these dimensions of value by
reviewing Momentum’s application criteria and exploring themes from
observations of the funding process.

**MOMENTUM’S APPLICATION CRITERIA**

From my own observations of the shortlisting and panel assessment processes,
the most important elements of diversity accounted for are genre, gender, ethnicity
and region. Because the main funding is public Lottery funding, the fund targets
only those based in England. In 2013, ACE received criticism for maintaining its
long history of London bias in the distribution of its funds to National Portfolio
Organisations (NPOs), which are the hundreds of organisations across artforms
and throughout England that receive a majority of its guaranteed funding (Stark et
al., 2013). Possibly as a result of the debate about ACE’s regional distribution
imbalance, which the Stark et al. (2013) report initiated, regional location became one of the most important factors considered when musicians applied for Momentum funding, although this is also partly due to PRSF’s aim to maintain a balance in the funded artists.

Noticeably absent from the guidance document ACE wrote to initiate the Momentum fund is any reference to the aim or need to support very early career artists, including those who are largely unknown or who are just starting to make names for themselves. The perceived career ‘level’ of achievement, success, recognition and/or of exposure of the targeted and funded musicians is significant because it influences the assessment of applications at all levels of the application process: through eligibility checking, shortlisting and panel assessment. The element of ‘timing’ – the point where an artist is in his or her career – was a key concern considered in assessment panels, as well as shortlisting processes. While the definition may be one specific to an artist and their context, timing was generally evoked to mean the right point when the funding would make the biggest contribution to an artist’s career or help an artist progress to a new career level. It is important to note that this idea of timing might be problematic when applied to women, who may have taken time out from their careers for maternity leave.

To apply for Momentum, PRSF requires bands/artists have:

- Coverage from national press/media or UK wide blogs
- Already played gigs or have ones lined up across the UK
- Be able to show they have a fan base within England and their area

Within the guidance provided to artists, PRSF put emphasis on timing and the perceived level the artist is at:

Artists/Bands applying for the Momentum Music Fund must be at a crucial tipping point in their careers, showing current progression and growth as an artist with the potential to significantly develop their careers over the next two years. (PRSF website, 2017)

The language has changed over time to put greater emphasis on a tipping point. In 2015, the application guidance for Momentum stated:
The Momentum Music Fund is for artists and bands who are at a crucial point in their development, with the potential to significantly further their career within the next two years. (PRSF website, 2015)

The language specifies 'two years' because the results of Impact Evaluations, described in Chapter 4, showed that artists' benefits from the funding, such as increased income and performing higher capacity gigs, were observed mainly after the funded activity had already occurred. PRSF determined from data analysis of the artists' self-reported evaluations that the clearest time period to observe impact was 24 months after the artist received the funding. Outcomes for funded artists were measured by contacts, deals, income, venue capacity, press and other measures aiming to capture a wide picture of the musicians at post-funding stage. Originally, the language about timing was framed more specifically for the artist’s particular situation and seemed to argue timing was right, as long as the artist possessed potential to progress. The current language now appears to present a contradiction regarding the correct timing for Momentum. Such a contradiction can problematise the aims of Momentum. While presenting my research at the Working in Music conference 2018 held at the University of Lausanne, I was asked by an attendee if looking for ‘tipping points’ might be contradictory to the term ‘momentum’ itself. Indeed, momentum implies that a career is moving and progressing but not necessarily at a critical juncture where a launchpad is needed to propel the artist vastly and rapidly forward. Defining Momentum’s purpose around boosting those at ‘tipping points’ seems to put the emphasis on making hits or hugely successful artists at a level that necessitates being commercial. This would not appear to align with the PRSF staff or ACE definition of the programme. I argue that PRSF’s framing of Momentum in terms of supporting artists at perceived ‘tipping points’ is not always aligned with the other funding aims. Therefore, the language used in assessment would be improved if it emphasised timing in terms of creating sustainable careers for artists, and this would better align with PRSF’s aims for the fund and the benefits they value. I discuss PRSF’s value of the funding and the process of assessment in the following sections through observational data acquired during four Momentum decision panels and one shortlisting session.
The idea of the turnaround for funded musicians being two years relates to the fund’s initial two-year pilot length but also the results of two ‘Impact Evaluations’ run by PRSF, for which I helped acquire data. In the two Impact Evaluations, conducted 2015 and 2016, it was thought that the effects of the funding would only show once the artists had completed their funded projects. On average, this took about two years.

SHORTLISTING FOR MOMENTUM PANELS

Before I examine the findings from observations at the Momentum assessment panels, I first briefly review the process of shortlisting in Momentum, drawing from my observation of the process at PRSF’s office.

Figure 5.4 The Stages of the Momentum Funding Process

The process of shortlisting is mainly run by the Momentum programme manager, who I will refer to as “SMA” for Staff Member A. It was formerly handled by another staff member, but his role has changed to a more senior position and provides him with a more strategic role overseeing several grant schemes. For
discussion of my observations, I refer to this senior staff member as “SMB” for Staff Member B. At the time I observed the process, SMA had assessed first and SMB oversaw and made comments and suggestions. The figures in Appendix B show the changes to PRSF’s organisational structure, shifting who is in charge of different aspects of Momentum and the scope for strategising at a higher level. The SMB’s ability to move into a strategic role, while still overseeing Momentum, has facilitated the greater frequency of monitoring and data acquisition within Momentum. Priorities that they have about extending Momentum’s reach across the regions and funding artists from all corners of England has become more prominent at the same time that his role changed. These priorities were apparent in the way that the shortlisting process was finalised.

While no longer the day-to-day programme manager for Momentum, SMB is still involved throughout the rounds. In 2016, I went to the PRSF office to observe the process of shortlisting for Momentum for this research. I sat down first with SMA as they worked through the applications, and SMB then talked me through the process. Items 2-4 in Figure 5.4 show the major steps involved in shortlisting as they fit into the entire Momentum funding process. Following shortlisting, the 70-80 applications are divided roughly in half, based upon genre, and then sent to eight panel advisors for assessment. The panel assessments follow, where funding decisions are made and approximately 10-20 (an average of 12) artists are chosen. Shortlisting decisions are made quickly based on tacit knowledge held by the PRSF staff and external assessors regarding up-and-coming artists, genres, members of the music industries, as well as data specifically on genre, gender and region. Ethnicity was not explicitly considered in shortlisting in the round I observed. The use of tacit knowledge by advisors is not an intentional reliance but comes into play. While this could create bias in favour of more well-known artists who apply, I would also argue that it is not a hindrance always to be undiscovered, as in music, that is often a valuable thing to whomever ‘discovers’ you.
Table 5.2 Momentum Shortlisting Process Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Undertaken By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim</strong></td>
<td>150 and 200 applications received in each round whittled down to no more than 70-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review and score applications for approx. 200</td>
<td>SMA and External Assessors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scores are 1-10 (up to 5 for music and 5 for activity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Once all of the scores are received:</td>
<td>SMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creates an Excel sheet with various data and factors from the applications as exported from Flexigrant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collects the scores assigned to each application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>From the long list of all the applications, ones that should go through to panel are highlighted. Ones needing a second look are also highlighted.</td>
<td>SMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Scores are considered against diversity characteristics to finalise the shortlist.</td>
<td>SMB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMB assessed the applications using a scoring system similar to one that PRSF use for many of their funds. The system and the criteria are shown in Appendix F. The process has external assessors or PRSF staff assign a score of 1 to 5 for the quality of music and 1 to 5 for the proposed activity in the application, with 5 being highest. The two scores are then combined, making the highest possible score an application can receive a 10. From my observation, most of the higher scores are 7s or 8s. There were some applications that received 9s and one or two might receive 10s, but these are rare. In my observation, the score sheet also included comments about why the scores were given, which are used in the feedback process for applications that do not make it to the panels. I was told the list of applications and scores were compiled at this point with no concern of how many were given particular scores and no quotas in mind. Diversity elements had not yet been considered.

The external assessors are chosen from pools of individuals who can quickly review applications for a variety of PRSF’s schemes. Assessors are chosen for their genre knowledge, but even experienced assessors can display
the difficulties of arguing ‘taste.’ In the session, I observed that the external assessor was well-experienced, but his decisions on some of the artists were questioned. SMB said he would check the assessor’s list and highlight all of the artists in hip hop, R&B, folk and world genres in case the assessor did not “understand it.” In one case, the assessor had voted not to send a female pop artist to panel, stating the music was “derivative,” a critique that pop genres in particular struggle with. The SMB claimed the assessor marked it below a 7, but it should have scored an 8, stating, “If it’s issues with the plan, it shouldn’t go through.” He was arguing that disliking the music somewhat does not disqualify the artist, yet he also stated that music was the most important factor when deciding who to fund. This artist did go to panel and was discussed but was not funded in the end. In the panel, her music was discussed as similar to another female pop applicant’s and advisors voiced concern that she might have an overlapping audience with that applicant. Ultimately, advisors were more excited about the other applicant and this female artist was not funded.

The session was then directed toward the diversity characteristics of different artists. The characteristics discussed included being from outside London, female or mixed gender or a niche or undersubscribed genre (such as rock, hip hop, R&B, pop, folk and world). All of those scoring above a 6 and possessing any of these characteristics were highlighted. The SMB said anything scoring above a 6.5 could be discussed, but, as the sifting for diversity traits went on, the number dropped and those with scores of 5s were being rechecked. Those with 7s, he decided, should be checked again, with the possibility to replace some of them with good 5s and 6s that could claim a diversity trait. Once SMB looked through the list, he began sorting and prioritising high scorers by gender, seeking more female or mixed gender artists. Then scores were sorted for region and genre. For those high scorers possessing any of the three traits and greater than a 6, they are much more likely to go to panel. Those without diversity traits and scores of 6 or lower, particularly alternative/indie genres, which apply in much greater numbers, were likely to be eliminated.

Such competition and the creation of pools of applicants mirrors the broader competitive nature of the cultural industries, where an “oversupply of applicants”
make it necessary to start marking decisions about who is out of the running early on (Eikhof, 2017: 295). The multiple points of decision-making within Momentum’s process create numerous opportunities for individual decision-makers to influence who moves forward and who does not. Within Eikhof’s framework, which here I have adapted to test decision-making processes, she argues that:

The high frequency of workforce participation decisions has consequences for diversity and opportunity: factors that systematically (directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously) influence workforce participation decisions to the detriment of workers with particular characteristics come into play more often, and thus more regularly and powerfully shape and reproduce industry practice. (Eikhof, 2017: 295)

However, in Momentum, the same diversity characteristics that could typically hurt workers’ progression in the cultural industries, due to discrimination, may serve to push them forward, and this is most pronounced within the shortlisting process.

Where pressure exists to make decisions quickly, factors of personal bias regarding music taste (e.g. claiming not to understand the metal genre well enough to make decisions about it) or having respect for a particular artist’s manager could just as well influence decisions. Impressions about talent are also tied up within the assessment process and come through in the ways assessors determine the musical score for applications. The music samples for Momentum are submitted in the application using weblinks to websites like SoundCloud, Spotify or YouTube, where music can be posted publicly or privately. Some applicants may have extensive catalogues of music at the time they apply, while others may have two singles tracks or some rough demos. The musical quality is assessed, and occasionally a ‘wildcard’, according to SMB, can occur where an application scores high musically but low for the plan. He argued that it likely makes sense as a “music funder to look at it,” but, as I will show, the viability of the plan is highly relevant to the likelihood an artist will be funded at the panel.

MOMENTUM ASSESSMENT PANELS

As I sat on a train speeding from London to Birmingham on a rainy morning, the PRSF staff member, whom I have coded as 1, and who later chaired the
Momentum assessment panel we were heading to, handed me sheets of paper to set out the day’s agenda. I had not seen these before, so I eagerly flicked my eyes over the pages, soaking up as much about the panel I was about to observe as I could. The sheets included the agenda for the day, the criteria, and the shortlist of 75-80 artists that were sent to panel. As an observer, PRSF let me see the scores the advisors gave the artists and who they chose as their top 8. In the Momentum process, the panel assessment process is divided into two panels based on genres. The first panel is for “Urban, Electronic, R&B/Soul and Hip Hop/Rap” genres, the next is for “Indie/alternative, Rock, Singer/songwriter” genres. The genre breakdowns of all four panels I observed can be seen in Table 5.3 below.

For the panel, I was allowed to see the papers for the day with lists of the shortlist and which advisors selected them. The fact that we were riding a high-speed train to a city outside of London for the panel reflects PRSF’s initiatives adopted after the pilot evaluation revealed that funded artists were still heavily located in London. Despite claims from music companies that they develop the very best talent the UK has to offer, that ‘talent’ still largely draws from London.

Opportunities for aspiring musicians living outside of London, or one of the other areas of music business concentration, like Manchester or Liverpool, may be limited. These artists may find it more difficult to enter the music industries or to build the teams and connections that help them rise to or above the Momentum application eligibility level. I discuss below the ways that the panel location can alter the level of discussion about non-London artists.

During the four panels I observed, an average of 38 artists were considered in each panel, with at least 20 artists discussed in detail. Table 5.3 illustrates the types of artist applications reviewed during the four panels I observed between 2015 and 2016. The types of artists discussed are divided in the table by those who were funded, not funded and by genre. Genre was an important characteristic for applications because, as stated above, it determined in which panel the artists were assessed. Artists choose their genre from a list PRSF derived from the official iTunes genres list in the application form when applying for Momentum. PRSF then filters shortlisted applications into two panels, as described above. Artists who state they are a singer/songwriter may end up in either of the panels, depending on where PRSF staff think they will best be assessed, and, in some
cases, PRSF staff may put an artist in the other panel; for example, putting a pop artist in the alternative/indie/rock panel. In the panels I observed, 12 were funded in the first round and 14 in the next. I now discuss who attended the panels I observed.

Table 5.3 Applications Discussed at Momentum Panel Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOMENTUM PANEL OBSERVATIONS: NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS DISCUSSED BY GENRE IN 1ST ROUND OBSERVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PANELS 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANEL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hip Hop/Rap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Singer/Songwriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Singer/Songwriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANEL 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Alternative/Indie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Singer/Songwriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUND TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOMENTUM PANEL OBSERVATIONS: NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS DISCUSSED BY GENRE IN 2ND ROUND OBSERVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PANELS 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANEL 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hip Hop/Rap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 R&amp;B/Soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANEL 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Alternative/Indie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Singer/Songwriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sound Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUND TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another one of the elements that have consequences for grant applicants is who is making decisions about their applications. From Figure 5.1 in Section 5.2, these are the decision-makers in the Momentum process who have the chance to influence decisions about artists that affect their professional development. In the panel observations I conducted, the race and ethnicity of the attendees was not explicitly discussed, but two of the panels did present diverse advisors. The 1st panel had 5 people of black or minority ethnic backgrounds (BME) and 3 white attendees, 4 including myself. The 3rd panel had 3 people of BME background with 5 white attendees. Except for one PRSF staff member, the 2nd and 4th panels were entirely white. The genres being decided at the panels correlated with the degree of representation for BME people, both within the panel advisors and the artist applications. In both rounds I observed, the first of the two panels were for the urban, electronic, R&B/Soul and hip hop/rap genres. These genres tend to have greater representation of BME artists than rock, indie/alternative, singer/songwriter and metal (the genres in the 2nd and 4th panels), which is broadly the case in the music industries, where there is good representation of black artists in particular genres, like hip hop and R&B/soul, but less so within singer/songwriters or indie bands. The greater representation of BME individuals in applications in panels 1 and 3 meant that more diverse artists were discussed, assessed and funded in these panels. It is possible the ‘ideal’ Momentum artist envisioned by the advisors might be impacted by their personal identity, much in the way it might be by being female, as Acker’s inequality regimes theory, discussed above, suggests. Acker posited:

The race and gender of both the applicant and the decision makers can affect that judgment, resulting in decisions that white males are the more competent, more suited to the job than are others. (Acker, 2006: 450)

Having a greater number of BME individuals in the applicant pool in the 1st and 3rd panels may have a similar effect or extend the effect, as the greater availability of strong BME candidates might make the acceptance of many ‘ideal’ types of artists possible.

16 All calculations include the researcher, PRSF staff, and any ACE observers in attendance. While neither the ACE observers nor I made funding decisions, our presence potentially affected the dynamics of the room.
The panels all proved to have at least 50% females attending and assessing. Advisors in the 1st and 2nd panels were equally split: two women and two men. The 3rd and 4th panels were both three women and one man. The split, as said by PRSF, is intended to be equal, but, due to availability, sometimes the panel dynamic is more in favour of a particular gender. Regarding gender balance in the applications discussed at panels, the ratio of women to men was lowest in the indie/alternative panels. Although more balanced, the number of applications from women versus those from men was still quite low in the Urban, Electronic, R&B/Soul, Hip Hop/Rap, Pop and Dance panels. Based on the prevalence of female artists in the pop genre, it might be expected that there would be more applications from women discussed at these panels, but the number of applications received by women throughout Momentum’s running has only ever topped 23% female and 20% mixed gender. The rounds I observed had 17% and 18% female applicants, with 74% and 70% male and 9% and 12% mixed gender total applications (PRSFT internal data, 2017).

5.4 DISCOURSES OF DECISION-MAKING AND SITES OF VALUE

During my observations of the Momentum assessment process, many different reasons emerged about whether to fund or not fund artists’ applications. These decisions varied by who made them and under what circumstances, yet the decisions could also be considered in how they reflect the concepts of talent, excellence and diversity discussed above. In addition, because the applications for funding centre around an activity or project, the feasibility and reasonableness of these plans, in artists’ specific contexts, was shown to be another key element, which I have called viability. The different ways the four discourses in the decision-making process (number 4 in Table 5.1) are articulated, contested and defined by those making the decisions reflect the variation in value from the perspectives of the advisors and PRSF staff. In the following sections, drawing from the observations of shortlisting and the assessment panels and two interviews with PRSF staff, I show how these four discourses are expressed and enacted by both PRSF and external advisors and the ways they reflect value. Through the panel
assessment process, Momentum’s value is conceived and expressed through the funding’s potential to support artists whose music, projects and identities represent talent, excellence, diversity and viability. The following four sections will each first present the views from the Momentum panels’ external advisors and then the PRSF staff and organisational perspective from observations and interviews.

**TALENT**

Talent is a concept that can be problematic, and what is seen as talent is tied up with individuals’ access to capital and resources, as described in the section above. Assessing talent is assessing an individual and their personal skills and abilities. Talent is seen as natural and from birth yet something that can also be honed. In the panels, advisors justified their choices in terms of an artist’s originality, image, brand, their artistic potential and uniqueness, where they are seen as ‘cool’ and not another one of many. The discussions about the individual artists often evoked the notion of talent, which advisors seemed to understand in different ways for different artists, sometimes differing by genre and gender.

Regarding gender, a female rock solo-artist was praised for the “vulnerability” in her voice, implying her voice was “honest.” A young female artist that the entire panel was ‘buzzing’ about was described by one advisor as having a “great voice” and being chosen based on “gut feelings”. She then followed these evaluations with “and she’s female -- we need great strong females.” The advisor valued the artist’s voice more, and perhaps read more talent into her, because she was female. However, being talented while female was not enough for some artists, including an artist described by one advisor as her “musical hero.” Other factors, such as being perceived to be past one’s time, inhibited artists clearly identified by multiple advisors as talented from getting through. Similarly, if the application plan was seen to be too soon in the artist’s career, the artist would not be funded.

One of the ways talent was questioned as a characteristic by assessors was tied to the idea that the artist is one of a few of a type, such a
singer/songwriter with an acoustic guitar, and not distinctive. When an artist was successful at conveying their unique talent, they proved they were stood out from the crowd. Where talent prevailed, in one case, the artist defied being just another female singer/songwriter by having the team at hand help her communicate and display her talent clearly to the assessors to the level it was unquestioned. Others could not convince the advisors through their applications that they were not just one of a few similar artists or better than similar bands. Being identified by one panel advisor as musically “different” and having a sense of identity constituted talent but was not enough for many artists to sway the advisors.

Alternatively, the ways talent was expressed by PRSF related to talent being natural, a skill or being understood as an artist’s potential for artist development. The model that PRSF have for supporting artists and music creators across their funding emphasises ‘developing talent’. The fluidity of the definition of talent makes it tricky to make definitive claims about an individual’s level of talent. Illustrating this difficulty were the cases of artists applying in one panel and not being chosen and reapplying in a later panel, only to be funded. The views of the person making the assessment has implications for the artist being assessed and their perceived level of talent.

In the shortlisting process, the concept of talent is assessed as part of the application, along with any personal knowledge the PRSF staff already possess about the artist. The PRSF staff managing the assessment process sometimes recognised artists they were already familiar with in the lists of applications. This is partly because they are in contact frequently with music industries personnel and attend events and gigs, which help them stay tuned into the scenes of many different genres and areas of the UK’s music ecosystem. They also recognise the names of those who have applied in the past in other rounds or for other PRSF funds. This knowledge of artists came out in the panels as well as the shortlisting. In informal conversations and during the panels, some of the PRSF staff made statements about liking a particular artist, or sometimes disliking them. The primary staff member making these comments, however, was not the one sitting on the panel. During the panels, one would chair, one would play music and take notes and one would sit on the panel and make statements based on his/her
scoring and knowledge of artists. Rarely did the member on the panel ever champion a specific artist.

EXCELLENCE

In my analysis of the observations at assessment panels, I compared the advisors’ and PRSF’s discussions of musical quality and their different understandings of what makes ‘excellent’ music. I use the term ‘excellence’ because Momentum was intended to support ‘excellence’ in popular music according to ACE (see Chapter 4) and supporting music of the highest quality was a value in the assessment process. Advisors in Momentum panels often expressed their views of the music based on their reaction to it – if they liked it, if they thought it was to their taste, if it sounded unique to them. Advisors also discussed quality in terms of the potential of the music to appeal to an audience (e.g. ‘commercial’ or ‘mainstream’).

Recognition of excellence appeared to be demonstrable through multiple metrics, such as the amount of radio support or number of radio plays, having a lot of sync opportunities and having a top 30 record.

Sometimes music was discussed in a highly positive manner. The choice to support one artist, who was funded, was based on the music ‘blowing’ the advisor away, which occurred because “it was based upon taste.” Ways that excellence was described included music “being different”, having a sound that advisors had not heard, being original, even being “brilliant.” Like all the other factors, excellence on its own was never deemed enough reason alone to fund an artist. Sometimes, the sound was considered strong in its specific genre or region. An R&B/Soul artist was said to “sound really London”, which was valued by the advisor because she felt London music could be too global sometimes. One of the only times I witnessed an advisor moving their body along to the music was to a male R&B/Soul artist, but the artist was not funded. Loving the music was never enough on its own to fund the applications, but many who were funded had enthusiastic supporters who enjoyed the music.
The case of a rock band, who applied in one of the rounds I observed, reflects the sometimes-secondary nature of excellence to viability. The artist applied for their next single, a video and tour from an album that had already come out and for which they had received an advance of money from a music publisher’s label services department. The advisors discussed whether Momentum should be funding the single promotion, as it was the label services department’s responsibility to financially support it. The focus of the discussion was on the plan and the need for Momentum not to just supplement label funding. There was not much discussion about the quality of the music. In a later round I observed, the artist reapplied, having taken on the advice of the previous panel to apply for their second record instead. With a more viable plan on the table, the discussion in the second panel focused almost entirely on elements of the music and the artist’s success. One advisor said, “It’s exactly what I want from a British punk band.” Another said it was quite honest and clear they wanted to do more radio friendly music, which was seen as a positive element. A third chimed in that it was an application that stood out and the funding “was gonna give them creative control.” The fourth used the word “authenticity,” a contentious word in popular music studies. In this artist’s case, having a clearer application with what seemed to the advisors a more reasonable plan allowed the assessment to focus on the music quality and their potential. It was only after mostly unanimous praise that any questions of issues with aspects of the proposed budgets and expenses were suggested, but these were quickly set aside as issues to deal with later. The panel easily voted to fund the artist.

Just like what happened with the first application filed by the artist above, advisors sometimes discussed the music positively – or even as exemplary – but the basis to fund was not considered good enough. Many artists who one or two advisors felt strongly about were not funded. Although advisors would have exchanges where one might be swayed to support another’s favourite applicant, they could easily be swayed back by other factors of the application. There was one exception, where the proponent of the artist was very determined and vocal about her support of this artist and eventually convinced the panel that their reservations about it being too early were not enough reason not to fund. Throughout the panel, she made her case and eventually the panel decided to
support the artist, despite advisors having reservations. This advisor was one of the most vocal participants in any of the panels, and this likely impacted the effectiveness of her argument to fund the artist.

In the same way that excellence could not override the value of a viable application, advisors viewed a few applications as not for them musically, but with valid plans. An example of this was with an alternative/indie artist, who did not appear to have much advisor support but had received enough votes to be discussed. The advisor who voted for them stated it was their team that had attracted her because they are a determined team. Musically, however, she stated, “this is where I wrote ‘hate music, but will work.’” Overall, comments on music were mostly positive, but some artists were not discussed so positively, with their music being critiqued in the panels. This ranged from statements that music was “very bad” to declarations that an artist just did not blow the advisor away.

In the panels, conflicting ideas about commercial and radio potential mingled in discussions about the values of being DIY, and genre had much to do with the various outcomes of these discussions. Not being commercial was sometimes seen as a positive aspect, depending on the genre of the artist. It could also be a neutral element of the application, but artists needed to show an awareness of whether their music was commercially suitable. One female electronic artist was praised for the application’s acknowledgement that “radio is closed down” and it’s not for radio. Another advisor stated she was positioned to have non-mainstream “underground” success. For artists that stood outside the mainstream, their plans to self-release or release music, regardless of whether they received funding, was valued. This was considered as just getting on with it.

Some artists were discussed positively for having mainstream potential, which reflected upon both their music and their identity as an artist, which can link to their perceived talent. In the case of one artist, the links between her perceived mainstream potential and the values of talent and excellence are clearly seen. The advisors spoke of this artist (a singer/songwriter) as standing out, with one declaring “I love this girl,” focusing on her personal identity. Discussion followed about her voice, which an advisor described as one “that could be mainstream,” where mainstream potential is positive. The same advisor followed up with “we
need great strong females." As mentioned above, she was one of the few artists where her gender was explicitly mentioned, which was rare within the panels. Gender is discussed in greater detail in the next section on diversity, but her example shows how the assessment process can easily meld three priorities of talent, excellence and diversity together.

For PRSF, excellence seems to be most often articulated as 'outstanding music'. According to a staff interview, the musical quality is of paramount importance to PRSF when making funding decisions. The following exchange I had with the PRSF staff member illustrates the significance:

**Interviewer:** What is the most important element of the application when deciding who to fund?

**PRSF staff:** Probably the music is still top, as in we still listen to everything when we are shortlisting. We still base a lot of the proportion of the score on the strength of the music submitted and even at panel stage if we are split on decisions we often comeback to the music and whether everyone is keen on the music or whether it is actually, in its area, excellent. So we would call it outstanding music.

One of the ways PRSF assert the importance of the music is to play the songs submitted with applications during the assessment panels. A third PRSF staff member usually runs the computer, marking scores, decisions and comments, while queueing and playing the musical tracks. Occasionally during panels, advisors ask to hear a specific song, perhaps their favourite track, and the PRSF staff member plays it for them. Typically playing the songs only fed into the existing narrative among advisors, rather than sharply deviating their opinions. Advisors would have a favourite track of the artists they supported and ask “can we listen to that track again?” Music is possibly the first element an advisor would check when sent an application to assess, listening to the tracks submitted by the artist and judging how they react to it. PRSF as assessors are no different, except they may have more knowledge of the artist if they have applied to PRSF schemes in the past. In a side commentary, one of PRSF’s staff mentioned an artist that had applied ten times and never been chosen and another he felt “weird about” because it had made it through shortlisting and gone to panel three times but not been selected by advisors. Having familiarity can be positive or negative, as a poor application or irritating manager creates a negative association. Making it
through to panel or even being funded in another scheme can, however, make an artist immediately identifiable and may help them succeed. During an interview I conducted with a PRSF staff member, he described what he saw as the further two important factors guiding funding decisions. These were timing and the potential for significant impact from the funded activity. Under my definitions of values, both timing and potential for impact fit within the viability of the application. Viability will be discussed below following discussion of diversity.

**DIVERSITY**

Diversity as a discourse was much more subtly communicated in the assessment panels than in other parts of the Momentum assessment process, such as the shortlisting. Advisors did mention artists’ characteristics and identities in relation to genre, gender, ethnicity and age or longevity. Given that the panels were at least 50/50 women to men and twice 75/25 women to men, it is not surprising that the fact that some applicants were women was mentioned. However, interestingly, at the beginning of one panel, a female advisor stated that she felt the quality of the female applicants was not as strong as the male ones. When deciding who to fund, the fact that some artists were female seemed to matter, but not decisively. If PRSF make efforts to increase outreach and bring in more applications to Momentum from women, and conscious effort is made to send them to panels, this is no guarantee that they will be recognised as talented and their applications quality enough to be funded. Diversity initiatives need to account for what happens once more diverse artists are in the process of assessment, not just ensuring that they are there. Female artists, for example, may not be as plugged into the industry machinery that helps them sounds polished and ready for funding.

My observations confirmed part of Eikhof’s (2017) argument that who is making decisions influences what decisions are made regarding diversity. In the case of ethnicity, there was one particular instance which confirmed the assertion. In the first panel I observed, when I was still figuring out how the process worked with advisors speaking and making funding calls, a British Asian advisor was in attendance. On multiple occasions, she mentioned when an applicant being
discussed was British Asian. In one instance, a white, male advisor critiqued an application she had voiced her liking for. He questioned the applicant, saying there is a market of guys with guitars and he needs to set himself apart. She audibly inhaled deeply at this, replying that he was British Asian. Following more critiques from the other advisors, she stated that they do not get many British Asian applicants because the British Asian community does not trust and does not apply to funding. In another panel, a different British Asian applicant was discussed and generally well-liked, aside from a question about his budget. This applicant argued in his application that the funding was right for him, partly because there are not many Asians in British music. Using his ethnicity as a rationale for why to fund him made one advisor uncomfortable, even though he liked the application.

As momentum has been running, PRS F has placed greater emphasis on funding more broadly across the protected characteristics, but primarily emphasis remains on the three areas of region, genre and gender. Speaking on the funder’s relationship with ACE since starting Momentum, PRSF’s CEO stated:

Something we both share, we say that we want to support songwriters and composers of all backgrounds, the Arts Council have their priority around diversity, so it is looking at every music genre, every sub-genre rather, within pop music, and every kind of cultural background. (PRSF CEO)

The ways that PRSF attempts to action the diversity goals brought over by ACE and their own ambitions to reach artists of different backgrounds involves, according to an interview I conducted with their CEO, “Encouraging them to come forward and making sure that we are targeting all the relevant communication channels for those people.” This statement acknowledges that traditional channels of reaching applicants may not be enough to overcome barriers to access. At the time of my observations, PRSF were attempting to remedy this by holding Momentum workshops in other areas of England, but with mixed results. There was little subtlety in the ways PRSF implemented the diversity priority, and, in one observation, the PRSF chair of the panel announced that, “A really important thing is diversity” and that he wanted to fund what they (the room) wanted the music industries to look like.

Genre has been a dynamic measure for PRSF, having initially included far fewer options than are currently available. The possible genres applicants can
choose include: Alternative/Indie; Blues; Children's Music; Classical; Comedy; Electronic; Folk; Hip Hop/Rap/Grime; Jazz; Metal; Music Theatre; Pop; R&B/Soul; Reggae; Religious; Rock; Singer/Songwriter; Sound Art; Spoken Word; and World. When Momentum first began, the options were Dance/Electronic, Indie, Other, Pop, Rock, Singer/Songwriter, and Urban. The genre designations currently used are based on iTunes genre breakdowns. Funding a wide variety of genres has been an intention for Momentum since it started. Genre was frequently mentioned in the shortlisting process and was one of the factors that pushed applicants up and into the panels. Genre is also a major element shaping the panel assessment process, as the rounds are split into two panels based on genre, and panel advisors are selected based on their genre expertise. In one case, the Chair provided guidance to the panel, who were stuck between two similar artists in the same genre, since they would not likely fund two male singer/songwriters. This shows the hierarchies of diversity characteristics that play out in decisions. Genre seems to be the most powerful characteristic relating to whether an artist is funded, as it determines who assesses an application and whether there are ‘too many’ or ‘not enough’ of an artist type.

Beyond genre, gender was also significant in the process, particularly in the panels for PRSF. In the shortlisting, gender was the first factor considered after the scores were totalled. In the panels, the PRSF chair would remark when the first female applicant was being reviewed. At one point, he stated that he was aware no female artists had yet been funded. In the case where a debate broke out over a female solo-artist whose application seemed to lack clear vision, the PRSF chair chimed in, saying that, as a funder, they see this sometimes with female applications where it is not clear what the artist or team want to achieve. The issue for the advisors seemed to be the lack of comparison points for female artists, due to a lack of successful female artists across genres, creating a paradoxical problem. The Chair stated that female artists may not have the same starting point, which reflects the awareness I observed within the funder of the barriers women face in the music industries. PRSF’s valuation of the funding to support female artists across pop genres was clearly seen. Like positive discrimination programmes, intentional efforts were made to include more females within the panels, allowing lower scoring applications through if they were female.
A third element of diversity valued by PRSF was regional representation. One of the senior staff members, Joe Frankland, has years’ worth of experience working in music outside of London in another area of England, and this perhaps contributes to his drive to improve the regional distribution of Momentum funding. Frankland explained in our interview:

A big personal goal is to ensure there was a more positive regional split between applicants based in London and those based outside of London but also to address certain other diversity issues or some genres where they are struggling to get funding based on their current criteria, just making slight tweaks. We have done that really positively, in the last year with urban music genres and really opened that up and made sure the decision-making process is favourable to people working in those genres. (Frankland)

The systemic issues that keep certain genres from being mainstream, or as well-resourced, can also relate to a lack of resources regionally. He acknowledged these issues in an interview:

So there is a definite wider issue, in the music sector, that there is a lot more support for those based in London and a lot more access to team members and the industry if you are based in London, but Momentum is not just there to reflect that and to stick with that as the norm. In the next two years, we are really going to tackle that head on; we have got a lot of ideas to make sure that that improves. (Frankland) 

In line with Frankland’s comments, PRSF’s CEO claimed in our interview I conducted that “you can’t necessarily change the status quo completely because the industry is in London.” Despite efforts to redraw the industry how they want to see it, the shortcomings that can result from a lack of resources of access to potential team members may still lead an artist’s application being denied funding. The reason is that whether the artist has a team, or a support system of specialised workers, is one of the most important factors shaping their potential to be funded.

VIABILITY

Finally, the viability of the application was a constant throughout the panel discussions. The panel’s Chair reminded advisors that they were looking for artists
as a “crucial point”, which, to the advisors, meant that the artists had buzz and were not past their prime. Advisors valued the artist’s application coming at the right time in their career, when they were not past their prime. Being an older musician with a longer track record could contribute to this notion of being ‘past it’, which might worryingly fit under age-based discrimination, something the music industries are critiqued for. In an interesting example, one artist was discussed, despite only having one advisor vote, which is not usually enough to receive funding. The artist, an indie group, had a body of work but were arguing that it was a crucial point for them to receive Momentum funding. They were dismissed by one advisor who said they had been around forever and had plateaued. In a later round of Momentum, this same artist was funded. I did not observe that panel, but it is likely that the dynamics of the room or the calibre of applications in the observed round created a less receptive environment to the case they were making.

In addition to arguing that the timing is of the essence, artists needed compelling budgets, replete with accurate estimates of costs and income. The Appendix D shows the complexity of the form required in the application. Discussion in the panels was peppered with questions about budgets. Budgetary questions almost served as a way to easily discount an applicant when the decisions were too difficult to make otherwise. Even for applicants that received wide support, budgetary questions existed. Advisors discussed whether artists would see a big impact from the specific type of funding they were requesting. Some costs were said to be too high, but these could be tweaked at the end of the panel, once the choices had been made of who to fund. Ultimately, budgets formed part of the case for viability, but where other factors, such as talent and excellence or a strong team, came into play, costs alone were not enough to make decisions.

Having a team was generally seen as both a requirement and a plus. The applications that were successful often mentioned managers or the involvement of other businesses who were known to the advisors. One of the artists that applied had completed the application himself, which he was critiqued for, as it was stated that his manager should have done it. Only artists that were perceived to
subscribe to a strong DIY ethos were praised for doing their applications themselves or passed for not having much of a team. At times, there were concerns raised about whether artists could action their proposed plans without the support of team members. In one panel, an older female pop artist initially had the support of two of the advisors who admired her longstanding work and described her as a “brilliant top liner” who has done a lot “off her own back.” It was stated she could possibly get a manager out of the funding. These elements would appear to be all positive. Then, a third advisor used the element of her being around a while and not having a manager currently to, she said, “put a dagger in it,” arguing that the panel should not fund that artist. She stated that she could be past her tipping point and may have had and lost managers in the past. Afterwards, the application was discussed with less enthusiasm and the artist was not funded. It was not enough for the artist to potentially acquire a manager, which was deemed important by the advisors, and open questions about her past left too much uncertainty for them to support her application. This raises questions of how age and career longevity are linked in the process, with concerns that advisors may unintentionally discriminate against older artists for having already had some level of past career.

For PRSF, the clearest reason not to fund an applicant is if their application is not viable. This might be because their proposed plan is not eligible for funding. PRSF laid out in their application guidance relating to the expenses that funding cannot cover, yet people still apply and manage, on occasion, to get to panel without having eligible plans. The activity ineligible for Momentum support includes:

- Van/car purchase
- International touring
- Support for a roster of artists – each application must focus on one artist
- Projects requesting funding that would, is or could be covered by the deal the artist/band has with a label, publisher, management company or other relationships (e.g. touring costs).
- Capital projects (e.g. building work)
• Buying equipment
• Building a studio (PRSF website, 2017)

In the panels I observed, two of the applicants who were said to have ineligible planned activity were female solo-artists. They had applied for international touring and were said to have not read the guidance, yet they had somehow made it through the shortlisting process to panel because their music was strong enough. During the shortlisting process, a few applications were highlighted in red to signal that they were not eligible, but some of these were due to them being signed to large labels. Any label considered a major label – such as Sony, Universal, and Warner, or their subsidiaries – would disqualify an applicant.

Assessing the budgets of applicants with a fine-toothed comb was something that PRSF appeared to do, with the PRSF member chiming in with budget questions throughout all four of the panels observed. A contentious element of the budget highly scrutinised by PRSF was the contribution, if any, from a record label, where the artist had a record deal. In a panel full of bands who had been dropped from their labels and others using short-term label services, the Chair declared that Momentum needs to not just supplement labels; labels need to be putting in investment too.

The four discourses of talent, excellence, diversity and viability had clear ramifications for applicants during panels. The value, as understood and articulated by PRSF and advisors, varied. I have sought to show how the ways external advisors and PRSF staff articulate the value of Momentum funding for artists and for the programme itself relate to discourses of talent, excellence, diversity and viability.

5.5 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has intended to show the dimensions of value in the Momentum from the perspective of the fund cycle manager PRSF and through the assessment process. I first considered how value was partly considered as a result of initiatives and efforts to decrease inequalities in cultural work. The growing body of literature
on inequality in cultural work helped contextualise my study, which builds on the
work on the relationship between talent and inequality (Banks, 2017a; Eikhof,
2017). My study extends the literature on inequality regimes in organisations and
adapts Eikhof’s framework for studying diversity as a result of decision-making
practices. The third section of the chapter established how the framework fits into
the study and laid out the data from the observations conducted at PRSF and in
the assessment panels.

In the fourth section, the data from the Momentum assessment panels was
presented, first from the perspective of PRSF and then the panel advisors. When
considering PRSF’s views on the funding and their decision-making in the
assessment process, the funding priorities of talent, excellence and diversity were
explored through PRSF staff’s actions and words. Proving significant to the
shortlisting process for PRSF, viability was examined as a fourth way of valuing in
decisions. Consideration was given to the resources needed by applicants, issues
of gatekeeping and the ways PRSF’s approach to funding diversity in Momentum
has impacted on the assessment processes.

The section on the panel advisors has summarised the different ways that
panel advisors make decisions in Momentum funding and how the concepts of
talent, excellence, diversity, and viability help explain the ways value is expressed
by different people. The most prominent factor in making decisions in the panels
observed appeared to be whether an application was seen as viable. As described
above, viability includes many different factors, but, ultimately, it was shown to be
a judgement of whether the funding would be useful, the plan actionable, the team
capable and the budget reasonable. Much of the knowledge that an artist needs to
craft a viable plan is bestowed by other specialist cultural workers, such as artist
managers, accountants and lawyers. Having access to these workers is not
something everyone possesses, and those artists operating in areas more rural or
less connected to the music hubs of England might be excluded. These are
important concerns that public funding must attempt to address. The following
chapter discusses the goals and aims of Momentum, in the context of analysis of
Momentum’s programme data on who has applied and who has received funding.
6. ARTIST MANAGERS: MEDIATING EMERGING MUSICIANS’ DEVELOPMENT

6.1 INTRODUCTION

When applying to Momentum for funding, applicants must attempt to translate their goals, artistic vision and identities as artists into an online form, and this was previously discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. In the previous chapter on the Performing Rights Society Foundation (PRSF), I aimed to show how PRSF and the fund’s advisors assess and value different characteristics when reviewing applications. While conducting this research, I discovered that the actors often performing this work of translation – by completing applications for popular musicians – were managers. The following chapter shows how managers act as intermediaries for musicians across a network of actors, and access funding to enhance their ability to develop artists and create value. I do this by introducing a typology of managers working with Momentum-funded musicians. In this chapter, I use the contested concept of ‘cultural intermediaries,’ as initially established by Bourdieu (1984), to explicate the intermediation work artist managers undertake for emerging musicians at the grassroots level and how they create value for musicians and themselves. The term has been critiqued for being too narrow in its original definition and too broad in its application. In the final section, I explore how the managers display capacities as intermediaries in several different ways, setting out how thinking about them as cultural intermediaries is useful but does not fully capture the artist development aspect of management or the networked process of cultural production.

While not all of those interviewed consider their main role to be management, for the purpose of this research and ease of discussion, I refer to all of the participants engaging in, what I consider managerial intermediation work for Momentum-funded musicians, as ‘managers.’ I define managers to include those individuals who undertake tasks typically associated with managers. While these may not be people who define themselves officially as managers, and they may
not have contracts with musicians, they, nonetheless, engage in managerial work for musicians, including seeking deals with labels, publishers and synchronisation agents, contacting booking agents, planning tours, going on tours with musicians, managing artists' diaries, and connecting artists with other specialised workers, such as producers. Intermediation is understood as the activity undertaken to broker and invest time and resources on behalf of an artist or musician between them and other parties. Later, I will discuss the managers based on the typology outlined here. I have designated them as managers because of the importance of their roles in acquiring, spending and evaluating Momentum funding and in handling other affairs managers typically handle, such as diary management.

Artist managers are significant actors on behalf of musicians, but their role has not often been investigated in great detail. However, even at the grassroots level, many musicians funded by Momentum already have managers or work with people who actively manage the creative and/or business aspects of their day-to-day affairs. In a 2015 evaluation of Momentum grantees, which aimed to capture information about previously funded musicians, 30 of the 32 respondents reported having a manager at the time they applied for Momentum funding (PRSF, 2015). Managers were typically the ones aware of the funding and the instigators of the application, even if the artist had a substantial part in composing the application. As managers are highly involved in the Momentum process, this chapter considers how managers working with artists who have received public funding create value for artists and, in turn, how Momentum funding creates value for managers.

‘Artist development’ became a key concept in the interviews I conducted with managers and appears as an area of value creation for the Momentum funding programme. Evidence from my interviews with 14 managers suggests that artist managers are now doing the support work of artist development that record companies previously were more involved in, yet this role does not appear fully acknowledged by the industries. Contradictory information about the level of record label investment exists, with the recording industry claiming that development expenditure is on the rise, in contrast to data from my interviews with managers, which shows that it is decreasing. The artist development period for a musician is when they are first supported, by a company or individual, to develop
artistically and creatively. The idea is to provide them with resources, connections and networks that can help them not only find their unique musical sound but also to establish and sustain future careers. A recent report on record label investment in artist development – released by the International Federation of the Phonographic Industry (IFPI), a global non-profit representing the recording industry – states:

Record companies invest 27% of revenues back into A&R [Artist & Repertoire] and marketing – this is the work of discovering, nurturing and promoting artists. Investment in A&R and marketing totalled US$4.5 billion in 2015. Companies sustained this level of annual investment even as the industry weathered two decades of revenue decline. (IFPI website, 2016)

The IFPI are claiming that, despite the steady decrease in revenue from recording sales reported globally over the past two decades, the record industry is investing more into new artists than previous years. The report further claims:

The ability to discover, nurture and break a recording artist is a defining skill and asset of the record companies. They invest US$2.8 billion (or about 17 per cent of revenues) a year in discovering and developing artists, with a view to achieving commercial success with their acts. (IFPI report, 2016: 10)

There are two things of note here. Firstly, the report claims that record labels are still the apparatus of the industries most responsible for finding and developing artists. Secondly, the report includes independent record labels and was co-authored in partnership with the independent label organisation Worldwide Independent Network (WIN). My research suggests that while labels are still involved in the development process, at the grassroots level and for emerging musicians at Momentum level, it is primarily the independent labels and artist managers that drive artist development. Therefore, it is not only record companies that “shoulder that considerable risk,” as IFPI claim (IFPI report, 2016: 10). Strikingly absent from the description of investment in new artists is any discussion of the practices of artist development beyond the financial cost, which represents only a partial view of what is required to develop a new artist.

One of the reasons Momentum was founded in 2013 was to meet a need for financial investment in the artistic development of “emerging musicians,” as identified in a music industries consultation carried out by ACE (Interview with Arts
Council England staff). The information provided by the IFPI and the statements of rationale for Momentum from ACE reveal a disconnect in understanding about who is developing artists and what development entails. This is significant because the managers in my study are engaging in an array of activities and accessing finance, such as Momentum, to do what many would consider ‘developing’ artists. Their intermediation is often in furtherance of this process. As the discussion below suggests, although artist development goes well beyond a financial transaction, having finance to execute development plans and artistic strategies is key to the development process. In this way, Momentum provides value both to musicians and managers because of its ability to enable the intermediation that facilitates artist development of emerging musicians, as carried out by managers and independent labels.

6.2 CULTURAL INTERMEDIARIES

I first explain the relevance of the theory of ‘cultural intermediaries,’ along with its uses and critiques, in examining managers’ activities. Following this, I establish a typology of managers working with Momentum-funded musicians before discussing existing research regarding music and cultural intermediaries. My focus is specifically on analysing artist managers as cultural intermediaries.

DEFINITIONS

The concept of ‘cultural intermediaries’ can be traced to Bourdieu’s work *Distinction* (1984), where Bourdieu examined the relationship between social class and ‘taste’ by analysing social survey data from France, as discussed in Chapter 2. Bourdieu’s theorising of the complex overlaps between legitimacy and distinction. The concept of cultural intermediaries fits within Bourdieu’s theories as a group of occupations important to the legitimisation processes within the production and consumption of symbolic goods. These occupations are held both by the new petite bourgeoisie, a new subset of the social classes created from the working class and the middle class seeking upward mobility, and by members of
the bourgeoisie, who seek retention of their place in the dominant class. The petite bourgeoisie have high levels of educational capital while the existing bourgeoisie possess lower levels of educational capital. Bourdieu considered cultural intermediaries to be workers from the emergent class, the ‘new petite bourgeoisie’, which “comes into its own in all the occupations involving presentation and representation” and in “institutions providing symbolic goods and services,” including “cultural production” (359). The aspects of representation and symbolic production are relevant in this research, but it is particularly the way Bourdieu sees these workers as capable of shaping goods to people’s tastes and legitimising them that ties to the mediating work managers are doing.

The managers working with Momentum-funded musicians are engaging in a larger artist development process, where they frame the musical texts and position the musicians as legitimate. They do this in the funding applications to PRSF and through their dealings with music companies who may want to initiate a deal with the musicians they manage. The strength of managers’ abilities to carry out this process is influenced by a melange of the social, educational, cultural and economic capital they possess. An example of the importance of social capital for managers is the value they hold to musicians as well-connected individuals capable of linking them with successful people and companies. Interestingly, Bourdieu identified that members of the petite bourgeoisie, derived from both the emergent classes and the upper classes, who ‘reconvert’ into roles such as cultural intermediaries, “possess a very great capital of familiarity and a social capital of ‘connections’” (1984: 360). While the class stratification of France, at the time of Bourdieu’s work, is not directly comparable to the current divisions within the UK music industries, the significance of capital for individuals in mediating roles – and the value of the interactions derived from mediation – are no less important.

In The Cultural Intermediaries Reader, Mathews and Smith Maguire seek to build a clearer definition of cultural intermediaries from Bourdieu’s original whilst incorporating conceptual steps made, since then, by scholars in economic sociology and political economy (2014). They put forth a two-part definition stating that, “First cultural intermediaries are market actors who construct value by
mediating how goods (or services, practices, people) are perceived and engaged with by others (end consumers, and other market actors including other cultural intermediaries)” (2014: 2). Within the first part of this definition, they argue that the description of cultural intermediaries is vague enough to solicit comparison to any power dynamic where one person is able to influence another person’s view of a person or thing. The element of value creation facilitated through mediation is also insufficient as a distinct characteristic of cultural intermediaries (Mathews and Smith Maguire, 2014: 2).

The second part of their definition contends, “In the struggle to influence others’ perceptions and attachments, cultural intermediaries are defined by their claims to professional expertise in taste and value within specific cultural fields (and the foundations on which such claims rest)” (Mathews and Smith Maguire, 2014: 2). They clarify and mitigate the possible pitfalls of identification by emphasising the expertise and the context of cultural intermediaries’ locations. The ‘foundations’ in the definition refers to the “devices and dispositions” cultural intermediaries draw upon to achieve their influence on others (du Gay, 2004).

Managers mediating for Momentum musicians not only need access to multiple types of capital (economic, social and cultural), they need to possess a level of expertise in musical knowledge. In order to make deals and build partnerships, they also need to be adept at spotting and developing talent that is recognised by those in the music industries with whom they seek to make goods legitimate.

HAS THE TERM INTERMEDIARIES BEEN EXTENDED TOO FAR?

After Bourdieu's work, Featherstone (1991) and du Gay et al. (1997) carried the ‘cultural intermediaries’ concept forward and popularised the term (Smith Maguire, 2014: 15). Research on cultural intermediaries now primarily takes an economic sociology, cultural economic or political economic perspective, with each area adjusting their understanding of the term to suit their research paradigm.

Critique has long accompanied discussion of the concept, and disagreement persists about which cultural workers might be seen as cultural
intermediaries, with scholars claiming on either side that the term is too broadly or too narrowly used. Hesmondhalgh’s work illustrates the ‘too broad’ argument:

By this point in its history, the term is being used to refer very generally to those involved in the production of symbols. And Justin O’Connor (2004: 40) points to other uses too: cultural facilitators and entrepreneurs from Diaghilev to Brian Epstein, and consultants who mediate between the interests of cultural producers and the world of cultural policy. (2006: 227)

Hesmondhalgh claims it is ironic that much of the work on cultural intermediaries misunderstands the original theory. He takes issue with the way the class subdivisions of the new petite bourgeoisie seem to be misunderstood as equaling the cultural intermediaries: “Featherstone equates the new petite bourgeoisie with a small sub-set of that social class, the (new) cultural intermediaries” (Hesmondhalgh, 2006: 226). On the other side, Negus argues the term is used too discriminately, only including certain groups as cultural intermediaries and excluding others who are potentially important mediators in the production process, like accountants in the recorded music industry (Negus, 2002: 6). Negus appears reticent to accept the value of a concept when its deployment contains inherent blind spots regarding who counts as a mediator.

Hesmondhalgh disagrees with Negus’ (2002) argument that the term should not be so limited. He instead advocates that engaging with Ryan’s (1992) proposed division of cultural labour is more productive as this would allow for a better understanding of cultural production as a process and those intermediating. He argues Ryan’s definition, “[involves] a number of different roles performed sometimes by different people, sometimes by the same people” (Hesmondhalgh 2006: 227). While Smith Maguire and Matthews call for better understanding of the differentiation of cultural intermediaries and their practices, they maintain the usefulness of this concept to analyse cultural production. I agree with their assessment that, “The specific practices and processes of how value is formed and added to cultural goods, the interconnections of various intermediaries operating in and across various fields, and how such cultural work can be conceptualised generally remain fertile areas for further study, discussion and debate” (Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2010: 10). There remains room to
understand the ways that value is formed by mediating actors and between other intermediaries.

6.3 ARTIST MANAGERS AS CULTURAL INTERMEDIARIES

Before I discuss managers as cultural intermediaries and how they have engaged with Momentum funding opportunities, it is helpful to understand the role of the artist manager and perceptions of managers more generally. Jones (2012) traces the history of the artist manager back through the 20th century, showing that the manager, as we know it today, did not appear until the rock era of the 1960s. During this period, the shift from a predominantly live industry to a recording industry occurred, leading to the designation ‘recording artist’ (Jones, 2012). After the 1960s, managers were important figures in the music industries, but, during the reorganisation of the music industries with the advent of digitalisation and file-sharing in the late 1990s and early 2000s, they became less prominent. A possible reason for this was the changes in technology from CDs to mp3s and peer-to-peer file sharing that negatively impacted record labels’ revenue, causing many independent labels to fold or be subsumed by major labels. Managers were strongly associated with larger labels and, therefore, Hracs claims many may have lost their jobs when profits declined (2015). It might also have been that “managers were sidelined by the desire of musicians to seize total control of their creative and commercial affairs and manage themselves” (Hracs, 2015: 469). Indeed, some musicians still exhibit a very strong desire to have a say in every area of their careers. Despite this, the majority of musicians interviewed for this research still sought help from others to manage their affairs. In my interviews, managers were the common first step to acquiring key individuals to build a team. In my case study, some managers are working with artists who want to maintain their autonomy at all costs: they want a hand in almost everything, including knowledge of the day-to-day running of matters, both financial and creative. Although musicians are seeking more autonomous working practices, they will often need assistance with the process of entering the market and marketing themselves.
Jones (2012: 35) asserts that the conditions of the music industries necessitate that musicians align themselves with music companies, like record labels, which gives them cause to hire managers to help navigate this position. Managers are the only actor, or mediator, between the musicians and all of the music companies involved: labels, publishers, music venues, distributors, etc. I observed that managers in my study were remarkable because they were the only individuals acting as go-betweens for the musicians and all other parts of the cultural production process – within all dimensions of the industries. Jones perceived the pivotal role that managers hold: “Artist managers occupy the only position in the Music Industry which interacts with all other areas of activity and the individuals involved in them” (2012: 91). Such unmatched involvement across the network of intermediation reveals their significance in the act of value creation for musicians’ careers.

My argument in this chapter aligns with Jones’ that musicians “are forced into working alliances” with various music companies, like labels, in order to market themselves (2012: 36). Musicians alone are not seen as able to arrange “the investment necessary for them to ‘grow’ themselves as businesses,” nor able to create and employ strategies to maintain their competitive advantage over other artists (2012: 36). This could be due to musicians not having a key means for musicians to ease the process of entering the competitive market and of making alliances with music companies is to acquire a manager. Managers are seen as able to “create the conditions for successful joint working with music companies and successful market entry” (2012: 93). Jones emphasises the value and expansiveness of managers’ involvement in bringing musicians to the market, describing processes akin to intermediation between musicians and the music companies and parties required to market them. Jones, however, does not explain the full range of managers’ capabilities through the lens of intermediation, and I take the argument further to differentiate different types of managers, as well as the range or intermediary activity.

The reason I decided to examine the relationship of managers to Momentum funding more closely and systematically was because of my observations, while working for PRSF, of the high level of involvement that
managers had in the application, execution and evaluation phases of the funding. It also became clear that most Momentum-funded musicians had managers, which could explain how their funding applications became successful. The benefits of having a manager able to strategise, develop and implement a plan of action for market entry could transfer to the funding application process, biasing the distribution of funds towards artists already possessing managers. The tendency for assessors to positively view artists already in possession of managers was discussed in Chapter 5 through discussion of Momentum panel observation data.

The observations I conducted of four Momentum assessment panels also illuminated the importance of the manager’s plan and reputation as well as his/her knowledge and experience level, as these areas were discussed during application assessment. Having a manager, or other similar ‘team members’, was talked about in a positive way, with somewhat negative discussion around musicians planning to execute everything proposed in the application themselves. It was said that not having a manager might show an artist was not advanced enough, as having a manager can be a marker of success. Ann Harrison, an entertainment lawyer, expressed similar views to the industry advisors brought in to make application decisions in Momentum assessment panels. Harrison wrote that record and publishing companies looking for prospective artists want to see experienced managers with positive track records at the helm: “They’d like the artist to choose someone who’s already successfully steered an artist through getting a deal, getting a record made and who’s already done the whole touring and promotion side of things” (Harrison, 2014: 43). Echoes can be seen between the record label Artist and Repertoire (A&R) process, as told by Harrison and the assessment discussions observed in Momentum’s panels. Such parallels, I argue, demonstrate that, even where public money provides certain priorities, old hierarchies and expectations of the commercial music industries will influence how public funding is distributed to popular musicians.

Scholarship on the work of artist managers is limited, with some notable exceptions. Cohen’s work on rock bands in Liverpool remains an important and illuminating view of the inner workings of the music industries at the level of the unsigned bands she profiled (1991). Cohen uncovers the diverse arrangements
the bands she studied had regarding management, with some having friends as managers and others seeking more formal, impartial managers from outside the band. Such outsider managers would arguably be more ‘objective’ about all business and personal matters compared to a band member who also manages the band, a practice still common for bands early in their careers. While a manager’s reputation can be a useful tool in opening doors, it can also have a downside, and a bad reputation for a manager can prevent an artist from getting deals. Cohen states, “Good management was regarded as gold dust,” (Cohen, 1991: 60) with people in the scene bringing many expectations to what a manager should do and what they thought about the quality of the managers around them. Reputations were significant and deals could be dependent on them. Cohen points to negotiating deals and handling the band’s career as a manager’s main roles (1991: 60). However, she also pinpoints the mediating potential that managers have, being representatives of the band, with specific duties to negotiate deals with other parties: “If a band signed a contract with a record company, the company might consider the manager an important mediator between it and the band” (Cohen, 1991: 60). Despite the ways the industries have changed, this holds true for the managers in this study. Whether they are important figures because they are working off old business models or whether it is inevitable that the manager will find a mediating role, managers are still very much mediators between the artist and nearly all other actors in this case study.

Entertainment lawyer Ann Harrison’s manual Music: The Business is aimed at people wanting to be artists or to work in the industries (2014). For Harrison, the, “manager has to be a diplomat, motivator, salesman and strategic planner – and has to have the patience of a saint” (Harrison, 2014: 43). Such a description displays Harrison’s recognition of the legal mediating position occupied by managers. Her statements are based on 30 years’ experience working in the UK as a lawyer advising artists, managers and others in the industries. Harrison lists a categorisation of sorts for managers, but it is restricted to just two main types: personal managers and business managers (2014: 44). Personal managers handle “day-to-day needs”. Important to this discussion is how Harrison distinguishes between the duties of a personal manager and a business manager but then brings them together. She establishes both types of manager separately:
A personal manager is also usually someone who organises your life and tries to make everything run smoothly. They put into action plans others have come up with. They don’t necessarily get involved in day-to-day business decisions or business plans. (Harrison, 2014: 44)

On the other side of management is the business manager:

A business manager doesn’t usually involve himself in the day-to-day business of running your life. It’s the job of the business manager to work out where you should be in terms of business planning and to help you put the plan into action. He will liaise with the record and publishing company, but usually more at the level of negotiating deals, changes to contracts, setting video and recording budgets, and getting tour support when it’s needed. (Harrison, 2014: 44)

What is interesting about the separation of duties above is that, after laying it out, Harrison quickly clarifies that, in the UK, managers tend to embody both roles, crossing over into either as needed. Such crossover illustrates the multi-faceted and, in some ways, highly personalised nature of management and helps to convey the breadth of activity that managers engage in on behalf of artists. As I shall go on to elucidate, the practices of managers working with Momentum-funded musicians take on a range of nuanced roles. I express these via a typology of managers working with musicians at a grassroots level.

A TYPOLOGY OF ARTIST MANAGERS IN THE CASE OF MOMENTUM

Fourteen interviews were conducted in 2016 with individuals identified as managers of Momentum-funded musicians or as intermediaries conducting managerial work. These were workers responsible for applying, monitoring and evaluating Momentum funding on behalf of musicians (see Appendix A for further details regarding interviews). Levels of experience as managers varied widely across the participants. Four were female and ten were male. Nearly all managers interviewed were London-based, with one now living in Scotland, who manages an artist based in England and one in South East England. In interviews, managers discussed a wide diversity of tasks undertaken by them, and other managers they work with, on behalf of musicians. In the next section, I present a typology of managers working with “emerging musicians” in England and examine how these
types of managers use Momentum funding in order to create value for musicians and themselves. This typology of managers has relevance beyond the Momentum funding into the larger realm of artist managers and cultural intermediaries working with popular musicians.

The interviews with artist managers and label workers acting as managers revealed the different ways that experienced and non-experienced individuals act for or on behalf of musicians at the grassroots level of the music industries. While my research provides only a single case study, the accounts from participants present striking parallels to recent work on managers in Canada and France (Hracs, 2015; Lizé, 2016 respectively). These parallels suggest that my findings may be generalisable beyond the sphere of public funding, and I hope to fill a gap in knowledge about the practices, roles and significance of managers, particularly those working with emerging musicians in England.

The work of Hracs (2015) and Lizé (2016) is especially relevant here as they examine artist managers and their roles as cultural intermediaries involved in value creation. Hracs (2015) reported that even in Toronto's mostly DIY music scene, which has many independent artists (artists/bands not signed to a label or publisher), managers were being hired to provide specialised knowledge and professional networks. Hracs witnessed independent musicians taking on managers even when musicians displayed a higher level of entrepreneurialism in handling their own careers. He deciphered a set of six separate roles that managers adopt to mediate on behalf of musicians. These are when managers act as a:

1. Consultant
2. Curator
3. Connector
4. Coordinator
5. Co-producer
6. Co-promoter (Hracs, 2015: 470)

The duties described in these different areas reflect the work that managers in my study reported doing, such as “translat[ing] the demands of this marketplace for musicians and translat[ing] their creative visions and career goals into operational plans,” assembling the right ‘team’, and “curating’ the appropriate collaborators or
contractors” (2015: 470). Similar roles came up in interviews with managers in my case study, showing parallels between the ways managers in Canada’s independent scene operate and the practices of managers working for emerging musicians in the UK. However, Hracs did not consider the important role managers are playing in applying for funding and facilitating acquisition of funds, which my research addresses.

Lizé considers the aspects of the intermediation role of managers (as well agents and tourneurs) in France through the “interventions” that managers engage in. He considers these to fall into three categories, which I summarise below:

1. “The promotional work” or using one’s capital to best situate an artist in the market (Lizé, 2016: 8)
2. “Play upon temporality and the mechanisms of the economy of musical goods” or possessing resources and knowledge to exploit timing and utilise it in a way that generates the most income, (Lizé, 2016: 10)
3. “Network strategies and symbolic capital” is not just knowing the right people but also being generally well-connected in circles that can help a manager get things accomplished and earn more for the artist and themselves (Lizé, 2016: 8)

While there is again some overlap with the tasks reported by my participants, I find these designations less helpful in understanding the specifics of what managers do, as the categories are broad yet seem to leave a great deal out. Lizé does not include a specific category for artist development – an activity of significant importance in my study – but he does acknowledge that managers are engaged in this and it is a primary activity (2016).

My own study differs from Lizé and Hracs because of its focus on how public funding might interact with and play a role in managers’ intermediation and the value creation process for different actors. Neither Lizé nor Hracs engage deeply with the concept of managers finding investment from public funds, despite both Canada and France having robust public funds available to popular musicians. This is in contrast to the situation in England, where there exists limited funding for popular musicians. Lizé does briefly acknowledge the role managers play in seeking funding:
Finally, some artistic work intermediaries fund -- or facilitate the funding of -- records or stage shows. This transaction between economic capital and technical or aesthetic quality (e.g. buying more studio time for a record) can provide the artist with a significant growth in specific capital. (Lizé, 2016: 8)

Lizé is focused on how the intermediation of managers affect the levels of symbolic and specific capital for musicians (2016). Lizé states, “Thus, the concept of symbolic capital provides a means to grasp both aspects of value creation process: on the one hand the increase of the visibility of the artist and his specific capital (to be ‘known’) and on the other hand the growth of the artist’s legitimacy (to be ‘recognized’)” (2016: 7). He is claiming that, when managers do invest or secure the funding of artists and their activity, the artist’s specific capital grows substantially.

From the interviews in my study, different models of managers working with artists became clear, and I developed these into four distinct types of managerial work. These models help to form a typology that categorises the types of managers observed in the UK grassroots music industry (see Table 6.1 below). These models are:

- **Focused Managers**: Artist managers at management companies working or running their own company where artists are on standard management contracts.

- **Comprehensive Managers**: Artist managers who have also founded record labels predominantly to release their managed artists, typically without receiving a cut of record sales.

- **Combined Managers**: Label owners or workers at companies acting for artists as both record label and as management, but where the label does not exist purely to release managed artists.

- **As-Needed Managers**: Independent label owners working with unsigned artists who adopt *ad hoc* artist management roles as-needed but without formal management contracts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(^\text{17})</th>
<th>Manager Role</th>
<th>Manager Type</th>
<th>Formal Contracts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Artist manager, label owner</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layla</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>Label worker: Manages funded musician’s diary</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Label owner, artist manager</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Label worker: Helps manage artists</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Artist manager, label owner, Label manager</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>Artist manager, label owner</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Label owner</td>
<td>As-Needed</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>Artist manager, label owner</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) All names have been anonymised and participants given pseudonyms. See the methodology chapter for an explanation on why certain participants are anonymous.
The main reasons for devising a typology are, firstly, to show the differentiation within and between managers and those acting in managerial ways. Secondly, this typology shows how managers are involved with Momentum-funded musicians through a variety of models or modes of working. Even though musicians funded by Momentum are typically at early stages in their careers, they have artist managers to help them with a range of activities. These include accessing networks, planning and strategising for song and album releases and tours, introducing collaborators (like producers), inviting members of the press or working with PR teams, and finding and securing funding. Beyond what a manager might be thought to do, managers also can offer creative suggestions about artwork and which songs to release as singles, for example. Next, I turn to discuss the concept of cultural intermediation within the music industries to help frame the analysis of managers and their role as mediators of value.

CULTURAL INTERMEDIARIES IN THE MUSIC INDUSTRIES

My findings from interviews with managers point to the complexity of the web of actors involved in developing emerging artists and bringing them to market and seeing them through successful careers through artist development. Such diversity of actors exhibiting some level of mediation and value formation cautions against a restricted definition of cultural intermediaries, but, as discussed above, managers are the only actors touching all parts of the production process. They may only be one of many intermediaries, but they are still essential. McFall’s solution to the problem of explaining a dialectical relationship between production and consumption – as opposed to a linear connection between two parts – helps conceptualise the simultaneity of roles.

McFall sees a weakness in only examining the current practices of so-called cultural intermediaries, which can lead to the assumption that what are historical practices are new (2014). This weakness is also picked up by Smith Maguire and Matthews in discussing how “a cultural economy approach rejects the position that there has been a fundamental break with the past, out of which has emerged a ‘new’ hybridization of culture and economy” (Smith Maguire and
McFall says that research using the term should be historically aware (asking “Are these roles really new?”) and be cognizant that there is not a single, linear connection between production and consumption that mediators occupy. Rather, mediators are part of a web of actors: “The point is that the function of intermediation is spread across a network, not situated in the middle of a line connecting production and consumption” (McFall, 2014: 49). Lizé’s typology of intermediaries (discussed above) provides an example of this network, and he claims that, “As a whole, these categories of intermediaries function in each artistic field (sometimes at their junction) as an ‘intermediation system’ in which they cooperate whilst still battling over their professional jurisdictions” (Lizé, 2016: 3). These two dynamic conceptions of an overlapping mediation web correspond closely with the characteristics of mediation observed in my research.

Instead of considering the occupations of cultural intermediaries as ‘new’, the idea of the ‘intermediation system’ better aligns with the “professionalization of occupations that mediate between the fields of production and consumption” (Smith Maguire, 2014: 19). Artist managers’ roles may seem to be new and, as Jones (2012) showed, as a professional category, they really became most prominent after the 1960s. Yet, as a historical practice, individuals have most likely helped musicians or controlled musicians in ways that could be considered managerial but have so far not been labelled as such. What is remarkable now is the ways that managers have become increasingly integral to the music industries’ established processes of cultural production. In turn, managers have also seen an increase in the ‘professionalisation’ of a still mostly unregulated position. This can be seen in the UK through the creation of the Music Managers Forum (MMF) in 1992, which works “to educate, inform and represent UK managers as well as offering a network through which managers can share experiences, opportunities and information” (MMF website, 2016). The MMF also offers masterclasses to aspiring managers and provides template management contracts and a Code of Practice for managers.
As discussed, managers are a point of access and a nexus of sorts for the music industries network – a pivot point, if you will – and their intermediation connects to the rest of the network. Managers are also one of the few mediators directly employed by the musicians. Lizé remarks of the intermediaries he classes as managers that to best understand “their activities, we need to draw a distinction (Lizé et al., 2011) between intermediaries working for the artists (managers, agents) and intermediaries working for their employers, investors or producers” (Lizé, 2016: 3). As my typology of manager types working with Momentum musicians reveals, there is considerable overlap between managers working for musicians and those employed by a label. However, the managers in my study are mostly working on standard contracts where their income is dependent on musicians’ successes, and they often invest their personal funds into the artists they manage. This means that while there is some overlap and diversity across the different types of managers, they will typically be employed by the musician directly.

One of the challenges for popular musicians is that, in order to get team members such as managers, it is helpful to already have other team members like accountants or attorneys. Hughes et al. (2013) describes this as “success breeding success,” in that, for popular musicians in Australia to attain certain markers of success, they must already have other markers of success, i.e. existing successes lead to more success. My work reflects similar dynamics regarding this paradox where, in order to obtain Momentum funding, artists need some markers of success: for example, good social media statistics or team members, such as managers. However, data available from the Impact Evaluations of funded musicians that I helped PRSF collect when I was working for them in 2015 and 2016 reflected that, out of 47 respondents, an overwhelming majority (79%) had a manager at the time they applied for Momentum funding. Three out of the 47 reported that they gained a manager following the Momentum funding, which may reflect the knock-on effect of receiving, where funding acts as a marker of legitimacy, facilitating an artist securing a manager.

Artist managers have not been specifically discussed in detail as cultural intermediaries until recently by scholars, who argue that their practices as
intermediaries need to be better understood (Hracs, 2015; Lizé, 2016). As discussed above, work on cultural intermediaries in the music industries has tended to focus on workers in A&R roles and the major labels. A recent diversion from this trend is the work of Hracs, whose research reveals two ways musicians are adapting to the necessity to do more themselves. He says that they either work harder to develop greater skills or they opt for “becoming more strategic and specialized by enlisting the support of collaborators, contractors and managers as intermediaries (working smarter)” (Hracs, 2015: 468). Hracs argues that, in Toronto, some independent musicians at the grassroots level are seeking help from managers who act as cultural intermediaries (2015). Similarly, musicians funded by Momentum are mostly recruiting people to work with them or approaching others to help. These are often managers who mediate between the musicians and the nebulous network of individuals and organisations operating in the digital music industries.

In my research, managers linked musicians with a range of other individuals, including freelance PR executives or radio pluggers, one-to-two-person managed record labels, promoters, booking agents, sound engineers, record producers, or music supervisors involved in syncing music. On the organisational side, managers can link musicians with major or minor record labels, music publishers, brands for sponsorship opportunities (e.g. with high street brands like UNIQLO or ASOS), digital and physical distributors like Apple iTunes or Believe Distribution, and music funding charities, such as PRSF and ACE.

The variety on these lists helps convey the vast web of actors interlinked across geography and throughout the production-consumption cycle that characterises the music industries today, even among musicians operating in a grassroots level. Artist managers working for artists early in their careers, as well as more experienced artists, must work between and across levels of the music industries, crossing hierarchies and knowing when to approach specialised workers. In the funding process, they mediate between all facets of the development process for funded musicians and help to make musicians’ music legitimate.
6.4 ARTIST MANAGERS WORKING WITH MOMENTUM-FUNDED MUSICIANS

The 14 artist managers interviewed in this case study work with musicians on a multitude of projects and tasks to help further the musicians’ careers and to ensure an income for them and the musicians. A helpful way of thinking about the categories of tasks managers engage in can be drawn from Hracs’ study of independent musicians in Toronto. In all of the functions undertaken by managers, according to Hracs (2015), there is the clear requirement that managers have a variety of specialist knowledge and expertise, similar to the way that cultural intermediaries must possess specific knowledge of their particular market context. My findings overlap with Hracs’ list of functions and the implicit need for specialist knowledge, as I explain in the sections that follow. It is worth considering that while the market context and genre area that the individuals in my study operate in differ from case to case, they still fit within the broader realm of the music production process.

Managers bring capital to the management process, but, as key cultural intermediaries with respected levels of expertise and connections, they can also offer social, cultural and economic capital to musicians who employ them. Scott (2012) summarises this relationship:

Cultural intermediaries also possess the social contacts and negotiation skills – which can leverage artists into profile enhancing performances, showcases, tours, influential media endorsements, and film, advert, computer game placements. Therefore, connecting with these super connectors remains a defining feature of the field. (Scott, 2012: 244)

While managers may have the connections and the track records necessary to deliver a project, they also need to be able to translate this capital into a written application that will convince the funding assessors to choose them. The next sections will discuss the process of applying for Momentum, considering the ways managers present themselves and the artists who employ them and how they use the funding.
APPLYING FOR AND USING THE FUNDING

As argued earlier, managers are heavily involved in the Momentum application process and the use and evaluation of Momentum funding. As funding is a relatively new phenomenon in popular music, it might be expected that artist managers would be hesitant to apply for funding, perhaps seeing its need as a failing in themselves or the artists they manage. However, the reality of the insecure music industry, where incomes are unstable and careers precarious, appears to make managers open to any type of funding available. Artists’ incomes formerly came from the sale of their music, but file-sharing and decimated this income. Today, artists derive income from a variety of sources, like touring, merchandise sale, sponsorship deals and synchronisation deals, but making a living remains difficult. The managers I interviewed supported the argument made by ACE in 2013, that there is less income available for artists to develop their careers than there used to be. Managers, unlike ACE, did not always blame the major labels. Rather, they pointed to falling sales in music leading to shortfalls in investment. None of the managers expressed any hesitancy about using funding and showed no signs of a stigma about needing funding. For manager Harry, Momentum appeared to just be another viable income source. Ethan specifically saw funding as meeting a need for the small independent labels who develop artists, saying, “the gap in the middle, the people who are developing artists is quite small and it’s quite tough to make it work, so I think the whole funding system is a massive boon in that respect.” Some managers showed knowledge of many funding options - from other funds at PRSF to the Music Export Growth Scheme run by BPI and the UK government. In some ways, being funded by Momentum might reflect well on a manager, as it shows they are aware of funding options and are capable of planning a project well enough to persuade a panel of experts to support their artist.

My analysis shows that managers have higher success rates than artists who apply for Momentum. For Rounds 9-15, 105 artists received funding, and the success rate for funded applications was 7.5% overall. During these rounds, there were 72 successful applications made by artist managers with a 5.1% success rate. Comparatively, only 29 successful applications were made by artists with a
2.1% success rate. What is noteworthy is that managers submitted 44% of all applications but had 69% of all funded applications. Musicians, however, submitted 54% of applications and had only 28% of all funded applications. Successful applications for Momentum submitted by managers contained multiple important elements. Beyond the requisite items, such as a project plan and budget, successful applications contained descriptions that mentioned specific individuals or companies the artist would be working with. Being able to make these collaborations and connect musicians to experts such as successful music producers demonstrates the social capital managers possess. While the successful applications made by artists also contained similar plans and details, managers are able to bring their track records into the application process in a way that emerging artists are not. These track records of success include claims of developing successful or famous artists, awards and nominations, number of releases or tours managed, involvement with large festivals and work with high-profile individuals and companies. As seen in Chapter 5, the track records of artist managers can have significant consequences for applications in the decision panels, where managers can be recognised by advisors making decisions. Indeed, determining a project’s viability partly hinges on the effectiveness of the application in conveying the capability of the manager and team to execute the plan.

Managers and artists applying for themselves used the funding for a variety of projects and activities. Figure 6.1 shows the types of activities applied for during Rounds 9-15. By far, the most common activity artists and their managers sought funding for was a combination of recording, marketing and touring costs.
When asked in interviews what the managers would have done without the funding, answers varied from a vague sense that it was helpful but could have been found elsewhere, perhaps through the Music Export Growth Scheme (MEGS)\(^\text{18}\), to clear conviction that without Momentum funding the funded project would not have happened. It should be noted that a majority of the funding opportunities for popular musicians are single use and have specific requirements that most musicians might not be able to meet. Therefore, timing applications to funders is an important skill. Luke’s description of what the funding did for him and his artist encapsulates the tension between having some certainty that it helped but knowing there is uncertainty in planning:

We wouldn’t have been able to do that, release that at that point in time. So, it was definitely another, it would have – god knows what would have happened without it? So, it was incredibly helpful. But I don’t know how that

\(^{18}\) The Music Export Growth Scheme is run between the UK department for International Trade and the British Phonographic Industry. It is a fund that supports artists in business activities by providing “£5,000 - £50,000 to UK-registered independent music companies to assist them with marketing campaigns when looking to introduce successful UK music projects overseas” (BPI, 2018). [https://www.bpi.co.uk/news-analysis/music-export-growth-scheme/](https://www.bpi.co.uk/news-analysis/music-export-growth-scheme/)
actual funding has helped progress further. But without it we’d have been dead in the water. Do you understand what I’m saying? (Luke)

Luke’s statement reflects the difficulty of knowing exactly which outcomes have resulted from the funding or what would have happened without it. Some managers described the benefits they saw from the funding in terms of a “knock-on effect”, where one positive thing leads to another. Some of the managers also recognised the temporary nature of the funding and the need to use it wisely so as not to waste the chance:

But again, same as what I said before, you know, if you get 15 grand that’s fantastic. But that 15 grand you have to spell out exactly what that money’s for. You can’t say 15 grand so I’ve got like five grand to pay my rent and then 10 grand to record an album, you know... and then as soon as you start eating into that money then it’s hard to get more money to make more money. (Luke)

This statement emphasises the importance of having a plan and strategy for using the Momentum funding – or any funding – in a way that will most benefit the funded artist. Such a need is especially important for Momentum funding as it can only be received once. There is also a difficulty in the application process of being realistic yet asking for enough to move a substantial step forward. One important element of Momentum is that it allows managers to benefit from funding because they can provide enough of a business plan and bring enough knowledge and capital to the process to be awarded. While it is possible that less experienced managers would be funded because Momentum’s assessors really liked the music in the application, the feasibility of the plan and the infrastructure and knowledge needed to bring the project to fruition are why experienced managers are so important. Cliff described how Momentum funding allowed him to get investment without having to be part of the major label networks because he had enough knowledge and experience:

And things like Momentum and [funding programme] MEGS [Music Export Growth Scheme], which you can structure as this is a proper idea for a business-based around a musician, are a big step forward with that kind of thing, because you can actually get them as an outsider. So, not to make a big song and dance about being an outsider or something, but I definitely came in without the major label background, and was successful in turning this artist into quite a lot bigger artist, because I was given 30 grand over two different grants. Yeah, but it made a massive difference.
The important thing for emerging musicians is that Momentum, while its criteria requires certain measurable amounts of success, does not immediately preclude anyone on the basis of which networks they do/do not belong to. Even the programme that Momentum is inspired partly by, FACTOR in Canada, requires a certain level of measured success to be eligible. Interestingly, because FACTOR has a long history of ties to the recording industry and record labels within Canada, the measures of eligibility – a threshold for success – relate to record sales, despite the decreased relevance of retail and physical sales. These requirements are explained by Hracs:

Although support exists, my research uncovered two key barriers to obtaining financial support. The first is that most independent musicians lack the skills and time required to write a winning grant application. The second barrier stems from performance benchmarks that exclude fledgling musicians. For example, FACTOR’s “Emerging Artist Sound Recording Program” requires musicians to have sold a minimum of 3,500 units and the “Radio Star Maker Fund” requires 10,000 units (The Foundation to Assist Canadian Talent on Records 2011). (Hracs, 2012: 460)

Hracs’ statement raises the issue of whether or not someone has the ability to write a successful application potentially excluding certain types of applicants – a very real concern for any funding programme. I address these concerns in Chapter 5, showing how PRSF determines eligibility for Momentum and the factors that lead to an application being valued for its ‘viability’, or the degree to which it has a feasible plan, the right ‘timing’ and a good team. Managers tell a story about the journey of the artists they manage, communicating their talent and passion alongside the feasibility of their plans. In successful applications, managers demonstrate viability and need by sketching out album release campaigns with timelines, listing tour locations, discussing the financial shortfalls and other budgetary needs all while positioning the artist as someone at a “crucial point.” At the same time, they also describe the “fiercely independent” ethos of some artists, the part-time jobs they still work but must be able to leave to reach their potential, the uniqueness of their vision and even that they have children. In the same way they sell the artists’ vision and tell a story about them, they also position themselves as the right people to deliver a project. As the nucleus of the artist

---

19 The FACTOR website has additional information about FACTOR’s history and the types of funding it provides. https://www.factor.ca/
‘team’ and often the first team member hired, managers appear uniquely placed to translate the artist’s vision into actionable plans that funding assessors can understand.

WHY MANAGERS APPLY FOR FUNDING: ARTIST DEVELOPMENT

One of the main reasons managers in this study apply for funding is because they are doing some of the work that record labels used to do but without the financial inflow labels had. The main task some managers seem to be adopting is that of artist development, which entails working with an unsigned early career artist to ‘develop’ them by helping them with their creative work, providing opportunities for growth and getting their music out to an audience that will become a dedicated following. However, developing an artist is about more than just releasing their songs on a label. For experienced manager Harry, the development work entails building a whole ‘story’ and working toward a long-term business plan of mutual benefit, rather than chasing a record or publishing deal:

As a manager, you have to do a lot of the development work yourself. And get a story going and start to get some traction at radio and press, early on basically, before you’re really in a strong position where you have a bigger company funding you. And there’s also the other alternative of a lot of bands just not even looking for that bigger deal now, and just building a very realistic business over time. And self-funding and using grant funding to develop their careers.

The phenomenon of managers developing artists is one that seems to be increasing. One of the ways they do this is through building a story, which entails creating a narrative about and around the artists and might be based on their history or their musical journey. It is almost equivalent to creating a mythology about the artist and their music which would appeal to either their fans or industry executives. In one application, for example, the manager states: “funding support combined with [the artist's] well known talent will enable us to create an undeniable high quality body of work to take his [artist] proposition to the next level and set him apart from his peers.” The manager goes on to say the funding will, “help us take our journey further where our resources can’t.” The manager also describes the journey the artist has taken to reach this point where he is ready to
advance. It is clear that the person directing the artist through the journey, should he get the funding, will be the manager.

Developing an artist was a process typically undertaken by record labels, but after labels lost substantial income from the decline in record sales, they became increasingly risk averse and relied mostly on their existing sure-fire catalogue of big stars and hit songs (Power and Hallencreutz, 2005). Several of the managers in this research stated they were developing artists, with one particularly stating that the need for managers to do development work is a recent shift. Manager Brett sees this at the management company he works at and says, of ‘developmental’ artists, “you have to release their music through the management company more and more now to get things off the ground” (Brett interview). The main players developing artists, as observed at the grassroots level, are predominantly managers and small independent labels with enough social and cultural capital to initiate and carry out developmental activities but with limited economic capital. Ethan, an ‘as-needed’ manager and label owner describes this situation:

Yeah, yeah, there’s a big gap really. I think the territory we’re in now is quite thin on the ground. You’ve got lots of little bedroom labels and digital only and hobbyist stuff, and then you’ve got the really big indies and the majors, but the gap in the middle, the people who are developing artists is quite small and it’s quite tough to make it work. So, I think the whole funding system is a massive boon in that respect. We don’t have the kind of really hefty catalogue that the big labels have to resource everything.

Developing an artist can involve an investment of money as well as time and resources, so managers are finding the Momentum fund to give their artists support that otherwise might not come. A few managers mentioned investing their own money into artists, which is not a new practice, and they may not be guaranteed to earn their investment back from the artist.

One reason managers are now doing more of the development work is the lack of infrastructure of medium-sized independent labels that have more capital to invest in artists, particularly new artists (Powers, 2015; Strachan, 2007). According to Ethan, an experienced label owner and ad-hoc manager, the infrastructure that used to develop artists in the 1990s has disappeared because the number of
record labels in general that have funds to invest in the development process has decreased.

I think the majors were doing a lot more development... there was a whole period in the 90s where there was a lot of offshoot labels. Whether that had been like a small label that a major had created just as part of them or they bought into other labels. And there was that whole, there was a lot of money getting spent on developing acts through that system, but as money got tighter, those relationships got kind of chopped back.

Micro-indie labels still exist\(^2\), but their catalogues are small and can be made up of music that is less well known, which makes less income and leaves minimal funds to invest in new acts. Momentum funding appears to reach into a void that used to be filled by record label advances but where there is now a lack of investment available for emerging musicians. This void was created by the industry’s re-concentration into fewer labels, occurring when medium-sized and independent labels were purchased and absorbed by a handful of larger labels (Rogers, 2013).

Jeremy sees the sharp division between his small label’s situation and even what he calls the ‘mini majors’:

I think there’s some really big indies that have been around for a while like Domino and Beggars, and they’ve got massive catalogues. So, they’re like mini majors in effect. And there’s other indies that are quite big doing well. But I mean for people like us it’s quite hard.

Managers occupy this developmental space, and it is important for them to know where they can access investment or funding to execute their plans and provide artists with support to develop them creatively and as a performing act. Brett, a young manager only recently full-time says, “I think it’s quite well known in the community now, PRS, if you’ve got a developmental act then you’re probably going to try and get some funding”. The responsibility to access funding is the manager’s in this case, and instead of only seeking the privately sourced money typically offered by labels through recording contracts, managers are turning to the public funding available through Momentum to further musicians’ careers.

\(^2\) There are countless examples of these micro-indie labels. My personal connections manage two different London-based micro-labels, including Kit Records and Alien Jams records. These labels typically were both started by regular DJs on London’s NTS Radio station.
Hracs claims that this is because “the majors were signing fewer new musical artists and focusing promotion and resources on a declining number of top-selling artists. This resulted in a declining level of musical creativity and diversity” (Hracs, 2012: 447). Therefore, the responsibility to develop artists now rests with the artists themselves and their managers. Hracs continues, “The risk of talent development has been downloaded from the major labels to the artists” (2012: 453). In interviews, managers appear to have taken up the mantle of talent development/artist development for musicians alongside indie labels, creating a symbiotic relationship between managers and indie labels in undertaking a development process. Across the interviews, the responsibility of developing the artist came across as belonging to managers and independent labels, but such labels were also managing the same artists. Speaking about her label, which also offers management, Julie, who is a combined manager, says:

I guess that development stage I would see as potentially falling more into a management role, although conceivably we, as a label, might sign an artist who hasn’t written an album yet and come to Momentum in the hope that they would support that.

Julie at first assigns the development responsibility to managers but quickly considers that labels might also take an artist on without any previous music releases and help them realise an entire record from inception. Even though the recorded music industry is less reliant on album releases than it once was (because digital sales tend to be individual songs), many of the Momentum musicians applied for funding to record a full album. The processes that go into making an album – song writing, recording, working with a producer – still contribute to an artist’s development, and when indie labels support record production, they support artist development. From the manager’s perspective, Felicia, speaking as a focused manager, described what it means for an artist to “be in development”:

Well, as in they don’t have a deal, so we need to find them a deal. We need to grow their online. We need to grow their fanbase. We need to grow their live. We’re basically starting almost from scratch with them. They’ve got great songs. They look great...They do all their videos themselves, their artwork. Um, their songs are really, I think, synch-able and very Radio 1 friendly, but we just need to get them in front of the right people and see how it goes from there.
The list of tasks Felicia gives illustrates her conception of the work involved in developing an artist and how she values her ability to connect her artists with those possessing greater social capital in the form of experience, reputation or resources. She conceives the process in relation to specific and concrete tasks with the outcome of placing the band in the right place “in front of the right people,” so they can grow an audience and increase the opportunities available to them.

Another manager, Ethan, saw his role developing artists as integral to the very early days of an artist’s career:

Really because like I say we’re an independent label, we are very much driven by artist development; whereas you find there’s lots of, you know, major labels and label services companies are there just really, they’re not really developing artists in lots of ways, they’re just kind of supporting acts that have had two or three albums out and have got a proven track record where we’re at the coalface developing acts from absolutely nothing, and I see that as a really important, you know, I love it, which is why I do it, but I see it as a really important aspect of the wider music community. You know so many bands that go onto bigger things get picked up by bigger labels or whatever have come through some kind of artist development system.

Ethan’s statement positions the indie labels as the incubators and the major labels and label services companies as benefactors of the work carried out by the indie labels. Describing his label as “at the coalface developing acts” likens their work to miners using their labour to uncover and extract coal – or, in the label’s case, talent. Ethan describes the opposition strongly between those doing artist development and those benefiting from it, and the main site of development is seen as the label. The different perspectives above from a combined (Julie), focused (Felicia), and as-needed manager (Ethan) reflect the different ideas of who is responsible for artist development. Managers are developing artists, whether in a management company, by themselves, or in an independent label, and one way they are doing so is by obtaining grant funding, including the Momentum fund. Momentum allows them to do the heavy lifting of developing artists outside of the major label structures and in line with the wishes and ambitions of the artists.

198
ARTIST MANAGERS: BUSINESS MODELS AND SUCCESS

Considering change in the music industries provides a lens to look at what managers do in this case study. How have their practices shifted and the definitions of success changed? Harry, an interviewee with 18 years’ worth of management experience in the music industries, summarises the changes he has seen:

We’re living in the day and age where as a musician you have to be slightly business savvy, actually... You know you have to be on your game. I mean, there’s a lot of self-management going on now, lot of self-releasing. They’re much more savvy these days than certainly they were 15, 20 years ago.

Several issues relevant to this research and the questions of value are raised by this quote. Firstly, the landscape for musicians has fundamentally changed through the nature of peer-to-peer sharing and now social media and streaming services. Musicians are expected to do more of the work themselves to, even in entrepreneurial ways, establish themselves and reach their fans (Morris, 2013). The increased pressure on musicians is significant to why managers become involved with artists and musicians even at early stages of development. Harry’s quote refers to ‘self-management’ as well as ‘self-releasing’, signifying the self-sufficiency required of musicians today, which he contrasts with musicians of the past with presumably more support. This emphasis on being independent and ‘self-releasing’ was witnessed across many of the interviews conducted for this study. The shifted landscape of today’s music industries presents a picture of many more musicians than ever before seeking success with fewer than ever record deals available to ensure success. So, success has to be obtained in different ways, and its very meaning has to be retooled (definitions of success will be further discussed in Chapter 7). Many of the funded applications for Momentum discuss retaining rights and either only wanting the ‘right’ record label deal or no deal at all. Quite a few artists used short-term label services contracts so that they would not have to give away ownership of their copyright.

For the musicians interviewed, success could still mean being able to secure a lucrative record deal where optimum in-house resources would be available to inject money into their development and careers. Notable here is the
way the type of record label becomes more important to musicians. It is not enough to simply acquire a record deal: it has to be the right kind of deal with the right label. Discerning what the ‘right’ one is falls to the manager and this requires him/her to understand the specific ambitions and desires of the musicians they represent. Brett, a young manager who studied engineering at university but decided to pursue management after he began informally managing his friend, stated, “So, I just think it’s about picking and choosing which pieces are definitely worth it for the artist at that stage of their career” (Brett). Brett further said that sometimes the ‘right’ thing might not seem appealing to the artist, but he tries to encourage the artists he manages to take good opportunities without bringing them ones he knows they will refuse.

For other musicians and managers interviewed, success was something that would be achieved on their own terms and would mean attaining sustainable income, usually expected from touring income. The idea behind this model of success is that once a sufficient number of fans are created and enough live performances played, the artist will be able to earn a profit from touring to eventually allow full-time musician status without having to take an advance from a label or publisher that then needs to be paid back. Artist manager Felicia had many years in diverse roles throughout the music industries but had to settle on management after working for a festival booking company. Felicia was managing a large rock band that strongly identified as do-it-yourself. She illustrates how the Momentum funding received by the band she manages for their touring costs and live show development feeds into the long-term plan she has for their careers:

Bands don’t make any money really...unless it’s merch [merchandise] on the road, um, which again is why live is so important and growing those audiences because bands make their money now, as you well know, no doubt, from live and merch. So, that’s why the Momentum funding for us is really important because that’s how [the band] will earn their living and get longevity is through their live more than anything, and also they don’t – they’re a band that don’t want to be in debt to a label. (Felicia)

An issue brought to the fore in Felicia’s statement is artists wanting to avoid debt, usually stemming from an advance of money given to artists at the time of signing a deal and recoupable by the label from their future income, assuming they have any. ‘Self-releasing' through their own record label or their manager’s label
provides an alternative for independent or unsigned artists without additional label investment. Indeed, this model proved popular among my participants, with managers operating in a way that allowed overlap between management duties and running labels.

As discussed above, several of the managers had started labels to release artists themselves or already owned their own labels that also offered management services to artists, whether informal or formally. The blurring of the lines between managing an artist and being their label could present some conflicts of interest where managers might stand to profit, both from a management commission and from income, from record or song sales. Harrison (2015) claims that managers might seek to have artists on their own labels to increase their potential income streams. In my research with managers, distinct business models emerged, each bringing a different set of potential conflicts.

There were some managers, like Felicia, a focused manager, who worked for a management company that did not release artists’ music or run artists’ record labels. While this is the most straightforward arrangement, Felicia was not able to give answers with certainty regarding the amount of commission she received from each artist she managed. She stated that the commission rates varied by artist due to the management company making different deals with each one – deals that she did not see. For the Momentum-funded artist, she said the multi-member band and she split the net income evenly at about 15% each.

Julie, a combined manager working at a small indie label, did not have a traditional management or record label contract with the Momentum-funded artist. Her label seeks instead to create a ‘partnership’ with an artist, rather than a traditional flat fee contract or single-release deal. This notion of partnerships as a business model came up regularly in successful Momentum applications, suggesting this model of making deals within the music industry is becoming more prevalent. Partnership models might have less transparent fees, in that the split of income might be more dependent on certain outcomes or factors. However, partnerships may also provide more chance for the balance of power in the manager – artist relationship and incentivise both parties to make the most of a mutually beneficial arrangement. Another combined manager, Jeremy, has both a
management agreement and separate agreements for releasing artists on his label. The management commission is 20%, which based on other interviews, appears to be fairly standard. Jeremy’s business model is a balance of management and a record label, with artists coming in for both services. Some managers did not take a fee for part of the work they undertook for Momentum-funded artists. Some managers, like Ethan, mainly derived income from running a label and did not receive formal income from management. Others, like Luke, only received income from management and did not take copyrights or fees for releasing artists’ music. Ultimately, I observed that, while roles sometimes blurred for the managers in this study, the contracts typically did not allow managers to double dip, whereby they would receive commission on work they did as a label, for which they also receive a fee. Some of the those carrying out managerial or label work for artists were not remunerated for this. This raises questions of who benefits most from the different business models presented above and what the long-term implications are for the independent labels developing artists and the managers establishing labels to release their artists.

PROTECTING MUSICIANS’ INTERESTS, AND THEIR OWN

In the case study, I observed the four types of managers laid out in the first section. Within these designations (Focused, Combined, Comprehensive, As-Needed, seen in Table 6.1), there were roughly four types of business models as well. The managers interviewed displayed a diversity of practices, but, essentially, the four types reflect these business models. Within them, there are more ‘partnership’ focused agreements between musicians and labels/managers. Julie described her label/management company’s relationship with the three artists they work with:

It’s about entering into a business relationship with an artist where they feel like they’ve got a lot of control – and I don’t necessarily mean creative control – but just like that they’re really clear on how everything is working and feel committed to that. And, in turn, we commit to their career in a more kind of wholehearted, not just like release-by-release label, a kind of like longer term. And actually, I suppose also committing to trying to find other ways of supporting creative projects. (Julie)
Visible within Julie’s comments is an underlying discussion of business ‘control’ for the musician, so that they are aware of the activities the label is undertaking on their behalf. Contrasted to this is the idea of the major label where the marketing department might operate with more discretion and less consultation with the musician. Julie is distancing her label from those that she sees as not considering musicians’ long-term careers and their full potential creatively. She was clear that she wanted to help musicians undertake whatever creative activity would further their career, such as making a film.

Luke and Brett, comprehensive and focused managers respectively, are operating a more standard management model, with Luke occasionally releasing records on his company’s label but without taking any cut of the sales. Both managers described the importance of protecting aspects of their managed musicians’ careers, but in different terms. Luke considers, in a similar way to Julie, the importance of the artist’s input and vision for themselves.

> We would never do anything that the artist didn’t want to do. The whole thing is about trying to make a career for the artist based on the music that they want to create and the image that they want to have. So, we will advise and kind of suggest things, but they get the final decision. (Luke)

Luke’s encounter with the musician that drives his business changed how he even modelled his company. After meeting her, he decided he wanted to manage her because he was so passionate about the music, and he altered his business from a record label to a management company. Altering his business was not difficult, as it was a very small operation, as were most of the labels operated by managers in this study. There is an air of respect and protectiveness in the way he discusses representing his artist. For Brett, the main way he could protect the interests of his managed client was to ensure that he did not sign his copyright away at any time:

> I think the biggest emphasis is rights retainership at this point, the best advice you can give to an artist like [a Momentum-funded band] is you should be keeping the rights to your songs. There’s always going to be a good song. Once it’s up online it’s only ever going to get listened to more. (Brett)

Maintaining ownership over copyright is important for managers as well, as those working with musicians in label capacities can ensure a more sustained income if they are able to release their artists’ work – even without a formal royalty pay
agreement. For those managers, they typically have a 50/50 split on physical sales. Brett saw the relationship between the musician and manager as mutually beneficial:

But they work with us because they want to make money as well. They want to be able to support themselves. They want to make a career out of it. So, at the moment the other artist is full-time employed, but he likes the fact that this is a business and we want to make money, because he wants to quit his job and become an artist full time.

The manager’s job, for Brett, is to look after the artist and find opportunities, deals, ventures and new prospects for them to both pursue, with him pursuing work where the artist takes their role as seriously as the manager does theirs. Possessing a manager was seen by the Momentum assessors in Chapter 5 as a marker of a serious musician, dedicated to their craft and pursuing a career as a professional musician. Many more artists at the emerging Momentum level possessed managers than I expected at the beginning of this research. In addition, the multitude of activities managers were found to be undertaking for artists and the ways they applied their knowledge to support them and adapt to the changes in the music industries suggest that managers are the significant cultural intermediaries for emerging popular musicians in England.

6.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter illustrated the processes through which managers mediate for musicians and argued that managers are using public funding to develop value for them and the musicians they manage. I first laid out the existing literature on ‘cultural intermediaries’, discussing the critiques and relevance to this project and taking on the idea of a web within which managers operate. I then reviewed the existing literature on artist managers, showing that a substantial gap in knowledge exists regarding the working practices and value of artist managers at the emerging level. I showed that recent research from Hracs and Lizé had similar findings regarding the types of tasks managers engage in, framed through the concept of cultural intermediaries. Drawing from my interviews with 14 artist managers and workers I termed ‘managerial workers,’ I developed a typology of
managers to describe the working practices of those supporting Momentum-funded musicians in this project. In the final section, I sought to show how managers act as intermediaries and drive the important process of 'artist development', which managers have increasingly taken over from record labels. Managers, therefore, appear to require additional support which Momentum now provides.
7. ‘EMERGING’ POPULAR MUSICIANS, WORK AND THE VALUE OF PUBLIC FUNDING

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of value is complex and changes based on the perspective of those valuing. I draw from the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) Cultural Value Project (CVP), as specified in Chapter 2, which ended in 2016 and determined that cultural value is “the worth attributed to activities” such as music, museums and heritage “and it embraces not just the classical and the canon, but also the informal, popular and commercial” (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 13). In line with the aims of the CVP to add nuance and richness to the research and knowledge on cultural value, in this thesis, value is understood to change between the perspectives of actors involved, these being musicians, managers, funding organisations, and the corporate or music industries. This chapter focuses on the perspective of the popular musicians funded by the Momentum music fund and seeks to explore the ways they value the funding and what it allows them to do through a cultural work perspective. Developing a way of conceptualising and unpicking the perceived value of the array of different opportunities that Momentum enables across different actors is important and useful because the funding derives from public sources and is expected by ACE and PRSF to meet specific aims. If we understand that these aims are organisationally constructed and from the funders’ perspective, a new view of the funding’s value from the musicians’ perspectives can be outlined and examined. The act of doing this helps answer the primary research question of what value public funding might create for popular musicians. This chapter will show that funding can enable up-and-coming musicians to pursue music careers in a variety of ways, and may be valued for its potential to be used by artists and artist managers to emulate other industry structures, such as record label support, without the perceived domination of those businesses. Public funding can contribute to an artist’s career through artistic and professional development as well as the economic benefit. In traditional models of
the music industries, musicians must align themselves with music companies and individuals with more expertise and networks than they have. Jones claims that:

Pop acts cannot be successful on their own so they need to form working relationships with intermediary figures. From here, what they need to aim at is to be successful on their own terms, but acts rarely attain this, although only partly for the reason of the lack of resources and lack of access to information. (Jones, 2003: 155)

The resources and information Jones is referring to are the limited resources the record labels can devote to the act and an awareness that labels operate a system of “prioritization,” where the most plausibly successful musicians receive the most attention and investment. Musicians’ failure to achieve success, Jones argues, cannot be solely attributed to these elements. Instead, the sheer number of musicians competing for limited positions of acclaim and profitable achievements (such as headlining large festivals, having a top 10 song, or selling out a tour), combined with the unpredictable audience, make for a precarious existence for many musicians. The popular music industries are plagued by uncertainty for both musicians and industry companies, and the musicians funded by the Momentum music fund are not immune to any of this uncertainty. It is therefore important to understand how they operate in this precarious environment and how the funding comes into play.

In this chapter, I examine what motivates popular musicians to seek funding in the first place and then, once funded by Momentum, to pursue music if so many musicians will be seen to “fail” in strict terms of numbers. Accounting for the musicians’ motivations using a framework developed by Banks (2017a) drawing from MacIntyre’s work (2007), I then consider how public funding might adjust or interact with structural constraints through the ideas of autonomy and work. Underlying this discussion are the concepts of success and failure, which, if understood merely in figures, are not adequate to explain why popular musicians seek funding for their careers. In addition to cultural work literature, relevant research from popular music higher education (Smith, 2013) and popular music studies (Zwaan, 2009), which focus on up-and-coming or ‘emerging’ musicians, provides different ways to conceptualise ‘success’ for emerging musicians and value creation strategies or processes. This chapter will therefore show how
'success' as a concept needs to be recalibrated and recast to capture more of the richness in how musicians value both the funding and their work as musicians.

7.2 MUSICIANS AS CULTURAL WORKERS

This chapter is informed firstly by the literature on cultural work as understood by Mark Banks (2007, 2017a), David Hesmondhalgh (2007) and Sarah Baker (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011), where artists (or musicians, in this case) or cultural producers are understood as workers in the cultural or creative industries and their processes of creation and creativity are seen as work. In 2007, Banks wrote that “accounts of such workers have been largely absent” from the then existing research on cultural industries (7). Since then, there has been a surge of interest in the conditions of cultural producers and their personal lives and identities, with research on many types of cultural workers, including musicians (such as Hracs, 2015; Hracs and Leslie, 2013; Morris, 2013; Scott, 2012; Umney and Kretos, 2014). Conceptualising creative work as ‘work’ is in opposition to the traditional romanticised idea of creativity and the genius artist. The framework of cultural work has embedded at its fundamental core the “apparent incommensurability and relative autonomy of the categories of ‘art’ and ‘commerce’” (Banks, 2007: 6). Music, as an industry and a practice, displays the push and pull between these two categories, and currently no work drawing from this framework has analysed popular musicians in receipt of public funding. My work fills this gap.

THE PRACTICE OF CULTURAL WORK: INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL GOODS

The approach Mark Banks develops and applies in his work *Creative Justice* offers some helpful ways of considering the cultural work of popular musicians in this study. One of the questions guiding Banks is how justice might be given to cultural work, and he draws from Keat, MacIntyre and Muirhead to conceptualise cultural
work as a practice (2017a: 2). He explains that this view of cultural work as a practice:

Focuses explicitly on exploring the plural value(s) of work – the range of qualities or benefits (and disbenefits) we might attribute or obtain through its undertaking. This involves consideration of cultural work as a source of (not just) an economic value, but also a social value, as well as an aesthetic one, underwritten by different kinds of political sensibilities. Doing justice to cultural work therefore means respecting the ‘internal’ goods and qualities of work as a practice – but without discounting the ‘external’ structures and pressures that tend to make such work somewhat less than appealing, and often deeply unfair and unjust. (Banks, 2017a: 2)

In this chapter, I adopt Banks’ definition of internal goods as “intrinsic qualities which are practice specific – that is, rewards that can only be attained through immersion in the particular practice in question” (Banks, 2017a: 45). Banks’ assertion that the focus of value derived from the practice should include, beyond an economic value, social and aesthetic values, aligns with the primary research question for the Momentum case study of what the value of public funding might be from the perspectives of different actors – in this chapter, the musicians (Banks, 2017a). While there is little research currently regarding the value of a publicly funded employment programme for popular musicians, Cloonan (2007) references a state programme in the UK in the 1990s that indirectly supported musicians. A historical example exists regarding the value of public funding for jazz in the middle part of the 20th century (Banks and Toynbee, 2014). Considering whether and how cultural work is just (equitable and equal) links to a further question driving my research. This question for my analysis is: What economic, social and cultural barriers to making music does Momentum funding aim to redress and does it achieve this? This chapter draws from perspectives on value for musicians and the CVP to analyse the multitude of ways that musicians value Momentum funding.

As expressed above, if considering cultural work as a practice, the internal goods and external structures should be considered. Banks attempts to show the moral economy of cultural work by integrating MacIntyre’s (2007) work on practice with Bourdieu’s (1984, 1993) field theory and concepts of consecration and capital. For cultural work to be a practice, “[a]s MacIntyre’s definition suggests, the acquisition of internal goods and their capacity to enrich the community is strongly
related to the ongoing achievement of objective *standards of excellence*" (emphasis in original Banks, 2017a: 45). These internal goods are only available to those who develop knowledge and understanding of the nature of a specific practice. Contrasted to internal goods, but still seen to be significant within a practice, external goods are "money, prestige, esteem, praise and status" (45). While external goods can be obtained outside of the practice, they are tied to the ability to obtain internal goods and can be translated into internal goods.

The illustrative area of cultural work Banks refers to as a practice in his example is jazz, which he argues fits MacIntyre’s definition of a practice in an exceptional way. This is because, he argues, jazz is a “coherent, rule-bound social activity” where applying the “virtues” of the practice allows attainment of internal goods, which “rely upon education” and “some historically developed objective standards of excellence” (47). Jazz is also seen to have more “emulative competition” rather than “market competition” (*ibid.*, 52). Popular music could be argued to be a less coherent area of study as a ‘practice’ (using this definition) than jazz, with it spanning disparate genres from dance to rock to hip hop, each possessing differing ideas of excellence and varying levels of market viability. Indeed, the many genres could be argued to each be its own practice. While jazz is perhaps more clearly an example of a practice defined by formalised standards of excellence than popular music, as popular music includes such a broad range of musical genres, popular musicians across genres still cooperate to realise internal goods in their work and are shaped by ideas of excellence born from institutions and the industries, which are fed back into and shape the practice. The concepts of internal and external goods, however, provide the most fruitful concepts to my research, affording a way in to articulate and analyse the different kinds of value derived from funding popular music. There are limitations to the strict application of a framework of excellence when analysing popular musicians (see Chapter 5 for discussion of excellence as a funding criteria), as it is not clear how much ‘excellence’ outweighs the lack of external rewards for musicians, which Banks observed. Internal rewards were certainly a motivation to stick with music and (for some) the belief that external rewards would come was enough (Banks, 2017a: 49).
I aim to show that up-and-coming popular musicians are also motivated by internal and external goods in similar ways to Banks’ jazz musicians and that understanding these is key to determining the value of public funding. The discussion will be guided by dynamics of different conceptions of value, such as cultural vs. economic value, excellence vs. amateurism, internal vs. external goods, and autonomy vs. security. Later in the chapter, I link the discussion of internal and external rewards with definitions of ‘success’ to elucidate how public funding can be valued and assessed.

**AUTONOMY VS. SECURITY**

Banks points out that the tensions in cultural work between “creative autonomy and independence” and “profit-generation and controlled accumulation” are emblematic of the larger tensions envisioned between art and commerce or culture and economy (2007: 6). He goes onto argue that the “cultural industries have emerged as a distinctive convergence of the cultural and the economic” (Banks, 2007: 7). While these two spheres might be seen to be in opposition with one another, the space between them is fertile ground for research and illustrative of the competing priorities all cultural workers face in the cultural industries. These priorities might be between having a say in the direction of their work and building more contacts to expand their income sources or support networks. Yet, as we will see, the space between is also not a linear or straightforward area, rather it is full of overlapping priorities and nuances. In spite of this, the relationships between the different spheres might be visualised as a matrix with creative autonomy and controlled accumulation opposite and internal and external goods between (see Figure 7.1). While each sphere may reach out, extending away, they also converge together. I regard this relationship as a matrix, merging the work of Banks (2017a), Gillespie et al. (2014) and Umney and Kretsos (2014). The matrix serves to represent multiple forms of value, and different actors might fall within particular quadrants based on the level to which they are motivated by acquisition of internal goods, external goods, autonomy and ‘controlled accumulation’.
Key to the approaches of Banks (2007, 2017a) and Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) is a discussion of what constitutes ‘good’ work and the normative concepts of autonomy and self-realisation. These scholars argue that normative ideas about cultural work should not be entirely abandoned as these can be useful in evaluating what kind of work is ‘good’ work in the cultural industries. Evaluating the work is particularly pertinent in an age of increased individualisation where the worker is increasingly separated from others in the cultural production process.

One area of struggle for cultural workers in particular may be the notion of autonomy. According to Hesmondhalgh and Baker, the type of autonomy workers have might be thought of in two ways:

1) artistic autonomy – possibly seen as “contradictory and ambivalent,” such autonomy symbolises an “aspiration to human freedom”. (2011: 65)

2) professional autonomy (2011: 66)

Hesmondhalgh and Baker use the term autonomy in these two ways and call for the concept to be ambivalent, being careful of its critiques, like the romanticised idea of artistic autonomy which can lead to self-exploitation (such as seen by McRobbie, 2002). Thinking through the importance of autonomy, there are other concerns, as it could encompass ideas related to the lone auteur or artistic genius as much as it could account for the importance of collaborative creative work which is unencumbered by outside interests.

Referencing Ursell’s (2000) ‘economy of favours’, where communities of creative workers exchange unpaid work for one another as a favour to be repaid, a study of London-based jazz musicians highlights how the lack of integration into a workforce and relative isolation of autonomous musicians creates a competitive atmosphere shrouded in ambiguity. Such ambiguity complicates actors’ abilities to then collectively work or even compete fairly.

Entrepreneurial work settings were characterized by complex, individualized relationship chains, which obscured the terms of transaction between economic actors… It can be added that the sheer opacity of relationships between creative workers and other actors such as agents and clients… is an important form of control in itself. (Umney and Kretsos, 2014: 586)
The musicians in the Momentum case often work in these obscured chains of connections, sometimes indeed doing favours for no initial remuneration out of necessity, which can be exploitative. Not being clear on who gets paid what can be a problem, as musicians may not know how much to pay others or may undercut their own fees.

**Figure 7.1 Cultural Work Value Matrix**

CONSIDERING ‘SUCCESS’: OBJECTIVE, SUBJECTIVE AND MULTI-DIMENSIONAL

There are two main reasons that achieving ‘success’ as popular musicians cannot be guaranteed. The first is the potential oversupply of musicians vying for what might be seen as limited spaces where musicians can be successful, as discussed in previous chapters. Caves describes the oversupply of labour, of the over-filled talent pool contributing to competition (2000). Jones summarises the different
numerical data scholars have used to show the penchant for failure that the recorded music industry can almost promise:

That there is one emergent pop act for every one thousand members of the population; the second, from Frith, that only 1 percent of these aspirant pop acts is likely to sign a deal with a major label; and third, from Negus, a record industry “rule-of-thumb” calculation that, of all the acts signed to a major record label at any one time, only one-in-eight is likely to make a profit. Taken together, this means that only one-eighth of one percent 1 percent of all pop acts extant at any one time enjoys appreciable success – the rest, sooner rather than later, fail. On this basis, it is reasonable to argue that the majority product of the music industry is not success but failure. (Jones, 2003: 148)

The issue with the narrow view of success, as described by Negus and Frith in Jones’ summary, is that it limits the understanding of success to one metric – being signed to a major label – an outdated metric today that does not reflect the reality of many popular musicians with successful careers in music. The second main reason that success cannot be guaranteed for funded musicians is the uncertainty of the audience reception, which music companies have sought to overcome through market research but which remains a financial risk (Caves, 2002; Miège, 1989: 44). In the traditional recording industry pre-digitalisation, often the largest music companies attempted to sidestep this risk through the acquisition of ‘stars’ to outweigh the costs of all the ‘failures’ (Meier, 2017: 49). Therefore, if the majority of musicians could be seen to ‘fail’ in the traditional conception of the popular music system where record sales and solid revenues are all that count when determining the ‘success’ or ‘failure’ of popular musicians, a more nuanced approach is required.

There are two separate ways of discussing success drawn from different disciplinary areas, which could help re-shape the concept. These include Zwaan’s research on the success of emerging popular musicians in the Netherlands, which provides a framework for analysing success, and Gareth Dylan Smith, who writes from a music education vantage point on ‘emerging’ musicians. I bring both approaches together to create a multi-purpose definition of success that captures the nuances of emerging musicians and speaks to the ways they value funding. I define success for popular musicians using the matrix I have compiled. My definition is inspired by Umney and Kretsos’ (2014: 579), who created a matrix
with the concepts of internal versus external goods mapped on. The concepts of controlled accumulation versus creative autonomy were drawn from Banks (2017a). In this definition, where success markers are hugely varied and difficult to compare or measure against one another, they are like tracks on a roller-coaster that will ebb and flow, rise and fall, moving into each of the four quadrants at different times and rarely being altered by singularly defining moments.

The approach to defining success employed by Zwaan (2009) illuminates useful linkages to the framework of internal vs. external goods, described above, and an understanding of the motivations underlying cultural work and more particularly popular musicians. Influenced by the career psychology framework, Zwaan’s descriptions of objective and subjective success show parallels to MacIntyre’s (as employed by Banks) concepts of internal and external goods. Zwaan explains that:

Subjective career success is defined as the individual’s feelings of accomplishment and satisfaction with one’s career. Here the focus is on intrinsic indicators of success such as the question of whether the individual considers him or herself successful. (Zwaan, 2009: 11)

Subjective success then might be conceived in a way that takes stock of the intrinsic value of internal goods obtained in the practice. On the other hand, objective success mirrors more the external goods and extrinsic values.

Objective career success can be defined as career success that is observable by others... This form of career success is based on extrinsic indicators of success, that is, objectively observable career accomplishments. (Zwaan, 2009: 11)

Here, there are also parallels, both to external goods and the standards of ‘excellence’ (since this is seen as objective in the ‘practice’ according to Banks) musicians seek to achieve. Objective success comes through those achievements in one’s career that others can perceive, which may constitute ‘excellence’ but must be acknowledged against established standards by others in a practice. For musicians, this means that their success, when viewed objectively, might depend on what can be seen by those inside and outside of the practice of popular music. In Zwaan’s studies of popular musicians and success, he defines more specifically the way subjective success could be defined with popular musicians.
In his 1st study, subjective success is: “defined by intrinsic values such as artistic development, recognition by other musicians and a general, subjective feeling of being successful” (Zwaan, 2009: 26). Like the internal goods that jazz musicians pursue, in Banks’ analysis (2017a), subjective success could be understood as a measure of the level an artist feels they have achieved something, such as creative control, thereby attaining internal goods. Objective success was filtered through Zwaan’s participants’ specific positions as Artist and Repertoire (A&R) managers: “Being successful as a musician means being profitable to the record company. As such, record sales can be seen as an indicator of success” (2009: 26). Objective success was measured through “national radio airplay, national television airplay, CD sales, and performance frequency” (63). The A&R managers possess specific conceptions of the external goods musicians need to obtain. Therefore, their version of success is constricted by their own desire to help the record label that employs them make money, or on objective over subjective valuation/external over internal goods.

Figure 7.2 shows the potential data missed in a narrowly economic or stats-based definition of success. The adapted matrix is inspired partly by the work of Gillespie et al. (2014), who developed an adaptable methodological tool to determine cultural value for different actors within the British Council and British Broadcasting Corporation World Service. Figure 7.2 builds on the four axes representing musicians’ motivations seen in Figure 7.1. In Figure 7.2, I take the matrix created by the four axes further by overlaying the concepts of objective and subjective success, drawing upon Zwaan’s (2009) definitions. Examining Figure 7.2, it is evident that success defined purely through objective measures is likely to only capture half of the quadrants of information and be lacking in nuance and detail. This is because in mapping objective and subjective success onto motivation types, there emerge zones of mixed motivations, where artists may be motivated by a balance of both external goods and creative autonomy or by both controlled accumulation and internal goods. Musicians can be motivated to varying degrees by a combination of factors, and these may change over time. Therefore, my research seeks to expand the definition of success for popular musicians toward a richer understanding, and I will do so through a focus on the musicians’
perspectives of the Momentum funding by examining the ways it can create value for them.

Figure 7.2 Motivations and Types of Success for Musicians

MULTI-DIMENSION SUCCESS

As we have seen, success may not be the opposite of failure when failure is understood in economic terms. However, this raises the question of how public funding can then be defined as a success based on what it enables musicians to do or the value it creates for them and those they work with. There have been landmark studies on DIY musicians working in the lower echelons and between amateur and professional, most notably Finnegan (1989) and Cohen (1991), both published nearly 20 years ago at the time of writing. Writing from the viewpoint of a musician and a music educator, Smith (2013) argues that music educators
teaching popular music to aspiring musicians need a better, broader understanding of success and sees the media and academia as perpetuating a limited view of being a successful musician. This definition should be one that incorporates understanding that many musicians may consider music their career but not earn a full-time income from it (Finnegan, 1989). It should also accept that even many popular musicians are not necessarily aspiring to – or driven by – the traditional idea of making it big and being a superstar musician. Smith says, of the teaching, that there is a responsibility to present more realistic and open-ended teaching on experiences of success:

Our institutions need to recognize diverse manifestations of success for musicians, and to reflect these back, through curriculum and pedagogy, to our students so that they are all the better prepared for navigating the future. (Smith, 2013: 29)

The pedagogical framework, according to him, continues to present a false or limited image to students during their studies as they learn about what it means to be a popular musician today, which does not prepare them for the realities of being a musician while working other jobs. He also asserts that music educators and scholars need a more encompassing view of what being a musician is, beyond the over-glorified accounts of “famous and commercially successful musicians,” which paint an unrealistic picture while also causing aspiring musicians to limit their views of success (2013: 32).

Particularly potent in Smith’s argument is his own comparison of himself as a professional drummer to the strictest definition of success, within which he argues he might not qualify as successful: “I am not famous, and my income derives largely from things other than performing. Most of the music that I make, and that I would consider truly successful in artistic and technical terms, pays me very little” (Smith, 2013: 33). He shows that having a piecemeal career, or ‘portfolio career’, can still mean a musician is successful in their own view, and this matters because portfolio careers are more common now. Smith claims:

We all have portfolio careers, pieced together from a mixture of high-profile performances, low-profile gigs, teaching, journalism, composition, and all manner of music-related and non-music-related work… This is the modus operandi of many a successful musician. (2013: 33)
The tasks Smith lists include many common activities for the musicians I interviewed. When researching popular music, I argue that we need a better understanding of what success might be for musicians who are receiving public funding. As Zwaan puts it, “Career success is a multi-dimensional concept, meaning that it encompasses several dimensions on which the evaluation can be made whether someone is successful or not” (2009: 10). While Zwaan uses the concept of ‘career success’, his argument is that we need a definition of multi-dimensional success which accounts for the fact that the evaluation can be made at various points. For public funding, the fact that, statistically speaking, most popular musicians will never have a hit record means the definition of success for publicly funded musicians cannot simply be cast in the same light that the risk laden, star focused record industry has shown on it. What might be hoped from public funding, however, is that some of the extreme likelihood of failure to chart on the radio, to sell millions of records, or even to subsist will be offset and musicians will be able to pursue and develop a range or internal and external goods. I now examine who the Momentum funding is for and explore what it means to be ‘emerging’.

7.3 MUSICIANS INTERVIEWS

The nine Momentum-funded artists interviewed for this research were funded between the first round of Momentum applications in June 2013 and the 13th round in July 2016. Given this distribution, this meant that some of the musicians interviewed had not yet used all of the grant money from Momentum or completed the project they requested to have funded. Tables 7.1 and 7.2 show the division of artists interviewed into bands with multiple members and individual solo-artists. They also include the roles of the musicians interviewed, as well as their round of

---

21 In this chapter, I use ‘artist’ to refer to the acts funded by Momentum. ‘Musician’ will denote the individual person. The terms ‘band’ and ‘solo-artist’ are understood to be the size or structure of the act itself, whether it has multiple members or is one individual.

22 Rounds 1-8 occurred from 2013-2014 and constituted the original two-year pilot where £500,000 was split over two years. Rounds 9-12 occurred in the third year, when ACE had renewed Momentum for an additional year and provided £500,000 – doubling the amount. Round 13 was funded by PRSF while they awaited the result of their application to ACE to continue managing Momentum. Rounds 14-15 returned to ACE funding.
application, the type of project they applied to have funded, genre, and their region of origin. Table 7.2 shows number of band members. The mix of genres represented is fairly broad, but I was not able to speak to any grime, rap, or hip-hop artists. These genres have had increasing numbers of funded artists in the last few rounds.

The ‘Type of Project’ refers to what the artist applied to have funded based on their application and the option they selected. Musicians were asked in interviews how they used the funding to see whether they used the funding for their original intention and if they felt that it would have been better used in a different way at an earlier or later time. In the case of Loxe, he was initially given funding under his previous artist name Debian Blak, but, after a defining period of artistic creativity, he felt he needed a new project name and adopted the name Loxe. Upon doing so, he wanted to adjust his plans and was granted permission to do so by PRSF.

Table 7.1 Momentum-Funded Musicians Interviewed – Solo-Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solo-Artists</th>
<th>Band / Artist name</th>
<th>Role of artist</th>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Type of project applied for</th>
<th>Genre on Application</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Perkins</td>
<td>Loxe (f.k.a. Debian Blak)</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Debut album</td>
<td>Dance/ Electronic</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Agombar</td>
<td>Jessica Agombar</td>
<td>Songwriter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Single Release, Marketing and Live Show</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Woods</td>
<td>Matt Woods</td>
<td>Singer / songwriter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Recording, Releasing, Marketing and Live Launch</td>
<td>Singer/Song writer (Pop)</td>
<td>South West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvastone</td>
<td>Silvastone</td>
<td>Artist / producer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Recording, marketing and touring of an EP</td>
<td>Reggae</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2 Momentum-Funded Musicians Interviewed - Bands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musician name</th>
<th>Band / Artist name</th>
<th>No. in Band</th>
<th>Role of artist</th>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Type of project applied for</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Wallis</td>
<td>Dutch Uncles</td>
<td>4 (was 5)</td>
<td>Singer, lyricist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Album no. 4</td>
<td>Indie</td>
<td>North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karthik Poduval,</td>
<td>Flamingods</td>
<td>4 (was 5)</td>
<td>Multi-instrumentalist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Recording, marketing, touring</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Rowe</td>
<td>Flamingods</td>
<td>4 (was 5)</td>
<td>Multi-instrumentalist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Recording, marketing, touring</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Jones</td>
<td>Employed to Serve</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Singer, lyricist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Recording, marketing, touring</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAMPLE REPRESENTATION

The sample of artists interviewed for this study differs from the total sample of 175 artists funded in rounds 1-15 of Momentum in a few ways. In the sample of interviewees, there is a slight bias toward artists funded in the initial two-year pilot with five of the 9 funded artists in rounds 1-8. This is due, in part, to the time period the data was collected in and the availability of contacts for earlier rounds. A greater number of artists have been funded per round in latter rounds, but there is still a balance because artists from each of the three phases of Momentum are included. Other areas of representativeness considered are regional location, gender, genre, level of experience, and number of members.
The regional distribution of the participants was London-biased with five out of nine artists from London. This mirrors the significant London bias of the Momentum fund. Other artists were located in the North West (2), in the South West (1), and in the South East (1). The gender split of musicians interviewed was three females (two solo-artists and one from a band with four other males) and seven males (two from the same four-member male band, one from a four-member male band and four solo-artists).

Regarding genres in the sample, the distribution was wide and included one each of dance, dance/electronic, indie, pop, rock, singer/songwriter, reggae, urban, and world. This dispersion is much more diverse than Momentum’s funded sample, which still reflects alternative/indie, hip/hop, and ‘other’ genre biases. In my interviews, seven of the ten musicians interviewed identified as “White British,” which reflects over-representation. There were three with other ethnicities in my sample - one musician was “Asian/Asian British – Indian,” one was “Black/Black British – African,” and two were from the multi-ethnicity band, Flamingods. Flamingods are unusual for the Momentum fund in that four of their five original members met as children in Bahrain, where three were growing up as British expats. Sam, with whom I spoke, is white and British, and Karthik, who I also spoke with, met the other band members later when the band formed in the UK but grew up in Dubai and is British with Indian heritage.

According to the interim evaluation of Momentum’s first two years, the percent of applicants from solo-artists was 16%. Six of the nine funded artists I interviewed were solo-artists; the remaining three were in bands (two had four members, and one had five). In the Momentum programme, the average number of band members for rounds 9-15 was three, with numbers ranging from 1-14. Solo-artists made up 34.58% of the 107 (37 count). My sample of musicians is therefore biased in favour of solo-artists. This could be reflected in the data and may relate to the number of those describing a level of devotion to an ‘independent’ way of working as a musician. However, three of the four musicians interviewed in bands expressed the value of creative freedom and the ability to determine their own paths in similar ways to the solo-artists interviewed. One way the sample could be affected by the dominance of solo-artists, however, relates to
being signed by a label. All of the bands I interviewed were signed to record labels and, at the time of interview, none of the solo-artists were. Therefore, my data from solo-artists may reflect a smaller number of artists seeking to become signed or pursue a label contract than would be seen Momentum fund overall.

7.4 MUSICIANS FINDINGS: VALUE WHEN THERE IS NO CERTAINTY

This section lays out findings of the case study, considering the funded musicians as cultural workers seeking internal and external goods. Firstly, the struggle for autonomy is considered in order to examine how the funding might interact with, further or limit the different aims of musicians. The relationship musicians have with autonomy came up frequently in interviews and contributes to the discussion of value. Themes of music as work, professional status and money are then correlated with attainment of internal/external goods. Finally, ‘success’ as an evaluative concept is brought in to further the discussion on value and how it can be framed.

AUTONOMY VS. SECURITY?

If we have learnt that artists often live precarious lives, where they may not always be paid for their work or know that future work is coming, it may be surprising that one would ever turn down an opportunity for a contract with an advance of funding. However, some artists I interviewed valued their autonomy – creatively and professionally – more than the security a guaranteed payment from a deal would bring. Matt explained:

I genuinely just said no to a deal... I feel like the email actually got written yesterday... and it’s really hard to do. It is always really hard to do because you are giving up... it feels like you are giving up this certainty, the certainty of success which is absolute bollocks. Like 80% of people that go to a major don’t even – are never heard really – so you are not giving up the certainty if anything. They promise you the world and it is really hard to give up. (Matt)
In this research, the idea of being signed, especially to a major label, seemed to equate to less creative and professional control. Like Matt, some musicians in the study had turned down record contracts and voiced concern that they wanted to find the ‘right’ contract with the ‘right’ label, if they even wanted a deal at all. This hesitancy was most noticeable in the solo-artists, and these were also the unsigned musicians. Those in bands spoke mostly positively about labels, all of them being signed to small independent labels. Matt’s words paint the mixed feeling towards major or larger labels in particular, which many of the musicians also expressed. In some ways, Momentum funding positions itself as the springboard toward success, but it might also be seen as an enabler of the double-edged sword of autonomous cultural work, where workers have more control over creative and business direction but are less secure as a result of being cut off from traditional supports other workers have (Banks, 2007; Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011; McRobbie, 2002). Momentum funding might allow musicians to occupy a space free of restrictive deals but without the full security of the five-figure advance some labels can offer.

In the strain of artistic autonomy, the musicians talked about the ways that the funding allowed them to realise their creative vision, in the way that they wanted to without having to change it or cut back. The idea of the funding essentially subsidising musicians’ time, so they have the space to be creative, also came up. This potential buyout of their own time is important for several of those who work other jobs full time and cannot devote every day or even week to time in the studio writing music and recording new ideas. For Rowan, the Momentum funding allowed him to rent a studio in East London, something he would not have been able to afford at that time: “Yeah, and like, you know, where there’s a will there’s a way and at the right time I started earning more and that meant that I just, I just happened to be able to pay for it, just good timing” (Rowan). After the funding ran out, he was in a position to keep the studio and work there for four-five days a week, giving him physical and temporal space to create music.

In the way that such time and space might enhance one creatively, creative room might also enhance the quality of the creative material. According to Silvastone:
That is what they are like, independent artists, like your Skepta has blown up. Skepta has done a lot of it and now it is like big companies want to align themselves with him... Levi's... big companies just because they know that he is cool, he has got that cool factor, and he has done it on his own and that is what is really cool about him... he has been signed before and then he has been dropped, you understand? The songs that he came out when he signed weren't as good as he has done now, since he has been 'I am going it on my own'.

Silvastone equates the independence of an artist with the quality of their music, crediting grime artist Skepta's 'cool' with his freedom from the major label and their meddling, as he sees it. Deuze and Lewis (2013), in their analysis of professional identity and media work, suggest that, within the larger processes of change in the media industries, workers may feel isolated, as some of these independent musicians likely do, but within the isolation, there can be a creative benefit.

The idea that being away from the structures that can support, but also dictate, might elicit more freedom from the worker/musician is an interesting potential where Momentum funding could intervene. Silvastone valued the quality of Skepta's songs which he saw as borne out from creative freedom. In addition to this, Silvastone seems to suggest that one of the greatest values of the funding to him relates to connectedness.

That is the main thing because money comes and goes but being able to meet different people and have conversations and just try and align yourself with different people is priceless because sometimes you are in a studio working, working, working and if you don't get the email or call to say, 'this is happening tonight, come down' you wouldn't know. You would just stay where you are. I think it is very important and that is something that I am trying to do more of; get out of the studio because you can stay in the studio forever and do a million songs and then someone will just do one song but they travel everywhere with that one song and get further, so I think that is where my mentality is now naturally. (Silvastone)

Silvastone saw the value of the money in terms of the connectedness he suddenly had with an entire network. He links receiving money from Momentum to the access he gained into the network of people he sees as important for developing his career through different opportunities not otherwise available. The linking of people within their isolated individual spaces as cultural workers is a potential value of the Momentum funding. These workers are operating in an individualised 'political economy of insecurity' where “the standard biography, therefore,
becomes a chosen biography where pervasive processes of individualization compel subjects to construct not only their own life stories, but also their own futures.” (Adkins, 2013 :115). Silvastone states that he is able to construct the future he wants to with the access the funding grants him to networks. Yet, as with all areas of cultural work, the process and necessity of connecting with others when it is akin to networking can reveal the hierarchical relationships at play (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011: 109). Silvastone may be connecting with his peers or potential collaborators; he may also be connecting with gatekeepers of sorts, such as music business owners and label executives, who can make decisions about his livelihood.

The opposite to creative space and freedom for some of the musicians was portrayed as record deals, which had presented them with a lack of control over their appearance, sound and career decisions. Jessica and Dahlia were both female artists who had or were making music in the pop genre. Perhaps in pop particularly, labels would be occupied with the artist’s image, as it is a genre known for creating a spectacle on stage, with choreographed dance moves and costumes, and is firmly focused on the individual making the music. Critiques of oversexualisation have been volleyed at pop practically since it began, with a recent example being the criticism received by Miley Cyrus for her 2014 song Wrecking Ball and the nudity in her music video. Both Dahlia and Jessica reflected concerns that, if they signed to the ‘wrong’ label (i.e. a major label) or signed before they were ready, they would be told how to dress, how to sound, and details about them, such as their age, would become immediately paramount.

Jessica had experienced being successful temporarily in another band and signed to a major label only for their main representative at the label to leave and them to be dropped. She described wanting to have a literal place at the table during label meetings about her band at the time and trying to make her opinion heard to the label’s executives while still learning about the business. Jessica had learnt to be wary of some of the business processes of major labels through the intense experience of being in the girl band Parade, which she was picked to join at a young age. The band had been signed to Atlantic records before being dropped and the band fizzling out. She referred to herself frequently as an
“independent musician” and did not want to sign a deal until she felt it was the right one, but she was not entirely anti-major or anti-record deal. Possibly from having been inside the recording industry and so fully immersed at a young age, Jessica saw the pros and cons of the majors. Despite some negative experiences, she was aware that major labels offered unparalleled marketing resources: “My ideal is a major because I love the resources that they’ve got and weirdly, when I was with Atlantic, I loved, like, the marketing team” (Jessica).

However, Jessica was not yet ready to return to a major label because of the control the most-powerful labels can wield over artists. Drawing from what she experienced with two previous girl bands, Jessica describes the fear she still has about the terms of her potential future being set by a label, and this taking her back to the domination of her appearance that she previously experienced.

And I know you need to give at some point, but I’m just scared that what will happen before will happen again. Where I sign and they’re like ‘oh, amazing, now take your glasses off, put contact lenses in. I’m going to cut your hair, and dye your hair blonde.’ And it’s like, oh, all right, is this what we’re doing now? ‘And you’re not doing that sort of music, and you’re going to dance like that, and you’re going to get up on stage, and you can’t wear trainers anymore, Jess, you’ve got to wear high heels…’ But my aim is definitely to sign an album deal and to make an album with the right team label rather than just any kind of record deal just for the sake of signing a contract. (Jessica)

Other musicians voiced similar concerns to Jessica about maintaining some autonomy over their image, sound and decisions. These mainly relate to artistic autonomy. Now that I have discussed autonomy, I will move onto how artists were able to use the funding in relation to their work as musicians, with Momentum enabling a more full-time focus on music for some.

---

**MUSIC AS WORK VS. WORKING TO FUND MUSIC**

Working in a bank on a casual zero hours contract, teaching, writing pub quizzes, working at a record label – these are just some of the different jobs that musicians in this study do in addition to their music. The bands interviewed all had members who worked other jobs, with music having to be done either outside of those work...
hours or with contracts flexible enough to allow for being away touring for weeks or months. For the solo-artists interviewed, making a living from music was more common. The main reason for this is likely that solo-artists do not have to split their earnings from royalties, record, vinyl or digital sales, merchandise sales, or touring fees with others band members. The costs of touring a one-person act around are also considerably lower than a five-member band with 15 instruments.

The opposite to Flamingods’ large set up with the multitude of instruments and five/now four members might be a solo-artist pop act with limited instruments and no other members except any dancers joining. Dahlia attributes her financial stability partly to not having the other expenses that bands with several members might.

I have been doing this professionally for six years or something, where I haven’t had to have another job but I think that is basically… this is a bigger conversation but essentially because I am 100% DIY in a sense, because I write it and perform it and produce it, I haven’t got the overheads. When we do get syncs and things like that I am not splitting it between five or six different writers or band members or anything like that so it has been quite good in that sense to establish ourselves fairly quickly as a little business. (Dahlia)

Whether solo-artists can more easily make a liveable income from music, particularly without a label contract, is an interesting consideration for the music industries. Either way, music remains a difficult area of cultural work to find steady income from. The Musicians Union Report from 2012 queried their members on musicians’ wages, and its findings highlight the difficulty that musicians have finding steady, full-time employment.

Teaching, theatre and orchestral work, for example, can provide steady regular work, sometimes even secure salaried employment status. These are exceptions to the norm; only 10% of musicians are full-time salaried employees. Half of musicians have no regular employment whatsoever. The vast majority of musicians (94%) work freelance for all or part of their income… Just over half (59%) are working full-time with 52% spending all (100%) of their working time as musicians. Only one in five are working less than 50% of their working week as musicians. For a sizeable minority of working musicians, earning money outside the music industry is necessary to maintain an income. A third of the musicians surveyed (34%) worked additional jobs not connected in any way to their music careers. (MU, 2012: 14)
The Momentum data from interviews and the programme statistics reflect similar findings. A larger number of musicians than I anticipated were working full-time in music, though not always 100% on their Momentum project, with them working jobs from graphic design to teaching music or other subjects to service jobs in restaurants. Justine, for example, works full-time at her band’s record label, a job she received through an internship she was offered while on tour with the label owner’s band.

Justine stated she enjoys working at her label and that the skills she lends to the band, as an organised person who enjoys planning, are similar to those she uses in her job. She thought, “it’s quite jammy to be so involved in music in job and hobby” (Justine). Her perspective on making music differed from some of the other participants, possibly because she already had full-time employment in a music or music industry-related job, unlike those working in education, banks and other non-music areas. Justine thought it would be great to be able to keep making music, but considered it more as a hobby: “It’s like an expensive hobby… maybe one day we’ll make money out of it, but I’m not holding my breath” (Justine).

For those in my study who were not full-time musicians, three of them wanted to be, which corresponds to the findings of the Musicians’ Union report. They found that, “Among the part-time musicians, over half indicated that they would like to be full-time. The barriers to securing sufficient opportunities for work will be even more magnified for musicians who lack the experience and longevity in the industry that most of our respondents have” (MU, 2012: 14). The musicians at the level of Momentum funding, while mostly somewhat experienced, may be at a particular disadvantage in finding a way to sustain themselves when their profile is limited and they are without a record or publishing contract. One difficult thing is how much income can fluctuate for musicians across their careers. Being experienced is not a guarantee that income will be steady or opportunities will keep coming. Duncan, whose band was funded in the first round of Momentum funding, recalled that he had previously earned enough from music (50% from non-musical work/50% from music) to consider it his career. This had changed, and he now had a different identity. In some ways he was hesitant to conceive
himself as a musician, while wondering if he would be able to earn a living from it again:

It has never been 100%, it has never been ‘this is what we do, this is our identity’. Right now, it is being done pretty much out of passion as well as obligation and commitment. (Duncan)

He went on to question whether the amount of funding from Momentum could help anyone advance their career properly: “I think, in the end, even if you didn’t win the maximum amount of money, the £15K is still not enough to really take your career to the next level really. Realistically, it is not…” (Duncan interview, 2016).

Five of the musicians interviewed are full time musicians. These were Rowan, Dahlia, Silvastone, XO, and Matt Woods. Musicians Duncan, Jessica, Sam, Karthik and Justine had other jobs, either part-time or full-time. On the Momentum application form23 for rounds 9-15, the question about being a full-time musician has been phrased as: “If you have another occupation other than **music**, please tell us what you do” (emphasis in original, see Momentum application form Appendix D). The form then asks if this other occupation is full-time. Out of 47 replies (of possible 107) from rounds 9-15, 18 said they had another occupation and it was part-time, 13 said they were a mixed band with some full-time and some part-time, 16 said they were full time with their other occupation.

This data is limited, however, as it only shows a partial picture. Firstly, it is difficult to capture the different amounts individuals are working for bands with several members. Also, since this data was gathered at the time of applying for Momentum funding, the status of musicians’ working lives now or post-funding is not captured in these numbers. There is some data post-funding from Momentum’s first and second ‘Impact Evaluations’, but filling this gap is where the interview data is particularly helpful.

---

23 The Momentum application form changed slightly between rounds 8 and 9 when the grants system used by PRSF changed from GIFTS to Flexigrant. This also coincided with the end of the two-year pilot for Momentum.
MOVING BETWEEN HOBBY AND ‘PROFESSIONAL,’ OR PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME AND BACK AGAIN

For independent popular musicians, the line between being professional and amateur is a blurry one. Finnegan posited that for community musicians in Milton Keynes, the designation of amateur or professional status was not a binary but should be seen to fall on a continuum. She argued:

In local music, then, the at first sight ‘obvious’ amateur/professional distinction turns out to be a complex continuum with many different possible variations. Indeed, even the same people could be placed at different points along this line in different contexts or different stages of their lives. (1989: 14)

This idea of a continuum seems to extend beyond only those in community music and to the musicians in this study. One telling example of the idiosyncratic nature of the relationship between professionalism and being a musician is Sunil, the youngest musician in this study. Sunil chose to focus on music rather than to attend university, which on its own may carry some weight towards him being a ‘professional’. He was also able to stop working in a family member’s shop and earns his living from his music.

I think I get by to be honest. I have a decent amount of money and stuff, I think. I did have a little job before which was working at my cousin’s corner shop which is a family business and working a few hours a day there but then I thought… music almost started to become secondary because I just wanted loads of money. I was like I can keep working and working but I need to crack on doing stuff that I actually want to do as a career” (Sunil, XO)

However, the fact that Sunil still lives with his parents and receives support from them, at least in that manner, may make it less clear that a full-time focus on music automatically equals being a professional musician – that is, if one is to define a musician based upon their ability to self-sustain through music income.

Dahlia was already working full-time as a musician before she got the Momentum funding, but her situation of having odd part-time jobs to supplement her, until she was able to leave them, coincides with the other musicians’
experiences. She was clear that she was a “professional musician” and had been for around six years.

Some musicians will always work other jobs and engage in music as more of a hobby level activity. Justine’s quote earlier in the chapter showed that she considered the work she does at her band’s record label as her ‘job’ and her music making as her ‘hobby’. While she spoke doubtfully about being able to make money from music, when asked what she wants to achieve, her answer reflects that there is a desire to make the ‘hobby’ into a career that will last:

“I’d like to have a long sort of musical career of this band. I’d like it to be a band that goes on for as long as everyone wants to do it, really… just going along and having fun because we love playing shows. It’s like one of my favourite things to do. I can’t imagine not doing it now. Just go on for tens of years, you know.” (Justine)

In Justine’s quote, she touches upon the enjoyment involved in the music and performance, which relates to why she is willing to carry on working full-time and dedicating her outside leisure time to working on music or touring. For those working other jobs or spending hours beyond what might be thought of as a standard work week of 40 hours, the line between their work and leisure time can be difficult to distinguish and may not be there at all. The drive these musicians maintain to give their leisure time to rehearsing or writing music or touring around the UK or Europe in a van derives from their own enjoyment of these activities (considered an ‘internal reward’) and from a belief that these actions and investment of time will reap benefits down the line for their fame or success (an ‘external reward’) (Banks 2007: 109). In these ways, they play the slow game, waiting for their music to finally pay enough to quit their outside and non-music-related jobs. I will now explore some of the costs of being an emerging and/or independent musician in the UK to extend the points about the desire to obtain internal and external goods and how these contribute to a better definition of ‘success’.
One of the ways funding sometimes facilitates career success for musicians who work other jobs is by ensuring that the profits they make – from touring, streaming and sales, etc – can be re-invested into the band rather than spent on personal living expenses. Being able to sustain the music project using income from that project can be seen as both an external good through the income and an internal good through the sense of fulfilment and satisfaction it provides. As stated above, many of the musicians had other jobs in non-music areas and supported themselves from that income rather than music. To get their projects off the ground, they had invested what money they had from these jobs into the various expenses musicians face, such as renting rehearsal spaces, recording studio time, paying a manager or booking agent, van rental, or purchase for touring, etc. For some of the musicians, their music was finally earning enough of a profit, enabling them to cycle the income back into the project and, in this way, create a more sustained career.

Dahlia (who received Momentum for a release) was offered a support slot on a tour with a well-known artist that would place her in front of a new audience, a valuable opportunity for up-and-coming musicians seeking to grow their fan base. However, despite earning her living full-time from music, the tour proved to be an expensive endeavour, which she and her team were not able to budget for. Dahlia did not earn a profit and would have been unable to finish the tour without external support. Speaking further, she stated:

I don’t know… I would probably would be living on the street somewhere (laughs)… that tour was crazy expensive, and I’m certain without the funding – I don’t know how we… I would have probably had to come back and get a job and scrape by. But thankfully halfway through the tour, we found out that we had that funding, so I was like ‘phew’. We set off with about a £5K hole in the budget and people to pay, and I’m like ‘yeah, I don’t actually have that money, I don’t know where we are going to get that from.’ But the funding filled that in, so it was good. (Dahlia)

During the tour, she was able to receive funding from a different funding scheme than Momentum, which prevented her from having to either not pay others on time or not finish the tour fully, which would be a loss for her and could limit the opportunities brought to her in the future. In Dahlia’s case, receiving funds was a
boost that came when she had dropped back down to an unsustainable level due to an expensive tour. Her example shows the tenuousness experienced by musicians who have to shift back and forth between having full-time income and full-time dedication to music and suddenly needing an outside job to live and/or fund their musical activities. A musician might move back to part-time employment when an unforeseen expense arises, such as a sudden tour opportunity like Dahlia’s. The tour slot came with limited pay, and prior to her receiving funding, all expenses had to be funded from Dahlia’s and Dahlia’s manager’s funds. Such an existence echoes, again, Finnegan’s statement about the fluidity of musicians’ statuses as professional or amateur across the continuum (Finnegan, 1989: 14).

The Momentum funding allowed some musicians to recycle the income from their music straight back into the project instead of needing to spend it on their living costs. Making a loss on tour was a major issue for Flamingods, who make most of their income from European tours and festivals but take a loss in the UK due partly to the low fees and the costly logistics of touring with nine people (five band members and four crew) and a multitude of instruments. The Momentum funding allowed them to tour in the UK without losing money in the process. Speaking of this, Karthik said:

It varies. So, in Europe, we’ll get anything up to max, I’d say max 2,000 Euros a show or like a grand and a half. Say that it’s normally a grand and a half… The net profits split after paying our van costs, our per diems, tour manager, all that stuff. But really, normally, the money just goes back into studio time, which is really expensive as well. But, in the UK, we’re getting paid like £150 a show in this next tour, which means that… we’d be haemorrhaging about £300 a day on top of that or about £250 a day. So, that’s why we needed the Momentum fund. (Karthik)

Karthik raises an important question about how we can define or conceptualise success for musicians at the emerging or up-and-coming levels when they are able to make a living wage in one territory and are haemorrhaging money in another. Success is an important concept to consider because there are questions raised by the different levels of income and sustained careers (or not sustained) that funded musicians experience. How success is defined, as seen in the section above, relates to the type and level that internal and external goods are obtained. These goods and the definitions of success are tied up in the ways that we value
the work musicians are doing, the funding they receive and the expectations we have for such ‘outcomes.’ If these three elements are purely defined, or even mostly understood in economic ways, a very limited notion of success, and as such, value will emerge.

**Ideas of ‘Success’ and What They Say About Value**

Both Jessica and Silvastone, whose genres of music are somewhat more in the same scenes, referred to artists who they see as successful. Both artists, Stormzy and Skepta, are based in Greater London, create hip hop music, and are influenced by the grime genre, which has seen a strong comeback in recent years. Important to their images, they are seen as successful despite or because of their independence. Silvastone saw Skepta’s ‘coolness’ and success as having been previously hindered by a label, but, since he is an independent artist now, his image benefits as well as his income, as he gets partnerships with big brands. He linked independence and coolness. He went far enough to suggest the musical quality even increased when Skepta was dropped from his previous label and became independent.

Jessica expressed similar views about the artist Stormzy, but from the perspective that the specific aim of getting a single in the music charts is possible without a record label deal. Explaining Stormzy’s success at charting helps justify Jessica’s desire to stay independent for longer, with the ultimate aim of getting a record deal that allows more control over her image and song writing. For Jessica, the choice of whether to get a record deal or to maintain the image and appearance she wants seemed an either/or at the time. Jessica had a background in music that started from a young age and led to some hard, early lessons about how some record labels may try to shape their acts. She was picked out in an audition at her school, which led to her being signed to a label in two different and all-girl pop bands as a teenager.

Jessica battles between the idea of having creative control and the seeming inevitability of securing a record deal. Her views relate to the battle between
autonomy and security, discussed above. Based on Jessica’s experiences, she now values writing the types of music she wants to, and releasing videos when and how she chooses to, much more than being, in her opinion, a ‘puppet’ for a record label:

But I just feel like now doing it independently and writing every word and being completely in control of everything I’m putting out just puts me in a better position than kind of being a puppet. I know at one point I need to sign a deal. I know that, and I did get offered a deal for my solo stuff. I didn’t feel it was right, and there was a gut feeling where I just thought ‘no.’ I’ve run in the other direction as soon as they started to say about contracts. I literally didn’t know what to do because I’ve had that major label… I’ve been on TV. I did the red carpet, and that’s not what I’m in it for. And I feel like if I do sort of like go ‘oh, okay, I need to do that again’ it’ll be for the right reasons and for the right songs rather than doing it because I want the experience or I just want to go on tour with my mates. (Jessica)

Jessica’s previous experiences in her past girl band have stayed with her and shape how she manages her career, including whether she turns down deals – something she has done. One facet that jumps out is doing it ‘for the right reasons’. Jessica returned to the idea of knowing she will need to be signed to a record label, and expressed reluctance and reticence about history repeating itself, since she has been dropped and ‘shelved’ by a label, meaning she was still signed but nothing was happening for her. Having experienced that situation, the only time when she would agree to sign another contract with a record label would be if she had already created the music she wanted to make. The record deal can be thought of as an external good, but, to her, is one that is mostly valuable because of its ability to feed back into the practice of music and excellence. Banks says that “while resources in the form of external rewards might be viewed as desirable, this is primarily because they offer a means to ensure the continued pursuit of artistic excellence – they are not principally viewed as means to the acquisition of economic profit” (Banks, 2017a: 52). This evaluation is echoed in how Jessica conceptualises her desire to make music and what she hopes she will achieve:

I want to put an EP out and I want to put a body of work out independently before going to a label and saying, ‘what can you add to what I’ve already done?’ Because I’ve made the videos independently with the help of PRS, and I’ve got onto radio. And I’ve got playlists independently, and there are things like the… PRS funds where you think, ‘hold on a minute, this is just like having a label.’ I’m being funded, but I’m making all of the decisions
and I’m making all of the creative decisions. I feel like if that was the same as a label, I’d run and jump into a deal. (Jessica)

Because of her previous experiences, Jessica’s value of the funding is partly in its ability to almost temporarily act like a label, without having anyone at a label making decisions for her or telling her how to do things, be it in a creative, physical or business sense. These types of value link strongly with the concept of internal goods but differ somewhat from the jazz musicians in Banks’ work (2017a). Instead of a focus on collective and community or established surpassing standards, Jessica sees value in the ability to achieve objective markers of success independently of a label. Doing so might be seen as reaping external rewards – and it should be considered to still be a reason for motivation – but she also derives fulfilment from such achievement, thereby receiving internal goods as well. Pursuit of “attaining a sense of creative or emotional fulfilment” is a type of internal good described by jazz musicians (Banks, 2017a: 48). In Jessica’s case, she derives emotional benefits from accomplishing goals while operating under the independent ethos because she feels less constricted in her creative pursuit and because being able to be successful while remaining independent is valuable in itself.

SUCCESS IS INDEPENDENCE VS. SUCCESS IS BEING SIGNED

A recurrent theme across the interviews was the discussion of record labels, with four of the musicians I interviewed being signed to independent record labels and the remained being unsigned. In the interviews with musicians, there was a clear division between the two categories with the musicians who were in bands being signed to a label and the solo-artists being unsigned. All six of the solo-artists at the time of interview were unsigned, with a few of them particularly stating they were not looking for a deal and that would not be their goal. On the contrary, the three bands were all signed to independent record labels, with Justine even working full time at her band’s label. For those who wanted a record deal, obtaining one in itself might be seen as a success, but of more significance would be the type of deal insofar as whether they felt it was fair.
The eligibility criteria for Momentum stipulates that applicants cannot be on a major label contract, as these deals come with advances of typically tens or hundreds of thousands of pounds. At the time of application, none of the musicians funded by Momentum currently had major label record deals, although some Momentum-funded musicians have been dropped from major label contracts, either in their Momentum-funded projects or previous bands.

All the multi-member bands interviewed were signed to labels, with significantly more of the solo-artists either choosing to remain unsigned or not being offered deals they wanted to accept. There are two possible reasons for this: solo-artists might value more highly the notion of independence or being ‘independent’ as they do not have other members to consider. Also, the cost of a larger band is greater so these bands need label funds particularly to tour, as they can easily make a loss from tours if the fees they are paid are low. It may also be more accepted in their scenes (psychedelic rock, indie rock, and rock/metal) that bands be on a label, whereas solo-artists might garner pride from being ‘unsigned’ and ‘independent’, even if it is not a choice. Momentum is being used by musicians like Justine to help them realise their creative ideas in their recordings when the labels they are at cannot afford to inject funding into the recording process or pay a big-name producer. These labels are, however, for-profit companies and there is the concern that the funding could become more of a crutch for them than a freeing tool for musicians.

Despite the inequality of access to resources, Dahlia did not see the value in signing a record deal if it required her to change her sound and her appearance, and she had turned down offers from large labels because they stated how they wanted her to look. Dahlia’s manager also stated that her age was one of the first things the executives in these meetings asked. Whether this is a question more relevant to Dahlia’s genre of pop, or a larger concern within the labels remains unclear. Either way, Dahlia was not interested in having a conversation about a record deal if her music and the very specific musical goals she had were overshadowed by her age or her body. However, beyond mandating her appearance, Dahlia saw that signing a deal with the ‘wrong’ label could lead to her career being truncated.
I have got another 60 years, I hope, of life ahead of me, and I don’t want it all to finish because I released some shit record that I was not in control of in the next three years’ time. So, if that means I have to keep self-releasing shit that is fine. I don’t know what is going to happen. I am just having this conversation at the minute with management; I don’t know. If someone comes up and offers me a shit ton of money and goes ‘yes, we want to do this and you can work with this guy’ maybe I would consider it, but it totally depends on whether I would be comfortable with it. And I don’t know until that presents itself whether I would be. (Dahlia)

Even more concerning than her image being controlled by a label would be a label controlling her music, which she sees as a potential threat to its quality. She is worried that signing the wrong deal would lead to her releasing a record she was not proud of or happy with. Her reservations here are about both the creative ramifications of what she sees as a low-quality record, as well as the economic ones. Dahlia would be sabotaging both her ability to achieve objective measures of success and external goods and quashing her potential for subjective success and internal goods due to losing her creative autonomy.

Duncan also had a negative view of major labels based on stories he heard from his friends, and a similar sentiment was echoed by other musicians about friends who had been through horrible experiences with major labels:

I know of a lot of other artists who are even on major labels that have been chewed out in horrible ways because actually the funding that they thought was there from their own labels just wasn’t in the end. Executive decisions were made before they even got to release an album on a certain label and all this lot. You do hear some absolute horror stories. So, in that sense, I am kind of glad that we are doing what we do with Memphis Industries because it is a lot more matter-of-fact really – essentially, the music will speak for itself. It does well because the songs are good; it is not because we have rammed it down people’s throats. (Duncan)

Duncan’s words toward the end reflect a reconciliation with being signed to an independent label where funding is significantly less than a major. He is at first clear that the major labels can be problematic and drop artists before they even release their music. In the second half of the quote, Duncan is speaking more of independent labels and his band’s own experience with how they promote their music. His words imply a rather hands-off approach from their label and perhaps even a limited ability to push the music out to an audience.
As Jones (2013) postulated, the recorded music industry’s main business might actually be ‘failure’ instead of ‘success’. The importance of this for Momentum is that measuring success is not a straightforward process. The value of the funding changes depending on whose perspective the valuation is coming from. In a similar way, the internal goods and the subjective success attained by funded musicians would be interpreted differently for different musicians. However, just because subjective success can appear more elusive does not mean it should be accounted for less than objective success measures like income amount and prestige of press coverage. The limitations of an objectively focused definition of success are particularly apparent when considering the nuances of music as work. This is because of the fluidity and variation across music workers and the ways they earn a living, with many supporting their music through another job. For the past few decades, the music industries have continually been in a state of flux, which has affected the ways that musicians find stability in their careers. One element that has not changed is the ways that major labels acquire large catalogues of music in order to hedge their bets and avoid costly losses on poorly received releases (Miège, 1989: 43). Musician Matt possessed a strong point of view shaped by his recent shift from wanting a record label contract to wanting to remain independent and try to make his career sustainable. Speaking about a large label, he felt that most artists signed to that label would in fact never be successful:

[They] run a pretty successful four for one model where they will sign five artists and four of them will never make any money, but the other one will cover the costs. I feel that… they are not even shy about that, they don’t… that is effectively their business model… They are businesses and they are running one of the most successful labels in the country, if you judge a label’s success on how enormous your enormous artists are. (Matt)

His scepticism is well-placed, as it is widely accepted in popular music research that hit songs and chart placing records will never come for the vast majority of musicians (Jones, 2003).
7.5 CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, I sought to explore the ways that popular musicians funded by public money value the grants in their practice as musicians. I began by showing how considering popular musicians to be cultural workers, particularly drawing from Banks (2007, 2017a), provides a useful way of framing the motivations driving musicians to participate in a vocation riddled with failure. The musicians in this study were then presented and compared to the larger pool of Momentum-funded musicians from rounds 1-15. I have presented different types of rewards that popular musicians in receipt of public funding are motivated by. I have extended the debate on defining ‘success’ to include more layered notions of subjective value (internal and external rewards, for example) and a more complex view of the contradictions within objective definitions. The ideas of autonomy and work were then reviewed to reveal the struggles of popular musicians at the early stages of their careers and the uncertainties within a musician’s identity.

Momentum funding was shown to play a significant role for musicians seeking to avoid entering into contractual agreements with record labels and other companies that can excise creative and artistic control. The battle to maintain some level of creative autonomy proved to be important to several of the musicians and was shown to be linked with the concept of being an ‘independent’ musician. Internal rewards were shown to dominate the musicians’ professed motivations for maintaining their practice, even in the face of financial difficulty or uncertainty that external goods can be obtained. Finally, the ways that success in music has been defined were contrasted with the realities of being a popular musician today to show the difficulty in assigning clear value to public funding for a varied group of musicians, for whom success cannot be defined in one or two ways. My research builds on current arguments that career success for popular musicians is a fluid concept with a multitude of definitions, particularly in the current environment in which popular musicians are working. My research further develops the arguments by Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011) regarding popular musicians’ pursuit of autonomy and the internal and external benefits they pursue from music (Banks, 2007; Banks, 2017a; Umney and Kretsos, 2014). I also contribute to understandings of musicians’ work as not easily defined in terms of professional versus amateur, building on work from Finnegan (1989) and Cohen (1991).
Finally, my analysis adds to debates about how we should define success for today’s popular musicians, considering Zwaan’s (2009) and Smith’s (2013) work on the ways we might define popular musicians’ success. I firstly showed how Momentum can be a marker of success for some musicians, for whom receiving funding is a seal of approval and a form of legitimation in the eyes of the industries. Momentum funding also creates the environment where musicians and the managers working with them can catalyse their own success.
8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The changes in the music industries brought on by digitalisation and the creation of online streaming continue to alter the working practices of popular musicians today. This context has created a difficult and precarious context for musicians but has also presented new opportunities. These complex changes form the backdrop and provided the impetus for the creation of the Momentum music fund. Momentum was set up by Arts Council England (ACE) in 2013 and run by PRS Foundation (PRSF) to provide small grants directly to emerging popular musicians in England. Questions arose about what forms of value this type of intervention could create and why ACE, not typically seen to fund popular musicians directly, would decide to fund popular musicians. Despite the persistent fervour of debates about ways of valuing culture in England, which have unfolded in the academic literature and in cultural policy circles for decades, few studies have examined the collision of the commercial popular music industries with public funding. This thesis plugs this gap and makes a contribution to this field by presenting an analysis of data and insights that contribute to our understanding of the working lives and challenges facing popular musicians. In addition, researchers have rarely considered emerging popular musicians and their evolving relationships with artist managers or their pursuit of and use of funding. This thesis has identified the potential of public funding for popular musicians to create multi-dimensional value for different actors, including the funding organisations ACE and PRSF, funded artists, their managers and external assessors.

8.2 CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE AND IMPLICATIONS

My research contributes to theoretical debates by bringing into dialogue concepts drawn from the literature on cultural value, cultural work, and cultural production. These areas of literature are brought together within a wider discussion of popular
music literature to analyse the multi-dimensional nature of value in terms of the Momentum funding programme. This research builds on recent work in cultural value (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2014; Gillespie et al., 2014; O'Brien and Oakley, 2014) that furthers the ongoing political debates regarding how to measure the value of culture. This study fills a gap by specifically examining the nuanced and multivariate nature of value created by public funds supporting the traditionally commercial art form of popular music in England.

The methodological design is innovative due to the inclusion of data gathered from privileged access to observations of funding decision panels — data rarely accessible to researchers or members of the public. The analysis also brings together data from multiple sources in such a way as to allow for comparative analysis across different actors’ perceptions of what constitutes success, diversity, excellence, and talent, in turn reflecting the types of value different actors derived from Momentum funding. The need to analyse multiple data sets to answer the main research question and four sub-questions led to the adaptation of multiple analytical frameworks, allowing the research to test and progress several theoretical concepts. The main research question, regarding the multi-dimensional nature of value, is partly answered through each of the four data analysis chapters (Chapters 4-7), showing, ultimately, that the Momentum funding has artistic, creative, economic, social, and cultural value. The funding has social, cultural and personal value in the ways that ACE and PRSF specifically target types of artists who may be under-represented in the English music industry in a manner that the recording and publishing music industries typically do not. Those who are less well-represented include artists who are female or in mixed gender bands, those located in less urban areas of England and away from London, those of minority ethnic backgrounds, and those in less-saturated genres, including metal, world and reggae.

In Chapter 4, I answered the question of why ACE was funding popular musicians through analysis of ACE and Momentum documents and interviews with ACE staff members, showing that Momentum was created for two primary reasons. These were, firstly, because an ACE consultation conducted in 2012 identified a need for small amounts of investment for emerging level musicians, which was a concept derived from a funding programme in Canada. Secondly, it
was because ACE sought a way to associate themselves as a funder with popular music – both externally to the public and internally within their organisation. Given that (as of 2018) ACE is no longer supporting Momentum funding, any positive benefits ACE received from association with Momentum and as a funder of popular musicians may not be long lasting. The ACE staff had voiced hopes that ACE’s association with Momentum would bring more popular musicians to their other funding programmes; this will no longer be possible. The new funding partners, PPL, Creative Scotland and the Arts Council of Wales, may inherit the benefits that ACE sought, but, ultimately, their own organisational priorities will also shift how the programme is run. The public funds contributing to Momentum are now coming from Wales and Scotland but not England. This divide suggests that Welsh and Scottish governments and their funding organisations may value popular music differently to their English counterparts. PRSF continues to manage the fund and contribute a portion of its own private funding, which anchors Momentum inside of England and allows English artists to apply.

Chapter 5 focused on the Momentum funding process by examining the funding cycle manager, music charity the Performing Rights Society Foundation (PRSF), and the processes of assessment and decision-making within Momentum. I answered research questions regarding how ‘excellence’ and ‘talent’ are understood through analysis of my observations of the shortlisting and panel assessment process, also drawing from interviews with PRSF staff. My research identified four discourses of decision-making, which also acted as funding priorities, that affected the ways the funding was valued. These were talent, excellence, diversity, and viability. Through the analysis, it became clear that PRSF staff and the external assessors brought into Momentum to assess applications understood these concepts differently. Increasing diversity in Momentum and conducting monitoring of diversity characteristics became important elements within the Momentum fund and as a practice carried out by PRSF, which spread into their other funding schemes. I discovered that the two most important characteristics in Momentum, derived from the 2010 Equality Act, were gender and ethnicity. In addition, PRSF monitored for diversity in genre and region. Genre was shown to be highly important in how and by whom artists were
assessed because the genre an artist chose affected which types of advisors scored their application.

Analysis in Chapter 5 predominantly drew from Eikhof’s (2017) framework, which suggested that we might better understand how diversity occurs within organisations by analysing decision points. I adapted her framework to consider how decisions are made in Momentum, and I added consideration of the additional resources and capital available both to applicants and those making the decisions. Analysis of the funding criteria and processes showed that PRSF prioritised funding excellence, talent, diversity, and viability. In terms of diversity, PRSF’s main areas of focus were region, genre, gender, and ethnicity, and these characteristics were considered in the funding assessment process. PRSF’s integration of diversity monitoring was discovered to be driven by ACE’s policies but became an integrated part of some of their other funding schemes through the process. Data drawn from Impact Evaluations conducted by PRSF, which I was involved in, demonstrated this integration. It was curious that there was a lack of any consideration of socio-economic characteristics in the diversity monitoring process, which mirrors ACE’s own lack of focused effort to measure and improve diversity in this area. My observations of Momentum panels provided new knowledge on the way decisions are made about individuals in funding programmes, which is an area typically closed to observation. In these panels, the idea of ‘timing’, in terms of artists’ careers, came up frequently in assessment, and this became important in the ways particular artists were perceived to be too early or too late in their careers to receive Momentum funding. This was particularly relevant in the way panelists discussed older artists or artists who had some past success and might be looking for their big break or a chance to reinvent themselves. There was not sufficient evidence to confirm whether the idea of being past their prime was applied more often to female artists, but initial evidence suggests this could be an issue when it comes to funding assessments of popular musicians. This is an area for further research.

Chapters 6 and 7 predominantly addressed questions of value from the perspective of funded artists and artist managers. These chapters considered how changes in the music industries impacted upon the working practices of artist managers and emerging popular musicians and in what ways Momentum funding
created value for them. Both chapters sought to answer two sub-questions. These were “To what extent is Momentum a response to or result of changes in the popular music industry and the roles of musicians?” and “What economic, social and cultural barriers to music making does Momentum funding attempt to redress, and does it achieve its goals?”

Chapter 6 drew from interviews with managers and those working in managerial ways with, and for, Momentum-funded artists. Initial observations at PRSF revealed that managers were integral to the application process for many of the funded musicians, and so their perspectives and working practices were integrated into the research design. The theoretical framework of ‘cultural intermediation’, as originally suggested by Bourdieu (1984) and further developed by Smith Maguire and Matthews (2010; 2014), guided the analysis in Chapter 6. The chapter considered the different tasks and intermediation managerial workers undertook on behalf of musicians to examine how managers’ created value for themselves and the musicians they worked for. The empirical work of Hracs (2015), based on interviews with musicians in Toronto, Canada, and Lizé (2016), focused on artists and managers in France, argues that artist managers were increasingly being hired by emerging and do-it-yourself musicians, who were previously thought unable or unwilling to seek managerial help. Both scholars developed their own ideas of the different roles or types of interventions they saw artist managers to be engaging in on behalf of musicians. I built on these studies and discovered, that four types of managerial workers existed in the case study. These were focused, comprehensive, combined, and as-needed managers, with comprehensive and combined managers being the most common. A key finding of this research has been that artist managers are not only helping emerging musicians find funding but increasingly investing time and financial resources of their own into the artist development process to further artists creatively and as a business. It was also discovered that musicians were sometimes able to find artist managers once they had received the funding. My findings developed the ideas of Lizé and Hracs but created a new typology of managers’ ways of working from an English perspective and within the frame of public funding – something not considered in their work.
The focus of analysis shifted in Chapter 7 to examine the popular musicians in receipt of Momentum funding. This chapter considered value from the funded musicians’ perspectives by drawing from in-depth interviews with ten funded musicians. I examined the ways musicians were shown to pursue autonomy – creative and professional – when applying for and using Momentum funding. Previous research on autonomy from Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011), Banks (2007; 2017a) and Umney and Kretsos (2014) provided a framework where musicians were treated as cultural workers motivated both by internal and external rewards. Popular musicians might be expected to be motivated to pursue Momentum funding in the hope of achieving financial benefits and the acclaim of a successful career in popular music, but preserving personal creative autonomy and maintaining control of their own image were also shown to be significant factors. The funding also provided important value to musicians as a means of financial freedom – not only as a grant to fund specific activity, but as a mechanism allowing some of them to transition away from jobs they previously needed to support their music making. Due to the fluidity in musicians’ careers and the difficulty Finnegan (1989) and Cohen (1991) articulated in terms of classifying professional versus amateur musicians, the funding appeared to offer a significant pathway for some musicians to transition to full-time work in music. Some Momentum-funded musicians were able to turn music into their full-time careers after receiving the Momentum grant; this was of note, since most of the musicians at the time of applying were part-time or in a band with part-time members. Analysis of the musicians’ fluid work patterns supported work by Finnegan (1989), Smith (2013) and Teague and Smith (2015), writing from a popular music education perspective, that defining success for emerging popular musicians must be adaptable and open to interpretation, as musicians’ themselves measure their success differently. Ultimately, the funding was valued in terms of the specific freedoms it provided to funded musicians. These freedoms included how it 1) supported their creative/professional control and let them delay signing deals until they were ready to, 2) provided them with financial freedom to make music full-time and to quit their part-time/full-time ‘bad’ jobs, and 3) provided freedom to manage their own visual/artistic image and allowed them to avoid adapting their
creative voice or physical appearance to meet the requirements of specific gatekeepers.

8.3 RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

In this study, I explored value from four different perspectives: 1) the primary funder Arts Council England (ACE), 2) the funding cycle manager the Performing Rights Society Foundation (PRSF), 3) the artist managers working with funded artists, and 4) the funded artists themselves. The findings in this research have important implications for the four different groups. Firstly, are the funders, ACE and PRSF, as well as newer Momentum funders PPL, Creative Scotland, and the Arts Council of Wales. While each of the publicly funded organisations has a charter and an organisational strategy that guides them, they will also have their own funding priorities. It may be important for the new funding partners to understand how these priorities can change and thereby alter the value of particular funding programmes. For the funder and funding cycle manager PRSF, the findings on the ways diversity plays out in the decision process will be relevant to their operational practices. Working with ACE influenced the ways PRSF considered diversity and monitoring, and there is potential for my findings to further shape their processes of evaluation and monitoring.

This study has shown the ways that different funding priorities of diversity, talent and excellence compete within a funding programme, which is relevant to the wider realm of public funding for popular culture and the government policymaking that creates such opportunities. Additionally, this study demonstrates how the value of the funding changes between different actors (musicians versus ACE, etc.), supporting the claims of researchers that, when discussing the value of funding for the arts, a nuanced and multi-faceted approach to measuring value is needed (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2014). After the rise of new public management, governments can be seen to be overly economically-focused in their approaches to measuring impact and value in public funding. Therefore, the non-economic aspects of value evidenced here will be relevant to Momentum’s new
funders in Scotland and Wales and to their government policies regarding arts funding.

Other important areas that this research addresses are the working practices of particular cultural workers, namely emerging artists and those undertaking managerial work for them, and the professional organisations that support them. These are, foremost, the Music Managers Forum (MMF) and the Musicians’ Union (MU) in England. For the workers themselves, we have seen some of the ways artists’ and managers’ roles are changing and myriad demands they must meet and manage to progress in their careers. In Chapter 6, not only were the roles of artist managers seen to be important for artist development even for emerging artists, but it was shown that managerial work was being undertaken by multiple workers, including those working at small independent labels. Beyond the expansion of managerial work to other workers, the depth and breadth of work managers are executing for artists appears to be expanding, particularly in relation to the costs and work of developing artists. As for emerging musicians, they undertake considerable work themselves, some without the assistance of managers.

While there is research on the working practices of musicians, the ways they are finding and using funding remain understudied. Some work is emerging on crowdfunding and musicians, but, like access to other funding, even crowdfunding may require a pre-existing audience to be successful. There is little research that explores the period in musicians’ careers particularly between the very earliest stages and the points where they can begin building a brand and a business. The musicians in my study are from different genres, they received money for different projects, and are at different points in their careers, yet they were all considered emerging. The opportunities available to them vary, and the decisions they make about their careers will too. Pursuit of greater autonomy was voiced as one of the ways Momentum funding was valued, supporting other researchers’ work on musicians valuing autonomy (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011). The implications this has for musicians may be seen in the decisions they make about their careers as they establish themselves and progress, and there
should be further work examining how autonomy is negotiated through these developmental stages.

8.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

The data on musicians in this study is somewhat limited: it can only show a partial picture. Firstly, the artists chosen for interviews were all in receipt of funding. In future work, the perspectives of bands and solo-artists who applied but did not receive funding could be included to present a comparison point to those who were funded. Another trait that makes studying popular musicians problematic is the fact that some bands have multiple members, and it may be difficult to obtain data about all of the members, their backgrounds, the other jobs they may have, and their past careers. This information can sometimes be gathered in evaluations or surveys, but it is not always complete. The absence of this data makes it difficult to fully comprehend the situations faced by different popular musicians working today.

In terms of representation within the study of different types of artists or artist managers, there were some types that it was not possible to include or could not be recruited. There were fewer women included in interviews with artists, which was not intentional but reflects the broader sample of who has been funded by Momentum. As far as managers are concerned, the number of women working as artist managers in England is likely lower than the number of men. The 2016 UK Music Diversity Survey reflected that 45.3% of the music industry workforce was female (UK Music, 2016). The survey further broke down the gender representation by career level. The artist managers in my study were predominantly self-employed, and the survey reflected that, of 270 self-employed workers, only 32.6% were female (UK Music, 2016). It may be the case that women are less likely to go into artist management, and this could be an area to further examine, given that managers are becoming increasingly involved in artists’ development.

Due to time constraints, there was limited ability to carry out longitudinal data collection of the artists or their managers. As Chapter 7 showed, musicians’
working lives are fluid and chaotic, with some musicians moving up and down between working multiple jobs and earning a full-time income from music. It is important to recognise that the data in this study was collected at specific points in artists’ careers. This included information artists submitted on application forms pre-funding, as well as information supplied after funding in evaluations and interviews. Because of this, the status of some musicians’ working lives may have changed and they may have found increased success or indeed withdrawn from musical life. An example of this can be seen in Amplify Dot, who was funded by Momentum in 2014, and has since found a career as a radio broadcaster and is not as musically active. Any study analysing individuals’ working lives may encounter this change, so it is important to acknowledge that this study reflects artists’ and artists managers’ working lives at a particular time: between late 2014 and late 2016.

The artists interviewed in this study were skewed toward solo-artists, so less data was available about band dynamics and how different members of the same band might or might not value funding differently. Interviewing more members of bands might have yielded interesting results. Indeed, the desire espoused by the musicians I interviewed to control their artistic image and musical sound might have been expressed less often or in different terms by multi-member bands. However, the data from the observation panels suggested that bands would also value the funding’s ability to help them preserve a do-it-yourself identity and ethos. It would likely have also been valuable for the ways it allowed some artists to preserve ownership of their copyright, which was seen in the Momentum panels when artists were dropped from their record label deals or were using label services.

The artists interviewed were from several genres, but it was not possible to represent every genre funded by Momentum due to difficulty in recruiting participants. This may mean that artists working in some genres, such as reggae or sound art, could have different views to those interviewed. However, care was taken to ensure that it was clear that, while those interviewed did not represent artists in every genre, they still possess some overlapping values and goals with fellow emerging musicians.
8.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Chapters 5 and 6 discussed the diversity monitoring practices both in ACE and PRSF and the origins of these in relation to the Equality Act 2010. This thesis was not able to analyse data on the socio-economic backgrounds of those involved in Momentum, either through funding or as assessors. The reason for this lack of data is partly due to the exclusion of socio-economic traits as a protected characteristic in the Equality Act. However, as O’Brien and Oakley (2014) pointed out, ACE has technically committed to the inclusion of socio-economic status as protected in their funds. They have not decided how this would be measured and monitored, however, and they have not been collecting data on this trait. Further research should investigate why socio-economic traits are not being monitored and how their exclusion may impact upon efforts to improve diversity across other traits, such as gender and ethnicity. This project was limited in time and was not able to question why religion has also never been tracked in Momentum and whether this is a trend across other ACE funds.

Another important area for further research will be into the working practices of artist managers and workers undertaking managerial work in the popular music industries. In line with work by Hracs (2015) and Lizé (2016), my research identified that artist managers were not only involved with artists, even at the emerging level, but also actively funding and driving artists’ development. Already, while this research was being conducted, the Music Managers’ Forum (MMF), which is the primary organisation representing artist managers in the UK, approached PRSF about managers’ roles in Momentum. MMF were able to change the Momentum application process, allowing them to apply for a portion of funding for themselves, as well as the artist. Clearly, more research is needed into the working practices of managers, but this step towards recognition of their roles in artists’ careers demonstrates that this is an area worth pursuing further. Additionally, at the time ACE first conducted the consultation that led to Momentum’s creation, they identified the need for support mechanisms, such as skills training and funding for managers, but this was never pursued by ACE. More
work needs to be done to scope out the extent of managers’ work and the needs for support that are still not being met. Further research could develop or adjust the typology I developed in this thesis and provide a more complete picture of managers’ work.

Finally, in 2018, ACE withdrew from the Momentum fund as a partner and was effectively replaced by Scottish and Welsh public funders, Creative Scotland and the Arts Council of Wales. PPL joined as a partner in 2016. It therefore remains unclear whether ACE leaving will have a lasting impact on the Momentum fund or whether ACE stepping away from funding popular musicians directly will affect their reputation as a funder or limit the types of artists who feel welcome to apply.

8.6 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I brought the findings from my empirical research, discussed in Chapter 4-7, on the value of public funding for popular musicians into dialogue. My aim was to answer the research questions and to particularly illuminate the dimensions of value public funding for popular musicians in England creates. This was done through the case study of the Momentum music fund, run by PRSF and primarily funded by ACE. I first explained how my research contributes to particular knowledge on cultural value, popular musicians’ work, and the changing music industries and discussed the wider implications for the research findings on current academic and policy debates. I then outlined potential limitations of the findings and suggestions for future research, linking the research to the wider realm of cultural policy and the organisational policies of those funding popular music. Overall, this thesis shows that Momentum funding provides access to resources, financial freedom, and a certain level of autonomy over creative and professional development for artists and artist managers. In doing so, it creates an opportunity to elevate and progress more diverse types of artists, whether in genre, gender, ethnicity or region. It is in this space, where public funding meets popular music, that we might be able to identify and overcome biases and more effectively address the inequalities present within the popular music industries.
### APPENDIX A

The musicians and managers interviewed in this study are collected in the below tables with details about the interviews.

#### Managers Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role(s)/Title(s)</th>
<th>Interview Date</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Artist manager, label owner</td>
<td>16-1-16</td>
<td>1hr 29m</td>
<td>Glasgow - public cafe in museum</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>5-2-16</td>
<td>1hr 25m</td>
<td>Cafe in member’s section of London</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layla</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>9-2-16</td>
<td>1hr</td>
<td>Cafe in East London</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>Label worker: Manages funded musician’ diary</td>
<td>10-3-16</td>
<td>1hr 9m</td>
<td>Cafe in East London</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Label owner, artist manager</td>
<td>17-3-16</td>
<td>46m</td>
<td>Cafe in North London</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Label worker: helps manage artists</td>
<td>15-3-16</td>
<td>1hr 12m</td>
<td>Pub in North London</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>30-3-16</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>30-3-16</td>
<td>1hr 7m</td>
<td>Cafe in East London</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Artist manager, label owner</td>
<td>31-3-16</td>
<td>44m</td>
<td>Skype Video Call: His office</td>
<td>Skype Video Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>Artist manager</td>
<td>28-4-16</td>
<td>1hr 1m</td>
<td>Google Hangouts Video Call: His home</td>
<td>Google Hangouts Video Call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24 All names have been anonymised and participants given pseudonyms. See the methodology chapter for an explanation on why certain participants are anonymous.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Band/Artist Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Perkins</td>
<td>Loxe (f.k.a. Debian Blak)</td>
<td>13-4-16</td>
<td>1hr 35m</td>
<td>Cafe in North East London and his studio</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Agombar</td>
<td>Jessica Agombar</td>
<td>4-5-16</td>
<td>1hr 30m</td>
<td>Cafe in Central London</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlia²⁶</td>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>16-5-16</td>
<td>1hr 11m</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Woods</td>
<td>Matt Woods</td>
<td>10-8-16</td>
<td>1hr 24m</td>
<td>Cafe in South London</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karthik Poduval, Sam Rowe</td>
<td>Flamingods</td>
<td>1-9-16</td>
<td>1hr 52m</td>
<td>Their home in South London</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunil Heera</td>
<td>XO</td>
<td>1-9-16</td>
<td>1hr 30m</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁵ Two additional pilot interviews were conducted informally by phone with funded musicians to test and adjust the interview questions. These were not recorded but notes were taken to inform the research design.

²⁶ This is a pseudonym, as this artist did not wish to be identified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justine Jones</td>
<td>Employed to Serve</td>
<td>5-9-16</td>
<td>56m</td>
<td>Skype Video Call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvastone</td>
<td>Silvastone</td>
<td>21-9-16</td>
<td>1hr 17m</td>
<td>His studio outside Croydon</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Wallis</td>
<td>Dutch Uncles</td>
<td>8-12-16</td>
<td>1hr 26m</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Branch27</td>
<td>Asylums</td>
<td>29-11-16</td>
<td>1hr 41m</td>
<td>Restaurant in Southend-on-Sea</td>
<td>In person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Luke’s band Asylums was not in receipt of Momentum funding. He was interviewed to get the perspective of a non-funded band in a similar position to that of some Momentum-funded bands. See methodology chapter for further detail.
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PRS for Music Foundation Organisational Hierarchy
November 2015

Directorial
- Executive Director
- Operations Director

Sr. Management
- Senior Manager, Grants

Management
- Communications Manager
- Industry Fund Manager

Support & Administrative
- Grants Co-ordinator
- Artist Liaison and Communications Co-ordinator
- Administrator

PRS for Music Foundation Organisational Hierarchy
November 2016

Directorial
- Chief Executive
- Senior Operations Director

Sr. Management
- Senior Grants and Programmes Manager

Management
- Grants and Programmes Manager
- Programme Manager
- Communications Manager

Support & Administrative
- Grants Co-ordinator
- Communications Co-ordinator
- Administrator
APPENDIX C

C.1 Musicians consent Form Approved

Musicians Interviews Consent Form - Gable

Consent Form for
Public Funding for Popular Music: What Is It Good For?
The case of Momentum

Please tick the appropriate boxes

Taking Part
I have read and understood the project information sheet and have been given the chance to ask questions.  □
I agree to take part in the project. Taking part in the project will include being interviewed and recorded (audio).  □
I understand that my taking part is voluntary. I can withdraw from the study at any time and can have any materials or data related to me destroyed within 3 months of the interview.  □

Use of the information I provide for this project
I understand my personal details such as phone number and address will not be revealed to people outside the project.  □
I understand that my words may be quoted in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs unless I request otherwise.  □

Choose one:
1. I choose to be named in the project. □
2. I prefer to be anonymous and request a pseudonym. □

Use of the information I provide beyond this project
I understand that my data will be kept in a secure place confidentially and without identifiers. □
I agree for the data I provide to be transcribed and used by the researcher in future reports and publications. □
I agree to assign the copyright I hold in any materials related to this project to Olivia Gable □
I would like to receive a copy of the final report. If yes, please type your email address here □

Name of Participant [typed]  Participant E-Signature  Date

Researcher [typed]  Researcher E-Signature  Date

Project contact details for further information:
Researcher Olivia Gable, Email: Olivia.gable@open.ac.uk, Phone: +44 1008888059
Or Professor Marie Gillespie, Email: Marie.Gillespie@open.ac.uk, Phone: +44 160359605
Example Interview Questions for Musicians

C.2 Musicians Interviews

These interviews were loosely structured with the musicians guiding the discussion. Questions related to a few topics. Examples are:

Momentum

What do you know about the Momentum Music Fund?

*Why did you apply for funding?

*What was the project you applied for?

*Did you or your manager submit the application?

What was it like filling in the application? / What did your manager tell you about the funding?

How do you think your application was assessed?

Have you applied for other funding? If so, where did you apply and did you receive it?

What do you think about the Momentum fund?

*Why do you think your project was funded?

*What would you have done if you didn’t receive Momentum?

*How do you feel that being funded by Momentum might change or affect how you’re perceived by other musicians and the industry? (Are you still authentic?)

VALUE – What’s the value of your music?

Excellence – What do you think makes music ‘good’ or ‘excellent’?

Barriers to music making
Background/education

How long have you been making music?

Why did you start making music or performing?

Did you study music at school/university?

What other musical training have you had?

What instrument/s do you play?

How long have you been putting out music under your current name?

*How many band members are in your band?

*Are you working with a manager or any other people?

*Who are they?

*Have your family and friends been supportive of your music career?

Their music


*How do you describe your musical style?

*What do you think is ‘excellent’ music?

Do you write the songs? If so, what is that process like for you?

Has anything changed in your creative process over the years? Why?

Do you usually write alone or collaboratively?

Have you recorded mainly in a home studio or professional studio?

How does listening to your own music make you feel?

What is it like performing your music?

How does the audience respond?
*How do you want to develop as a musician?*

**Career**

*What are your goals as a musician?*

*What do you hope to achieve through your work?*

*How do you pay for your projects?*

*Do you consider music your career?*

Who handles your day-to-day operations as a band?

Do you manage your own finances?

Have you sought any outside help or training?

What kinds of work do you do to keep up a fan base?

How much time do you think you spend on running your band a week?

Do you currently have a record or publishing deal?

**Personal**

What is your age?

What do your parents do for a living?

Where did you grow up?

Was music important to you as a child?

What kinds of music did your family listen to?

Have you had any support from your family or friends? Has this been financial?

How long have you been playing the [instrument]?
APPENDIX D

Momentum Application July 2015

Current application: 20% complete
You have fully completed:

Contact Details

* Denotes a required field

Application contact details
Please provide details of the primary contact for this application.
N.B. All correspondence will be sent to this contact.

Flora Ward
07734964012 (Work)
flora@prsfomusicfoundation.com (Work)

We would like to send you a monthly newsletter with the latest information about our funding opportunities and supported artists/organisations. If you would not like to receive this newsletter, please tick here.

Data Protection
From time to time PRSF may hear about opportunities which might be of interest to our applicants. If you would like your details passed on to other relevant organisations, please choose "can pass on".

PRS for Music Foundation will use all the information supplied for the administration of your application and other related purposes. We may disclose your information to PRS for Music, our agents and service providers for this purpose. We may contact you by mail, telephone, fax or e-mail in connection with your application. If you have provided us with personal data, you explicitly consent to our processing this data where this is necessary for the purposes described above.

If you would like your details passed on to other relevant organisations (e.g. for performance / press opportunities), please choose "Can pass on" from the drop down below.

No
How did you hear about the Momentum Music Fund? Please select the most appropriate option from the drop-down menu.*

If ‘Other’ was selected above, please tell us how you first heard about the Momentum Music Fund.

Who will be completing this application? Please select one option below.*

Please tell us your artist name.*

If B. If you are applying on behalf of an artist, please tell us their artist name.

Region/country in which you are currently based.*

If B. If you are applying on behalf of an artist, please tell us the town or city in which they are currently based.

Momentum funding is only available to artists based in England. See our FAQ page for more information.

Please tell us the town or city that you are from originally, if different from that given on your current address.

If B. If you are applying on behalf of an artist, please tell us the town or city that they are from originally.

This information will help us collate more accurate statistics on regional impact.

Region of town or city mentioned in the above answer (if applicable)

This information will help us collate more accurate statistics on regional impact.

Request amount (between £5,000-£15,000)*

Please answer only in figures, e.g. 6000. Enter figures directly into the box, or use the cursor. This amount should correspond with the figure allocated in your budget.

Total project budget - i.e. your requested amount from Momentum, plus any funds that others are contributing.*

Please answer only in figures, e.g. 12500. Enter figures directly into the box, or use the cursor.

If you are a member of PRS for Music, please provide your 9-digit CAE number.*

If you are applying on behalf of a music creator, please provide their CAE number.

If there are multiple CAE numbers, please enter these separated by a comma. If you are not a member of PRS for Music, please enter 0.

Please provide a link to your website.*

N.B. If you are applying on behalf of an artist, please provide a link to their website.
Your Music

* Denotes a required field

Please provide up to four musical examples to the artist/band's work via Soundcloud/YouTube/Bandcamp (or similar) *

Please see guidance at top of page when selecting your links. Ensure that links are presented on separate lines. Please note that we do not accept links to Dropbox, MySpace, Spotify, Yousendit, Sendspace or Last FM.

If you are applying on behalf of a band, how many people are in the group?

Enter numbers only. You can enter the number directly into the box, or use the cursors.

How many years have you been working on this musical project?

Enter numbers only. Enter figures directly into the box, or use the cursors.

If you have another occupation other than music, please tell us what you do.

N.B. If applying on behalf of an artist, tell us about their occupation if relevant.

If you have told us about your additional occupation above, please tell us whether the occupation is full time or part time.

Genre
Please select the most appropriate genre from the drop down menu.

*
Your project

* Denotes a required field

What type of activity are you applying for? Please select the most appropriate option from the drop-down menu. *

If 'Other' was selected above, please tell us what type of activity you are applying for.
10 words maximum

Please give detail on the activity you would like us to fund
150 words maximum

Why is this activity suitable for Momentum funding? Briefly explain how this activity will have a significant impact and why PRS for Music Foundation support is needed.
150 words maximum

If you are working with a manager, please tell us about their track record for developing artists.
N.B. If applying as the artist/band's manager, please tell us about your track record for developing artists.

If you are working with a manager, please describe the nature of your professional relationship.
N.B. If applying as a manager, tell us about your professional relationship with the artist/band.

If you are signed to a publisher or record label, please provide the company names.
N.B. If applying on behalf of an artist/band, please provide relevant company names.

If you have a contract with a record label/publisher/other investment company, please explain why that company (or group of
companies) is unable to support the proposed funded activity.

N.B. If applying on behalf of an artist/band please tell us why relevant companies are unable to support proposed activity.

Please provide details of your career to date, including any significant successes

This is your opportunity to tell us about any successes to date, including but not exclusively, some or all of the following:

- details of the current profile and success in the UK, i.e. airplay on national radio, established artists that you have toured or collaborated with, festivals the artist appeared at, media and industry recommendations and feedback
- track record in playing live e.g. tours or key live dates
- level of industry interest (i.e. record labels, agents, promoters)
- radio play (in the UK or overseas, on FM, digital or internet)
- popularity on social media (please provide figures)

N.B. If applying on behalf of an artist/band, please provide all relevant details.

Please state music-related income over the last 12 months

This should relate to the project for which you are applying (e.g. syncs, live fees, royalties). It should not include additional unrelated income such as music teaching or performances with other groups.

Please enter numbers only. You can enter a figure directly into the box, or use the cursor.

What were the main revenue streams that contributed to the above income from music during the past year?

- e.g. sync fees, live fees, royalties etc.

Please provide details of any secondary business activity (e.g. merchandise, endorsements, etc.)

Also tell us how these activities have boosted profile, increased income or developed the music.

Tell us about where you see your music career in two years’ time and how this activity is going to help you get there. What goals will you achieve?

This is your chance to tell us how the funded activity will enable you to significantly develop your music and career. Consider how this activity fits in with the overall business plan/career development plan.

Please list at least three measurable outcomes that you can refer back to when you complete your final evaluation report (see ‘Conditions of Funding’ in Guidance notes for more information).

For example:

- playing X capacity venues
- selling X number of units (digital/physical)
- growing fan base by X
- producing higher quality/bigger stage show - improving live performance
- developing song-writing by working with other artists or producers

N.B. If applying on behalf of an artist, please provide an appropriate answer based on the guidance above.
Who are you already working with?

Tell us about the people and companies that have already invested time, money and effort in your career to date. It can include, but not exclusively, any/all of the following:

- Management
- Label
- Publisher
- Producer
- Agent
- Lawyer
- PR/Pegger
- Anyone else you think has played a significant role in your career so far

N.B. If applying on behalf of an artist, please adapt your answer as appropriate.

Please provide a supporting statement from a person involved in the delivery of the proposed project (e.g. if applying for tour support, you could supply a statement from a promoter; and if applying to lo record, you could supply a statement from your proposed producer, etc.), followed by their full name and email address.

This should not be written by the artist, manager or anyone applying on behalf of an artist.

Please provide an online link to a recent press or blog review.

Please provide a full marketing and promotional plan for the proposed activity.

The proposal can include information on PR plans and personnel, social media, website development, merchandise, radio plugging and video promotion.

Please tell us why now is the right time for you to receive Momentum funding.

Tell us why this is a crucial point in your career development, stating how support from Momentum will have a significant impact on your career.

N.B. If applying as a manager, this statement must be provided by the artist.
## Your budget

Please enter your predicted expenditure here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Description / notes</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Will Momentum cover this cost?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artist/band fees e.g. rehearsal time and time spent performing and creating new music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording costs e.g. studio time, producer fees, session player fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and promotion e.g. advertising, PR, plugger, website, digital marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel e.g. van hire, petrol, airfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional expenditure 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional expenditure 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional expenditure 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (up to 10% for unforeseen spending)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total expenditure**

£0.00

Insert your income here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Description / notes</th>
<th>Confirmed amount</th>
<th>Unconfirmed amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ticket sales / gig fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution from label/ publisher/ management company/ any other investors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record sales - digital and physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other donations Money raised through individual or community donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds from Momentum

This figure must match the request amount noted earlier in your application

| Additional income 1                             |                     |                  |                    |
| Additional income 2                             |                     |                  |                    |
| Additional income 3                             |                     |                  |                    |
| Additional income 4                             |                     |                  |                    |

**Total income**

£0.00

Your total expenditure: £0.00

Your total income (confirmed and unconfirmed): £0.00

Discrepancy in expenditure and income:
(should be £0.00) £0.00

If applicable, please give a figure for in-kind income (i.e. cost of any goods or services you receive but do not pay for directly)

If you have entered a figure in the box above, please describe the in-kind income.
Monitoring

Age
What are the age ranges of the musicians/members associated with proposed activity?
Please tick relevant boxes

Disability
The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 defines disability as a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long term adverse effect on a person's ability to carry out normal day to day activities. This can include not just people with apparent disabilities, but also people with hidden disabilities such as dyslexia, diabetes, epilepsy, heart disease, severe disfigurements, multiple sclerosis, ME, depression, liver disease and speech impairment, etc.
Do you consider yourself to have a disability?
N.B. If you are applying on behalf of an artist, please select the option that applies to the artist.

This question is optional. We use this data for equal opportunities monitoring.

Disability

If yes, please state the nature of the disability?

If yes, please state the number of members who consider themselves to be disabled

Ethnicity
Which of the following options best represents your ethnicity?
N.B. If you are applying on behalf of an artist, please select the option that best describes their ethnicity.

This question is optional. We use this data for equal opportunities monitoring.

Marriage and civil partnership
Are you married or in a civil partnership?
Pregnancy and maternity

A woman is protected under section 18 of the Equality Act 2010 and cannot be treated unfavourably because of the pregnancy or because of illness suffered by her as a result of it, or because she is on compulsory maternity leave, or she is exercising or seeking to exercise, the right to ordinary or additional maternity leave.

(If applicable) As a woman, are you pregnant, on maternity leave or returning from maternity leave?

How do you identify your gender?

N.B. If applying on behalf of an artist, tell us how they identify their gender.

We collect this information for statistical purposes. If applying on behalf of a solo artist, please state 'male', 'female', 'transgender' or 'other'. If applying on behalf of a group consisting of more than one gender, please state 'mixed'.

Sexual orientation

Which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself?

Please select the most appropriate option
APPENDIX E

Diversity Section of Momentum Application 2018

Section 5 - Monitoring

Age
What are the age ranges of the musicians/members associated with proposed activity?
Please tick relevant boxes

Disability
The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 defines disability as a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long term adverse effect on a person's ability to carry out normal day to day activities. This can include not just people with apparent disabilities, but also people with hidden disabilities such as dyslexia, diabetes, epilepsy, heart disease, severe disfigurements, multiple sclerosis, ME, depression, liver disease and speech impairment, etc.

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

N.B. If you are applying on behalf of an artist, please select the option that applies to the artist.

No
Response

If yes, please state the nature of the disability?

No
Response

If yes, please state the number of members who consider themselves to be disabled

No
Response

Ethnicity

Which of the following options best represents your ethnicity?

N.B. If you are applying on behalf of an artist, please select the option that best describes their ethnicity.

No
Response

Marriage and civil partnership
Are you married or in a civil partnership?

No
Response

Pregnancy and maternity
A woman is protected under section 18 of the Equality Act 2010 and cannot be treated unfavourably because of the pregnancy or because of illness suffered by her as a result of it, or because she is on compulsory maternity leave, or she is exercising or seeking to exercise, or has exercised to sought to exercise, the right to ordinary or additional maternity leave.

(Id applicable) As a woman, are you pregnant, on maternity leave or returning from maternity leave?

No
Response

How do you identify your gender?

N.B. If applying on behalf of an artist, tell us how they identify their gender.

No
Response

Sexual orientation
Which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself?

Please select the most appropriate option

No
Response
Momentum Shortlisting Assessment Criteria in 2016

Music Score
5 - Outstanding music, performed to the highest standard.
4 - Well constructed/ performed and showing strong potential.
3 - At a good standard but unremarkable
2 - Derivative and poorly performed/constructed
1 - Unlistenable

Proposed Activity Score
5 - An effective plan. The artist is clearly at a crucial tipping point, with the right elements in place and a great plan to ensure the activity will have significant impact on their career
4 - A well-researched plan, suggesting that the activity will have an impact, and that the artist is at an important point in their career. But more could have been done to convince
3 - A decent outline of plans which could be improved to demonstrate how the artist is at the right stage of their career, or that this activity will have an impact
2 - A poor or underdeveloped plan, with little evidence this will have the required impact
1 - Little/no evidence the artist is at the right point of their career for Momentum support

Question:
Momentum is a competitive scheme. In most deadlines we put 80 applicants to panel stage (approx. 1 in 3 applicants). Please let us know if you feel the applicant deserves panel consideration.

One line request for feedback to send to the applicant.
An example of the types of diagrams created when analysing data
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