



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/140138/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Walmsley, B (2019) The death of arts marketing: a paradigm shift from consumption to enrichment. *Arts and the Market*, 9 (1). pp. 32-49. ISSN: 2056-4945

<https://doi.org/10.1108/AAM-10-2018-0013>

---

© Emerald Publishing Limited 2019. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. Licensed re-use rights only. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Arts and the Market*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# **The Death of Arts Marketing: A Paradigm Shift from Consumption to Enrichment**

## **ABSTRACT**

### *Purpose*

This article demonstrates how researchers in the field of arts marketing are gradually abandoning the traditional marketing concept in order to respond to established and emerging modes of audience engagement.

### *Design/methodology/approach*

The study is based on a comprehensive content analysis of the past three decades of journal articles related to arts marketing.

### *Findings*

The results of the content analysis highlight that a paradigm shift in arts marketing has occurred over the past two decades, from an overriding focus on neoliberal processes of consumption towards a relational, humanistic approach, which aims to enrich audiences and interrogate the wider value and impact of their arts experiences.

### *Research implications*

The logical conclusion to be derived from this paradigmatic shift is that 'arts marketing' is increasingly becoming an outmoded misnomer. This suggests the need for a fundamental reassessment of the traditional arts marketing concept.

### *Practical implications*

In order to develop meaningful relationship with audiences, arts and cultural organisations should prioritize the long-term relational approaches offered by audience engagement over short-term tactical activities such as segmentation and promotion.

### *Originality/value*

The article advocates a radical reconceptualization of the field that would replace the transactional 4P model with a relational 4E model, derived from an adoption of theories, processes and practices related to the elements of experience, exchange, environment and engagement.

**Keywords:** arts marketing; audience engagement; customer engagement; consumer behaviour; audience enrichment; arts management; marketing mix.

## Introduction

The development of any new academic field requires a paradigm, which can be simply defined as a fundamental set of assumptions shared by members of a scientific community (Kuhn [1970] cited in Lovelock and Gummesson, 2004, p. 21). But as Lovelock and Gummesson remind us, paradigms exist merely as “temporary postulates” whose conceptual validity “must always be open to challenge” (ibid.). By exploring evolving theories and practices of arts marketing and audience engagement, this article traces the conceptual development of arts marketing both as an academic field and a professional practice. In so doing, the article aims to expose the limitations of the traditional marketing mix for contemporary philosophies, modes and techniques of audience engagement and propose an alternative, audience-centred paradigm fit for twenty-first century arts organisations and scholars. Following a comprehensive content analysis of journal articles published between 2007 and 2016, the article culminates in a discussion of the key implications for arts marketing and identifies fruitful avenues for future research. Its core contribution is thus to the established field of critical marketing, which examines discourses produced by marketing professionals and reveals their historical, social and cultural origins (Cova and Cova, 2009, p. 82).

As a young academic field that only emerged in the late 1960s (Colbert, 2017), arts marketing owes much to an exceptionally diverse range of disciplines, including arts management, marketing, business studies, economics, cultural policy studies, cultural economics, museology, musicology, performance studies, psychology, sociology, anthropology, strategic management and consumer behaviour (Dennis *et al.*, 2011; O'Reilly, 2011). The research problem that will be elucidated in the course of this article is that traditionally, the theoretical underpinning of arts marketing has been provided by marketing rather than the arts: seemingly entrenched cross-disciplinary tensions have prevented the fully interdisciplinary approach demanded by this inherently hybrid field. As Ian Fillis notes, “only a very small number of assessments of the state of arts marketing knowledge have been carried out” (2011, p. 11). Fillis goes on to assert that arts marketing research “has evolved from being an application of marketing using long-held principles into a discipline where critical and creative approaches are now being used to generate more meaningful and actionable arts marketing theory” (ibid.). One of the core aims of this article is to explore this thesis through a deductive content analysis of the relevant literature.

The arts consultant Andrew McIntyre (2017) rightly claims that we are living in a post-marketing world, while Chris Bilton (2017) notes that traditional products are “disappearing” in the creative industries and argues that the rise of experiential consumption “will require new approaches to branding, market segmentation, marketing strategy and competitive positioning” (p. 9). In response to the ongoing evolution of arts marketing, the core rationale behind this article is that it is now time to move *beyond* marketing; to redress the balance and reassert the primal role that arts and humanities research can play in tailoring the discipline back to its creative and not-for-profit origins and context. As Miranda Boorsma has maintained, despite the increasingly prevalent focus on experience and interaction provided by hedonics, potentially invaluable insights from aesthetics were not pursued by arts marketing scholars in the latter half of the Twentieth Century (2006, p. 80). This neglect is particularly surprising in light of the growing scholarly consensus that the *experience* of art, rather than the artefact itself, is the ultimate determinant of artistic value (Schaeffer, 1998, p. 47; Walmsley, 2018; Shusterman, 2001, p. 101; Belfiore and Bennett, 2008; Bourriaud, 2002).

Ultimately, I will argue in this article that as the key term and concept evoked to encapsulate the relationship between audiences and the arts, ‘arts marketing’ is steadily losing traction: having alienated many artists, audiences, and arts and humanities scholars for decades, it is now in a state of steady decline as a result of socio-cultural phenomena including public participation and co-creation, which have themselves been bolstered by technological advancements that have facilitated more interactive, relational, dialogic and disruptive modes of engagement. As humanistic processes of audience engagement start to eclipse the transactional tactics of segmentation and promotion, there is compelling evidence that we have finally reached a paradigm shift in arts marketing.

### **The conceptual development of arts marketing**

The idea of extending the marketing concept to the not-for-profit sector was first advocated in the late 1960s by Kotler and Levy, who argued that marketing activities could no longer be “confined to the traditional economic units that have held them as their function” (1969, p. 67). This *broadening* of the marketing concept was supported by other scholars such as Shapiro (1973), who confirmed that marketing was recognized as an intrinsic element of not-

for-profit organisations. By the end of the 1970s, what Hirschman (1983, p. 45) refers to as “the intellectual battle for the acceptance of the broadened perspective of marketing” seemed to have been decisively won, perhaps reflecting Guy Debord’s foreboding about the “autocratic reign of the market economy” (ibid.). In the arts, this neoliberal ‘victory’ manifested in organisations adopting commercial marketing tactics, while remaining highly sceptical about the supposed benefits of either an arts-led or holistic approach (Fillis, 2011). However, it has been justifiably argued that as a normative framework, the marketing concept is not applicable to artistic production and consumption because of the particular social norms and personal values involved (Hirschman, 1983). In other words, artists create art and audiences engage with art in contexts whose values lie way beyond (and indeed often eschew) the capitalist market. As Jennifer Radbourne (2013) observes, arts marketing has reached a state of “convergence” between creators and consumers, artists and audiences, that is so marked that it demands a reconceptualization of the entire arts marketing paradigm.

Influenced both socially and philosophically by high profile movements such as Debord’s Situationists and the Frankfurt School, the not-for-profit sector has a long tradition of resisting the encroachment of neoliberal concepts and terms, which constitutes a serious “semantic and conceptual problem” (Levy and Kotler, 1969, p. 70). If there was a semantic and conceptual problem back in 1969, this has evolved into a crisis in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, where consumers are demanding an increasingly participatory and co-creative role in both artistic production and meaning-making. Kotler and Armstrong tried to circumnavigate this conceptual problem by redefining marketing in broader, more humanistic terms, describing its core aim as creating value for customers and capturing value from them in return (2010, p. 26). This definition of marketing is useful for arts marketers as it places value and audiences at the heart of marketing activity; but it inevitably raises questions about how audiences perceive the value they derive from the arts and what reciprocal value arts organisations might capture from their audiences in return. It also fails to define or deconstruct the concept of ‘value’ itself. This is hugely problematic because as Arvidsson (2009) has argued, “value is a normative concept [...] standards of value are socially constructed: they are the result of political struggles and, consequently, they vary from one social formation to another” (p. 16). We can infer from this that the value exchange mooted in Kotler and Armstrong’s definition might productively involve the more co-creative approach suggested in O’Sullivan and O’Sullivan’s (2003) definition of arts marketing as a

process that seeks an *interactive relationship* with audiences via an integration of artistic objectives and management strategies (my italics).

Very few scholars have thus far traced or challenged the conceptual development of arts marketing. This is possibly because as a discreet academic field, arts marketing has always struggled to establish consensus on an agreed definition of its underlying paradigm. It therefore continues to suffer from charges of incoherence and illegitimacy (Colbert and St-James, 2014). To date, its conceptual paradigm constitutes little more than a palimpsest of McKitterick's first definition of the marketing concept in 1957, which essentially championed the production of products in response to the expressed or latent needs and desires of consumers to maximize profitability (Hirschman, 1983, p. 46). Accordingly, traditional arts marketing theory and activities are still based around what is generally referred to as the 'marketing mix': the four core elements (or 4Ps) of product, place, price and promotion. However, with the advent of services marketing in the 1970s and its rapid development into a major sub-discipline of marketing in the 1980s and 1990s, focus started to shift away from production and the traditional predominance of the 'product' towards aspects of consumption. This in turn effected a renewed appreciation of consumers and their different needs and led to more postmodern approaches to marketing.

The most persistent attempt to differentiate arts marketing conceptually has come from François Colbert (2007), who has repeatedly rejected a consumer-centric model in favour of a product-led approach. However, in recent years Colbert and other arts marketing scholars have acknowledged a shift away from "supply-side marketing" in the arts (Colbert and St-James, 2014, p. 569) based predominantly on the emerging cultures of participation, co-creation and audience-centricity. To date Ruth Rentschler has provided the most empirically grounded historical framework for the discipline. Based on a content analysis of journals covering topics related to arts marketing over the two decades preceding 1995, Rentschler (1998) traced the conceptual development of arts marketing, which she demarcated into three distinct periods: the Foundation Period (1975–1984), the Professionalization Period (1985–1994) and the Rediscovery Period (from 1995). In the Foundation Period, Rentschler maintains, the arts sector started to diversify its offer; engage in audience analysis; and think more strategically about the potential benefits of marketing. The Professionalization Period witnessed arts organisations finally investing in marketing staff as they strove to operate in a more tactical, strategic and financially viable way and respond to their funders' increasing

demands for stronger management and greater accountability. Over this period, they began to invest in strategic audience research in order to segment their audiences and differentiate between different stakeholder groups. It was also in the Professionalization Period that arts marketing began to come of age as an academic field: Rentschler recounts how from 1985 to 1994 five journals ran a combined total of six special issues on arts marketing and how towards the end of this phase, a wider interest in behavioural and social sciences began to manifest (1998, p. 92).

This wider interest reflects the highly interdisciplinary nature of arts marketing and the need for a ‘broad territory’ approach to elicit “novel journeys of enquiry” (O’Reilly, 2011, p. 27). O’Reilly’s systematic content analysis of the arts marketing literature highlighted the need for an overarching framework to understand arts consumption and culminated in a call for future research on aspects of “collective consumption” in the arts (p. 36). These acknowledged gaps in scholarship support Fillis’s (2011, p. 12) claim that many arts organisations’ approaches to marketing failed to address the specific requirements of the arts sector. Indeed by maintaining that “a contemporary interpretation of arts marketing should acknowledge its foundations in the application of the marketing mix but [...] move forward on its own terms” (2011, p. 13), Fillis shores up the ‘exceptionality’ argument and implicitly makes the case for a paradigm shift. My argument here is that the conceptual terms have now shifted so definitively away from marketing that this paradigm shift has now definitively occurred.

### **Rediscovering the field**

As Rentschler rightly anticipated back in the late 1990s, the trend towards a more strategic approach to arts marketing practice continued into the new millennium, with audience analysis and segmentation becoming embedded as standard practice in many parts of the world. However, at the end of her analysis, Rentschler also mused whether we might be on the cusp of a new era of arts marketing characterised by a wholesale adoption of relationship marketing based on a more collaborative approach. She labelled this putative new phase the ‘Rediscovery Period’ and followed up her analysis four years later with a new article that highlighted a shift in arts marketing scholarship and practice towards a more holistic focus on communities and on the aesthetic experiences of audiences (Rentschler, 2002).

In hindsight, it certainly does appear that the period from 1995 to around 2006 was marked by a rediscovery of what arts marketing actually entails, an era when artists and organisations started to play, collaborate, co-produce and co-create with their audiences and wider communities. This is perhaps evidenced most explicitly by the phenomenal popularity of immersive and site-specific or site-responsive work mastered in the UK by ‘new wave’ theatre companies such as Grid Iron, Punchdrunk, National Theatre of Scotland and National Theatre Wales. In the USA, it is most readily apparent in the rise of ‘participatory museums’ (Simon, 2010) such as Brooklyn Museum and Santa Cruz Museum of Natural History and in the growth of audience enrichment programmes. This participatory turn is increasingly discernible on a global scale in co-creative projects such as Google Arts and Culture. These case examples also serve to illustrate how technology has enabled (and arguably compelled) arts and cultural organisations to reconnect with their audiences, environments and wider communities, and to invest time and money in developing exchange-based relationships. It has certainly encouraged them (and their researchers) to set their sights higher by focusing more on the *kinds* of experiences they offer to their audiences (immersive, haptic, ludic, alienating, etc.) and unquestionably made experiential engagement intrinsic to what arts marketers should actually do.

It is not simply this more relational approach that is challenging the traditional concept of arts marketing. For example, Sigurjonsson (2010) argues that core organisational activities such as audience development are far too broad and socially significant to be “theorized solely in terms of dominant marketing conceptions” (p. 266). As a sub-discipline of arts management, arts marketing has always encompassed policy priorities and directives, such as the moral imperative to broaden access and maximise participation. This polymathic role explains Diggle’s (1994) sociological qualification of the aims of arts marketing to “bring an appropriate number of people, drawn from the widest possible range of social background, economic condition and age, into an appropriate form of contact with the artist” (p. 25). The social, educational and political considerations that are inherent to the practice of arts marketing (at least in the non-profit sector) are poorly represented by the marketing paradigm. This is largely because, as Boorsma (2006) maintains, the academic field of arts marketing has traditionally been far too derivative of business and management studies. It is important, therefore, to reflect on what theoretical insights from the arts and humanities might offer the field at this pivotal moment in its evolution.

## Experimental and relational aesthetics

Philosophers and psychologists have always been interested in questions of artistic production and appreciation. But as Berlyne (1971) claims, epistemological progress in this area has been hampered by weak theorization and by the reduction of complex phenomenological questions to simplistic lines of enquiry. This suggests that like arts marketing, the fields of philosophy and psychology have historically neglected to focus on complex notions of cultural consumption and engagement. As Paul Silvia (2005) contends, the study of art and emotions “languished during much of the last century”, and as a result “the study of emotional responses to art has remained curiously detached from the psychology of emotions” (p. 342). This disciplinary divide presents a significant problem for arts marketing and has effected a vacuum at the heart of its conceptualisation.

Berlyne’s work notably influenced arts marketing theories of hedonic consumption, defined by Hirschman and Holbrook (1982) as the “multisensory, fantasy and emotive aspects” of audience experience (p. 92). Since then, Silvia’s (2005) research has indicated that audiences have a more enjoyable experience of art when they feel that they have grasped its meaning and Silvia calls for aestheticians to adopt the appraisal theories developed by emotional psychologists – theories which, he argues, offer “an expansive set of new ideas, hypotheses, and research directions” (p. 354). These appraisal theories find consensus in their acceptance of audiences’ subjective evaluations of their aesthetic experiences and in their acknowledgement of the complexity of emotions involved.

This focus on subjective experience is also a key characteristic of relational aesthetics. In his formative work in this emerging field Nicolas Bourriaud (2002) proposed that artistic practice and criticism should shift their focus away from the primacy of the artistic object or performance and embrace instead the discursive characteristics that engagement with art can produce. Bourriaud was interested essentially in how art can *transform* the aesthetic project from an object to an encounter and, in so doing, unite artists and audiences in a common aesthetic endeavour. The insights offered by relational aesthetics are significant in that they attempt to move beyond the artistic product and beyond the producer-consumer divide. Likewise Boorsma and Chiaravalotti (2010) maintain that arts marketing has evolved away from a functional approach towards a more relational view which recognizes artistic consumption as experiential. This, they contend, is serving to highlight the role of audiences

in the creation and reception of the arts and pose significant challenges to the role of arts marketing both as a practice and as an academic discipline. However, whilst there is clearly a shift towards a more relational view in a minority of arts organisations and in niche sub-disciplines such as relational aesthetics, mainstream arts marketing activity and the academic field of arts marketing itself has thus far failed to transcend the product-led approach.

### **Audience engagement and enrichment**

The rise of collaborative consumption (Cova, 1999) that has been driven by increasing social participation, co-production, and the development of interactive digital communication has been so significant over the past few decades that the set of socio-cultural assumptions that led to the advent of arts marketing has become outmoded. While arts and cultural organisations used to keep their audiences and visitors at arm's length, digital engagement tools are fostering a new relationship that is both creative and involved (Pulh and Mencarelli, 2015). Younger generations lack the brand loyalty of their parents and grandparents and are cynical about, if not indeed alienated by, traditional approaches to marketing (Lamminman, 2004). Meanwhile, twenty-first century arts audiences are increasingly yearning for more meaningful and longitudinal modes of engagement (Boorsma, 2006); and, as Bilton maintains: "The multiplicity of potential meanings and values inherent in a cultural product can only be realised through exchange, interactivity and engagement" (2017, p. 101).

Although, as we shall see, the arts marketing literature has witnessed an exponential rise in the deployment of the term 'engagement' since 2005, very few authors have even attempted to define the concept, never mind differentiate it from sister concepts such as participation and involvement. Brodie et al. trace the theoretical roots of engagement back to relationship marketing's focus on interactive experience and value co-creation, which they argue offers "a transcending view of relationships, which contrasts with a more traditional, transactional view of marketing relationships" (2011, p. 253). Sashi (2012) claims that effective engagement establishes intimate bonds, which culminate in enduring relational exchanges between producers and customers, and which can effect both loyalty and delight, transforming customers into fans. In summary, theoretical definitions coalesce around the notion of engagement as a psychological process which aims to develop intimate, meaningful and enduring relationships with audiences by involving them in interactive, co-created experiences.

Practitioners and scholars (particularly in the USA) increasingly refer to this relational approach in terms of ‘audience enrichment’. Enrichment is a complex and contestable concept because it can imply some kind of personal transformation, some underlying aspiration to make audiences ‘better people’. At worst, it recalls arguments around cultural deficit and the role of the arts to civilise the masses. However, if we recall the existing research into audience motivation (e.g. Walmsley, 2011; Bergadaà and Nyeck, 1995), enrichment might equally imply an emotional, interpersonal, social or even spiritual development; and if we accept a mission-based approach to strategic arts management (Varbanova, 2013), then the fact that many arts and cultural organisations claim to transform their audiences’ lives suggests that their ultimate goal should indeed be audience enrichment. According to Lynne Conner (2004; 2013), the practice of audience enrichment requires a shift in power dynamics from producers to audiences. Conner maintains that the underlying power struggle here is about ownership of the meaning of the arts and that a viable approach to audience enrichment facilitates “the interplay of ideas, experience, data, and feeling that makes up the arts experience” (2004, n.p). So we can see how audience engagement and enrichment go hand in hand; we could argue in fact that engagement is a strategic and relational process that leads ideally to enrichment.

These insights from related fields of the arts and humanities demonstrate the rich theoretical terrain that underpins arts marketing. Although this terrain is largely absent from the standard textbooks on arts marketing and from mainstream arts marketing activity, it is important to analyse what impact these fields are having on scholarship more broadly in the field. The remaining sections of the article are thus dedicated to this empirical and analytical endeavour.

## **Methodology**

The empirical aspect of the study took a predominantly deductive approach in order to investigate the hypothesis that since Rentschler’s seminal review of arts marketing traditions back in 1998, the field has witnessed a paradigmatic shift away from traditional conceptions and applications of *marketing* towards relational notions and modes of *engagement*. Grounded theoretically in the critical review of the relevant bodies of literature, the empirical evidence for this shift was investigated through a content analysis of research articles published in academic journals between January 2007 and December 2016. This approach

followed the acknowledged methodology adopted by both Rentscher in 1998 and Daragh O'Reilly in 2011. The core aim of this approach was to draw out the implications of artistic and sociological developments for the theoretical and practical development of arts marketing through a comprehensive thematic survey of existing academic research related to arts marketing and audience engagement.

The first part of the empirical investigation comprised a literature search of key terms (namely: 'arts' + 'marketing'; 'arts' + 'engagement'; 'arts' + 'audience development'; and 'arts' + 'audience enrichment') from journal article abstracts carried out via the University of Leeds's library search engine in March 2017. The search engine accessed 122,095 individual journal titles from a comprehensive range of academic publishers, including Cambridge University Press, Elsevier, Emerald, Oxford University Press, Sage, Taylor & Francis and Wiley. It incorporated the most populated business and management databases, including ABI Global, Business Source Complete and EBSCO. Content analysis has been proven to provide a "clear and systematic study of textual content as a basis for analysis and interpretation. [...] It potentially has a high degree of validity and reliability in terms of precise sampling, providing clear empirical evidence for research findings, and in allowing for replication and generalisation" (Seale, 2012, p. 460). However, in order to avoid the charges of positivism and description (ibid.) commonly levelled at more quantitative methods of content analysis (such as counting key terms), the study also conducted a qualitative content analysis of article abstracts from leading arts management and cultural policy journals. As Alasuutari (1995, p. 6) acknowledges, quantitative and qualitative methods can be effectively deployed in combination to analyse the same data, and this mixed-methods approach was utilised in this study to produce robust statistical data that was qualified by the nuance and depth of qualitative enquiry.

In the course of the qualitative content analysis, the eight core arts management journals (O'Reilly, 2011) were scrutinised: *Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management*, *International Journal of Arts Management*, the *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, the *Journal of Arts Management*, *Law and Society*, *Journal of Cultural Economics*, *Media International Australia*, *Museum Management and Curatorship* and *Poetics*. In order to encompass recent and emerging journals in the field, *Arts and the Market* (formerly *Arts*

*Marketing: An International Journal*) and *Cultural Trends* were also analysed.<sup>1</sup> Only articles pertaining specifically to arts marketing or audience engagement were selected.<sup>2</sup> Where possible (i.e. for all of the journals established prior to 2007), titles, keywords and abstracts published in these ten journals over the ten-year period 2007–2016 were analysed thematically. These articles were then represented chronologically (to enable the identification of scholarly trends within the period) and by journal designation on an Excel database under the following fields: ID, Title, Author(s), Publication Date, Keywords, Abstract, Categories, and Sub-Categories. This process was designed to guarantee a structured analytical approach (Welsh, 2002). Analysis was undertaken by two independent researchers to enhance reliability by reducing the likelihood of researcher error and/or bias (Krippendorff, 2011). Once both researchers had categorized each article independently, they met up to discuss any discrepancies and agreed final categorizations to ensure that the final database was refined by a thorough meta-analysis of each researcher’s initial coding.

## **Findings**

The keyword analysis of the abstracts of journal articles published between 2007 and 2016 confirmed the hypothesis by revealing a significant conceptual shift in scholarship focus from marketing to engagement. As illustrated in Table 1, over this ten-year period 3,689 articles were published that contained the words “arts” and “engagement” in their abstracts, compared with only 1,287 containing both “arts” and “marketing”. This suggests that almost three times as many articles over this era focussed on aspects of arts engagement as opposed to arts marketing. This finding appears even more significant when compared with the

---

<sup>1</sup> The selection of ‘core’ arts marketing journals was always going to be both limiting and controversial. Alongside *Arts and the Market* and *Cultural Trends*, a number of e-journals have emerged in recent years, for example *American Journal of Arts Management*, *ENCACT Journal of Cultural Management & Policy*, and *Cultural Management: Science and Education*. A number of arts marketing articles have also been published in more mainstream marketing journals such as *Journal of Marketing Management* and the *European Journal of Marketing*. In order to maximise comparability with extant studies and to limit the scope of the content analysis, a decision was taken to restrict the sample to print journals specialising in arts and cultural marketing / management and in cultural policy.

<sup>2</sup> This was a complex and inevitably subjective process, which is why two independent researchers undertook the analysis. Some journals (e.g. *International Journal of Arts Management*) automatically categorize their articles into different sub-fields, such as Marketing Management, but the researchers found that even then, some of the categorization was questionable and somewhat arbitrary. Most of the journals didn’t categorize their publications, so the researchers selected articles based on elements of the competing paradigms explored in the present study – i.e. on notions of and topics related specifically to product, price, place, promotion, and to experience, exchange, environment and engagement. This meant, for example, that while articles on product placement, place marketing, co-creation and community engagement were selected, those exploring aspects of fundraising, sponsorship, media policy or strategic arts management were not.

analysis of the two previous decades: whereas in the era 1987–1996 (which roughly covers Rentschler’s (1998) Professionalization Period) there were significantly more articles dedicated to arts marketing than to arts engagement, by the following decade this situation had been reversed, with almost 200 more articles mentioning “engagement” in their abstracts than “marketing” (see Table 1). The exponential growth in articles on “audience engagement” between 1997 and 2016 is also striking from the analysis, as is the sharp spike in articles published post-2006 mentioning “audience enrichment” in their abstracts.

<<Table 1 here>>

This content analysis also confirms Rentschler’s hypothesis that in 1998 we were on the cusp of a new era which ‘rediscovered’ arts marketing as relational and collaborative. This “Rediscovery Period” marked a significant tipping point in arts marketing scholarship, as scholars for the first time gave priority to questions of engagement over traditional notions of marketing. Figure 1 visually illustrates this tipping point.

<<Figure 1 here>>

It could justifiably be argued that this quantitative analysis is overly descriptive and semantic. However, the hypothesis was confirmed by the qualitative analysis of abstracts from the ten leading peer-reviewed journals dedicated to arts management and cultural policy listed above. More importantly, this qualitative analysis revealed *how* and in which theoretical and practical *contexts* scholars were writing about engagement. The researchers determined that overall, between January 2007 and December 2016, 457 articles were published in these ten journals on aspects of arts marketing and audience engagement. Of these, 104 (23%) were categorized by the researchers under “audience engagement”, including 78 under the sub-category of “audience experience” and 41 under “digital engagement”.<sup>3</sup> While “marketing” was understandably prevalent as a term (considering the focus and titles of the journals), only 188 articles (41.1%) were deemed to focus on traditional aspects of arts marketing. Table 2 provides an overview of the categorization.

---

<sup>3</sup> Categories were not discreet in order to allow for articles to be categorized under more than one topic to reflect their multifarious focus. A follow-up article will provide an in-depth account of this analysis, together with a proposed taxonomy of audience engagement.

<<Table 2 here>>

Although these figures support the findings of the quantitative analysis and reconfirm the hypothesis that arts marketing scholars are increasingly focussing on the more relational aspects of arts marketing, such as consumer behaviour, audience engagement, cultural participation, cultural consumption, cultural value and public engagement, they also indicate that this trend is less marked in the leading arts marketing journals than it is overall. Considering that many of these journals support the field of arts marketing in their aims and scope, this is perhaps unsurprising; however, this finding does intimate that the evolution in the field is taking place in journals not specifically dedicated to arts marketing *per se*.

Having said this, the qualitative analysis revealed that a significant number of articles (e.g. Debenedetti *et al.*, 2009; Collin-Lachaud and Passebois, 2008) focussed on aspects of audience engagement, particularly through digital technologies, but neglected to actually deploy the term ‘engagement’ in their keywords or abstracts. Likewise, there was a notable growth in fandom research (e.g. Kerrigan and Dennis, 2011; O’Sullivan, 2007), which reflected the rise of co-creation, participation, crowdfunding and prosumption but again neglected to classify these phenomena explicitly as ‘engagement’. The increasing prevalence of the term ‘engagement’ became apparent as the analysis progressed from the late 2000s to the early 2010s, providing further evidence of the paradigm shift: all thirteen articles that included ‘engagement’ specifically in their titles were published post 2009, with nine of these being published post 2013.

Furthermore, the analysis revealed a shift away from a management-based interpretation of strategic marketing concepts such as branding towards a more relational and/or psychological approach based on interdisciplinary enquiry. For example, the 2014 special issue of *Arts Marketing: An International Journal* on branding contained one article on experiential design (Ober-Heilig *et al.*, 2014), one on brand attitude and brand attachment (Baumgarth, 2014), and one on co-creating value through brand communities (Vaux Halliday and Astafyeva, 2014). This highlights how arts marketing scholars are reconceptualizing traditional marketing concepts to

incorporate not only insights from the arts and humanities (in this case, architecture, design, psychology, aesthetics and sociology), but also the phenomenological experiences of audiences and their increasing role in (co-)creating their own satisfaction and value. Further evidence of the shift towards relational engagement was evident in the rising prevalence of articles dedicated to experiential emotions (e.g. Aurier and Guintcheva, 2015) and cultural value (e.g. Miles, 2016; Behr *et al.*, 2016).

Indeed a significant insight into the scholarly progression away from marketing was revealed by the relatively high proportion of articles (15.5%) focussing on the cultural value and social impact of the arts (see Table 2). This confirmed Fillis *et al.*'s (2015) contention that the value of artists' work is often "constructed via the intrinsic worth of their work, rather than from market influences" and that cultural value is often "personal to the viewer, shared with others [...] and co-created among the other stakeholders involved" (p. 245). This focus on the co-creation of value was observed particularly in articles published post 2010, exemplified by Reynold's (2011) paper on the museum's role as a forum for debate, Vaux Halliday & Astafyeva's (2014) study of Millennials' brand communities, and Gateau's (2014) research on the role of open licenses amongst music fan communities.

Overall, the analysis revealed significant cross-fertilisation from cultural policy studies to arts marketing, to the extent that it was challenging to classify many articles as pertaining predominantly to either field. A typical example of this disciplinary blurring would be the 123 (26.9%) of articles that focused on cultural participation, public engagement or social inclusion. This raises the question of whether cultural policy studies or even sociology might ultimately cannibalise arts marketing, or at least fight to tear it away from its traditional alliance with arts management.

It is, however, important to acknowledge the tensions and counter-arguments in this debate about the changing nature of arts marketing: the content analysis of abstracts revealed a solid core of scholars who hold the traditional marketing concept dear and argue that it is perfectly compatible with post-modern cultural consumption. A typical example of this body of work is Stephen Brown's (2015) article on the marketing of modernist painters, which draws on theories and case examples of cultural entrepreneurship to argue that "there is no reason why contemporary culture and

commerce cannot collaborate, co-operate, co-exist, coalesce” (p. 5). Perhaps predictably, the *Journal of Cultural Economics* continues to attract a predominance of submissions on pricing and traditional approaches to cultural consumption. Arts marketing is not, then, dying away altogether; it is evolving and morphing, but steadily being subsumed by notions of engagement.

## **Discussion**

The findings of the content analysis appear to confirm beyond any reasonable doubt the underlying hypothesis of this article that over the past twenty years, arts marketing scholarship has witnessed a paradigm shift from neoliberal processes of consumption towards relational and collaborative practices of engagement. Whilst the quantitative content analysis fails to highlight the reasons behind this shift, the qualitative analysis suggests that this development has been effected principally by a number of interrelated phenomena. These include: the gradual evolution of consumers’ tastes from goods to services to experiences (Pine and Gilmore, 1999); audiences’ growing cynicism towards marketing (e.g. O’Reilly and Kerrigan, 2010; Lamminman, 2004); changing notions of creativity from individual to collective (Wilson, 2010); the renewed scholarly focus on embodied and kinaesthetic modes of engagement (e.g. Reason and Reynolds, 2010; 2011; Reason, 2010; Bleeker and Germano, 2014; McKinney, 2013); the structural inequalities of arts and cultural participation (e.g. Jancovich, 2011; Evans, 2016); and audiences’ growing desire to co-produce experiences and co-create interpretation and meaning (e.g. Boorsma, 2006; Walmsley, 2013).

It is justifiable to argue, then, that the discipline traditionally referred to as ‘arts marketing’ has now entered a fourth era – one which I shall call the ‘Enrichment Period’ (2007 to date). Semantically and philosophically, this new era has once again been led by the USA, largely thanks to Conner’s (2013; 2004) seminal work on audience engagement and enrichment. This enrichment period is characterised by a renewed focus on questions of cultural value, and by a reclaiming by artists, audiences and scholars of subjective, intrinsic, co-created and aesthetic value over the predominantly economic values of the market. It marks, perhaps, an attritional victory for relational aesthetics: as Bill Sharpe (2010) comments, “[t]he value of art is precisely that it concerns itself with reflecting the experience of a particular life in its own terms, and bringing that into the infinite conversation of shared culture (p. 43).

In their movement away from traditional notions and concepts of marketing, many authors seem to be embracing Mintzberg's (2009) concept of community leadership, which demands a much more relational collaboration with close and "distant" followers (Fanelli and Misangyi, 2006; Goffman, 1959) than that enabled by the traditionally transactional marketing paradigm. For example, Thibodeau & Ruling (2015) contend that the successful non-profit arts and cultural organisations of the future will embrace a community-wide process which encapsulates internal and external stakeholders; nurtures relationships with them; and strengthens social and emotional bonds (p. 157). This process, they maintain, will facilitate the collective bridging endeavours of sociomateriality and sensemaking (ibid.). Similarly, Grönroos (2011; 1994) maintains that relationship building should *precede* marketing exchanges with consumers rather than develop *via* them. This, we might argue, is the focus of audience engagement, and its ideal outcome is audience enrichment.

At the end of her seminal article on aesthetics, ideologies and the limits of the marketing concept, Elizabeth Hirschman concludes that the "producer-centred, subjective, abstract, holistic and unique nature [of aesthetic and ideological products] makes them incrementally valuable as objects for research *because* of the difficulties involved" (1983, p. 53, emphasis in original). Hirschman goes on to claim that to "deal adequately with such products, we must grapple with the central premises of both our theories and our measures, which often may be glossed over or ignored when the focus is upon commercial, utilitarian goods" (ibid.). The arts are so fundamentally different from the utilitarian products and services of commercial industries that ultimately they challenge the traditional concept of marketing itself. In the context of the arts, marketing has become an adjunct or supporting activity to the ultimate pursuit of audience enrichment.

If we agree in the context of this new Enrichment Period that it is more appropriate to refer to the arts as an "experience" rather than a "product"; that "exchange" conveys the collaborative and mutually valuable relationships inherent to the arts experience more effectively than "price"; that "environment" is a more appropriate term than "place" to encapsulate the context, locale and reflexivity of this experience; and that "engagement" captures the more holistic and relational approach to marketing more accurately than the reductive and transactional notion of "promotion", then we must accept the need to fundamentally reconfigure and re-conceptualize the arts marketing mix. This constitutes nothing less than a

conceptual paradigm shift, and the rationale for the new concepts that comprise this paradigm is elaborated in Table 3.

<< Table 3 here >>

### **Conclusions and implications**

This article has traced the conceptual development of arts marketing and demonstrated how the term itself is rapidly becoming a misnomer for the predominantly relational concepts and activities that it now encapsulates. Scholars investigating aspects of the field traditionally referred to as arts marketing are increasingly responding to insights from the arts and humanities, and researching how modes and processes of engagement are developing deeper and more collaborative bonds between audiences, artists, arts organisations, and society more broadly. Although the strategic tactics and activities developed by arts marketing have not disappeared (and should not disappear), they are steadily being subsumed by cultural policy imperatives and by activities designed to enrich audiences' experiences and understand their socio-cultural value and impact.

This study has demonstrated that a paradigm shift has taken place in the field of arts marketing over the past two decades. The new paradigm is based on aspects of experience, exchange, environment and engagement. In order to reflect the conceptual origins of the field, I have labelled this concept the 4E model and outlined how this model has emerged organically from the influences of services and relationship marketing, with vital insights provided by relational aesthetics. This 4E model encapsulates the value-based exchange relationships that arts organisations are increasingly developing with their audiences much more accurately and appropriately than the outdated 4P model.

The implications here are of urgent significance for both scholars and practitioners: in this post-marketing era, artists and arts organisations need to prioritize the long-term relational approaches offered by audience engagement over short-term tactical activities such as segmentation and promotion, whilst educators and researchers in the academy must quickly catch up with the exemplars of audience engagement in the arts sector and reconceptualize the arts marketing paradigm itself. Content analysis has revealed that non-specialist journals are leading the way here, so the ten journals that have been traditionally distinguished as

leading in the field of arts marketing might benefit from broadening their scope and encouraging more innovative and provocative submissions. Future research might also benefit from exploring how the “appraisal theories” emanating from emotion psychology might provide further insights into this evolving paradigm, and seek to fully theorize existing practices of audience engagement and enrichment. These are perhaps the key challenges facing the emerging academic field of audience studies.

Wider afield, this paradigm shift is certainly not limited to arts and cultural marketing: commercial marketers, marketing scholars and indeed governments are increasingly looking to the arts for insights on developing richer and deeper relationships with their consumers and into designing and delivering more creative, immersive, meaningful and even transformational experiences. Although this is particularly apparent in high-end retail, fashion and luxury goods marketing, these considerations are rapidly entering the mainstream.<sup>4</sup> As in arts marketing, what is lacking is a rigorous and interdisciplinary conceptual exploration of the theories and practices of engagement, which might culminate ultimately in a reconceptualization of marketing itself.

---

<sup>4</sup> Tangible evidence of this is provided by the UK Government’s Industrial Strategy of 2017, which highlights live events as an area of strategic importance. One strand of this Strategy is entitled “Audience of the Future” and the UK Government has earmarked up to £33m to support activity in this area. A core aim of this strand is to investigate how interdisciplinary working can create “striking new experiences that are accessible to the general public [...] that will capture the world’s attention and position the UK as the global leader in immersive technologies” HM Government (2017), "Industrial Strategy White Paper: Building a Britain Fit for the Future", HM Government, London.

## References

- Alasuutari, P. (1995), *Researching Culture: Qualitative Method and Cultural Studies*, Sage, London.
- Arvidsson, A. (2009), "The Ethical Economy: Towards a Post-Capitalist Concept of Value", *Capital and Class*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 13–29.
- Aurier, P. and Guintcheva, G. (2015), "The Dynamics of Emotions in Movie Consumption: A Spectator-Centred Approach", *International Journal of Arts Management*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 5–18.
- Baumgarth, C. (2014), "'This Theatre Is a Part of Me': Contrasting Brand Attitude and Brand Attachment as Drivers of Audience Behaviour", *Arts Marketing: An International Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 1/2, pp. 87–100.
- Behr, A., Brennan, M. and Cloonan, M. (2016), "Cultural Value and Cultural Policy: Some Evidence from the World of Live Music", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 403–418.
- Belfiore, E. and Bennett, O. (2008), *The Social Impact of the Arts: An Intellectual History*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Bergadaà, M. and Nyeck, S. (1995), "Quel Marketing Pour Les Activités Artistiques : Une Analyse Qualitative Comparée Des Motivations Des Consommateurs Et Producteurs De Théâtre", *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 27–46.
- Berlyne, D.E. (1971), *Aesthetics and Psychobiology*, Appleton, New York.
- Bilton, C. (2017), *The Disappearing Product: Marketing and Markets in the Creative Industries*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Bleeker, M. and Germano, I. (2014), "Perceiving and Believing: An Enactive Approach to Spectatorship", *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 66 No., pp. 363–383.
- Boorsma, M. (2006), "A Strategic Logic for Arts Marketing: Integrating Customer Value and Artistic Objectives", *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 73–92.
- Boorsma, M. and Chiaravalloti, F. (2010), "Arts Marketing Performance: An Artistic-Mission-Led Approach to Evaluation", *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 297–317.
- Bourriaud, N. (2002), *Relational Aesthetics*, Les Presses du Réel, Dijon.
- Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D., Juric, B. and Ilic, A. (2011), "Customer Engagement: Conceptual Domain, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications for Research", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 252–271.
- Brown, S. (2015), "Brands on a Wet, Black Bough: Marketing the Masterworks of Modernism", *Arts and the Market*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 5–24.
- Colbert, F. (2007), *Marketing Culture and the Arts*, HEC Montreal, Montreal.
- Colbert, F. (2017), "A Brief History of Arts Marketing Thought in North America", *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 167–177.
- Colbert, F. and St-James, Y. (2014), "Research in Arts Marketing: Evolution and Future Directions", *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 8, pp. 566–575.
- Collin-Lachaud, I. and Passebois, J. (2008), "Do Immersive Technologies Add Value to the Museumgoing Experience? An Exploratory Study Conducted at France's Paléosite", *International Journal of Arts Management*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 60–71.
- Conner, L. (2004). Who Gets to Tell the Meaning? Building Audience Enrichment. *GIA Reader* [Online], 15.
- Conner, L. (2013), *Audience Engagement and the Role of Arts Talk in the Digital Era*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Cova, B. (1999), "From Marketing to Societing: When the Link Is More Important Than the Thing", Brownlie, D., Saren, M., Wensley, R. & Whittington, R. (Eds.), *Rethinking Marketing: Towards Critical Marketing Accountings*. Sage, London, pp. 64–83.
- Cova, B. and Cova, V. (2009), "Faces of the New Consumer: A Genesis of Consumer Governmentality", *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 81–99.

- Debenedetti, S., Caro, F. and Krebs, A. (2009), "'I'd Rather Play Than Look at Statues': The Experiences of Children with Art Works and Interactive Devices at an Art Exhibition ", *International Journal of Arts Management*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 46–58.
- Dennis, N., Larsen, G. and Macaulay, M. (2011), "Terraforming Arts Marketing", *Arts Marketing: An International Journal* Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 5–10.
- Diggle, K. (1994), *Arts Marketing*, Rhinegold, London.
- Evans, G. (2016), "Participation and Provision in Arts and Culture: Bridging the Divide", *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 2–20.
- Fanelli, A. and Misangyi, V.F. (2006), "Bringing out Charisma: Ceo Charisma and External Stakeholders", *Academy of Management Review* Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 1049–1061.
- Fillis, I. (2011), "The Evolution and Development of Arts Marketing Research", *Arts Marketing: An International Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 11–25.
- Fillis, I., Lee, B. and Fraser, I. (2015), "Measuring the Cultural Value of the Royal Scottish Academy New Contemporaries Exhibition as a Platform for Emerging Artists ", *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 245–255.
- Gateau (2014), "The Role of Open Licences and Free Music in Value Co-Creation: The Case of Misteur Valaire ", *International Journal of Arts Management*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 49–59.
- Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Doubleday Anchor Books, New York.
- Grönroos, C. (1994), "From Marketing Mix to Relationship Marketing", *Management Decision*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 4–20.
- Grönroos, C. (2011), "Value Co-Creation in Service Logic: A Critical Analysis", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 279–301.
- Hirschman, E.C. (1983), "Aesthetics, Ideologies and the Limits of the Marketing Concept", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 45–55.
- Hirschman, E.C. and Holbrook, M.B. (1982), "Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts, Methods and Propositions", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 92–101.
- HM Government (2017), "Industrial Strategy White Paper: Building a Britain Fit for the Future", HM Government, London.
- Jancovich, L. (2011), "Great Art for Everyone? Engagement and Participation Policy in the Arts", *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 20 No. 3–4, pp. 271–279.
- Kerrigan, F. and Dennis, N. (2011), "The Secret Jazz Fan: A Tale of Sublimation Featuring Film and Music", *Arts Marketing: An International Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 56–69
- Kotler, P. and Armstrong, G. (2010), *Principles of Marketing*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, N.J.
- Krippendorff, K. (2011), "Agreement and Information in the Reliability of Coding", *Communication Methods and Measures*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 93–112.
- Lamminman, M.S.J. (2004), "Advertising and Millennials", *Young Consumers*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 62–73.
- Levy, S.J. and Kotler, P. (1969), "Beyond Marketing: The Furthering Concept", *California Management Review*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 67–73.
- Lovelock, C. and Gummesson, E. (2004), "Whither Services Marketing? In Search of a New Paradigm and Fresh Perspectives", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 20–41.
- McIntyre, A. (2017). "Sensational Segmentation", available at: <https://soundcloud.com/capacity-interactive/ci-to-eye-sensational-segmentation-andrew-mcintyre> [accessed 26 January].
- McKinney, J. (2013), "Scenography, Spectacle and the Body of the Spectator", *Performance Research*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 63–74.
- Miles, A. (2016), "Telling Tales of Participation: Exploring the Interplay of Time and Territory in Cultural Boundary Work Using Participation Narratives", *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 182–193
- Mintzberg (2009), *Managing*, Berrett-Kohler, San Francisco.
- O'Reilly, D. (2011), "Mapping the Arts Marketing Literature", *Arts Marketing: An International Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 26–38.
- O'Reilly, D. and Kerrigan, F. (2010), *Marketing the Arts: A Fresh Approach*, Routledge, London.
- O'Sullivan, T. (2007), "Sounding Boards: Performing Arts Organizations and the Internet Forum ", *International Journal of Arts Management*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 65–77.

- Ober-Heilig, N., Bekmeier-Feuerhahn, S. and Sikkenga, J. (2014), "Enhancing Museum Brands with Experiential Design to Attract Low-Involvement Visitors ", *Arts Marketing: An International Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 1/2, pp. 67–86.
- Pine, B.J. and Gilmore, J.H. (1999), *The Experience Economy: Work Is Theatre and Every Business a Stage*, Harvard Business School, Boston.
- Pulh, M. and Mencarelli, R. (2015), "Web 2.0: Is the Museum–Visitor Relationship Being Redefined?", *International Journal of Arts Management*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 43–51.
- Radbourne, J. (2013), "Converging with Audiences", Radbourne, J., Glow, H. & Johanson, K. (Eds.), *The Audience Experience: A Critical Analysis of Audiences in the Performing Arts*. Intellect, Bristol, pp. 143–158.
- Reason, M. (2010), "Asking the Audience: Audience Research and the Experience of Theatre", *About Performance* Vol. No. 10, pp. 15–34.
- Reason, M. and Reynolds, D. (2010), "Kinesthesia, Empathy, and Related Pleasures: An Inquiry into Audience Experiences of Watching Dance", *Dance Research Journal*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 49–75.
- Rentschler, R. (1998), "Museum and Performing Arts Marketing: A Climate of Change", *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 83–96.
- Rentschler, R. (2002), "Museum and Performing Arts Marketing: The Age of Discovery ", *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 7–14.
- Reynolds, D. and Reason, M. (Eds.) (2011) *Kinesthetic Empathy in Creative and Cultural Practices*, Bristol: Intellect.
- Reynolds, R. (2011), "Reinventing the Forum: Multiple Perspectives, Information Transmission and New Technology", *Museum Management and Curatorship*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 45–62.
- Sashi, C.M. (2012), "Customer Engagement, Buyer-Seller Relationships, and Social Media", *Management Decision*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 253–272.
- Schaeffer, J.-M. (1998), "Experiencing Artworks", Schaeffer, J.-M. (Ed.) *Think Art: Theory and Practice in the Art of Today*. Witte de With, Rotterdam pp. 39–53.
- Seale, C. (2012), *Researching Society and Culture*, Sage, London.
- Shapiro, B.P. (1973), "Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 51 No. 5, pp. 123–132.
- Sharpe, B. (2010), *Economies of Life: Patterns of Health and Wealth*, Triarchy Press, Axminster.
- Shusterman, R. (2001), "Pragmatism: Dewey", Gaut, B. & Lopes, D. M. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. Routledge, London; New York, pp. 97–106.
- Sigurjonsson, N. (2010), "Orchestra Audience Development and the Aesthetics of “Customer Comfort”", *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 266–278
- Silvia, P.J. (2005), "Emotional Responses to Art: From Collation and Arousal to Cognition and Emotion", *Review of General Psychology*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 342–357.
- Simon, N. (2010), *The Participatory Museum*, Museum 2.0, Santa Cruz.
- Thibodeau, B.D. and Ruling, C.-C. (2015), "Nonprofit Organizations, Community, and Shared Urgency: Lessons from the Arts and Culture Sector", *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 156–177.
- Varbanova, L. (2013), *Strategic Management in the Arts* Routledge, New York; Oxon.
- Vaux Halliday, S. and Astafyeva, A. (2014), "Millennial Cultural Consumers: Co-Creating Value through Brand Communities ", *Arts Marketing: An international journal*, Vol. 4 No. 1/2, pp. 119–135.
- Walmsley, B. (2011), "Why People Go to the Theatre: A Qualitative Study of Audience Motivation", *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 335–351.
- Walmsley, B. (2013), "Co-Creating Theatre: Authentic Engagement or Inter-Legitimation?", *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 108–118.
- Walmsley, B. (2018), "Deep Hanging out in the Arts: An Anthropological Approach to Capturing Cultural Value", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 227–291.
- Welsh, E. (2002). Dealing with Data: Using Nvivo in the Qualitative Data Analysis Process. *Qualitative Social Research* [Online], 3. Available from: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/865>.

Wilson, N. (2010), "Social Creativity: Re-Qualifying the Creative Economy", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 367–381.