
Managing Feelings

*Raising Films' Testimonials and the Impact of
Caring Responsibilities on the Emotional
Well-being of Mothers Who Work in
the UK Film and Television Sector*

Susan Berridge

This chapter explores the impact of caring responsibilities on the emotional well-being of mothers who work in the UK film and television industries. Childcare responsibilities are often identified as a significant reason behind gender imbalances in the sector, with a 2010 Skillset report concluding that many women aged thirty-five and older were leaving the media industries due to difficulties reconciling work with family life.¹ Although this chapter argues that care is not essentially gendered, women remain disproportionately affected by caring responsibilities.² In recent years, there has been a growing body of feminist scholarship on gender inequalities in the film and television industries, with care often identified as a key issue.³ Despite this awareness of the significant impact that caring responsibilities have on women's experiences of creative work, several feminist scholars have argued that challenges posed by childcare, along with wider gender inequalities, remain silenced in competitive neoliberal and postfeminist working cultures that privilege self-regulation above all else.⁴ In 2016 three key industry reports and initiatives emerged that challenged this silencing and explored these inequalities in more depth, looking at various gendered barriers to access.⁵ The official discourses of care that have emerged in this context

are significant in highlighting the scale of the issue and the number of parents and carers impacted. However, the focus of these reports, mirroring wider scholarship on this issue, has predominantly been on practical challenges posed by caring responsibilities. In comparison, there has been little research into how these challenges are experienced and felt by women on an emotional level.

This chapter aims to expand upon official discourses of care by examining also the unofficial discourses that emerge in online spaces, specifically the testimonials of parents who work in the film and television industries collected and published on the website of activist organization Raising Films. Raising Films was founded in 2015 by independent scholar So Mayer, producers Nicky Bentham and Jessica Levick, writer Line Langebek, and director Hope Dickson Leach to explore the challenges of balancing work in the film and television industries with caring responsibilities.⁶ I argue that these testimonials offer different and valuable insights into the challenges women face, moving beyond a focus on practicalities to highlight the significant detrimental impact that negotiations involving work/life balance can have on women's emotional well-being. The findings presented here expose just what is at stake when women are expected to suppress or deny their lived—and felt—experiences of balancing caring responsibilities with creative work. In turn, they point to the value and necessity of centering the emotional dimensions of these experiences in order to effectively challenge the sector's normative masculine working cultures that produce and reinforce wider gender inequalities in the first place.

Scholarship on Creative Working Cultures and Inequalities

Traditionally, there has been a lack of scholarship on the experiential reality of the work lives of creative workers in favor of a focus on the more celebratory aspects of this labor. However, in recent decades, there has been a shift toward challenging the notion of the wider cultural industries as “cool, creative and egalitarian,” with many scholars seeking to expose the more punishing nature of contemporary creative working cultures and the potentially poor quality of work life.⁷ Mark Banks calls for more attention to be paid to contemporary labor conditions, noting that the economic imperatives underpinning the creative industries have resulted in cultural workers' “material conditions of existence, and their meaningful lives and

ambitions becoming increasingly undermined.”⁸ Similarly, in a U.S. context, Andrew Ross argues that while there are many statistics about the cultural industries from a policy perspective, “by contrast, there has been precious little attention to the quality of work life with which creative livelihoods are associated. Job gratification, for creatives, has always come at a heavy sacrificial cost.”⁹ The tension between pleasure and pain in creative work has been interrogated by a number of creative labor scholars who seek to understand the reasons given by cultural workers for continuing to work in conditions that potentially offer such a poor work/life balance.¹⁰

David Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker interrogate this tension further in their research on the quality of working life in three cultural industries: independent television production, magazine publishing, and music. They are centrally concerned with the relationship of work to well-being, defined as “whether the relationships between the different parts of our selves operate in a healthy way, whether they allow us to flourish over time.” They argue that while celebrations of creative labor frequently ignore negative aspects of this work, even critical accounts often fail “to scrutinise the normative implications of their critiques.” This absence of scrutiny, in turn, results in a lack of clarity regarding how to make effective interventions into these working cultures. To address this lack, they devise models of good and bad work. Good work is characterized by “good wages, working hours, high levels of safety, autonomy, interest, involvement, sociality, self-esteem, self-realisation, work-life balance, security.” Bad work, in contrast, is marked by “poor wages, working hours and levels of safety, powerlessness, boredom, isolation, low self-esteem and shame, frustrated development, overwork, risk.”¹¹ The creative industries are marked by ambivalence: on the one hand, they provide workers with high levels of self-fulfillment, but on the other hand, the working cultures can be highly punishing, falling into the category of “bad work.” For example, the increasing deregulation and casualization of the film and television industries has led to precarious working conditions and, in turn, greater degrees of risk being displaced onto individual workers. In a competitive climate, long hours, feast/famine patterns of work, an eradication of work/life boundaries, and financial insecurity are common.

Hesmondhalgh and Baker, motivated by a commitment to “equality, social justice, well-being and democratization of creativity,” recognize the way in which other identities shape experiences of the quality of working life.¹² However, they are not centrally concerned with the impact of gender

or caring responsibilities on these experiences. Despite this, many of the aspects of “bad work” that they outline have been similarly identified by feminist scholars as key factors in, as well as outcomes of, the persistence of gendered inequalities in the film and television industries and the wider creative sector.¹³ For example, the notion of “powerlessness” is reflected strongly in Leung Wing-Fai et al.’s interviews with women working in the UK film and television industries, who commonly expressed that they felt a profound lack of choice in terms of their decisions about returning to work after having children.¹⁴ “Frustrated development” is evident in Natalie Wreyford’s research into the gendered impact of informal recruitment practices on screenwriters; many women with caring responsibilities are unable to progress in their careers due to not being able to attend the necessary evening and weekend networking events.¹⁵ High levels of personal “risk” are also identified by several feminist scholars as endemic in a predominantly freelance working culture, where there are few workplace benefits and no maternity pay.¹⁶ As Rosalind Gill identifies, inequalities are produced by the working cultures themselves.¹⁷

Official Discourses on Care in the UK Film and TV Industries

In 2016 three key industry reports were published that sought to explore further the relationship between these working cultures and broader inequalities to uncover precisely what barriers exist: Creative Scotland’s *Screen Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion* report, the Directors UK *Cut out of the Picture* report, and Raising Films’ *Making It Possible* report. A concern with gender inequalities is key to each report, but only that of Raising Films places a consideration of caring responsibilities at the center. All three reports draw on quantitative methodologies to expose the scale of inequalities in the sector, documenting the numbers and percentages of workers impacted by particular barriers. In doing so, they have proved vital in challenging common myths that these industries are egalitarian.

Cut out of the Picture focuses exclusively on gender inequalities among directors in the UK film industry. It argues that the sector’s “permanent short-termism” precludes long-term thinking, planning, and positive HR practices, “best exemplified by the un-family-friendly nature of the industry.”¹⁸ Because recruitment occurs in very tight time frames, the tendency is to hire people who are already known. As the report explains, “The sporadic

employment, long hours, and unpredictable and constantly changing nature of the work make it nearly impossible to effectively progress in the industry whilst also being the primary care-giver in a family, a role which is disproportionately held by women.¹⁹

Creative Scotland's *Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion* report, published in May 2016, more directly focuses on care. This report, based on a survey of over five hundred people working in the Scottish screen industries, addresses wider barriers to equality, inclusion, and diversity, including geography, socioeconomic status, and ability. It includes a section devoted to gender and parental responsibilities, highlighting that 39 percent of women cited gender as a key barrier to participation in the screen industries (compared with just 7 percent of men). Further, women with children were 75 percent more likely to cite parental responsibilities as a barrier to work than their male counterparts, despite more men identifying as parents across the survey as a whole.²⁰

This section on parenting is followed by one on gender and work/life balance, exclusively associating this balance with childcare.²¹ As one open response explains, "The fact remains that from commissioning downward, this remains a fatally family-unfriendly business. Unless you are willing to have your entire life consumed by work, a meaningful career is hard to maintain."²² Another response similarly comments on the "enormous impact" that the sector's working cultures have on the family (and wider social) lives of employees, "particularly those with children or caring responsibilities."²³ In the open responses, respondents identify specific challenges in reconciling caring responsibilities with career progression, including "limited parental leave" and long, erratic hours of work that make childcare difficult to schedule. As the report notes, "Women are still perceived culturally as the primary child-carers," with several respondents noting the commonality of women with children leaving the industry due to the lack of provision for and understanding of new parents.²⁴

These are important and urgent issues yet the brevity of the open responses means that the emphasis remains on practical challenges rather than on how these barriers might be felt or experienced by women, and how they might impact their emotional well-being. The question of well-being is addressed later in the report in a separate section unrelated to gender, the only section where the psychological and emotional impact of the film and television sector's working cultures is raised. Many of the open responses

here refer to the effects of pressurized working conditions on mental health and well-being.²⁵ One respondent recalls having had “serious concerns about the health and safety” of colleagues due to long, unpredictable working hours. A five-day working week is identified by another as having a positive impact upon the mental health of crew members. However, again these responses are relatively brief and broad, giving little insight into the complexities of the experiences of working in the sector. Further, despite long hours being similarly identified as a key challenge in the section on parental responsibilities, no connections are drawn. Because well-being is addressed in a separate section, the specific gendered dimensions of the impact of caring responsibilities on well-being remain invisible.

Raising Films’ *Making It Possible*, based on an online survey of 640 film and television practitioners across the United Kingdom, explores various barriers that caring responsibilities pose for career development and retention. It found that 79 percent of respondents view caring responsibilities as having a negative impact on their role in the industry, with women one and a half times more likely than men to report this.²⁶ The report focuses in particular on practical barriers to parents and carers posed by the industries’ working cultures, such as location shooting, long hours, financial insecurity, lack of industry infrastructure, and lack of long-term stable employment.²⁷ Indeed, 63 percent of respondents identified as freelance. The report also identifies key issues around discrimination, such as being asked at interviews about childcare arrangements, having contracts pulled when pregnant, and ceasing to get work after disclosing caring responsibilities.

While the focus is on pragmatic challenges posed by care, the report includes short quotes from open responses that speak to the way in which these challenges are felt by practitioners. A freelance female discloses, “I am sinking under the stress of juggling childcare,” adding that “there is no choice” not to work long hours and weekends.²⁸ The term *frustration* is used by several other respondents to describe various limitations, such as the lack of understanding in the industry around issues of care, the rarity of acting roles for pregnant women, and the broader impact of exclusion.²⁹ In the section “Further Responses” toward the end of the report, a female freelancer notes, “As a BAME [Black, Asian, and minority ethnic] female parent in this industry, I feel like I’m drowning sometimes.”³⁰

These brief snapshots of the emotional challenges of negotiating caring responsibilities and work in the industries provide further important

insights into how practical limitations are felt and experienced by women working in the sector. I turn now to the testimonials of mothers gathered and published on Raising Films' website to gain a deeper understanding of the emotional challenges of balancing caring responsibilities with a career in film and television.

Unofficial Discourses of Care in Raising Films' Testimonials

Raising Films' website includes a section entitled "Stories" that typically features testimonials written by industry practitioners on their experiences of negotiating a balance between caring responsibilities and their careers.³¹ At the time of writing, there are sixty testimonials published on the site, spanning an almost three-year period from May 2015 to March 2018. The majority of these testimonials are written by mothers (forty-five), with a smaller number written by fathers (six) or by childfree practitioners who were raised by parents who worked in the creative sector (three). Three are jointly written by co-parents, and one by two mothers who work together. An additional two are written by family-friendly companies. The majority of contributors are freelancers based in the United Kingdom. These testimonials are gathered by Raising Films or solicited from practitioners at events the group runs. Raising Films primarily view its site as a platform for these accounts, and therefore, any editing of the testimonials is done with a very light touch. There are no specific guidelines on tone and content, although potential questions to address are identified. In a context in which the challenges of care are often silenced, it is notable that the majority of authors provide names and often accompanying images. I focus exclusively in this chapter on mothers' accounts, the majority of the testimonials.

The testimonials offer rare and valuable insights into lived experiences. They are typically addressed to other practitioners (and often implicitly other mothers), and as such they are commonly written with humor and warmth, enhancing their relatability.³² There is frequently a slight uneasiness about seeming to complain. For example, Stevie Lee, a development producer and script editor, notes after outlining some of the challenges posed by care, "Sorry this sounds very woe-is-me! When actually I feel lucky every day to have my kids and, like many of the people who have written testimonials for the site, I know that they have brought me bags of pragmatism and

common sense and a much readier sense of humour—all of which informs my work in a really positive way.” Lee’s unease is reflective of the “antipathy to whinging” that Leung Wing-Fai et al. identify as a key feature of creative industries, which expect workers to suppress challenges around care in favor of a can-do entrepreneurial mindset.³³

A common argument in creative labor scholarship is that creative workers typically accept their working conditions as “unremarkable,” seeing changes in their work cultures as “the new normal.”³⁴ Further, several scholars have argued that passionate engagement with creative work often makes for a conducive context for the justification of self-exploitation or exploitation by others.³⁵ Reflecting this notion of creative labor as “passionate work,” many of the women begin their testimonials by stating their deep love of their jobs, frequently mentioning how “lucky” they are to be able to work in a sector they feel invested in.³⁶ However, rather than uncritically accepting their working cultures, the writers are often highly self-reflexive, open, and critical about the difficulties of negotiating the industries’ intense and unrelenting laboring conditions. For example, many of the mothers refer to frustrations, feeling like their work is a hobby due to the lack of adequate respect and payment.

Like the official discourses of care in the industry reports and initiatives mentioned above, the testimonials frequently draw attention to the practical challenges emerging from the incompatibility of caring responsibilities with the industries’ intense working cultures. For example, Deborah Sathe comments on the lack of job security, while several other mothers mention the difficulties of scheduling regular childcare when hours are long and erratic, and finances are irregular. Significantly, the testimonials also provide an insight into how these practical challenges are experienced and felt. Frustration is one of the most common emotions expressed. An anonymous mother notes that the common expectation that people will work for free in order to gain a commission is “difficult and frustrating,” adding that while she would have accepted this in the past, “now that I’m paying out a fortune each month for childcare, I just can’t be hanging around waiting 6 months to be paid a meagre amount or not paid at all.” Fear is another commonly expressed emotion, often related to financial insecurity and what this means for accessing regular and reliable childcare. Freelance film editor and screenwriter Olivia Hetreed describes it as “scary” to schedule expensive childcare without the security of regular work.

Fear and anxiety around the potential impact of caring responsibilities on women's careers are evident even before pregnancy. Producer Nicky Bentham explains, "I was terrified of everything that lay ahead of me and although I had a really strong desire to forge ahead in my career, I was pretty sure that the best advice would be to bow out for a bit." Alexis Strum, actor and screenwriter, describes being "terrified, literally terrified about how motherhood would affect my productivity," adding, "How sad is that?" Laura Scrivano similarly reveals, "When I found out I was pregnant, I was terrified that my career was over." This fear resonates with Gill's argument around new laboring subjectivities and the way in which "power and compulsion operate psychosocially, through a remade worker subjectivity that is . . . profoundly anxious, and fearful of being displaced."³⁷

Anxieties around displacement due to the competitive nature of the sector manifest again in an explicit frustration caused by the apparent lack of choice in women's decisions regarding work and childcare. Assistant director Mel Heseltine writes, "I find it so frustrating that there isn't a balance to have their career and be a Mum. What if I were to call one morning and say I couldn't come in as one of my boys wasn't well? I can't imagine being employed again and word would soon get out that I was unreliable and uncommitted." Another woman, who left the industries after having children, notes her frustration at not being able to find a way to reconcile her career with caring responsibilities, despite having invested several years in the sector before having children. Lee similarly mentions feeling frustrated by having to work in the evenings when her children are asleep in order to accommodate caring responsibilities.

The industries' expectation that workers should be committed to their job above all else results in a relentless "always on" culture. As MP, writer, and actor Tracy Brabin argues, "There are never *any* concessions that you might have family commitments when you get notes on a Friday afternoon for a Monday morning delivery." This culture is reflected in a sense of temporal urgency in the testimonials—it is difficult for mothers to fully live in the present due to always needing to look ahead to find the next job, but the future is also a space of fear and uncertainty. In their study of conceptualizations of the future by people on precarious contracts, Barbara Read and Carole Leathwood note that "the effects of precarisation have a strong temporal element," which manifests in a sense of "being 'stuck' in the present."³⁸ They draw on Carmen Leccardi's notion of "presentification," defined

as a “reduction of ability to plan for the future in any confident sense.”³⁹ This inability to plan ahead comes through strongly in the testimonials, with many women speaking of finding it difficult to schedule family holidays even in the short term for fear of missing out on potential work. There is an inherent tension here: working conditions leave women stuck in the present on a practical level, but nevertheless they are always looking to the future on a more affective level. A number of testimonies end with reflections on the future and a longing for a time when life will be more stable and less pressurized, usually in relation to young children starting school and childcare becoming cheaper and potentially less difficult to manage. For example, producer/director Naomi Wright concludes, “I try to be patient and remember that my children are only small for a very short time. I am hoping to store up all the inspiration that life brings now and see it flower in the future. The near future, I hope.”

Hesmondhalgh and Baker argue that, in the creative industries, “the lure of self-realisation brings about an over-identification of the self with work.”⁴⁰ The result of this intimate connection, combined with the industries’ relentless working cultures, is articulated by many women as creating a profound rupture in their identity once caring responsibilities are added in. Several of the testimonials make a clear distinction between their work life before and after having children, noting that the advent of caring responsibilities resulted in a loss of their former identity. Actress, writer, and activist Sarah Solemani questions, “Why must I die because I have given her life?” Writer Joy Wilkinson similarly articulates a loss of identity: “With each kid, it seemed to take the first two years to get through the firefighting stage and find time to really get myself back in focus again.” Kate Hardie notes that “so much of this is about me trying to juggle, feeling guilty, losing myself, unsure if I wanted to be a good mum or have a successful career, and nearly always feeling I was failing at both.” Similarly, Pippa Best recalls, “My career had provided both my sense of identity and my self-worth and now I had neither. . . . I had absolutely no idea who I was anymore. The only thing I was sure of was that I was a failure.” The central conflict for women—expected to be wholly committed to work above all else, but also disproportionately responsible for caring responsibilities—results in them being pulled in two different directions, with a highly detrimental impact on their well-being.

This identity split is further reinforced by the way in which the industry often expects women to suppress or silence the emotional and practical

challenges of care. In the neoliberal climate, the ideal cultural worker is characterized as vigilant, self-regulating, individualistic, flexible, passionate, driven to perfection, entrepreneurial, autonomous, and possessed of a “can-do” attitude—characteristics that are seen to have strong economic value.⁴¹ Feminist scholars have acknowledged the paradox in the kind of skills valued by contemporary neoliberal working cultures that are typically feminine—for example, the ability to multitask and be adaptable—and the way that these same cultures create and reinforce barriers for women.⁴² The firm emphasis on individual resilience leaves little room to critique the quality of work life or to raise challenges of caring responsibilities.

Notably, however, rather than internalize the challenges posed by balancing caring responsibilities with creative work as their own personal problems, women frequently do draw attention to and critique the way in which the film and television industries expect them to deny or suppress these difficulties. Some mothers reflect back on this previously internalized denial, now with the benefit of hindsight and a more critical perspective. Scrivano, for example, speaks of having been determined to “buck the trend” of women whose careers dry up after having children, adding, “I was still on set at 38 weeks pregnant. I was going to be a working-mama-director and it would all be fine.” She then goes on to detail the challenging realities of complications in the late stages of pregnancy, childbirth, issues with feeding, and exhaustion. Becca Ellson, development producer and script editor, recalls being in denial that her life had changed “rather profoundly” after having a child: “I had it all. Except for my sanity.”

This notion of the denial resonates with Arlie Russell Hochschild’s conception of care as emotional labor in her influential work *The Managed Heart*. In her analysis of U.S. flight attendants in the 1980s, Hochschild defined emotional labor as “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display.”⁴³ There is a parallel here with the way in which the film and television industries expect certain feelings or emotions to be managed by workers, and further, the way in which these expectations then become internalized by workers themselves. Cinematographer Laura Bellingham recounts feeling guarded when a former colleague asked after her children, explaining, “My daughter appears to have fallen in with the unmentionables: pregnancy, children and childcare, motherhood, a healthy romantic partnership . . . in fact any passion or commitment that could be perceived as preceding your passion and commitment to the job

at hand. It seems someone would have us believe that in order to excel in this industry you need to keep these parts of your life quiet, if they are to be indulged at all.”

The mothers’ testimonials often argue instead for the benefits of bringing emotion *to* work in terms of enhancing creativity. Lorna Martin, for example, argues that “being a mother opens up a range of emotional experiences that I couldn’t have imagined and that are invaluable for writing drama or comedy.” Similarly, Kerry Fox notes, “I found acting an awful lot easier as a mother, because I had more emotional range,” adding that she also required fewer takes and had more self-confidence in her own ability. Scrivano also describes an enhanced ability to “access deep emotions” after having a child. All three, then, challenge the idea that suppressing or denying motherhood on set is necessary for producing strong creative work.

Both Kate Hardie and Sunshine Jackson identify writer/director Joey Soloway as being particularly inspirational in recognizing the value of emotion on set. Hardie argues, “For the most part women are told if they want to be working in the film industry they must be really strong and not lose their tempers or cry at work. They need to do everything they can to prove wrong the cliched idea that women are too emotional and cannot separate their feelings from their day jobs.” These gendered stereotypes set all women—not just those who have caring responsibilities—up for a fall. Hardie continues, “The industry is not a huge forgiver of emotions at work, however intermittent or, in fact, justified,” arguing in line with Soloway that we should instead celebrate displays of emotion at work as beneficial for enabling emotionally complex creative outputs. Jackson echoes this admiration for Soloway, highlighting that Soloway’s “daily emotional check-in” with their on-set crew has “enormous” implications: “imagine a creative workplace where you can bring your whole self? Where it is explicitly encouraged that you share what is going on for you outside of the narrow confines of the workplace.”

Conclusion

The testimonials reveal the significant impact that caring responsibilities have on the emotional well-being of women working in the film and television industries, a sector that has intense working cultures and expects women to suppress the challenges of caring responsibilities in favor of presenting a neoliberal resilient and can-do attitude. The women’s experiences

indicate that in order to create a more egalitarian and inclusive sector for all parents—both mothers and fathers—one where their well-being can flourish, the working cultures need to change. We need collective action. I share Angela McRobbie’s call for the reclamation of the term “welfare-in-work.”⁴⁴ She argues that “being expected to work without workplace entitlements severs a connection with past generations who not only had such protection (in the form of sick pay, pensions, maternity leave etc.) but also fought hard to get them.”⁴⁵ She continues that it is difficult to conceive of such entitlements being reinstated due to the intense struggle it took to win them in the first place.

Over the past few years, important work has been undertaken to challenge the traditional silencing around the difficulties of reconciling caring responsibilities with normative working cultures in the film and television industries and the way in which these challenges disproportionately impact women. However, the focus has predominantly been on the practical rather than emotional challenges or how these challenges make primary caregivers who work in the industry—predominantly women—feel. If we overlook the emotional dimensions of these issues, any potential solutions to addressing barriers posed by caring responsibilities will only ever be partial. We need to take a holistic approach to understanding the issue. Examining the testimonials gathered and published on the Raising Films website offers a way to begin to think about this, providing rare and valuable insights into the experiential realities of balancing caring responsibilities with work in the sector.

Notes

- 1 Creative Skillset, “Women in the Creative Media Industries,” *ScreenSkills*, September 2010, www.screenskills.com/media/1507/women_in_the_creative_media_industries_report_-_sept_2010.pdf.
- 2 Creative Scotland, *Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion in the Scottish Screen Sector: A Report on the Findings of the Screen Equality Survey by Creative Scotland* (Edinburgh: Creative Scotland, 2016), www.creativescotland.com/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/35020/ScreenEqualitiesSurveyMay2016.pdf; Raising Films, “*Making It Possible: Voices of Parents & Carers in the UK Film and TV Industry*” (London and Edinburgh: Raising Films, 2016), www.raisingfilms.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Making-It-Possible-Full-Report-Results.pdf.

- 3 Natalie Wreyford, "Birds of a Feather: Informal Recruitment Practices and Gendered Outcomes for Screenwriting Work in the UK Film Industry," *Sociological Review* 63, no. 1 (2015): 84–96; Tamsyn Dent, "Feeling Devalued: The Creative Industries, Motherhood, Gender and Class Inequality" (PhD diss., Bournemouth University, 2016), eprints .bournemouth.ac.uk/29424/1/DENT%2C%20Tamsyn_Ph.D._2017.pdf; Leung Wing-Fai, Rosalind Gill, and Keith Randle, "Getting In, Getting On, Getting Out? Women as Career Scramblers in the UK Film and Television Industries," *Sociological Review* 63, no. 1 (2015): 50–65; Anne O'Brien, "Producing Television and Reproducing Gender," *Television and New Media* 16, no. 3 (2015): 259–74.
- 4 Gill, "Unspeakable Inequalities: Postfeminism, Entrepreneurial Subjectivity and the Repudiation of Sexism among Cultural Workers," *Social Politics* 21, no. 4 (2014): 509–28; Wing-Fai, Gill, and Randle, "Getting In, Getting On, Getting Out?"
- 5 Creative Scotland, *Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion*; Raising Films, *Making It Possible*; Stephen Follows and Alexis Kreager with Eleanor Gomes, *Cut out of the Picture: A Study of Gender Inequality amongst Film Directors in the UK Film Industry*, *Directors UK*, 2016, <https://d3gujhbyl1boep.cloudfront.net/uploads%2F1462302197658-3hv8831pb1bagm48-b4e5c367ebd7882e3502f05bc451aea6%2FDirectors+UK+PRESS+PACK+-+Cut+Out+of+The+Picture+-+Research+Report+%5B2016%5D.pdf>.
- 6 See Raising Films Research Collective's chapter 1 in this volume.
- 7 Gill, "Cool, Creative and Egalitarian? Exploring Gender in Project-Based New Media Work in Europe," *Information, Communication and Society* 5, no. 1 (2002): 70–89.
- 8 Mark Banks, "Moral Economy and Cultural Work," *Sociology* 40, no. 3 (2006): 40.
- 9 Andrew Ross, *Nice Work if You Can Get It: Life and Labor in Precarious Times* (New York: NYU Press, 2009), 18.
- 10 Angela McRobbie, "Clubs to Companies: Notes on the Decline of Political Culture in the Speeded Up Creative Worlds," *Cultural Studies* 16, no. 4 (2002): 516–31; David Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker, *Creative Labour: Media Work in Three Cultural Industries* (London: Routledge, 2011); David Lee, *Independent Television Production in the UK: From Cottage Industry to Big Business*. (Oxford: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).
- 11 Hesmondhalgh and Baker, *Creative Labour*, 30, 7–8, 39, 2.

- 12 Hesmondhalgh and Baker, *Creative Labour*, 2.
- 13 Wreyford, "Birds of a Feather"; Wreyford, *Gender Inequality in Screenwriting Work* (Oxford: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); Gill, "Unspeakable Inequalities"; Wing-Fai, Gill, and Randle, "Getting In, Getting On, Getting Out?"
- 14 Wing-Fai, Gill, and Randle, "Getting In, Getting On, Getting Out?"
- 15 Wreyford, "Birds of a Feather."
- 16 George Morgan and Pariece Nelligan, "Labile Labour—Gender, Flexibility and Creative Work," *Sociological Review* 63, no. 1 (2015): 66–83; Wreyford, "Birds of a Feather."
- 17 Gill, "Unspeakable Inequalities," 514.
- 18 Follows, Kreager, and Gomes, *Cut out of the Picture*, 9.
- 19 Follows, Kreager, and Gomes, *Cut out of the Picture*, 9.
- 20 Creative Scotland, *Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion*, 21.
- 21 Creative Scotland, *Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion*, 18–19.
- 22 Creative Scotland, *Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion*, 19.
- 23 Creative Scotland, *Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion*, 19.
- 24 Creative Scotland, *Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion*, 19.
- 25 Creative Scotland, *Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion*, 21.
- 26 Raising Films, *Making It Possible*, 9.
- 27 Raising Films, *Making It Possible*, 11.
- 28 Raising Films, *Making It Possible*, 9.
- 29 Raising Films, *Making It Possible*, 11.
- 30 Raising Films, *Making It Possible*, 18.
- 31 See www.raisingfilms.com/stories/.
- 32 Akane Kanai, "On Not Taking the Self Seriously: Resilience, Relatability, and Humour in Young Women's Tumblr Blogs," *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 22, no. 1 (2019): 60–77.
- 33 Wing-Fai, Gill, and Randle, "Getting In, Getting On, Getting Out?" 50–51.
- 34 Susan Luckman and Stephanie Taylor, *The New Normal of Working Lives: Critical Studies in Contemporary Work and Employment* (Oxford: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 5.
- 35 O'Brien, "Producing Television"; David Lee, "The Ethics of Insecurity: Risk, Individualization and Value in British Independent Television Production," *Television and New Media* 13, no. 6 (2012): 480–97.
- 36 McRobbie, *Be Creative: Making a Living in the New Culture Industries*. (Cambridge: Polity, 2016).

- 37 Gill, "Unspeakable Inequalities," 516.
- 38 Barbara Read and Carole Leathwood, "Tomorrow's a Mystery: Constructions of the Future and 'Un/Becoming' amongst 'Early' and 'Late' Career Academics," *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 27, no. 4 (2018): 8–9.
- 39 Read and Leathwood, "Tomorrow's a Mystery," 8.
- 40 Hesmondhalgh and Baker, *Creative Labour*, 19–20.
- 41 Banks, "Moral Economy"; Ross, *Nice Work*; Lee, "The Ethics of Insecurity."
- 42 Rosalind Gill and Christina Scharff, introduction to *New Femininities: Postfeminism, Neoliberalism and Subjectivity*, ed. Rosalind Gill and Christina Scharff (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 7.
- 43 Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Managed Heart: Commercialisation of Human Feeling* (1983; repr., Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 7.
- 44 McRobbie, *Be Creative*, 13.
- 45 McRobbie, *Be Creative*, 13.