**ARTIVATE: A JOURNAL OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE ARTS**
VOL. 8, NO. 2, WINTER 2019

# *A Theory of Arts Entrepreneurship as Organizational Attack*

Jason C. White
*College of Charleston*

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.34053/artivate.8.2.3

Theory is developed by way of a systematic process that attempts to explain or provide a rationale for the way something works. Kuratko (2014) defines a theory of entrepreneurship as "a formulation of verifiable relationships, or underlying principles that explain entrepreneurship, predict entrepreneurial activity, or provide normative guidance" (p.8). Scholars in the entrepreneurship literature have been critical of the lack of theory guiding entrepreneurship research, education and practice (Baumol 1993; Bull & Willard 1993; Bygrave & Hofer 1991; Chandler & Lyon 2001; Cooper 1993). Distinguished entrepreneurship scholars Shane and Venkataraman (2000) soften this critique and suggest entrepreneurship theory is underdeveloped. In addition to the establishment of a discipline, related professional associations, and dedicated career paths, scholars in the entrepreneurship literature suggest that systematic theory is necessary for the development and advancement of an academic field (Bird, Welsch, Astrachan, & Pistrui 2002). Similarly, in the arts entrepreneurship literature, White suggests that there are few proposed theories specific to arts entrepreneurship (White 2015). For example, while White works towards theory development (White 2015, 2018), Essig (2015) proposes a means-ends theory "in the absence of a body of theory about arts entrepreneurship specifically" (p.228).

Given that the academic field of arts entrepreneurship is still emerging, it is not surprising that arts entrepreneurship theory is underdeveloped. As a result, arts entrepreneurship researchers have had to import other theories from outside of the arts literature to provide a rationale for their conceptual frameworks, models, hypotheses, and research conclusions (Essig 2015; Preece 2013; White 2017). Additionally, in arts

entrepreneurship education, due to the lack of definitional consensus (Chang & Wyszomirski 2015), educators might have problems explaining what arts entrepreneurship is to students. Although definitional consensus is difficult, Beckman (2014) suggests that the theoretical exercise of defining arts entrepreneurship is nevertheless a critical part of our field development because "…it communicates the explicit binary – is and isn't, *the study object exists* or *it does not, it is identifiable* or *it is not*" (p.5). While a theory of arts entrepreneurship could help answer the recurring question (i.e., What is arts entrepreneurship?), without a theory or theories based on repeated observations that are verifiable, what arts entrepreneurship "is" may be based on individual subjectivity, discipline-based bias, and untested assumptions. To address this gap in the arts entrepreneurship literature, I propose a theory of arts entrepreneurship evidenced by repeated observations that are verifiable via case study experiences.

## Methodology

To aid in the collection of supporting empirical data, the theorist uses grounded theory as a method for theory development. As internationally recognized grounded theorist Anselm Strauss (1995) points out, "In theorizing, a fair amount of imagination is reflected and even unabashed speculation. Not anything goes, because these operate within the constraints of some current knowledge; yet rigor seems reserved for verification – that is, for the creating, eliciting and discovering of evidence" (p. 11). In grounded theory, researchers aim to move beyond description to a "unified theoretical explanation" for an observed phenomenon (Corbin & Strauss 2008, p.107). In discussing grounded theory, Creswell (2013) states, "a key idea is that theory development does not come off the shelf, but rather is generated or grounded in data from participants who have experienced the process (Chapter 4, section 3, para 1). Continuing, Creswell suggests that by discovering emerging patterns in the data, the researcher is able to "generate a general explanation (a theory) of a process, an action, or an interaction shaped by the views of a large number of participants" (Chapter 4, section 3, para 1). Long recognized as an effective scientific method by researchers in the qualitative paradigm, the grounded theory method is a systematic process with defining features; such as a focus on a process or action that has distinct steps or phases, data collection by way of connecting implicit meanings, and data analysis leading to either a general theoretical model or a theory presented as a diagram, propositions, or a discussion (Corbin & Strauss 2008; Creswell 2013).

## Theoretical Foundations

As there is little consensus amongst scholars in both the arts and entrepreneurship literature on a definition of "entrepreneurship," a selected definition may be useful for understanding and interpreting the proposed theory. Throughout the majority of the entrepreneurship literature, scholars have tended to recognize the entrepreneur as an individual who fills

market gaps in an economy by engaging in a process of innovation and (for-profit) business creation in one or more economic industries and/or sectors (Gartner 1985; Kuratko 2014; Schumpeter 1934). While the economic frame of entrepreneurship has helped to advance the entrepreneurship field, researchers who use this particular lens often fail to recognize entrepreneurship as both a social and collective activity that is enabled and constrained by social structures (i.e., the pattern of social relationships which regulates social interactions and guides socio-cultural norms in a society). As such, a structuration view is hereafter utilized because this particular frame of reference can help researchers recognize entrepreneurs as "reflexive agents engaging in purposeful action carried out in the context of social systems" (Sarason, Dean, & Dillard 2006, p.287). In addition, according to Sarason, Dean and Dillard (2006), a structuration view of entrepreneurship can help researchers gain a better understanding of how entrepreneurs both interpret and influence society.

Entrepreneurship scholars have long called for a re-attention to the context in which entrepreneurship occurs (Welter 2011); because as Gartner (1995) notes, observers "…have a tendency to underestimate the influence of external factors and overestimate the influence of internal or personal factors when making judgments about other individuals" (p.70). To better recognize the influence of both internal and external factors on arts entrepreneurs' behavior, Howard Becker's art world(s) metaphor (2008) is hereafter utilized to provide context. Note that as an alternative to Pierre Bourdieu's metaphor of art field(s) (1996), the art world(s) metaphor has been selected to encourage the reader to think about how both art and entrepreneurship activity is created within a particular "social" (world) rather than a particular "spatial" (field) context. In support Becker states, "…the metaphor of world – which does not seem to be at all true of the metaphor of field - contains people, all sorts of people, who are in the middle of doing something that requires them to pay attention to each other, to take account consciously of the existence of others and to shape what they do in light of what others do" (2008, p.375). In addition, Becker's art world thesis not only provides context but also rightly acknowledges the production of art (i.e., a psychological product) as a collective rather than singular activity carried out by a lone artist. This understanding helps us to recognize that artworks "are not the products of individual makers" (e.g. artists), but rather "joint products" created by groups of people within the art world who follow conventions (i.e. patterns, rules of order, standard ways of doing things) (Becker 2008, p.35). Thus, theorizing entrepreneurship in the context of art worlds may help the field recognize patterns (conventions) of entrepreneurship activity that have since lead to either innovation in art worlds, revolutionary changes in art worlds, or the creation of wholly new art worlds. Building on Becker's (2008) pioneering text and supported by case study observations, this theory helps to explain how arts entrepreneurs facilitate revolutionary changes in artworlds.

## Rationale

The central argument of this theory is that through coordinated organizational attacks on the social structure and sacred aesthetic beliefs of an artworld, arts entrepreneurs change

established conventions in the artworld, which results in revolutionary changes to both the artworld and *the work* of art in society. Importantly, *the work* of art does not refer to an art object, but rather to what an art object does to or for others. For example, there is a difference between observing a painting (i.e., the art object); and being lead to a new understanding by the combined elements within the painting (e.g., colors, style, shapes, strokes, symbols) to think, see, smell, hear, taste and touch things in the world from a different perspective. Additionally, there is a difference between a play (the art object) and attending a live theatrical production of a play (the experience). The latter refers to *the work* of art, or rather to the psychological (Kreitler & Kreitler 1972), biological (Fancourt 2017) and socio-cultural changes (Gonçalves & Majhanovich 2016) often triggered by aesthetic experiences. Empirical support for the concept of aesthetic experience can be found in direct observations written by John Dewey (2005). Arguably through *the work* of art, we are drawn away from our own perspective of human experience towards another, which results in a revelation (or new understanding) about the world that we live in. Thus as Martin Heidegger references in his landmark essay *The Origin of A Work of Art*, embedded in an artwork "truth is set to work" and "the revelation that occurs through an encounter with an artwork, not the art object itself, is the work of art" (Bolt, 2011 p.41). Thus, for those who seek revolutionary change in artworlds, *the work* of art may be the best value proposition because arguably, *the work* of art is what the artworld values the most.

In theorizing entrepreneurship within the context of artworlds, it is important to recognize that while all members of an artworld utilize entrepreneurial thinking to guide diverse forms of entrepreneurial action(s) (or behavior), not all entrepreneurial action(s) result in revolutionary changes to artworlds. For example, effectuation and causation are recognized as the two primary logics which guide entrepreneurial action(s) and help to reduce uncertainty. As Saras Sarasvathy notes in her pioneering text on effectuation, "Causal logics helps us choose; effectual logics help us construct" (Sarasvathy 2008, p.73). Arguably, the logic which guides the production of art can be effectual (goals emerging through recurrent rounds of experimentation), such as in work-shopping a play; or causal (predictive and strategic), such as in design thinking. Additionally, effectual logic can be observed in the process of artistic creation. In support, Jonathan Gangi draws our attention to the synergies of artistic and entrepreneurial action (2015) and the relationship between effectuation and artistic creation (2017). Causal thinking can be observed in the process of firm creation as undertaken by artists. In support, Essig (2015) argues that "artists form firms (a predictive and strategic process) or otherwise undertake entrepreneurial action toward the end of creating art sustainably" (p.227). Empirical research suggests that in addition to artists, distinct members of the artworld also use both causal and effectual logic to guide various entrepreneurial actions. For example, arts managers use causal logic when they create strategic plans for arts organizations, often to address internal or external challenges that call for organizational and/or institutional entrepreneurship (Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum 2009; Grandori & Gaillard 2011). Arts policymakers use effectual logic when they recognize an opportunity (a

policy window), mobilize policy support (acquire social capital), draft the policy (innovation), test its effects on a smaller scale of the artworld (prototyping), and learn from policy failure (entrepreneurial learning) (Heidelberg 2019). In short, based on direct observations in artworlds (Becker 2008), it seems apparent that many members of the artworld utilize entrepreneurial logic on an everyday basis, and thus "think as entrepreneurs."

Who then is the arts entrepreneur if all members of the artworld think as entrepreneurs? The answer to this question can be informed by a similar topic discussed by Gartner (1988), who concluded that *who the entrepreneur is* - is best identified by determining a distinct pattern of behavior. Moreover, Gartner (1988) argued that what differentiates entrepreneurs from non-entrepreneurs is that entrepreneurs create organizations. At its most foundational level of analysis, an organization is a group of people coming together for a shared or common goal (Staber, 2013). Contextual support for this assertion can be found in Becker's artworld thesis, when he states, "The history of art deals with innovators and innovations that won organizational victories, succeeding in creating around themselves the apparatus of an artworld, mobilizing enough people to cooperate in regular ways that sustained and furthered their idea" (2008, p.301). Becker (2008) refers to some of these innovations as "organizational attacks" that "disrupt routine patterns of cooperation [conventions], which with some stretching of Thomas Kuhn's (1962) usage, could be called a 'revolution' " (pp.304-305). Additionally, Becker (2008) refers to these organizational attacks as "an attack on social structure" (p.306) and sacred "aesthetic beliefs" (p.305), which through coordination aim to "take over sources of support, audiences and distribution facilities" (p.305), resulting in either revolutionary changes to, or the creation of *artworlds* (i.e. networks of "people who have never cooperated before to produce art based on and using conventions that were previously unknown or not exploited in that way" [2008, p.310]). In cases where this is true, there could be a pattern of coordination to these organizational attacks which may help distinguish this particular form of entrepreneurial action from other forms which occur in the artworld (e.g., artistic creation, self-employment, firm creation). Case study support for this particular form (i.e., organizational attacks) can be observed within the art history, creative, and cultural industries literature.

## Case Study Support for Organizational Attack

Becker provides evidence of organizational attacks on the social structure and sacred aesthetic beliefs of artworlds by pointing us to socio-cultural movements that have occurred in art history (2008, p.305). Susie Hodge (2019) provides a summary useful for theory development. According to Hodge (2019), "Realism was the first art movement to denounce traditions that had been established by official art academies" (p.12). The realist movement in 1830 was not organized by one singular artist, but rather a group of French painters who sought to attack the sacred aesthetic beliefs of official art academies which (at that time) valued and prioritized art subjects that included religion, history, mythology, and portraits appealing to the rich (Hodge 2019). By recruiting like-minded painters and encouraging relevant painters in the

visual artworld such as Gustave Courbet, Rosa Bonheur, and Jean Baptiste-Camille Corot to paint in a certain way for a certain purpose, groups of French painters were able to successfully change the conventional way of painting, which led to the birth of the realist movement in 1830.

Additional support can be gathered by studying the birth of the modern Indian art market. According to Mukti Khaire (2017), prior to 1995, the modern Indian art market did not exist either in India nor abroad. This nonexistence is largely because, as Khaire references, no criteria for evaluating Indian Art existed. Although existing for centuries in India, *the work* of Indian art wasn't considered valuable in the western artworld until the 1990's, when "both academics and art historians (intermediaries) began characterizing it as modernist with a particular original aesthetic that they asserted was just as valuable as the aesthetic of Western modern artists, albeit different" (Khaire 2017, chapter 1, section 6, para 4). Arguably, this is evidence of a coordinated organizational attack on the sacred aesthetic beliefs of the Western artworld. Khaire (2017) states that, "Once this discourse was broadly disseminated and inter-subjectively accepted, the art was perceived as complying with prevailing norms of appropriateness and value. Because of this commentary, auction houses dealing with twentieth century Indian art found consumers willing to invest in the works" (chapter 1, section 6, para 4).

Support can also be found by studying the blue ocean strategy of Guy Laliberté (Former street performer & Founder of Cirque du Soleil), who along with a team of street performers, undertook causal and effectual actions to change conventions in the circus industry in the 1980's (Kim & Mauborgne 2015, pp.1-19). Prior to Cirque du Soleil's emergence, circuses around the world were still using live animals and lion tamers in acts, incorporating celebrity acrobats and famous clowns known for slapstick routines, exhibiting multiple acts simultaneously under the big top (i.e., the three-ring circus model), and focusing on children as the primary target market. However, over time, public attitudes shifted in favor of animal rights, and children began to acquire increasing options for live entertainment (e.g., video games). These changes in the market resulted in rising costs without raising revenues in the circus industry (Kim & Mauborgne 2015). Rather than compete using established conventions, Laliberté and his team of street performers broke the best practice rule (convention) in the circus industry by eliminating live animals and lion tamers, reducing the role of the circus clown, incorporating a more enchanting and sophisticated style of clowning and acrobat performance, creating independent shows with singular acts aligned to specific themes and storylines, and catering to adults (Kim & Mauborgne 2015). Arguably, this coordinated organizational attack on both the social structure and the sacred aesthetic beliefs of the circus industry resulted in revolutionary changes to *the work* of the circus, which now offers audiences the fun and thrill of the traditional circus along with "the intellectual sophistication and artistic richness of the theater at the same time" (2015, p.14).

Consider the birth of Hip Hop music and the interrelated Hip Hop socio-cultural movement, both of which did not exist in society before the late 1970s. According to Alridge

and Stewart (2005), "Over the past three decades, Hip Hop has developed as a cultural and artistic phenomenon affecting youth culture around the world" (p.1). They assert that "for many youth, Hip Hop reflects the social, economic, political and cultural realities and conditions of their lives, speaking to them in a language and manner they understand" (2005, p.1). As Khaire (2017) notes, at the beginning of Hip Hop's emergence, "Some listeners questioned its very categorization as music" (Khaire 2017, chapter 1, section 9, para 3), let alone as a socio-cultural movement. However, through public discourse about Hip Hop generated by both emerging Hip Hop artists and music intermediaries, knowledge about *the work* of Hip Hop spread, participation in the Hip Hop movement increased, and evaluation criteria for Hip Hop music was socially constructed (Khaire 2017). Notably, the Hip Hop movement is an example of a coordinated organizational attack on the social structure and sacred aesthetic beliefs of the music world that resulted in the creation of a new artworld (i.e., the Hip Hop industry) (Rabaka 2013).

More recent support can be found by studying the emergence of *hiplet* in the contemporary dance world. In an effort to overcome conventional racial barriers to participation in ballet, Homer Bryant (former principal dancer of the Dance Theater of Harlem) created hiplet in the 1990s. Although the art form is still emerging, hiplet has been recognized as a fusion between classical pointe technique, hip-hop, and a variety of other urban dance styles (Chicago Multicultural Dance Center n.d.). As art is socially constructed, it is not surprising that public discourse on hiplet began when a performance by the hiplet ballerinas went viral on Bryant's Instagram page in 2016. While some members of the contemporary dance world have since shown love and support for hiplet, others have been critical suggesting, "a lack of ballet technique, being neither hip-hop nor ballet, undercutting legit advances for black dancers, feeling immature and opportunistic" (Howard 2017). In addressing the critics, Bryant both defends and re-asserts *the work* of hiplet, when he states: "That's why we have so many haters. People are like, who does this guy think he is? I have other teachers, white teachers, telling me I'm going to break their ankles and maybe I should go take a ballet class. I love the conversation, though. It's going to bring more African-American kids into us" (Marks 2016). This particular example is helpful for theory development because it not only references a coordinated organizational attack on the social structure and sacred aesthetic beliefs of an artworld, but also the resistance one may experience from members of an artworld when attempting to do so.

## Coordinated Attack Patterns

Upon analyzing each of these case studies, it is apparent to the theorist that the process of organizational attack (as previously defined) in artworlds may not be a static linear process, but rather more like a pattern or repeated design that includes different colors with every iteration. In other words, organizational attacks in artworlds may be similar (i.e., repeated design), but are unlikely to begin or be carried out in the same way (i.e., different colors). For example, while the realism movement began with a group of painters feeling restricted by

romanticism, the surrealist movement began in Paris with one author's (André Breton) publication of *The Manifesto of Surrealism* (Hodge 2019). While the birth of the Indian art market began with a recognition of aesthetic value amongst Western academics and art historians, the birth of the African American art market began when both African American visual and literary artists started challenging aesthetic standards (conventions) put forth by white artists, white academics and white art historians (Addison Jr. 1972). While Cirque du Soleil began with the Canadian government asking a group of street performers to develop a new artistic concept (Eng, 2011), the Royal Court Theatre, known in the 1950's for championing the works of undesirable playwrights, began with artistic director George Devine aiming to discover "hard hitting, uncompromising writers", in an effort to create a company that would challenge and stimulate British theatre" (Billington 1981; "History of Royal Court Theatre" n.d.). Arguably, the pattern evident across all these case studies reveals a call to action, influenced by a desire to move away from one or more conventions in an artworld, followed by the creation and promotion of an alternative (i.e., a value proposition).

Additionally, each of these case study examples involves one or more members of an artworld convincing a group of people from within an existing artworld to participate in the alternative. Empirical support for this assertion can be found in Becker's artworld thesis, when he states, "revolutionary changes succeed when their originators mobilize some or all of the members of the relevant art world to cooperate in the new activities their vision of the medium requires" (2008, p.308). In cases where this is true, the process of organizational attack in artworlds would likely include *social innovation* (i.e., "efforts that are begun and maintained by a core group of committed people who share the work") (McKnight & Plummer 2015, pp.51-52). According to the research of McKnight & Plumber (2015), social innovation tends to begin by way of an encounter with one or more individuals presenting a call to action that has been "strengthened by shared insights, complementary abilities, mutual support and multiple bonds" (p.52). Moreover, McKnight & Plumber note, "participation in social innovation efforts requires consensus building, which can be time consuming and frustrating" (p.52). In addition, McKnight & Plumber assert, "social innovation requires significant dedication from core members of a steering committee, and many efforts fail because the individuals are unwilling or unable to invest the time and energy needed for success" (p.52). Support for the failure of social innovation efforts in artworlds can be found in Becker's (2008) artworld thesis, when he states, "Artistic mavericks show what happens to innovators who fail to develop an adequate organizational support system" (p.300); a reference to those members of the artworld who propose revolutionary changes to artworlds without a convincing call to action (i.e., value proposition).

Furthermore, each of these case studies points to the role of discourse (i.e., intentional written or spoken communication or debate) as a key strategy for sustainability of the call to action. Khaire (2017) supports this assertion when she states, "a single source of commentary that proposes and supports a new idea, definition, or set of evaluation criteria or standards of

quality will likely not be impactful unless that discourse is disseminated widely and reinforced in the general commentary. Without intersubjective agreement over the value of the new idea, most consumers, unsure of the social validity of adopting it, will not change their beliefs and preferences" (Chapter 2, Sec 2, para 7). Through discourse centered on the social structure and sacred aesthetic beliefs of an artworld, established conventions of the artworld are challenged (Becker 2008). In the artworld this discourse often occurs through "the linked practices" of arts criticism, art curatorship, arts patronage, and arts scholarship (McCarthy, Ondaatje, Brooks, & Szántó 2005, p.12), or through such forms as "manifestos, critical essays, aesthetic and philosophical reformulations," and revisionist histories (Becker 2008, p.304). Arguably, by generating and facilitating discourse related to the call to action, opportunities are created inside the artworld for social innovation, elaboration and defense of the call to action; thus making organizational attacks in artworlds easier to initiate and sustain. In addition, related discourse generated and facilitated outside the artworld can lead the public to question prior beliefs about conventions within the artworld (Khaire 2017), which can result in a better understanding of the call to action, and public support for revolutionary change in the artworld. Given the seemingly vital role of discourse in the pattern of organizational attack, the ability to generate and facilitate discourse is perhaps one defining skill of the arts entrepreneur; considering the necessity of discourse in facilitating revolutionary change(s) to the social structure and sacred aesthetic beliefs of artworlds.

## Summary of the Theory

Based on the aforementioned empirical research conclusions, the theorist is prepared to offer a foundational theory that may help the field recognize a distinct and observable dimension of entrepreneurship activity. To restate, the central argument of this arts entrepreneurship theory is that through coordinated organizational attacks on the social structure and sacred aesthetic beliefs of an artworld, arts entrepreneurs change established conventions in the artworld, which results in revolutionary changes to both the artworld and *the work* of art in society. Motivated in part by a desire to move away from one or more established conventions in an artworld, arts entrepreneurs develop a call to action which functions as a value proposition. The purpose of this value proposition is to get enough members in the artworld to participate in revolutionary changes to both the social structure and sacred aesthetic beliefs of an artworld. Participation in revolutionary change is not certain because revolutionary change may be perceived as inconvenient or disruptive to routine patterns of cooperation. As a strategy, arts entrepreneurs engage in social innovation in artworlds, utilizing their social capital to mobilize and encourage specific influential members of the artworld to participate in the attack. Attacks are organized and coordinated by way of the linked practices of arts criticism, art curatorship, arts patronage, and arts scholarship; or may be presented in the tangible written discourse of manifestos, critical essays, aesthetic or philosophical reformulations, or revisionist histories. In the artworld, this discourse functions as a key strategy for organizational attack because it creates opportunities for both the introduction,

elaboration and defense of the value proposition. Outside the artworld, this discourse can lead people to question prior beliefs about conventions within the artworld, which can result in external support for the value proposition. While not all organizational attacks in artworlds are successful, success is achieved when the attack either results in revolutionary changes to conventions that are accepted by the relevant majority or, when the attack results in the birth of a whole new artworld. Importantly, in both cases of success, *the work* of art in society will change, because the conventions used to produce art will change.

## Conclusion

In theorizing art as experience, Dewey (2005) reminds us that, "theory is a matter of understanding…the trouble with existing theories is that they start from a ready-made compartmentalization or from a conception of art that spiritualizes it out of connection with the objects of concrete experience" (2005, p.11). Guided by Dewey's thoughts on theory development, this proposed entrepreneurship theory advances both the arts entrepreneurship field and Becker's theory of artworlds by recognizing a distinct type of entrepreneurship activity that occurs in artworlds. In doing so, the theorist further clarifies the difference between entrepreneurship activity, and arts entrepreneurship activity. The former focused on entrepreneurial action more broadly (e.g., new venture creation, self-employment, firm creation, intrapreneurship, innovation, etc.), the latter focused on a dimension of entrepreneurial action specific to the artworld (i.e., organizational attack). In addition, by supporting the theory with case study observations, the theorist has created opportunities for explanatory power, or the degree to which a theory affords the most rational and sensible explanation for a phenomenon of study. In discussing theory development strategies in the broader entrepreneurship field, Kenworthy & McMullen remind us that "theories with high explanatory power can make sense of a large amount of data from many studies" (2014, p.42).

In addition to explanatory power, the theorist has created opportunities for predictive power, or an assessment of practical predictive significance (Kenworthy & McMullen 2014). For example, embedded in this theory is the assertion that in the artworld, a call to action functions as a value proposition. This logic is supported by current thinking in customer value propositioning, which as Neck et al. state, " …should always be focused on the value generated for the customer" (Neck, Neck, & Murray 2018) (Amit 2014). Given lessons learned from the research on customer value propositioning (Neck et al., 2018), this theory predicts that organizational attacks in artworlds will be more successful if the attack is perceived to benefit the artworld significantly. Importantly, this assertion can be tested through the case study method, and thus adds to the predictive power of the theory.

In theorizing arts entrepreneurship "as" an organizational attack in artworlds, the theorist has also aided the field in reducing arguments about the constituent and contextual definitions of arts entrepreneurship. Beckman concurs when he states, "we may find it more helpful to discuss art and entrepreneurship within a broader theory (or theories) of arts entrepreneurship" (Beckman 2014, p.10). Continuing, Beckman states "Using this theory

methodology can account for multiple observations of the phenomenon, thus providing distinct data points and hypotheses with which to develop not only a unified theory, but to help disprove theories that cannot support predictions" (2014, p.11). In addition, by framing arts entrepreneurs as distinct members of the artworld who both initiate and gain participation in organizational attacks on the social structure and sacred aesthetic beliefs of an artworld, the theorist helps us to recognize that while all members of the artworld think as entrepreneurs, not all of them initiate and gain participation in organizational attacks, which is arguably a distinct behavior of arts entrepreneurs. If this theory is advanced, it could help the broader entrepreneurship field distinguish between the behavior of business entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, and arts entrepreneurs.

## *References*


Addison Jr., G. (1972). *The Black aesthetic*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Alridge, D. P., & Stewart, J. B. (2005). Introduction: Hip Hop in History: Past, Present, and Future. *The Journal of African American History*, *90*(3), 190–195.

Amit, R. (2014). The Latest Innovation: Redesigning the business model. Retrieved May 9, 2014, from https://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/redesigning-business-model/).

Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How Actors Change Institutions: Towards a Theory of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *3*(1), 65–107.

Baumol, W. J. (1993). Formal Entrepreneurship Theory in Economics: Existence and Bounds. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *8*(3), 197–210.

Becker, Howard S. (2008) *Art Worlds, 25th Anniversary Edition.* Oakland, CA. University of California Press.

Beckman, G. D. (2014). What Arts Entrepreneurship Isn't. *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Research*, *1*(1), 3–14. Retrieved from https://jaer.ncsu.edu/

Billington, M. (1981). The Theater That Sparked A Revolution. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/1981/05/10/theater/the-theater-that-sparked-a-revolution.html

Bird, B., Welsch, H., Astrachan, J. H., & Pistrui, D. (2002). Family Business Research: The Evolution of an Academic Field. *Family Business Review*, *15*(4), 337–350. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2002.00337.x

Bolt, B. (2011). *Heidegger Reframed*. New York, NY: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.

Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bull, I., & Willard, G. E. (1993). Towards A Theory of Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *8*(3), 183–195. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0883902693900262

Bygrave, W., & Hofer, C. (1991). Theorizing about Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *16*(2), 13–22.

Center, C. M. D. (n.d.). #hiplet. Retrieved May 9, 2019, from https://www.hipletballerinas.com/

Chandler, G. N., & Lyon, D. W. (2001). Issues of Research Design and Construct Management in Entrepreneurship Research: The Past Decade. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *25*(4), 101–113.

Chang, W. J., & Wyszomirski, M. J. (2015). What is Arts Entrepreneurship? Tracking The Development Of Its Defintion In Scholarly Journals. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, *4*(2), 11–31.

Cooper, A. C. (1993). Challenges in Predicting New Firm Performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *8*(3), 241–253.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research:Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (Kindle (3r). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dewey, J. (2005). *Art as Experience* (Kindle). New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Eng, D. (2011). How Cirque du Soleil got started. Retrieved from https://archive.fortune.com/2011/10/25/smallbusiness/cirque_du_soleil_guy_laliberte.fortune/index.htm

Essig, L. (2015). Means and Ends: A Theory Framework for Understanding Entrepreneurship in the US Arts and Culture Sector. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, *45*(4), 227–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2015.1103673

Fancourt, D. (2017). *Arts in Health*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Gangi, J. (2015). The Synergies of Artistic and Entrepreneurial Action. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, *45*(4), 247–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2015.1088912

Gangi, J. (2017). Towards Consensus: Suggested Foundational Building Blocks For Entrepreneurship Research and Pedagogy. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, *6*(1), 46–62.

Gartner, W. B. (1985). A Conceptual Framework for Describing the Phenomenon of New Venture Creation. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(4), 696–706. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1985.4279094

Gartner, W. B. (1988). "Who Is An Entrepreneur?" Is the Wrong Question. *American Journal of Small Business*, *12*(4), 11–32.

Gartner, W. B. (1995). Aspects of organizational emergence. In H. Thomas, I. Bull, & G. E. Willard (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship: Perspectives on theory building* (pp. 67–86). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Gonçalves, S., & Majhanovich, S. (Eds.). (2016). *Art and intercultural dialogue* (E-book). Rotterdam: The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Grandori, A., & Gaillard, L. G. (2011). *Organizing Entrepreneurship*. NY, NY: Routledge.

Heidelberg, B. M. (2019). Learning From Negative Space: Categorizing Success in Arts Policy Entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, *8*(1), 23–44.

History of Royal Court Theatre. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://royalcourttheatre.com/about/history/

Hodge, S. (2019). *The Short Story of Modern Art*. London: Laurence King Publishing.

Howard, T. R. (2017). Why Some Dancers Are Giving Hiplet Serious Side Eye. Retrieved May 9, 2019, from https://www.dancemagazine.com/why-are-so-many-people-cringing-over-hiplet-2383346949.html

Kenworthy, T. P., & McMullen, W. E. (2014). From philosophy of science to theory testing: generating practical knowledge in entrepreneurship. In A. Carsrud & M. Brännback (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods and Applications in Entrepreneurship and Small Business* (pp. 20–55). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Khaire, M. (2017). *Culture and Commerce: The value of entrepreneurship in creative industries* (Kindle). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. (2015). *Blue Ocean Strategy: How to Create Uncontested Market Space and Make the Competition Irrelevant*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kreitler, H., & Kreitler, S. (1972). *Psychology of the Arts*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kuratko, D. F. (2014). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, Process and Practice* (Kindle). Mason, OH: Cengage.

Marks, A. (2016). Why Are People So Riled Up About Black Girls Dancing Hip-Hop on Pointe? Retrieved May 9, 2019, from https://www.chicagomag.com/arts-culture/June-2016/Hip-Hop-Ballet-Hiplet-Homer-Bryant/

McCarthy, K. F., Ondaatje, E. H., Brooks, A., & Szántó, A. (2005). *A Portrait of the Visual Arts: Meeting the Challenges of a New Era*. Santa Monica, CA. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG290.html

McKnight, J. S., & Plummer, J. M. (2015). *Community Organizing: Theory and Practice* (Kindle). New York, NY: Pearson.

Neck, H. M., Neck, C. P., & Murray, E. L. (2018). *Entrepreneurship: The Practice and the Mindset* (Kindle). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Preece, S. B. (2013). Social Bricolage in Arts Entrepreneurship: Building a Jazz Society From Scratch, *3*(1), 23–34.

Rabaka, R. (2013). *The Hip Hop Movement: from R&B and the civil rights movement to rap and the hip hop generation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Sarason, Y., Dean, T., & Dillard, J. F. (2006). Entrepreneurship as the nexus of individual and opportunity: A structuration view. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *21*(3), 286–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2005.02.007

Sarasvathy, S. D. (2008). *Effectuation: Elements of Entrepreneurial Expertise*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). The theory of economic development: an inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Reference in Entrepreneurship. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=1496199

Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 217–226.

Staber, U. (2013). *Understanding Organizations: Theories and Images* (Kindle). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss, A. L. (1995). Notes on the Nature and Development of General Theories. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *1*(1), 7–18.

Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing Entrepreneurship—Conceptual Challenges and Ways Forward. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, *35*(1), 165–184. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00427.x

White, J. C. (2015). Toward a Theory of Arts Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Education*, *1*(1), 4–17.

White, J. C. (2017). Analyzing Entrepreneurship in the U.S. Arts Sector: Identifying Arts Entrepreneurs

Demographics and Shared Characteristics. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, *6*(1), 8–32.
White, J. C. (2018). Toward a Theory of Minority Entrepreneurship in the Non-Profit Arts Sector. *Journal of Arts Management Law and Society*, *48*(4), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2018.1431986