

EDITORIAL

Editorial Perspectives

A Futurecasting Glossary

We invited past, present, and future *Artivate* editors to contribute to a glossary collectively, futurecasting the central ideas advancing our field. Their provocations shared here help us build forward together.

The Entrepreneurial We

Paul Bonin-Rodriguez
University of Texas-Austin

How and to what benefit might our growing field focus on arts entrepreneurship not as a site of independent excellence but as a result of multiple stakeholders hailed into a process of mutuality, collectivity, and support? I speak of a fundamental transition from “I” to “we” that signals the generosity of engagement required of artistic production. I submit that countering longstanding notions of scarcity first requires a recognition of the abundance of stakeholders in any one work. Two books inspire me to think this way.

In *Creative Industries* (2000), the economist Richard Caves offers seven “bedrock properties for creative activities and show[s] how they drive organizational patterns in the many markets with substantive creative elements” (p. 2). Among them is “the motley crew property,” a term acknowledging that creative production relies on the “close temporal coordination” of the multiple stakeholders who bring any one work to market (p. 10). Caves states that he speaks primarily of “the performing arts and creative activities involving complex teams,” yet his term seems applicable to all arts fields where production meets the public (ibid).

Taking a different approach in *The Gift: Creativity and the Artist in the Modern World* (1982, 2007), the historian Lewis Hyde posits “that works of art exist simultaneously in two ‘economies,’ a market economy and a gift economy, and only one of these is essential: a work of art can survive without the market, but where there is no gift there is no art” (p.

ARTIVATE 11.3

xvi). Hyde, of course, is acknowledging that artmaking itself is rooted in gifting, the product of a relationship that anticipates engagement and exchange.

I am equally inspired by my location in a Department of Theatre and Dance, where there's a lot of emphasis on studio and craft. The students focus on themselves. Faculty focuses on the students. It's lovely. It's heartwarming. Nice to see the students thrive. Yet, in the transition from apprenticeship to professional life the students would be well advised to turn the focus around and get to know stakeholders/gatekeepers who maintain the sites where they will work. Those stakeholders may include those who operate spaces, a community, or a public. In the process, they will undoubtedly see that there is an abundance of support not only available but requiring cultivation with the same focus they have applied to their craft.

After having co-edited this journal since the Winter 2019 issue and followed its contents and progress and the scholarship of the arts entrepreneurship field, I have become convinced that the artist entrepreneurship we (re)present is fundamentally team-based. Our emerging arts entrepreneurs will benefit from thinking how they can participate rather than thinking in terms of what the field can offer them.

References

Caves, R.E. (2000). *Creative Industries: contracts between art and commerce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hyde, L. (2007). *The Gift: creativity and the artist in the modern world*, 25th Anniversary Ed. New York: Vintage Books.

Plural Sector

E. Andrew Taylor
American University

Entrepreneurship in most contexts is tied explicitly to business, financial resource, financial risk, and profit. While artistic expression and experience certainly occupy many domains where all four are salient concerns, financial and economic logic cannot begin to encompass the theory and practice of arts entrepreneurship. We can carve out a bit more territory by exploring both for-profit and not-for-profit entity types. But even then, the focus is on "profit" or its absence, not on the alternate logics in play.

Management scholar Henry Mintzberg suggests the "plural sector" as an inclusive label to capture the domain of collective action organized by social logic. "The plural sector," he writes, "is not some middle position between left and right, but as different from the other two sectors as they are from each other. Its particular focus is on communities, whereas the other two sectors focus on governments and businesses" (Mintzberg 2015).

Exploring arts entrepreneurship within a plural sector frame (rather than not-for-

profit, volunteer, independent, or third sector) can open discovery to a full array of practices, including not only not-for-profit corporations but also unincorporated, cooperative, mutual aid, indigenous, informal, and other forms of collective effort—even social movements (Matlon et al 2014). This is a rising and compelling area of innovation and action in the arts. It deserves an inclusive and useful frame.

Harvard professor Howard Stevenson defined entrepreneurship as the pursuit of opportunity beyond resources controlled (Sinoway and Meadow 2012). In arts entrepreneurship, that pursuit can require mastery in multiple domains—economic logic and financial risk (private sector), political logic and public process (public sector), and social logic and community action (plural sector). Among the many challenges of arts entrepreneurship is to identify the best terrain(s) to reach the intended destination and to assemble the appropriate people and practices for a successful expedition.

The plural sector can and should be among the useful names we give the landscape.

References

Matlon, Mina Para, Ingrid Van Haastrecht, and Kaitlyn Wittig Mengüç. 2014. "Figuring the Plural: Needs and Supports of Canadian and US Ethnocultural Arts Organizations." *Plural*.
Mintzberg, Henry. 2015. "Time for the Plural

Sector." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 13 (3): 28–33.
Sinoway, Eric, and Merrill Meadow. 2012. *Howard's Gift: Uncommon Wisdom to Inspire Your Life's Work*. Macmillan.

Collaborative Organizational Culture

Neville Vakharia
Drexel University

Organizational culture is a complex construct serving as both a consequence of and an antecedent to how an organization achieves its goals. Commonly accepted definitions of organizational culture describe shared assumptions, values, beliefs, and perceptions that are embodied and socialized within an organization. Despite this somewhat opaque definition, a large body of research demonstrates how organizational culture drives multiple dimensions of organizational performance.

In my own research, I've explored how a collaborative organizational culture in creative and cultural organizations can support efforts towards innovation and institutional entrepreneurship. In fact, I found that organizations that more strongly exhibited this type of culture were more likely to engage in innovative practices and programmatic approaches. Conversely, a lack of a collaborative culture led to silos, mistrust, and high staff turnover.

Central to creating a collaborative organizational culture is the role of leadership. It is the leadership of an organization that sets the tone for how an organization's culture is established. In creative and cultural organizations, I found that leaders who actively and

ARTIVATE 11.3

deliberatively fostered collaboration created a culture in which all staff members felt empowered to collaborate within and outside of their respective roles. They were given the agency to explore new ideas, act entrepreneurially, and learn from failure. However, I found that it was not enough for leaders to simply encourage collaboration for it to become imbued within their organization's culture. These leaders had to act with intention to create the processes and practices that fostered collaboration—leaders who did not ultimately expressed frustration at their organization's inability to be innovative and entrepreneurial.

Ultimately, an organizational culture of collaboration provides an environment to foster new ways of doing things. It can motivate teams and help organizations achieve their goals. Like all types of organizational culture, a culture of collaboration is only possible if leaders take an active role in building it. As the director of a small science museum told me in a research interview, "The work we're doing to be collaborative will push us towards innovation."

Worldmaking

Diane Ragsdale
Minneapolis College of Art & Design

Building on a decade of research on effectuation, in 2012 Saras Sarasvathy posited *worldmaking* as a primary affordance of the entrepreneurial method as distinct from *understanding* afforded by the scientific method (p. 2). Elaborating on this distinction, she writes:

The moment we embrace the notion of worldmaking, we cede the notion of inevitability. We are no longer satisfied with the pursuit of understanding *the* world as it is or even arguing about *the* world as it should be. Instead, we also have to grapple with plurality, contingency, and possibility of the *worlds* that *could* be, the worlds we can make as well as the world we find ourselves in. Since we no longer seek to understand what *will* happen, we have to be ready to explore all the different things that *can* happen. And all the things that could have happened but did not. Moreover, everything we take as given and granted—assumptions, constraints, and objective functions—all become subject to choice and contingency. (p. 11)

While the scientific method takes for granted a causal direction between predictability and control, Sarasvathy's entrepreneurial method is a tool for times of uncertainty—when prediction is not possible, but leveraging what is within one's control (however modest) and learning (i.e., gaining insights and capacity for prediction) through making/taking action (i.e., effectuation) *is* possible (Sarasvathy et al. 2008 as cited in Sarasvathy 2012, p. 9).

In an effort to address a related issue—the need to move towards “uncertainty, discomfort and knowledge gaps” when undertaking scenario planning—Vervoort et al. (2015) likewise identify worldmaking as a valuable framework. In addition to supporting the need to take decisions in the face of the unknown, along with Sarasvathy the researchers assert that a worldmaking framework can support *plurality* or the “connected need to capture and make productive” fundamental differences in people’s understandings and goals for the future (p. 62).

Vervoort et al. ground their work in the seminal (1978) contribution, *Ways of Worldmaking*, by analytic and aesthetics philosopher Nelson Goodman, who analyzes the types and functions of symbols and their systems to explore the ways in which it is valuable to talk about multiple, coexisting, true versions of the world (or a pluriverse) rather than a single fixed world and multiple perspectives on it (pp. 2-5). Goodman conceptualizes a pluriverse “constructed through creative processes instead of given, and always in the process of becoming” (Vervoort et al. 2015, p. 62). Importantly, the making of new worlds, in Goodman’s view, always draws upon existing worlds: we “divide and combine, emphasize, order, delete, fill in and fill out, and even distort” (p. 17). Individually and collectively, we make worlds that are meaningful and that reflect what is most important to us (Vervoort et al. 2015, p. 64). In Goodman’s approach, art is fundamental to this process (1978) as, to count as art, an object must have “symbolic functions”; and these hold the capacity, through certain methods of pointing, to “contribute to a vision of—and to the making of—a world” (pp. 69-70).

Sarasvathy conceptualizes worldmaking as an affordance of the entrepreneurial method; however, within artistic realms, worldmaking is often the *method itself*—and one that directly draws upon the re-combinatory—“taking apart and putting together”—processes already discussed (Goodman, 1978, p. 7). The imaginative making inherent to artmaking is essential to radical innovation and the emergence of new ways or worlds (Kerr & Frasca 2021). The arts are used to “model new worlds so that we can see how we might feel about them” (Eno 2022, p. 6) and to “create alternate worlds that may serve as a proposition or a map for substantial change” (Bogart 2022). Designers and their designs embody and point to the possibilities of new worlds, including those that are more just and eco-conscious; and in doing so they also become a mechanism to catalyze and support the transition to future worlds (Escobar 2018, pp. 8-9). In this sense, the arts and design enable “rehearsal for action in real life” (Boal 2006, p. 6), including the enactment of democracy by modelling sound, responsible, and healthy ways of being with each other and engaging in community life (East 2016, p. 174). In the realm of social justice, artists engage in a process of “sensing, questioning, intervening in, and reimagining [of] existing arrangements” that holds the potential to reshape our material world and ideas about it (DS4SI, 2020). In sum, the arts hold the potential to point to injurious worlds and (ways) to remake them.

Building on a decade of research into the dynamics of effectuation, Sarasvathy asserts

ARTIVATE 11.3

that worldmaking can be “made accessible to all” (p. 8) to the extent that everyone is taught to embrace the entrepreneurial method as part of daily living. I propose that (a) it would be equally valuable for everyone to be taught to embrace *artistic methods* as part of daily living and (b) that there is a potentially significant contribution to our understanding of worldmaking from artist-entrepreneurs and from scholars of arts entrepreneurship in particular. Nelson Goodman (1978) writes, “comprehension and creation go on together” (p. 22). As both artists and entrepreneurs evidence time and again, it is through making that we come to understand and move ourselves beyond current frames/logics/paradigms/worlds (Kerr and Frasca, 2021). If translated to a form capable of being applied in non-arts contexts, the creation/worldmaking methods, practices, and processes inherent to artmaking and art-firm-making could contribute greatly to an understanding of how to collectively imagine/make new ways of relating to ourselves, each other, our built and natural worlds, history, the present, and the future.

References

- Boal, A. (2006). *The aesthetics of the oppressed*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Bogart, A. (2022, November 15). World-making. *SITI Blog*. <https://siti.org/world-making/>.
- Design Studio for Social Intervention: Lobenstine, L., Bailey, K., and Maruyama, A. (2020, July 13). Ideas arrangements effects: Systems design and social justice. *NPQ*. <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/ideas-arrangements-effects-systems-design-and-social-justice/>.
- East, A. (2016). Rehearsing democracy: Enhancing community through the interdisciplinary performance improvisation series, ‘Shared Agendas’. *Dance Research Aotearoa*, 4, 171-187.
- Eno, B. (2022). Foreword in Alexander, J. with Conrad, A., *Citizens: Why the key to fixing everything is all of us* [Kindle Paperwhite version]. Retrieved from amazon.com.
- Escobar (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds* [Kindle Paperwhite version]. Retrieved from amazon.com.
- Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmaking*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Kerr, I. and Frasca, J. (2021) *Innovating emergent futures: The innovation design approach for change and worldmaking*. Monee, IL: Emergent Futures Lab Press.
- Sarasvathy, S. (2012). WORLDMAKING. In A. Corbett and J.A. Katz (Eds.), *Entrepreneurial Action* (Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth, Vol. 14, pp. 1-24) Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1074-7540\(2012\)0000014013](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1074-7540(2012)0000014013)
- Vervoort, J.M., Bendor, R., Kelliher, A., Strik, O., and Helfgott, A.E.R. (2015). Scenarios and the art of worldmaking. *Futures* (74), 62-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.08.009>.

Entrepreneurial Futures

José Valentino Ruiz-Resto
University of Florida

Entrepreneurial futures embrace the transformative potential of the present moment. They enable individuals, organizations, and communities to navigate challenges, seize opportunities, and continuously evolve. Three core concepts shape our entrepreneurial futures: creative adaptability, post-COVID multimodal creative economy, and migratory

entrepreneurship. Integrating these concepts into arts entrepreneurship education and practice guides innovative approaches for sustainable growth in the ever-evolving arts ecosystem.

Creative Adaptability: Today's dynamic and interconnected society calls on the ability of individuals, organizations, and communities within the arts entrepreneurship field to flexibly respond to and navigate through challenges, changes, and uncertainties. Creative adaptability encompasses the capacity to embrace ambiguity, adjust strategies, and seize opportunities for growth and impact. It goes beyond mere survival; it implies the proactive ability to transform adversity into creative energy and to continuously evolve to meet the demands of a rapidly changing world with agility, creativity, and a sense of purpose.

Post-COVID Multimodal Creative Economy: The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the adoption of digital technologies and virtual platforms for showcasing work, reaching wider audiences and generating revenue. This shift not only provided opportunities for remote collaboration and global exchange but also demonstrated the importance of developing new skills and business models to thrive in a rapidly changing landscape. The post-COVID multimodal creative economy represents the transformation and diversification of the arts entrepreneurship sector in response to the global pandemic. It encompasses the ability of individuals, organizations, and communities to operate and thrive through various modes of business delivery, including online, synchronous, and in-person asynchronous models. Multimodality in the creative economy refers to the flexibility and adaptability to engage with audiences and customers across different platforms and formats, thereby expanding reach, enhancing accessibility, and ensuring sustainability (Ruiz et al., 2021).

Migratory Entrepreneurship: In our interconnected and globalized world, artistic and entrepreneurial initiatives have the power to transcend physical borders and cultural barriers. Migratory entrepreneurship represents the idea that innovations, products, and services within the arts entrepreneurship field have the potential to influence not only the target community and audience but also to create a ripple effect that transcends geographical boundaries. It goes beyond localized impact and aims to create a broader resonance that reaches new audiences, influences different communities, and stimulates creative and economic growth in unexpected places.

References

Ruiz-Resto, José Valentino; Lee, Derris; and Shelton, Chris (2021) "Entrepreneurial Responses to the COVID Era: A Qualitative Study of Five Professional Music Entrepreneurs," *Journal of Arts*

Entrepreneurship Education: Vol. 3:2, Article 4. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/jaee/vol3/iss2/4>

Pace

Gary Beckman
North Carolina State University

When speaking about the field, holding fast to its potential is critical to many—and with good reason. For the many of us who see daily the potential in our either wide-eyed or suspicious students, envisioning how our field can be made pliable for all is a critical aspect of our endeavor. Indeed, this is why many of us teach in the first place; changing a life is as much a privilege as it is pouring the intellectual basis of our teachings into many, many different molds.

The accompanying thoughts surrounding the one you are presently reading will likely reflect this potential. Yes, scaling, expanding, pushing, and re-envisioning what Arts Entrepreneurship may be—both now and—in the future is critical to the growth of the field and our students (if not ultimately to their future sense of self-efficacy). What we do in the classroom is vital, yet how we interact and sculpt our field is also important. Both are the responsibilities we accept as ones who choose to go about this endeavor.

While other expansive thoughts surrounding this one will likely (and should) inspire many, we should note the lesson of basic gardening. A productive plant requires strong roots. Keeping in mind that our emerging field will go through trends, phases, etc., we should note that our roots must keep pace with the emerging leaves. If we really mean to support our students with new growth and new fruit, we have a responsibility to make fast the roots of our emerging academic discipline—the scholarship that makes it so.

If we envision an academic discipline in the truest sense, we must come to terms with the fact that waiting for others to intellectually engage with building *our* body of knowledge will only result in a lack of innovation. Many ask students to demonstrate the courage to launch a business. We'd likely be more successful educators if we could tell the story of our courage to publish a brick in our emerging discipline's foundation. *This* is keeping pace.

Uniqueness and Originality¹

Linda Essig
Baruch College of City University of New York

Artists create something unique that has aesthetic value. This uniqueness, the originality of the artist's work, is also one source of the work's value in exchange. It is not necessary for an artist to produce multiple copies (i.e., mass production) for there to be arts

¹ Adapted from "Novelty, Uniqueness, Originality" in *Creative Infrastructures: Artists, Money, and Entrepreneurial Action* (2022).

entrepreneurial activity. The arts entrepreneurial activity can take place when there is only one unique product that the artist connects with the audience for that work. It is that connection that is at the core of arts entrepreneurial action, whether there is one of something (a performance, an object, a recording of some kind) or many.

There is a tension between what art fundamentally is, a unique work that expresses symbolic meaning, and the reproduction of that work. Yet there are artists who harness reproducibility as a way to produce an innovation (a creative idea that has impact), enact entrepreneurship (connect work with audiences through a mediating structure), and work efficiently so that they can make the money they need to feed their art. But reproduction of work that was unique in its origin also feeds the capitalist urge to exploit the labor of the artist for financial gain, albeit sometimes to the benefit of organizations that themselves support artists or are part of the cultural fabric of a community.

Photo by Dó Castle, www.pexels.com/photo/white-clouds-2274729/