

## **WHAT IS ARTS ENTREPRENEURSHIP? TRACKING THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITS DEFINITION IN SCHOLARLY JOURNALS**

Woong Jo Chang, Seattle University

Margaret Wyszomirski, The Ohio State University

### **Abstract**

In this study, we investigate the ways in which arts entrepreneurship has been operationalized and defined in the literature. We identify eight scholarly journals in arts administration and policy, in business administration, and in nonprofit marketing published during 2003-2013 and review articles published in these journals. Our review found that the scholarly literature on arts entrepreneurship has in fact been quite scarce. We also examine all articles in *Artivate*, a journal that specializes in arts entrepreneurship. Taking the literature as a whole, we found a plethora of meanings used in the literature, indicating an, as yet, unsettled definition. We suggest that some analytical clarity can be obtained by grouping the many meanings of arts entrepreneurship into five analytical “levels”: Personal Character traits, Goals, Strategies, Tactics, and Context. We also suggest a possible general definition: “arts entrepreneurship” is a management process through which cultural workers seek to support their creativity and autonomy, advance their capacity for adaptability, and create artistic as well as economic and social value. This management process involves an ongoing set of innovative choices and risks intended to recombine resources and pursue new opportunities to produce artistic, economic, and social value. Identifying the emerging clusters from the meanings found in the literature, we conclude that to understand arts entrepreneurs, one must focus on the innovative combinations of strategy, individual skills, and mindset operating in each case of arts entrepreneurship and its context. As arts entrepreneurship is a constant exercise in recombination of skillsets, the possibility of flexible recipes begins to reveal what might be regarded as the recombinant DNA of arts entrepreneurship.

### **What is Arts Entrepreneurship? Tracking the Development of its Definition in Scholarly Journals**

Arts Entrepreneurship is a relatively new topic of research in arts management, cultural policy, and arts education, as well as a relatively new focus in entrepreneurial research. In arts-related fields, the topic appears on the program of many scholarly and professional conference programs. From the conferences of the Association of Arts Administration Educators (AAAE), the international conference on Social Theory, Politics and the Arts (STP&A), the International Association of Arts and Cultural Management (AIMAC), the International Conference on Cultural Policy Research (ICCPR), the International Council of Fine Arts Deans (ICFAD) to the annual conferences of the League of American Orchestras (LAO), Dance/ USA, and the US Association for Small Business & Entrepreneurship (USASBE), arts entrepreneurship has been the focus of panel sessions, keynote speakers, and/or affinity groups. The practice has even been recognized with the award of a first MacArthur Fellowship in 2010 when musician Claire Chase was named a MacArthur Fellow for arts entrepreneurship.

In his 2007 article surveying the landscape of higher education offerings, Gary Beckman identified 36 institutions that offered courses and/or certificate or degree programs in arts entrepreneurship. Writing more recently in 2013, Jason White noted the number had grown to 60. In 2012, *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, an online journal on arts

entrepreneurship, was launched. In June 2014, the Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education was established following its inaugural conference in Dallas. Clearly, the subject of arts entrepreneurship has become a hot topic. Thus, it is timely to explore how our understanding of the subject of arts entrepreneurship has developed. A significant component of the scholarly literature concerns arts entrepreneurship pedagogy. While we note these as part of the literature, we will not discuss them in detail—that is a subject for another article. Our focus is on the way in which literature has operationalized the concept of arts entrepreneurship, thereby presenting implicit definitions of the idea.

### **Identifying the Literature Pool**

To assemble a broad pool of relevant literature we chose to review all issues of selected journals that appeared regularly over the ten-year period between 2003 and 2013. This period was selected because 2013 was the most recent year for which online copies of the journals and their articles were downloadable from university library holdings and because scholars in arts administration broadly share the impression that the literature on arts entrepreneurship is steadily growing (e.g., Beckman, 2007; Beckman & Essig, 2012; Rentschler, 2003; Scherdin & Zander, 2011). Then we moved back ten years to 2003. As we discovered, moving back a decade brought us to a cluster of entrepreneurship articles that appeared in the leading arts management journals at the very beginning of the decade, likely reflecting the emergence of arts entrepreneurs in practice.

We identified major groups of regularly published scholarly journals. The first group, journals in the fields of arts administration and policy, was selected on the basis of published ranking and impact studies, specifically the assessment compiled by Ruth Rentschler and David Shilbury (2008), which was “the first internationally accepted ranking in the field of arts management” (Rentschler & Kirchner, 2011). This multidimensional rating survey identified 14 journals using 30 expert informants who ranked each journal according to four quality and knowledge use indicators. Four major journals in arts administration and cultural policy received top rating scores. These included the *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, *International Journal of Arts Management*, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, and *Journal of Cultural Economics*. We reviewed all articles published in each journal between 2003 and 2013 to identify those that dealt explicitly with entrepreneurship.

A second group of journals treated the subject of entrepreneurship from the perspective of business administration. These included the *Journal of Business Venturing and Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Both of these received high rankings in the 2011 study by Dos Santos, Holsaple and Ye. In addition, we looked at the journal *Creativity and Innovation Management*, understanding that its explicit commitment to creativity (as can be seen in the journal’s title and introduction) might make it focus particularly on arts entrepreneurship. We reviewed all articles published in these journals over the 2003-2013 decade and identified those that discussed entrepreneurship in a setting of the arts, culture, creativity, or any single artistic discipline (such as dance, music, opera, theatre, crafts, etc.).

Finally, two other likely publication outlets on arts entrepreneurship that are dedicated to nonprofit marketing were identified: *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing* and *International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing*. Finding and building audiences is a leading subject of concern for arts managers and funders, and there is a stream of thinking in the field of arts management that implies marketing and entrepreneurship are closely

identified with arts entrepreneurship. Therefore, we were particularly interested in the possible role of nonprofit marketing literature in the field of arts entrepreneurship.

Among the articles published in each of the journals between 2003 and 2013, we selected those that self-identified (thru either the title or abstract) an interest in arts entrepreneurship. We also did a keyword search within the articles to see whether any additional articles contained a discussion of entrepreneurship, even though it did not self-identify the topic as a focal interest.

In the next section, we report our findings from this review and present our analysis of the conceptual and definitional patterns displayed in the literature. A third section will then review all of the articles published in the recently established journal, *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, and compare them with the inter-disciplinary literature.

### **A Decade of Interdisciplinary Arts Entrepreneurship Literature: A Plethora of Definitions**

The idea of arts entrepreneurship is widely regarded as a fairly recent phenomenon. What may have prompted the recent interest? A clue to an answer may be found in the unstable and changing environment in which the arts found themselves during the period under study. The decade between 2003 and 2013 was characterized by a number of macro-level changes that challenged established operating assumptions and practices of artists and arts organizations. Repeated economic disruptions destabilized the dynamics of cultural philanthropy. Marketing faced a need to adjust to demographic shifts that saw the age of established arts audience members increase even as the arts sought to reach younger and more diverse populations. Technological developments allowed audiences access to high quality arts experiences from their homes and social media revolutionized the ways in which arts marketing reached “born digital” generations. Meanwhile, the spread of the concept of the creative industries emphasized the economic scale and significance of arts, entertainment, and cultural activities. But this proved to be a double-edged sword: it increased policy pressure for stronger earnings performance in a globalizing marketplace, while also diminishing support for public subsidies for the fine arts. As we will see, all of these developments had a hand in the rise of arts entrepreneurship discourse—particularly on the topics of change management and arts leadership, as well as new approaches to funding and marketing (Wyszomirski & Chang, 2012).

Nine journals were examined as plausible locations of literature on arts entrepreneurship:

- Four leading Journals in arts management and arts/cultural policy
- Three leading journals in the general management field specializing in entrepreneurship
- Two leading journals in nonprofit, voluntary, or public-sector marketing

Table 1, following, summarizes the findings from this review.

<b>Journal</b>	<b>Total # of Articles Published during 2003-2013</b>	<b># of Articles on Arts Entrepreneurship</b>	<b>% of Articles on Arts Entrepreneurship</b>
<b><i>Arts Management &amp; Policy Journals</i></b>			
<i>Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society</i>	218	10 (+2 educ)	4.59% (5.50%)
<i>International Journal of Arts Management</i>	203	6	2.96 %
<i>Journal of Cultural Economics</i>	169	1	0.59%
<i>International Journal of Cultural Policy</i>	300	4	1.33%
<b><i>Entrepreneurship Journals</i></b>			
<i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>	463	2	0.43%
<i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i>	432	2	0.46%
<i>Creativity and Innovation Management</i>	267	2	0.75%
<b><i>Nonprofit Marketing Journals</i></b>			
<i>Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing</i>	203	0	0%
<i>International Journal of Nonprofit &amp; Voluntary Sector Marketing</i>	312	2	0.64%

Table 1. Journal and Article Pool Reviewed

### **Journals in Arts Management and Arts/Cultural Policy**

The four arts management/cultural policy journals contained a total of 890 articles (excluding book reviews, issue introductions, and tributes to individual scholars). Of these, only 19 (+2) presented research and analysis focused on arts entrepreneurship.

*The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society (JAMLS)* was established in 1969 as the *Performing Arts Review*. In 1982, it changed its name to the *Journal of Arts Management and the Law*; then in 1992, the title was amended to become the *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*. Its long publishing history makes *JAMLS* the oldest scholarly journal in the field of arts management and art/cultural policy. In the decade between 2003 and 2013, 218 articles were published in *JAMLS*, of which only ten treated the subject of entrepreneurship and the arts from a conceptual and/or definitional perspective. This represented only 4.59% of the total (an additional two articles discussed the teaching of arts entrepreneurship).

Ruth Rentschler edit the Fall 2003 issue, focused on the exploration of arts and entrepreneurship. Rentschler was the head of the Dowater School of Management and

Marketing at Deakin University in Melbourne, Australia. She was also the acting head of the Center for Leisure Management Research. Thus, she brought a business management and marketing perspective to the study of arts management. Even more to the point, Rentschler had published a book, *The Entrepreneurial Arts Leader*, in 2002, which focused on cultural policy entrepreneurship in response to changes and challenges in government funding of the arts in a number of countries across the globe. In her introduction to the Fall 2003 issue of *JAMLS*, Rentschler spoke of the desire to contribute to the development of broad theoretical perspectives and declared the topics of entrepreneurial leadership and entrepreneurial organizations as innovations in relating to a changing marketplace. The articles included in the Fall 2003 issue of *JAMLS* discussed small for-profit and nonprofit arts organizations, as well as “how arts leaders have managed in a complex and changing environment, while struggling to apply new ways of performing human work in a service industry” (Rentschler, 2003, p. 163). The articles ranged widely, sought to contextualize entrepreneurship and the arts with regard to cultural policy, cultural leadership, cultural value, nonprofit development, leisure activities, and networking theory. In short, many conceptual and implementation tools that would come to characterize the arts entrepreneurship literature were introduced in this 2003 special issue.

The Fall 2003 issue of *JAMLS* clearly demonstrated that scholarly interest in arts entrepreneurship at this time was regarded primarily as a form of leadership, the ability to manage the recombination of basic organizational functions (such as marketing and funding) in the face of contextual change, and as a demonstration of policy entrepreneurship. As such, these articles built on two earlier experiments in studying entrepreneurship and the arts – studies by Paul DiMaggio (1982) and Margaret Wyszomirski (1987). DiMaggio’s article, “Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth Century Boston,” was concerned with formative organizational leadership at the Boston Symphony Orchestra and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. It raised concerns with new organization formation, with cultural leadership, and with manipulating both financial and artistic resources in new ways. Alternatively, Wyszomirski’s study of NEA Chair Nancy Hanks appeared as a case study chapter in an edited book on policy entrepreneurship and leadership innovation in the public sector. It was essentially a case study of policy opportunity spotting and new ways of organizing and directing advocacy (which could be regarded as a form of policy marketing).

Thus, the 2003 *JAMLS* issue introduced an international and broadly descriptive definition of arts entrepreneurship. The articles in the 2003 issue dealt with many facets of the concept. These included arts consumption patterns and competition (Burton, 2003); leadership and regional cultural development (Radbourne, 2003); managing a mixed funding system for arts organizations in the U.S. (Mulcahy, 2003); “unraveling” the multiple value propositions of arts organizations (Geursen & Rentschler, 2003); music industry networks (Jackson & Oliver, 2003); and arts policy leadership in the public sector (Thompson, 2003). Furthermore, the Jackson and Oliver article linked music networks to the interest in the creative industries that spread out from the UK.

After the Fall 2003 special issue, entrepreneurship and the arts disappeared from *JAMLS* until a Summer 2007 article by Gary Beckman explored the teaching of arts entrepreneurship in higher education. Beckman reported a diversity of curriculum and programmatic approaches indicating a weak conceptual foundation amidst growing administrative and student interest. Somehow in the years between 2003 and 2007, arts entrepreneurship had developed from a small research interest to a much talked about topic among deans of schools of the arts. Beckman attributes this interest to “a response to poor professional outcomes, accountability pressures, and

the potential for meaningful community engagement [that led to] the development of innovative career strategies for arts students” (p. 88). Thus, Beckman returned to the concept of entrepreneurship as finding new ways to foster success and new expectations regarding what constitutes success in arts education and the professional preparation of artists. Significantly, Beckman noted that “there is no consensus on an accepted definition of entrepreneurship in an arts context . . . and that the subject arouses resistance among many arts administrators and artists from a belief that entrepreneurship represents solely a path toward monetary success at the expense of art” (p. 94).

Between 2009 and 2012, five other articles appeared in *JAMLS* that touched on arts entrepreneurship. In Winter 2009, Aleksandar Brkić published “Teaching Arts Management,” identifying four approaches to teaching arts management, one of which was arts entrepreneurship. Thus, Brkić’s article falls outside the scope of our current interest, since it is concerned with pedagogy rather than research-based conceptualization and definition. However, his inclusion of entrepreneurship as one of four main approaches to arts management is indicative of how arts entrepreneurship has become a commonly discussed topic in the field. In Spring of 2009, Pier Luigi Sacco and colleagues discussed fostering local entrepreneurship as a key dimension of local cultural development strategy. While the article also discussed the importance of networking, entrepreneurship was treated largely as a development tool for the local creative economy, rather than a leadership or innovation approach in its own right. In 2010, Christoph Behnke presented a case study of a German Swiss curator of contemporary art in the 1960s, arguing that curators could be cultural entrepreneurs. Behnke’s idea of entrepreneurship emphasized the ability to recombine political, economic, and aesthetic components in a new way to navigate a period of significant change. He also identified an entrepreneurial tactic in the way rhetoric and symbols are used, which suggested marketing. In 2011, Steven Preece (2011) brought up performing arts entrepreneurship (PAE) as a disciplinary micro-culture in the arts. He argues that PAE deserves its own theoretical treatment in the literature. Incorporating concepts of “The Performing Arts Event Cycle” and the “Performing Arts Value Chain,” the author addressed fundamental questions within the PAE subfield such as why, where, and when PAE takes place. Finally in 2012, Angela Besana presented an analysis of symphony managers as creative entrepreneurs in the sense of constantly finding new approaches to marketing and fundraising. Besana’s (2012) article provided an interesting discussion of the entrepreneurial tactics of finding new sources of funding as well as new ways of finding and connecting to markets. However, it did not really present an entrepreneurial analysis. Rather, it labeled orchestra managers as creative entrepreneurs, without clearly defining what this means or how it differs from administrative management.

Additionally, of the six articles that appeared in *JAMLS* between 2007 and 2013, only one dealt with conceptual and/or definitional issues: the Behnke case study. Two (Brkić and Beckman) discussed entrepreneurship with a focus on teaching arts management and pedagogy. Preece’s article (2011) was focused on the new venture creation aspect of entrepreneurship. Two other articles (Sacco, et al. and Besana) essentially labeled certain activities as “entrepreneurial,” but did not distinguish them either conceptually or definitionally.

*The Journal of Cultural Economics (JCE)* is another well-established publication in the field of arts management and arts/cultural policy, having started in 1977. A review of the 169 articles that appeared in the decade between 2003 and 2013 revealed only one relevant article, “The Cultural Entrepreneur and the Creative Industries: Beginning in Vienna” by Swedberg (2006), which deals with the definitional and conceptual origins of entrepreneurship as presented

by Joseph Schumpeter, that also considered how he applied this discussion to the arts (Swedberg, 2006). This lone article seems to suggest that while cultural economists might regard arts entrepreneurship as a topic within economic theory, they seem less likely to consider it as a subject for economic analysis.

*The International Journal of Arts Management (IJAM)* published its first issue in the Fall of 1998 with a mission to improve information exchange and learning between arts managers and academic researchers who were also preparing future generations of arts managers in a growing number of academic programs (Colbert, 1998). During our review period, six articles appeared discussing arts entrepreneurship: two were focused on arts marketing (one of arts organizations and the other of individual artists); another two were concerned with organizational leadership and change management; and each of the two final articles either discussed opportunity spotting to develop innovative types of arts and business relationships or the role of education in preparing musicians for careers as freelancers and in creating start-ups.

In Winter 2003, Des Griffin published an article about museum leaders as possible entrepreneurs. Des Griffin painted a backdrop of extensive change both in the environment surrounding museums and in the transformation of museums from “predictable, preachy, white-walled and academic institutions into more engaged, educational, and entrepreneurial organizations committed to building audiences as well as collections” (2003, p. 5). As a result of these changes, Des Griffin argued, museum leaders have faced growing expectations to act as “superior change managers.” Such entrepreneurialism is held to mean “an increasing focus on [their] audiences and on the generation of revenue from beyond the realm of traditional sources” (p. 5). Later, Des Griffin reinforced the financial connotation, arguing that any distinction between entrepreneurship and innovation has to do with the implication that entrepreneurship involves generating money. He pointed out that this produces the expectation that museum managers “[do] more with less or generat[e] more revenues from outside government (or other traditional) sources” (2003, p. 10). He finished with a critique of “the wrong-headedness of a focus on the entrepreneurial business model and on efficiency.”

Later in 2003, *IJAM* editor Francois Colbert explored entrepreneurship and leadership in marketing the arts. The focus on marketing addressed a common concern of entrepreneurs: finding new ways to approach and appeal to new markets/audiences. Colbert drew on a broad base of marketing knowledge to argue that marketing the arts has particularities that differ from other products. It is product-focused, yet the product does not exist to fulfill a market need. The established arts market is distinctive and limited, yet diversifying it is an important element of leadership. Getting children interested in the arts is “crucially important” (Colbert, 2003, p. 34). Entrepreneurship in arts marketing seems to require using common marketing tools such as branding, marketing both products and experiences, forging closer community ties, improving the level of customer service, and strengthening data collection and processing through new technology use. Thus, for Colbert, adapting and recombining well-known marketing tactics to the particularities of the arts market was the hallmark of arts entrepreneurship. In contrast, we see arts marketing as a key entrepreneurial tactic rather than the entire concept.

Ian Fillis expanded on the perspective of marketing as entrepreneurship in his 2004 article on “The Entrepreneurial Artist as Marketer: Drawing from the Smaller Firm Literature” published in *IJAM*. The focus is on individual artists and artists working as owners of small businesses or as sole proprietors. Heretofore, much of the arts entrepreneurship literature has tended to look at arts organizations as the context in which entrepreneurship is practiced. Fillis launched a broad critique of conventional marketing strategies as being too logical, too linear,

and too uncreative (2004, p. 12). In seeking more creativity in marketing in general, Fillis also argued for more creativity and new approaches in arts marketing in particular. By looking at small and mid-sized enterprises (SMEs), rather than large organizations, he linked into the idea that entrepreneurship is critical to new and small firms. Furthermore, new and small firms have more flexibility and can adapt to change quickly. They also rely on extensive networking, including more personalized customer relations, and may be more creative in spotting opportunities. Here, Fillis alerted the arts manager as well as the individual artist not only to the marketing/entrepreneurship “interface,” but also to a set of elements that included effective marketing, artistic creativity, and small arts enterprises. This conceptualization of arts and entrepreneurship is broader than seen elsewhere in the literature of this decade, but its innovativeness was masked by treating entrepreneurship simply as “marketing” as it was assumed to represent the full picture of the concept.

Finally, in her article, “Arts, Culture and Business: A Relationship Transformation, a Nascent Field,” Bernadette McNicholas (2004) explores various forms of cultural entrepreneurship to examine the evolution of arts and business relationships from arts sponsorships (which she claims are outdated) to different types of strategic arts and cultural partnerships and various forms of cultural entrepreneurship, as illustrated by a framework of types of arts and business relationships. The author concludes that arts/culture and business relationships now act as on-the-edge-innovation systems and dynamic complex adaptive relationship systems, offering unique opportunities and powerful economic advantages for business and communities in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Note that McNicholas (2004) and other authors in *IJAM* use the term, “cultural entrepreneurship” rather than “arts entrepreneurship.” This may be because *IJAM* is more Europe-centric (as well as Canada and Australia) where the term “culture” is used more interchangeably with the term “art,” and, therefore, the term “cultural management” is used far more frequently to refer to “arts management” than is done in the United States.

Just like *JAMLS*, after 2003-2004, articles selected and published by *IJAM* seldom focused on entrepreneurship. However, discussions of the subject could be found in articles about specific case studies or regional studies, such as in “Martin Revheim, Blå and the Kongsberg Jazz Festival: Suksess Need Not Be Translated” (2006) by Stéphane Vigneault, Bernard Chassé, and Laurent Lapierre. This case study examines the work of Martin Revheim, director of Norway's very successful Kongsberg Jazz Festival, since 2002. Entrepreneurship in this article is discussed as a form of leadership.

Andrea Hausmann (2010) again touches on the educational problems for arts entrepreneurship. In her article “German Artists Between Bohemian Idealism and Entrepreneurial Dynamics: Reflections on Cultural Entrepreneurship and the Need for Start-Up Management,” Hausmann explores contextual factors in cultural entrepreneurship in Germany, especially focusing on start-up arts organizations. Acknowledging the problems with the long-term economic success of start-ups in the German cultural sector, she finds the existing system of music education in Germany to be inappropriate for young artists who will soon engage in freelance life or in the management of start-ups to be inappropriate.

Thus, while *IJAM* published six articles on arts entrepreneurship during the decade under review, the term “entrepreneurship” was largely treated as an asserted, descriptive label and therefore escaped clear definition either conceptually or operationally.

*The International Journal of Cultural Policy (IJCP)*, formerly known as *The European Journal of Cultural Policy*, was first published in 1994, and renamed in 1997. The *IJCP* focuses on exploring the meaning, function, and impact of cultural policies. It discusses “culture” as



symbolic communication related to policy at any level rather than a way of life. In the decade between 2003 and 2013, 300 articles were published in *IJCP*, of which four treated the subject of entrepreneurship and the arts, representing only 1.33% of the total number of articles.

The following articles draw attention to various forces of change as prompting a turn toward entrepreneurship in the arts. As such, they point to the importance of context and to a need to improve change management. Among the changes discussed in Andrea Ellmeier's article, "Cultural Entrepreneurialism" are "the 'marketisation' of culture and the 'culturalisation' of the market" (Ellmeier, 2003, p. 5) – that is, the meeting point of market and culture. To respond to these concurrent processes of change, the author calls for "cultural entrepreneurialism" (which we term "arts entrepreneurship" in this review) and observes a transition from "cultural worker" to "cultural entrepreneur" in the creative sector. Ellmeier recognizes new job profiles emerging in the creative cultural sector that fundamentally alter the image of artists and creators into cultural entrepreneurs who earn their living from their various micro-enterprises. In response to these changes, Robert Hewison, in his article "The Crisis of Cultural Leadership in Britain" (2004), calls for new forms of leadership driven not by market values, but by the social and public good. As he examines cultural leadership, he sees that relational cultural leaders, who work with and through others, will be of more value in the future, rather than transformational or transactional leaders. Cultural leadership driven by the social and public good stretches the concept of arts entrepreneurship beyond the sustainability of artists and arts organizations and extends it to also produce social and public benefits that help to sustain civil society.

In the process of change management, the following two articles question the general description of entrepreneurship as a form of "creative destruction" and, instead, suggest that arts entrepreneurship might emphasize "creative adaptation." For instance, in "Manageable Creativity," Chris Bilton (2010) notes how creativity in both theory and practice has become a "manageable" rather than a "destructive" concept. The structural model of creativity emphasizes the systems and infrastructure of an individual's creativity, rather than that individual's raw talent and the pure content of his or her creation. However, this approach overlooks the unpredictability of artists and their creations, posing an inevitable oxymoron – the belief that the creative process *can* be "managed" and held to a "structured" system through policy, even as its practitioners and products remain unpredictable by nature. In their article, "Management Skills for Artists: 'Learning by Doing'?" (2011), Christine Bauer, Katharina Viola, and Christine Strauss also consider the shift in the perception of creativity from being "destructive" to being "manageable" and the shift from transformational to relational leadership. Consequently, they problematize the current training for artists that reflects on those shifts and call for more entrepreneurial education that includes business-related content for career development for artists.

### **Journals in the General Management Field Specializing in Entrepreneurship**

Studies regarding the arts and arts organizations have also been scarce in business journals that focus on entrepreneurship. Between 2003 and 2013, the entrepreneurship journals (*Journal of Business Venturing*, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, and *Creativity and Innovation Management*) that we reviewed contained a total of 1,162 articles (excluding book reviews, issue introductions, and tributes to individual scholars). Of these, only six reported research and analysis focusing on arts entrepreneurship.

*The Journal of Business Venturing (JBV)*, which has been published since 1986, introduced two articles in recent years that discuss the arts or the cultural sector. True to the journal's name, each of these articles focuses on how arts activities try to obtain venture capital. In "Nascent Ventures Competing for Start-up Capital: Matching Reputations and Investors" Joris J. Ebbers and Nachoem M. Wijnberg (2012) argue that investors cannot know whether a nascent venture is worth investing in, since it does not yet have an established reputation; however, investors can rely on the past reputations of a venture's founder based on his/her performance in earlier years. Thus the authors studied the reputations of Dutch producers and directors and examined their impact on investors. They use Selection System Theory to analyze the impact of different types of reputations on the behavior of investors. The professional reputations of individual artists play a significant role in securing funding not only from investors, but also from public and private donors. This article touches upon arts entrepreneurship to the extent that it focuses on investments in new projects in the Dutch film industry.

In 2013, Paul Belleflamme, Thomas Lambert, and Armin Schwiendbacher published "Crowdfunding: Tapping the Right Crowd" in *JBV*. They address how for-profit, artistic, and cultural ventures use crowdfunding to raise external financing from a large number of small investors, namely the "crowd," with each person providing a very small amount. This type of fundraising is carried out in place of soliciting money from a small number of investors who are in a position to make larger contributions. The authors compare two forms of crowdfunding: in one, individuals are invited to pre-order a product; and in the other, they are asked to advance a fixed payment in exchange for a share of future profits. In both cases "crowdfunders" are assumed to enjoy "community benefits." Belleflamme et al. (2013) used a unified model to determine when an entrepreneur chooses one or the other forms of fund raising. They found that entrepreneurs pre-order when a relatively small initial capital is required compared with market size; otherwise, they engage in profit sharing.

*Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice (ET&P)*, which has been issued since 1988, published two articles in recent years that examine entrepreneurial practices in the arts or cultural sector. The first article was "Learning from Levi-Strauss' Legacy: Art, Craft, Engineering, Bricolage, and Brokerage in Entrepreneurship." The authors, Bryan T. Stinchfield, Reed E. Nelson and Matthew S. Wood (2013), studied 23 entrepreneurs using grounded theory; they were interested in "less 'rational' entrepreneurial behaviors" (p. 889). From their findings, five types of entrepreneurial behavior emerged: art, craft, engineering, bricolage, and brokerage. They then considered the association between these types of entrepreneurship and the financial sustainability of the venture.

Also in *ET&P*, we found Kristine M. Kuhn and Tera L. Galloway's (2013) paper, "With a Little Help From My Competitors: Peer Networking Among Artisan Entrepreneurs." The authors implicitly challenge the general definition of arts entrepreneurs by focusing instead on "artisan entrepreneurs"-- those who sell their arts and crafts through e-commerce sites such as Etsy and Artfire. They surveyed 343 artisan entrepreneurs to learn about their uses of technology in giving and receiving advice and assistance, both formally and informally, which the authors call "soft support" (Kuhn & Galloway, 2013, p. 1). They found that the types of advice and support (friendship, creative ideas, or business management, among others) an artisan entrepreneur sought, depended on his or her type of motivation (creative-expression and business-oriented).

*Creativity and Innovation Management (C&IM)*, which first appeared in 1992, publishes papers that discuss how imagination and innovation are organized and implemented in business,

with the goal to reduce the gap between theory and practice. In recent years, two articles were published in *C&IM* that are related to the arts. In “Bring in the Arts and Get the Creativity for Free: A Study of the Artists in Residence Project,” Alexander Styhre and Michael Eriksson (2008) examine Artists in Residence, a ten-month project conducted in Sweden involving a collaboration of musicians, painters, actors, directors, dancers, and choreographers with a regular company so that artists would be in touch with the world of business. The goal of the project was to “think in new and creative ways” (Styhre & Eriksson, 2008, p. 47). The project showed the potential benefits of bringing artists into industry.

In “A Competence Portfolio for Professionals in the Creative Industries,” Dana Mietzner and Martin Kamprath (2013) consider the impact of developments in media and ICT technologies on creative industries. Through a literature review, interviews, and workshops with industry experts, they investigate trends in what they call “competence shifts.” The authors compile a portfolio consisting of professional, methodological, and personal-social competences for the creative industries, making recommendations regarding the competences that they felt needed to be included in training creative professionals.

### **Journals in Nonprofit, Voluntary, or Public-sector Marketing**

After reviewing the other journals in our study, we also decided to look at two leading nonprofit marketing journals. Since marketing was one of the most common themes in the arts entrepreneurship literature to date, we wanted to inquire whether journals focused on this particular meaning of “entrepreneurship” might prove a fruitful source of pertinent articles and ideas. Furthermore, since a significant segment of the arts are produced and presented by nonprofit organizations, we chose to concentrate on marketing journals concerned with nonprofit activity.

*Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing (JNPSM)* was first published in 1996. Within the decade that we reviewed, we found eight articles on issues related to the arts sector, several articles on social entrepreneurship, with one special issue (2010 Volume 22 issue 2) devoted to social entrepreneurship. However, there were no articles in the *JNPSM* that address the subject of arts and entrepreneurship.

*International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing (IJNVSM)* also began publishing in 1996. Among a total of 312 articles that appeared between 2003 and 2013, the journal published 46 articles about the arts; of these, only two (0.64%) address issues in arts entrepreneurship. In “Using Creativity to Achieve an Entrepreneurial Future for Arts Marketing,” Ian Fillis and Ruth Rentschler (2005) address marketing behavior in non-profit arts organizations. They examine how art, marketing, and entrepreneurship are related to creativity – that is, how it is necessary to think creatively when managing one’s arts organization to cope with the resource constraints. This paper utilizes creativity as a central concept to include a wide range of literatures to embrace non-linear, free thinking to solve current issues in arts marketing.

In 2006, Ruth Rentschler and Megan Cardmone published “Indigenous Innovators: The Role of Web Marketing for Cultural Micro-Enterprises,” in which they discuss arts entrepreneurship. Focusing on the indigenous cultural sector in Australia, which annually contributes \$100 million to the country’s economy, the authors note that most Australian indigenous cultural producers are micro-enterprises. Furthermore, due to their remote and isolated locations or few resources in urban areas, these micro-enterprises are struggling to market their cultural products. Incorporating two case studies, Rentschler and Cardmone discuss the innovative uses of information technology, exploring web marketing as a possible solution

for the struggling indigenous cultural micro-enterprises (ICME) and assess the attributes of effective web marketing.

### Designative Patterns in the Scholarly Literature

Despite a sense that arts entrepreneurship has been a hot topic in recent years, this review found that the scholarly literature on arts entrepreneurship has, in fact, been quite scarce. The preceding discussion of nine scholarly journals focused on arts management/policy, business journals concerned with entrepreneurship in general, and journals focused on marketing in nonprofit and public sectors during the years between 2003 and 2013. Of the number of articles reviewed, only 29 (31 including arts entrepreneurship education) arts entrepreneurship articles appeared among a total of 2,567 articles published during our period of concern. Although the number of articles is relatively small, many different phenomena were identified as exhibiting the phenomenon of arts entrepreneurship. Each meaning can be understood as offering at least a partial and implicit definition of the term. In other words, our vocabulary is primarily designative. The sheer variety of these meanings reinforces the often-noticed lack of consensus among researchers about the definition of arts entrepreneurship.

Table 2 below lists fifteen meanings of arts entrepreneurship that appeared in the literature reviewed. The list is presented in simple alphabetical form. The number of times a given meaning appeared in the literature is noted in the left hand column, with an additional column noting frequency of use in articles published in *Artivate*, launched in 2012. Note that the number of appearances exceeds the number of articles because many articles address more than one manifestation or defining topic.

The three most frequently used meanings of arts entrepreneurship refer to common business meanings of entrepreneurship: new ventures, locating new financial capital, and developing new markets. Similarly, the next most common meanings also appear frequently in the general business literature —networking and change management. (Change management is a term common to the nonprofit literature. Perhaps the more apposite business term is “creative destruction.”)

Alternatively, many articles discuss more than one meaning or attribute of arts entrepreneurship in a single article. For example, a number of authors who explore arts organizational leadership as an exercise in entrepreneurship also argue that such leaders often aim to develop new forms of funding and/or new initiatives in audience/market development. Other authors who examine arts organization case studies combine leadership, change management, and opportunity spotting in the same discussion. Furthermore, organizational change is seen as being driven both/either by internal, organizational developments or by external, contextual factors. A number of authors touch on a role for new technology use in combination with other meanings. Yet other authors, particularly those dealing with individual artists and arts micro-enterprises, tend to integrate issues of new venture creation with venture capital acquisition (sometimes employing social media such as crowdsourcing) with networking. Those dealing with arts entrepreneurship in the public sector seem to emphasize opportunity spotting, with contextual sensitivity, networking, and recombination initiatives although such cases seldom use explicitly entrepreneurial terminology.

Designated Meaning (N = Total # of meanings discussed)	7 journals reviewed (N = 55)	2 nonprofit marketing journals (N=5)	<i>Artivate</i> (N = 40)
Arts Organization Leadership	3	1	--
Bricolage	--	--	2
Change Management	4	--	--
Competency/Skills/Education	4	--	7
Funding Acquisition	6	--	1
Individual Artists/Small Business	11	1	4
Local/regional Development	2	--	2
Marketing/Audience Development	6	--	2
Mindset/Personal Traits	2	1	4
Networking	4	--	1
New Technology Use	3	1	2
Partnerships	1	--	2
Public Leadership/Policy Innovation	1	--	--
Opportunity Spotting	2	--	7
Recombination	2	--	2
Social Enterprise	1	1	4
Theory/Types	3	--	--

Table 2. Designated Meanings of Arts Entrepreneurship

### Examining the Specialized Literature: *Artivate*

A new scholarly journal – *Artivate* – dedicated to developing the field discussion and to stimulating research on arts entrepreneurship began publishing in 2012. In their introductory article for the first issue, co-editors Gary Beckman and Linda Essig (2012) referred to the Journal “...as the first peer-reviewed platform for arts entrepreneurship scholarship originating in the U.S...”(p. 7). In the dialogue-structured article, Beckman describes arts entrepreneurship as a hybrid of disciplinary inputs and stakeholders, noting that “‘...our product’ is aesthetic, thus, our prefix separates us from the business school and our suffix separates us from the arts school, but the beauty of our field is that our title unites the two in a new way.”(p. 1) and that “...what

*Artivate* publishes is aimed at assisting scholars, educators, decision and policy makers, emerging and working arts professionals, and the public in understanding the field” (p. 7).

The article goes on to discuss the emergence of interest in the subject in terms of contextual factors—such as the Culture Wars over arts and cultural policy; the impact of a changing economic climate on arts funding practices in both the public and private sectors; a growing recognition that artists have little practical training in managing their careers or their practice; and a search among arts and arts administration educators for better ways to prepare their students for professional success in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Thus, the very field itself is an example of intellectual entrepreneurship: it recombines existing disciplinary elements into a new way to educate future generations of creative workers; as an exercise in change management; and as a shift from cultivating “best practices” to fostering opportunity spotting and innovation.

Given the focus of *Artivate*, it seems appropriate to compare how it has built upon, added to, and differed from the scholarly literature that largely preceded its appearance. *Artivate* published 5 issues between its appearance in 2012 and September of 2014. Each issue had three research-based articles which were peer reviewed for a total of 15 articles (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Lord, 2012; Nytych, 2012; Essig, 2013; Roberts, 2013; Shockley & Frank, 2013; Mathew & Carl, 2013; Kolsteeg, 2013; White, 2013; Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Preece, 2014; Webb, 2014; Enhuber, 2014; Griffey, 2014; Welsh, Onishi, DeHoog, & Syed, 2014). Issue introductions and book reviews were not included in this count.

While this gives us a much smaller pool of articles to consider, they were all concerned with arts entrepreneurship. This pool generated nearly as many designated meanings (N=50) as the larger pool of articles reviewed in the journals the focused on arts administration and policy more generally as well as the general business journals on entrepreneurship (N=54) and nonprofit marketing (N=5). Looking at Table 2, we can see that the *Artivate* articles on arts entrepreneurship displayed many of the same meanings found in the more general literature review. However, a few additional meanings appeared in *Artivate*—these included bricolage, mindset, and social entrepreneurship. *Artivate* articles were also more likely to focus on two topics: 1) relevant competencies and skills as well as how these might be taught to artists and arts managers (n=7), and 2) opportunity spotting (n=7).

### **Moving From Case Studies to a Definitional “Recipe”**

Taking the literature as a whole, we can now offer a preliminary definition of “arts entrepreneurship” as a management process through which cultural workers seek to support their creativity and autonomy, advance their capacity for adaptability, and create artistic as well as economic and social value. Different combinations of resources can be directed toward different value equations and involve different risk calculations.

Seeing all these meanings and possible combinations, it would seem that the next step is to try to discern patterns or clusters that reduce the variety into a more manageable and parsimonious taxonomy. Recognizing the possible basis for the taxonomy should advance our understanding of the phenomenon of arts entrepreneurship. This, in turn, could help generate explanations and research hypotheses that would guide and facilitate not only practice but also pedagogy. Additionally, the fact that case studies seem to exhibit linkages among designations—such as mindset, new ventures, and opportunity spotting in cases concerned with individual artists—also suggests that each designation is not an alternative meaning of arts entrepreneurship but rather represents different aspects of the entrepreneurial process.

So, what clusters emerge from the collection of meanings found in the literature reviewed? We start with an observation that the literature carries the assumption that entrepreneurship is a form of management, and as such, calls on actions, skills, and decisions to direct an endeavor to achieve a set purpose. In arts entrepreneurship, this management purpose involves an ongoing set of innovative choices and risks intended to recombine resources and pursue new opportunities in order to produce artistic, economic and social value. As Joseph Schumpeter, the founding theorist of entrepreneurship, has described it, the process recombines pre-existing elements of activity in a novel fashion involving a measure of risk (Schumpeter, 1934). For entrepreneurs in the arts, these risks can be three-fold: creativity risk, market risk, and career risk (Tremblay, 2008). Schumpeter argued that the functions of an entrepreneur were to reform or even revolutionize production and distribution by being alert to innovations in forces around them (e.g., new technology or invention) and changes in their environment (new market demographics, access to new markets, new sources of resources, etc.). Furthermore, for products of the creative and cultural industries there are also many opportunities for innovative value propositions, since they embody multiple types of value—economic and cultural (Throsby, 2001).

DEFINITION: arts entrepreneurship is a management process through which cultural workers seek to support their creativity and autonomy, advance their capacity for adaptability, and create artistic as well as economic and social value.				
Arts Entrepreneur Purpose: the purpose of this management process involves an ongoing set of innovative choices and risks intended to recombine resources and pursue new opportunities in order to produce artistic, economic and social value.				
Leadership Vision	Leadership Tools	Personal Capacity	Personal Traits	External Environment
<b>STRATEGIES</b>	<b>TACTICS</b>	<b>COMPETENCIES /SKILLS</b>	<b>MINDSET</b>	<b>CONTEXT</b>
- New Ventures - Creative Enterprise - Career Portfolios - Community or Heritage Enterprise - Social Enterprise - Change Management - Intrapreneur	- New Marketing Approach - Audience Development - New funding Source - New Funding Approach - Networking - Partnerships - Recombination - Bricolage - New Technology	- Opportunity Spotting - Business Skill Acquisition - Professional Development: Training and Education	- Perseverance - Risk-taking - Tolerance of Failure - Open-minded	- Organization - Individual Artist or Small Business - Artistic Field - Local/Regional Locale

Table 3. Taxonomy of Arts Entrepreneurship Components

These aspects cluster into five categories of considerations. Table 3 sets out these five categories and lists specific examples of each that have appeared in the literature that we reviewed. Each instance of arts entrepreneurship embodies a metaphorical “recipe” that includes at least one element from each category. Thus, arts entrepreneurship is a constant exercise in recombination.

- 1) Leadership categories include both strategies and tactics—or ends and means. Strategies identify the goals of value creation and the innovative vision. These can include new venture creation as independent microenterprises; arts based social entrepreneur activities; the creation of new artistic products or services relying on imagination; the promotion of policy change through policy entrepreneurship; self-management of career transitions and the construction of career portfolios; managing change by recombination of “recipe” components; the generation of new cultural products and services relying on cultural heritage resources.
- 2) Tactics indicate the tools or approaches one intends to employ in implementing the strategic vision. Much of the research on art entrepreneurship has focused on the explorations of tactics—on developing new markets and reaching them in new ways; on using Internet and social networks to deliver and promote the distribution of the arts via digital technology; on the benefits and processes of cultivating partnerships between arts organizations as well as non-arts organizations; on the use of crowdsourcing methods of fundraising; and on turning bricolage into an innovative production approach.

While better understanding of these leadership ends and means tell us how arts entrepreneurs can act effectively, they do not help us understand (or teach) how to think entrepreneurially. Thus, there are also two categories of personal characteristics that must be added into the entrepreneurship “recipe:” Personal capacities and personality traits.

- 3) Personal Capacity consists of knowhow (competencies and skills) that effect the ability of an entrepreneurial leader to carry out the vision and to use implementation tactics. An often identified skill is opportunity spotting which is sometimes treated as a kind of intuition. Business skills are another frequently mentioned aspect of personal capacity. Sometimes discussions of personal capacity for entrepreneurship is discussed in term of how these competencies and skills can be acquired, namely through processes of training, education, and ongoing professional development.
- 4) Personality Traits and Mindset refers to qualities of character or to ways of thinking that are believed to be associated with entrepreneurial behavior. Frequently mentioned are being open-minded, perseverance, risk-taking, and tolerance for failure.
- 5) Finally, entrepreneurship does not take place in a vacuum; it must be sensitive to the external environment and conditions that the entrepreneur contends with. These external factors provide the context in which entrepreneurship is practiced. Studies of arts entrepreneurship generally specify whether the frame is organizational or individualistic. Case studies often frame the entrepreneurial setting as dependent on the art form at its core, hence stipulating whether a case is set in the performing arts, or even more particularly in the field of music, or in museums, or the film industry. Another significant contextual frame seems to be the actual community, geographic or spatial environment which shows up in explorations of how individual cities or



regions seek to foster greater arts entrepreneurship or the development of creative and cultural industries.

With this set of categories, we can begin to understand why individual case studies often exhibit an implicit recipe in which a specific strategy (e.g. career portfolios) appears to be associated with a particular tactic (e.g. networking), with the acquisition of new (business or technological) skills acquired through training or education, by individuals who are risk-takers and persevering, and that these cases tend to involve individual artists who are either self-employed or freelancers.

To understand such entrepreneurs, one must focus on the innovative combinations of strategy, tactics, individual skills, and mindset operating in each case and its context. If arts entrepreneurship is a constant exercise in recombination, then the possibility of flexible recipes begins to reveal what might be regarded as the recombinant DNA of arts entrepreneurship. We are only beginning to understand the interactions between leadership and personal categories, between context and choice of tactics, between certain mindsets and the ability to use certain tactics effectively. There are many gaps in our understanding of each category as well as the interactions among categories, but enough literature has begun to accumulate on the subject of arts entrepreneurship to show that we are dealing with a complex and dynamic phenomenon. These categories begin to allow us to see “variables” rather than simply variety. Variables enable us to hypothesize relationships and to frame researchable questions. The resultant capacity for explanation, prediction, and choice will, in turn, help us to build models as well as discover how we can teach entrepreneurship.

### **Next Steps: Exploring Other Types of Literature**

While the literature in scholarly journals that we reviewed provided a sample adequate to begin developing a layered and flexible definition for the phenomenon of arts entrepreneurship, it does not tell the whole story of the how our thinking on this concept has evolved. Aside from *Artivate*, which was designed to focus on arts entrepreneurship, the scholarly literature displayed an initial spurt around 2003-2004 with only sporadic contributions appearing thereafter. A consistent stream of arts entrepreneurship literature only emerges with the establishment of the specialized journal *Artivate*. This is not the expected pattern for the growth of an idea and of interest in defining and operationalizing it, neither does this literature document or explain the intense interest in arts entrepreneurship pedagogy. We believe that other streams of literature and discourse have contributed to the emergence of the arts entrepreneurship concept. One additional stream lies in a number of scholarly books, most often edited collections, that produced literature that might otherwise have appeared in journals (e.g., Doig & Hargrove, 1990; Hagoort & Kooyman, 2009; Hagoort, Thomassen, & Kooyman, 2012; Henry, 2007; Scherdin & Zander, 2011). Another stream can be traced through projects and studies that were stimulated by Foundation initiatives (e.g., Ageson, 2010; Beckman, 2007; Jackson, Kabwasa-Green, Herranz, Ferryman & Rosenstein, 2003; Markusen, 2013; Mirikitani, 2008). Yet another stream is evident in policy-directed research and program initiatives undertaken both in the US and abroad, especially in the Commonwealth nations (e.g., Higher Education Academy Art Design Media Subject Centre & National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts, 2007; HKU, 2010). And finally, we can also explore the literature published in arts disciplinary journals such as *Theatre Topics* and *Arts Education Review* for single field discussions. Only by tracing these additional streams of arts entrepreneurship literature can we piece together a more holistic understanding of the emergence of the concept of arts entrepreneurship as it currently exists.

These are avenues of further research that we are continuing to explore and hope to share with the field in the near future.

### References

- Aageson, T. (2010). *Cultural entrepreneurship: At the crossroads of people, place and prosperity (a report to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation)*. Santa Fe, NM: Global Center for Cultural Entrepreneurship.
- Abfalter, D. (2013). Authenticity and respect: Leading creative teams in the performing arts. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 22(3), 295-306.
- Bauer, C., Viola, K., & Strauss, C. (2011). Management skills for artists: 'learning by doing'?. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(5), 626-644.
- Beckman, G. D. (2007). "Adventuring" arts entrepreneurship curricula in higher education: An examination of present efforts, obstacles, and best practices. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 37(2), 87-112.
- Beckman, G. & Essig, L. (2012). Arts entrepreneurship: A conversation. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(1), 1-8.
- Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T., & Schwienbacher, A. (2013). Crowdfunding: Tapping the right crowd. *Journal of Business Venturing*.
- Bilton, C. (2010). Manageable creativity. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 16(3), 255-269.
- Bonin-Rodriguez, P. (2012). What's in a name? Typifying artist entrepreneurship in community-based training. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(1), 9-24.
- Burton, C. (2003). Scoping the challenge: Entrepreneurial arts management in times of uncertainty. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 185-195.
- Cardamone, M., & Rentschler, R. (2006). Indigenous innovators: The role of web marketing for cultural micro-enterprises. *International journal of nonprofit and voluntary sector marketing*, 11(4), 347-360.
- Colbert, F. (2003). Entrepreneurship and leadership in marketing the arts. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 6(1) 30-39.
- DiMaggio, Paul. (1982). Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston, *Media, Culture and Society*, 4, 33-50.
- Doig, J. W., & Hargrove, E. C. (Eds.). (1990). *Leadership and innovation: Entrepreneurs in government*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dos Santos, B. L., Holsapple, C. W., & Ye, Q. (2011). The intellectual influence of entrepreneurship journals: A network analysis. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(4), 735-754.
- Ellmeier, A. (2003). Cultural entrepreneurialism: on the changing relationship between the arts, culture and employment. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 9(1), 3-16.
- Enhuber, M. (2014). How is Damien Hirst a cultural entrepreneur?. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(2), 3-20.
- Essig, L. (2013). Frameworks for Educating the Artist of the Future: Teaching Habits of Mind for Arts Entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(2), 65-78.
- Fillis, I. (2004). The entrepreneurial artist as marketer: Drawing from the smaller-firm literature. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 7(1) 9-21.

- Fillis, I., & Rentschler, R. (2005). Using creativity to achieve an entrepreneurial future for arts marketing. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 10(4), 275-287.
- Geursen, G., & Rentschler, R. (2003). Unraveling cultural value. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 196-210.
- Griffin, D. (2003). Leaders in museums: Entrepreneurs or role models? *International Journal of Arts Management*, 5(2), 4-14.
- Hagoort, G., & Kooyman, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Creative industries: Colourful fabric in multiple dimensions*. Delft, The Netherlands: Eburon Uitgeverij BV.
- Hagoort, G., Thomassen, A., & Kooyman, R. (Eds.). (2012). *Pioneering Minds Worldwide: On the Entrepreneurial Principles of the Cultural and Creative Industries*. Delft, The Netherlands: Eburon Uitgeverij BV.
- Hausmann, A. (2010). German artists between Bohemian idealism and entrepreneurial dynamics: Reflections on cultural entrepreneurship and the need for start-up management. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 12(2), 17-29.
- Henry, C. (Ed.). (2007). *Entrepreneurship in the creative industries: An international perspective*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Hewison, R. (2004). The crisis of cultural leadership in Britain. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(2), 157-166.
- Higher Education Academy Art Design Media Subject Centre & National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts. (2007). *Creating Entrepreneurship: entrepreneurship education for the creative industries*. Retrieved from <http://www.adm.heacademy.ac.uk/projects/adm-hea-projects/creating-entrepreneurship-entrepreneurship-education-for-the-creative-industries/>
- HKU. (2010). *The Entrepreneurial Dimension of the Cultural and Creative Industries*. Hogeschool voor de Kunsten Utrecht, Utrecht. Retrieved from [http://www.creativwirtschaft.at/document/11\\_StudyontheEntrepreneurialDimensionoftheCulturalandCreativeIndustries.pdf](http://www.creativwirtschaft.at/document/11_StudyontheEntrepreneurialDimensionoftheCulturalandCreativeIndustries.pdf)
- Jackson, J., & Oliver, T. (2003). Personal networks theory and the arts: a literature review with special reference to entrepreneurial popular musicians. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 240-256.
- Jackson, M. R., Kabwasa-Green, F., Swenson, D., Herranz, J., Ferryman, K., Atlas, C., & Rosenstein, C. E. (2003). *Investing in creativity: a study of the support structure for US artists*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Kolsteeg, J. (2013). Situated cultural entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 2(3), 3-13.
- Kuhn, K. M., & Galloway, T. L. (2015). With a little help from my competitors: Peer networking among artisan entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(3), 571-600.
- Lord, C. (2012). Shattering the myth of the passive spectator: Entrepreneurial efforts to define and enhance participation in “non-participatory” Art. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(1), 35-49.
- Mathew, V. & Carl, P. (2013). Culture coin: A commons-based, complementary currency for the arts and its impact on scarcity, virtue, ethics, and the imagination. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 2(3), 14-27.
- Markusen, A. (2013). *How cities can nurture cultural entrepreneurs*. Kansas City, MO: Ewing Marion Kaufmann Foundation. Retrieved from

- [http://www.kauffman.org/~media/kauffman\\_org/research%20reports%20and%20covers/2013/11/cultural%20entrepreneurs%20report.pdf](http://www.kauffman.org/~media/kauffman_org/research%20reports%20and%20covers/2013/11/cultural%20entrepreneurs%20report.pdf)
- McNicholas, B. (2004). Arts, culture and business: A relationship transformation, a nascent field. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 7(1), 57-69.
- Mietzner, D., & Kamprath, M. (2013). A competence portfolio for professionals in the creative industries. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 22(3), 280-294.
- Mirikitani, C. (2008). *Business of art: An artist's guide to profitable self-employment*. Los Angeles, CA: The Center for Cultural Innovation.
- Mulcahy, K. V. (2003). Entrepreneurship or cultural Darwinism? Privatization and American cultural patronage. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 165-184.
- Nytch, J. (2012). The case of the Pittsburgh new music ensemble: An illustration of entrepreneurial theory in an artistic setting. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(1), 25-34.
- Paris, T., & Leroy, F. (2014). Managing transition in an artistic company with entrepreneurial management: A case study of Groupe Bernard Loiseau. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 16(2), 42-54.
- Pollard, V. & Wilson, E. (2014). The “entrepreneurial mindset” in creative and performing arts higher education in Australia. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(1), 3-22.
- Preece, S. B. (2011). Performing arts entrepreneurship: Toward a research agenda. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 41(2), 103-120.
- Preece, S. B. (2014). Social bricolage in arts entrepreneurship: Building a jazz society from scratch. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(1), 23-34.
- Radbourne, J. (2003). Regional development through the enterprise of arts leadership. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 211-227.
- Rentschler, R. (2003). Culture and entrepreneurship introduction. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 163-164.
- Rentschler, R., & Kirchner, T. A. (2012). Arts management/marketing journal citation analysis: Assessing external impact. *Arts Marketing: An International Journal*, 2(1), 6-20.
- Rentschler, R., & Shilbury, D. (2008). Academic assessment of arts management journals: A multidimensional rating survey. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 10(3), 60-71.
- Roberts, J. (2013). Infusing entrepreneurship within non-business disciplines: Preparing artists and others for self-employment and entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(2), 53-64.
- Scherdin, M., & Zander, I. (Eds.). (2011). *Art entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shockley, G. E. & Frank, P.M. (2013). Dostoevsky's “the grand inquisitor”: Adding an ethical component to the teaching of non-market entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(2), 79-91.
- Stinchfield, B. T., Nelson, R. E., & Wood, M. S. (2013). Learning from Levi-Strauss' legacy: Art, craft, engineering, bricolage, and brokerage in entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37(4), 889-921.
- Styhre, A., & Eriksson, M. (2008). Bring in the arts and get the creativity for free: A study of the artists in residence project. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 17(1), 47-57.

- Swedberg, (2006). The cultural entrepreneur and the creative industries: Beginning in Vienna. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 30(4), 243-261.
- Thompson, G. (2003). Public control of museums in New Zealand and the United Kingdom: Implications for entrepreneurship. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 228-239.
- Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and culture*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tremblay, D. G. (2008). From casual work to economic security: The paradoxical case of self-employment. *Social Indicators Research*, 88(1), 115-130.
- Wakin, D. J. (2004, December 12). The Juilliard effect: Ten years later. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from [www.nytimes.com/2004/12/12/arts/music/12waki.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2004/12/12/arts/music/12waki.html).
- Webb, D. (2014). Placemaking and social equity: Expanding the framework of creative placemaking. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(1), 35-48.
- Welsh, D. H., Onishi, T., DeHoog, R. H., & Syed, S. (2014). Responding to the needs and challenges of arts entrepreneurs: An exploratory study of arts entrepreneurship in North Carolina higher education. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(2), 21-37.
- White, J. (2013). Barriers to recognizing arts entrepreneurship education as essential to professional arts training. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 2(3), 28-39.
- Wyszomirski, M. J. (1987). The politics of art: Nancy Hanks and the National Endowment for the Arts. *Leadership and Innovation*, 207-245.
- Wyszomirski, M.J., & Chang, W. (2012, May). *Arts-Based entrepreneurship in the new economy and the competition state: Developing policy options to fit a different context*. Paper presented at the Arts, New Growth Theory, and Economic Development Symposium, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://arts.gov/sites/default/files/Wyszomirski-PPT.pdf>