Title

Examining Educator Conceptions of Postsecondary Studio-Based Arts Entrepreneurship

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9594t1qj

Author

Bach, Glenn

Publication Date

2017

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Examining Educator Conceptions

of Postsecondary Studio-Based Arts Entrepreneurship

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Glenn Bach

2017

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Examining Educator Conceptions

of Postsecondary Studio-Based Arts Entrepreneurship

by

Glenn Bach

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2017

Professor Robert A. Rhoads, Chair

This study queried arts entrepreneurship educators about their conceptions of arts entrepreneurship, its pedagogy, and its applicability to studio art majors in the context of traditionally held notions of the hostile relationship between art and commerce. In a problematic labor market for studio art graduates, arts entrepreneurship education promises to address the disappointment expressed by arts alumni about the quality of professional training they received in college. Implementing a qualitative research design, I interviewed sixteen educators who taught or supervised arts entrepreneurship curricula at public or private postsecondary institutions, and I gathered participant syllabi and publically available course information.

Using an inductive process of coding borrowed from grounded theory, I coded the resulting data and organized the findings into three broad themes: 'conceptions of arts entrepreneurship,' 'art and commerce,' and 'studio-based arts entrepreneurship.' This study

found that educators conceive of arts entrepreneurship in terms of traditional business concepts but also differentiated entrepreneurial training for artists in significant ways, particularly emphasizing career self-management as a key outcome. Another finding reveals that the tension between art and commerce may not play a significant role in the arts entrepreneurship classroom, but that studio art majors still struggle with the process of pricing their work. Finally, my participants made it clear that they do not serve studio art majors as a unique subculture, but feel that their existing curricula is more than adequate to address their needs.

My study contributes to a growing body of literature in a field that is still wrestling with common definitions and theoretical frameworks for arts entrepreneurship, and addressed a specific gap in the literature on studio art majors as a distinct subculture. I provided empirical evidence to support Chang and Wyszomirski's key framework for arts entrepreneurship and for future researchers to further explore questions of territorial silos between arts entrepreneurship education, career services, and disciplinary art education.

The dissertation of Glenn Bach has been approved.

Barbara Drucker

M. Kevin Eagan

Linda Rose

Robert A. Rhoads, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2017

DEDICATION

To the studio art majors who may question their career goals and wonder how to support themselves and their families; a sustainable life as an artist is entirely possible. Do not give up.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

VITA

Education

1991   Bachelor of Fine Arts (Drawing and Painting-Intermedia)
            California State University, Long Beach, CA

2000   Master of Arts (Studio Art)
            California State University, Long Beach, CA

2004   Master of Fine Arts (Drawing and Painting)
            California State University, Long Beach, CA

Professional Experience

1998-2007   Office Manager
            English Department
            California State University, Long Beach

2007-2009   Adjunct Assistant Professor
            Department of Film
            University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

2013-2015   Program Coordinator
            Media Arts
            Art Institute of California-Orange County

2015-2016   Scheduling and Enrollment Planning Analyst (substitute)
            Office of Instruction
            Irvine Valley College

2016-present Faculty Advisor and Retention Specialist
            College of Arts and Humanities
            California State University, Dominguez Hills

Chapter One: Introduction

Studio art alumni face professional uncertainty in the contemporary labor market, with too few full-time positions for the number of arts graduates (Cooley, 2007; Faggian, Comunian, Jewell, & Kelly, 2013; Lingo & Tepper, 2013), lower pay and fewer benefits than their counterparts in other majors (Luftig et al., 2003; Throsby & Hollister, 2003; Throsby & Zednik, 2011), and a significantly higher amount of student debt (Fusco, 2015; Jahoda, Murphy, Virgin, & Woolard, 2014; Simon & Barry, 2013; Urice, 2000). To prepare studio art students for the artistic labor market, some institutions offer career development courses, such as basic business skills, résumé writing, or tax advice (Judkis, 2010). According to recent national surveys of art student alumni, however, a majority of respondents reported dissatisfaction with the professional training they received in college (Fanthome, 2013; Lena et al., 2014; Neher, 2010; Skaggs, Frenette, Gaskil, & Miller, 2017).

A number of researchers and educators call for a deeper commitment to career development for art majors by implementing entrepreneurial training in marketing, crowdfunding, non-profit management, and other business practices (Beckman, 2007; Hisrich, 2006; Roberts, 2013). Because these courses may provide a unique solution to the artistic labor problem, a growing number of institutions have adopted art entrepreneurship curricula (Essig & Guevara, 2016; Korzen, 2015; Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education, 2016). Few, however, tailor curricula specifically for the needs of the studio art major (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2015b). In this study, I examine educator conceptions of arts entrepreneurship, their perceptions of how the tension between art and commerce plays out at their institutions, and whether studio-specific curriculum is necessary. This study also contributes to the growing academic field of arts entrepreneurship by providing empirical evidence to support key

conceptual frameworks and addresses a gap in the literature on studio arts entrepreneurship education (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2016; Tucci, 2006). In the following sections, I discuss the contexts in which arts entrepreneurship education is situated, including postsecondary art education, the artistic labor market, and the tension between art and the marketplace. I finish by introducing arts entrepreneurship education, outlining the research design of the project, and discussing the public significance of my study.

Background and Context

Graduates in the arts are generally happy with their disciplinary education, but expressed disappointment with the lack of professional development, a problem that arts entrepreneurship education promises to address (Lena et al., 2014; Skaggs et al., 2017). The landscape in which arts entrepreneurship education resides, however, makes this mission more challenging to accomplish. An oversaturated labor market, combined with significant student debt, complicates an already shaky transition to post-collegiate life for professional artists (Alper & Wassall, 2006; Lena et al., 2014; Lingo & Tepper, 2013). Before exploring the artistic labor market and the experiences of art students as they transition to their careers, I first briefly outline the state of postsecondary studio art education.

Postsecondary Studio Art Education

Postsecondary studio arts education, hereafter referred to as *art school*, serves a wide variety of students and prepares graduates for life as artists, teachers, and other positions in the creative arts (Gerchman, 2011; Strategic National Arts Alumni Project, 2012). Art school features technical training and theoretical practice at two- and four-year public and private

institutions, as well as at conservatories dedicated entirely to studio arts (Grant, 2004, 2013). Art students practice in a wide variety of artistic media, with visual arts (painting, sculpture, printmaking, fiber, and ceramics) differentiated from the performing arts (theater, music, and dance), design (graphic design, illustration, interior design, web design, and industrial design), and time-based media (video, film, performance art, and sound art). This study focuses on visual art students, hereafter referred to as 'studio' art students for their emphasis on a hands-on, studio-based practice.

Art schools have evolved from the apprentice model popular through the middle of the twentieth-century, although training largely remains housed in disciplinary silos (Neher, 2010; Singerman, 1999; White, 2013). A greater emphasis on theory and the role of art in a global context has added additional layers of complexity to the baccalaureate art degree (Gregg, 2003). Even though no license or certification is required to practice art, arts programs continue to grow and serve an increasing number of art students and graduates (Cooley, 2007; Daniel & Daniel, 2015; Lena et al., 2014; Lingo & Tepper, 2013; Singerman, 1999; Skaggs et al., 2017). Greater expectations for an arts degree result in a tension between individual creative expression and a more vocational mode of technical training (Chin & Qualls, 1995; Grant, 2004; Gregg, 2003; R. White, 2015). According to Clements (2014), the "deeper issue might be the professionalization of undergraduate degrees in general and the increased pressure to turn them into strictly vocational programs rather than a time to increase critical thinking and communication skills regardless of the field" (para. 16).

Studio art majors may expect that art school, particularly the professional tracks of Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) and Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degrees, will prepare them for gallery representation or other badges of art world success (Grant, 2004; Gregg, 2003;

3

Singerman, 1999). This BFA/MFA culture stems from the professionalization of the role of the artist, resulting in the perception that the MFA is the accepted professional entryway into an artistic career, despite claims by gallery directors and curators that the artist's work itself is the true barometer of artistic merit (Chin & Qualls, 1995; Neher, 2010). For young artists looking to college for a pathway to the art world, as well as community college art students interested in transferring to a four-year institution, the BFA/MFA track is a powerful draw (Luftig et al., 2003).

Labor Market for Studio Art Graduates

Reports vary on the state of employment for studio art graduates (Shaw, 2004). Some research suggests that art students manage well in the marketplace, with a range of soft skills, including resiliency and adaptability, gained from their disciplinary studies (Berrett, 2011; Lena et al., 2014; Lindemann & Tepper, 2010; Lingo & Tepper, 2013; Strategic National Arts Alumni Project, 2012). Art students can expect employment as art directors, curators, teachers, arts administrators, and community organizers (Urice, 2000), as well as other positions in the fields of advertising, publishing, research, and broadcast media (Comunian, Faggian, & Jewell, 2011; Harbour, 2005). A weightier body of literature paints a less rosy picture; underemployment, low wages, and substandard benefits reinforce the common perception of the 'starving artist' (Berrett, 2011; Cooley, 2007; Grant, 2004; Lindemann & Tepper, 2010; Neher, 2010). "Even in the best of economic times," according to Luftig and his colleagues (2003), "majoring in the arts in college can be a risky business" (p. 5). In this climate, a small number of art students choose not to pursue careers in arts at all (Strategic National Arts Alumni Project, 2012).

While the research differs on the employability of artists, a consensus on financial aid debt held by art students is more clear (Grant, 2004; Gregg, 2003; Neher, 2010). Because of factors such as low student-teacher ratios and the overhead costs of art supplies, art schools rank among the most expensive colleges and programs (Fusco, 2015; Lena et al., 2014; Urice, 2000). With yearly tuition at some institutions as high as $50,000, studio art students take on higher levels of student debt than many other majors (Gregg, 2003; Lena et al., 2014; Simon & Barry, 2013). Faced with lower lifetime earnings than those of other majors, studio art graduates experience greater difficulties managing steep monthly loan repayments (Fusco, 2015; Schwartz & Finnie, 2002), ultimately complicating the efforts of these young artists to sustain careers (Clements, 2014; Grant, 2004; Millett, 2003). Some students expect their significant investment to pay off with successful careers, if not art world stardom (Gregg, 2003), while others may base their decision to pursue further education on the level of debt they will add to the load they currently carry (Millett, 2003; Strategic National Arts Alumni Project, 2011).

In light of these complications, how do studio art graduates manage their careers? Some research indicates that art graduates struggle with their career transitions because of a lack of marketable skills (Lindemann & Tepper, 2010; Tucci, 2006). Since most artists cannot survive on art alone, a low percentage of art graduates find work as full-time artists; instead, most hold multiple jobs or work in non-creative fields to make ends meet (Clements, 2014; Comunian et al., 2011; Cooley, 2007; Faggian et al., 2013; Lingo & Tepper, 2013; Shaw, 2004). "Aspiring artists," according to Lingo and Tepper (2013), "largely from middle class backgrounds, take working class jobs in order to live like an artist" (p. 351). Because artistic careers depend on the social aspect of studio visits, public exhibitions, and other communal experiences, artists may develop strong social networks to increase their employability (Grant, 2004; Lena et al., 2014;

Tucci, 2006), but their efforts to maintain community suffer in a globalized market (Lingo & Tepper, 2013).

Other research is more positive. Artists use the creative skills they learned in art school in a variety of ways (Clements, 2014; Harbour, 2005; Lindemann & Tepper, 2010), managing ambiguity and negotiating contradictory pathways (Abreu, Faggian, Comunian, & McCann, 2012; Lingo & Tepper, 2013; Shaw, 2004). As artists shift from individual practices to cooperative or collective engagement, they seek out cities as artistic hubs, many settling down where they went to school, eventually navigating multiple center/edge art scenes (Lingo & Tepper, 2013). Ultimately, artists make sense of their career paths and persist despite challenges they may face (Luftig et al., 2003; Shaw, 2004), diversifying their job skills by improvising a collection of part-time jobs and short-term freelance projects, what researchers have dubbed 'portfolio' careers (Clements, 2014; Hong, Essig, & Bridgstock, 2012; Lindemann & Tepper, 2010; Reid, Petocz, & Bennett, 2016; Tucci, 2006). Many artists, according to Lingo and Tepper (2013), "work across sectors, and they do so with little regret or concern about selling out, crafting portfolios of jobs that enable them to harness their creativity and earn a living, whether working in nonprofits, commercial enterprise, in their own business, or working for free" (p. 342). By creating their own opportunities out of necessity, art graduates become 'accidental' entrepreneurs, adopting capital-generating activities without the entrepreneur label and its pejorative connotation for some artists (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Brown, 2007; Korzen, 2015).

As impromptu as these career paths may appear, the works of studio art alumni contribute to the 'creative economy,' defined by Böhm & Land (2009) as an economic system powered by the arts, culture, and entertainment in which the artist is defined as a worker (Lingo & Tepper, 2013; Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation, 2015). Civic and business

6

leaders have turned to the arts—and the artists who supply creative products—as a key factor in stimulating economic growth and urban revitalization (Bridgstock, 2012; Phillips, 2010; Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015). Actual artistic jobs are scarce, however (Cooley, 2007; Luftig et al., 2003), and, in a buyer's market, employers look beyond the bachelor degree for skills such as collaboration and creativity that will allow art graduates to transition more smoothly into specific positions in the workplace (Holmes & Miller, 2006). In an oversaturated labor market, an enterprising philosophy will become increasingly important to artist training and economic development (Beckman, 2007; Bridgstock, 2012; Phillips, 2010).

As much as we know about the artistic labor market and its challenges, art schools have performed poorly at illuminating these discrepancies or preparing students for life after graduation (Bridgstock, 2012; Fanthome, 2013; Jahoda et al., 2014; Neher, 2010; Tucci, 2006; Whitesel, 1980). "Many artists are unprepared," according to Fanthome (2013), "and poorly equipped to deal with current conditions and expectations about professional activity and development" (pp. 281-282). While generally satisfied overall with their college experience, arts alumni reported a desire for more professional development in school (Lena et al., 2014). "Many emerge with multiple degrees," Judkis (2010) argues, "to find few sources of funding, fewer jobs that utilize their degrees, and no idea how the art market even works" (para. 1). This gap in training might adversely affect studio art majors as they attempt to forge an artistic career after college (Fanthome, 2013).

Art and Commerce

Scholars note a hostile relationship between art and commerce that affects our understanding of how artists make a living (Baines & Wheelock, 2003; Beckert & Rössel, 2013;

Beckman, 2007; Bilton, 2010; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006, 2007). Originating in long-held romantic conceptions of the role of the secluded artist, the "so-called bohemian lifestyle," according to Eikhof and Haunschild (2006), "is marked by egocentrism and a deliberate contradiction of bourgeois norms and values. In modern times, the ideas of praising art for art's sake and negating bourgeois world views…have been central to artistic identities" (pp. 235-236). This bohemian concept of artistic behavior, articulated in the persistent myth of the starving artist, complicates discussion of art's function in the marketplace (Oakley, 2009), but ultimately fails to accurately reflect the attitudes of contemporary artists in the context of the creative economy (Bass, Milosevic, & Eesley, 2015; Naudin, 2015; Reid et al., 2016; Roberts, 2015; Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015).

Artistic labor is valued differently than other forms of productivity, according to Caves (2003), resulting in a tension between individual creativity in organizational settings (Fachin, 2009). Artists, therefore, engage in a highly personal, continually evolving, process of identity creation to reconcile their artistic process with institutional and financial realities (Reid et al., 2016; Schroeder, 2005; Taylor & Littleton, 2008). Embracing the bohemian lifestyle, artists emphasize individuality, creative fulfilment, and a devotion to art over commercial concerns (Bennett, McGuire, & Rahman, 2015; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007; Faggian et al., 2013). According to Eikhof and Haunschild (2006),

> self-employed workers in the creative industries do not have to see themselves as cold-blooded, hard-hearted entrepreneurs exploiting their very own individual creative potential. Their work context allows them to maintain a bohemian self-understanding…and managing themselves is part of being an artist.

Art majors are, therefore, more interested in their own practice than the complexities of business, and are less driven by monetary concerns (Klamer & Petrova, 2007; Pollard & Wilson, 2014).

Arts Entrepreneurship for Studio Artists

While traditional professional practice training for studio artists (résumé and grant writing tips, portfolio advice, and copyright basics) can be helpful, many arts educators propose deeper training in entrepreneurial practice inspired by curricula taught in traditional business disciplines (Beckman, 2007; Hong et al., 2012). While definitions vary, arts entrepreneurship education often covers a broad range of approaches, ranging from venture creation to skills development for artists, including networking, resource identification, and community building (Aggestam, 2007; Bryan & Harris, 2015; Gartner, 2015). The curricula, often borrowed wholesale from business, may involve a single class or series of workshops on the simpler end, to more advanced certificates, minors, or degrees (Beckman, 2007). While increasingly popular in higher education institutions and conservatories, curricula attuned to the specific needs of studio art majors remains uncommon; the majority of curricula are housed in design, performing arts, or arts management programs, or tailored to a general student population (Essig & Guevara, 2016; Korzen, 2015).

As the arts entrepreneurship academic community seeks to build consensus on common definitions of arts entrepreneurship and its curricular makeup, little empirical research has been conducted on the state of studio-based arts entrepreneurship (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2015b, 2016). This research project, therefore, examines models of art entrepreneurship from the point of view of the educators who teach or oversee these curricula to better understand how they conceptualize arts entrepreneurship education and how these materials fit the specific needs of

studio art majors. To address the state of arts entrepreneurship for studio art students, this study will address the following research questions:

1. How do arts entrepreneurship faculty define and conceptualize arts entrepreneurship?

2. In what ways, if any, does arts entrepreneurship education address the tension between art and commerce?

3. What is the curricular content of arts entrepreneurship education and what are some of the indices for success for these courses and programs?

4. In what ways, if any, have educators tailored arts entrepreneurship curricula for the specific needs of studio art majors?

Research Design

To answer the question of how educators define and conceptualize studio-based arts entrepreneurship, I designed a study to solicit input directly from this population. How do these educators define and execute arts entrepreneurship, and how do they accommodate the needs of studio artists in their classrooms? How is the tension between artistic practice and the financial expectations of venture creation resolved in the curricula (Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Roberts, 2013; Welsh, Onishi, DeHoog, & Syed, 2014)? To address these questions, this study takes the form of qualitative inquiry, described by Merriam (2009) as research that seeks to understand how people interpret and attribute meaning to their experiences. The openness of qualitative research, according to Maxwell (2013), gives the researcher the flexibility to adjust the research design to accommodate emerging findings and connections. An approach using Glaser and Strauss' (1967) grounded theory offers an additional level of flexibility to allow emergent themes resulting directly from interview and document data to shape the research project. In

grounded theory, according to Merriam (2009), the researcher examines each piece of data and compares it to another. Tentative categories result, which are then compared with each other to form additional levels of organization, and the process continues until an overall theory emerges (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Using this inductive approach, I designed a project to sample a representative population of arts entrepreneurship educators, and formulated a data collection and analysis strategy to elicit useful data from this sample. I summarize these elements of my research design, detailed in Chapter Three, in the next sections.

Sample Selection

To better understand the state of arts entrepreneurship education for studio art majors, I sampled faculty at postsecondary institutions offering arts entrepreneurship curricula. To generate a sufficient pool of sample participants, I established an initial database of educators at institutions in the United States that host arts entrepreneurship degrees, minors, certificates, or dedicated courses in arts entrepreneurship. As the stewards of these initiatives, these educators have unique perspectives on how these curricula may, or may not, address the specific needs of studio art majors. I emailed each educator on the list and invited them to participate in my study. Of forty-four invitations, sixteen participants accepted. These educators serve at public or private four-year universities with broad-based arts entrepreneurship courses and/or programs open to a wide range of majors, including, but not limited to, studio art majors. I scheduled phone interviews and asked each interviewee for sample syllabi to use in my document analysis.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data for this project consists of semi-structured interviews with sixteen arts entrepreneurship educators as well as document analysis of participants' syllabi and course or program descriptions from the websites of their institutions. Because geographical limitations prevented me from visiting participants in person, I conducted the interviews over the phone, recording the interview sessions using multiple digital devices. Interviews lasted between forty and sixty minutes. I transcribed the recordings verbatim, and checked each transcript against a playback of the original recording.

Once I finished transcribing the transcripts, I began an inductive coding process using the open, axial, and selective coding process of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The open stage of identifying significant data points and assigning each a unique code led to the axial stage, in which I compared each data point to others in search of commonalities. Finally, in the selective stage of developing core categories or hypotheses, I organized these common groupings of similar data into the overall themes of 'conceptions of arts entrepreneurship,' 'art and commerce,' and 'studio-based arts entrepreneurship.'

Significance of the Study

Research confirms the claims of art alumni that professional training is generally lacking in postsecondary arts education (Cooley, 2007; Fanthome, 2013; Lena et al., 2014; Lingo & Tepper, 2013; Linnemeyer & Brown, 2010; Skaggs et al., 2017; Strategic National Arts Alumni Project, 2012). While the arts entrepreneurship community pursues consensus on common definitions of arts entrepreneurship, its theoretical foundation, or how it is assessed, progress is being made in augmenting basic career training with venture- and skills-based entrepreneurial

approaches in arts education (Beckman, 2007; Essig, 2014a; Korzen, 2015). Of the programs with curricula housed in the arts rather than in business, the bulk of coursework is taught by faculty in the performing arts, design, and arts management disciplines (Essig & Guevara, 2016; Korzen, 2015; Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education, 2016). Scholars acknowledge a dearth of literature on how arts entrepreneurship education functions best for studio artists such as painters or sculptors (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2016; Tucci, 2006). I situated my study, then, to address this gap in the literature, and to add empirical evidence to the continuing conversation about how to best define arts entrepreneurship and move appropriate pedagogies forward. Because studio art graduates are among the most vulnerable entrants into the labor market (Comunian et al., 2011; Lingo & Tepper, 2013; Shaw, 2004; Tucci, 2006), it is imperative that, "for those of us running arts training institutions," according to Lena and her colleagues (2014), we reflect on what "these results tell us about where we need to focus our attention and how we can serve our students and graduates better as they transition from school to work" (p. 6).

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Professional training for studio artists has arrived at a crossroads. The artistic labor market cannot support the increasing number of arts graduates who report disappointment with the professional training they received in their programs (Fanthome, 2013; Lena et al., 2014; Neher, 2010). While more traditional professional development activities such as résumé writing and interview skill-building may help artists improve their employability, a more effective solution may include entrepreneurial training adapted for the specific needs of artists (Daniel & Daniel, 2015; Hisrich, 2006; Roberts, 2013). As arts entrepreneurship continues to grow in higher education, entrepreneurial training for studio art students is far less common than for design, arts management, and performing art majors (Korzen, 2015), and largely absent from an already small body of literature on arts entrepreneurship (Chang & Wyszomirski, 2015).

As part of the development of arts entrepreneurship, scholars and practitioners have developed curricula informed by a wide range of scholarly and pedagogical work from a variety of fields. In this chapter, I briefly introduce traditional, social, and cultural entrepreneurship before reviewing the state of the literature on arts entrepreneurship and its status in higher education. I also position my study to address the gap in the literature on arts entrepreneurship for studio art majors.

Traditional Entrepreneurship

As arts entrepreneurship began to coalesce as its own discipline, scholars drew upon theoretical frameworks borrowed from traditional entrepreneurship (Preece, 2014). Fisher (2012) contrasts traditional entrepreneurial theory (also known as causation theory or classic theory by some scholars), where individuals or organizations identify possible imbalances between supply

and demand and determine whether the gap can be successfully exploited, with the emergent theories of effectuation and bricolage. Sarasvathy (2001) proposed a theory of effectuation, or the use of existing resources to improvise contingent results rather than attempt to execute predetermined goals in the traditional approach. "In an effectual process," Essig (2015) writes, "the entrepreneur *creates* the connection between the means and the most suitable ends. The means…originate with the entrepreneur herself: who she is, what she knows, and whom she knows, rather than with opportunities" (p. 235). Bricolage—making do with available resources, local knowledge, and small-scale support networks—emerged from the work of Levi-Strauss (1966), and was later adapted to entrepreneurship as a leading theoretical framework for understanding entrepreneurial activity in action (Baker & Nelson, 2005; Garud & Karnøe, 2003; Preece, 2014). The reflective and active aspects of bricolage necessitate a commitment to improvisation as a technique and guiding principle (Moorman & Miner, 1998; Weick, 1998).

Social and Cultural Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship, defined as leveraging resources to solve social problems or achieving ethical or moral objectives by selling products or services (Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010; Di Domenico, Tracey, & Haugh, 2010; Naudin, 2015), aligns with research differentiating artistic activity from traditional business practice (Katre, 2015; Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015). According to data from a recent survey conducted by Lena and her colleagues (2014), art majors are "socially engaged—as teachers, volunteers, and patrons of the arts, deploying their artistic talents to tackle social problems or serve their communities, more likely to volunteer, more committed to social change, and more tolerant and open than previous generations" (p. 6). Lingo and Tepper (2013) note that art majors are

15

becoming increasingly less selfish, and that "instead of an artistic career organized to optimize opportunities for individual creativity, artists…seek to be socially engaged in their communities" (p. 7).

Definitions of cultural entrepreneurship vary, but generally describe entrepreneurial activity by artists and other cultural workers in the arts and culture sector for largely symbolic or aesthetic purposes (Bilton, 2010; Ellmeier, 2003; Hausmann & Heinze, 2016; Scott, 2012; Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015). Cultural entrepreneurs adapt and redefine entrepreneurship to suit their own needs (Naudin, 2015; Patten, 2016), and, according to Wyszomirski and Goldberg-Miller (2015), "commonly engage in creative recombination of business management tactics, skills, and resources as they take into account the influence of disciplinary and locational context" (p. 80). In the absence of a substantial or consistent income, cultural entrepreneurs activate and exploit social, cultural, and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1986; Scott, 2012). By tapping into a wide variety of skills and behaviors, cultural entrepreneurs constantly vacillate between creative and managerial roles (Bilton, 2010; Katre, 2015; Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015). Because of the flexibility of cultural and social entrepreneurship, they serve as ideal models for arts entrepreneurship, which I discuss in the next section.

Arts Entrepreneurship

Efforts to train artists in business skills predate the arts entrepreneurship label. In the introductory essay for the inaugural issue of *Artivate*, a journal dedicated to arts entrepreneurship, Beckman and Essig (2012) cite film, theatre, and conservatory programs as early adopters of the arts entrepreneurship mantle. In an earlier, but influential, empirical study,

16

Beckman (2007) conducted informal interviews with instructors, administrators, and students from institutions offering arts entrepreneurship programs or courses, and established a blueprint for the structure and basic features of arts entrepreneurship as they apply to higher education. Arts entrepreneurship continues to grow in the United States, and in the most recent snapshot of the field, Essig and Guevara (2016) quantified 168 institutions with 372 offerings in some way related to arts entrepreneurship. In the following sections, I discuss the state of arts entrepreneurship as an academic field, the primary models used in arts entrepreneurship education, and how artists are seen as entrepreneurs.

Arts Entrepreneurship as an Academic Field

Scholars have explored the development of arts entrepreneurship as an academic discipline (Beckman, 2007, 2014; Beckman & Essig, 2012; Bryan & Harris, 2015; Gartner, 2015; Korzen, 2015). As a young field, however, arts entrepreneurship does not enjoy widespread acceptance or inclusion in the mainstream curriculum (Beckman & Essig, 2012; Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Welsh et al., 2014). A lack of consensus on the definitions and parameters of arts entrepreneurship, as well as a reluctance to embrace disciplinary differences and similarities, limits the ability of scholars to define the field (Beckman, 2007; Beckman & Essig, 2012; Essig & Guevara, 2016; Korzen, 2015; Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015).

Beckman and Essig (2012) posit that because arts entrepreneurship is simultaneously its own entity and a hybrid of aesthetics and commerce, it should be considered a transdiscipline applied to, and adjusted for, each artistic discipline, rather than housed as disparate subsets in each discipline. According to the authors, this latter model suffers from a lack of disciplinary clarity and consensus, without which the field of arts entrepreneurship cannot evolve. Other

17

scholars argue for infusing entrepreneurship within the individual artistic disciplines so that entrepreneurial principles become foundational rather than tacked on at the end. (Ballereau, Sinapi, Toutain, & Juno-Delgado, 2015; Daniel & Daniel, 2015; Essig, 2009; Hong et al., 2012; Roberts, 2013). A paradigm shift in arts entrepreneurship is necessary, according to Pollard and Wilson (2014), to "support curriculum development and support the case for embedding arts entrepreneurship more fully into creative and performing arts education" (p. 14).

Citing a shortage of empirical literature on arts entrepreneurship in general, scholars acknowledge a strong need for further research on the theory and practice of arts entrepreneurship, particularly on assessment and outcomes (Beckman, 2007; Chang & Wyszomirski, 2015; Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Welsh et al., 2014). Collecting and sharing best practices would allow the arts entrepreneurship community to counteract negative connotations of entrepreneurship and contribute to a transformation of arts education (Beckman, 2007; Korzen, 2015; Pollard & Wilson, 2014). Before this alignment with a transformed higher education can happen, White (2015) cautions, arts entrepreneurship needs to be grounded in a body of theory. Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) argue for a strong philosophical tradition to situate arts entrepreneurship in a sustainable practice rather than rely on a hodgepodge of disciplinary-specific approaches and hope for positive outcomes for arts graduates (White, 2013). According to Rabideau (2015), a wide range of theoretical approaches, from Preece's (2014) discussion of bricolage to the Artistic Meta-Praxis model proposed by Bryan and Harris (2015), will help advance arts entrepreneurship as a legitimate field of scholarly inquiry. This infusion of new literature, as well as updated reading lists shared by researchers and practitioners, may inspire arts entrepreneurship leaders to build consensus on definitions and grow as a scholarly community (Gartner, 2015).

Before moving forward on cogent curriculum design, scholars argue for the necessity of settling the question of definitions (Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Welsh et al., 2014). What, exactly, is arts entrepreneurship? As researchers and theorists seek consensus on shared conceptions of arts entrepreneurship, a common definition has eluded administrators, faculty, and students (Aggestam, 2007; Beckman, 2007; Gartner, 2015; Korzen, 2015; Roberts, 2013). Gartner (2015) prefers the terms 'organizing activity' or 'organizing emergence,' which refer to the ordered management of resources, but hesitates to speak for the field. Bonin-Rodriguez (2012) uses 'artist-producer' to describe what an entrepreneurial artist actually does as a corrective to the myth of the artist as a creative genius aloof from the base influence of commerce (Beckman & Essig, 2012). Essig (2014) proposed her own definition, "the application of entrepreneurial action in the service of art" (para. 4), which she later (2016) dismissed as "tautological" (p. 4) in favor of her preferred definition: "a discovery and creation process for connecting means with desirable ends through an appropriate mediating structure within the arts and culture sector" (p. 5). According to Chang and Wyszomirski (2015), 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" (p. 11). While these definitions are helpful in understanding arts entrepreneurship, more useful for this study is Chang and Wyszomirski's (2015) taxonomic framework derived from their definition, where the basic structure of arts entrepreneurship consists of the philosophical approach entrepreneurs choose, the tools they use, the skills and traits they possess, and the contexts in which they operate. I discuss this final framework, and its applicability as a logical model for my study's findings, in more detail in Chapter Five.

Researchers agree that the professional needs of art students are different than those of other majors, and that entrepreneurial training for art students is, therefore, different than general entrepreneurship (Bridgstock, 2012; Essig, 2013; Faggian et al., 2013; Hong et al., 2012; Pollard & Wilson, 2014). Studio art majors, furthermore, represent a micro-culture within postsecondary arts education to which the traditional modes of entrepreneurial practice do not apply (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2016). Art graduates enter the marketplace with technical training in their disciplinary specialization, but with gaps in the business-related skills necessary to navigate the challenging artistic labor market (Thom, 2015a). Rabideau (2015) argues that arts entrepreneurship must be local and transcend curricula, bridging silos and planting the seeds for a productive, collaborative, and sustainable model for artists to plan their careers (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012). Without an entrepreneurial foundation, in short, artists are sure to struggle (Bridgstock, 2012; Korzen, 2015). Ultimately, for arts entrepreneurship to grow as a field, practitioners need to define entrepreneurship beyond simply transferring traditional business entrepreneurial curricula into an arts environment (Hong et al., 2012; Korzen, 2015).

Arts Entrepreneurship Models

Looking to their business counterparts for models, arts entrepreneurship practitioners adopted the two prevailing philosophies in general entrepreneurship: new venture creation and skills development (Beckman, 2007; Hong et al., 2012; J. C. White, 2015). As the traditional approach in business schools, venture creation features the fundamentals of starting, growing, and selling a for-profit business; some arts entrepreneurship programs reflect this mainstream approach, particularly those institutions featuring incubators and student-run ventures (Beckman, 2007; Brush et al., 2003; J. C. White, 2015). While venture creation remains popular because of

its entrenchment in business schools, some scholars argue that this approach remains an ill fit with arts entrepreneurship because it ignores a wide range of less entrepreneurial activities, including non-profit and community-based initiatives (Beckman, 2007; Bryan & Harris, 2015; Pollard & Wilson, 2014). Artistic practice, according to Bryan & Harris (2015), is simply too complex to be handled by a venture-focused curriculum alone. In fact, some question whether entrepreneurship, either venture- or skills-oriented, is appropriate in an arts context at all (Beckman, 2007; Bryan & Harris, 2015; Daniel & Daniel, 2015; Roberts, 2013). In spite of these criticisms, venture creation as pedagogy continues to thrive, and has evolved to include emphases on collaboration and creativity, traits typically associated with a skills development approach (Hong et al., 2012).

Skills development deemphasizes venture creation in favor of a wide range of techniques and behaviors, specifically networking, self-efficacy, and fiscal literacy (J. C. White, 2015). Also referred to as 'skills for transitioning' (Beckman, 2007), 'entrepreneurial habits of mind' (Essig, 2014a), the 'entrepreneurial mindset' (Pollard & Wilson, 2014), and 'being enterprising' (Bridgstock, 2012), this approach aims to cultivate self-confidence, creative thinking, communication skills, art world knowledge, and a willingness to collaborate. Beckman (2007) notes that as this model matures, practitioners will need to address critics who claim a skills approach relies too heavily on experiential education and resource-heavy requirements. Pollard and Wilson (2014) argue for a balance between skills and venture creation, and call for additional research to better understand the entrepreneurial mindset and how it can be effectively taught (Lindqvist, 2011). In one such study, Korzen (2015) conducted a key inventory of arts entrepreneurship courses and programs, and identified key traits of what Bass, Milosevic, and Eesley (2015) deem the 'artist-entrepreneur,' which I discuss further in the next section.

Artist-Entrepreneurs

What is an artist-entrepreneur? Bass, Milosevic, and Eesley (2015) define the artist entrepreneur as "those individuals that achieve artistic and financial success by creating their own business of selling their artwork" through an "identity reconciliation process through which artists become artist-entrepreneurs" (pp. 99-100). According to Korzen (2015), artists often engage in entrepreneurial activity while rejecting the term itself. Some artists "create their own definitions of entrepreneurship," according to Naudin (2015), "rejecting the idea or adapting it to suit their personal aspirations (p. 8). Entrepreneurship is necessary to both sustain art practice and create income, according to Korzen (2015), especially outside of the mainstream of commercial art galleries and arts-related employment. Because of this misalignment with the artistic labor market and the uncertainty of artistic venture creation, measuring the fiscal value of arts entrepreneurship may be difficult in the short term (Lindqvist, 2011).

While some artists may complain that discussions of commerce distract from the sanctity of art making (Beckert & Rössel, 2013; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007; Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015), researchers agree that entrepreneurial skills such as creativity, assembling disparate materials, and breaking boundaries are important to a sustainable arts career (Beckman, 2007; Colbert, 2003; Korzen, 2015; Lindqvist, 2011; Thom, 2015a). The myth of the starving artist persists, despite the ability of contemporary artists to balance art and commerce through the use of entrepreneurial skills (Naudin, 2015; Oakley, 2009; Reid et al., 2016; Roberts, 2013). Even though artists may reject the arts entrepreneurship label out of a distaste for its connection to commerce (Korzen, 2015; Lindqvist, 2011; Roberts, 2013), they will often unknowingly engage in accidental entrepreneurship, which occurs when artist-entrepreneurs use whatever

22

entrepreneurial skills they already possess to improvise a portfolio career, one marked by contingent positions and improvised solutions to funding (Brown, 2007; Hong et al., 2012; Lingo & Tepper, 2013; Reid et al., 2016; Shaw, 2004).

As opposed to general entrepreneurs, artist-entrepreneurs create and exchange creative and intellectual capital, balancing aesthetics and profit, a complexity not accounted for in the traditional entrepreneurial pedagogies (Bourdieu, 1986; Bryan & Harris, 2015; Gartner, 2015; Scott, 2012). By calibrating artistic and financial goals, and by identifying "readily available resources to be mobilised and converted in the struggle to build a career," (Scott, 2012, p. 238), artist-entrepreneurs function as both artist-producers and consumers, seeking an audience rather than filling a need (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Colbert, 2003; Roberts, 2013). According to Lindqvist (2011), artist-entrepreneurs can innovate in works of art or experiment with the process of production or organization, with the eventual goal of recognition, status or monetary exchange. Ultimately, arts entrepreneurship is influenced by the context in which a particular artistic practice occurs, and should reflect the realities of the artistic industry (Gartner, 2015; Pollard & Wilson, 2014).

Arts Entrepreneurship in Higher Education

As entrepreneurship has evolved over recent decades to reflect the developments in the global economy, it has become more accepted as an academic discipline (Brush et al., 2003; Hisrich, 2006). Even though some instructors and administrators question whether entrepreneurship can be taught, most business educators believe that at least some entrepreneurial skills can be learned under the right conditions (Klein & Bullock, 2006; J. C. White, 2015). With its origins in business curricula, entrepreneurship has gradually spread to

other disciplines, such as liberal arts, which favors entrepreneurial traits and behaviors such as curiosity and crossing disciplinary boundaries (Brush et al., 2003; Roberts, 2013; Shaver, 2005). Some researchers argue that the studio arts promise to align even more closely with entrepreneurship, as boundary crossing and transcending accepted norms in the act of production are features shared by entrepreneurial and artistic practice (Colbert, 2003; Gartner, 2015; Lindqvist, 2011).

While the demand for arts entrepreneurship continues to spread in higher education (Beckman, 2007; Hisrich, 2006; Korzen, 2015; Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Roberts, 2013), entrepreneurial content rarely appears in most art school curricula, and existing entrepreneurial training has been mostly ineffective (Bridgstock, 2012; Korzen, 2015). Arts entrepreneurship is an increasingly popular solution, however, to address artistic career training and encourage entrepreneurial skills and traits for art students (Beckman, 2007; Bridgstock, 2012; Welsh et al., 2014; White, 2013). Before exploring the question of arts entrepreneurship for studio art majors, I briefly examine the curricular structure of arts entrepreneurship, how it has been funded and implemented, and some of the challenges inherent in adopting business-oriented curricula and philosophies to arts education.

Curriculum and Structure

Professional development curricula in the arts take on many forms (Beckman, 2007; White, 2013). Practitioners distinguish arts entrepreneurship from traditional professional development through a concerted effort to move beyond basic training modes, such as résumé workshops, to teach elements from both venture and skills models (Beckman, 2007; Hong et al., 2012). From the few scholarly articles on arts entrepreneurship pedagogy, including Beckman's

early survey (2007), a picture of an efficient arts entrepreneurship curriculum has emerged (Essig, 2013, 2014a).

In a key analysis of arts entrepreneurship pedagogy, Hong and her colleagues (2012) outline the basic elements of traditional business entrepreneurial curriculum—faculty lectures, visits by guest entrepreneurs, business plan development, and internships—and how arts entrepreneurship has adapted these to fit artistic career goals by emphasizing independence, flexibility, and adaptability (Beckman, 2007; Pollard & Wilson, 2014). Arts entrepreneurship builds on the traditional business structure by adding coursework in personal finance and grant writing to support a portfolio career, although participation in business plan competitions, a vital element of traditional entrepreneurship education, has yet to appear widely in arts entrepreneurship curricula (Hong et al., 2012). Ultimately, arts faculty wish to "pass on lessons that they learned in the field," according to Korzen (2015), and "help students avoid mistakes and learn from their…experience" (p. 67). No matter the inspiration, arts educators eager to implement arts entrepreneurship in their institutions face a number of financial and logistical challenges.

Funding and Implementation

Arts entrepreneurship has experienced a rocky path as it branched off from traditional business entrepreneurship (Beckman, 2011). In the early stages, arts entrepreneurship courses or programs, often the pet project of an interested faculty, suffered from a lack of funding and only appeared intermittently (Beckman, 2007). Although the climate is changing, many examples of arts entrepreneurship continue to reside outside of existing art programs, following the path of least fiscal resistance (Beckman, 2007; Korzen, 2015).

In his study, Beckman (2007) found that while some art educators remain open to incorporating entrepreneurial outcomes, they believe that arts entrepreneurship should be housed in their own departments "within the context of disciplinary culture" (p. 94) rather than in the business school. While some administrators believe that arts entrepreneurship may be an easier sell in applied or vocational arts, faculty support and an interdisciplinary openness remain important in developing arts entrepreneurship. Because arts entrepreneurship borrows courses from business schools, arts/business partnerships are common at public institutions, where business schools have typically been helpful to their arts colleagues in the interest of collegiality and cooperation. Arts entrepreneurship cannot simply be imported wholesale, however, from business schools because the arts possess an entrepreneurial history separate from business (Bridgstock, 2012; Essig & Guevara, 2016; Korzen, 2015). As arts entrepreneurship grows, it can cast a wider net than traditional entrepreneurship, enveloping a wide variety of artistic ventures, including studio art practice (Beckman, 2007; Korzen, 2015; Thom, 2016).

Challenges in Implementing Arts Entrepreneurship

With the evidence highlighting arts entrepreneurship as a distinct practice from traditional entrepreneurship, why has arts entrepreneurship failed to spread more widely? What obstacles prevent entrepreneurial curricula from taking root in studio arts disciplines? Beckman (2007) found that educators face significant challenges in implementing arts entrepreneurship, including the red tape and administrative indifference typical to new program development. While music and other performing arts programs seem to have taken naturally to arts entrepreneurship, Beckman found that studio art programs balk, partly due to ingrained disciplinary habits. With the diverse disciplinary aspects of studio art, how do educators address

the wide variety of artistic needs in designing arts entrepreneurship curricula and programs? Beckman ties this confusion to a widespread lack of consensus on what an arts entrepreneurship curricular model looks like. Even if arts entrepreneurship practitioners could answer that question, they might disagree on whether to situate arts entrepreneurship in existing arts coursework or in general education courses or electives (Holmes & Miller, 2006; White, 2013).

Beckman (2007) discovered another implementation barrier in the belief among some arts educators that entrepreneurial values such as wealth creation do not align with the classical values of a liberal arts education (Shaver, 2005). Perhaps these tensions can be attributed to a pejorative connotation of the vocational aspect of entrepreneurship shared by many art students and instructors (Beckman, 2007; Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Holmes & Miller, 2006; Korzen, 2015). In light of this tension between traditional entrepreneurship and discipline-based pedagogies in arts education, arts entrepreneurship promises to develop professional skills beyond those typically acquired through the performance of disciplinary practice (Beckman, 2014; White, 2013).

According to Beckman (2007), additional hurdles include overly defensive faculty guarding their own disciplinary self-interests. Faculty ignorance of the connections between entrepreneurial and artistic practice as well as a lack of career-oriented training may also present obstacles to wider adoption of arts entrepreneurship curricula (Beckman, 2007; Holmes & Miller, 2006). Faculty may feel that they are busy enough teaching the discipline, let alone taking on the responsibility for their students' financial well-being after graduation (Holmes & Miller, 2006). With overall faculty support for arts entrepreneurship mixed at best, student interest can also waver (Beckman, 2007; Holmes & Miller, 2006; Thom, 2015a). Low enrolled arts entrepreneurship courses can result from poor marketing, scheduling conflicts, or a lack of

enthusiasm from their instructors faculty (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2015a). Art students may not understand the business-oriented terminology of entrepreneurial curricula, and may not accept the content as relevant to their lives (Thom, 2015a). Finally, students often attend professional courses or seminars near the end of their college careers, too late to be truly effective (Beckman, 2007).

Barriers to the legitimization of arts entrepreneurship as an academic discipline include questions not only about curriculum and buy-in from students and faculty, but also concerns about assessment (White, 2013). The success of arts entrepreneurship education depends on whether a particular course or program met students' academic and professional needs, and whether graduates improved their financial and entrepreneurial literacy (Thom, 2015a; Welsh et al., 2014). Until consensus is reached, however, on common definitions of arts entrepreneurship-specific student outcomes, assessment will be difficult (White, 2013). While some researchers cite increased self-efficacy, self-confidence, managerial knowledge, and the ability to garner multiple forms of financial support as key outcomes, future research is needed to help shape the conversation in the arts entrepreneurship field about best practices in assessing and improving arts entrepreneurship curriculum and pedagogy (Korzen, 2015; Welsh et al., 2014; White, 2013).

Arts Entrepreneurship for Studio Art Majors

Researchers stress the importance of professional development for artists in higher education (Beckman, 2007; Throsby & Hollister, 2003; Throsby & Zednik, 2011; White, 2013). Despite large numbers of self-employed artists, however, professional training has lagged (Fanthome, 2013; Judkis, 2010; Neher, 2010; Tepper & Kuh, 2011; White, 2013), and art schools increasingly feel pressured to better train their graduates (Gregg, 2003; Lena et al., 2014;

28

Pollard & Wilson, 2014). Arts entrepreneurship promises to solve this deficiency by adapting the best parts of traditional business entrepreneurship to the backgrounds and context of artists seeking success in the creative economy (Beckman, 2011; Beckman & Essig, 2012).

While still new to the mainstream curriculum, arts entrepreneurship contributes to the mission of helping postsecondary art graduates succeed after graduation (Pollard & Wilson, 2014). Arts entrepreneurship encompasses the full spectrum of visual and performing arts, but, in contrast to commercially-minded programs such as theatre, music, design, and arts management, studio art programs have yet to adopt arts entrepreneurship curricula in large numbers (Beckman, 2007; Essig & Guevara, 2016; Korzen, 2015). The tension between art and commerce may explain why entrepreneurial training often alienates studio art students conditioned to the disciplinary focus of their chosen medium (Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Roberts, 2013). How, then, do educators account for the needs of studio art students, whose goals seem to be in misalignment with the profit motive associated with venture creation? How are arts entrepreneurship curricula tailored, if at all, to the professional goals of studio art majors? The literature on arts entrepreneurship is largely silent on this issue (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2016). My project addresses these questions and contributes to this gap in the literature. I discuss the design and methodology of this project in further detail in Chapter Three.

Chapter Three: Methodology and Research Design

The research is clear on the need to help artists navigate a problematic professional market (Cooley, 2007; Fanthome, 2013; Lena et al., 2014; Lingo & Tepper, 2013). As art graduates adopt entrepreneurial strategies through trial-and-error; arts entrepreneurship education is designed to codify those strategies in a coherent curriculum so that students may enter their career transition better prepared (Beckman, 2007; Korzen, 2015). How this happens is not well known, however, and scholars have called for further research on pedagogy and assessment (Chang & Wyszomirski, 2015; Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Welsh et al., 2014). To answer this call, and to better understand the specifics of studio-based arts entrepreneurship education, I designed this study to address the following research questions:

1. How do arts entrepreneurship faculty define and conceptualize arts entrepreneurship?

2. In what ways, if any, does arts entrepreneurship education address the tension between art and commerce?

3. What is the curricular content of arts entrepreneurship education and what are some of the indices for success for these courses and programs?

4. In what ways, if any, have educators tailored arts entrepreneurship curricula for the specific needs of studio art majors?

The arts entrepreneurship scholarly community has made progress on formulating curricular best practices, but we do not know how these curricula serve studio art students in either major-specific or general audience courses (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2016). With a field in its nascent stages, and definitions still in flux and highly contextual (Aggestam, 2007; Hong et al., 2012; J. C. White, 2015), these types of highly personal and unique solutions to curriculum implementation and interpretation are best illuminated with a qualitative research approach

(Merriam, 2009). Although surveys and other quantitative methods may help us understand certain aspects of the arts entrepreneurship problem, such as the distribution of arts entrepreneurship curriculum housed in studio arts departments, or the retention rates of students in those programs, they are insufficient in revealing how faculty conceptualize arts entrepreneurship for studio art students or how they reconcile the pedagogical differences between venture- and skills-based approaches. Such specific data is best generated from in-depth, semi-structured interviews featuring open-ended inquiry and probing follow-up questions (Merriam, 2009; Rallis & Rossman, 2012). The research questions of this study, therefore, are best addressed through a qualitative design.

Research Design

I chose a qualitative research design for this study to better understand studio-based arts entrepreneurship and how educators conceive of arts entrepreneurship. Because I believe that each of these individuals has come to understand arts entrepreneurship and their roles as curricular stewards in their own ways, I grounded my inquiry in a constructivist worldview, one in which meaning is socially and culturally constructed (Creswell, 2009; Lambert et al., 2002). Such an approach considers participants' own theories and beliefs rather than simply imposing an external, rigid structure, and allows the researcher to ask open-ended questions (Maxwell, 2013). First-hand narratives are important because they can reveal how participants make sense of their world and the meanings they attach to their experiences (Merriam, 2009). Accordingly, I first describe the sample population for this study. Second, I detail my data collection methods (document analysis and semi-structured interviews) and data analysis methods. Finally, I address the ethical issues of my project and the trustworthiness of my data.

Sample Selection

Because this project focuses primarily on the perceptions of arts entrepreneurship educators, I drew from a pool of all faculty or staff who teach or oversee these curricula in postsecondary institutions in the United States. I used several sources to establish a database of arts entrepreneurship programs or courses from which to identify this pool of participants: Beckman's (2007) informal inventory of arts entrepreneurship programs, more thorough documentation of these programs by The Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education (2016) and Korzen (2015), and general online search tools; Essig and Guevara's (2016) comprehensive inventory was published too late to inform my sample selection. I limited my initial search to educators at institutions that featured arts entrepreneurship curricula and program information on their websites. I later targeted additional instructors from institutions with less robust online profiles.

I further delimited the set of possible participants by identifying those who teach or oversee curricula devoted to studio art majors and those in the performing arts, arts administration, or design fields who welcome studio art majors in their classrooms. After contacting these forty-six instructors directly with a formal request for participation in my study, I received twenty replies. Sixteen educators ultimately joined my study (see Table 1). I included in my interview protocol a quasi-snowball sample query for likeminded colleagues who might be interested in joining my study, but the leads I received resulted in no additional study participants.

Table 1

Participant Demographics (N=16)

Alias	Tenure	Part / Full Time	Position	Teach / Direct	Offering	Studio Art Background	Gender	Years of Service	Four-Year Institution Type	Region
Catherine	No	FT	Faculty	Both	Course	No	F	12	Private	Northeast
William	No	PT	Faculty	Teach	Course	No	M	15	Private	Northeast
Fraser	No	FT	Faculty	Both	Program	No	M	6	Public	South
Joe	No	FT	Staff	Both	Course	No	M	13	Private	Northeast
Peter	No	PT	Faculty	Teach	Course	No	M	5	Private	Northeast
April	Yes	FT	Faculty	Both	Program	No	F	13	Public	Southwest
Seth	No	FT	Faculty	Both	Program	No	M	1.5	Public	Midwest
Dana	No	FT	Staff	Direct	Program	No	F	19	Private	Northeast
Rosalyn	No	FT	Faculty	Both	Program	No	F	4	Private	Midwest
Jill	No	FT	Staff	Both	Program	Yes	F	17	Public	South
Marilyn	No	FT	Staff	Direct	Program	No	F	33	Public	Northeast
Lillian	No	FT	Faculty	Both	Program	Yes	F	10	Private	Northeast
Terrence	No	FT	Faculty	Both	Program	No	M	3	Public	Midwest
Adam	No	FT	Faculty	Teach	Course	No	M	20	Public	West
Wallace	Yes	FT	Faculty	Direct	Program	Yes	M	30	Public	Northeast
Sophia	Yes	FT	Faculty	Teach	Course	No	F	25	Public	Midwest

Data Collection Methods

To address the research questions and overall goals of this study, I conducted semi-structured interviews with the sixteen participants and analyzed their syllabi and online course and program descriptions. Interviews proved appropriate to understand the experiences, beliefs, and feelings of these educators in their own words. An analysis of syllabi, catalog descriptions, and other materials established a baseline understanding of how arts entrepreneurship is being defined, measured, and tailored for studio artists. Together, both data collection methods allowed me to collect the evidence I needed to gain a better understanding of how educators conceive of arts entrepreneurship and how effectively arts entrepreneurship curricula address the needs of studio art majors.

Interviews. To chronicle the perspectives of the educators involved in teaching or administering arts entrepreneurship curricula, I conducted semi-structured interviews with

sixteen participants to capture the perspectives of these educators in their own words (Merriam, 2009; Rallis & Rossman, 2012). I designed the interview protocol based on an analysis of units of observation—the items being studied (Blackstone, 2012)—for each of the four research questions. For example, the question, 'What constitutes successful outcomes in your courses in your program?' directly addresses the second research question, and is designed to generate a list of success indicators as articulated by the participants themselves.

I piloted the questions with peers and a colleague in art education. Since all participants live outside of California, I conducted the interviews over the phone. Interviews lasted between forty and sixty minutes. I recorded the sessions using multiple digital devices (two handheld digital recorders and a laptop computer running Audacity software), storing the digital recordings on an external hard drive in a secured, locked cabinet. I transcribed each interview verbatim, and then reviewed the transcript against a real-time playback of the original audio.

Documents. Before conducting the interviews, I accessed the websites of participants' institutions and collected publically available materials that referenced arts entrepreneurship. These included descriptions of program designs and outcomes, marketing narratives, and advising materials. Course-level documents included catalog descriptions and sequencing matrices. I conducted a preliminary analysis of these materials to compile an initial listing of common terminology to inform and shape the interview protocol. Later, I solicited syllabi from participants to establish an inventory of curricular information that I then analyzed with the same inductive process used on the interviews, as detailed in the next section.

Data Analysis Methods

      To avoid an explicit agenda, and to ensure that any findings resulted from the statements of participants and language appearing in their curricular materials, I used the inductive coding process of grounded theory: open, axial, and selective (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Both methods of data collection—interviews and document analyses—were analyzed and thematically coded using this process. Rather than code each data point to align with a pre-existing category, I analyzed each sentence of each interview and assigned it a unique code, resulting in over 300 individual codes. Moving from this open coding process into the axial stage of grouping individual codes into loose associations, I then identified emerging patterns and commonalities across the data in the selective stage.

      I supplemented interview data with an analysis of language used in syllabi provided by participants and publically available online course and program descriptions. Using the same inductive process as described above, I coded each sentence in these documents, resulting in a large number of individual codes, although fewer than those collected for interview data. After matching document categories to the corresponding interview categories, renaming some categories for consistency, I then consolidated both sets of data before moving into the final stage of selective coding. Here, I continually analyzed the relationships between categories, refining the taxonomy until three broad themes emerged: 'conceptions of arts entrepreneurship,' 'art and commerce,' and 'studio-based arts entrepreneurship.' These aligned with the original research questions regarding how educators conceive of arts entrepreneurship, how they deal with the tension between art and commerce in their curricula, and to what extent they serve studio art majors. I discuss these relationships, and the findings within these themes, in greater detail in Chapter Four.

Ethical Issues and Trustworthiness

I believe the goals of my study were manageable and grounded in a review of the literature. My research questions led to a vetted interview protocol. The interviews were recorded using several digital recording sources and were faithfully transcribed and reviewed for accuracy. I assigned pseudonyms to protect the confidentiality and identity of my interviewees as much as possible; all identifying information remained confidential. I carefully selected transcript quotes to illustrate findings, and paraphrased more sensitive quotes that could have revealed identifying details. The data, including original recordings and transcripts, were secured in a locked location, along with the coding key that identifies participants.

The inductive coding scheme used to analyze the interview and document data allowed the research questions and interview protocol to guide the process rather than directing the data to fit into a preexisting conceptual framework. I triangulated interview data with data resulting from an analysis of syllabi and online course documentation. I narrowed the findings of my study to the specific population in question, and I freely acknowledge my positionality and bias.

All participants expressed positive opinions about my study, and were forthcoming about sharing their experiences and best practices in the interest of growing the field of arts entrepreneurship. This introduced possible subject self-selection bias; the opinions of the educators who agreed to be interviewed may not represent the broader population of arts entrepreneurship faculty. I also acknowledge my own bias as a qualitative researcher. While I brought passion to the project, I remained open minded throughout the process, mindful not to reject data contradicting my hypothesis, or ignoring emergent theoretical perspectives (Maxwell, 2013; Rallis & Rossman, 2012). Since I work in an arts related position in higher education and

have incorporated entrepreneurial approaches in my syllabi, I took great care to monitor and acknowledge potential bias as a researcher, particularly regarding traditional entrepreneurial philosophies, such as wealth creation. I remained open-minded to those interpretations of entrepreneurship on the wealth-creation side of the spectrum.

To further ensure reliability, I used elements from the framework of trustworthiness developed by Egon Guba (1981). Addressing the category of credibility, I conducted member checks—asking participants to review interview transcripts and provide feedback—to ensure that the recorded transcripts reflected what participants intended to say and accurately reflected their perceptions (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006; Shenton, 2004). To track my own development as a researcher dealing with bias, I maintained a reflexive journal, which Guba (1981) describes as an important method of addressing my assumptions, worldview, and the process by which I interpreted the data and presented my findings (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). I did so, for example, as discussions of social and cultural entrepreneurship emerged in the interviews, and I adjusted my follow-up questions accordingly.

Summary

This study aimed to analyze the perceptions of collegiate educators of their experiences in addressing the needs of studio art majors within arts entrepreneurship curricula at their institutions. The goals of the project—to better understand how educators conceive of arts entrepreneurship and how the needs of studio art students are addressed by arts entrepreneurship curricula—necessitated a qualitative research design. Using an inductive coding and analysis framework inspired by grounded theory, I conducted semi-structured interviews and document analyses to reveal how educators perceive arts entrepreneurship education for studio art majors,

and how those perceptions are reflected in the curricula. My project addresses a gap in the

literature on studio-based arts entrepreneurship and, ultimately, to calls for a training

infrastructure adapted for the rapidly changing needs of artists and the increasingly complex

contexts in which they work (Center for Cultural Innovation, 2016).

Chapter Four: Findings

The findings from this chapter are based on my analysis of semi-structured interviews with sixteen educators who teach or oversee arts entrepreneurship curricula at public or private four-year universities. An analysis of syllabi and online course descriptions support participant statements and helped to confirm my findings; in no cases did participants contradict pedagogy detailed in published materials. Using the inductive, three-part coding process of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), I coded each sentence separately, resulting in over 300 individual codes. After searching for emergent themes, I organized the individual codes into larger categories and finally into three broad themes: 'conceptions of arts entrepreneurship,' 'art and commerce,' and 'studio-based arts entrepreneurship.' These three themes align seamlessly with three of the original four research questions relating to faculty perceptions of arts entrepreneurship, art versus commerce, and studio-based arts entrepreneurship education. In this chapter, I introduce each of the three themes and discuss the findings therein.

I begin with the first theme, 'conceptions of arts entrepreneurship,' and explore my finding that participants define and conceive of arts entrepreneurship in different, and seemingly conflicting ways. On one hand, participants tapped traditional notions of entrepreneurship, such as opportunity recognition and exploitation, in defining arts entrepreneurship. On the other hand, participants also articulated the many ways in which arts entrepreneurship diverges from traditional entrepreneurship. There seemed to be consensus, however, in the conception of arts entrepreneurship as a philosophical blend of new venture creation and skills development approaches. The second finding under this theme involves a conception of arts entrepreneurship as career self-management in addressing a specific need for professional, real-world training for

art students in ways that counteract the perception that art careers are unsustainable. Participants also sought to situate their curricula in the context of the creative economy, and to differentiate what they do from the traditional job readiness training delivered by career services.

The second theme, 'art and commerce,' addresses the need for art students to financially support their artistic practice. My first finding illustrates a perceived lack of tension between art and commerce among art students. While participants believe that their students generally view entrepreneurship positively or, at least, neutrally, many of their faculty colleagues still cling to the romantic separation of art and the marketplace. Ultimately, participants agree that financial survival outweighs the argument for aesthetic primacy. Although arts entrepreneurship educators strive to actively debunk the myth of the starving artist, studio art majors still struggle with the monetization of their work. A second finding under the 'art and commerce' theme involves the articulation by a majority of participants of elements of arts entrepreneurship that align with how scholars understand cultural and social entrepreneurship (Bilton, 2010; Hausmann & Heinze, 2016; Naudin, 2015; Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015). Under this model, arts entrepreneurship values engagement with the world, social impact over profits, and social connectivity as a key soft skill necessary for professional success (Bass et al., 2015).

Finally, I finish with the third theme, 'studio-based arts entrepreneurship,' in which participants articulate arts entrepreneurship education through the lens of studio art majors. I found that my participants did not specifically consider studio art majors in the design or implementation of their arts entrepreneurship curricula, instead tailoring their offerings to all majors interested in an arts-based career. While most participants believe that existing curricula adequately addresses the needs of studio art majors, some feel that there is room for improvement on how arts entrepreneurship can be tailored for studio art majors.

Conceptions of Arts Entrepreneurship

The arts entrepreneurship community has yet to agree on a common theory or definition of arts entrepreneurship, although not for a lack of effort (Aggestam, 2007; Essig & Guevara, 2016; Gartner, 2015; Roberts, 2015). As the coding process evolved, it became clear that the participants in this study would not be putting this issue to rest; faculty participants did not agree on a homogeneous definition of arts entrepreneurship. All participants did, however, tie their conceptions of arts entrepreneurship to traditional modes of entrepreneurial practice. At the same time, participants identified ways in which arts entrepreneurship diverges from traditional entrepreneurial education and articulated their pedagogical philosophy as a hybrid of venture- and skills-based approaches. While seemingly contradictory, these perceptions support research that arts entrepreneurship shares fundamental traits with traditional entrepreneurship in terms of new venture creation and the role of the business plan, but differs in other unique ways, such as ideation, in the context of the arts (Beckman, 2007; Bridgstock, 2012; Bryan & Harris, 2015; Rabideau, 2015).

I also explore my second finding that arts entrepreneurship is being taught by study participants as career self-management. The data supports claims in the literature that arts entrepreneurship addresses a need for advanced professional training in the arts (Beckman, 2014; Bridgstock, 2012; Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Roberts, 2013; White, 2013). Participants also grounded their curricula in the context of the creative economy, tailoring their assignments to help students succeed in a complex job market. Finally, participants made the case for arts entrepreneurship as a deeper, if not parallel, accompaniment to traditional job training provided by their colleagues in career services departments.

Conflicting Conceptions of Arts Entrepreneurship

As reflected in the scholarly literature, a shared definition of arts entrepreneurship did not emerge from my collected data. "It's even hard to define what arts entrepreneurship is," Lillian said. "To have you ask that question is really telling, I think. Because everybody has a different answer." According to four of the participants, one reason to dodge this question is the relative youth of arts entrepreneurship as a field, a finding supported in the literature (Beckman, 2007; Gartner, 2015; Hausmann & Heinze, 2016; Korzen, 2015; Welsh et al., 2014). Fraser cited the difficulty in defining arts entrepreneurship since a common definition of entrepreneurship itself is contested by scholars and practitioners in the business field (Aggestam, 2007; Beckman, 2007; Gartner, 2015; Roberts, 2015; Welsh et al., 2014). Adam described his perception of the arts entrepreneurship field as "a great thing, and…something that should have been there all along. This is going places. I think that this is something that's in the air. I think this is being more widely thought about and actually taught." Seth agreed, reporting that "programming has grown exponentially across the country, since when I first heard about the idea of arts entrepreneurship. I think back then there might have been fifteen or twenty programs, now there are hundreds of them." This recognition of the field's maturation is detailed in an updated inventory by Essig and Guevara (2016). Hereafter, I detail how participants based their notions of arts entrepreneurship on traditional models, techniques, and behaviors of business entrepreneurialism, describing their pedagogies as a blend of venture creation and skills development.

Traditional notions of entrepreneurship inform arts entrepreneurship. While my findings do not include a singular definition of arts entrepreneurship, traditional concepts of entrepreneurships color how arts entrepreneurship is conceived by the study participants. Before

articulating their conceptions of arts entrepreneurship, eleven participants tackled the suffix, 'entrepreneurship,' on its own by referring to common traits of traditional entrepreneurship: ideation and monetization. "The idea of an entrepreneur," Peter said, "is somebody who creates an idea [and] comes up with a business plan…that's what most people think of." Sophia provides "all sorts of support for artists who wish to begin their own businesses, have their own businesses, or arts management professionals who will run small theater companies" in her region. This nod to traditional entrepreneurship appears in ten syllabi and ten online documents, with language describing the process of bringing ideas to the marketplace, turning ideas into action, recognizing opportunities, avoiding threats, and launching arts-related ventures.

Opportunity recognition was a common theme throughout the data, supported in ten interviews, seven syllabi, and six online documents. Catherine explained the aspect of opportunity recognition and exploitation of entrepreneurship, which "really is about discovering a need and fulfilling it, or a problem and fixing it. But it's a process: need, create, fulfillment." Rosalyn, agreed, noting that "most business majors come at entrepreneurship from an opportunity recognition perspective. They're looking for the gaps in the market, they're looking for untapped resources. They're looking for how do you leverage weaknesses or strengths or what have you." Adam and Dana encouraged their students to get into the 'head space' of generating their own opportunities. "'You're not passively waiting for somebody to offer you a job,'" Dana tells them, "'but you are actually taking your skill set and generating those opportunities for yourself.'" Wallace wants his students to ask themselves, "'Okay, here's an opportunity,' or 'here's something that needs to be done, a product that could find a place in art.'"

To support this emphasis on opportunities, nine participants reported assigning a venture

creation project resulting in a business plan. This aligns with mentions of new venture creation and the business plan in twelve syllabi and six online documents. William stated that the "whole entrepreneurial track" at his institution "is set up…to get these people off the ground and realizing revenue." Whether the venture is an art gallery or a sole proprietorship based on a student's own work, participants expect students to use the business model structure to articulate a working venture. Adam works with his students to turn their work into a business using the business plan structure. The project then

> grows out from that core very quickly. Well, 'Who is this for? Who is your market? You need to define that.' And then, 'who is the competition in that market? Okay, let's talk about the production cycle, what are the inputs and outputs associated with this idea? So, now you're talking about the organizational side. Then you start getting into very quickly the fundraising, the marketing and managing of it.' I think those skills are what you need to be able to understand how to do a marketing plan as part of the venture creation.

A key aspect of venture creation is the importance of executing an idea to completion, which is mentioned in six syllabi and five online documents. For Dana, it is important for students to be "able to take an idea and see it through to full execution…they have to create a venture as part of the course as well. It's a hybrid…they understand how to take a basic idea and put it into action. That's a key objective." Lillian concurred, stating that her course "definitely focuses in on the practical application of those skills; sometimes students create a business plan that they actually then go and start the business."

Arts entrepreneurship differs from traditional entrepreneurship. In light of this emphasis on a traditional, venture-based conception of entrepreneurship, all participants, supported by language in seven syllabi and eight online documents, differentiated arts

entrepreneurship from traditional entrepreneurship. According to nine participants, ideation in arts entrepreneurship involves the artistic work itself, and the entrepreneurial act for artists resides in finding a market for this preexisting product. Seth believes that art majors are not "looking for an answer; they've already got their answer. Their answer is their art." This embrace of a preexisting artistic product, according to Seth, is "exactly the reverse of how entrepreneurship is often taught in business school." Adam explained that

> artists are different in that they're going into business for a career based on themselves, on their own interests. Again, that's very different than the invent, develop, distribute, monetize and exit strategy that you find in other entrepreneurship models. The studio arts majors are in many cases people who have been drawing or painting or designing music or doing theater or poetry and stuff from quite a young age. It really is part of who they are.

For Jill, the role of artistic identity explains the contrast between the internal focus of arts entrepreneurship with the external orientation of traditional entrepreneurship:

> Students in the arts entrepreneurship program…are learning how to take internal motivation and this internal drive and these internally cultivated gifts or value, and then…place that within the marketplace. Whereas, business students…who are taking a class on entrepreneurship are basically looking for opportunities in the marketplace that may not be associated with something that they're very internally connected to.

According to Dana, this internal focus results in a more mission-focused approach to venture creation, in contrast to the market-driven approach used by business majors: "I think that if I did have to make a generalization, I think that it would be more accurate to say the artists begin with the mission, and maybe business students begin with the money. Ultimately, they could both be

pursuing both." Rosalyn agreed, stating that "art entrepreneurs come to it from the other side, and that is from passion and talent. They look at 'how do I find a market that meets that drive within me that calls me to create?'"

Passion and drive, according to some participants, are key elements of artistic entrepreneurship, where, according to Peter, there is no exit plan, a key outcome of traditional business plans. "It's almost like it's all they can do," he said. "That's the passion for their art, whether that's business as an art, because…that passion that 'this is what I have to do' [is] the overwhelming piece to it, as opposed to taking a traditional route." Adam agreed, noting that his art students "are in it for the long term. They're less likely to want to abandon that over the long term. They're going to want to keep making art, no matter whether they have a business or not."

An important element in this mission-driven approach is audience identification and cultivation, according to seven participants and language appearing in ten syllabi and three online documents. "It's all about the business acumen," Catherine said, "knowing how to read a potential audience, a customer base. But, the business kids don't even know how to do that either." Further contrasting artistic and traditional entrepreneurship, April states that "the act of entrepreneurship is finding…people and figuring out how to connect what the artist makes with what those people have or want or need." William ties audience identification and cultivation to the planning process. "We're there to help," he said, "to coach, to challenge, to say, 'Have you thought of that? Have you tried this technique to find out more about your audience or your customer base or whatever? How can you monetize these things, and you have to deal with your audience in order to do that?'" Seth expanded the definition of 'audience' to include other types of non-paying support:

We like to think of that process about building a community around your work. Because,

there are a lot of people that are going to support your work without ever giving you a dollar for it. It could actually be critical for your career, right? They can be the person that connects you…they can be the connector that connects you to all the most important people in your city.

This focus on added value is a key element of arts entrepreneurship, according to six participants. When Seth's students complain that their work does not sell, he responds, "'Well, that doesn't mean that it doesn't add value in some way, it doesn't mean that you haven't done things that connect with other people. And it doesn't mean that you haven't developed partnerships, or you haven't explored channels.'" Dana believes that there is a "need for studio art majors to connect value in this act of making that is so important to them," and asks her students to consider why they have committed to art school so they can answer confidently when people ask them, "'Why in the world are you doing this? What is the point? You can't make money doing this.'" The answer to Dana's questions, some participants believe, is that artmaking already *is* entrepreneurship. "In the arts," Peter said, "so much of what artists do is entrepreneurship. In the arts, everybody is an entrepreneur for the most part." According to Dana, "the word 'artist' predates 'entrepreneurship.' Successful artists, of course, have to be also entrepreneurial artists." Because artmaking is the business, according to Peter and others, it requires the same qualities as other business ventures, a claim supported by language appearing in three syllabi and two online documents. "For the studio artists," Joe said, "a lot of them recognize if they're going to create art and sell it, that they need to be involved in that process somehow."

Some participants described the need for art majors to think of themselves as entrepreneurs and not rely on their work to speak for itself. "It is uncomfortable for them,"

47

Catherine said, "because it's this blend between letting the work speak for itself, but then also realizing that they themselves as artists become part of that commodity in a way." Sophia believes that, although her students are "incredibly well-trained in their disciplines, there's such a gap in their training between the practice, their own practice, and how to actually to go out into the world and apply that to their own businesses." Peter elaborated on the artist as entrepreneur:

> If you're going to be a true artist…you really become an entrepreneur because you *are* the business, and you're out doing things that in growing that business…[and] to be successful outside of your art, you have to have the same types of qualities that an entrepreneur has in business.

In the end, some participants feel that traditional and arts entrepreneurship are not incompatible, but that they simply diverge in language and approach. "Those two different approaches are not mutually exclusive," Rosalyn said, "but we do find that it's important to talk in different language to each of those parties…we're very aware that it is the approach that is different. That it is the language that is different." Peter agreed, stating that the "differences are really technical. The mindset is what's most important. And in that case it's really similar." Marilyn noted that "if you were really designing this in a way that speaks to [art students], you might not use this language."

Arts entrepreneurship blends venture- and skills-based approaches. Supported by language appearing in twelve syllabi and ten online documents, ten of the sixteen participants characterized their pedagogy as a blend or hybrid of new venture creation and a skills/mindset approach. "We blend those two approaches together," Seth said, "and see them as part of a continuum…we really focus on the middle ground between those two outcomes." Catherine, who emphasized the prominent role of mentorship in her program, said the blend depended on

the particular situation of each student. April's program "exist[s] in various places on that spectrum," as the emphasis shifts toward venture creation or skills development based on the particular course or extracurricular activity or advising session. "It's really a combination of both," Peter said. "There's the mindset, you got to have that as the underlying passion. You also have to recognize that there is this…business structure around that." Adam acknowledged the simultaneity of both ends of the spectrum:

> New venture creation and the ability to add more skills onto yourself and to your team…I see those as pretty deeply integrated. The venture creation and the skills are in some ways inseparable in my mind. You can't really decide a venture and then just stop and say "Well, here's my concept." Even in the classic entrepreneur world, on the tech side, you have to demonstrate that you've studied the market. You have to know how to do competitive analysis for marketing. You have to be able to convince somebody that your financial projections are real.

Five participants reported that their curricula leaned toward a skills approach with an emphasis on the efficacy of the entrepreneurial mindset (seven syllabi and five online documents include the term 'mindset' or 'entrepreneurial mindset). Dana stressed the need for her students to embrace the entrepreneurial mindset, while Joe and Terrence felt the mindset is actually the most important aspect of their approach. "We have this idea," Lillian said, "that the skills that they're getting are more important than just for the purpose of creating a new venture. It makes them more marketable." Peter agreed that the entrepreneurial mindset is transferable to the job market. "If you want to go in the business world," he said, "if you want to get a job, if you have that same type of mindset, you can make it work." Terrence agreed, stating that "it's really about taking artists and giving them an entrepreneurial mindset. So it's more of a mindset than anything

else…you're able to create your own future, just like you create art. You create your own future."
Explaining her understanding of the entrepreneurial mindset, Dana believes that, even for those
students hesitant to monetize their practice, it is important to "'adopt an entrepreneurial mindset
so you can do what you're doing and really question why you're doing it, and who you're doing it
for.'" Only one participant, Marilyn, focuses on venture creation exclusively in her curriculum:
"What this course promises…is, 'I'm going to show you how to own your own business, and in
arts.' That's it."

Nearly all syllabi and web documents that included references to new venture creation
also referred to an emphasis on developing hard and soft skills. A majority of participants
mentioned the hard skills critical to entrepreneurial success, including traditional management
issues, budgeting, promotion, licensing, audience identification, location, branding, and others.
"We're teaching super basics," Dana said. "They have to know how to put together a budget."
April detailed some of the skills she covers:

> You have to teach the hard skills, like, "Okay, now you know how to put a portfolio
> together, and you have to put the icing on the cake and print the business cards, and how
> are you going to make the gallery connections," and stuff like that. How do they market
> themselves? How do they create their budget? Communication, budgeting, financial
> management…those are the top ones.

In addition to these hard business skills, Lillian exposes her students to the "practicalities of
gallery work, curatorial work, more governance, or marketing, accounting. All the different
things that come into play writing a business plan." In addition to marketing, pricing, and other
business issues, Jill includes specific topics such as "'how to register your business, and if you
want to do eCommerce, how you go about doing something like that.'" Describing her hands-on

approach to teaching hard skills, Marilyn helps her students

get contracts. We help people get MWBE [Minority and Women Business Enterprise] certification, we help people set up a better bookkeeping system, or learn QuickBooks, and how to hire employees for the first time. They learn how to do research, they learn how to set up their webpage, they learn about accounting. They learn how to hire an accountant…with an overview of how you think about the money. They learn where the micro-loans are. This is very appropriate for them. We don't bring in somebody who does big financing; none of them need it. The micro-lenders come to meet with them: 'this is what you need to do to hire people. This is what you need to pay your tax requirements. This is how you get all the ID numbers. This is how you get a federal identification number so you can hire people.' I'm trying to deliver…technical information. How you do your copyright, how you file for it, how you do all these different things. They get all the equipment in this course, hands-on.

Some participants argued that fiscal literacy for all artists is crucial. "That's a major literacy," April said, "[and] should be considered along with all of the other literacies that we think about." For Joe, "money is part of this whole thing, you want to make sure that students have a foundation on managing money and figuring out ways to maybe make a little money on their ideas." Dana agreed, noting that her "goal in talking to art students about cultural entrepreneurship is that the financial aspect has to be factored in with the goal of becoming financially sustainable." Adam wants his students to understand

'how money works and how you can make it to your own benefit is just another way to advance your career as an artist.' Then they go very quickly into the practical side of how to do these cash flow projections, and it turns out it's not that difficult, and people get it. I

think it's pretty easy to demystify this stuff.

Rosalyn asks her students to "talk about [their] income, [their] revenue, and [their] expenses, and profits in a way that makes sense and is not intimidating." Adam reminds his students that "understanding things like profit loss analysis or cash flow projections or doing a balanced budget…it's just another skill." Lilian often has to rebuff students who want the hard skills spoon-fed to them, and instead tries to get them to pivot to tackling the soft skills needed to master the technical aspects of venture creation.

Fifteen of sixteen participants cited these soft skills, inherent to the entrepreneurial mindset, and appearing in nine syllabi and five online documents, as integral to their curricula. Named by nine participants, self-confidence ranked highest among these important soft skills. "I want them to believe in themselves," Peter said, "and if this is what they want to do…I want them to think that they can do it, and have the confidence in themselves that they're going to be a success." For Catherine, self-confidence is key to the entrepreneurial mindset. "It's an interesting shift," she said, "to get them to understand that they have the mindset within them. I always do the Dorothy's ruby slipper speech with them all the time: 'You have the power to be entrepreneurial.' It's a matter of courage and bravery. Courage and curiosity." Dana explained how her program is "about empowering people to see their potential, and to not feel limited by a studio arts degree, to really see that in an ideas-based economy," and that students can take inspiration from the fact that "it's a very exciting time to be a creative professional." Seth believes "that the longer-term idea or rubrics for success for us is that every student that comes through the school…feels a) empowered over their future and b) feels equipped to deal with the challenges that they face." For Jill, self-confidence pays off in immediate and tangible ways: "I want them to…have the confidence in themselves, where they can say, 'Okay, I got this

opportunity. I got my bio ready. I got my LinkedIn ready. I know how to behave during a job interview.'"

Seven participants cited a need for resiliency or grit in the face of hard times or failure. Seth wants to "help artists become resilient and empowered over the work that they do, and feel like the choices that they make, that they have some agency over their future, then I do think that's better for the world in general. It's certainly better for the arts." Jill described her efforts to counter discouragement:

It's a revelation to them how much work goes into this idea of being a creative entrepreneur. It's the joke about the person who will work 80 hours so they don't have to work 40…I want them to get excited, because they can get beat down, and just worn out by all the work that's involved with something like a creative venture. I want them to understand that 'you're going to fail, and failure is learning…and this is going to happen to you over and over again throughout your life.'

Wallace wants his students to have "faith in their own inventiveness…and a sense of… personal resiliency…everything's a learning experience as you do it, and, to have faith that you would be resilient enough to overcome the low points and learn from them."

Some participants mentioned additional soft skills, including the ability to be flexible and open-minded. Catherine urges her students toprepare ahead of time in order to immediately act on an opportunity. Jill agreed, seeing arts entrepreneurship training as "getting them to be nimble." Lillian stressed that, because self-employment is far less predictable than a regular job, art students need to be "flexible and understand that…projects change, expectations change, different things happen, and that there's a lot of thinking on your feet that comes into play with regards to arts entrepreneurship." Dana hopes her students adopt problem solving and critical

thinking as key tools, "'so you can do what you're doing and really question why you're doing it, and who you're doing it for.'" Catherine suggested the need for these skills is particularly important for the Millennial generation of students who "have been catered to for so long. 'What…would be your next step?' The patience to let their brains click, click, click. That's the tough part." Rosalyn concurred, and noted that students "have a paralysis because somebody else has been doing it for them, and now, 'You mean I actually have to act?'" Fraser agreed: "There's a generational divide...and, to me, that's the real elephant in the room."

Arts entrepreneurship as Career Self-Management

All participants discussed arts entrepreneurship in terms of empowering students to take control of their career paths. Eleven syllabi and eleven online documents support this finding, with language describing creative opportunities, personalized career paths, and the creative economy. Seven participants described their curricula as an effort to help students build a sustainable professional life. Seth described his approach:

> The way I think about it is…that it's about building a sustainable life in the arts. 'How do we frame these resources as a way of broadening your Plan A? How do we make that track into more of a pie shape? You have your core activities, then you have these other activities around it that are hopefully related in some core value way to what you're doing, even if they're a slightly different piece of work, that can kind of create a resiliency and sustainability in your overall career.'

Even if some of Seth's former students are no longer running their ventures, he still wants to hear whether their "experience of being in that program paid dividends later on in their career choices and opportunities." Lillian differentiates the personalized pathway of arts entrepreneurship from

more traditional venture-based efforts:

> The students are really able to never feel like they're trying to fit themselves into some arts entrepreneurship mold, but that they can gather lots of different aspects of it. It's not just about being able to create a business, or a studio, or a design firm in which you sell your work or your services. That, to me, is like majoring in graphic design, and minoring in business. This is different.

Adam highlights the role of sole proprietorship in artistic ventures as "more personal…more about creating a sustainable life as an artist in society. I think that that's something that deserves some special emphasis, because many folks are less interested in expanding the range of their organization beyond themselves." For Dana, a successful career in the arts benefits more than the artist. She wants

> to live in a world with artists. I think that I'm of the mind, too, that so many people have repressed this very basic human need that is the deep expression of our deepest self, and that artists really help people to get into contact with that, the essence of who we are as people. From that angle, my feeling is this curriculum is so essential for studio artists to make the connection between what they're doing in the studio and how they might imagine parlaying this into a professional life.

This emphasis on building a sustainable work-life balance, articulated by Bridgstock (2012) as career-self management, requires some form of professional training in business and career skills. In the following sections, I detail my participants' responses concerning how their curricula addresses a need for professional training at their institutions, how they ground their lesson planning in the real world of the creative economy, and how they perceive what they do in the classroom as distinct from the mission of career services.

55

Arts entrepreneurship addresses a need for professional training. Seven participants shared that their curricula directly address a need for arts entrepreneurship at their institutions. Rosalyn bemoaned the lack of professional training at her institution, where, in the past, students graduated "with these art degrees, and there was no preparation whatsoever. They're literally just thrown out there and there you go." Her program gives her the authority to say to parents, "'Let your child be an artist. Be what they want to be, and we will help with these other skills, so that they do have some means of making good with their passion out in the world.' That was the primary impetus to starting this program." Wallace agreed, stating that "schools were cranking out these art students with no capacity to figure out how to get into the fine arts…market. They didn't know how to prepare themselves professionally to get out there." Dana explained her interest in quantifying the need for arts entrepreneurship education:

> I feel like, ethically, I can't do my job without believing in my heart that there are real opportunities for artists. I know there's a need, but are there economic opportunities for artists? I wanted to know. A lot of my exploration had to do with that interest…I know now that, yes, people can do this.

Some participants responded to doubts, expressed by students and parents, that a career in the arts can be sustainable. Even if art students are passionate about their practice, Terrence suspects that "they don't want to pursue it because you can't make a living at it." Addressing stereotypes at her institution, Catherine said that if students "declare that they are a visual arts major, the assumption is, "oh, you're going to work for somebody else, you're not going to work for yourself." There's that kind of caste system already…in place." Addressing these stereotypes, Seth notes the danger of selling students a career backup plan:

> If they see what you're telling them, whether it's related to career development or

entrepreneurship…as a Plan B…in other words, "Look, you're really great as a violinist or a sculptor or whatever, but you're probably not going to make it. So, here's what you can do if you don't." It's a non-starter. I think most of the time it's a disempowering process.

Arts entrepreneurship is grounded in the creative economy. To increase the feasibility and sustainability of artistic careers, some participants felt that arts entrepreneurship should be grounded in the context of the art world culture and the overall creative economy (language referring to 'real world' or 'creative economy' appears in six syllabi and six online documents). Fraser stressed the importance of aligning business tools to the specific subcultures of the arts:

> This is the world you live in. You live in a bunch of different ecologies, where, if one thing goes wrong, everything goes wrong. And if one thing goes right, some things go right, or everything goes right, and you live in a hybrid of these things. And you need to make decisions about what is going on in the rest of the world as it relates to you and your world.

To help her students understand the heterogeneity of the creative economy, Lillian asks them to define the 'art world,' a construct that "gets thrown around so much…[and] when you actually try to define it, you realize that it really doesn't exist as one thing. It's a culmination of tons of things." Dana talks with her students about

> the creative economy, and explaining really, 'What is the difference between a non-profit and a for-profit? What is the business model? What do they look like? What is the goal?' I think that really at the heart of it, it's about empowering people to see their potential, and to not feel limited by a studio arts degree, to really see that in an ideas-based

economy…we really look at the context…at how the economy is changing, and has been changing over the last ten years, what you see is that there are these massive shifts going on…manufacturing doesn't exist in this country, for the most part. Idea-based industries are going up.

Emphasizing the importance of external contexts, several participants reported that their curricula model real world experiences and activities. William requires his students to engage in client consulting on projects by other students, "to practice their craft and to engage as close as possible with a real world situation as we can find within the university. We can never duplicate a real world situation, but we come close." Rosalyn's students practice with "real ventures, with real launches, with real learning laboratories, but the intent is to develop skills that they can use later on." Jill requires her students to be "out in the marketplace. This is not a theory class." Adam agreed on the practical side of coursework: "The course is not very much focused on theory. Like I said, it's very practical. We go into the doing of the stuff and applying it to your life almost immediately." As Marilyn's goal is to "put them in their own business…we are successful in this program if they set up a business, or if they expand their business. Otherwise, we're just entertainment."

According to seven participants, four syllabi, and two online documents, a successful career in the arts may not follow a traditional pathway. Adam believes "there's quite of bit of new energy around establishing yourself as an independent artist without trying the traditional routes." Dana agreed, asking students to consider "other tools in their tool kit, and what might they generate? What might they do that's different and that's unique to them?" Wallace supported this flexible approach, noting that many of his students "don't go and start businesses necessarily, even though that's what we teach, but they work for somebody, and they're a valued commodity,

a human commodity for those businesses, and that's fine, too." He acknowledged that venture creation may not always be a good fit, "but that doesn't mean that there's no value in learning how to start a business, because you're…learning that language and that's great, and those skills."

Portfolio careers or freelancing were mentioned by some participants. "87% of working professional or performing artists have been self-employed," Seth stated, adding that some of his students "want a portfolio career, they want to have a stable kind of freelance base of activity that supports them, but with enough flexibility to take on a creative project." Jill agreed that a flexible approach is a perfect fit for art majors:

I want them to go out and basically be survivors, and to understand that, in the arts, you're going to have to manage a portfolio of basically diversified revenue streams…I'm very frank with the students. 'If you go into the arts, here's the thing. You're going to have a day job, but then you're going to have to have these side hustles.' I want them to be able to think about, in a broad way, 'What's my value? What do I bring into the marketplace? Okay, so, I have to pay my rent; what are all the different ways that I could monetize that value?' Understanding that there's more than one way. There's not *the* job out there. There's going to be multiple jobs, and those jobs are going to change.

One possible pathway to a sustainable career is employment or leadership in arts organizations, which appeared in six interviews, seven syllabi and eight online documents. Seth supports students who are "looking for employment within an arts organization of some kind, whether that's as a performer, teacher, or administrator, or researcher." Terrence agreed, noting that students "can be an employee of a not-for-profit and really have an entrepreneurial mindset, and try to affect change in that organization." Adam and Lillian agreed that the entrepreneurial mindset could inspire students to join arts organizations as leaders or 'intrapreneurs,' those

59

acting entrepreneurially within an organization (Hisrich, 2006). Dana expanded on the role of the intrapreneur, citing students who were

> artist[s] for a while, but now want to get into the administrative end of things or the management end of things. With that course, we do a quick intro to the entrepreneurship, and then we do deep dives into, "Okay, what's innovation looking like in the for-profit? What's innovation looking like in the non-profit? What's innovation in the government sector?"

Regardless of the context, participants emphasized the entrepreneurial mindset as a guide to navigating professional careers. Dana asks her students to consider that leadership in non-profit arts organizations, as well as governmental entities, can be as entrepreneurial as a sole proprietorship. "They learn how to go on [their] own," Jill said, and "be more business minded, think about the market, be entrepreneurial. But, they also learn about being a part of the collaborative organization, and how you advocate, and how does art policy work…they're seeing both sides of it." Joe agreed, stating that arts entrepreneurship benefits a wide population beyond the practitioner, and that "creating that mindset and learning some of these basic skills can help you no matter what field or what part of the field you go into, what your role in the field is."

Arts entrepreneurship is more than traditional career training. All participants stated that arts entrepreneurship differs from traditional career preparation. Seth explained his conception of the relationship between the two:

> Imagine this is sort of a horizontal line, and there are two ends to the line, and there are two dots, and one dot is entrepreneurship, and the other dot…is career development. And I feel like it's just a spectrum of activity and thought process that you can jump back and forth along, and you have to.

April noted that key elements of entrepreneurial practice, like opportunity recognition, is "not something that's going to be covered in a course about how to build a résumé or a portfolio." Adam agreed, stating that arts entrepreneurship requires art students who may have already written an artist statement for a gallery show to reflect on their development through the lens of the business plan and the steps required to launch an arts-related venture. "The differences are…relatively straightforward," Fraser said. "Entrepreneurship is a discipline in and of itself, and career services…seems to me to be about the practical stuff that entrepreneurship as a discipline sort of assumes, and that art students desperately need as well." April pointed out that art departments already cover career-related topics for studio artists. Catherine clarified, however, that the entrepreneurial mindset is not something covered in traditional disciplinary art training.

Six participants made it clear that they do not cover traditional career preparation at all in their classrooms. Terrence acknowledged that while "career services is a little part of what this is…it's not really the basis of what we do with arts entrepreneurship anyway." Sophia noted that the division between arts entrepreneurship and career training resulted in a "disconnect with many of my students, and so what I do is I don't do the résumé training or looking at résumés." Marilyn was more emphatic:

> Entrepreneurship here is absolutely not job readiness to a career working for someone. We don't do that at all. Oh, no, no, no, no, that would be somebody else. I mean, there's other programs around to do that type of thing, but we don't touch that, no.

While most participants agreed on the differences between arts entrepreneurship and career training, a number of participants complimented the worthy efforts of their colleagues in career services departments, and reiterated the strong ties between arts entrepreneurship and

traditional professional training. Joe was careful not to tread on career services' turf, and Fraser praised his colleagues in career services for serving students "where the rubber meets the road." Terrence agreed that developing portfolios, résumés, and cover letters is "incredibly important, and we have a great career services group here that works with students on that." Adam stressed the importance of traditional career preparation to help students secure stable employment while building up the social and fiscal capital needed to launch their ventures:

There is some overlap, obviously. Sometimes what I tell students is that, even in the arts management path, if you're about to graduate from college and you're still pretty young, you don't have a lot of experience, and you certainly don't have a lot of money to invest in a business, there's nothing wrong with going out and getting a job working for an arts organization or apprenticing with an established artist, even a commercial artist, in order to learn very quickly how things in the real world actually work. And to get connections and references and save up some money so you can launch your own business based on what you discovered. Again, this is not necessarily aligned with the classic career development, although like we said before, those two, they do connect in several important ways.

Art and Commerce

The conflict between the aesthetic goals of the artist and the demands of the marketplace have been covered in the literature (Clements, 2014; R. White, 2015). Some scholars believe that this tension hinders the broader adoption of arts entrepreneurship curricula in higher education (Beckman, 2007; Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Holmes & Miller, 2006; Korzen, 2015). My findings, however, indicate that this tension may not be as prevalent as once believed. In this next section,

I explore my finding that a majority of participants in my study felt that the romantic notion of the artist removed from the distractions of the marketplace is outdated and does not reflect the attitudes and experiences of the Millennial generation of art students. Participants acknowledge that, even if some students experience discomfort in their initial contacts with the marketplace, they learn quickly that financial security is a compelling driver. While participants downplay the tension between art and commerce, they believe that studio art majors find the monetization process more difficult than their colleagues in other majors.

I also discuss the finding that many participants view arts entrepreneurship in terms that align with the tenets of cultural or social entrepreneurship. In this model, arts entrepreneurship values artistic work and practice that makes a contribution to the world. Participants observed that their students understand that having a social impact can be as, or more, important than profits, a key factor that distinguishes arts entrepreneurship from traditional entrepreneurship. Participants also cited aspects of social connectivity—collaboration, networking, and community engagement—as a key feature of the cultural import of arts entrepreneurship.

Decreasing Tensions Between Art and Commerce

Contrary to some research on the tension between art and commerce at play in arts entrepreneurship (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007; Faggian et al., 2013; Oakley, 2009; Taylor & Littleton, 2008), ten of sixteen participants reported that they do not sense such a conflict at their institutions. Articulating a similar opinion similar to that of William and Joe, Sophia stated, "I don't see that necessarily in my students…I don't know whether there's been some transformation over time, because I don't see what you speak to necessarily with my students." Wallace sees his students evolve in their thoughts on the marketplace: "Well, I think the students come in with

that idealistic notion…but, I think they end up getting over that…we are in a context that that…they are not seen as being diametrically opposed in any way." Jill noted that her institution "serves a lot of first-generation students. They don't have the privilege of thinking of a life where they're going to be cared for in that way." April, Lillian, and Adam stated that because their students self-select into their classes or programs, they do not see art students resisting commercialization. Adam elaborated:

> The students who come to my class have already understood that it is about entrepreneurship, and that's what they're going to be learning and they're going to be expected to show up, design a business based on their interest, and explore these different topics. I think that the students—you've got studio artists as well as other majors—are more than willing to imagine themselves designing and launching a business.

While most of my participants downplayed the tension between art and commerce, an examination of the data reveals a complex picture of how this phenomenon plays out at their institutions. In the following sections I discuss this finding in terms of the different ways that students and faculty perceive the term 'entrepreneurship,' how financial survival tends to trump aesthetic purity, and that, even though my participants believe Millenial-age students have no problem with entrepreneurship, studio art majors still struggle with the pricing of their artwork.

Entrepreneurship is viewed differently by students and faculty colleagues. Even though the term 'entrepreneur' has been cited as a problematic term in the literature (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Brown, 2007), nine participants reported no resistance to the term at their institutions, with many students having neutral or positive opinions about entrepreneurship. Terrence noted that the term is a "little vague" for his students, and that "a lot of them don't really even think about it. In other words, when I ask them about it, they have less of an opinion

than the faculty does on it. It doesn't really mean good or bad, necessarily." April agreed, stating, "we don't have the kind of pushback against that word that I think you hear in some other universities but also especially in studio art programs." "We are a multicultural society," Wallace said, "and these are two cultures that have come together, so I don't see it, it's not an issue in any case, really." Adam reported that his students perceive entrepreneurship positively:

What I will say from the students' point of view that I come across, especially the studio artists, they're somewhat fearless about this. They don't necessarily accept somebody else's definition of the term. They want to embrace it. They're certainly not running from it. but, I can say that the ones I have been getting in my courses…on this topic, there's a lot of enthusiasm. I don't perceive resistance or reluctance to imagine this idea that the artist can be a business person. By and large, this may end up being a generational thing.

Joe believes "the attitude that I get from the students in my class…is one that's very positive. I think whether it's because that's kind of a hot topic these days, or…entrepreneurship as a whole. I would say that the attitude has been largely very positive about that term."

While these participants perceive that students view the term positively or neutrally, others feel their faculty colleagues consider 'entrepreneurship' a pejorative. Terrence believes many of his colleagues view the term with disdain, and Rosalyn admits that, "some of the language tends to set people off." April agreed, reporting that some of the faculty at her institution "don't want to hear their students described as entrepreneurs, or themselves described as entrepreneurs." Dana, however, reports that her colleagues see right through the term:

I think that artists, in general, have healthy skepticism of anything that becomes group speak. I think a word as overused as 'entrepreneurship' is automatically met with skepticism by some of our faculty, who really feel that this is a completely overused and

tired way of thinking, and that basically, it's trying to put a spin on what is always going to be a challenging path. That is the path of being an artist, right? I want to really honor that, and…that creates a healthy tension. But, that doesn't mean that in an academic institution, our arts faculty are going to love the word and embrace it.

Some participants felt that the term 'entrepreneur' itself carried a buzzword appeal that was not always helpful. "In the beginning," Wallace said, "nobody actually knew what that term was, and then it became more aligned with…the business domain." Adam agreed, stating, "it's gotten so much attention in recent years because of tech. I think there's a tendency to jump to that understanding of the word entrepreneurship, almost immediately." Lillian believes "the idea of an entrepreneur has got a certain ring to it, not specific to the arts. Like you're a mover and a shaker. Jill agreed that students consider 'entrepreneur' "some kind of a buzzword, and it's got this kind of sex appeal to it. There's a sort of lone wolf sort of thing, but that's a fallacy." Terrence defends the term because "it can be applied to a lot of different things, and it means a lot of different things to different people. The term isn't bad on its own. It's just that it's gotten the sort of a reputation of the capitalist ideal. It's not necessarily that."

The demands of financial survival outweigh the purity of artistic practice. Even if not all students are keen on entrepreneurship, as several participants noted, financial security is important. "Everybody exists within the marketplace," Jill summarized. Peter feels that students need to understand the relationship between art and the marketplace to be successful. "Artists tend to think of themselves as artists," he said, "and not going to get a job and not going to be involved in commerce, but anybody who does that, unless they come from a wealthy family, at some point recognize that they got to make money. So, commerce is going to become a part of it." Fraser believes that art majors will enter the creative economy at a disadvantage if they resist

monetizing their practice. Terrence agreed, noting "we're in a capitalist society…people have to make a living. I think that you've got to accept that commerce is part of that. I mean commerce in the sense of, 'How are you going to get paid? How are you going to pay your rent?'" Wallace added that even the most dedicated studio artists "realize that they're businesses too, and they do some things for cash flow purposes and then other things are more grandiose…but they've got to pay the rent too."

Dana stated that arts entrepreneurship can stabilize an artistic career. Artists already work with a lot of unknowns," she said, "and a lot of tenuous circumstances. Our goal in talking to art students…is that the financial aspect has to be factored in with the goal of becoming financially sustainable." Lillian debunks the stereotype of artistic unsustainability, noting that "the first lesson for most art students is you have to teach them to forget what they've been told, which is that they're going to be a starving artist." Adam agreed, saying that the "idea that artists have to starve and have a day job and work a café or wait tables somewhere at a restaurant in order to be an artist is something we want to dispel right at the beginning. An artist deserves to have a place in society, a career. It's not easy, but it's possible." Wallace concurred, stating "the myth of the heroic artist stuff in their grotto on the Left Bank of Paris is not really relevant." Five participants even introduced famous composers or artists, such as Beethoven and Picasso, as examples of artists who had to support themselves. Dana cited Shakespeare and Dürer, for example, as artists who were "finding ways to generate income streams while practicing their art and finding ways to make it happen."

While most participants did not see a problem mixing art and business at their institutions, six others argued, with caveats, that the tension between art and commerce is still a problem for some students. "Yes," Seth said, "it's very dependent on the individual….so I guess

the answer ultimately to your question is, yes, there is tension always between commerce and [art]." Dana agreed, but noted that "it's such a healthy tension," opening the door for creativity and innovation. Terrence observed that for "some people, there is a schism between art and commerce, and to some people, they truly believe in their heart that any market forces on their art diminishes what they do. I see that." Lillian also qualified her observation of the art/commerce schism:

> I do think there is, and I think it probably varies from institution to institution based on the people who are the professors…I think a lot of young art students who maybe don't take…this course see themselves as either wanting to be above that, or wanting to just focus on their work and not have to do the rest that would come with being someone who runs their own business.

Marilyn was the only participant unreserved in her opinion: "Well, there's definitely a tension, I mean I've been doing this for years. We started this several years ago, but you're articulating it far better than I did. I just know it's a pain."

Studio art majors struggle with monetization. While the majority of participants feel that the tension between art and commerce is not an issue for their students, nine participants feel that studio art majors are more hesitant about monetization than other majors. Rosalyn believes studio art majors are "more resistant than the theater and the music majors…the general rule is the studio art students that are most apprehensive." Sophia states that studio art majors often "have the greatest challenge with completing a business plan and…they oftentimes are the weakest with regards to the business skills…of seeing themselves as entrepreneurs, and…with regards to having the personal management for business development." At Jill's institution, studio art majors "haven't quite figured out how they're going to navigate…getting a full-time

job versus, 'Am I going to setup my business,' or 'Am I going to have a side business?' They're the ones that I find have the most difficulty thinking about how they're doing to take what they do and…realize any sort of monetary value out of it." Lillian observed that studio art majors

> need a lot of support and mentoring when it comes to making the transition between being a self-focused student, insofar as they're completely focused on the conceptual and aesthetic development of their work, to thinking about how to meld that with thinking, 'What does it mean to make something that you sell?' And, teasing out the nuances between making something to sell, and selling something you make…they either think they won't be good at math, or they won't be good at accounting, or they have a certain idea that their work isn't cool enough, or they don't have something that's really a product. I think the notion of an economic good being synonymous with a work of art, for some students, is not just a reach, or difficult to wrap their mind around, but also something to avoid.

Marilyn believes that studio art majors are her "most difficult group…because they're very afraid of everything. They're more fearful than any other group. They are so difficult compared to any other entrepreneurship group that we do, there's no comparison."

Ten participants stated that studio art majors struggle with pricing their work. Catherine believes that until her students understand that their "work has value, it's hard to take that next step to monetization." Sophia considers the commercialization process "an alternative way of thinking about what they do. The concept of selling their art and then viewing themselves in commercial space, I think, is not something that they think about." Peter ties monetary value to artistic identity: "If you never have anybody interested in your art, you can kid yourself and say you're an artist but you're really not, or you are to some extent but you're not creating something

that anybody sees any value in." Lillian agreed that "because so much of their identity is tied to the work they make…it becomes very daunting, very quickly, to think about pricing, or to think about knowing who your market is, and knowing who your competitors are." Fraser and Terrence have seen studio artists struggle with reconciling long hours in the studio with a pricing structure that makes economic sense. "They're afraid to put a price on their work," Terrence said. "Not so much because art versus commerce, just because they don't have the confidence to say, 'I'm worth something. I'm worth this. I put 40 hours, 60 hours, 100 hours into this, and…it's high quality work, and it's worth something.'" Jill noted that even very prolific artists have to consider how "to exist in the world, and understand how to convert [their] value into resources." Seth describes the struggle in terms of freelance work:

> [O]ne of the biggest mistakes that artists make is that they go into a community and they'll say, "Well the going rate here is $50 an hour, or whatever, and since I'm new and since I'm younger than most of these people, I'll just probably charge $40." That's not how you should price your work. I mean, you should be aware of the market, but you should know what you're charging for. You should know what costs go into what you're doing, and you should also know what you have to offer. And, in some cases, it might make sense that you charge less than other people, and in other cases you charge a little bit more.

Some participants have responded to this problem by emphasizing how to sell work without selling out. Joe encourages his students to feel "that they don't have to put their creativity aside and become a different person when it comes to doing the entrepreneurial side of things." William tells students to "be aggressive, and there's no harm in that. You're not selling out in doing these things. You're only making it possible for yourself to have a very successful

70

and lengthy career." Seth acknowledged the challenge in communicating entrepreneurial

concepts to students who believe their job is to paint in the studio and not "sell cars." Offering

her students a "safe place to practice with pricing strategies," Rosalyn works with them to find a

balance "between doing what the market wants and is willing to pay for, but at the same time,

'what is your artistic talent and what is it calling you to do? How do you find a personal balance

for yourself?'" Lillian also mentors her students in forging this balance, reminding students to

> really think about what it means to blend what they have created in the studio in an
>
> intensely autonomous way, to then situate it in the marketplace. And, to understand that
>
> the validity of that, and the success of that, always goes back to the work. Anytime they
>
> start to feel like the focus becomes on selling, or figuring out what's popular, or what's
>
> the best thing, it always goes back…to what is authentic to their own story, their own
>
> work. In that way, it demystifies that dimension…and takes the power out of it. They
>
> start to see it as just one aspect of it, but…it doesn't overpower what drives the whole
>
> thing, which is the work itself.

The Social Benefit of Arts Entrepreneurship

The role of artistic entrepreneurial activity in generating social value appeared in

comments by twelve participants and in nine syllabi and five online documents. This supports

research on social and cultural entrepreneurship showing that artists are more socially engaged

and active in producing art for symbolic or aesthetic purposes rather than for a straightforward

pursuit of profits (Bilton, 2010; Dacin et al., 2010; Lena et al., 2014). In a typical response, Seth

noted that he wants to "help artists become resilient and empowered over the work that they do,

and feel like the choices that they make, that they have some agency over their future, then I do

think that's better for the world in general. It's certainly better for the arts." In the following sections, I discuss how arts entrepreneurship as a social practice informs artists' connection to the world, the social impact of their work, and social connectivity.

Arts entrepreneurship values civic engagement. Eight participants discussed how student work could provide positive contributions to the world. Seth works with his students on "the steps [they] are taking to solve problems in [their] community, in a project, whatever. To get them primed, thinking that way, is going to be valuable to them, no matter what they do." Catherine encouraged her students to consider "how [their] work as an artist is a part of the community that [they] are in. And the entrepreneurship bent is to listen and reflect, because art is supposed to reflect life…and see where [their] art is of service to the greater good of the community." Sophia agreed, and encourages her students to "stay in the city," and "help them think about their place within the city…as an artist and how they can be extraordinarily successful here instead of going other places." Adam remarked that "a lot of artists and arts organizations want to have a positive social impact," and that his students are open to the idea of social connectivity because he believes "that's how people want to live their lives now, right? The studio artists that I teach are no less interested in designing an organization with social impact than any other student." Joe shows his students "what kind of impact the arts can have on people, and communities, and then…give them ideas on how their art…can have the most possible impact on whoever it is they're trying to reach." Dana directs her students to reflect on the "social and cultural impacts" of their work in addition to how it may function in the marketplace, while Terrence framed the social engagement of his students in terms of advocacy for the arts in general. "I think becoming advocates for the arts is an incredibly important part of what we do," he said, "and more important today than in…any time in history. I think…people

72

who think the arts train us in creativity, collaboration, communication…are better representatives of, not only our college, but of themselves."

Arts entrepreneurship values social impact over profits. According to the participants, viewing arts entrepreneurship as cultural or social entrepreneurship emphasizes the social and cultural value of artistic practice over the desire to maximize profits. With this focus on social impact, arts entrepreneurship finds value beyond transactional exchanges. "It doesn't really have anything to do with money," Seth said. "The biggest difference," he continued, "between entrepreneurship in the arts and entrepreneurship in other areas is that money is generally the last priority in terms of why people are engaging in this work." Joe agreed that artists are "not necessarily in it for the money, all the time. Now, that doesn't mean we shouldn't make money on it for what we do…I think that there's a lot to be gained from learning entrepreneurial skills that is not just about commercializing art." Dana feels that this freedom from a strictly monetary focus frees arts entrepreneurship to do things that traditional entrepreneurship cannot, and that because "commerce…is linear, and I think that the arts can be non-linear. I think that when these two worlds collide, it's where excitement happens. It's where innovation begins. It's where there's fertile ground." Seth's students "want to do something that adds value, so they're already thinking about this idea of creating…underlying those material ideas that you would create something that has value for a particular community." He hopes his students will "lead the world equipped to be relevant in their field and also to make their field relevant to society…I'd say we want to be an engine for fulfilling that mission for our students on an operational level."

Arts entrepreneurship values social connectivity. In addition to this fiscal flexibility, participants noted an emphasis on networking in arts entrepreneurship, with nine participants, along with four syllabi and two online documents, naming collaboration as a key feature of arts

73

entrepreneurship. Citing the benefit of leveraging diverse backgrounds and experience, Catherine hopes to "celebrate those differences and understand that collaboration and trust between the expertise is what makes a successful program." For Sophia, "building relationships is a huge part of my class…how to be able to locate people, how to network." Seth noted the importance of "build[ing] the partnerships that [they] need to realize the creative project." Dana described her approach to group projects:

[R]ather than having people do individual creative ventures, we had creative ventures done in teams. We blended the teams so that we had people who were kind of representing these different areas. That proved to be an incredibly rich way to learn, because you do have these people coming from these different disciplines who think differently, and approach problems differently. That blending made for really great projects at the end of the class. People could add their strengths to that.

Rosalyn feels that because teamwork is not usually covered in the studio arts disciplines, collaboration "is a skill that we feel they need. In order to get things done, at least being able to understand where they fit within a team, and how you could utilize that team to accomplish goals."

Six participants cited the benefits of art students working on projects with other majors, particularly business majors. Rosalyn feels that her students "learn that [it is] not always bad to have friends on the other side…those collisions that we have [in] class are quite fantastic." This emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration supports the professional networking some participants believe is important for navigating artistic careers. By having her students develop their professional networks, Catherine encourages them to be "responsible for nurturing their own, and once they graduate from college, hopefully they have that network to continue in their

field of interest, whether it's vocational or avocational." Terrence asks his students to leverage their immediate and extended networks to help them make decisions about how to situate their work in the marketplace, while Wallace encourages his students to rely on their community that will "'help you, they will bend over backwards to help you, and don't be afraid to ask, because everybody else asked at one point in time.'"

Four faculty mentioned relationship building and dot-connecting as key components for success. Terrence talked about his "passion to connect the dots for artists," while Catherine sees herself as a "professional dot-connector" who brings stakeholders together to make their own connections. She cited creative placemaking, the strategic cultural transformation of a city or region (Markusen & Gadwa, 2010), as "more about collaborations and not the artists emerging from the studio prepared to bless the world with their creative mind." Dana described the benefit of leveraging expertise through these collaborations:

> We…have a whole part on creative placemaking, where you're bringing together the non-profit, the for-profit, the government. Where these things are intersecting together, and to really have an understanding of how you have your strengths. You don't have to be everything. You can find partners who have areas of strength where you don't, and that can lead to opportunities.

Some participants feel that social or cultural entrepreneurship is particularly well suited to help studio art majors. Catherine believes that art practices with a social component are ultimately more successful ventures than those limited to an individual's work in the studio. Catherine and April mentioned the theatre as a model for studio artists of an art form that exists solely because of its collaborative nature. Seth added that collaboration adds more than monetary value by "building a community around your work…there are a lot of people that are going to

75

support your work without ever giving you a dollar for it. It could actually be critical for your

career, right? They can be the…connector that connects you to all the most important people in

your city."

Studio-Based Arts Entrepreneurship

I have previously made the case for the lack of scholarship on studio-based arts

entrepreneurship in Chapter Two, and my findings under this theme support the need to further

examine studio art majors as a unique population. In this section, I discuss how studio art majors

at the institutions in this study appear to be underserved by arts entrepreneurship education.

Participants reported that they do not serve studio arts majors specifically because their curricula

have been designed to accommodate a wide range of majors interested in an arts-based career. In

fact, in my final finding, participants believe that existing arts entrepreneurship curricula, for the

most part, are more than adequate to address this population. The visioning exercises, for

example, that participants designed to help student reflect on their place in the world seem to be

ideally suited for the general reflective practices of studio art majors. Experiential projects, such

as student-run gallery exhibitions, expose studio art majors to real world scenarios. Some

participants acknowledge, however, that they see opportunities to improve the arts

entrepreneurship experience for studio art majors.

Studio Art Majors Underserved by Arts Entrepreneurship Education

Addressing a gap in the literature on studio art majors (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2015b), I

designed a research question, and a related series of interview questions, to probe educator

perceptions of how, and how well, studio art majors are being served by existing arts

entrepreneurship education. Based on a fundamental, and previously unexamined, assumption that studio arts majors constituted a unique subculture with different needs than other arts majors, this line of inquiry generated mostly interview data that did not support this assumption. In fact, participants treat the processes of venture creation, skills and mindset development, and career self-management as discipline-neutral. Participants reported that, not only do they not specifically serve studio art majors as a unique subculture, they have broadened their curricula to attract a wide range of majors.

Arts entrepreneurship does not specifically serve studio art majors. Ten participants stated that they do not serve studio art majors specifically, either because they have not thought much about that population personally, or that their curricula are discipline-neutral. "No," Terrence said,

> we don't really have anything for studio, specifically, but the general classes that they take can be applied to a studio…there are opportunities in galleries and museums and places where there's…studio art. I think that, at least, gives them some option that if they're not going to…make a living as a studio artist."

Fraser, Joe, April, and Seth cited a lack of expertise in studio art; Seth's response was typical: "I guess I haven't thought a whole lot about that…I should say that I'm maybe not an expert on the realities of professional visual artists today. I don't have as much firsthand experience." As an outsider to the unique culture of artistic disciplinary education, Fraser feels educators like himself "can be sort of objective, but at the same time, you don't know the culture of the art form or the training culture either." William said that, despite his non-studio background, he is open to having more studio art students, and that he believes he "can do a lot to offer to painters and musicians to promote themselves and figure out how to reach an audience, but I haven't had

much experience to do that." Sophia does not "create different kinds of opportunities for the different majors. However," she continued, "I'm aware that my feedback is going to have to be different…normally, from an instructional perspective, it's the same, but from a feedback perspective, it's very different." Wallace thinks it's a good thing that arts entrepreneurship at his campus is not specifically tailored to studio art majors:

> We do a disservice to students by…conforming to these expectations of what a studio art major would need, as if…they just don't have the skills, that sort of thing, they're shy, they don't do math very well, they like to hold up in their bedroom a lot and paint. I think that we do that, and we're not an art school, we're in a university.

Two participants expressed disappointment that their courses are not reaching their intended target audience. "My class is aimed at the College of Fine Arts," William said, "and I thought I would get a bunch of cello players and painters in the class. Well, it hasn't quite worked out that way. I don't think we've reached those people."

Arts entrepreneurship is open to all majors. Nearly all participants agreed that studio art majors make up only a small portion of the wide variety of students interested in arts entrepreneurship. "A lot of the students that I have are not necessarily just artists," Catherine said. "They are business students and journalists, which is crazy." Joe also sees a variety of majors: "I teach musicians, I teach visual artists, I teach actors, I teach writers. People who have all kinds of backgrounds." Fraser also serves a broad population who come from all over campus. "Some semesters I'm flooded with business students," he said. "Some semesters I'm flooded with engineering students. Some semesters I'm flooded with P.R. students. I really do genuinely get them from all over campus." Wallace states that, even in his program dedicated to studio artists, he sees students with a variety of career interests, including education,

78

entrepreneurship, and environmental science. Dana reports that she has "majors from across disciplines. It's really for people who want to incorporate the arts in their life. That also makes for a fabulous blending of students." Joe also sees a "very large population of students here who are very serious about the arts, even if they're not doing it as their major." Adam agreed, and further discussed this secondary interest in the arts:

> You find people who have, and this is actually pretty common, more than one interest. They have their sort of professional, let's say academic career path, and then ultimately a job or something, a business they want to start later as what they're focusing on during their college career. But they also have a pretty serious relationship to some kind of an art form. They want a chance to express that. I think that's pretty healthy. I think that's a good thing.

Several participants defined the 'arts' in arts entrepreneurship as a bridge across all disciplines, and similar language appears in two syllabi and six online documents. April included studio arts as merely a subset of the broad, multidisciplinary span of all arts entrepreneurship. Some curricula had been designed specifically by participants to serve a broad audience. "It had to be open to everybody," said Joe. "Again, keep in mind, part of this is…the way that my class is set up to accommodate any kind of creative endeavor, not just one area…the broader I can be in such a thing, the better." Sophia sees three types of students: business majors, students with an idea but who do not consider themselves entrepreneurs, and others "who probably have the personal abilities to manage their work and school and a business, but that may not have an idea and that don't have the business skills. I have to take into consideration a curriculum that would be suitable for all three." Seth transformed a class originally designed for performing art majors into one serving a broader demographic, and Jill adjusted a course originally designed for artists

to allow for more diverse viewpoints from majors across campus. Fraser sees his program eventually growing to allow for a wider variety of majors. "We try to make it as meaningful to the student's venture as possible," he said. "I think we do an okay job at that. We'll get really good at it in ten or twenty years."

Arts Entrepreneurship Addresses the Needs of Studio Art Majors

In the third research question for this study, I ask to what extent arts entrepreneurship educators tailor their curricula to the needs of studio art majors. Beckman (2007) found that studio art programs have been slow to adopt entrepreneurial curricula because of accrediting concerns or an attachment to traditional disciplinary aesthetics. While the curricula represented in this study address a broad population of students interested in the arts, all participants discussed how they addressed studio art majors within their existing coursework. These educators incorporated reflective exercises for studio art majors to define their professional mission and purpose and designed experiential projects to expose these students to real world conditions. While participants felt confident about their service to studio art majors, some admitted that improvements could be made to better address the needs of these students.

Visioning exercises help studio art majors find their way in the world. Several participants stated that studio art majors need time to reflect on how their artwork fits into the bigger picture. Seth encourages his students to identify their core values and the steps they are taking to situate their work in their lives and in their communities. "To get them primed," he said, "thinking that way, is going to be valuable to them, no matter what they do." Sophia wants her students "to be able to speak about themselves and speak about what they do in relation to how they are different and how they are unique from others, and so that takes a bit of training to

80

do." Lillian wants her students to think about the "ethics behind what comes into play when certain people request of you something that maybe isn't in line with what your vision and mission is." As part of this visioning process, Dana asks her students where they fit in the world:

[A] big part is knowing who they are and knowing where they might fit in to this landscape…do they feel comfortable being entrepreneurial? Are they more intrapreneurial? Do they like the idea of working in a for-profit versus a nonprofit? What are their values, and how do their values sync up? That is just so critical for students.

Seth feels this visioning exercise is important for students to articulate the types of professional activities they feel comfortable conducting or the types of jobs they would accept at certain organizations. Peter asks his students to "look at what it is they want to accomplish. 'Tell me what your dream position is. If you could do anything, what is that?' So, that's the basis of the class. That's the starting point." Rosalyn hopes to move "the needle in some direction, that's helping the student learn more about themselves or more about what they can do at this point in their life, or want to do at this point in their life."

Acknowledging that studio artists lean toward introversion, seven participants encourage studio art majors to become more outward-looking in their career management. "I definitely think they have a need to look beyond themselves," William said. "Getting them to look beyond their easel," he continued, "beyond their canvas, is I think the difficulty." Wallace agreed, and he believes "it's good to push them out there a little bit, and it's painful for them, but then, after they get it they…and they do just fine." April believes that "the artist alone in their studio is making work for themselves. The entrepreneurial artist makes work for themselves and other people." Rosalyn acknowledged that students are still exploring the public aspect of their artistic personas and "discovering what kind of artists they are, and it's almost too raw to put that out. It's almost

like a scab or something. A wound, right? That they're trying to put on display. It's very strange."

Lillian feels that studio art majors struggle because "they have been trained in their studio courses to let the work speak for itself, and let the work do the talking, and not need to be explained."

Seven participants believe that, because studio art majors want their work to be seen, arts entrepreneurship is ideally suited for them, particularly those aspects dedicated to marketing and exposure. Peter sees that "people on the art side that are taking this entrepreneurial class are looking for a way to make it." April concurs, noting that "the artists are very interested in, 'Well, how can I sell my work? I'm going to make this work.' They're not as concerned with who they're selling to as much as they…somehow figure out how to get their work out into the world." Seth explains how his students defy the stereotype of the inward-looking artist:

> There are some mythologies about what it means to be an artist in general, and one of those mythologies is that artists are really sort of selfish in a way, that they're really self-absorbed in their own work, and that that's really all they care about. In my experience working with artists, it's kind of the opposite, I think most artists feel an urge to communicate so that they help the world become better. They want to do something good for the world.

According to seven participants, arts entrepreneurship differs from traditional entrepreneurship in that artists already have a built-in idea for their venture idea. Joe noted that "visual artists tend to be a little bit more product centered," and, as a result, it is easier to teach marketing to them because they do not have the struggle of ideation that business majors often face. Seth agreed, noting the direct links between the artistic product and the identity of the maker, an intimacy not often found in traditional entrepreneurial ventures." Dana agreed, stating

82

that "on a certain level, they know it. They know these challenges, and they pursue it, because it's what they're…it's who they are." Rosalyn supported this contrast between traditional and arts entrepreneurs:

> The artists almost always know what it is they'd like to launch…the art students have an idea and they have a passion and talent. They have some idea of what they can do and launch. The business students, they don't have a clue. They really don't. They don't have a skill, right? They're not afraid of the numbers, but they very rarely have any idea of what kind of business they might want to launch.

Experiential projects provide studio artists with real world exposure. Six participants use case studies to understand how professional artists have managed their careers. Lillian's students "select an artist entrepreneur to either interview or research if it's someone really well known." William wants to know who his students "admired in the art world. Everybody has a hero or two. So, I would ask them very much to say, 'look at that person's career that you admire, and what did they do to achieve their success?'" Peter requires his students to contact and interview artists who are in the position in which they are interested. "I really want to stretch them to the point," he said, "where it's pushing them out and being able to find people that are in what they want to do, make them connect with these people, give them a list of questions so that they can talk to these people." Adam requires students to ask specific questions:

> 'How did you get your first commission? How did you become the go-to portrait photographer for some major media outlet? How did you decide to come up with a book based on your own work and negotiate a contract with the publisher and have that turn into sales?'

Dana hopes that, by completing these case study exercises, her students experience epiphanies

about their own work. "These sparks go off," she said, and "they might be able to make a go of this. They might be able to see something that they hadn't seen before."

Fifteen participants supplemented case study assignments by inviting guest artists to the classroom, a practice reflected in the language in six syllabi and three online documents. Sophia brings in speakers "who are involved in some way in the arts scene…to help shape their projects." Catherine's students meet "a lot of artists who do their work as their main state of income…I invite many practitioners in for their stories, their lessons, their potholes, or their words of encouragement." She features speakers with backgrounds similar to her students, a practice shared by Peter, who brings in "guest speakers that are in different disciplines that match up with what the students' goals are." Jill invites to her campus "anywhere from half a dozen to ten to twelve presenters a semester, because I think that that's really important for them to meet people, and then to hear from what's going on with people who are actually doing that. The challenges, and then also the successes the people have had."

To supplement students' exposure to working artists, some participants have designed experiential group projects to help studio art majors navigate the professional environments they will face after graduation. "Experiential learning opportunities are huge," Seth said. "We have a growing number of options for our students now to get funding for new projects, internship funding to help them go and do work in organizations." Five participants ask their students to organize an exhibition or arts-related event. "In the fall they run the art show," Catherine said. "They get to pull all of those logistics together." Joe based his group project on

> an arts related event on campus, or in [town]…that they conceive of, and they plan and
> actually implement over the course of the semester, where they must actually put together
> something and create it and make it happen. Something that will have a positive impact

on the…campus.

Jill designed a final project where students participate in a "student managed…show that we have in the gallery…Pretty much all of the visual arts students have to participate in the show."

Three participants ask their students to engage in an experiential group activity assisting local arts organizations. Fraser requires his students to work in teams for a local arts organization, so that they can "see the economic landscape, and they can see an artistic landscape, and they can see a geographical landscape, and how the arts fit into all of those." He sees this assignment as a way for students to "practice decision making" in a safe environment. In a representative assignment, Joe identified

> "[a local] arts organization that maybe was small or just getting started, and our class would provide some kind of consulting help to them, because they don't have a budget to handle such things. Usually what they wanted was some kind of marketing help, so it often came down to that. And the class would either do it as a whole or break into groups and handle different elements of what they wanted us to do. But, it was nice for the students to work with an actual arts organization that was trying to be creative and they could help them do that.

Room for improvement. Although participants describe their implementation of arts entrepreneurship education in ways that seem to engage studio art majors, participants identified opportunities to better tailor the experience to the needs of this population. Ten participants expressed a desire to better implement exhibition opportunities in their lesson planning. We would visit places in which this work can be exhibited," Marilyn said. "We don't do that. We [would] talk about getting gallery space, if that's relevant." Catherine describes her vision for taking over an "empty storefront…to launch a show, it doesn't have to be for sale, but we are

going to put an effort into letting people know that you are an artist and you are here." Rosalyn would like her students to be "able to go into a space, any space, and figure out how to make a display look appealing or…to intentionally utilize space and display. We don't have that right now." Seth is interested in offering "disciplinary-specific classes, like the 21st century gallery system…that would help navigate the realities of getting your art out into the world."

A few participants expressed interest in experimenting with business models specifically for studio art majors. Adam thought that the role of the sole proprietor would be a good model to explore further, while William considered bringing in agents to work with studio art majors. "Everybody needs an agent," he said. "Everybody…a painter…everybody needs representation…at the gallery, you have to get a gallery interested to get your stuff hung and shown. So, how do you go about finding a gallery, and how do you get them interested? What do you need to do?" Fraser imagined a deeper exploration of the monetization of artistic practice. "I've been thinking more about opportunities and outcomes first," he said, "in the educational experience. It would be about laying out a landscape of success and experimentation for students, not just to display their art, but to make money with their art."

Five participants cited partnerships with art faculty and working artists as a key feature of their ideal program. Seth wants to "have some collaborators that have that experience," while Marilyn would like to launch a program "with a successful studio artist, an artist who's making a living based on their passion and their creativity." Terrence agreed, thinking he could partner with more professional artists who made the leap to a full-time practice to serve as mentors and role models. "There is…a need and a hole in our program," he said, "to really help studio artists figure out a way to continue being studio artists and make a living. I don't think we have that component in it." Adam described his vision for partnerships:

I think that one of the most inspiring things you can do is to bring in some established

artists into the classroom from these disciplines. Have a painter and a photographer and a

sculptor and a fiber artist tell these students what their life was like. How they were able

to create a world for themselves. Then that can become a case study model. I think that's

certainly one of the courses would be that.

For his ideal program, Fraser would want to ensure that the "majority of the arts faculty are

behind it, and then make them a partner in it as well."

Some participants dreamed of additional instructional capital to improve the experience

for their students. Jill wishes "that we had more instructional resources so we could craft

curriculum that was just more relevant…getting students interested, and, in a perfect world, we

would have more classes…that plugged into those areas…specific to arts marketing." Marilyn

would like to "provide more literature that deals with their particular industry. The literature we

produce right now is more general, pertaining to the arts. I think this program could be further

reassigned to meet particular target groups." Wallace envisions more resources "at the capstone

level that it would be a bit more, a few more hours and more focused. That would be great."

Conclusion

Data from semi-structured interviews and analysis of syllabi and other online course or

program descriptions reveal that a majority of arts entrepreneurship educators in my study

conceive of arts entrepreneurship in terms of a hybrid between venture creation and skills

development, with a heavy emphasis on career self-management, contrasting their conceptions of

entrepreneurial training for artists with traditional models. This study also provided evidence that

tensions between art and commerce may not be as pronounced in younger generations of art

87

students than in the past. Participants believe their students are socially engaged and less interested in maximizing profits than in building a sustainable practice. Finally, the majority of my participants do not consider studio art majors as a unique population in their lesson planning, but feel that studio art majors are adequately served by existing curricula. In Chapter Five, I discuss these findings in the context of Chang & Wyszomirski's (2015) conceptual framework for arts entrepreneurship, suggest possible directions for future research, and consider the implications and limitations of this study's findings.

Chapter Five: Discussion

This research project grew out of my interest in preparing art students, particularly studio art majors, for their professional lives after graduation. I quickly narrowed my focus to arts entrepreneurship education as a promising solution to addressing the gap in professional training cited by a majority of arts alumni in national surveys (Lena et al., 2014; Skaggs et al., 2017). I was particularly interested in hearing from faculty about their perceptions of what arts entrepreneurship education looks like at their institutions and how their curricula address the needs of studio art majors. Using the inductive data coding and analysis procedure detailed in Chapter Three, I coded responses from sixteen semi-structured interviews with arts entrepreneurship educators. I also analyzed fifteen syllabi and numerous online course descriptions from each participant's institution (one participant was unable to secure institutional permission to share syllabi). In this chapter, I explore my findings that resulted from my analysis of this data, I discuss the limitations of the study, and I outline a number of implications and possible avenues for further study.

Discussion of Results

As I detailed in Chapter Two, the academic field of arts entrepreneurship is currently in the conceptual phase of development (Essig & Guevara, 2016), and has yet to establish a singular definition or common theory of arts entrepreneurship (Aggestam, 2007; Beckman, 2007; Gartner, 2015; Korzen, 2015; Roberts, 2013). The findings of this study do not contradict this literature; no singular, homogeneous definition of arts entrepreneurship emerged from the interview or document data. While traditional notions of entrepreneurship informed participants' conceptions of arts entrepreneurship, all participants confirmed a consensus in the literature

differentiating how entrepreneurial training for artists diverges from traditional entrepreneurship (Bridgstock, 2012; Essig, 2013; Hong et al., 2012; Pollard & Wilson, 2014). Because participants provided definitions that point to personal, and highly local, pedagogical contexts, perhaps the search for a common definition may not be as necessary as scholars have claimed (Beckman, 2007; Korzen, 2015; Welsh et al., 2014). It may be "more helpful," according to Beckman (2014), "to discuss art and entrepreneurship…as a *phenomenon* within a broader *theory*" (p. 10) of arts entrepreneurship. Ultimately, my study provides the "data points for our campus colleagues as they help us define the field" (Beckman, 2014, p. 13).

Study participants conceive of the teaching of arts entrepreneurship as a blend or hybrid of venture- and skills-based approaches, or a fixed position on the continuum between the two, depending on the course. This aligns with Beckman's (2007) division of arts entrepreneurship education into a venture/skills binary, a model cited by other scholars (Hong et al., 2012; J. C. White, 2015). According to Ballereau (2015), "a combined approach should certainly prevail" (p. 168), while Welsh and her colleagues argue for a "holistic approach that combines both these perspectives with other related courses" (2014, p. 21). A majority of participants, however, leaned toward the skills end of the spectrum, supporting claims by Pollard and Wilson (2014) that the skills approach "is seen to be more appealing for creative and performing arts students in general and more appropriate in terms of making a scholarly contribution to creative and performing arts education" (p. 6). As valid as these models may be, nearly all of my study data point to Chang and Wyszomirski's (2015) framework for arts entrepreneurship, which promises to help move the field forward and maps the disparate elements of arts entrepreneurship for educational uses. Hereafter, I examine this framework in greater detail.

Framework for Arts Entrepreneurship

In a key analytical survey of existing literature on arts, cultural, and creative entrepreneurship, Chang and Wyszomirski (2015) have provided not only a working definition of arts entrepreneurship, but also a framework that promises to address Beckman's (2014) call for an examination of arts entrepreneurship as a phenomenon within a broader theory. After a rigorous dissection of the arts entrepreneurship literature, Chang and Wyszomirski (2015) propose a 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" (p. 11). Dividing this management process into five categories—strategies, tactics, skills, mindset, and context—the authors use the metaphor of recombinant DNA to further conceptualize how artists pull from various leadership strategies and tools, as well as skills and personality traits, to improvise professional solutions in various artistic contexts (Moorman & Miner, 1998; Preece, 2014; Weick, 1998).

Strategies. The authors begin by describing the overall visionary aspect of leadership in identifying the goals of the individual entrepreneur or organization, or the 'end' in the ends and means equation. The authors include in this category new ventures, social entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, and career self-management, all of which are supported by the data in my study. My participants emphasized the multiple pathways to career sustainability available at this stage, and, because an artist's work *is* the business, studio art majors are already one step ahead of those in other majors in terms of venture creation. In this way, artists can focus on cultivating an audience rather than brainstorming ways to fill a need (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Colbert, 2003; Roberts, 2013). As key goals for artist entrepreneurs, according to my participants, value creation, social impact, and community engagement supersede profit maximization, aligning

with Essig's (2015) conception of sustainable culture, as well as with data from the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (2014) and research by Lingo and Tepper (2013). Naudin's (2015) discussion of cultural entrepreneurs as "being 'enterprising' for counter-cultural activities or for 'good' work (morally, ethically and practically)" (p. 1) supports participants' comments about their students wanting their work to have a positive impact on their communities.

Participants encouraged their students to consider intrapraneurship within arts organizations as a possible manifestation of the management and innovation skills developed during the business planning process. Even though the art graduate may spend long hours away from her studio, employment within an arts organization remains a valid option within the art world infrastructure, and makes up a part of an overall strategy of career self-management, described by Bridgstock (2012) as the "ability to manage intentionally the interaction of work, learning and other aspects of life throughout the lifespan" (p. 6). Viewed through this lens of employability, many of this study's findings align with this category in terms of the participants' ultimate interest in helping students build sustainable careers. Participants' emphasis on a myriad of pathways, including their encouragement of 'side hustles,' also aligns with research on portfolio careers (Clements, 2014; Hong et al., 2012; Lindemann & Tepper, 2010; Reid et al., 2016). According to Bridgstock (2012), this process of managing an artistic career "occurs through an ongoing interaction of reflective, evaluative and decision-making processes, based on ongoing information gathering about one's own needs, and the requirements of industry and the world of work in the arts" (p. 6).

Tactics: Chang and Wyszomirski (2015) define 'tactics' as the "tools or approaches one intends to employ in implementing the strategic vision" (p. 26). This includes marketing, branding, distribution, partnering with organizations, crowdfunding, and other production

methods. My interview and document data support this category in terms of ideation and product development by art majors, one in which the traditional workflow from invention to exit strategy is replaced by the process of audience cultivation for a preexisting artistic product. In doing so, they draw from a more complex and diverse toolbox of skills and tactics than their business counterparts (Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015). Because the ideation stage is minimized for artists, according to my participants, work can immediately begin on the marketing and distribution step of the business planning process. While striving to satisfy the "double bottom line" of profit and artistic value, arts entrepreneurs "operate within a system of dual value and as such, they must keep a unique 'bottom line' in mind as they develop their ventures" (Bryan & Harris, 2015, p. 29). Participants believe that, because of the prominence of marketing and distribution in artistic entrepreneurship (Meyer & Even, 1998), everything at this stage in the entrepreneurial process, and thereafter, ultimately serves to support the artist's work.

Participants' frequent mention of networking and working across disciplines also align with this category and in the broader literature (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006; Grant, 2004; Holmes & Miller, 2006; Lena et al., 2014; Lingo & Tepper, 2013). Indeed, Konrad (2013) found that networking is "perhaps the most important…element in the entrepreneurial behaviour of cultural business founders and managers" (pp. 307-308), and that artists prioritize their need for "non-financial support obtained from networking and peer encouragement" (Welsh et al., 2014, p. 34). Participants cited networking and collaboration as key features of the skills development approach and the entrepreneurial mindset (Beckman, 2007; Pollard & Wilson, 2014). Because studio art majors primarily receive training in solo disciplinary practice, social connectivity and team-building are even more important in helping these students find an audience, actualize a complex project, or improve their employability (Bridgstock, 2012; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006;

93

Holmes & Miller, 2006; Throsby & Zednik, 2011).

Competencies and Skills: The authors describe the importance of what they call 'personal capacity,' or the *"knowhow (competencies and skills) that effect the ability of an entrepreneurial leader to carry out the vision and to use implementation tactics"* (p. 26). My interview and document data support this category with repeated mentions of the necessary hard skills of traditional entrepreneurialism, including opportunity recognition and fiscal literacy. Cited by nearly all participants, these hard skills are also encouraged in the literature (Bain, 2005; Lena et al., 2014; Lingo & Tepper, 2013; Tepper & Kuh, 2011).

Most of these hard skills are woven into the fabric of the business plan assignment that appear in the curricula of most participants. For artist-entrepreneurs, the business plan goes beyond traditional uses of this tool to encompass the articulation of a mission statement and overall vision for arts ventures (Essig, 2009). According to many of my participants, venture creation is a means in itself, as the business plan exercise offers a mechanism for their students to brainstorm ideas and solidify who they are and how their artwork can serve their careers. The business plan exercise helps set ethical boundaries, and exercises the soft skills cited by participants as critical to post-collegiate success. The combination of soft skills with hard skills, according to Katre (2015), is "necessary to create sustained social, cultural and environmental value" (p. 72). This reflective aspect is particularly well suited for studio art majors; participants reported the use of visioning exercises to help studio arts find their place in the world. While the business plan, even one as open-ended as Osterwalder and Pigneur's (2010) business model canvas, remains a core exercise, its use goes beyond the planning and execution of a venture to encompass a wide range of visioning and reflective activities designed to help art students identify their vision, mission, and ethical boundaries.

Mindset: My findings align with Chang and Wyszomirski's (2015) fourth category, mindset, described by the authors as the "qualities of character or ways of thinking that are believed to be associated with entrepreneurial behavior" (p. 26). Participants discussed the soft skills or traits they highlighted in their curricula, including resiliency, grit, nimbleness, flexibility, open-mindedness, and critical thinking/problem solving skills. The most prevalent soft skill in my findings was self-confidence and a belief that the artistic venture is worthy and entirely possible. This emphasis on confidence and self-efficacy is also supported in the literature (Bain, 2005; Ballereau et al., 2015; Essig, 2014b; Welsh et al., 2014). In Korzen's (2015) study, for example, her participants "agreed that a primary goal for arts entrepreneurship education should be for students and aspiring entrepreneurs to enter the workforce feeling capable" (p. 67). Participants' emphasis on failure as a learning opportunity is supported by empirical research by Hanage (2015) showing that the artists in his study recognize that financial failure is not necessarily personal failure, and that "finding that something doesn't work is part of finding what does work" (p. 7). Participants also highlighted communications skills, particularly in terms of students getting their work in front of an audience and controlling the narrative about their work. Participants encourage this dialogue by asking them to present in class, give an elevator pitch, or engage in small group discussions. This emphasis on communication as a key skill is also supported by other works in the literature (Bain, 2005; Bryan & Harris, 2015; Clements, 2014; Hong et al., 2012; Welsh et al., 2014; J. C. White, 2015).

Context: Chang & Wyszomirski (2015) discuss their final category, 'context,' in terms of the external environment and conditions that the entrepreneur contends with," (p. 26), including organizational or individual practice, specific disciplinary conditions (museums, theaters, concert halls), and the specific geographical region in which the artist-entrepreneur operates. Frequent

mention in my data of arts-related ventures, nonprofit organizations, and artist sole

proprietorships coincide with this category. This contextual emphasis aligns with other literature

(Beckman, 2007; White, 2013; Wyszomirski & Goldberg-Miller, 2015),(Bridgstock, 2012) and

with participant and document data on the necessity for students to consider the contexts and

ecologies in which their work exists, the creative economy, and the 'art world'

According to Pollard and Wilson, context refers to "the ability to know what is current in

terms of artistic trends and values, popular and artistic culture" (p. 17). My participants discussed

a wide variety of employment and venture contexts, including portfolio careers, intrapreneur

roles in arts organizations, and community-based projects. Understanding that not all of their

graduates will go on to launch and sustain ventures, participants felt confident that the hard skills

of business planning, along with the soft skills of the entrepreneurial mindset, will serve their

students in the creative economy. This emphasis on drilling students on the art world context, or

what Pollard and Wilson describe as the "cultural policy environment in order to know how

[their] art fits in, how it can challenge the cultural moment and how [they] can reflect on [their]

work through contemporary currents" (p. 17) is supported by a number of other scholars

(Beckman, 2007; Brush et al., 2003; Hong et al., 2012; Preece, 2014; Welsh et al., 2014; J. C.

White, 2015).

Implications and Recommendations for Further Study

In the previous section, I mapped my project's findings onto Chang and Wyszomirski's

(2015) conceptual framework in order to situate my study, and the data deriving from interviews,

in the context of the ongoing conversation in the field of arts entrepreneurship. I specifically

address Beckman's (2014) call for moving away from the necessity of defining arts

entrepreneurship to an examination of arts entrepreneurship as a phenomenon within a broader theory, or theories, of arts entrepreneurship. The comprehensive nature of Chang and Wyszomirski's (2015) study, for which I have provided empirical support, may inspire the field to coalesce around their framework, at least in terms of the phenomenon of arts entrepreneurship. Hereafter, I discuss implications of my study's findings for educators, including instructors and leaders, and the need for future research on the relationship between arts entrepreneurship education, disciplinary professional practices, and career services.

Implications for Instructors

As instructors implement or revise arts entrepreneurship curricula, a number of issues should be considered. Student demographics is an area that will continue to be of concern to arts entrepreneurship instructors; who are these students, where are they coming from, and what are their needs? While many students enrolling in arts entrepreneurship specialize in one or more disciplinary art practices, others may simply be pursuing entrepreneurial training out of a personal interest in, or passion for, the arts as a hobby or even professional career. Some of these arts advocates may even practice art on their own and have simply declared a non-art major for their baccalaureate degree. The self-selection of entrepreneurially-minded art majors may also be a factor; perhaps the students who choose to add arts entrepreneurship to their full programs of study are already interdisciplinary in their thinking. While my participants feel that their existing curricula are discipline-neutral, a review of pedagogy would help identify units or lessons that could be adjusted to account for the specific needs of studio art majors, particularly concerning exhibition design and gallery representation.

While my participants believe that studio art majors are not different enough in their needs to warrant studio-specific curricula, the problem of monetization remains a relevant concern that should be addressed in the curricula. According to my participants, the entrepreneurial mindset, with its emphasis on the key soft skills of self-confidence and flexibility, is a good way of helping studio art majors come to terms with the process of assigning commercial value to their work. By emphasizing the social and cultural aspects of art making and distribution, instructors can situate the venture creation process in the context of career self-management and planning a sustainable work/life balance. As part of the many pathways available to professional artists, intrapreneurship and sole proprietorship, according to my participants, seem to be particularly suited for studio art majors, and instructors should consider assigning case studies or inviting guest lecturers to discuss these pathways.

Implications for Educational Leaders

While my study did not consider the perspectives of upper-level administration and leadership, twelve of sixteen participants direct or supervise their programs, and, from their responses, I note some concerns for educational leaders to consider. Although mentioned by name by only two participants, creative placemaking can serve as a fruitful approach to establishing 'town and gown' partnerships with the local community and industry. "Creative placemaking," according to Markusen and Gadwa (2010), "animates public and private spaces, rejuvenates structures and streetscapes, improves local business viability and public safety, and brings diverse people together to celebrate, inspire, and be inspired." Participating in this civic

transformation could help put an arts entrepreneurship program on the map, attracting positive press and potential donors. This may be especially attractive for resource-strapped programs, and for those leaders interested in encouraging their alumni to remain in the local community.

Common among nearly all study participants is an acknowledgment of the strict separation between disciplinary art education, traditional career training, and arts entrepreneurship. Educational leaders invested in dismantling silos across campus may want to further examine how and where these departments can collaborate while maintaining the unique characteristics of their individual missions. Although most of my participants serve in full-time positions, few have tenure, which could be a factor in how arts entrepreneurship instructors and directors are able to navigate cross-campus relationships. Further study, however, is needed to determine the significance of instructor load and status on educator perceptions of these territorial silos and their sense of their own political capital in managing these relationships.

In an effort to broaden the reach of their curricula to their entire campus, nearly all of my participants serve a diverse population of majors in their courses, with no special dispensation directed to studio art majors. In addition to the territorial issues expressed by my participants, enrollment management pressures may have also compelled these educators to expand the umbrella of their curricula; a class section is more likely to survive if registration is open to all majors, particularly in elective, single-course offerings outside of a required degree program, certificate, or minor. Educational leaders can support arts entrepreneurship educators by clearing curricular roadblocks and providing adequate resources to allow these educators to implement the experiential lessons necessary for artistic entrepreneurship to flourish. Leadership can also encourage collaborative environments where arts entrepreneurship educators can harness the expertise of studio art subject matter experts, working artists, and industry representatives.

99

Implications for Researchers

In addition to providing empirical support for the efficacy of adopting Chang and Wyszomirsky's (2015) framework as a flexible model for future research , my study data also point to a number of lines of possible inquiry. Because my study failed to find evidence of a need for studio-specific arts entrepreneurship curricula, more empirical research targeted at professional art schools is needed to determine how to best serve this population. Whether included in a future iteration of the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project survey or a case study of one or more specific institutions, research on studio art majors is necessary to better understand their reasons for adding entrepreneurial training to their degree plans. Whether they launch ventures or not, further inquiry into the use of the business plan in the arts, particularly Osterwalder & Pigneur's (2010) business model canvas, could illuminate how studio art majors have taken to this tool and how it has affected their perceptions of their career outlook.

It would also be helpful to compare arts entrepreneurship education, particularly for studio art majors, with existing professional practices workshops and seminars offered in the studio art disciplines. Empirical studies, as well as essays in the theoretical and popular literature, support the idea that these courses help students navigate the art world (Fanthome, 2013; Gregg, 2003; Harbour, 2005; Judkis, 2010; Neher, 2010; Throsby & Hollister, 2003). My study did not target these types of courses, and I have no evidence of whether entrepreneurial training is conducted in these courses beyond an individual lesson or guest lectures. I am unaware of whether professional practices coursework in the disciplines helps students come to terms with setting a price for their work, and, because of a dearth of substantial literature on this topic, further research on the relationships between disciplinary and entrepreneurial training could help illuminate how studio art majors settle on a market-based price for their work. Part of

the sting of the monetization process could be minimized by the emphasis on values in arts entrepreneurship more closely associated with cultural entrepreneurship. According to Meyer and Even (1998), the distribution and communication aspects of marketing trumped the pricing process for the artists they studied. Even though the term 'entrepreneur' may carry some baggage, my participants noted a lack of pushback on the term from students, which contradicts some research by Korzen (2015) and Pollard & Wilson (2014). Many participants described entrepreneurial training pragmatically: everyone has to eat, and artists and composers have been acting entrepreneurially for centuries.

While my participants were careful to differentiate arts entrepreneurship from traditional career training, it would be helpful to hear from career services professionals about how the introduction of entrepreneurial training to art education has affected their mission or the services they provide to art majors. What steps would these professionals suggest to help bridge territorial divisions, real or perceived, between career services, arts entrepreneurship, and disciplinary art education? In any case, there appears to be a value judgment by some of my participants between arts entrepreneurship and career services, even though, according to interviewees, career self-management is a central part of entrepreneurial training.

Finally, the problem of insufficient assessment of arts entrepreneurship education remains an important topic for future inquiry. While most participants felt that their courses and/or programs were successful, many agreed that there are few, or insufficient, mechanisms in place to track graduates for assessment purposes. The majority of participants relied on anecdotal reports from alumni on how well they are doing and how important their coursework was to their careers. A few cited official assessment materials like course and program evaluations and written student self-assessments, while others pointed to consistent over-enrollment of courses as an indicator of high demand, contradicting research suggesting arts entrepreneurship courses

tend to suffer from low enrollment (Beckman, 2007; Thom, 2015a). While these metrics are certainly helpful, a more robust plan is needed to determine whether arts education is fulfilling its promise of preparing students for career self-management.

Limitations of the Study

Because of the relative youth of arts entrepreneurship as an academic field, I positioned my project to contribute to a slim body of literature on studio-based arts entrepreneurship. Although unexpected, my findings show that the educators in my study did not take the needs of studio art majors into special consideration, because they believe that existing curricula adequately address their needs. Since this line of inquiry was based on my assumption that studio art majors represented a key micro-culture of artists with fewer monetization options than performing arts or design majors, I was unprepared to adjust to participant responses to this line of questioning. This limitation, and other weaknesses of my study, are exposed in the research design. My focus on individual faculty interviews, for example, resulted in a broad overview of educator perceptions rather than the varied qualitative and quantitative data that may have resulted from a single or multiple case study design. In further considering the limitations of my study, concerns relating to research design (including the sample, selection criteria, and the interview protocol) and key assumptions that I made when designing this study need to be addressed.

Research Design

I conducted semi-structured interviews with sixteen arts entrepreneurship educators, fifteen from public or private four-year institutions that serve studio art majors generally, and

one who teaches at a public four-year university in a program serving studio art majors specifically. I was unable to secure interviews with anyone from an art school or conservatory. Due to time and resource constraints, my selection criteria was limited to dedicated arts entrepreneurship coursework; I did not open my search to courses that included a preponderance of entrepreneurial concepts or training but did not have 'entrepreneurship,' 'enterprise,' or 'business' in the title.

Because of this limited sample size, my findings cannot be generalized to the larger population of arts entrepreneurship educators. Most of my participants purposely serve a broad population of majors, and their perspectives on the needs of studio art majors may not be representative of the field as a whole, and studio art educators specifically. Only three participants have a studio art background, but even their responses do not deviate from those of the other participants. The fact that my participants self-selected to join my study must be considered when reviewing the results. It is possible that they share some key characteristics and/or experiences that may have limited the range of responses.

For my interview protocol, I hesitated to include questions about social or cultural entrepreneurship out of a concern about leading my interviewees down a predetermined path. As a result, I did not have a robust infrastructure with which to explore this aspect of arts entrepreneurship beyond probing follow-up questions. I also found the interview questions associated with the third research question—concerning the structural makeup of arts entrepreneurship curricula—to be overly general, resulting in some superficial responses. Stronger questions, such as why participants chose certain lessons or pedagogies, may have yielded better data. Perhaps a more rigorous piloting of the protocol might have revealed these weaknesses.

Assumptions

The data collection and analysis process revealed a fundamental assumption that colored my approach to this project. Based on research that questioned the one-size-fits-all model of entrepreneurial education (Beckman, 2014; J. C. White, 2015), I assumed that studio arts majors were unique, had different needs than other art majors, and therefore required a studio-based iteration of arts entrepreneurship. It turns out that studio art majors are not that special after all, according to my participants, at least in terms of how arts entrepreneurship education supports venture creation, skills development, and career self-management. In that light, my participants felt that the needs of a painter, for example, are not that different than those of a musician or actor. In Chapter Two, I asked, 'How, then, do educators account for the needs of studio art students, whose goals seem to be in misalignment with the profit motive associated with venture creation? How are arts entrepreneurship curricula tailored, if at all, to the professional goals of studio art majors?" The answer to these questions, according to the majority of participants, is that studio art majors are treated like any other major when it comes to entrepreneurial training.

A second assumption I made is that arts entrepreneurship education primarily exists to help art majors make a living from their work, despite some research claiming arts entrepreneurship education also serves anyone interested in arts-related ventures (J. C. White, 2015). Even though I did not make this distinction in my research design beyond open-ended questions about student demographics, my interviewees reported on this freely. Participants cited their business students who explored arts-related ventures out of a passion for the arts rather than an interest in building and selling widgets. My project may have evolved differently had I taken into account the demographic heterogeneity of the arts entrepreneurship landscape.

Finally, I believe that my articulation of the venture and skills manifestations of arts entrepreneurship as a binary rather than as a more open-ended structure probably affected the way I designed my research questions and my interview protocol, as well as the ways in which I provided follow-up questions. While most participants reported their philosophy as a blend of venture and skills approaches, it seems that their responses indicate the need for a more complex model (Aggestam, 2007; Beckman, 2007; Bryan & Harris, 2015; Gartner, 2015; J. C. White, 2015). I believe that, ultimately, the interview protocol served its purpose in sparking discussion by participants, resulting in an alignment with the key works in the literature as previously discussed. A more informed research design, however, may have yielded stronger data and an even clearer pathway through the literature.

Conclusion

In summary, interview and document data decisively answered the research questions at the heart of this study. "How do arts entrepreneurship faculty," I asked in my first question, "define and conceptualize arts entrepreneurship?" My participants spoke in terms of helping students forge sustainable careers, emphasizing the hard skills of venture creation along with the soft skills of the entrepreneurial mindset. "In what ways, if any, does arts entrepreneurship education address the tension between art and commerce?" Setting aside the key assumption that the tension between art and commerce exists in the first place, my participants used the business model process as a means of encouraging students to articulate their mission and vision for a sustainable career, so that questions of monetization were always posed in the context of the work itself. "What is the curricular content of arts entrepreneurship education and what are some of the indices for success for these courses and programs?" Content is largely experiential, with

numerous opportunities for students to investigate case studies, design exhibitions, network with guest artists and entrepreneurs, and engage in real-world client scenarios. Participants defined success as students mastering the hard and soft skills required for venture creation or employability, although nearly all participants wished for more robust official assessment mechanisms. "In what ways, if any, have educators tailored arts entrepreneurship curricula for the specific needs of studio art majors?" According to my participants, studio art majors are not served specifically in the curricula because their needs are similar enough to other art majors that existing pedagogies work just fine, and not only for studio art majors but for a broad population of non-art majors as well.

In short, participants want their students to have sustainable careers. Arts entrepreneurship education is one way, along with professional practices and career development, to help make that happen. The data in this study support a need for professional training at the institution and in the community; career self-management seems to be the underlying commonality throughout the participant comments and in language appearing in syllabi and course/program descriptions, whether slightly bent toward venture or skills. We may even be seeing a decreasing reliance on the expectations for venture creation; in fact, in a survey of art educators in the UK and Germany, Thom (2016) found that new venture creation was ranked last among a number of skills deemed important for professional artistic success.

In the interest of improving the way postsecondary educators prepare art students, particularly studio art majors, for their careers, I argue for a broadening of the conversation around arts entrepreneurship to include all aspects of professional training. Perhaps using a term like 'career design' as an overarching structure, arts entrepreneurship education can take its place alongside studio-specific content like artist residency applications and gallery cultivation, as well

as traditional training in résumé writing and interview strategies, to help improve students'

chances of sustaining an arts venture or securing the individual jobs that make up a portfolio

career. Enterprising activity and behavior can then join managerial strategies in a balanced

toolbox of approaches from which students can draw depending on the context; a student may

act entrepreneurially in one situation and managerially in another. The distinctions that are

important to the field may not be as strongly demarcated by the student. As an educator and

advisor, I do not care whether an art student launches a venture, works in an arts organization,

successfully manages a portfolio career, or even lands a non-arts position in order to free up

studio time on nights and weekends. I only care that they leave their campus with the skills,

techniques, and mindset necessary to strike a sustainable work/life balance for themselves,

whatever form it takes. If they are happy with their work/life balance, I am happy.

Until entrepreneurial activities and behaviors are infused throughout the art disciplinary

curriculum, as some scholars argue (Ballereau et al., 2015; Daniel & Daniel, 2015; Essig, 2009;

Hong et al., 2012; Roberts, 2013), there will continue to be a need to reconcile the overlapping

territories served by studio art faculty discussing portfolios and grant applications, by career

services professionals trying to help students become better job candidates, and arts

entrepreneurship educators instilling in their students a plan for venture creation and nurturing

the entrepreneurial mindset. "Whether or not this shift in paradigm is successful," according to

Pollard and Wilson (2014), "is dependent on further research that investigates the challenges

faced and innovations undertaken by arts educators with the responsibility for teaching for

employability skills" (p. 20).

Clearly, this study helps to advance knowledge toward addressing Essig and Guevara's

(2016) call for more empirical research to help develop a theoretical framework for arts

107

entrepreneurship. I have provided evidence to support a number of key definitions and frameworks from the literature (Beckman, 2007; Bridgstock, 2012; Essig, 2015; Pollard & Wilson, 2014), in particular Chang and Wyszomirski's (2015) flexible conceptual framework that functions as both definition and pedagogy. I have also shown, through the words of the study participants and in the language used in their course materials, that a broader conception of professional training for studio art majors is necessary to advance the cause of artistic career success. As the creative economy shifts and evolves, so, too, should our efforts to prepare our students to meet the challenges of supporting themselves as artists.

Appendix

Interview Protocol

Oral Consent
As a UCLA student, I am conducting a study on studio arts entrepreneurship, and I would like to ask you some questions about that. For the purpose of data analysis, I would like to digitally record our conversation. You may decline to answer any question you don't wish to answer. You may also request to continue off the record. If at any time you want to withdraw from this study, please tell me and I will erase the audio file of our conversation. I will protect your privacy to the best of my ability. Do you agree to participate?

Introduction

1. Please describe your background in the arts and how you came to be involved in arts entrepreneurship.
    a. *Are you tenured, tenure-track, adjunct, or a lecturer?*
    b. *How long have you been at your institution?*
    c. *How long have you been in your current role?*
    d. *How much of a role does arts entrepreneurship play in your career?*

Research Question 1 *How do arts entrepreneurship faculty define and conceptualize arts entrepreneurship?*
2. What is your definition of arts entrepreneurship? 3. In what ways do you think arts entrepreneurship differs from more traditional coursework in career preparation, like resume writing or interview skills? 4. What do you feel are the similarities and differences between traditional business entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial curricula designed for art majors?

Research Question 2 *In what ways, if any, does arts entrepreneurship education address the tension between art and commerce?*
5. How do you think the term "entrepreneur" is perceived by your students and colleagues?

6. Do you perceive a tension between art and commerce at your institution, and, if so, how is it articulated by students and faculty?

7. Is there a difference in attitude among different majors toward the art/commerce divide?

8. How is the tension between art and commerce addressed by the design and/or teaching of the curricula?

Research Question 3

What is the curricular content of arts entrepreneurship education and what are some of the indices for success for these courses and programs?

9. What was the impetus for developing this course/program?

10. Please describe how arts entrepreneurship curricula is organized at your institution.
    a. *Is coursework required or elective?*
    b. *Are the curricula housed in business, art, or elsewhere?*
    c. *Are courses taught by business faculty, arts administrators, or by artists?*
    d. *Are these instructors typically tenured, tenure-track, or adjunct?*
    e. *How often are these courses offered?*
    f. *How many students typically enroll?*
    g. *How is the course/program funded?*
    h. *Is the course/program more expensive than others?*

11. Please describe your course assignments and activities, such as internships, guest lectures, group projects, presentations, etc.

12. In your curricula, is there an emphasis on new venture creation, skills development, or a combination of the two?

13. What skills, knowledge, techniques, and attitudes do you want your students to take with them as they enter the workforce?

14. What constitutes successful outcomes in your courses and in your program?

15. In what ways are you able to measure those outcomes?

Research Question 4

In what ways, if any, have educators tailored arts entrepreneurship curricula for the specific needs of studio art majors?

16. Please describe the disciplinary makeup of the students in your program.

17. In what ways do you accommodate students from different disciplines in your courses or program?

18. In what ways do you think the needs of studio art students differ from the needs of other majors?

19. In what ways, if any, does your curricula address the needs of studio art majors?

20. How have studio art faculty and students responded to these curricula?

21. If you had to design a studio-focused arts entrepreneurship course or program from scratch, what would it look like?

Wrap-Up

22. Do you have anything you would like to add?

23. Do you have colleagues in the field who you think might be interested in participating in my study?

24. Do you have any questions for me?

References

Abreu, M., Faggian, A., Comunian, R., & McCann, P. (2012). "Life is short, art is long": The

persistent wage gap between bohemian and non-bohemian graduates. *The Annals of*

Regional Science, 49(2), 305-321.

Aggestam, M. (2007). Art-entrepreneurship in the Scandinavian music industry. In C. Henry

(Ed.), *Entrepreneurship in the creative industries: An international perspective*.

Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Alper, N. O., & Wassall, G. H. (2006). Artists' careers and their labor markets. In V. A.

Ginsburgh & D. Throsby (Eds.), *Handbook of the economics of art and culture* (Vol. 1).

Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Bain, A. (2005). Constructing an artistic identity. *Work, Employment and Society, 19*(1), 25-46.

Baines, S., & Wheelock, J. (2003). Creative livelihoods: The economic survival of visual artists

in the north of England. *Northern Economic Review, 33/34*, 105-117.

Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005). Creating something from nothing: Resource construction

through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 50*(2005), 329-366.

Ballereau, V., Sinapi, C., Toutain, O., & Juno-Delgado, E. (2015). Developing a business model:

The perception of entrepreneurial self-efficacy among students in the cultural and

creative industry. In O. Kuhlke, A. Schramme, & R. Kooyman (Eds.), *Creating cultural*

capital: Cultural entrepreneurship in theory, pedagogy and practice. Delft, The

Netherlands: Eburon Uitgeverij BV.

Bass, E., Milosevic, I., & Eesley, D. (2015). Examining and reconciling identity issues among

artist-entrepreneurs. In O. Kuhlke, A. Schramme, & R. Kooyman (Eds.), *Creating*

cultural capital: Cultural entrepreneurship in theory, pedagogy and practice. Delft, The

Netherlands: Eburon Uitgeverij BV.

Beckert, J., & Rössel, J. (2013). The price of art. *European Societies, 15*(2), 178-195.

Beckman, G. D. (2007). "Adventuring" arts entrepreneurship curricula in higher education: An

examination of present efforts, obstacles, and best practices. *Journal of Arts

Management, Law, and Society, 37*(2), 87-112.

Beckman, G. D. (2011). So what's the point? An introductory discussion on the desired outcomes

of arts entrepreneurship education. In G. D. Beckman (Ed.), *Disciplining the arts:

Teaching entrepreneurship in context*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Beckman, G. D. (2014). What arts entrepreneurship isn't. *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship

Research, 1*(1), 3-17.

Beckman, G. D., & Cherwitz, R. A. (2009). Advancing the authentic: Intellectual

entrepreneurship and the role of the business school in fine arts entrepreneurship

curriculum design. In G. P. West III, E. J. Gatewood, & K. G. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook

of university-wide entrepreneurship education*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar

Publishing Limited.

Beckman, G. D., & Essig, L. (2012). Arts entrepreneurship: A conversation. *Artivate: A Journal

of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 1*(1), 1-8.

Bennett, S., McGuire, S., & Rahman, R. (2015). Living hand to mouth: Why the bohemian

lifestyle does not lead to wealth creation in peripheral regions. *European Planning

Studies, 23*(12), 2390-2403.

Berrett, D. (2011, May 3). The myth of the starving artist. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from

    https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/05/03/graduates_of_arts_programs_fare_bett

    er_in_job_market_than_assumed

Bilton, C. (2010, July). *Identity, creativity, and the cultural entrepreneur.* Paper presented at the

    23rd EGOS Colloquium, Vienna.

Blackstone, A. (2012). *Principles of sociological inquiry: Qualitative and quantitative methods*

    Retrieved from https://www.saylor.org/site/textbooks/Principles of Sociological

    Inquiry.pdf

Böhm, S., & Land, C. (2009). No measure for culture? Value in the new economy. *Capital &*

    Class, 33(1), 75-98.

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.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and*

    research for the sociology of education. New York: Greenwood Press.

Bridgstock, R. (2012). Not a dirty word: Arts entrepreneurship and higher education. *Arts &*

    Humanities in Higher Education, 12(2-3), 1-16.

Brown, R. (2007). Promoting entrepreneurship in arts education. In C. Henry (Ed.),

    Entrepreneurship in the creative industries: An international perspective. Cheltenham,

    UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Brush, C. G., Duhaime, I. M., Gartner, W. B., Stewart, A., Katz, J. A., Hitt, M. A., . . .

    Venkatraman, S. (2003). Doctoral education in the field of entrepreneurship. *Journal of*

    Management, 29(3), 309-331.

Bryan, T., & Harris, D. (2015). The aesthetic value exchange: A potential framework for the arts entrepreneurship classroom. *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Education, 1*(1), 25-54.

Caves, R. E. (2003). Contracts between art and commerce. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 17*(2), 73-83.

Center for Cultural Innovation. (2016). *Creativity connects: Trends and conditions affecting U.S. artists*. Retrieved from https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/Creativity-Connects-Final-Report.pdf

Chang, W. J., & Wyszomirski, M. J. (2015). What is arts entrepreneurship? Tracking the development of its definition in scholarly journals. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 4*(2), 11-31.

Chin, D., & Qualls, L. (1995). The arts and education. *Performing Arts Journal, 17*(2/3), 1-7.

Clements, A. (2014). Indicting higher education in the arts and beyond. *Hyperallergic*. Retrieved from http://hyperallergic.com/156068/indicting-higher-education-in-the-arts-and-beyond/

Cohen, D., & Crabtree, B. (2006). *Qualitative research guidelines project*. Retrieved from http://www.qualres.org/index.html

Colbert, F. (2003). Entrepreneurship and leadership in marketing the arts. *International Journal of Arts Management, 6*(1), 30-39.

Comunian, R., Faggian, A., & Jewell, S. (2011). Winning and losing in the creative industries: An analysis of creative graduates' career opportunities across creative disciplines. *Cultural Trends, 20*(3-4), 291-308.

Cooley, J. A. (2007). *The career decision making experiences of college students in the visual arts.* (Doctoral Dissertation), Florida State University. Retrieved from http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/islandora/object/fsu:181717/datastream/PDF/view

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 24*(3), 37-57.

Daniel, R., & Daniel, L. (2015). Success in the creative industries: The push for enterprising and entrepreneurial skills. *Journal of Australian Studies, 39*(3), 411-424.

Di Domenico, M., Tracey, P., & Haugh, H. (2010). Social bricolage: Theorizing social value creation in social entreprises. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice, 34*(4), 681-703.

Eikhof, D. R., & Haunschild, A. (2006). Lifestyle meets market: Bohemian entrepreneurs in creative industries. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 15*(3), 234-241.

Eikhof, D. R., & Haunschild, A. (2007). For art's sake! Artistic and economic logics in creative production. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(5), 523-538.

Ellmeier, A. (2003). Cultural entrepreneurialism: On the changing relationship between the arts, culture and employment. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 9*(1), 3-16.

Essig, L. (2009). Suffusing entrepreneurship education throughout the theatre curriculum. *Theatre Topics, 19*(2), 117-124.

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), 65-77.

Essig, L. (2014a). *Not about the Benjamins: Arts entrepreneurship in research, education, and practice*. Paper presented at the Arts Business Symposium, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Essig, L. (2014b). Ownership, failure, and experience: Goals and evaluation metrics of

    university-based arts venture incubators. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal, 4*(1), 117-

    135.

Essig, L. (2015). Means and ends: A theory framework for understanding entrepreneurship in the

    US arts and culture sector. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 45*(4), 227-

    246.

Essig, L., & Guevara, J. (2016). *A landscape of arts entrepreneurship in US higher education*.

    Tempe, Arizona: Pave Program in Arts Entrepreneurship.

Essig, L., Taylor, R. W., Huttler, A., Radich, A., Evans, R., Taylor, A., & Lerner, R. (2014). Arts

    entrepreneurship blogathon--day 1. *Barry's Blog: News, Advice and Opinion for the Arts*

    Administrator. Retrieved from http://blog.westaf.org/2014/05/arts-entrepreneurship-

    blogathon-day-1.html

Fachin, F. (2009, September). *The artistic identity of the entrepreneur: Ongoing struggles in the*

    creation of a sense of self. Paper presented at the The Association on Employment

    Practices and Principles, Montreal.

Faggian, A., Comunian, R., Jewell, S., & Kelly, U. (2013). Bohemian graduates in the UK:

    Disciplines and location determinants of creative careers. *Regional Studies, 47*(2), 183-

    200.

Fanthome, L. (2013). 'Am I still an artist?': Sustaining arts practice in an age of austerity. *Visual*

    Culture in Britain, 14(3), 281-300.

Fisher, G. (2012). Effectuation, causation, and bricolage: A behavioral comparison of emerging

    theories in entrepreneurial research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 36*(5), 1019-

    1051.

Fusco, C. (2015). Critics page. *The Brooklyn Rail*. Retrieved from

    http://www.brooklynrail.org/2015/12/criticspage/coco-fusco

Gartner, W. B. (2015). Arts entrepreneurship: Scope, practice and community. *Artivate: A*

    Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 4(2), 3-6.

Garud, R., & Karnøe, P. (2003). Bricolage versus breakthrough: Distributed and embedded

    agency in technology entrepreneurship. *Research Policy, 32*(2), 277-300.

Gerchman, R. (2011). Parental reality check. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from

    https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2011/01/06/parental-reality-check

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for*

    qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Grant, D. (2004). *The fine artist's career guide: Making money in the arts and beyond*. New

    York: Skyhorse Publishing.

Grant, D. (2013). Ph.D. challenges M.F.A. as requisite degree for arts professors. *Inside Higher*

    Ed. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2013/05/24/phd-challenges-

    mfa-requisite-degree-arts-professors-essay

Gregg, G. (2003). What are they teaching art students these days? *ARTNews, 102*(4), 106-109.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries.

    Educational Communication and Technology, 29(2), 75-91.

Hanage, R. (2015, September). *Transition to expreneurship: A longitudinal study of creative*

    graduate nascent entrepreneurs/expreneurs. Paper presented at the British Academy of

    Management 2015 Conference, Portsmouth.

Harbour, S. (2005). Employability issues for fine art educators. *Art, Design & Communication in*

    Higher Education, 4(2), 121-134.

Hausmann, A., & Heinze, A. (2016). Entrepreneurship in the cultural and creative industries: Insights from an emerging field. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 5*(2), 7-22.

Hisrich, R. D. (2006). Entrepreneurship research and education in the world: Past, present and future. In A. K. Achleitner, H. Kland, L. T. Koch, & K. I. Voigt (Eds.), *Jahrbuch Entrepreneurship 2005/06* (pp. 3-14). New York: Springer.

Holmes, A., & Miller, S. (2006). A case for advanced skills and employability in higher education. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 52*(4), 653-664.

Hong, C., Essig, L., & Bridgstock, R. (2012). The entreprising artist and the arts entrepreneur. In N. L. Chick, A. Haynie, & R. A. R. Gurung (Eds.), *Exploring more signature pedagogies: Approaches to teaching disciplinary habits of mind*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Jahoda, S., Murphy, B., Virgin, V., & Woolard, C. (2014). *Artists report back: A national study on the lives of arts graduates and working artists*. Retrieved from http://goo.gl/N2AYyx

Judkis, M. (2010, April 15). The art of keeping oneself fed in art school. *U.S. News & World Report*.

Katre, A. (2015). Entrepreneurship education for social innovation: An approach based in design thinking and the humanities. In O. Kuhlke, A. Schramme, & R. Kooyman (Eds.), *Creating cultural capital: Cultural entrepreneurship in theory, pedagogy and practice*. Delft, The Netherlands: Eburon Uitgeverij BV.

Klamer, A., & Petrova, L. (2007). Financing the arts: The consequences of interaction among artists, financial support, and creativity motivation. *THe Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 37*(3), 245-256.

Klein, P. G., & Bullock, J. B. (2006). Can entrepreneurship be taught? *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics, 38*(2), 429-439.

Konrad, E. D. (2013). Cultural entrepreneurship: The impact of social networking on success. *Cultural Entrepreneurship, 22*(3), 307-319.

Korzen, K. (2015). Arts entrepreneurship in higher education: Preliminary inventories and examinations. *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Education, 1*(1), 55-79.

Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D. P., Cooper, J. E., Lambert, M. D., Gardner, M. E., & Szabo, M. (2002). *The constructivist leader* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lena, J. C., Gaskil, S., Houghton, R. F., Lambert, A. D., Miller, A. L., & Tepper, S. J. (2014). *Making it work: The education and employment of recent arts graduates*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.

Lévi Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lindemann, D. J., & Tepper, S. J. (2010). *Painting with broader strokes: Reassessing the value of an arts degree*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.

Lindqvist, L. (2011). Artist entrepreneurs. In M. Scherdin & I. Zander (Eds.), *Art entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Lingo, E. L., & Tepper, S. J. (2013). Looking back, looking forward: Arts-based careers and creative work. *Work and Occupations, 40*(4), 337-363.

Linnemeyer, R. M., & Brown, C. (2010). Career maturity and foreclosure in student athletes, fine arts students, and general college students. *Journal of Career Development, 37*(3), 616-634.

Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation. (2015). *2014 Otis report on the creative economy*. Retrieved from http://www.otis.edu/sites/default/files/2014_Otis-Report-on-the-Creative-Economy-of-the-Los-Angeles-Region.pdf

Luftig, R. L., Donovan, M. J., Farnbaugh, C. L., Kennedy, E. E., Filicko, T., & Wyszomirski, M. J. (2003). So what are you doing after college? An investigation of individuals studying the arts at the post-secondary level, their job aspirations and levels of realism. *Studies in Art Education, 45*(1), 5-19.

Markusen, A., & Gadwa, A. (2010). *Creative placemaking*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, J.-A., & Even, R. (1998). Marketing and the fine arts: Inventory of a controversial relationship. *Journal of Cultural Economics, 22*(4), 271-283.

Millett, C. M. (2003). How undergraduate loan debt affects application and enrollment in graduate or first professional school. *The Journal of Higher Education, 74*(4), 386-427.

Moorman, C., & Miner, A. S. (1998). Organizational improvisation and organizational memory. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(4), 698-723.

Naudin, A. (2015). *Cultural entrepreneurship: Identity and personal agency in the cultural worker's experience of entrepreneurship.* (Doctoral dissertation), University of Warwick, Coventry, UK. Retrieved from http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/73086

Neher, R. (2010). Art and delusion: Unreality in art school. *Academic Questions, 23*, 117-124.

Oakley, K. (2009). From bohemia to Britart: Art students over 50 years. *Cultural Trends, 18*(4), 281-294.

Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business model generation: A handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Patten, T. (2016). "Creative?"..."entrepreneur?": Understanding the creative industries entrepreneur. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 5*(2), 23-42.

Phillips, R. J. (2010). Arts entrepreneurship and economic development: Can every city be "Austintatious"? *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship, 6*(4), 239-313.

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. (2014). Social bricolage in arts entrepreneurship: Building a jazz society from scratch. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 3*(1), 23-34.

Rabideau, M. (2015). AE 2.0: Moving beyond the single arts entrepreneurship course model. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 4*(2), 8-9.

Rallis, S. F., & Rossman, G. B. (2012). *The research journey: Introduction to inquiry*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Reid, A., Petocz, P., & Bennett, D. (2016). Is creative work sustainable? Understanding identity, motivation, and worth. *Australian Journal of Career Development, 25*(1), 33-41.

Roberts, J. S. (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), 53-63.

Roberts, J. S. (2015). Entrepreneurship in the arts. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 4*(2), 6-7.

Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 243-263.

Schroeder, J. E. (2005). The artist and the brand. *European Journal of Marketing, 39*(11/12), 1291-1305.

Schwartz, S., & Finnie, R. (2002). Student loans in Canada: An analysis of borrowing and repayment. *Economics of Education Review, 21*(5), 497-512.

Scott, M. (2012). Cultural entrepreneurs, cultural entrepreneurship: Music producers mobilising and converting Bourdieu's alternative capitals. *Poetics, 40*(2012), 237-255.

Shaver, K. G. (2005). Reflections on a new academic path: Entrepreneurship in the arts and sciences. *Peer Review, 7*(3), 21-23.

Shaw, P. (2004). Researching artists' working lives. *Arts Research Digest, 30*, 1-4.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22*(2), 63-75.

Simon, R., & Barry, R. (2013, February 18). A degree drawn in red ink: Graduates of arts-focused schools are shown to rack up the most student debt. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887324432004578306610055834952

Singerman, H. (1999). *Art subjects: Making artists in the American university*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Skaggs, R., Frenette, A., Gaskil, S., & Miller, A. L. (2017). *Career skills and entrepreneurship training for artists: Results of the 2015 Strategic National Arts Alumni Project survey module*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.

Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education. (2016). Resources. Retrieved from http://www.societyaee.org/resources.html

Strategic National Arts Alumni Project. (2011). *Forks in the road: The many paths of arts alumni*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.

Strategic National Arts Alumni Project. (2012). *A diverse palette: What arts graduates say about their education and careers--annual report 2012*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Taylor, S., & Littleton, K. (2008). Art work or money: Conflicts in the construction of a creative identity. *Sociological Review, 56*(2), 275-292.

Tepper, S. J., & Kuh, G. D. (2011, September 4). Let's get serious about cultivating creativity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Thom, M. (2015a). The entrepreneurial value of arts incubators: Why fine artists should make use of professional arts incubators. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 4*(2), 33-56.

Thom, M. (2015b). The suffering of arts entrepreneurs: Will fine art students be educated on how to become successfully self-employed? *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 3*(1), 64-77.

Thom, M. (2016). Crucial skills for the entrepreneural success of fine artists. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 5*(1), 3-24.

Throsby, D., & Hollister, V. (2003). *Don't give up your day job: An economic study of professional artists in Australia*. Sydney, Australia: Australia Council for the Arts.

Throsby, D., & Zednik, A. (2011). Multiple job-holding and artistic careers: Some empirical evidence. *Cultural Trends, 20*(1), 9-24.

Tucci, R. (2006). *Career preparation in the bachelor of arts degree in general studio art at Delaware State University.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 3247682)

Urice, J. K. (2000). The coming crisis in public higher education: Implications for the arts. *THe Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 30*(2), 160-168.

Weick, K. E. (1998). Introductory essay: Improvisation as a mindset for organizational analysis. *Organization Science, 9*(5), 543-555.

Welsh, D. H. B., 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. C. (2013). Barriers to recognizing arts entrepreneurship education as essential to professional arts training. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts, 2*(1), 28-39.

White, J. C. (2015). Toward a theory of arts entrepreneurship. *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Education, 1*(1), 4-23.

White, R. (2015). A few good reasons to drop out of art school. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from

    http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/a-few-good-reasons-to-drop-out-of-art-

    school

Whitesel, L. S. (1980). Career attitudes of art students. *Studies in Art Education, 22*(1), 36-41.

Wyszomirski, M. J., & Goldberg-Miller, S. (2015). Adapting the Promethean fire of business for

    arts and cultural entrepreneurship. In O. Kuhlke, A. Schramme, & R. Kooyman (Eds.),

    Creating cultural capital: Cultural entrepreneurship in theory, pedagogy and practice.

    Delft, The Netherlands: Eburon Uitgeverij BV.