Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Education

Jason C. White  Toward a Theory of Arts Entrepreneurship

Thomas Bryan  David Harris  The Aesthetic Value Exchange: A Potential Framework for the Arts Entrepreneurship Classroom

Kimberly Korzen  Arts Entrepreneurship in Higher Education: Preliminary Inventories and Examinations

Volume 1, Number 1, 2015
Toward a Theory of Arts Entrepreneurship

JASON C. WHITE
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

The Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education provides a national inventory of Arts Entrepreneurship programs and currently identifies at least ninety-six institutions offering courses and programs dedicated to the study of entrepreneurship in the context of the arts. Research suggests such courses are commonly associated with new venture creation across the arts and creative sector, as well as the teaching and learning of skills, competencies and behaviors necessary for self-employment in the arts and creative industries. However, despite the existence of such courses and programs, there currently exists no proposed theory or theories of arts entrepreneurship in nascent literature for guiding contextual entrepreneurship pedagogy and practice. In an effort to advance the concept of arts entrepreneurship, this paper identifies challenges to theory building, explores a theory of arts entrepreneurship, and proposes how a theory of arts entrepreneurship can inform program theory development.

According to a program inventory available on the Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education (SAEE) website, there are currently at least ninety-six institutions of higher education offering courses and programs dedicated to the study of entrepreneurship in the context of the arts. Comparisons of this inventory to an informal program inventory conducted by Beckman and Gangi in 2013 suggest an increase from 83 to 112 dedicated courses. Research suggests such courses are commonly associated with new venture creation across the arts and creative sector, in addition to the teaching and learning of skills, competencies and behaviors necessary for self-employment in the arts and creative industries. Despite the existence of such courses and programs, both scholars and critics have argued that

---


2 On July 30th, 2013, an informal planning meeting/webinar concerning the development of an academic society for arts entrepreneurship educators was held at North Carolina State University. During this meeting, a national program inventory was distributed to those in attendance indicating sixty institutions and eighty-three dedicated courses to the study and/or practice of Arts Entrepreneurship. While the distributed inventory compiled by Gary Beckman and Jonathan Gangi was not intended to be inclusive of all associated Arts Entrepreneurship programs, it nevertheless served as an indicator of the demand for the topic as a specialized field of study in higher education.

entrepreneurship cannot be taught. Alternatively, authors Hagoort and Thiel contend that “...an enterprising attitude and skills for self-employment can be developed in any individual as a genuine discipline, provided that the appropriate knowledge is presented in the right place, in the right manner and at the right time.” Briga Hynes concurs, contending that entrepreneurship education can be taught in non-business disciplines, presents a case study and identifies distinctions between both entrepreneurship training and education.

Although many entrepreneurship education programs and courses exist, scholars have been critical of the lack of theory guiding entrepreneurship education and practice. Distinguished entrepreneurship scholars Shane and Venkataraman soften this critique and suggest that entrepreneurship theory is underdeveloped. Entrepreneurship researchers Amit et al suggested that “...the received literature offers neither a predictive theory of the behavior of entrepreneurs nor much in the way of guidance for practice.” In The Theoretical Side of Teaching Entrepreneurship, James O. Fiet states:

“The objective of entrepreneurship theory is to help entrepreneurs to understand the consequences of their decisions. Why else should students study entrepreneurship? If we do not move toward the development of a general theory of entrepreneurship, in the end, our courses will have little more than motivational value.”


Similarly, there currently exists no proposed theory or theories of arts entrepreneurship within the field’s premier journals. Scholars suggest that a theory attempts to explain or provide a rationale for the way things work. Theory is often developed via a systematic process of identifying and examining relationships among variables factors and cases of study. Such relationships are often mapped and expressed in the form of a theoretical framework; essentially a structure composed of formal theories and hard evidence in support of broader propositions and/or concepts. For example, entrepreneurship scholar Donald Kuratko states:

“A theory of entrepreneurship is a verifiable and logically coherent formulation of relationships, or underlying principles, that either explain entrepreneurship, predict entrepreneurial activity (for example, by characterizing conditions that are likely to lead to new profit opportunities or to the formation of new enterprises), or provide normative guidance (that is, prescribe the right action in particular circumstances).”

Given these understandings—devoid of a theory of arts entrepreneurship—it is likely an exercise in futility to work towards consensus among educators on common learning outcomes for arts entrepreneurship education. Moreover, in the absence of a theory of arts entrepreneurship, distinct curriculum and learning outcomes will likely be based on personal assumptions. Such assumptions in arts entrepreneurship education have the potential to contribute to the exclusion and dissuasion of students with diverse interests from participating in arts entrepreneurship courses and programs.

For example, research suggests that there are two common approaches to arts entrepreneurship education in U.S. higher education institutions: (1) New Venture Creation (NVC); (2) Skills for Transitioning (SFT). Entrepreneurship scholar William Gartner refers to the process of NVC as, “the organizing of organizations.” Courses guided by the NVC approach tend to emulate business incubators and offer students experiential learning

---

11 A search within Artivate (www.artivate.org) and Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Research (www.jaer.ncsu.edu) was conducted on January 21, 2015.
17 See Beckman, ”Adventuring” Arts Entrepreneurship Curricula in Higher Education: An Examination of Present Efforts, Obstacles, and Best Practices,” 91.
opportunities in business entry, business planning and organizational development.\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, authentic learning outcomes in such graduate courses are commonly aligned with business planning and pitching activities.\textsuperscript{20}

Alternatively, the SFT approach seems to be focused on the development of certain skills, competencies and behaviors necessary for transitioning into the artistic workforce. Students in such courses may learn among other things how to construct artistic portfolios and resumes, how to create and manage a personal budget, how to network in social settings, how to manage themselves as a business. Generally, such SFT-based courses seem to share the goal of preparing visual, literary and performing arts students for the realities of freelancing and self-employment.\textsuperscript{21}

While these two common approaches (NVC & SFT) provide educators with guidance for curricular planning, I posit that in the absence of a theory of arts entrepreneurship, both approaches contribute to assumptions in arts entrepreneurship education and practice. Consider the seminal article “Is There an Elephant in Entrepreneurship? Blind Assumptions in Theory Development,” where William Gartner states “The thesis of this article is that theory development in entrepreneurship research depends on whether we are conscious of the assumptions we make about this phenomenon.”\textsuperscript{22} With this understanding, it is possible that some educators guided by the NVC approach may embrace the assumption that arts entrepreneurship is a process that leads to the creation of new arts and cultural organizations. However, consider students who wish to learn how to develop unincorporated arts-based ventures such as: arts and non-arts partnerships/collaborations, arts festivals, cultural district plans, public art exhibitions, arts/cultural programs, artist housing, etc. Are these not our students as well? Similarly, it is possible that some educators guided by the SFT approach embrace the assumption that arts entrepreneurship is a process that leads to the development of necessary skills competencies and behaviors for self-employment in the arts. However, consider students who may wish to develop non-profit arts and cultural organizations and for-profit arts-centered businesses in the traditional sense.\textsuperscript{23} Further, concerning the SFT approach, who gets to determine the necessary skills competencies and behaviors for self-employment in the arts? Does one size fit all students across artistic disciplines? Does a Dancer need the same skills for transitioning as an Actor? Additionally, how do proposed skills, competencies and behaviors for arts entrepreneurship differ from those learned by arts administrators?\textsuperscript{24} While there is merit in the NVC, SFT and additional approaches to arts

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
entrepreneurship education, I posit that a theory of arts entrepreneurship is needed for rationalizing and guiding curricular and pedagogical decisions in arts entrepreneurship education.

**TOWARD A THEORY OF ARTS ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

Theory development in entrepreneurship is a great challenge, perhaps for several overarching reasons. First, entrepreneurship is multidisciplinary. In the *Handbook of Research Methods and Applications in Entrepreneurship and Small Business* (2014), authors Carsrud et al point out that the field includes entrepreneurship, small-business management and family business. Further, these authors point out that the field’s leading scholars hail from a wide variety of disciplines outside of entrepreneurship; including but not limited to “…management, finance, strategy, sociology, organizational behavior, social psychology, economics, anthropology, demography, political science, clinical psychology, accounting, marketing and industrial engineering to name a few.” Second, entrepreneurship is contextual. Practically speaking, context drives entrepreneurship planning, shapes the entrepreneurship process and influences outcomes of the entrepreneurship experience. For example, Friederike Welter argues that “...a contextualized view on entrepreneurship can add to our knowledge of when, how, and why entrepreneurship happens.” Welter goes on to say that “Conceptually, context is a multiplex phenomenon, which cuts across levels of analysis and influences entrepreneurship directly and indirectly, but which also is influenced by entrepreneurial activities.” This position suggests to me that context is what distinguishes arts entrepreneurship from other types of entrepreneurship. Arguably, the context of the arts and creative sector differs in many respects from the corporate context that business students are traditionally trained to inhabit.

Third, given the multifaceted nature of entrepreneurship, the broader field understandably lacks consensus on a definition. For example, entrepreneurship is frequently typified as small business, technology, social, cultural, educational, political, policy and/or

---


26 Ibid., 3

27 For the purposes of this discussion, the term “context” is defined as the group of conditions that exist where and when something happens


29 Ibid., 176


framed as new venture creation, innovation, ideation and/or change. Thus, in the absence of consensus, it is understandable how entrepreneurship can equate to “everything and anything” to some and “no-such-thing” to others.

Of all the proposed reasons given, I posit that the latter presents the most immediate challenge to the development of a theory (or theories) of arts entrepreneurship. As discussed, the definition of entrepreneurship is both subject to and influenced by the context in which it is situated. In the absence of definitional consensus, it appears that entrepreneurship researchers and scholars have referred to entrepreneurship more broadly as a phenomenon.32 Consider the volume Entrepreneurship in Context, where a gathering of entrepreneurship scholars both refer to and explore entrepreneurship as a context bound phenomenon.33 Within the emerging literature on arts entrepreneurship, a similar idea has been suggested:

“We may find it more helpful to discuss art and entrepreneurship (both separate and together) as a phenomenon within a broader theory (or theories) of Arts Entrepreneurship. This way, the field can account for the observations of human actions and behavior without being drawn into arguments about constituent and contextual definitions.”34

Based on these perspectives, one might consider that whatever arts entrepreneurship is, it is also a phenomenon both subject to and influenced by context. For example, research suggests visual, literary and performing artists commonly seek out and compete for opportunities to produce and distribute/exhibit art within a hyper-competitive winner take-all marketplace (e.g. context).35 Competition for opportunities to do so can create a need for competitive advantage. Within this context, relationships can be just as valuable as financial compensation. As a result, artists may engage in entrepreneurship within the arts and creative industries for the purpose of developing valuable industry relationships (e.g. creation of an arts-based society, formation of arts/non-arts partnerships, development of artist co-operatives, development of artist housing, formation of artist unions, development of arts-oriented conferences).


34 Gary D. Beckman, “What Arts Entrepreneurship Isn’t,” Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Research, 1 (2014): 10, accessed 1/15/15, http://www.jaer.ncsu.edu. In an attempt to advance this perspective, it is helpful to first understand how the term “phenomenon” is generally defined. The Merriam-Webster dictionary (2014) defines phenomenon as, “Something (such as an interesting fact or event) that can be observed and studied and that typically is unusual or difficult to understand or explain fully.” Alternative dictionary definitions include, “A remarkable person, thing, or event” (Oxford Dictionary 2014) and “...anything that is or can be experienced or felt, especially something that is noticed because it is unusual or new” (Cambridge Dictionary 2014).

In another example, research suggests that arts employment within the hyper competitive winner-take-all marketplace is commonly intermittent (e.g. context). Beyond providing income to support the creation of art, arts employment serves as validation for artists’ talents and abilities. Thus, many visual, literary and performing artists share the goal of not only obtaining arts and arts-related employment, but also of doing so consistently. As a result, artists may engage in entrepreneurship within the arts and creative industries in an effort to reduce their risk of intermittent arts and arts-related employment.

Continuing, research has evidenced a duel system of U.S public funding that has historically prioritized economic support for the cultural expressions of the dominant cultural majority of U.S society (e.g. context). As a result, both minority artists and minority arts organizations may engage in entrepreneurship across the broader arts and creative sector in an effort to develop economic and socio-political resources necessary for the production, distribution, exhibition and preservation of minority art forms.

Further, the market is oversaturated with those who self-identify as visual, literary and performing artists (e.g. context). Since there is a high supply of such individuals, market demand is low and often there are not enough employment opportunities to accommodate the supply. As a result, visual, literary and performing artists may engage in entrepreneurship across the arts and creative sector for the purpose of employing not only themselves, but also each other.

To summarize, in cases where such contexts are present, I posit that entrepreneurship is a probable intervention for overcoming common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution, exhibition and preservation of art. Further, both scholars and practitioners have long acknowledged the role of emergent learning in the process of entrepreneurship; often referred to within entrepreneurship literature as entrepreneurial learning. For example, in discussing a theory of entrepreneurship, Minniti and Bygrave state “Entrepreneurship is a process of learning, and a theory of entrepreneurship requires a theory...

---


of learning."\(^40\) Diamanto Politis refers to entrepreneurial learning as “a continuous process that facilitates the development of necessary knowledge for being effective in starting up and managing new ventures.”\(^41\) Likewise, entrepreneurship researcher Robert Chia suggests entrepreneurial learning is about learning along the way, referring to the concept as a process characterized by creative search and incessant experimentation.\(^42\) Given common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution, exhibition and preservation of art, entrepreneurial learning is likely for individuals groups and organizations that engage in the process of entrepreneurship across the arts and creative sector.\(^43\) Where this is evidenced, researchers might consider cases whereby individual artists, groups of artists and/or arts and cultural organizations are learning/have learned to overcome such common challenges and historical barriers as case studies in arts entrepreneurship; arguably a phenomenon both subject to and influenced by context.

Additionally, perhaps in an effort to overcome common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution/exhibition and/or preservation of art, some individual artists are developing portfolio careers.\(^44\) Whereas the artist who adopts a more traditional career approach might support his/her art-making with an unrelated part-time job (e.g. actor-waiter); the artist who adopts the portfolio career approach might advance the development of multiple arts and arts-related skill sets to be contracted across the arts and creative industries on a project basis (e.g. actress/speech coach/screenwriter, musician/voice teacher/songwriter, dancer/choreographer/yoga instructor, mural artist/K-12 art educator/sculptor, etc). In contrast to traditional full-time and part-time work, research suggests that portfolio careers afford individuals key benefits such as: increased autonomy, multiple and simultaneous self-employment opportunities, increased opportunities for multiple revenue streams and control of one’s work schedule.\(^45\) However, it is important to note that even given the potential benefits, portfolio careers may not be the best option for all, as they are often sustained by a range of safety nets such as: savings, the support of a working partner and personal contacts.\(^46\) Nevertheless, in an effort to address common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution/exhibition and/or preservation of art, there is evidence that many individual artists have adopted entrepreneurial career approaches.


\(^43\) Additionally I posit that respective research studies on entrepreneurial learning within context will be useful for theory development. Understandings from such studies can help specify the oft-used terms “entrepreneurship activities,” “entrepreneurial mindset” and “entrepreneurial actions.”


\(^45\) Andrew J. Templer and Tupper F. Cawsey, "Rethinking Career Development in an Era of Portfolio Careers," Career Development International 4, no. 2 (1999): 70-76.

For example, in a comprehensive research study, Gilmore et al explore how artists across artistic disciplines build careers across commercial, non-profit and community sectors. The study includes forty-one case studies. Arguably, general definitions not only helped the researchers to create criteria for selecting the participants to be studied, but also helped the researchers identify and describe the context in which various entrepreneurial activities took place. The authors define a working artist as “...anyone who self-identifies as an artist, spends ten or more hours a week at his/her artwork (whether for income or not), and shares his/her work with others beyond family and close friends.” On the same page, the authors define the commercial sector as a sector that “...encompasses for-profit firms that employ artists, contracts with them for services, buys their work or process, and packages and markets their work for distribution.” The authors define the non-profit sector as a sector that “...encompasses work done for or with the support of the public sector or legally incorporated nonprofit organizations, such as museums, orchestras, opera houses, nonprofit presses, religious and social service organizations.” They define the community sector as a sector that “...encompasses forums and organizations often called informal, traditional, or unincorporated, where artists create and share their work unmediated by either markets or non-for-profit organizations, whether paid or not.” Later, the authors reference a fourth sector closely related to the non-profit sector, “...government, or the public sector,” in which artists work in the public art domain. In summary, although participants encountered common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution/exhibition and preservation of art, many of these participants overcame such challenges and barriers by adopting entrepreneurial career approaches across the referenced sector(s).

ALIGNING A THEORY TO PROGRAM THEORY

The discussion thus far argues for the development of a theory that rationalizes the process of entrepreneurship as it occurs within the context of the arts and creative industries and across the broader arts and creative sector. Explicitly, I attempted to advance the notion of arts entrepreneurship as a phenomenon both subject to and influenced by context. The discussion now turns towards an exploration of how a proposed theory of arts entrepreneurship might inform program theory development in arts entrepreneurship education.

To begin this conversation, I would like to point out what I believe to be a re-occurring theme in the nascent arts entrepreneurship education focused literature: the framing of arts
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48 Ibid., 85.
49 Ibid., 7.
50 Ibid., 16.
entrepreneurship education as an intervention. For example, in the article *The “Entrepreneurial Mindset” in Creative and Performing Arts Higher Education in Australia*, authors Pollard and Wilson discuss the role that arts entrepreneurship education plays in many creative and performing arts higher education programs. Notably, the authors call attention to the increasing pressure on higher education institutions to improve graduate employment outcomes:

“Arts entrepreneurship is a relatively new discipline in creative and performing arts higher education and is currently attracting attention due to the possibilities it affords to address graduate employability issues.”

Practically speaking, prior to developing any educational intervention, it’s helpful to first consider the situation(s) the intervention is trying to address. Concerning the calls for increased employability of arts students, several studies support Pollard and Wilson's analysis. Additionally, there is increasing acknowledgement within higher education arts focused literature that the employability of arts students is an issue worth prioritizing. Given these understandings, I posit that educators will have an easier time developing program theory for arts entrepreneurship education if they frame the education as an intervention. Moreover, I posit that program theory development in arts entrepreneurship education can be greatly informed by a theory of arts entrepreneurship. Prior to expounding on this position, I encourage educators to first consider the following questions:

---


What is the problem that arts entrepreneurship education proposes to address?

Where is the evidenced problem taking place?

Who is being affected by the problem?

What actions are needed in order to address the evidenced problem?

Now consider the following program theory (e.g. rationale for intervention), which is greatly informed by a proposed theory of arts entrepreneurship:

**Theory**

Because there are common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution/exhibition and preservation of art, artistic, administrative and technical creative workers engage in a process of innovation and new venture creation across the arts and creative sector.

**Program Theory**

By offering students an education associated with the phenomenon of arts entrepreneurship, students will be more prepared to overcome common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution, exhibition and preservation of art across the arts and creative sector.

Although this is just one example of a program theory informed by a theory of arts entrepreneurship, educators may find this immediately useful not only for addressing stakeholder inquiries (students, parent, deans, etc), but also for guiding curricular and assessment planning. From various perspectives within higher education, let us consider each section of the proposed theory and program theory separately:

(1) Because there are common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution, exhibition and preservation of art

(2) artistic, administrative and technical creative workers engage in a process of innovation and new venture creation

(3) across the arts and creative sector.

The theory above identifies a causal hypothesis whereby (1) the cause of the problem, (2) those affected by the problem and (3) the context in which the problem is situated is clearly identified. For an arts student, the above theory may communicate a relevant problem, a relevant context and a process being undertaken to address the evidenced problem. To diverse arts faculty, the theory may communicate the relevance of entrepreneurship practice to the broader field of arts education—an understanding that may lead to collaborative efforts between arts faculty and entrepreneurship educators. For deans, the theory may suggest an opportunity to take preventative action for improved student outcomes.
By offering students an education associated with the phenomenon of arts entrepreneurship

The program theory offers an intervention hypothesis: a statement that clearly identifies who the intervention will serve, and what the intervention will consist of.

Students will be more prepared to overcome common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution, exhibition and preservation of art across the arts and creative sector.

Note that the program theory also offers an action hypothesis: a statement that clearly identifies the proposed outcome of the intervention. Although this is only one example for the purposes of this discussion, the referenced program theory is clearly informed by a proposed theory of arts entrepreneurship. As can be seen, a proposed theory of arts entrepreneurship can help educators communicate the rationale for arts entrepreneurship education programs and courses. Furthermore, educators can use the causal hypothesis in such a theory to guide pedagogical questions. For example, considering (t), I am left wondering, “Are common challenges and historical barriers the same across artistic disciplines?” “What strategies have specific groups of artistic, administrative and technical creative workers utilized in order to overcome common challenges and/or historical barriers they have faced?” Certainly these are but two important research questions for the field. In another example, consider the program theory (6), which left me wondering, “How will I assess the degree to which my students are more prepared to overcome common challenges and historical barriers to production, distribution, exhibition and/or preservation of art?” “What will be the direct and indirect indicators of student learning?”

Further, the intervention hypothesis within the program theory (4) (5) can help stakeholders identify who the program serves and what the program/curricular activities will contain. Likewise, the action hypothesis within the program theory (6) can be used to communicate the intended outcome(s) of the program. In summary, I posit that guided by proposed theories of arts entrepreneurship, educators will be more prepared to develop program theory for arts entrepreneurship education.

CONCLUSION

It is important to note that a field is defined by its concepts, theories and research methods. To date, the nascent field of arts entrepreneurship has no generally accepted conceptual or theoretical frameworks, no distinct theories of learning and no proposed research methods for analyzing (what might be called) the phenomenon of arts entrepreneurship. As this emerging field works to develop theories, concepts, research methods, and effective curricula, educators will benefit from proposed theories of arts entrepreneurship. This question suggests a need for emerging educators to develop competence in assessment practice.

55 This question suggests a need for emerging educators to develop competence in assessment practice.

methods and models, let us not forget to take adequate time to check our assumptions along the way, specifically those that guide research pedagogy and practice. Fiet reminds us that “... atheoretical teaching has limited usefulness as a guide for instructing aspiring entrepreneurs about their prospects for future success.” As evidenced in this discussion, one of the greatest challenges to theoretical development in arts entrepreneurship is the lack of definitional consensus. To date, I remain optimistic on this matter, holding the belief that by working across artistic disciplines, the field can define key terms generally enough so that we can get on with the acquisition of knowledge. Given the need for a general definition of arts entrepreneurship—and given the new understandings that can emerge by framing arts entrepreneurship as a phenomenon both subject to and influenced by context—I suggest that when attempting to communicate what arts entrepreneurship is, educators consider the following as a proposed general definition:

**Arts Entrepreneurship refers to the process of overcoming common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution, exhibition and preservation of art.**

For the purpose of theory development, criticism of this proposed definition is encouraged. To that end, I contribute several assertions to help facilitate criticism. First, I assert that the proposed definition is general; although it does admittedly frame entrepreneurship within a specific context, it does not assume that common challenges and historical barriers are homogenous across all proposed dimensions (e.g. production, distribution, exhibition, preservation).

Also, I maintain that the definition is general because it intentionally omits who the arts entrepreneur “is.” The definition thereby follows practical guidance provided by Gartner, who once famously argued that research identifying what an entrepreneur does (e.g. behavioral approach) will tell one more about the process of entrepreneurship than research focused on describing whom an entrepreneur is (e.g. trait approach). Gartner’s article reminds me of the assumptions that can arise by utilizing prescriptive traits to identify people as “arts entrepreneurs.” Arguably under the proposed definition, the process of arts entrepreneurship refers to a context-bound phenomenon that anyone can experience or undertake.

I also contend that the proposed general definition is process-focused, action-oriented, as it is important to note that rather than an emphasis on creating an organization, business or company, the proposed general definition refers to “a process of overcoming.” Arguably, the process of overcoming common challenges and historical barriers to the production, distribution, exhibition and preservation of art is a discipline worthy of study. Further, I argue that this particular emphasis distinguishes arts entrepreneurship from that of small business entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship and arts administration; the latter of which is arguably primarily concerned with the management and sustainability of

arts and cultural-centered organizations. Additionally, I assert that such a definition is broad enough to encompass both the current NVC and SFT educational approaches: two approaches that in the absence of a theory (or theories) of arts entrepreneurship, may lead to the exclusion and/or dissuasion of diverse students from participating in arts entrepreneurship courses and programs.

Nevertheless, regardless of the approach one currently subscribes to (NVC, SFT, etc.), this discussion proposes that a theory of arts entrepreneurship can help educators avoid the “laundry list thinking” that is so often associated with the teaching of entrepreneurship skills, competencies and behaviors. For example, I think many educators in this nascent field would like nothing more than for their students to develop entrepreneurial skills, competencies and behaviors prior to graduation. What we don't know is what would best serve the needs of students desiring to engage in arts entrepreneurship. Instead of being guided by personal assumptions, I consider it more advantageous for students engaging in the process of arts entrepreneurship (as defined) to be guided by a theory or theories of arts entrepreneurship.

---
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This article presents an argument for a distinct educational framework more relevant to the aspirations of arts entrepreneurs by outlining commonly used business-based entrepreneurship structures when building an entrepreneurial venture within the realm of the arts. Disparities between the arts and business schools of thought are addressed and dissected within the context of arts entrepreneurship. Proposed is an auxiliary framework for arts entrepreneurship education, which delineates an aesthetic paradigm within entrepreneurial activity.

Arts entrepreneurship—as a field of inquiry and practice—integrates a number of disciplines. Operating in both tangible and intangible currencies, practitioners require a broad expertise in business, creativity and communication. More traditional, non-arts based entrepreneurs benefit by an abundant supply of knowledge, guidance, frameworks and models designed for an economic value exchange. For aesthetically oriented ventures, however, the value exchange expands in scope to focus on economic profit as well as aesthetic value. The Tetrahedral Model introduced in this paper is an updated schematic for venture creation that builds on the traditional entrepreneurship canon. It delineates the essential components for success in an entrepreneurial arts venture while describing an ecosystem that arises as a result of component relationships. It is not the authors’ intent for this essay to serve as a philosophical resource for the field of aesthetics; rather, discourse on aesthetic value within the context of this model is intended to be interpreted with both thoughtful and critical perspectives. Ideally, this model is intended to foster discussion on a topic of critical importance to the field of Arts Entrepreneurship.

---

1 The authors acknowledge the assistance of Perry Wester and Jadyn Salang in the early development of the model presented below.

2 See Appendix A for discussion of aesthetic value in the context of this model.
SURVEYING EXISTING FRAMEWORKS: PROS AND CONS FOR THE ARTS ENTREPRENEUR

Several useful models for new venture creation exist within the business school canon. However, some question the appropriateness of this model in an arts context. Non-arts-based models theorize an equation for success focusing on objective variables, yet ignore subjective factors critical to aesthetically oriented ventures such as authenticity and beauty, as they were not designed to consider these aspects in their value exchange. Driving a singular economic value exchange appears relatively simple when compared to the value an arts entrepreneur must exchange with audiences, arts consumers and critics. What follows is a brief abstract of a few models accompanied by an arts entrepreneurship-based critique.

Ma and Tan’s 4-P Framework appears universally applicable to all interpretations of entrepreneurship and suggests the base elements of entrepreneurial action include Pioneer, Perspective, and Practice, which are then leveraged to generate Performance. The entrepreneur defines each of the 4 “P”s within an entrepreneurial context, then weighs them against each other before being compared with the 4 “P”s present in the unique context of other business interpretations. It is a broad framework that has entrepreneurs consider a wider variety of elements present in the process of venture creation and is designed to be a tool for any aspiring entrepreneur.

A fundamental issue with the 4-P framework for arts entrepreneurs is that (anecdotally) many artists feel as if they are an artist first and an entrepreneur second. Though the practices of artistic creation and entrepreneurship appear synergistic, to reduce artistic creation to an entrepreneurial device is to question the subject’s authenticity; something many artists would find antithetical to the creative process. For these aesthetically oriented entrepreneurs, the 4-P framework ignores the creative process that artists employ to convert their emotional and physical world into aesthetic products that can be appreciated by human observers. This process comes

---


7 Ma and Tan, “Key Components and Implications of Entrepreneurship,” 705.

intuitively to artists before any entrepreneurial processes are contemplated and is an integral part of their identity. Due to the intuitive nature of the creative process, it can be difficult for an artist to translate the aesthetic value of their creation into something a market can understand. Factors like motivation, intent, and artistic authenticity may affect the way artists exchange value with their markets. With a venture that depends on transmitting aesthetic value to consumers, arts entrepreneurs could benefit from a framework that more effectively integrates with their personal creative process.

New Venture Creation (NVC) is a popular, comprehensive model for aspiring entrepreneurs that outlines the developmental elements of a successful new venture. It is an empowering, broadly applicable set of lessons and examples providing foundational knowledge for creating a venture and is highly useful for an emerging entrepreneur. The wisdom presented in this framework is delivered in business parlance and focuses strictly on business elements the authors believe entrepreneurs should concern themselves with. The NVC framework, however, lacks a deep examination of the model’s applications when additional variables besides revenue are critical to a venture’s success. Depending on the market a venture is targeting, an entrepreneur’s success may be defined in more dimensions than just profit.

9 Richard Caves suggests “The concentration of the creative entrepreneur differs from that of the typical business or social entrepreneur in that s/he is concerned first and foremost with the creation and exploitation of creative or intellectual capital. First and foremost, creative entrepreneurs are investors in talent, even their own and/or other people’s talent.” Richard E. Caves, Creative Industries: Contracts Between Art And Commerce, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 2-10.

10 An arts entrepreneur can use a tool called a “value statement” to express the unique aesthetic value in their creations to a consumer. A value statement is a contextual statement prepared by the artist that can provide a consumer with important perspective as they engage in an aesthetic consumption experience. (Herein, we loosely define an aesthetic consumption experience as the act of “consuming” (via the senses) an object/product/service/experience that has aesthetic qualities.) A value statement is a subjective statement of the value in a work of art as expressed by the artist, which is accompanied by a subjective interpretation from the arts consumer. Each time a creator makes an aesthetic value exchange with a consumer, the value statement they present will be interpreted differently depending upon factors like the consumer’s education, personal preferences, past experiences, arts training, etc. With practice, an artist can develop competency in translating their unique aesthetic value in a way that consumers can better appreciate. There is no magic bullet for manifesting a successful aesthetic value exchange consistently, but arts entrepreneurs can shape their value statement to their advantage, using it to give the consumer a framework for the interpretation and consumption of an aesthetic product, service, or experience. Also note that the way value is presented often guides the trajectory of a consumption experience—aesthetic or otherwise. Value statements are essentially a guide for understanding an artistic creation that provide a sense of context consumers can utilize as they make their own assessment of a work’s aesthetic value. This is in contrast to the business school, which uses a “value proposition” to frame value for consumers. Barnes and Blake loosely define a value proposition as a clear, compelling and credible expression of the experience that a customer will receive from a supplier’s measurably value-creating offering. They go on to say that it articulates the essence of a business, defining exactly what the organization fully intends to make happen in the customer’s life; essentially, it provides useful information and perspective in the consumption of a product or service. See Cindy Barnes and Helen Blake, Creating & Delivering Your Value Proposition Managing Customer Experience for Profit (London: Kogan Page, 2009): 21-37. This is a different concept than the “value statement” presented above and may refer to value in terms of utility and desired outcomes. Consider a “value statement” as an aesthetic value proposition—a packaging of the aesthetic benefits of a particular work of art that may serve to streamline the consumption experience for an interested arts consumer.


Patricia Stokes attempts to connect the arts and business realms by drawing a parallel between the creative process and the process behind organizational innovation.\textsuperscript{13} The proposed creative/innovative process is modeled graphically as a decision tree-solution path. Each decision made brings the subject closer and closer to the solution state. Constraints coming from the source, task and subject of the venture serve to modify the solution path by rendering specific steps in the established (or developing) solution path impossible. Stokes provides a profoundly simple and useful framework for facilitating creative action in an organizational context, yet conflates an artistically associated phenomenon modeled as a business process. This framework, (and many other similar business school entrepreneurial efforts), is much like equipping an arts entrepreneur with a map for a part of a park they will not explore; while much of the terrain may be familiar, the trails are different.\textsuperscript{14}

The Artist’s Meta-Praxis is a conceptual tool that depicts commonalities and draws connections between artistic and entrepreneurial action.\textsuperscript{15} It is a framework incorporating both micro and macro perspectives on the processes involved in artistic/entrepreneurial action. It also serves as an empirical study outlining the similarities between artists and entrepreneurs. Gangi provides qualitative data gathered from three successful professional artist-entrepreneurs elaborating on the value of a broad skill-set rooted in both business and art—as well as—how the two disciplines frequently intertwine in day-to-day activities. The Artist’s Meta-Praxis proposes that entrepreneurial and artistic action are synergetic, with 1) applied practice in either element leading to growth in the other and that 2) both are absolute necessities for the successful arts entrepreneur. This is a new thought model highly valuable to the field of arts entrepreneurship. However, it is a conceptual tool focusing more on the thought processes involved in driving successful entrepreneurial artistic action rather than the relationship that arises between business and creative variables in an artist’s entrepreneurial space.

The authors of this article suggest approaching an arts entrepreneurship curriculum from another perspective. Specifically, arts entrepreneurship education caters to two obvious categories of students (traditionally-trained artists and non-traditionally-trained artists), which influences how day-to-day classroom activities are contextually understood. 4-P and NVC provide a “business school” perspective. Stokes provides a glimpse into the application of arts concepts within a business context for business-minded students. Gangi’s article is framed for artists applying themselves entrepreneurially, delving into the link between artistic/entrepreneurial action and drawing a theoretical comparison between the two, but remaining aloof in terms of practical application of the relationship. A more arts-minded approach to business processes is proposed below.


\textsuperscript{14} Gary Beckman, “Entrepreneuring the Aesthetic,” 300.

\textsuperscript{15} Jonathan Gangi, “Arts Entrepreneurship: An Essential Sub-System of the Artist’s Meta-Praxis.”
DUAL VALUE EXCHANGES: AN ARTS ENTREPRENEUR’S UNIQUE CHALLENGE

Arts entrepreneurs are faced with a dynamic challenge: having to consider both tangible and intangible factors into their venture. An aesthetically oriented business venture can be considered as having aesthetic/artistic elements, which are fundamentally incorporated into the economic components of the business featuring unique aesthetic elements as an important part of the venture’s success, (ex: personal style, subject matter, color choice, etc.). Without a roadmap for success, these businesses are left to develop on their own terms in an attempt to better exchange value in two mediums. Much like social entrepreneurs who operate with a double bottom line of profit and social benefit, arts entrepreneurs often operate in two currencies: profit and aesthetic value. In short, 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 venture. It is exactly this concept that is not currently served by existing entrepreneurial frameworks. The currencies of the arts entrepreneur can be exchanged in both tangible (economic) and intangible (aesthetic) mediums. While existing frameworks offer a motivated entrepreneur a useful set of tools for developing a venture, something is notably missing: an understanding of the artist’s dual value exchange and its aesthetic component.

Defining the Economic Exchange

The economic component of the arts entrepreneur’s dual value exchange is more easily defined thanks to its tangible nature and vaunted place in the business school canon. In the past, it was not necessary to develop a deep understanding of the individual consumer’s habitus as economic exchanges relied more on predictable demographic consumption trends with a tendency to focus on broader variables like age, race, and location in marketing campaigns. As marketing technology has become more adept at deciphering individual consumption patterns, highly targeted marketing is emerging as a more effective method of reaching the right consumer quickly and driving a sale. This kind of marketing effectively bridges the gap between a business’s appeal to their target consumer and the expectations of that individual consumer’s unique habitus.

16 Combining tangible and intangible components (in the context of business startups) is recognized by Vivek Velamuri, who defines the concept of hybrid value creation as “...the process of generating additional value by innovatively combining products [tangible component] and services [intangible component].” Vivek Velamuri, Hybrid Value Creation, (Leipzig: Springer, 2011), 8.


18 The popular definition of the habitus as it appears in sociological literature will be used for the remainder of this article. “The habitus can be understood as a structure of the mind characterized by a set of acquired schemata, sensibilities, dispositions and taste.” A Dictionary of Sociology, 2nd ed., s.v. “Habitus.” Also see: Nikolaus Fogle, “Social Topology” in The Spatial Logic of Social Struggle: A Bourdieuan Topology (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2011), 13-15.

as the interaction proceeds. Price is often a prime concern when someone searches for utilitarian commodities or consumer goods and some combination of an effective marketing appeal and price point may be enough to trigger a purchase. For many companies, the intrinsic components of their value exchange remain irrelevant as long as they can continually and effectively place their product at a competitive price point in front of interested consumers.

### Defining the Aesthetic Exchange

An economic exchange hinges upon extrinsically valuable elements like utility and monetary value, but in large part, those same elements are given only minor emphasis in the process of forming an aesthetic judgment. The aesthetic component of the arts entrepreneur's dual value exchange has heretofore remained unexplored and undefined, yet, despite this lack of inquiry, the aesthetic value exchange remains a critical factor in the success of arts ventures.

However, an aesthetic exchange requires a more intimate understanding of the arts consumer to be successful, eschewing the older business school method of demographic targeting in lieu of a highly targeted approach that emphasizes a more personal connection. The qualitative nature of aesthetic variables requires a tactful recalibration of traditional paradigms, which involves both creator and consumer perspectives. Indeed, aesthetic consumption is driven by many factors, however, both innate appreciation and either a cultural or biological predisposition to consume art may factor significantly.

### What the Arts Entrepreneur Needs

Ventures in the arts are suspended in the midst of a challenging duality; one that requires a balanced application of both business and artistic elements for success. Aspiring arts entrepreneurs may not naturally possess an effective set of tools for developing a venture. Depending upon their level of classical training in business and/or art, they may experience a vast array of difficulties in effectively blending the two approaches. For example, from the business school of thought they are given “business” suggestions for their ventures in “business” language that targets metrics such as return on investment, profit and customer satisfaction as key factors of venture health and success. This is a results-driven, process-based approach, which is fine-tuned based on quantitative data from the aforementioned metrics.

At the same time, the arts school perspective provides “arts” suggestions for these aspiring entrepreneurs in “arts” language. The arts school focuses on improving the art product itself, more so than improving the actual process required to successfully generate value and money via the art. Factors typically accounted for include aesthetic intent, technical acumen and inspiration from a variety of subjective sources. This perspective also uses a process-based approach, however, it is the qualitative factors of the artistic process that drive the creation of something that can generate revenue.

---


When both suggestions are contemplated in tandem, the emerging arts entrepreneur is left to reconcile the disparate parlance and cultural contexts to effectively combine what they can of the two. With the strategy and practice of the business/arts schools vying for dominance in the entrepreneur’s ecosystem, emerging arts entrepreneurs waste significant energy and time sorting through the linguistic and cultural noise resulting from this clash. This feedback disturbs the clarity of thought needed for effective entrepreneurial preparation, action and sustainability, occluding the most effective path to success.

Arts entrepreneurs would greatly benefit from a framework that addresses these concerns and synergistically leverages the best techniques of both schools. Consider the range of opinions and perspectives from the business and arts schools as a continuum—with effective techniques for entrepreneurial action scattered throughout the continuum. Some may say that the business school tends to evaluate artistic creations and practices as a product that can be commoditized, no matter how imaginative or emotionally charged. Others would suggest that the business school contemplates art as an investment, revealing its perspective on art as one of further commodification that ignores the aesthetic properties of the art object. In seemingly complete opposition, the arts school can treat artistic creations with an element of sanctity, citing “art for art’s sake,” perceiving the business end of the spectrum as a nebulous paradigm operating at the expense of the artistic creation.

Many artists emerge from arts training programs operating under a paradigm ineffective for successful entrepreneurial action; one that misconstrues the relationship between business and art to the detriment of an artist’s success. One wonders if these classically trained artists view business and art in terms of a zero-sum game, where economic gain stemming from artistic action corresponds with an equal and opposite loss in “artistic value.” This viewpoint is unfavorable to the artist-entrepreneur as it is a manufactured limitation hindering entrepreneurial action. It behooves the creative entrepreneur to think divergently rather than convergently as divergent thinking empowers an arts entrepreneur to better recognize, generate and capitalize on opportunity within their entrepreneurial ecosystem.

For the arts entrepreneur, a balanced blend of both business and arts school perspectives is crucial. A more effective representation of the relationship between the two is that of a non-zero-sum game, where a win-win scenario arises that bolsters both economic and artistic elements. In a successful arts venture, a cohesive blend of business and creative elements are present, with a balance eventually arising between the two, negotiated by the arts entrepreneur him/herself. The importance of both elements to an arts entrepreneur’s success is critical to note. Without the business component, generating enough revenue for the venture to survive may be a struggle. Without the arts component, there will be very little compelling aesthetic value that the venture

---


25 See Appendix C, Figure 9.

can actively present to a consumer. Thus, it will be a struggle for the arts entrepreneur to communicate their authentic artistic identity and connect with consumers when the arts component of their venture is poorly represented.

THEORETICAL DESCRIPTION

The Tetrahedral Model (TM) presented below is an attempt to describe a fertile middle ground between the business and arts schools. It presents a synergistic and adaptable auxiliary framework for the dual value exchange in arts entrepreneurship ventures and treats the two school’s views not as oil and water, but as complementary ingredients in a new recipe. This model highlights the communication of aesthetic value as a powerful catalyst in the process of facilitating a value exchange. It also outlines a value exchange addressing both a consumer’s and creator’s habitus responses within the scope of the artist’s entrepreneurial ecosystem. Further, the TM incorporates a deeper understanding of a target consumer or community’s habitus into entrepreneurial action and utilizes this understanding to help arts entrepreneurs better understand what makes a successful aesthetic value exchange. Arts entrepreneurs employ a more active and personalized communication process when providing value to their consumers.27 Keeping the target’s habitus in mind when developing a venture may allow an arts entrepreneur to more accurately craft a personalized presentation of value, potentially driving a successful value exchange and generating revenue.28

Importance of Creator/Consumer Relationships in Arts Entrepreneurship

As mentioned above, past marketing tactics focused on targeting demographics with specific consumption patterns and with the advent of post-demographic consumerism, antiquated consumption profiles and the methods for generating such profiles are obsolete.29 Modern business models now incorporate more direct and highly targeted methods of consumer engagement, such as Google AdWords (pay per click) and Facebook’s targeted marketing campaigns (pay per click and impression).30 These modern methods easily integrate into a business’s marketing campaign and are optimizable with time, hindsight and assistance from trained professionals. For example, ChannelAdvisor is an e-commerce company based in Morrisville, NC providing tailored e-commerce marketing solutions to businesses around the world. With a proprietary database of global e-commerce information, they are a best-in-class

27 See Appendix A, figure 7.
28 A graphical representation of the four frameworks presented above in the context of the author’s proposed model appears in figure 1.
29 Clearly, this idea has permeated modern business culture as TrendWatching.com notes: “Consumers can (and increasingly do) pick and choose what products and services they purchase and the brands they identify with, without any regard to demographic ‘conventions’,” 19 and “[Businesses that] attempt to navigate using demographic maps, with borders defined by age, gender, location, income will be ill-prepared for the speed, scale, and direction of change,” 41. TrendWatching.com, “Post-Demographic Consumerism,” November 2014, accessed June 28, 2015, http://trendwatching.com/trends/post-demographic-consumerism.
30 See Harold Davis, Google Advertising Tools, 94.
resource for companies with business models relying on highly targeted consumer interactions to drive economic transactions. The e-commerce business model can be highly effective at reaching the right consumer, but doesn't necessarily establish the deeper connection between the marketer and the consumer that arts entrepreneurs thrives upon.

The authors’ postulate that the difference between what modern marketing platforms do—and what arts entrepreneurs do—to reach the right consumer lies in the relationship established between the marketer and the consumer. For arts entrepreneurs, a personal connection fostered with the consumer's habitus in mind may add more aesthetic value to the dual value exchange. This relationship may also help an arts entrepreneur's target consumer interpret the value statement for an arts product or service in a more educated/knowledgeable way.

A large portion of the TM revolves around discovering how to craft a more
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personalized value exchange to better translate aesthetic and economic value. Essentially, the
Tetrahedral Model weaves artistic, economic and communicative elements to empower arts entrepreneurs and their ventures by describing an useful set of skills and tools that leverage dual value exchanges in the generation of revenue.\footnote{Appendix B provides practical examples of the model illustrating how one might optimize personal, artistic and financial development as an artist and entrepreneur.} Building the proper framework for the optimal value exchange is crucial, and requires personal attention and flexibility. With this model in hand, an artist-entrepreneur has the potential to accurately craft a self-tailored framework operating in direct relation to their entrepreneurial ecosystem.

**CNB Triangle: Basis of the Model**

The TM elaborates on the interactions between three elements, creativity (C), network (N) and business (B) as seen in figure 2. These sections are broadly segmented in this way to encompass a wide range of variables the authors believe are critical to the success of entrepreneurial ventures in the arts. The C element is meant to represent the entirety of an artist’s creative identity as applied to their arts venture. This includes a number of qualitative elements, such as aesthetic inclinations in the creative process, the identity of the artist and the manifestation of creativity and divergent thinking in business practices.

Representing the state of an artist's social spheres as well as their communities is the function of the N element. It also includes the act of networking in target communities and actively expanding the artist’s potential consumption market. The B element is meant to include the commercial endeavors the artist undertakes for an arts venture. It encompasses all materials and processes utilized in the creation of art products and business ventures that yield monetary return for the artist’s business.

Mapping these elements as the three lines of a triangle allows us to delineate the flow of ideas and energy throughout the model and provides a visual reference for the entrepreneurial ecosystem arising via the relationships between elements. Creativity is placed at the top of the triangle for an arts venture, because it is a fundamental component of the venture’s success. The position of the C element is intended to illustrate that an artist’s success is rooted in their creativity.\footnote{Jonathan Gangi, "Arts Entrepreneurship: An Essential Sub-System of the Artist's Meta-Praxis," in *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Research* 1, no. 1 (2014): 40, accessed November 1, 2014, http://jaer.ncsu.edu.} The importance of creativity in this context cannot be understated. Without the creative spark, an artist is unable to generate the compelling aesthetic creations that serve as the
life blood for an aesthetically-oriented venture. Creativity is the hallmark of this model, directly addressing the impact of individual's creative identity on commercial and communicative endeavors.

The C element organically feeds both B and N elements, in that an artist's creativity can be leveraged to grow their business operations as well as influence their network of collaborators and consumers. To maximize the impact of the C element, it is recommended that C organically synergize feedback from B and N into the arts entrepreneur's developing creative business. In certain instances, feedback into an artist's creativity via business operations or network influence can compromise an artist's integrity in the eyes of potential consumers and devitalize the aesthetic value they seek to exchange. However, it is important to note that for aspiring arts entrepreneurs, uniting their creative, business, and networking endeavors can yield a more holistic, compelling presentation of value. B and N elements may also serve as indicators for discovering new audiences and markets.

B and N possess a relationship highly symbiotic in nature. Developing B generates more revenue for the business and financial sustainability for the venture. It can also contribute to the development of a larger network. Developing N generates a larger network by building credibility within both business and artistic spheres. As the artist fine-tunes the presentation of their brand to their network and beyond, they will create more connections and find more opportunities for revenue-generating transactions. This triangle is a simple starting point for envisioning the relationship between the elements critical to an arts entrepreneur's success, and serves as the foundation for building a deeper understanding of the artist's venture.

**Breadth & Depth**

Each element of the CNB framework can grow in two dimensions: breadth and depth. Breadth represents gaining more understanding and developing a broader perspective and depth represents the arts entrepreneur's ability to apply

---

33 The importance of creativity in this context is recognized by many. Edward de Bono, for example, states that creativity “...is not simply a way to make things better...Creativity is the soul of business. Without creativity, you have a body with no soul; creativity provides the value that is the whole purpose of any business.” Edward de Bono, *Lateral Thinking* (New York: Harper, 1973), 15. A more recent conception of creativity’s importance in popular business literature is outlined by Richard Florida: “Creativity—‘the ability to create meaningful new forms,’ as Webster's dictionary puts it—is now the decisive source of competitive advantage. The deep and enduring changes of our age are not technological but social and cultural.” Richard Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class* (New York: Basic Books, 2003), 10.


and actualize that understanding. The presentation of this model is intended to facilitate growth through deeper understanding in both dimensions for the elements C, and B. Each development means something within its own segment of the framework as well as in relation to the other elements. Creative breadth concerns facilitating perfection of the artist’s creative method and the development of a distinct brand. Creative depth addresses the application of the artist’s method and brand as competitive advantages. Business breadth speaks to asset assembly and valuation, while business depth involves recognizing, developing, and utilizing the most effective channels of consumption. Lastly, network breadth concerns growing the volume and variety of creative connections, while network depth leverages those connections to cement network loyalty and promote the networks involvement in the artistic and entrepreneurial processes. The evolving elements of breadth and depth reflect the dynamic nature of the arts entrepreneur’s journey, adding new dimensions to the development of an arts venture.

**CNB Micro-ecologies**

The triangles in Figure 4 are distinct micro-ecologies representing the unique relationships between CNB variables and what their development entails. As the top element in each of these three micro-ecologies develops in depth, it is focused towards the bottom-most intersection point of the other two elements. This development in depth represents a growing ability to apply mastery over an element critical to their venture’s success. When an element is more developed in terms of depth, the artist is more effectively leveraging their deeper understanding within the context of the other elements to drive a successful value exchange. For the arts entrepreneur, this growth in depth represents a more complete understanding of the relationship between micro-ecologies and in theory, is something an entrepreneur can leverage to generate and capitalize upon opportunities. The point of maximum depth represents an ideal presentation of value; one that is highly effective at driving a value exchange. Each distinct micro-ecology is elaborated upon below.
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In this model, an “ecology” refers to the entrepreneurial ecosystem that arises between arts entrepreneurs and their consumers, including the associated creative variables and personal tastes that accompany (and drive) their interactions. A micro-ecology is a close-up of a segment of the artist’s larger arts ecology, representing an in-depth examination of the relationships between a smaller number of selected variables.
C Element (Fig 4.)

The C micro-ecology encapsulates the relationship between the main Creative element and the auxiliary elements of Business and Network. The more depth an artist can develop in their Creative element, the closer their unique creative message is to being effectively transmitted to their consumer. Effectively more depth represents well-developed and well-presented aesthetic value. The C element is the authors’ conceptual representation of the arts venture’s main operation—crafting the aesthetic. A manufacturing company could not exist without a broad and deep understanding of their manufacturing process and its place in the manufacturing industry. An arts business is similar. In many ways, the C element is an embodiment of the artist’s brand. When developing the C element, an artist is growing their brand equity within their market, (read: their network), and learning how to leverage it as a differentiating factor in the marketplace. In arts ventures, each interaction with a new potential customer may be completely distinct, requiring a presentation of the artist’s creativity that responds to both economic and social cues while remaining true to its original nature. The ability to creatively adapt the presentation of a venture's aesthetic products to a consumer’s desires may greatly enhance the opportunity to make sales. The empathic arts entrepreneur is one who sees aesthetic value from a variety of perspectives and is comfortable with packaging it differently, depending on personal interpretation. With continued and calculated execution of business operations, along with support from peers and protégés in their network, an artist can grow in the understanding of their own creativity and apply that knowledge within the context of Business and Network variables. A point of holistic understanding may be reached where an artist is able to effectively transmit their creative identity through economic and social channels, theoretically reaching a point of maximum depth in the micro-ecology where the C element is being fulfilled through the B and N elements. This point represents a positive reception by the network; here, the artist’s brand and intent are clearly presented in a way that allows the expansion of the C element alongside B and N without compromising artistic integrity. With a solid, identifiable brand on the arts entrepreneur’s side, the possibility of a successful value exchange is more likely.\(^{38}\) The authors hypothesize that positive brand equity strongly factors into a favorable interpretation of aesthetic value by the consumer. At the hypothetical point of complete creative depth, the venture more clearly communicates distinct aesthetic value through business operations and network channels and utilizes that value as a revenue-generating part of the arts venture.

N Element (Fig 4.)

The N micro-ecology encapsulates the relationship between Network and the focusing elements of B and C. At N’s full depth, the artist’s network is supportive of both artistic and business operations and becomes a catalyst for bolstering brand equity and generating revenue. This hypothetical point is where the value that the arts entrepreneur wants to deliver is favorably interpreted by the network (market), representing a deeper understanding of the artist’s identity by consumers and peers interested in the artist’s work. When connected with and integrated into their network, the arts entrepreneur is able to more effectively communicate their creative message—habitus to habitus. This micro-ecology is directly related to a consumer’s interpretation of aesthetic

\(^{38}\) In this case, “solid, identifiable brand” refers to a high level of customer-based brand equity, defined as the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand. Note that “Positive customer-based brand equity...can lead to enhanced revenue, lower costs, and greater profits,” Kevin Lane Keller, “Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity,” *Journal of Marketing* 57, no. 1 (1993): 1-22
value and acknowledges the impact of business and artistic elements on the positioning and evaluation of aesthetic value when operating in tandem.

**B Element (Fig 4.)**

The B micro-ecology encapsulates the relationship between Business and the focusing elements of Creative and Network. As B grows in depth, the execution of business operations is focused to a point by the strategic communication of an artist's creative message and the support of their network. In the B micro-ecology, this is where the business operation successfully completes value exchanges and generates sales. It is at this theoretical point where business processes are directly and positively impacted by both the artist's connection to their network and the manner in which they package their aesthetic value. For the arts entrepreneur, it's important to understand that a monetary exchange in an arts venture (as the authors hypothesize the exchange) generally occurs when a consumer feels that the aesthetic value of a creation is actually worth the money required to purchase the work. This micro-ecology highlights the impact of network interconnectedness and creative transparency on business metrics like profit, revenue and customer satisfaction. By developing a deeper understanding of the network (market) that an arts venture operates within, arts entrepreneurs can tailor a presentation of aesthetic value that resonates intimately with consumers. This personal connection can greatly increase the perceived value of an aesthetic creation or experience.

**Tetrahedron Model**

By taking the three separate two-dimensional micro-ecologies from Figure 4 and combining them into a three-dimensional tetrahedron model, (Figure 5), a simple visualization emerges that can be used to extrapolate how differences in the variables of breadth and depth affect the process of the value exchange with a consumer's habitus. In the 3D tetrahedron model, we have chosen to represent the habitus of a potential arts consumer as the central column running from the center of the base of the tetrahedron to the pinnacle of the...
tetrahedron, where the three separate micro-ecologies join together at one point. An arts entrepreneur can consider a cross section of the tetrahedron as a visual aid in assessing the balance of elements in their arts venture. In Figure 5, there is an unbalanced array of variables, representing an arts venture that may be struggling with effectively driving value exchanges. By observing cross-sectional features such as skew and surface area, the entrepreneur can produce a rough estimate of balance, strengths and weaknesses in their venture. Formulating an effective balance of variables that yields a successful value exchange depends on the artist’s understanding of the consumer and the consumer’s understanding of the artist. There is always the opportunity for an arts entrepreneur to provide additional context for the interpretation of their art to the consumer. This context may positively impact the consumer’s ability to understand the artist’s creative message and consequently bolster the perception of value.

A well-balanced cross section represents a simpler value exchange for the entrepreneur. Balance between CNB elements empowers the arts entrepreneur to filter out less important variables in their transaction, simplifying the process of effectively delivering value to a consumer. Arts entrepreneurs can tailor the presentation of their creation according to what they think consumers will expect of a creation and consumption experience. A lopsided cross section with CNB elements that are out of balance, (for example, a Network section that is less developed than Creative and Business portions), may theoretically require more holistic calculations from the entrepreneur to successfully deliver value via the consumer’s habitus. A heavily slanted cross section may not make for the easiest value exchange, but as the arts entrepreneur grows in wisdom, skill and self-awareness, this off-kilter cross section can be remedied.

As the arts entrepreneur develops the depth of each element towards the pinnacle of the tetrahedron, the overall surface area of the cross section will shrink, representing an entrepreneur who has grown to be more effective at packaging their venture’s unique value as Figure 6 illustrates. Theoretically, by developing each micro-ecology to its
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maximum depth (100%), the surface area of the cross section joins the habitus column at the pinnacle as a single point. This means that, should the arts entrepreneur be able to achieve maximum depth across all micro-ecologies, a successful value exchange is more simply executed, saving the arts entrepreneur time and energy.

It must be noted that in reality, full focus in each element of the Tetrahedral model can never truly be attained due to the special constraints of inter-habitus communications. The CNB points of maximum depth are meant to denote ideals towards which the arts entrepreneur should continually strive. With each component, whether Business, Network, or Creative, there are certain hiccups in the delivery of value that are insurmountable. For example, B suffers from the impersonal nature of targeted marketing methods. There is less of an intrinsic connection between modern business practices and the individual consumer's habitus. Unlike the B element's economic value exchange, the aesthetic value exchange driven by C involves a very specific habitus communication between creator and consumer that is more personal and individually tailored. For an artist to convey their creative message to a consumer's habitus with 100% efficacy, that consumer would need an infallible understanding of the entirety of the artist's existence at the moment the art creation was conceived. No one can truly comprehend the complete combination of experiences, emotions, and inspirations that goes into an aesthetic creation except the creator, and as such, this scenario of infallible understanding is only possible if the consumer is also the artist. Translating the message and value of an aesthetic creation into something a consumer can actually fathom is the fundamental struggle of the arts entrepreneur and it requires a deep level of understanding between creator and consumer that is generally cultivated over time. The N element also has inherent limits in its value exchange capability due to consumer tastes and preferences spanning a wide range of art forms. In a competitive market environment, no artist can conceivably build a network of individuals who ascribe the entirety of their appreciative capacity to a singular creator. It would be folly to assume that a person, (who may indeed be a loyal fan or collaborator), would completely ignore the existence of aesthetic creations beyond those made by a singular artist.

The qualitative nature of these three variables may require continuous rooting within a fresh, individualized context each time a value exchange opportunity arises. However, this versatile shifting context ensures that the arts entrepreneur is responding to market demands and adapting to more effectively position their venture for success. To maximize the impact of the aesthetic value exchange in an arts venture, the arts entrepreneur should consider maximizing the breadth and depth of Creative, Network, and Business elements while working to evenly develop and maintain the three. An arts entrepreneur who has established depth in each micro-ecology will be more creatively empowered, entrepreneurially savvy and socially connected. In short, they will be better equipped for entrepreneurial success with their aesthetic product.

CONCLUSION

There is much more to successful entrepreneurship in the arts than turning a profit. This model begins the task of delineating the missing variables in the arts entrepreneur's
venture equation. Until now, the aesthetic value exchange that is so pivotal for an aesthetic-based business venture has remained uncharted—and consequently—many arts entrepreneurs have been left to fend for themselves. By clarifying a more enigmatic portion of the arts entrepreneur’s dual value exchange, the Tetrahedral Model provides a possible blueprint for balanced growth and venture development as one entrepreneurs the arts. It seeks to demystify the relationship between creative, communicative, and economic variables in arts ventures, placing them into a personalized frame of reference an entrepreneur navigates and updates as needed.

Further, this framework possesses far-reaching implications. By understanding the parameters of aesthetic value exchanges and by utilizing the TM as an auxiliary framework for traditional business models, businesses rooted in economic value exchanges can potentially drive a more meaningful value exchange with existing consumers—while potentially attracting new markets responding strongly to a consumption experience with more aesthetic elements. If one believes that art is what one declares it to be, then potentially every object or service has some unique aesthetic value that can then be packaged. The aesthetic value exchange is an empowering concept that creative entrepreneurs and marketers might consider using when crafting a compelling brand and developing their venture.

In a classroom context, the TM framework has another use previously unexplored in arts entrepreneurship literature. When conceived as a curricular delivery model as envisioned in figure 8, educators can present classroom material meeting the needs and dispositions of students, institutions and disciplinary training structures/traditions. For example, in more conservatory environments, strongly focusing on the Creativity and Networking elements early in a semester may help these students transition into the necessary increasing exploration of the Business element occurring later in a semester—while maintaining a constant focus on the N element and decreasing emphasis on the C element as the semester progresses. As needs, classrooms or instructional awareness changes, the TM can provide an overarching method (or roadmap) to plan and deliver arts entrepreneurship instruction.

This field has manifested a bizarre existence. In marrying influences from two seemingly antithetical schools of thought, the field has wedged itself in the conceptual gap between the two approaches—synergizing two disparate paradigms into one. In some cases, the elements and processes related to arts entrepreneurship have sprung up organically from a new school of thought that grows alongside the field itself. However, there is a distinct need for more. The unique positioning of this field demands literature that embodies its original approach. The Tetrahedral Model framework presented attempts to elucidate some of the relevant forces at play in the arts entrepreneur’s ecosystem. The framework identifies basic elements important for a successful value exchange in an arts venture and outlines a process by which these elements may reach a comfortable synergy. It is intended that the ideas presented in this article spark the development of similar frameworks in arts entrepreneurship scholarship; ones that fortify the unique thought processes and practices of the arts entrepreneur. It is also intended that this article serve as a preliminary roadmap for arts entrepreneurship students and educators seeking paths to success. It is the authors’ hope that with this model in hand, laying the groundwork for aspiring arts entrepreneurs will become easier.
APPENDIX A: AESTHETIC VALUE EXCHANGE

Within the contexts of the Tetrahedral Model and arts entrepreneurship, aesthetic value is of critical importance. Assigning and assessing this value is, however, a subjectively interpreted characteristic affected by personal, environmental and cultural inputs, to name but a few modifying factors. For an arts entrepreneur to be most effective in driving revenue generating value exchanges, we suggest it is critical they develop competency in explaining and contextualizing aesthetic value. For an arts entrepreneur, aesthetic value might be explained as the quality of being able to elicit an innate physiological or psychological reaction in the “consumer,” which stems from the consumption of an aesthetic object or experience.

From the arts entrepreneur’s perspective, many factors affect the exchange of aesthetic value between creator and consumer. A good arts entrepreneur will seek to involve themselves in the consumption experience of their art, whether in person or by proxy, to ensure that the unique aesthetic value in their product or service is presented in a way that the consumer can more easily understand/interpret. Regardless of the creator’s intent, consumers will interpret some portion of a creation’s aesthetic value on their own terms. To improve the perception of a creation’s aesthetic value beyond that of the individual’s initial interpretation, an arts entrepreneur might consider seeking to provide perspective for the consumption experience in a way that presents the aesthetic value of a piece such that the consumer is better able to interpret the value as perceived by the creator.

We theorize that two types of aesthetic value exchanges occur: one with input from the creator, and one without. Consumption experiences obviously occur quite frequently without the physical presence of a creator, (ex: .mp3’s, paintings inside of a home, etc.). For an arts entrepreneur to maximize the reception of their aesthetic product in an aesthetic value exchange, they should consider involving themselves in the consumption experience. Consumers may interpret a piece of art subjectively on their own terms and—having no idea how they are supposed to feel about the work—find themselves confused by the art and possibly uninspired by its message. Creators can aid consumers in art consumption experiences by providing markets with additional context for assessment purposes, (via artist/value statements or some other explanatory device) consequently allowing consumers to interpret more aesthetic value.

Independently, a consumer can find positive aesthetic value in a work of art regardless of input from its creator. It’s important to note that the artist is not the ultimate arbiter of a consumer’s aesthetic judgments. Some portion of a consumer’s perception of aesthetic value is undoubtedly beyond the scope of what the artist intended or can control as this judgement is generated through unique interpretations of that distinct value in the consumer’s habitus. This is all to say that an arts entrepreneur has the opportunity to affect a change in the consumer’s perception of what they are consuming. The change may be positive or negative, but in the end, it is better for the arts entrepreneur to develop skill in expressing their unique aesthetic value to consumers. We suggest that arts entrepreneurs actively involve themselves in the consumer’s aesthetic consumption experience to foster a more positive perception of the aesthetic value present in a creation—note the opportunity to catalyze the process of aesthetic judgment formation. This involvement can be as simple as the artist actively choosing a specific venue for the display of their work or as complex as taking the time to

---

39 We define an artist statement as: a contextual statement by an artist describing their background, intent, inspirations and other qualitative factors about their creative process and creations. Essentially, the statement is a short summary of factors an artist feels integral to themselves, their process and their creations. By providing information about themselves to consumers, artists set a simple reference point for consumers to use when formulating a judgment of aesthetic value.

personally describe the aesthetic value of a piece to a consumer in an attempt to drive a sale. Essentially, it is the arts entrepreneur's obligation to provide a consumer with context for the interpretation of aesthetic value.

An Example:

Eating with chopsticks would be a very strange way to consume a meal if those dining have never heard of or seen chopsticks before; a lesson in using chopsticks would be all it takes to turn a pair of useless sticks into a whole new dining experience. Some might say that the contextual value of a chopstick is in the utility it serves when dining. This utility might simply be a novelty to the people dining, but for others, the chopstick is an object present in everyday life. Without the dining context, the explanation of a chopstick's value becomes more abstract. It is harder to explain the value in something when it is removed from the context in which it exists. For an arts consumer who lacks context for their interpretation of an aesthetic creation, the process is reminiscent of a first-time experience with chopsticks. Without prior knowledge of a chopstick's function as a dining utensil, a hungry individual may not be able to recognize its utility. Factor in prior knowledge of a fork and it may become even harder for an individual to recognize the utility of a chopstick at the dinner table. A chopstick may not be the form in which a diner expects their desired function to manifest. While some may consider the function of art as the delivery of aesthetic value, the forms in which this value manifests are many and varied. It's up to the arts entrepreneur to present creations within a context that streamlines the consumer's interpretation of aesthetic value.

Figure 7 below represents the two types of aesthetic consumption experiences we see present in arts ventures. An independent aesthetic consumption experience is one that occurs without the presence or influence of the creator. An example of this type of experience might be a restaurant patron observing paintings present inside a restaurant that were placed there by a local artist. The local artist may have left a name, a title, and a price on the wall by each painting, however the restaurant patron may be interpreting the art in passing and it is likely they won't be particularly concerned with the creator's intent as much as they are with the immediate visual aspects of the creation. The aesthetic value they perceive in the art will be largely based on an evaluation comprised of personal factors (i.e.; the habitus of the patron) as the creative intent of the painting may be completely unappreciated.

The second type of aesthetic consumption experience is an assisted experience. In this experience, the consumer interprets the aesthetic value present in an artistic creation in tandem with contextual cues provided by the creator. With additional context to use in their evaluation of aesthetic value, the consumer may be able to perceive more aesthetic value in a creation. Contextual cues can be value statements explaining specific aspects of a creation, artist statements mentioning unique features of the artist's identity or design process, personal interactions with potential clients, etc. We believe that providing context for aesthetic interpretations is something that arts entrepreneurs should leverage, as it can positively impact a consumer's perception of aesthetic value.

Social media is an incredibly powerful tool for the modern arts entrepreneur. Many channels exist that can serve as an additional contextual intermediary for arts consumers to experience the artist more “personally,” and consequently recognize more aesthetic value with a creation. With context serving as an impactful modifier in the aesthetic consumption experience, arts entrepreneurs might consider incorporating a social media presence into their ventures. The establishment of an online hub where consumers can touch base virtually with an artist or arts venture can serve as an autonomous catalog of an artist's identity and intent; a way for consumers to personally connect with a creator. The
Twitter, Facebook, or Instagram account associated with an artist or arts venture can be accessed at the consumer's leisure, potentially allowing them to perceive more aesthetic value by recognizing commonalities that consumer and creator share. An interesting way to consider social media in terms of an artist and their aesthetic venture is that social media pages function as a modern form of the artist statement. They allow a consumer to access a set of personal statements, thoughts, products, and experiences as written by the artist / arts entrepreneur. This access fosters a deeper connection for consumers interested in exploring it. While fans of the Beatles in the '60s may have truly been fanatical about the band, the personal access these fans had into the habitus of the creators was limited to the mediums of the time—TV/Radio interviews, assorted popular media and the music itself. In 2015, fans of mainstream musical artists like Katy Perry and lesser-known performers like Mac DeMarco can easily explore a personal connection with these artists by touring their social media accounts. Twitter and Instagram allows fans to take a peek into the daily lives and thoughts of artists who may otherwise be forever beyond their contact. Fostering a connection with consumers via social media is a powerful way for arts entrepreneurs to add valuable context in the interpretation of their aesthetic value.

Figure 7
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By assisting in the consumption of their creation, the arts entrepreneur has the opportunity to increase the aesthetic value as perceived by the consumer. The arts entrepreneur can add value to the aesthetic consumption experience by providing CONTEXT for the interpretation.
APPENDIX B: SUGGESTIONS FOR CREATING A PLATFORM FOR SUCCESS

Each entrepreneur has different strengths and weaknesses. As one goes about crafting his or her aesthetic-based venture, different levels of care should be given to the separate—and priority of—CNB elements. For a solitary creator who intimately understands their own creative process, a creative exploration experience may not be as beneficial as attending an artist networking event where they could meet potential collaborators. By breaking down the entrepreneurial journey into stages, an arts entrepreneur can create a “curriculum” for maximum personal development by utilizing a carefully balanced application of time and energy across the three elements. The following example is accompanied by activities the authors feel relevant to developing breadth and depth in the context of this model.

Example: This arts entrepreneur is a mixed-media artist and before delving into business operations they need a better understanding of their own creative process. This understanding empowers them to more effectively present their art’s aesthetic value to a potential buyer. To leverage their unique creative state and build a successful venture in the arts, they must know how to translate their creativity into something a consumer can understand and appreciate. In this example, the artist has chosen to break their venture’s development into three levels.

In Level 1, this artist has placed precedence upon development of the Creative element, while the Business and Network elements are given a proportionally smaller amount of time and energy. In Level 2, each element has equal priority. In Level 3, Business is now the element

![Diagram](Figure 8)
experiencing the most development, with Networking remaining at a static level and Creativity receiving less immediate focus and development.

As can be seen in figure 8, the Creative element decreases as the levels progress, indicating that this artist expects to develop a deeper understanding of their artistic identity and the factors affecting how they create, as well as the technical ability to create more aesthetically-impactful art. With a well-developed C element, this artist will expend creative energy more efficiently in the process of facilitating a dual value exchange.

The Business element grows in importance as this artist progresses from understanding their creativity to leveraging it as a point of difference in their marketplace. A shrinking element is not to imply that it becomes less important to the artist, rather, it is to illustrate a dedicated focus on improvement in a particular area. With a larger focus on developing and perfecting business techniques, this artist will find themselves selling more work and growing towards a mature enterprise.

The Network element maintains equal importance throughout this artist's development, as it is a crucial piece of their entrepreneurial endeavor. Developing the Network element for this artist entails becoming familiar with local venues and important cultural intermediaries present in their environment. Networking consistently through each level of this artist's progression expands their opportunities for collaborations, sales, positive press, etc. This unified development across the CNB elements empowers this artist (and her arts venture) to grow towards success.

Developing Breadth and Depth

Creative, network and business elements use the subjective metrics of breadth and depth to measure their comparative levels of developments. If this process of growth is mastered as the Tetrahedral Model and accompanying explanation allow, the artist can determine how to prioritize their development as needed and generate a working roadmap for success with their venture. The breadth and depth metrics, again, are subjectively determined and allow a basic quantification of why and how the CNB elements are exercised. Some exercises for developing breadth and depth in the CNB elements are listed below.

*Creative*

Manipulating the senses can help to freshen the artistic perspective and inspire the artist to make something new and different from their previous works.

- Sound: Listen to different types of music while working; observe how an artwork changes accordingly during the creative process.
- Touch: Wear a variety of garments during creative production; observe how different sensations on the skin affect the artwork.
- Scent: Place scented candles or incense in the workspace; observe how specific scents affect the artwork.

- Taste: Chew different candies or foods during the creative process; observe how the artwork is impacted by flavors.

- Sight: Place lighting in new places around workspace or utilize colored lighting while creating; observe how the artwork changes.

Adding new constraints to the creative process can pave the way for innovation in the way an artist goes about making their art.

- Create a prompt or set of prescribed parameters for an art project
  - Ex: color constraints, brush/pen size, or stylistic themes like Japanese wood-block printing or 3D art.

- Use new materials to create art in a familiar style.

These tactics serve to exercise creative breadth, which in turn, develops the ability to work creatively from multiple perspectives. Depth is achieved by recognizing a specific style or sensibility present in the artistic process and exercising/exploring that signature component. Repetition and introspection are important for maximizing the Creative element.

Network

The network, the market and the individual are all important to the arts entrepreneur's success. Building new connections and expanding one's network develops network breadth. Attending artist networking events locally or joining online arts communities are reliable methods for expanding the artist's network of peers and consumers. Nurturing network connections with friendliness helps grow network depth and can enhance the power of the relationship between artist and arts consumer to create a sales opportunity. To strengthen and deepen the connection with one's network, meet peers and clients for lunch or coffee, offer a newsletter for website/portfolio visitor or make art publicly. Countless methods exist to expand the artist's network locally and beyond. These depth-building activities provide a setting to showcase an artist's distinguishing value.

Business

Business breadth and depth are developed by testing and employing strategies to deliver creative products to the consumer as effectively as possible. Exercises of breadth focus more on employing new strategies, like starting an e-commerce platform, modifying creative works into branded merchandise or utilitarian products, reaching out to boutiques or developing new business models. Exercises of depth involve determining effective consumption methods, effective cost/benefit analysis, and what can be done to improve/streamline the offerings. An example of developing business breadth is redesigning an artist's website to accommodate an e-commerce store. An example of developing business depth
would be starting a Google AdWords campaign and paying to position the artist's website in the top results of a Google search for specified keywords describing an artist's unique sensibility. This campaign can be refined as the artist becomes more proficient with AdWords’ keyword selection. Targeted online marketing is a valuable resource for the arts entrepreneur who understands their creative product and the intended market. Also important to note is the growing amount of simplified web development apps online. Sites like Wix, Strikingly, Presskit and BigCartel make it incredibly easy to design an aesthetically pleasing portfolio or e-shop for little to no cost.
APPENDIX C: ZERO AND NON-ZERO SUM GAMES

Figure 9: The zero-sum game signals that there can be no go gain in one element without a corresponding loss in the other. Many artists believe that to trade aesthetic value for economic value compromises the legitimacy and authenticity of an artistic creation, perpetuating the “starving artist” archetype: that to be concerned with monetary success undermines the authentic artistic identity.41

Figure 9

Figure 10: The non-zero-sum game can be summarized with the following analogy: “A rising tide floats all boats.” This scenario is a win-win, with each element in the transaction capable of growing, unhindered by the other. An artist can indeed retain their authenticity while running a successful, profitable arts venture. The mentality of the non-zero-sum game can serve as a helpful rationalization and empowerment tool for an arts entrepreneur to actively exist in this state as they grow their venture.

Figure 10

41 Gary Beckman, “‘Adventuring’ Arts Entrepreneurship,” 94.
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Arts Entrepreneurship in Higher Education: Preliminary Inventories and Examinations
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This paper examines and identifies arts entrepreneurship curricula in higher education using interview and online data gathered primarily in the summer of 2014, with the purpose of illustrating trends and trains of thought. An additional goal of this article is to encourage further research and interaction among educators to create the most influential and effective curricula possible.

At the first annual conference of the Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education in the summer of 2014, attendees discussed questions framing the following topics: What is arts entrepreneurship? How can we best teach the topic? What are our desired student outcomes? What are the metrics of our efforts? Though there were no simple answers, educators made progress in determining responses to these questions by sharing research and making new connections with colleagues. Although a standardized arts entrepreneurship curriculum does not presently exist, the topic has been gaining popularity across the country. This paper builds on the trends of discovery and growth in arts entrepreneurship education and is intended to serve as a call for further inquiry. Organized into two parts, this paper first updates pre-existing program inventories to articulate trends in the curricular structure and academic housing of these efforts. The second section analyzes 17 interviews with active arts entrepreneurs, educators and students to identify broad-based themes of need and action. Note that this paper examines and encapsulates titled efforts as they were identified during the research period, using online sources from 96 institutions with identifiable curricula.

1 The data set used in this article was compiled between May 15, 2014 and February 1, 2015. A systematically updated list of arts entrepreneurship programming appears at http://www.societyaee.org/resources.html.

2 The pool of seventeen interviewees consists of one student and arts entrepreneur, one artist who behaves entrepreneurially and fifteen educators with varied backgrounds in arts entrepreneurship.
THE NEED FOR COMMUNICATION

Arts entrepreneurship programming (curricular and non-curricular) are created for many reasons, including helping artists support themselves with their art, encouraging entrepreneurs to think artistically, leveraging arts markets, etc. Interviews with arts entrepreneurship educators demonstrate that many are motivated to engage in the field based upon their previous experiences; indeed, it appears that many—either in the past or presently, full-time or part-time—were/are using (or attempting to use) their art to financially support themselves. Across the country, institutions are creating programs and courses focusing on either one of two very broad trajectories: discipline-specific (such as “music” entrepreneurship) and discipline unspecific (typically using the title “arts” entrepreneurship, signifying that the programming serves all arts disciplines). Despite the fact that arts entrepreneurship programs dot the nation, some still describe their course or degree as unique and one of a kind.³ This is not to diminish the value of each new program, rather to articulate a lack of awareness concerning arts entrepreneurship programs nationally. Though institutions may be unaware of this nationwide phenomenon, they are all part of a new higher education effort to imbue entrepreneurship into arts training (and vice versa in some cases).

To develop a set of best practices, colleges and universities must come together to share materials and findings. Such collaborations can generate new research, curricula, effective classroom practices, program mentorship, shared student outcomes, common educational standards, etc.⁴ It should be noted that such communication positively impacts students as they directly reap the benefits of these innovations and matters of consensus. Therefore, I suggest that creating an awareness of extant arts entrepreneurship programs will strengthen the field.

As the data presented articulates, the types and levels of both programming and curricula are diverse. If we assume that these efforts generate a somewhat unique or contextual definition of “arts entrepreneurship,” gaining consensus on a definition of the term within the field may be difficult—at least in the short term. This lack of consensus impacts the data and analysis presented in this paper as the fluidity of the term appears to energize a fluidity of curricular and programmatic interpretations. Until the phenomenon of arts entrepreneurship education is more unified and understood, trying to define what it is or how to teach it restricts the field’s development.


⁴ See http://societyaee.org/reason-for-existance.html.
DATA ANALYSIS AND CATEGORIZATION

Qualifications for Inclusion

Because of both an amorphous definition and the dynamic nature of arts entrepreneurship as an emerging academic field, the metrics used for the housing inventory (appearing in the appendices) may not be applicable to similar examinations, though may provide a touchstone for future research. The boundaries for this project have nevertheless created a workable structure and space to explore current arts entrepreneurship curricular programming across the country.

For clarity and standardization of this data set and analysis, an institution's curricula needed to meet definite requirements. Stand-alone courses were required to address entrepreneurship and the arts in some way. This could be through terms as clear as the title “arts entrepreneurship” or through less succinct but equally valid indicators, such as course descriptions detailing how the course would prepare creative individuals to be entrepreneurial in an arts field. If a course was an entrepreneurship course offered to arts students, but without any arts-specific terminology in the course description—and not offered exclusively to arts students—the course was not listed.

However, if a certificate, minor, degree or other broader curricula included such an unspecified entrepreneurship course (defined in the sentence above) in addition to arts courses (whether discipline-specific or not), then the program as a whole was included in the data set, even though the course was not. Majors, minors and other programmatic offerings were included; this ranges from zero stand-alone arts entrepreneurship courses to seven in a single program. As educators seek to provide aspiring artists with ways to make an entrepreneurial living, different institutions use different models based on unique conditions at their institutions, within their disciplines among other variables. This variety of efforts and avenues has led to the diverse phenomenon we have today; the numerous branches and sub-genres of arts entrepreneurship curricular and programmatic offerings contributes to the difficulty in defining arts entrepreneurship education and—consequently—how to both describe and enumerate these efforts.

Along with excluding courses or other offerings based on their lack of specificity to arts entrepreneurship, some related, emerging fields of study were excluded based on their uniqueness and minimal overlap with the field of “arts entrepreneurship” as it presently appears. For example, both publishing and fashion boast entrepreneurship courses across the country, but these courses were not included in this study as there is only so much that a course targeted to performing or visual artists could offer these aspiring entrepreneurs and vice versa. Likewise, culinary arts and architecture courses were not considered. Though these

---

5 Throughout this article, I define “curricula” as a course, or sets of courses offered by colleges and universities in an area of specialization comprising a course of study. By extension, when considering “relevant curriculum,” I am referring to courses or sets of courses that provide arts entrepreneurship education. Further, I define “program” more broadly as consisting of a workshop, certificate, stand-alone course, academic degree to present “arts entrepreneurship” to higher education students in addition to its use in the ‘other’ category in the appendices.
artists would be welcomed in many arts entrepreneurship courses and programs, based on descriptions of current arts entrepreneurship courses, the specifics of the culinary arts and architectural industries would likely not be addressed in the classroom. Courses specific to more traditional arts disciplines (performing/fine arts or design) were considered as instructional as they appear targeted toward aspiring artists and overlap more than instruction in other areas.

Inventories

Research for this project began with updating two existing, outdated or informal inventories of arts entrepreneurship curricula around the country. The first task was to update links and reorganize offerings based on changes or revaluations. Next, the second phase of the project involved finding and investigating arts entrepreneurship curricula using publicly available online search engines as well as internal search engines within university websites. Because of the numerous ways of framing topics in and related to the field, locating some curricula were more elusive than others. Since no database of arts entrepreneurship curricula exists, searching the internet for relevant offerings was the first and most direct method of creating this inventory. Though it is likely that institutions offering arts entrepreneurship programming were not captured in the search, the results presented below (again) includes the colleges and universities whose curricula could be found online using the methodology described above.

Once found, relevant curricular offerings were categorized in two ways: 1) by curricular level (appendix B: “Curricula Inventory”) and 2) where the programs are academically/administratively housed (appendix C: “Housing Inventory”). In the Housing Inventory, there are seven broader categorizations: cross-campus, business school, fine arts discipline, arts management, conservatory and other. Cross-campus curricula appear differently at each institution, but can be cross-listed under multiple departments, housed within a college itself (independent of other departments) or offered by one department but available to students outside of that discipline. The unifying feature is that these offerings are available and marketed to the students across campus. Within each of these seven larger categories, cross-campus, fine arts and conservatory are broken down further. Both the arts-centered categories are divided by arts discipline; note that music houses the most arts entrepreneurship content and dance the least.

The second inventory categorizes curricula by their academic degree/level: graduate, baccalaureate, minor, certificate, program and dedicated course. In this inventory, as in the first, institutions can be listed twice or more if they have offerings that fit into different categories. Some colleges and universities have separate curricula in different departments,

---

6 The first published inventory appeared in Gary D. Beckman, “'Adventuring' Arts Entrepreneurship Curricula in Higher Education: An Examination of Present Efforts, Obstacles, and Best Practices,” Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society 37, no. 2 (2007): 87-112. Note that this inventory identified less than 40 institutions. This inventory was informally updated by Jonathan Gangi in 2013.
such as Duke University’s program in Chicago and a separate course on campus available through six different departments. Other institutions have courses and degrees or other curricula in the same department, school or college of the university. For example, Arizona State University offers an MFA program, a certificate, seven courses and a program dedicated to arts entrepreneurship in their School of Film, Dance and Theatre. On the other end of the spectrum, there are schools with one elective special topics course offered occasionally. Clearly, no model is universally applicable, which supports prior research noting the need for time in defining the field of arts entrepreneurship.\(^7\)

**FINDINGS**

**College and University Data**

**Curricular Variety**

As stated above, surveying higher education institutions around the country offering arts entrepreneurship education revealed enormous variation—from the framing of knowledge to the housing of curricula. Though a multitude of variables could be examined when comparing educational structures around the country, for clarity’s sake, this study considers only a few attributes. For example, two comparisons untouched by this study that may prove valuable are: the age of these programs and the tuition differences between institutions.

The first variable examined concerns the highest level of curricula at each school—from stand-alone courses to degree programs. For this analysis, graduate and undergraduate degree programs were grouped together, but the other four categories are the same as listed above and in Appendix B. Of the 96 schools identified, exactly half offered either a single course or courses not leading to a degree (see Figure 1). This demonstrates that arts entrepreneurship education 1) is predominately integrated in pre-existing disciplinary programs and areas (i.e.: not in dedicated or “arts entrepreneurship” programs or areas) and 2) the skills for “being” an arts entrepreneur are introduced amongst other training or as electives. (Note that the second point is a finer-grained distinction). Additionally, the high number of schools with single courses are certainly indicative of the field’s growth and have the potential to seed future curricular offerings in the future.

---

There are equal numbers of certificates, minors and degree programs. Eleven schools offer undergraduate degree programs, but only one also offers an academic minor. The school in question, the University of the Arts in Philadelphia, offers a BS or minor in Music Business, Entrepreneurship and Technology. A potential explanation for majors without minors is that the established degree programs are complex and interdisciplinary, with requirements from across departments or schools and/or intensive capstone projects. These programs may not translate easily to pared-down minors with less requirements.

Some arts entrepreneurship degree programs are exclusively centered on one art discipline and have entrepreneurship (or some other phrasing of the term, such as entrepreneurial studies) as a concentration, elective study or a track in a degree program. This sort of degree variety is not always possible within a minor, though it should be mentioned that at some institutions, students can create their own individual interdisciplinary course of study, which could generate a student-designed arts entrepreneurship curricula based on available and appropriate offerings.

---

8 The levels of curricula are ranked, lowest to highest: course, certificate program, minor, and degree. For each school, the highest level offering is recorded and represented in this graph. For example, a college or university with a degree could also have a course or other lower offering, but only the highest is recorded.

9 The degree program at Eastern Michigan University includes the completion of the entrepreneurship minor through the business school; however, as that minor is not specific to the arts, it is not analyzed as a stand-alone minor.
The 13 degree programs listed (including graduate degree programs) have a greater affinity to specific arts disciplines relative to programs, minors and certificates. For comparison, of the 17 academic minors, 10 are not arts discipline-specific. Of the 14 certificates, nine are broadly categorized as “arts entrepreneurship.” In both areas, over half the programs are not affiliated directly with one art form. However, in the degree programs, only one of the 12 is not tied to art, music or theatre. The 11 other degree programs are conglomerates, as they are mostly curricular collaborations between specific arts departments and the business school or other departments—not campus-wide curricula. Of the courses offered, many are independent and available cross-campus but in other cases, courses have been developed within music or arts programs that specifically fit the needs of these students and discipline.

The variety of courses and curricula offered related to arts entrepreneurship results from the diversity of schools and departments, as well as the interdisciplinary nature of the subject matter. As past researchers have ventured, the resulting cross-campus and collaborative programs in higher education can be very beneficial to arts entrepreneurs in training because they offer a holistic and flexible approach. This survey demonstrates that most arts entrepreneurship programs are indeed interdisciplinary (at least at some level) as evidenced by where they are housed, availability across campus or through the incorporation of courses from multiple departments. This frequency of holistic programming is a hopeful sign for those desiring an interdisciplinary approach to the field’s development; further research, however, will be needed to assess potential effectiveness.

We should note that curricular distinctions need not create divisions or disagreements over best structures or practices, but they do complicate the process of defining arts entrepreneurship education. The specificity of the degree programs tied to arts disciplines (contrasted with the numerous minors, certificates programs and freestanding courses) creates an environment full of potential ripe with information and diversity. Variations between curricula do not give rise to easily crafted universal definitions, though options abound for those seeking entrepreneurial training in the arts. Arts entrepreneurship is housed in various disciplines and draws from many fields; as such, any definition found must take this diversity into account.

Courses: Stand-alone or within Larger Curricula?

As detailed above, many arts entrepreneurship courses are not part of a larger curricula and there is a very low rate of arts entrepreneurship minors and degrees when compared to

---

10 See Dianne Welsh et al, “Responding to the Needs and Challenges of Arts Entrepreneurs: An Exploratory Study of Arts Entrepreneurship in North Carolina,” Artivate 3, no. 2 (2014): 21-37 recommending that cross-campus programs and other collaborative/diverse curricula are beneficial to aspiring arts entrepreneurs. It is interesting to note that a brief examination of arts entrepreneurship curricula in North Carolina, which reveals significant curricular diversity, both reflects the desires of some of the state’s emerging arts entrepreneurs (as identified in the interviews) and recent scholarship.
the number of colleges and universities nationally. The following analysis explores the frequency of dedicated arts entrepreneurship courses within broader arts entrepreneurship curricula. More concisely, the question is this: how often do larger, relevant curricula include arts entrepreneurship–specific courses?

Figure 1 shows that courses exist as stand-alone arts entrepreneurship offerings in half of the 96 schools examined. In analyzing courses within broader curricula, it is clearest to analyze each of the broader categories separately. To start, among the 13 undergraduate and graduate degree programs, only 3 incorporate specifically titled arts entrepreneurship courses: Syracuse University, Arizona State University and The University of the Arts. As stated above, this suggests the interdisciplinary nature of arts entrepreneurship education.

Given the higher probability of smaller programs being more holistically based, it is not surprising that curricula—not including degrees—are more likely to incorporate a course specific to arts entrepreneurship (either titled as such or strongly suggested in the course description). Of the 14 schools with minors, 9 include a course within this curricula. Three of 10 certificates offered include a dedicated course, displaying the second-lowest level of correspondence between curricula and specific courses. Seven of 13 of degree-conferring institutions offer programming that include an arts entrepreneurship course. Overall, there is a much higher number of specific courses within smaller curricula and degree programs. The number of degrees without dedicated courses should be included in a conversation about best practices, as the benefits of specific courses and interdisciplinary/cross-campus curricula appear important in smaller curricula.

Stand-alone courses were found in fields and disciplines from arts management to broader entrepreneurship education to the fine arts. Of the 48 schools with stand-alone courses, two have multiple housing, ten offer classes across campus, five house classes in the business school, 24 offer courses through fine arts colleges or departments, nine offer courses in non-fine arts colleges or departments, seven house courses in arts management curricula, two belong to a center or institute and six exist in conservatories. Again, there is overlap because of tiered categorizations. The concentration of courses in the fine arts parallels the prominence of arts discipline-specific degree programs. Within the fine arts, six schools’ courses fell under art and/or design, two schools had courses specific to dance, 16 housed courses in their music department and two schools’ courses fell in theatre departments. Music departments have a strong presence in the distribution of arts entrepreneurship

---

12 Note that two schools host two minors. Ohio State University does not have an arts entrepreneurship course in either. Salem College has one arts entrepreneurship course, which is required for both minors.
13 For the housing breakdown, this total is over 48 because some schools have multiple housing (e.g., Normandale’s course has multiple housings under cross-campus, business school, college and art and design) or are categorically layered (such as cross-campus and college, for the University of California at Berkeley.) In the fine arts curricula, the total is not 24 because colleges have multiple courses or are cross-listed.
curricula, with almost a third of the schools surveyed housing their curricula in music programs.¹⁴

Clustering of courses in and outside the arts requires us to reflect on the respective benefits of researching the movement as a whole versus analyzing subgroups.¹⁵ To create national educational standards, decision makers must consider differences in distribution within colleges and universities, as well as within sub-categories. As curricula continues to emerge and evolve, examining where new offerings emerge within schools, which persist or grow and what distinct/localized student outcomes appear will be helpful in establishing best practices. Ultimately, both meta-analysis and narrower lenses will be necessary to view the whole picture to optimize and understand the impact of arts entrepreneurship in higher education.

Interviews¹⁶

What is Arts Entrepreneurship?

As described above, defining arts entrepreneurship has proved difficult in both academic and non-academic environments due to the interdisciplinary, diverse and evolving aspects of the field. Some researchers propose supplementary or illustrative terms for the idea itself, while others focus on developing academic models.¹⁷ In discussing terminology, one interviewee stated that arts entrepreneurship can be most aptly described as a phenomenon and very clearly opposed the idea of the field being described as a discipline. Both broad analysis and curricular specifications are occurring across the country, but nevertheless, there is no consensus on a definition of arts entrepreneurship or how it should manifest in academia.

---

¹⁴ 31 of 96 schools.


¹⁶ Subheadings in this section are not necessarily the direct questions posed to interviewees. Note that the list of questions are found in Appendix A. Interviewees were asked between five and six questions each.

The responses of interviewees reflect this national condition when asked to define arts entrepreneurship. However, most answered with knowledge of possible responses, as well as references to research and frameworks, though they did not have a singular definition. Some seemed reluctant to provide a definition because they felt a lack of authority to dictate an answer and many of these respondents—and others in the group as a whole—noted that it was too soon to decide on one set definition. Another respondent stated that there might not be one definition. One tactic in defining the term was to describe the basic activity involved in starting an arts-related venture or using the arts as a means of transaction. Two similar answers described the phenomenon as entrepreneurship for artists or artists who act as entrepreneurs.

Almost every interviewee recognized and cited the variation in the field and lack of consensus. However, after noting this uncertainty, many optimistically continued that this lack of definition was not an inhibitor. Rather, educators mentioned the opportunities they possess in shaping the field. They cited the potential of impacting students’ and departments’ potential and best practices. Arts entrepreneurship, educators said, should be part of a holistic arts education. Educators have been creating and executing curricula without a formal definition by doing what works. Finding a definition will be important and influential, but its delay in emerging has not delayed many arts entrepreneurship educational efforts.

Who is an Arts Entrepreneur?

Researchers and casual observers have noted the reluctance of artists to adopt the term “entrepreneurship” to describe their activity, even when performing many entrepreneurial activities. Two artists interviewed (one of whom also teaches arts entrepreneurship) resist the term “arts entrepreneur,” but recognize and identify many of their actions as entrepreneurial. Noting the power of connotation and history in their answer, they also gave clear and applicable distinctions between their actions and those of an entrepreneur. The common division they drew centers on intention. Both described their entrepreneurial activities as necessary to sustain a main objective: their art. Entrepreneurs, they both delineated, are in the marketplace attempting to create income from art, not simply trying to fund their art. One artist cautioned that behaving entrepreneurially always directs time from the actual process of art-making; to “be” an entrepreneur requires sacrificing time from artistic objectives. However, it is also clear (as the interviewees admitted) that without these activities, there would be no funding for art-making. Consequently, entrepreneurial behaviors are somewhat inescapable when operating outside pre-existing structures such as companies and galleries.

When asked about their experience with arts entrepreneurship, multiple educators spoke about a transitional period from acting as an arts entrepreneur to adopting the terminology. Some came to the conclusion that the term best fit what they were doing through research, others through encounters with academics at conferences or in classes. One student-

---

turned-educator described her first encounter with the term arts entrepreneurship as being very negative; she reported feeling that this was not what she wanted to do. In the course of the class, however, she recognized the value of the ideas. The only person we spoke to who described setting out to pursue arts entrepreneurship was a recent graduate of the North Carolina State program intent on launching her dance wear business. Most others spoke of adopting the terminology after already behaving or witnessing others act entrepreneurially.

Speaking with these artists and educators about practicing arts entrepreneurship revealed one of the critical components needed in arts entrepreneurship education: combating the negative connotation of “entrepreneur” in the arts world. Although every student does not need to emerge an arts entrepreneur, arts entrepreneurship education should provide students the knowledge necessary to define their actions and career path without the burden of the historical (and seemingly negative) connotation, “entrepreneur.” Entrepreneurial activity can be essential to an artist’s success, thus, providing this education is crucial.19 Students do not need to adopt the term as these classes may be useful, despite feelings of reticence. Though using different terminology is possible, the field does not seem to be turning in that direction given the existing foundation of the term “arts entrepreneurship.” Instead, redirection of negative connotation and reconfiguration of the term appears the practical path.

The Role of the Business School

As the diverse structures of arts entrepreneurship curricula indicate, there is no formulaic approach to this course of study. Within this uncertainty is the question of how—and how much—“the business school” should be involved. Extensive research in entrepreneurship and other resources stem from business, but the arts have an entrepreneurial history as well.20 Additionally, each business school and arts entrepreneurship educational endeavor are different; therefore, one educational perspective’s answer will not suffice. There is a spectrum of opinions on involvement, ranging from viewing the business school as completely distinct to a potential ally. Interviewees’ responses fell along this gamut.

One clear answer expressed by multiple educators was that research from the business school, as well as guidance and other resources, can and should be vital in the field’s development. They expressed optimism about the wealth of knowledge, as well as the potential for advancement of the field through the use of existing literature and possible collaborations. Importantly, as it appears in the business school, “entrepreneurship” as a term

is not rigid and research continues to attempt to define this concept. As such, these explorations can occur concurrently with attempts to define arts entrepreneurship. Some interviewees spoke about past experiences with business colleagues who directed them to literature or provided resources. Others described how arts entrepreneurship training should draw from the best of business school teachings, especially from existing entrepreneurship courses.

In the next, less-certain category of interviewees on the question, respondents described a need for caution when drawing from the business school. These individuals recognized the value of existing business resources on entrepreneurship, but warned that care was necessary when attempting to apply practices; traditional entrepreneurship can only be applied to a point in the arts without confusing intention beyond the point of recognition. One educator spoke of the need for distinct entrepreneurial tactics and differing objectives in arts entrepreneurship. As described above, the word “entrepreneur” still evokes the idea of prioritizing profit over creation for many. Conversely, another respondent noted that arts entrepreneurship can and should also inform the business school, because arts programs have their own findings and resources to offer.

A compromise between these mindsets would recognize the benefit of using business school research to maintain the uniqueness of artistic pursuits without excluding resources. Moreover, collaboration between arts entrepreneurship programs and business schools can indeed be two-way streets, with each party gaining knowledge, teaching practices and new perspectives. Arts entrepreneurship education is a multifaceted pursuit. Entrepreneurship pedagogy from the business school can be a part of the overall make-up, just as many art forms inform arts pedagogy. Complexity is inherent in the structure of this phenomenon and adding resources will not impede clarification; instead, it will expedite the process of incorporating

---


22 See Daniel Y. Hamidi, Karl Wennberg and Henrik Berglund, “Creativity in Entrepreneurship Education,” *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 15, no. 2 (2008): 304–320 for an examination of creativity training benefits for entrepreneurs, which evidences the valuable exchange potential between arts and traditional entrepreneurship. Some schools—Wake Forest University, for example—include courses such as “Creativity and Innovation” in interdisciplinary entrepreneurship training.
best practices and teaching into a successful model. As one educator and artist described: while the field is wrestling with terminology, the business school and existing entrepreneurship research should be involved in the conversation. She added that the terms are not fixed and that we must deal with the preexisting (and still somewhat intangible) building blocks of arts and entrepreneurship to clarify this relatively newer idea.

Why do you Teach Arts Entrepreneurship?

In describing both ideal goals of arts entrepreneurship education and challenges facing arts entrepreneurs today, interviewees mentioned the confidence levels of students. Many agreed that a primary goal for arts entrepreneurship education should be for students and aspiring entrepreneurs to enter the workforce feeling capable. Linda Essig’s 2014 survey of four arts incubator programs in universities also cites self-efficacy as a primary goal for students engaged in these opportunities. Likewise, Self-efficacy is a concern of traditional entrepreneurship education. The challenge in the identification and acceptance of terminology is described above; in identifying goals of arts entrepreneurship education, interviewees described addressing the difficulties faced by artists, including confidence in their abilities.

Besides inspiring confidence in students, many wished to pass on their entrepreneurial-based knowledge and experience to students. Many of the same educators who described gradually adopting the term “arts entrepreneur” also noted that one of their key goals in educating students is to pass on lessons that they learned in the field. As some phrased this idea, they desire to help students avoid mistakes and learn from their instructor’s experience. Others described wishing they had had a mentor or professor to guide them, providing practical skills while they were still in school. The concordance between interviewees in this regard reveals a part of the growth of arts entrepreneurship. Artists in the field acquire certain skills to make a living and then want to pass on this knowledge to students because they see a void in education. This generous mindset is helping fuel the growth of arts entrepreneurship education.


25 For example, see Rachel S. Shinnar, Dan K. Hsu and Benjamin C. Powell, “Self-efficacy, Entrepreneurial Intentions, and Gender: Assessing the Impact of Entrepreneurship Education Longitudinally,” The International Journal of Management Education 12, no. 3 (2014): 561-570 as one of many common goal analysis examples.
As these individual responses indicate, each person studying, practicing and teaching arts entrepreneurship has a distinct story and perspective. Employing one definition and one educational model would be difficult and possibly counterproductive. The ability to act independently is essential for an entrepreneur; why would the educational structure be uniform? Focusing on national standards and definitions is helpful to some degree because education should be as effective as possible. However, if standardization impinges on individuality of instruction or learning, then this regulation will have done more harm than good.

CONCLUSION

A major strength of arts entrepreneurship training is that it fulfills an existing need. Interviewees stated that they became educators because they want to train others to successfully make a living with their art. Respondents likewise described becoming entrepreneurs out of necessity and adopting the terminology later. These educators are trying to fill in gaps they witnessed in their own training and students are taking advantage. Students clearly want resources in this area and establishing arts entrepreneurship programs across the country will help the next classes of aspiring artists and creative minds.

In areas from industries to academic fields, creating a central body is an important step in garnering recognition and creating common goals. The formation of the Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education marks a conscious leveraging of opportunity and a chance to formalize the intention and goals of this phenomenon. Arts entrepreneurship offerings are spreading across the country and may continue to grow. To harness this potential and formulate best practices, communicating not only across schools but also across departments will be important, as will comparing strategies of educators at similar schools. The Society can facilitate these sorts of conversations, as can individual members, by reaching out to others in or outside the organization.

This research has briefly analyzed the variety of curricula across colleges and universities dedicated to arts entrepreneurship. Findings presented in this study have only scratched the surface, Ideally, others will take this as a call to action for further research comparing curricula, whether in the distribution of courses and degrees or in analyzing actual content of these educational offerings. The expansion of arts entrepreneurship education is very exciting—as is the chance to harness the momentum behind the field to build the best curricula possible.
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Appendix A: Interview Questions

- How would you define arts entrepreneurship?
- (Faculty only) What draws your students to your classes?
- (Faculty only) Why do you teach arts entrepreneurship?
- (Students only) What draws you to arts entrepreneurship classes?
- (Students only) What do you want out of the classes?
- (Artists only) Why/How do you practice arts entrepreneurship?
- (Artists only) What would you expect or want from an arts entrepreneurship education?
- Do you feel the field is growing? Do you see more demand, more programs popping up?
- What should the role of the business school be in arts entrepreneurship education?
- What advice would you give to someone interested in entering the field?
- What are some of the challenges facing arts entrepreneurs today?
- What makes arts entrepreneurship unique?
## Appendix B: Curricula Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMDA Los Angeles</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Colleges of the Midwest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berklee College of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Piedmont Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman School of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flathead Valley Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haywood Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiram College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussian School of Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judson University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juilliard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan School of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millikin University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State University, Mankato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Conservatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandale Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase College, SUNY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringling College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem College</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Nevada College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Missouri State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Methodist University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Technical Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of the Arts</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado at Boulder</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore County</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Amherst</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Pembroke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina School of the Arts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson State University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Community College</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Piedmont College</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Community College</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of the Arts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit College</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bard College</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bard College</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMDA Los Angeles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C: Housing Inventory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman School of Music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire State College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flathead Valley Community College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussian School of Art</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan School of Music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan School of Performing Arts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Community College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millikin University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juilliard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juilliard University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Art or Design</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Film Arts</td>
<td>Fine Art Education</td>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>Cross-Campus College</td>
<td>Arts Institute</td>
<td>College of Fine Arts</td>
<td>Conservatory</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State University, Mankato</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission College</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Conservatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Dade College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners College of Design of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>Multiple-Housing</td>
<td>Cross-Campus</td>
<td>Fine-Arts</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Arts Management</td>
<td>Conservatory</td>
<td>Other Art or Design</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Fine-Arts</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Arts Management</td>
<td>Conservatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore County</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Pembroke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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