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1 Cultural entrepreneurship

Cultural entrepreneurship (DiMaggio, 1982) is seen as the driving force behind the dynamics of the cultural and creative industries, which epitomise the emphasis on innovation and creativity in contemporary, Western societies (e.g., Caves, 2000; Florida, 2012; Hirsch, 1972, 2000; Leadbeater and Oakley, 1999). According to policy experts, cultural entrepreneurs are vital for economic development and wealth creation. Their presence and activities spill-over and boost the capacity for innovation in other industries (e.g., UNESCO/UNDP, 2013; European Parliament Committee on Culture and Education, 2010). Others describe cultural entrepreneurs and the creative industries as pioneers and trend setters of entrepreneurial practice (e.g., Lampel and Germain, 2016). The ideas of creative destruction and creative renewal are not only characteristic of cultural products and services but also of the organisational forms and structures (e.g., DeFillippi et al., 2007; Jones, 2010; Konrad, 2013). At the same time, cultural entrepreneurship might also foreshadow darker aspects of future self-employment as we can see in notions such as the enterprising self or the freelancer, who often work under precarious conditions (e.g., Lampel and Germain, 2016).

This special issue of “cultural entrepreneurship” intends to take stock of current trends and issues in the field of cultural entrepreneurship. Given the specific challenges of entrepreneurship in the creative industries compared to other industries (e.g., Lampel
et al., 2000; Townley et al., 2009) and the creative industries’ pioneering role in innovation and creativity, the special issue was particularly interested in highlighting what the field of entrepreneurship can learn from studying cultural entrepreneurship, including questions of business model, venture creation, and longevity.

Our focus in this special issue reflects what Gehman and Soublière (2017) have termed cultural entrepreneurship 1.0. Accordingly, culture is understood as “a sector or set of [cultural] industries” and cultural entrepreneurship a form of entrepreneurship “taking place within this domain” (p.64, emphasis in original). However, this is but one of several different understandings of cultural entrepreneurship. To help grasp the variety of meanings and opportunities for research that are associated with the term, we briefly outline four research perspectives that we consider noteworthy (albeit not exhaustive) before summarising the five papers selected by our reviewers for this special issue.

2 Perspectives on cultural entrepreneurship

The intersection of culture and entrepreneurship holds ample opportunities for exploring contemporary issues, leading to a variety of research questions and perspectives. The first perspective considers entrepreneurship in a particular culture, namely the cultural or creative industries (Hirsch, 1972, 2000). It outlines the challenges and opportunities that entrepreneurs face in a context where the focus of value creation is on “non-material goods that fulfill aesthetic rather than utilitarian functions” [Hirsch, (1972), p.639]. Originating in DiMaggio’s (1982) use of the term cultural entrepreneurship, this perspective stresses the making of culture (Gehman and Soublière, 2017) by highlighting the creation of new institutions or new products in the cultural sphere (Swedberg, 2006). As mentioned above, entrepreneurship is cultural because it takes place within the domain of cultural industries (Gehman and Soublière, 2017; for overview see e.g., Jones et al., 2016; Lampel and Germain, 2016).

A second perspective, likewise referred to as cultural entrepreneurship, highlights the use of cultural resources, toolkits, frames or cultural values by entrepreneurs – independent of industry. Culture is seen as a resource [Swidler, 1986 – for overview see Giorgi et al. (2015)] that enables entrepreneurs to act successfully. For example, Lounsbury and Glynn (2001) outline how the cultural practice of storytelling helps entrepreneurs to create a new venture identity, gain legitimacy, and secure resource acquisition. According to this perspective, entrepreneurs deploy (Gehman and Soublière, 2017) or make use of culture in their quest to become successful cultural operators (Überbacher et al., 2015).

A third perspective takes a more critical stance and considers the culture of entrepreneurship in contemporary capitalism (e.g., Marttila, 2013; Tedmanson et al., 2012), including the neoliberal imperative for artists to become culturepreneurs (e.g., McRobbie, 2002a, 2002b; Oakley, 2009, 2014). Here the focus is on how the necessity to be enterprising and make profits affects the identity of cultural entrepreneurs (e.g., Coulson, 2012; Loacker, 2013; Taylor and Littleton, 2012, 2013).

The fourth perspective entails research that applies a cultural lens to the phenomenon of entrepreneurship. Instead of viewing entrepreneurship from an economic or financial perspective, this approach highlights entrepreneurship’s cultural relevance, its cultural embeddedness as well as the cultural practices and meanings that entrepreneurs produce, (e.g., Hjorth and Steyaert, 2004, 2009; Steyaert and Hjorth, 2003, 2006), including the
entrepreneurial or social nature of creativity and the parallel between being an artist and being an entrepreneur (e.g., Hjorth and Holt, 2016). Here, entrepreneurship is not just situated in cultural industries or deploying cultural resources; instead, entrepreneurship is a cultural process working through language, representation and meaning.

3 The papers in the special issue

While the majority of our selected papers build on the first research perspective, considering entrepreneurship in a particular culture, the opening paper by Naudin (‘Cultural entrepreneurs: identity and ‘becoming’ a cultural entrepreneur’) also includes elements of the third and fourth perspectives by combining literature from entrepreneurship studies and cultural policy studies to offer an interdisciplinary account of the process of becoming an entrepreneur in the context of cultural work. Empirically, Naudin reconstructs the lived experiences and inherent tensions of constructing an identity as cultural entrepreneur. She shows that while cultural workers are aware of the pitfalls of being an entrepreneur, they remain positive about becoming one because they are able to appropriate ideas from entrepreneurship (such as autonomy) without compromising other ethical, artistic or creative objectives. Overall, while some of the tensions described by Naudin are linked to the specificity of cultural work, others have more universal implications for the study of entrepreneurship in that they challenge existing, often rather narrow, definitions of the entrepreneur.

The second paper by Jagiello (‘Cultural entrepreneurship in the arts sector: a case study of a ‘curatepreneur’’) addresses cultural entrepreneurship in the arts and culture sector by outlining creative business models that capture the visionary, strategic, and creative activity of entrepreneurs of cultural enterprises. The paper offers a reflective case study approach based on Jagiello’s own practice, highlighting the applicability of business models to curatorial work.

The third paper by Lindqvist (‘Art ventures as hybrid organisations: tensions and conflicts relating to organisational identity’) employs institutional logics theory to outline the hybrid nature of art ventures and the tensions that differing logics can create for organisational identities in the creative industries. Departing from the question what drives the dynamics of entrepreneurship in the arts field, Lindqvist presents three cases of tensions and conflicts with respect to priorities, goals and strategies in the stabilisation phase. She discusses the differences and similarities between art and other ventures and concludes that while growth constitutes a strong success indicator of traditional commercial ventures, in a hybrid field like art and culture, stabilisation seems to be the biggest challenge.

Sharing the interest in the ‘balancing acts’ of entrepreneurship and management in creative industries (Lampel et al., 2000) the fourth paper by Musial (‘Managing creative individuals via freedom and control in film-making companies’) considers how creative ventures can be further stabilised and managed. By drawing on motivational theory, Musial argues for the necessity of combining creative freedom with managerial control when managing creative individuals in creative companies. She thus follows a research tradition that highlights the appropriateness of hybrid forms of management in the creative industries (e.g., Cohendet and Simon, 2007; Endrissat et al., 2016). While the paper tries to add to this research by linking it to career development and the concept of
boundaryless career in particular, it does not fully outline its implications for entrepreneurship – or intrapreneurship – in creative industries.

The fifth paper, an essay by Paterson (‘Early independent production entrepreneurs in UK television: pioneering agents of neoliberal intervention’), considers the opportunities and entrepreneurial aspirations of independent television producers in the UK in the 1990s. This paper, similar to the first paper by Naudin, incorporates elements of the first research perspective on cultural entrepreneurship but links it with a more critical account of the culture of enterprise in contemporary society. Empirically, Paterson follows those entrepreneurs over an extended period of time to understand their experiences in managing their ventures, the tensions, as well as frustrations that emerged when they negotiated an evolving fitness landscape. Paterson links micro-level individual accounts of entrepreneurial experiences to broader macro-level changes in the broadcasting sector. Accordingly, many of the early independent production entrepreneurs have ceased to exist and the ones that were able to establish and stabilise themselves depend on state support to secure their existence.

Together, the five papers provide a glimpse of the research possibilities in the field of cultural entrepreneurship. As a whole, they can be read as different moments in the process and life-cycle of entrepreneurship: While Naudin pays attention to how artists engage in identity work to become cultural entrepreneurs, Jagiello considers creative business models to develop and grow an artistic venture, and Lindqvist focuses on the challenges of stabilising an art venture. In the fourth paper, Musial continues the quest for stabilising art ventures by asking how creative employees can be best managed and Paterson closes the cycle by considering the fierce competition and difficult conditions for many entrepreneurs in the independent broadcast production sector, making the link to government policies and regulations that either hinder or enable entrepreneurial activities in the creative industries.

4 Learning from cultural entrepreneurship

In the final piece of this special issue, the Editorial Epilogue, we engage in a conversation with Daniel Hjorth, Professor of Entrepreneurship at the Department of Management, Politics and Philosophy at Copenhagen Business School. Hjorth is among the pioneering founders of the European School of Entrepreneurship Research. He has put forth a ‘novel reading of entrepreneurship’ (Hjorth, 2003, 2005), focusing on process and transformation and advocating a multi-disciplinary approach to entrepreneurship (see above the fourth perspective on cultural entrepreneurship). In our conversation with him, Professor Hjorth takes a reflective stance on the topic of cultural entrepreneurship and highlights the relationship between entrepreneurship and creativity, amongst other topics. We also address the question that initially motivated this special issue, namely: what can the field of entrepreneurship learn from studying cultural entrepreneurship?

We hope that this special issue will provide fertile ground for discussion and debate. The selected papers cover a broad array of research questions that invite us to reconsider established knowledge and concepts. As we know from experience, it is not necessarily through agreement – but often through disagreement – that good conversations and new ideas develop. In that sense, we hope that this special issue will inspire scholars and practitioners alike to engage in good conversations and to explore the potential of cultural entrepreneurship in its multiple meanings and consequences.
We thank all the authors who submitted their work to this special issue and express our gratitude to the reviewers who dedicated their time and effort to bring together an entrepreneurial issue of *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*.
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