



OpenAIR@RGU

The Open Access Institutional Repository at Robert Gordon University

<http://openair.rgu.ac.uk>

This is an author produced version of a paper published in

International Journal of Education Through Art (ISSN 1743-5234)

This version may not include final proof corrections and does not include published layout or pagination.

Citation Details

Citation for the version of the work held in 'OpenAIR@RGU':

KEARNEY, G. and HARRIS, P., 2013. Supporting the creative industries: the rationale for an exchange of thinking between the art and business schools. Available from *OpenAIR@RGU*. [online]. Available from: <http://openair.rgu.ac.uk>

Citation for the publisher's version:

KEARNEY, G. and HARRIS, P., 2013. Supporting the creative industries: the rationale for an exchange of thinking between the art and business schools. *International Journal of Education Through Art*, 9 (3), pp. 311-326.

Copyright

Items in 'OpenAIR@RGU', Robert Gordon University Open Access Institutional Repository, are protected by copyright and intellectual property law. If you believe that any material held in 'OpenAIR@RGU' infringes copyright, please contact openair-help@rgu.ac.uk with details. The item will be removed from the repository while the claim is investigated.

**Supporting the Creative Industries: The Rationale for an Exchange of Thinking
between the Art and Business Schools**

Gemma Kearney

Gray's School of Art, Robert Gordon University

Garthdee Road, Aberdeen

AB10 7QD

Email: g.kearney@rgu.ac.uk

Paul Harris

Gray's School of Art, Robert Gordon University

Garthdee Road, Aberdeen

AB10 7QD

Email: p.harris@rgu.ac.uk

Abstract: *Increasing interest in the concept of the 'Creative Industries' with emphasis upon the 'industry' aspect, presents questions as to how Art Schools can best prepare students. Indeed the industrial aspect encourages consideration of business and entrepreneurship and by adopting a conceptual approach to draw together different strands of literature from art, design, business and entrepreneurship research, this paper explores the issues and challenges in supporting students in a creative context. Areas where an exchange of thinking could occur between the Art and Business Schools are identified and where the cross-fertilisation of ideas and teaching practices could offer new methods to support students to engage in the Creative Industries. Barriers remain in teaching entrepreneurship, but viewing it as a process, utilising the Theory of Effectuation and drawing attention to the prevalence of entrepreneurial teams proffers insights.*

Key words: Creative Industries, Art School, Entrepreneurship, Scotland.

Biographical Notes: Dr Gemma Kearney is a Design in Action Research Fellow at Gray's School of Art in Robert Gordon University. Design in Action is a knowledge exchange hub, funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, which aims to build economic capacity

through design-led innovation. Gemma's research interests include entrepreneurship, innovation and the use of design in business practices.

Professor Paul Harris is Head of Gray's School of Art at the Robert Gordon University in Aberdeen. In 2002, Paul became Professor of Screen Media and subsequently Creative Director of the Institute of Arts, Media and Computer Games at the University of Abertay Dundee and established the National Centre for Excellence in Computer Games Education. Paul has championed the games industry, delivering presentations and addresses in both Holyrood and Westminster, and giving keynote addresses at many national and international conferences.

Introduction

Growing interest in the concept of the Creative Industries, their importance in the economy and the crucial role of the Art School in the sector, provides impetus to examine how this impacts upon the School's approach in preparing students. Whilst it may be controversial to view creative endeavours as an 'industry' it nevertheless shifts into focus the commercial aspect that may accompany creative students' future endeavours. This poses questions as to how students can best be prepared and turns attention to the concept of entrepreneurship as many students will act entrepreneurially to support their creative practices. However, teaching entrepreneurship is a relatively new practice even in its traditional home in the Business School. Although courses have been growing since the 1980s (Jack and Anderson, 1999) there is still no universal pedagogy for teaching entrepreneurship (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008). Thus this conceptual paper aims to draw together different strands of the literature to enable an exchange of thinking between the Business and Art Schools to facilitate the cross-fertilisation of ideas and practices to help teach entrepreneurship and prepare students to enter the Creative Industries.

The Concept of the Creative Industries

It was during the late 1990's that the UK government introduced the phrase 'Creative Industries' defining them as *'those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property'* (DCMS, 1998: 3). The Creative Industries are commonly regarded to include the following sectors: advertising, architecture,

art and antiques, crafts, design, fashion, film, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software, and television and radio (*ibid*) and are recognised as a key sector in knowledge-based economies (Henry and Johnston, 2005). For instance, Scotland is a prime example and here recent research found that the Arts and Creative Industries sector, directly employed 84,400 people in 2010 and the Gross Value Added for the sector was £3.2 billion (DC Research, 2012). Furthermore the report highlighted the difficulty in accurately identifying the scale of self-employment and sole traders in the sector but noted that these activities are more common in the Arts and Creative Industries than in other sectors (*ibid*). Thus whilst the figures reported are substantial in themselves, in practice, they may actually be higher given the difficulty in capturing activity in the sector utilising traditional metrics.

Therefore given the entrepreneurial nature of the Creative Industries, they may be particularly important in the economies they inhabit. Again Scotland demonstrates this clearly because here traditionally across the whole economy participation in entrepreneurship has been lacking. For instance, the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor survey in 2011, found that of the Total Early-Stage Entrepreneurial Activity across twenty-three innovation driven nations, Scotland ranked in the third quartile with a rate of just over 6 percent compared to countries such as Australia and the US, where rates were over 10 and 12 percent, respectively (Levie, 2012). Hence any increase in the number of entrepreneurs in the Creative Industries would be very beneficial and may help Scotland to close the entrepreneurial gap with other countries.

However, there are concerns with the use of the term 'industry' to describe the sector. In lay terms it conjures up images of heavy industry or automated production lines which are far from the reality of the production methods of creative practitioners. Moreover creative endeavours aim to create novelty but the term 'industry' implies a value chain that has been organised and integrated to produce functional products with values that are known (O'Connor, 2009). Hence 'industry' is a difficult term and may be a misnomer in the creative sector. Much has also been written about the change in terminology from the 'Cultural Industries' to the 'Creative Industries' with the shift heralding an increased focus on the sector's potential for economic growth (Oakley, 2009) and the possibility of job creation and export earnings in the global economy (Garnham, 2005). Indeed there are concerns that the terminology 'Creative Industries' changes the focus from a cultural one to an economic one (Banks and O'Connor, 2009; O'Connor, 2009). This is problematic because it implies that the sector's only function is to contribute to the economy when in fact it is much broader than this contributing to areas such as the collective good and social cohesion.

The broader remit of the Creative Industries has been recognised with organisations such as UNCTAD noting that as well as being one of the most dynamic emerging sectors of world trade '*the interface among creativity, culture, economics and technology, as expressed in the ability to create and circulate intellectual capital, has the potential to generate income, jobs and export earnings while at the same time contributing to social inclusion, cultural diversity and human development*' (2008: 333). It is this interface between creativity, culture and economics and how the Art School can best support students to engage in this broad sector that this paper will focus upon. Considering these issues is particularly timely due to the current economic climate and time of austerity with the accompanying economic pressures on

the creative sector. Here thinking in terms of entrepreneurship may offer a different pathway into the economy and help to overcome the difficulties associated with the term 'industry'.

The Role of the Art School

As the nexus between creative students and the wider creative economy the Art School is in a unique position. Brown (2005) notes the vital role that Higher Education plays in maintaining the creativity base through encouraging new talent which in turn, brings new ideas and innovations to industry. Indeed Art Schools are a crucial part of the Creative Industries with education and industry existing together in a '*virtuous cycle*' (Matheson, 2006: 62). In addition to the taught curriculum Higher Education also provides an informal context which has allowed creative diversity and experiments in cultural productions to flourish (Banks and Hesmondhalgh, 2009). Thus there is an essential relationship between Higher Education and the Creative Industries with the Art School helping to foster and produce the next generation of creative talent. Upon graduating from the Art School students will work in a wide variety of different contexts and it is necessary for the Art School to be cognisant of the changes that are taking place in the wider environment including the Creative Industries, in order to best prepare students for whichever path they follow.

At the organisational level there are changes occurring, for instance in Arts organisations, particularly those which have traditionally received grant funding. In reviewing government funding of the Arts, primarily in Australia but also in the UK and the US, Caust (2003) notes how, for example, upon receiving grant funding the performance of Arts organisations may

be judged by economic criteria such as increasing revenues, rather than artistic criteria and producing outstanding work, consequently the dominant values are market driven in nature. Changes in the funding structures, terminology and application processes with the associated requirements for materials such as business plans and marketing plans, can leave art practitioners isolated unless they can learn the new language and adhere to the dominant culture (Caust, 2003). These changes mean that Arts organisations are required to adopt a stronger business focus and a more economic outlook in order to gain support. Again this may intensify due to the current economic climate and increased competition for fewer funding sources. This places pressure and urgency upon Arts organisations to acquire entrepreneurial skills and behave more akin to businesses.

These changes are also replicated at the individual level. Given the changes in the structure of work, notably increased opportunities albeit with more uncertainty, Henry *et al.* (2005a) argue that there is a greater need than ever for people to possess entrepreneurial skills and abilities with corresponding requirements for entrepreneurship education. Although Henry *et al.* (2005a) are referring to all sectors, the need for entrepreneurship education to enable creative students to engage in the Creative Industries may be particularly important. For instance, Brown (2005) drew attention to the difficulties those working in the Arts encountered, citing the increased pressures in the sector with more complex funding mechanisms, greater risk and very little training, coupled with a lack of stable employment. Working in the Creative Industries in general, also involves challenges in securing favourable pay, hours, terms and conditions combined with job instability and insecurity (Banks and Hesmondhalgh, 2009). Whilst creatives such as artists, may not set out to create a business, they may find themselves in a position where they must do so in order to fund their practice

and consequently require a broad set of commercial skills (Brown, 2005). However, research into the training and learning undertaken by cultural entrepreneurs, found that though Higher Education had a major influence on the thinking that entrepreneurs brought to their businesses in terms of grounding and inspiration, the knowledge and skills for operating their business were learnt in the workplace itself (Raffo *et al.*, 2000).

Hence perhaps more can be done to prepare students for the economic realities of working in the sector and equip them with the necessary skills. There have been calls for further research into the interface between Higher Education and the Creative Industries and how best to prepare graduates (Brown, 2005) and the government has issued a challenge to academia to *'build on their success in equipping students with the skills they need to make the most effective contribution they can to the creative economy'* (DCMS, 2008: 25). Thus there is a clear mandate to explore in more depth how the Art School can best prepare students for their future endeavours.

Although operating in a commercial environment may be an unwelcome necessity for some there are parallels between art and entrepreneurship which are often overlooked. In discussing the creation of new organisations, Anderson (2000) adopts the analogy of an art form for entrepreneurship, as the entrepreneur has a blank canvas on which to develop their creation. Indeed Anderson and Jack (2008) emphasise the art of entrepreneurship and the creative process entailed and the diverse and varied roles the entrepreneur must undertake. They provide a typology of the four sets of skills required, noting that entrepreneurs are required at different times in their venture and to different extents, to act as the professional,

technician, artisan and artist. These four typologies, with the professional referring to the analysis and application of judgement from the knowledge base, the technician the skilled application of knowledge, the artisan the skill and task involvement and the artist the creativity and perception required, demonstrate the diverse skill set of entrepreneurs (Anderson and Jack, 2008). Thus the entrepreneurial process has parallels with the creative process and as such should not be an anathema to creative students. In fact, Matheson (2006) notes that those working in the Creative Industries are often recognised as innovative entrepreneurs themselves. Attention will now turn to the issues encountered in teaching entrepreneurship.

Problems in Teaching Entrepreneurship

To date the Art School has taken steps to include entrepreneurship in the curriculum. However, previous research has identified problems in doing so. One difficulty was the lack of qualified mentors and lecturers to teach the subject which led to increased pressure on a small number of guest lecturers (Carey and Naudin, 2006). This difficulty was further compounded by the lack of suitable text books (*ibid*). Moreover generic enterprise teaching material was not relevant (Brown, 2005) and traditional business courses may not appeal to art students (Carey and Naudin, 2006). Hence existing methods of teaching entrepreneurship may not suffice for teaching creative students. In fact, Carey and Naudin (2006) noted that Art School educators, discussed if it should be Art or Business Schools who teach the subject. Merely questioning if teaching entrepreneurship should be taught by the Business School may underestimate the problem and seeking a ready made model to import may be too simplistic. The situation is more complex than this and there may be epistemological reasons

for this. Essentially the Art and Business Schools have two different notions of teaching and to fully understand the problem the different types of models that are used to teach in each School must be considered.

Winters (2011) notes the unique educational approach in Art and Design whereby students play a key role in determining their own learning. The studio-based teaching model is a flexible environment where students are expected to generate creative projects and identify their own areas of research (*ibid*). Consequently Art students self-direct their learning to a large extent and this type of individual learning is based on discussions leading to ideas being incubated and developed. In effect students must come up with ideas for the teaching process to begin. This method of teaching is also closely aligned to the expert-pupil model where students learn from an established expert. However, this model can have its limitations as learning may be bound by the expert's field of knowledge and experience. It may also lead to a diluted model of working whereby the student might be overly influenced by one expert's work potentially causing elements of replication. The lack of theoretical tools may also limit the student's application of knowledge to different situations. Whilst it is accepted that in the discipline there is no single correct answer and a multiplicity of vantage points and structures can be used to consider work (Winters, 2011) perhaps a broader model of teaching could help to further develop students' learning and here meta-level thinking could be particularly beneficial. Notably though the emphasis upon the student producing ideas and the celebration of ideas in the Art and Design teaching model has resonance with the process of entrepreneurship and provides a pathway in which an exchange of thinking can occur.

In contrast to the Art School, the Business School has traditionally taught through precise transferable models however, this approach has also been critiqued. As Binks *et al.* posit '*Many believe that higher education in general, and the business school in particular, are at a crossroads. There is growing sentiment that universities and business schools no longer offer programmes and environments that provide the right training for today's business world*' (2006: 1). This critique recognises that thinking in the Business School needs to shift and indeed Binks *et al.* (2006) argue that teaching entrepreneurship is a mechanism to do this, as it provides an opportunity to develop a new model.

Nonetheless despite the growing number of entrepreneurship courses both worldwide (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008) and in the UK (Binks *et al.*, 2006) there exists a number of challenges in teaching entrepreneurship. In fact '*numerous ontological, theoretical, pedagogical and practical challenges remain*' in teaching entrepreneurship (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008: 570). One reason may be that the concept of entrepreneurship is confusing and the lack of shared understanding makes it difficult to teach. Indeed '*the woolliness of the entrepreneurial concept*' has led to it becoming an overused concept with a variety of meanings from which people pick and choose (Jack and Anderson, 1999: 115). Academic research into entrepreneurship is also a relatively recent phenomenon and it is still a young field (Davidsson and Wiklund, 2001; Low, 2001). There are also ongoing difficulties in agreeing terminology and common definitions (Low and MacMillan, 1998; Brazeal and Herbert, 1999) whereby entrepreneurship scholars are unable to even agree upon a common definition for the very terms 'entrepreneur' and 'entrepreneurship' (Gartner, 1990; Bygrave and Hofer, 1991; Shaver and Scott, 1991; Gartner *et al.*, 1992; Amit *et al.*, 1993; Sarri and Trihopoulou, 2005). The difficulty in defining the entrepreneur reflects the fact that

entrepreneurs are not a homogeneous group (Gartner, 1985; Bhide, 1994) and entrepreneurs and the firms they create differ enormously (Gartner, 1985).

In his seminal text, Schumpeter (1934) regarded the entrepreneur as the creative destructor. Further to Schumpeter's work, scholars aimed to increase their understanding of the entrepreneur by attempting to isolate common personality characteristics that entrepreneurs shared. However, attempts to build a profile of the characteristics of an entrepreneur were unsuccessful and widely critiqued (Chell, 1985; Gartner, 1985; Low and MacMillan, 1988; Shaver and Scott, 1991; Davidsson and Wiklund, 2001; Mitchell *et al.*, 2002). The crux of the problem was summarised by Bhide who rejected the notion of an entrepreneurial profile stating that '*successful founders can be gregarious or taciturn, analytical or intuitive, good or terrible with details, risk adverse or thrill seeking. They can be delegators or control freaks, pillars of the community or outsiders*' (1994: 152). In short, entrepreneurs are highly diverse. A further problem with defining the entrepreneur on the basis of their traits is that any traits associated with successful entrepreneurs may be the product of their entrepreneurial experience rather than their innate characteristics (Amit *et al.*, 1993).

Thus Gartner (1988) advocated that the focus of entrepreneurship research ought to be on the process of how a new organisation is established rather than on the characteristics of the entrepreneur which may evolve during the process. To help bring clarity to the field of research, Gartner (1988) conceptualised entrepreneurship as the creation of new organisations. Similarly Bruyat and Julien (2000) consider anyone who creates a new innovation or organisation that is, the person without whom the value would not have been

created, to be an entrepreneur. Focusing on how a new organisation is established, rather than the characteristics of the entrepreneurs themselves, helps to clarify the term and informs understanding of how it can be taught. As Kuratko summarises '*It is becoming clear that entrepreneurship, or certain facets of it, can be taught. Business educators and professionals have evolved beyond the myth that entrepreneurs are born, not made*' (2005: 580).

However the teaching of entrepreneurship remains a relatively young field which only emerged as a subject in the 1970's (Kuratko, 2005) with the number of courses growing since the 1980's (Jack and Anderson, 1999). Consequently knowledge and research on teaching entrepreneurship remains underdeveloped (Kirby, 2004) and problems in teaching entrepreneurship have been encountered. Upon analysing fifty enterprise programmes in four countries, at all levels of the education system including Higher Education, Hytti and O'Gorman (2004) noted the requirement for appropriately trained trainers and recommended in career development for teachers. Moreover, there is little uniformity in entrepreneurship education (Henry *et al.*, 2005b). In Higher Education, Matlay (2005) notes that an overwhelming proportion of entrepreneurship education is delivered in Business Schools however, there remains disparities in the quality of the courses, design of the curriculum and delivery and assessment mechanisms. In fact in a ten year study of entrepreneurship education in forty universities in the UK, it was apparent that although the vast majority of courses were delivered by Business Schools, there was no significant commonality in the conceptual approach to entrepreneurship education with each university deciding upon its own definition of what constituted entrepreneurship education (Matlay and Carey, 2007). Hence teaching entrepreneurship is still developing in the Business School and the traditional teaching model has also been critiqued. In Figure One, Gibb (1996) compares the

conventional teaching approach with a suggested enterprising approach which may be more beneficial:

Figure One: Conventional and Enterprising Teaching Approaches

Conventional Approach	Enterprising Approach
Major focus on content	Major focus on process delivery
Led and dominated by teacher	Ownership of learning by participant
Expert hands-down knowledge	Teacher as fellow learner/facilitator
Emphasis upon 'know what'	Emphasis upon 'know how' and 'know who'
Participants passively receiving knowledge	Participants generating knowledge
Sessions heavily programmed	Sessions flexible and responsive to needs
Learning objectives imposed	Learning objectives negotiated
Mistakes looked down upon	Mistakes to be learned from
Emphasis upon theory	Emphasis on practice
Subject/functional focus	Problem/multidisciplinary focus

Source: Gibb (1996: 315)

Gibb's (1996) comparison demonstrates the shift in thinking that is required. Moreover, some elements of the enterprising teaching approach are current practices in the Art School, for instance the ownership of learning by the participant, the problem/ multidisciplinary approach and the need to learn from mistakes, exemplifying the possible benefits of an exchange of thinking. Shifting towards a more enterprising teaching approach may also reduce the isolation of the Business School from networks and customers and offers the opportunity to introduce a broader range of teaching pedagogies into the School (Gibb, 1996).

Subsequently Gibb (2002) further highlighted the difficulty in teaching entrepreneurship in the Business School due to the narrow, constricting business orientation, arguing that universities as a whole are better placed to deal with the challenges and that there are opportunities to open the enterprise curriculum to the arts and science. Additionally Kirby (2004) argues that Business Schools must do more to help students develop their right-brain entrepreneurial capabilities, as well as the left-brain analytical skills which are more readily taught, calling for changes in the content of courses and the process of learning. Anderson and Jack (2008) also emphasise the important role of opportunity perception and turning ideas into viable opportunities and how entrepreneurship is more than managerial competence. Thus they conclude that whilst Business Schools may be good at teaching management methods they may be less equipped to teach the art of entrepreneurship and developing ideas into new ventures (*ibid*).

It is also of concern that the traditional business plan approach that is frequently adopted to teach entrepreneurship may dissuade graduates from launching a business. For instance, Zampetakis *et al.* (2011) found that students who had not attended an entrepreneurship course were more likely to intend to start a business than those who had participated in an entrepreneurship course. In fact Zampetakis *et al.* (2011) posited that perhaps the business plan approach and outlining the pitfalls of starting a business had dissuaded students against the idea of starting a business. The findings in the literature underline why it is pertinent for the Business School to consider new ways of teaching entrepreneurship and emphasise the nature of the challenge. Nevertheless despite the necessity to reconsider entrepreneurship

education, there is only limited research into educational issues in the field and only a few researchers are specifically considering this topic (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008). The rewards of further consideration are great however, as Binks *et al.* (2006) stress entrepreneurship education provides Higher Education with the opportunity to become more integrated into both industry and society.

The Exchange of Thinking

Given the difficulties that both the Art and Business Schools have encountered in attempting to teach entrepreneurship adopting an alternative approach and exchanging thinking may offer advantages to both. One area where collaboration could offer benefits is in the assessment of creative ideas. Business Schools are still struggling to reconcile tensions between the need for new forms of assessment and the traditional examination system and there remains a need for research into the validity of other forms of assessment such as assessment in the classroom by the teacher (Gibb, 2002). Here Carey and Matlay (2010) note the expertise that Art Schools have in assessing creative ideas whereby assessment is often discussion based and students may present or exhibit their work for critique by their peers and lecturers. Thus the Art School has significant experience in assessing work, in a non-exam format but within the context of the Higher Education environment, which could be adopted in other discipline such as the business school (Carey and Matlay, 2010). Penaluna and Penaluna (2009: 730) also note the expertise of design educators in assessing creative ideas and ponder if it is a '*silos mentality*' in universities that has prevented the cross-fertilisation of assessment strategies. Improving assessment could offer better information on the outcomes of teaching practices which, in turn, could provide support for the course itself.

Additionally the analogy of entrepreneurship as a science and an art, was further demonstrated in exploring business idea generation, where Heinonen *et al.* (2011) found that creativity had to be complemented by opportunity search activities and students had to aim to generate as many novel ideas as possible to find a unique idea but this must be accompanied by seeking information on industries and markets. Indeed the two aspects of the process demonstrate how those engaging in entrepreneurship could benefit from both creative and business skills. Broadly divided, the Art students could generate creative ideas whilst the Business students could research market opportunities and in this way both sets of students could benefit from a multi-disciplinary, collaborative approach. Hence there appears to be fertile ground for the cross-pollination of ideas and the sharing of resources to enable entrepreneurship education to be taught for the benefit of both Schools. This exchange of thinking would allow the sharing of best practice and could help Higher Education to prepare students to engage in the Creative Industries. Nonetheless, given the confusion regarding the concept of entrepreneurship and the ongoing debate as to whether it should be taught by the Business or Art School, this has not occurred to a great extent. To try and break down the barriers and encourage this exchange of thinking it is helpful to consider entrepreneurship as process so that the practice is possible to understand and conversations regarding the sharing of ideas can be entered into. By turning to meta-level thinking this process can be understood and pathways for engagement clarified.

Here Sarasvathy's (2001) Theory of Effectuation is helpful, as it proposes a practical approach towards entrepreneurship, considering the process entrepreneurs engage in. This

theory was derived from a study of expert entrepreneurs and in essence, Sarasvathy (2001) argues that entrepreneurs start their venture with three types of 'means', that is they know who they are, what they know and whom they know. It is with this knowledge that the entrepreneurs go on to develop their business. In effect, entrepreneurs exploit the contingencies that are open to them in their own particular circumstances (*ibid*). In offering this explanation, Sarasvathy (2001) provides an alternative perspective that places the entrepreneurial process at the centre of the analysis. Indeed, rather than exploring the data to locate the successful personality or the characteristics of the successful firm, Sarasvathy (2001) suggests that the only way to understand how there are so many different types of entrepreneurs and different types of firms are successful is to consider the process they adopt. As Sarasvathy argues: *'The essential agent of entrepreneurship... is an effectuator: an imaginative actor who seizes contingent opportunities and exploits any and all means at hand to fulfil a plurality of current and future aspirations, many of which are shaped and created through the very process of economic decision making and are not given a priori'* (2001: 262).

The Theory of Effectuation also suggests that the entrepreneur attempts to mould and create the world that they are interested in rather than predicting it and reacting to the prediction (Sarasvathy, 2003). The entrepreneurs' approaches can be distilled into four effectuation processes including; considering what they can afford to lose rather than what they expect to gain; building strategic alliances rather focusing on competitive analyses to assist with the process; exploiting the contingencies that arise in the marketplace rather than exploiting pre-existing knowledge; and finally not focusing on predicting an uncertain future but rather focusing on the controllable aspects of an unpredictable future (Sarasvathy, 2001).

Moreover, once in business the configuration of the business is fluid as the entrepreneur exploits the changing means available to them as they increase their knowledge of the sector or as they expand their network or build their reputation (*ibid*). This bottom up, fluid approach to building the business, allows the entrepreneur to exploit their learning and helps to minimise the costs of failure (Sarasvathy, 2003).

This re-conceptualisation of the entrepreneurial process views starting a business as a bottom up, fluid process, whereby the entrepreneur seeks to minimise the costs of failure (Sarasvathy, 2003). This theory offers a pragmatic approach, focusing upon the process rather than solely on the outcome or the inputs, however they are conceived. In doing so, the Theory of Effectuation provides a useful tool in moving the entrepreneur and the process they follow to the centre of the theoretical perspective and provides a lens through which to understand the process of starting a business. Thus this theory provides Art educators with a framework through which to understand the iterative and flexible process that entrepreneurship is and it offers a means to understand what is essentially an untidy process. It also offers a paradigm through which students can view entrepreneurship to help increase their understanding and familiarity with the concept. Acting as an 'effectuator' and attempting to shape and mould the world may also have particular resonance with students embarking on creative endeavours producing new and innovative offerings. To summarise, by engaging in meta-level thinking and taking a theoretical approach, the theory offers a set of parameters through which to understand entrepreneurship and may make it easier to understand and teach, helping to embed it in the curriculum.

Benefits of Collaboration

There are further indications that engaging in an exchange of thinking and adopting a collaborative approach could be beneficial in practice in both the Art and Business spheres. For instance in the 1970s a pioneering group, the Artists Placement Group (APG) was formed in the UK and through placing artists in both industry and government, it allowed artists direct participation in organisations and gave them an open brief to express their creativity. These collaborations resulted in a range of outputs from sculptures to performances and studies of organisational decision making processes (Kester, 2004). The artists also brought a new perspective to the organisation and the project achieved a level of success which resulted in the British Civil Service encouraging government departments to involve artists in planning activities. Moreover the founder of the group argued that the long term thinking of artists offered an antidote to the short term outlook encouraged by modern business practices (*ibid*). Whilst the idea of the ‘artist in residence’ has gained traction and is often implemented there is rarely the same level of engagement that the APG achieved. The success of the APG indicates that there is the possibility for the Arts and Business to exchange thinking and enter into dialogue for mutual benefit. Again this provides further support for a forum for discussion between the Business and Art Schools and leading the way in the educational sphere and breaking down barriers here, may engender a culture of discussion that could enable conversations to continue in the work sphere.

The role of collaboration is further demonstrated when tackling the common misconception that entrepreneurship is a solo process. Entrepreneurial teams are actually very prevalent, although in the past these teams have been relatively neglected in the entrepreneurship

research (Ucbasaran *et al.*, 2001). In fact, Davidson and Wiklund (2001) analysed the contents of a leading entrepreneurship journal for the ten years from 1988 to 1998 and found no articles on entrepreneurial teams. As a result, the conceptual framework that underpins most entrepreneurial research tends to view the entrepreneur as a single enterprising individual (Harper, 2008). Yet emerging research highlights the role of the team in the entrepreneurial process (Harper, 2008). Research into entrepreneurial teams in Scotland also found that teams were prevalent with 61% of the 600 businesses sampled co-owned, providing evidence that the individual owner manager is less common than the literature implies (Rosa and Hamilton, 1994). Similarly, the Federation of Small Businesses undertook a survey with their members and found that 44% of the businesses in Scotland were co-owned (Mason *et al.*, 2006). Nonetheless in the commonly used models of teaching, entrepreneurship is often taught as an individual endeavour when in some cases a collaborative partnership may be more realistic. Revisiting Anderson and Jack's (2008) typology of the four sets of skills, where entrepreneurs at different times in their venture and to different extents are required to act as the professional, technician, artisan and artist, also illustrates the range of skills required. Arguably a team approach here may help meet requirements for the four different types of skills as these fit neatly with the complementary skills that the Art and Business students possess, providing further justification for a collaborative approach.

In practice collaborative working in the Creative Industries is also evident. For instance, Alessi, the internationally renowned design firm that creates kitchenware, clearly demonstrates the benefits of collaborative working. Indeed Alberto Alessi, a lawyer by training, has grown the company by utilising a diverse network of collaborations. These

collaborations harness the wisdom of a wide network of architects, curators, publishers, professionals, craftsmen, artists and designers which ensure that the firm remains at the cutting edge of design (Verganti, 2006). This network, with over two hundred participants, is frequently credited for the firm's success (Dell'Era and Verganti, 2010). In this way both the artistic and business skills are present and highly regarded and there is a catalytic interrelationship between these skills.

The real world examples of the Artists Placement Group and Alessi, offer practical demonstrations of the benefits of dialogue and the strength of collaborative practices, providing further encouragement for the Art and Business Schools to enter into dialogue to exchange thinking and encourage collaboration at an early a stage as possible. The potential benefits are wide ranging and both Schools may move closer to solving the problem of teaching entrepreneurship to their students. Indeed entrepreneurship education could act as the bridge between the two Schools and through understanding the strengths and weaknesses of each others teaching models, the Schools are well placed to collaborate and share their expertise and resources. The benefits to students are potentially significant and the insight and learning accrued could be transferred to their future working practices.

Conclusion

The increased focus on the Creative Industries and emphasis upon the 'industry' aspect creates questions as to how the Art School can best support students. Whilst the terminology of the 'Creative Industries' is not without critique, there remains the need to prepare students

for entering a creative sector which is increasingly commercially focused. Entrepreneurship education may assist in equipping students with the necessary skills. However, teaching entrepreneurship is fraught with difficulty both in the Art School and its traditional home in the Business School. Thus neither School has the monopoly on teaching entrepreneurship and there are difficulties at the levels of meta-thinking. Therefore there is a strong argument for the Schools to come together and engage in an exchange of thinking to develop new practices. To help facilitate this exchange, this paper has sought to prepare the ground by offering a better understanding of the concept of the entrepreneur and the entrepreneurial process through the 'Theory of Effectuation'. Moreover by drawing attention to the existence of entrepreneurial teams and the success of collaborative practices, there are strong indications that dialogue has the potential to be mutually beneficial. In short, by encouraging the cross fertilisation of ideas and the collaboration between the Art and Business Schools, new methods for preparing students engage in the Creative Industries can be developed.

Bibliography

Amit, R., Glosten, L. and Muller, E., 1993, Challenges to Theory Development in Entrepreneurship Research, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 30, Issue 5, pp.815-834.

Anderson, A.R., 2000, The Protean Entrepreneur: The Entrepreneurial Process As Fitting Self and Circumstance, *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, Vol. 8, Issue 3, pp. 201-234.

Anderson, A.R. and Jack, S.L., 2008, Role Typologies for Enterprising Education: the Professional Artisan? *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 15, Issue 2, pp. 259-273

Banks, M. and Hesmondhalgh, D., 2009, Looking for Work in Creative Industries Policy, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 15, Issue 4, pp. 415 -430.

Banks, M. and O'Connor, J., 2009, Introduction, After the Creative Industries, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 15, Issue 4, pp. 365-373.

Bhide, A., 1994, How Entrepreneurs Craft Strategies that Work, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 72, Issue 2, pp.150-161.

Binks, M., Starkey, K. and Mahon, C.L., 2006, Entrepreneurship Education and the Business School, *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, Vol. 18, Issue 1, pp. 1-18.

Brazeal, D.V. and Herbert, T.T., 1999, The Genesis of Entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 23, Issue 3, pp.29-45.

Brown, R., 2005, Performing Arts Creative Enterprise, Approaches to Promoting Arts in Higher Education, *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Vol. 6, Issue 3, pp. 159-167.

Bruyat, C. and Julien, P., 2000, Defining the Field of Research in Entrepreneurship, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol.16, Issue 2, pp.165-180.

Bygrave, W.D and Hofer, C.W., 1991, Theorizing about Entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 16, Issue 2, pp.13-22.

Carey, C. and Matlay, H., 2010, Creative Disciplines Education: A Model for Assessing Ideas in Entrepreneurship Education? *Education + Training*, Vol. 52, Issue 8/9, pp. 694-709.

Carey, C. and Naudin, A., 2006, Enterprise Curriculum for Creative Industries Students: An Exploration of Current Attitudes and Issues, *Education + Training*, Vol. 48, Issue 7, pp. 518-531.

Caust, J., 2003, Putting the “Art” Back into Arts Policy Making: How Arts Policy Has Been “Captured” by the Economists and the Marketers, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 9, Issue 1, pp. 51-63.

Chell, E., 1985, The Entrepreneurial Personality: A Few Ghosts Laid to Rest? *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 3, Issue 43, pp.43-54.

Davidsson, P. and Wiklund, J., 2001, Levels of Analysis in Entrepreneurship Research: Current Research Practice and Suggestions for the Future, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 25, Issue 4, pp.81-100.

DCMS, 1998, *Creative Industries Mapping Document 1998*, Department of Media, Culture and Sport.

DCMS, 2008, *Creative Britain New Talents for the New Economy*, Department of Media, Culture and Sport.

DC Research, 2012, *Economic Contribution Study: An Approach to the Economic Assessment of the Arts & Creative Industries in Scotland*, Final Report.

Dell’Era, C. and Verganti, R., 2010, Collaborative Strategies in Design-intensive Industries: Knowledge Diversity and Innovation, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 43, Issue 1, pp. 123-141

Fayolle, A., and Gailly, B., 2008, From Craft to Science, Teaching Models and Learning Processes in Entrepreneurship Education, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 32, No. 7, pp. 569-593.

Garnham, N., 2005, From Cultural to Creative Industries, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 11, Issue 1, pp. 15-29.

Gartner, W.B., 1985, A Conceptual Framework for Describing the Phenomenon of New Venture Creation, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10, Issue 4, pp.696-706.

Gartner, W.B., 1988, “Who is an Entrepreneur?” Is the Wrong Question, *American Journal of Small Business*, Vol. 12, Issue 4, pp.11-32.

Gartner, W.B., 1990, What Are We Talking About When We Talk About Entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 5, Issue 1, pp.15-28.

Gartner, W.B., Bird, B.J., Starr, J.A., 1992, Acting As If: Differentiating Entrepreneurial From Organizational Behaviour, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 16, Issue 3, pp.13-31.

Gibb, A., 1996, Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management: Can We Afford to Neglect Them in the Twenty-First Century Business School? *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 7, Issue 4, pp. 309-321

Gibb, A., 2002, In Pursuit of a New 'Enterprise' and 'Entrepreneurship' Paradigm for Learning: Creative Destruction, New Values, New Ways of Doing Things and New Combinations of Knowledge', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 4, Issue 3, pp. 233-269.

Harper, D.A., 2008, Towards a Theory of Entrepreneurial Teams, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol.23, Issue 6, pp.613-626.

Heinonenm J., Hytti, U. and Stenholm, P., 2011, The Role of Creativity in Opportunity Search and Business Idea Creation, *Education + Training*, Vol. 53, Issue 8, pp. 659-672.

Henry, C., Hill, F. and Leitch, C., 2005a, Entrepreneurship Education and Training: Can Entrepreneurship Be Taught? Part I, *Education + Training*, Vol. 47, Issue 2, pp. 98-111.

Henry, C., Hill, F. and Leitch, C., 2005b, Entrepreneurship Education and Training: Can Entrepreneurship Be Taught? Part II, *Education + Training*, Vol. 47, Issue 3, pp. 158-169.

Henry, C. and Johnston, K., 2005, Special Issue: Entrepreneurship in the Creative Industries – an International Perspective, Introduction, *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Vol. 16, Issue 3, pp. 141-142.

Hytti, U. and O’Gorman, C., 2004, What is “Enterprise Education” An Analysis of the Objectives and Methods of Enterprise Education Programmes in Four European Countries’, *Education + Training*, Vol. 46, Issue 1, pp.11-23.

Jack, S.L. and Anderson, A.R., 1999, Entrepreneurship Education within the Enterprise Culture: Producing Reflective Practitioners, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, Vol. 5, Issue 3, pp. 110-125.

Kester, G.H., 2004, *Conversation Pieces, Community and Communication in Modern Art*, University of California Press, Berkley.

Kirby, D.A., 2004, Entrepreneurship Education: Can Business Schools Meet the Challenge? *Education + Training*, Vol. 46, Issue 8, pp. 510-519.

Kuratko, D.F., 2005, The Emergence of Entrepreneurship Education, Development, Trends and Challenges, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 29, Issue 5, pp. 577-598.

Levie, J., 2012, *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, Scotland 2011*, University of Strathclyde Business School.

Low, M.B., 2001, The Adolescence of Entrepreneurship Research: Specification of Purpose, *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, Vol. 25, Issue 4, pp.17-25.

Low, M.B. and MacMillan, I.C., 1988, Entrepreneurship: Past Research and Future Challenges, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 14, Issue 2, pp.139-161.

Mason, C., Tagg, S. and Carter, S., 2006, *Lifting the Barriers to Growth in UK Small Businesses, The FSB Biennial Membership Survey, 2006 Scotland*, Report to the Federation of Small Businesses.

Matheson, B., 2006, A Culture of Creativity: Design Education and the Creative Industries, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 25, Issue 1, pp. 55-64

Matlay, H., 2005, Entrepreneurship Education in UK Business Schools: Conceptual, Contextual and Policy Considerations, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 12, Issue 4, pp. 627-643.

Matlay, H. and Carey, C., 2007, Entrepreneurship Education in the UK: A Longitudinal Perspective, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 14, Issue 2, pp. 252-263.

Mitchell, R.K., Busenitz, L., Lant, T., McDougall, P.P., Morse, E.A. and Smith, J.B., 2002, Toward a Theory of Entrepreneurial Cognition; Rethinking the People Side of Entrepreneurship Research, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 27, Issue 2, pp.93-104.

Oakley, K., 2009, The Disappearing Arts: Creativity and Innovation After the Creative Industries, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 15, Issue 4, pp. 403-413.

O'Connor, J., 2009, Creative Industries: A New Direction? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 15, Issue 4, pp. 387-402.

Penaluna, A., and Penaluna, K., 2009, Assessing Creativity: Drawing from the Experience of the UK's Creative Design Educators, *Education + Training*, Vol. 51, Issue 8, pp. 718-732

Raffo, C., O'Connor, J., Lovatt, A. and Banks, M., 2000, Attitudes to Formal Business Training and Learning Amongst Entrepreneurs in the Cultural Industries: Situated Business

Learning Through 'Doing With Others', *Journal of Education and Work*, Vol. 13, Issue 2, pp. 215 -230.

Rosa, P. and Hamilton, D., 1994, Gender and Ownership in UK Small Firms, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol.18, Issue 3, pp.11-27.

Sarasvathy, S.D., 2001, Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 26, Issue 2, pp.243-263.

Sarasvathy, S.D., 2003, Entrepreneurship as a Science of the Artificial, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 24, Issue 2, pp.203-220.

Sarri, K. and Trihopoulou, A., 2005, Female Entrepreneurs' Personal Characteristics and Motivation: A Review of the Greek Situation, *Women In Management Review*, Vol. 20, Issue 1, pp.24-36.

Schumpeter, J., 1934, *The Theory of Economic Development*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Shaver, K.G. and Scott, L.R., 1991, Person, Process, Choice: The Psychology of New Venture Creation, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 16, Issue 2, pp.23-45.

Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P. and Wright, M., 2001, The Focus of Entrepreneurial Research: Contextual and Process Issues, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Vol. 25, Issue 4, pp.57-80.

UNCTAD, 2008, *Creative Economy Report 2008, The Challenge of Assessing the Creative Economy: Towards Informed Policy Making*, UNCTAD.

Verganti, R., 2006, Innovating through Design, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 84, Issue 12, pp. 114-122.

Winters, T., 2011, Facilitating Meta-learning in Art and Design Education, *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 30, Issue 1, pp. 90- 101.

Zampetakis, L. A., Gotsi, M., Andriopoulos, C., and Moustakis, V., 2011, Creativity and Entrepreneurial Intention in Young People, Empirical Insights from Business School Students, *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Vol. 12, Issue 3, pp. 189-199.