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Abstract

Researchers from around the globe have long evidenced entrepreneurship; broadly defined in the literature as the organizing of organizations; usually analyzed through an economic lens and frequently evidenced by way of for-profit business ownership, legal incorporation and/or organizational development. For over half a century of rapid growth in the academic field, the study of entrepreneurship has aided students, researchers, practitioners and policy makers in initiating both business and organizational development within various fields and sectors of human society. However, perhaps due to the prevailing view of entrepreneurship as the establishment of a new for-profit business, the preference for an economic lens of analysis, and to the absence of a national sectoral frame for the arts, entrepreneurship researchers have yet to conduct empirical research evidencing entrepreneurship as it occurs across a defined arts sector. Given the absence of the arts sector as a research focus within top tier entrepreneurship journals, there is a need for researchers to conduct empirical entrepreneurship research for the purposes of informing arts entrepreneurship education and practice. To address this need, the study lays a foundation for comparative analysis of (1) owner-founder demographics, (2) entrepreneurial characteristics, (3) entrepreneurship practice and (4) venture trends and tendencies in a defined arts sector. After generating the data for analysis, I analyze the data through the lens of a conceptual framework, utilizing key findings as a catalyst for guiding and informing research directions for the future.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Researchers from around the globe have long evidenced entrepreneurship; broadly defined in the literature as the organizing of organizations; notably a concept traditionally framed in the business context, analyzed through an economic lens and evidenced by way of for-profit business ownership, legal incorporation and non-profit organizational development. However, perhaps due to the prevailing view of entrepreneurship as the establishment of a new for-profit business, the preference for an economic lens of analysis in the broader field of entrepreneurship research, and to the absence of a national sectoral frame for the arts, entrepreneurship researchers have yet to conduct empirical research evidencing the organizing of organizations as it occurs across a defined arts sector. For example, while the Kauffman Index of Entrepreneurial Activity does provide the only U.S. national measure of business creation by both industry and specific population groups\(^1\), the index only focuses on the following sectors and associated fields of the U.S. economy: construction; manufacturing; trade; services; other (Fairlie, 2014, p. 17). Moreover, while research on the rise of arts organizations has been conducted (National Endowment for the Arts, 2008; Smith, Nichols, Ott, Ball, & National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], 2003), I know of no publically accessible state dataset from which to compare demographics and characteristics amongst owners and

founders who lead such entrepreneurial initiatives within or across fields of art. Due to the absence of a respective database, there is no easy way for aspiring entrepreneurs in the arts to find out who organizes arts organizations across the U.S. Nor is there an easy way to figure out what they need in order to do so, or how entrepreneurs in the arts have done so in the past. ²

While the field of arts management has emerged as a source of guidance for aspiring entrepreneurs in the arts, the academic field concerns itself with the internal management of individual arts organizations and their environment (Towse, 2010b, p. 10). Notably such a focus centers on the management of existing arts organizations, rather than the organizing of new arts organizations. Furthermore, scholars suggest that the academic field of arts management is fairly new; emerging at the college level in the 1960’s (Rosewall, 2014, p. xiv), shifting out of the broader field of cultural economics in the early 1990’s, and repositioning as a sub-field in management in the late 1990’s (Evrard & Colbert, 2000). As such, the young field of Arts Management has yet to develop into an academic research field, as evidenced by the lack of PhD programs in Arts Management across the U.S.³ Plausibly due to the Arts Management fields’ attention to the management of existing arts organizations, and to the fields prioritization to the practical training of arts managers, aspiring entrepreneurs in the arts have likely had no

² Although a model survey comes to mind (e.g. Characteristics of Business Owners Survey), the U.S. census bureau discontinued that survey after 1992; adapting it into what is now known as the Survey of Business Owners (SBO). Notably the SBO currently provides the only comprehensive regularly collected source of information on selected economic and demographic characteristics for U.S. business owners by gender, ethnicity, race and veteran status.
³ See http://www.artsadministration.org/find-a-program/graduate-other-programs/
choice but to look to the business school for guidance on entrepreneurship practice in the arts. However, due to the Hayek, Kirzner and Schumpeterian origins of the academic field of entrepreneurship, both education and research in entrepreneurship has tended to focus on *business* entrepreneurship as it occurs within economic environments, rather than emergent entrepreneurship sub-categories - such as arts entrepreneurship (hereafter defined as the organizing of arts organizations). For example, while business entrepreneurship rightly exists as a path to socio-cultural and economic development, empirical research has long evidenced challenges and barriers to business entrepreneurship (Cooper, 1993; Danish & Smith, 2012; Furchtgott-Roth, 2008, pp. 1-14; Lasprogata & Cotton, 2003; Shane, 2008; Tosterud, 1999). Common business development challenges are often categorized across the entrepreneurship literature as educational, financial, regulatory, socio-cultural and human capital in scope. Origins of such challenges may be endogenous or exogenous. Barriers to business entrepreneurship may be systemic; as evidenced by research on immigrant, ethnic and minority entrepreneurship (Butler, 2005; Butler & Kozmetsky, 2004; Wood, Davidson, & Fielden, 2012; Zhou, 2004, pp. 37-60). Research by distinguished entrepreneurship scholar Scott Shane suggests that the typical entrepreneur forms a business that dissolves within five years (Shane, 2008, p. 110). Additional research on business entrepreneurship supports Shane’s findings by evidencing a high failure rate of business start-ups (firms) across all industries of study (Towse, 2010b, p. 383). At first glance, one might presume that such claims within empirical business entrepreneurship research are inclusive of the arts industry; a proposed industry which according to the 2010 National Arts Index, supported
2.2 million artists and generated $150 billion in consumer spending (Kushner & Cohen, 2010). However, despite the successful framing of the arts as a national industry, or the merging of the arts into creative and cultural industry classifications⁴, a Boolean search conducted on 4-14-16 using the respective terms “arts industry”, “arts industries” and “arts sector” within top tier entrepreneurship journals (Sassmannshausen, 2012, p. 4) suggests to me that entrepreneurship research in the arts is largely absent from empirical entrepreneurship research.⁵

Importantly, Towse reminds us that within the realm of national statistics, an industry refers to an aggregation of groups of firms and individual producers classified as producing similar (but not the same) goods and services (Towse, 2010b, p. 376). Interestingly, scholars position artistic, administrative and technical creative workers (hereafter referred to as core workers) as the primary facilitators of production within proposed arts, cultural and creative industry classifications (Cherbo, Vogel & Wyszomirski, 2008, p.13; Hesmondhalgh, 2012, p. 46, pp. 77-78; Peltoniemi, 2015, pp. 48-49). In cases where this is true, core workers within such arts industries who identify as entrepreneurs may not be exempt from contextual educational, financial, regulatory, socio-cultural and human capital challenges and barriers to entrepreneurship, as research

---

⁴ Note that within the realm of cultural economics, the creative industries paradigm refers to a policy shift which attempts to integrate those industries respectively and previously known and conceptualized as “arts industries” and “cultural industries” (Towse, 2010a, p. 462). Although often contested, creative industries classifications commonly include advertising, arts and antiques market, architecture, crafts, design, designer fashion, film and video, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software and computer services, television and radio (Prince, 2010, p. 122).

⁵ A search within the Journal of Business Venturing returned no hits. A search within the journal Research Policy returned only two hits. A search within Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice returned no hits.
suggests: (1) access to high quality and sequential arts education is limited by socio-economic status (Bodilly, Augustine & Zakaras, 2008; Hetland, Palmer, Seidel, Tishman, & Winner, 2009); (2) traditionally entrepreneurship education has not been recognized as essential to arts education (Beckman, 2007; Brown, 2007; Pollard & Wilson, 2014; White, 2013); (3) opportunities for production, exhibition, subsidization and legitimacy in the arts are stratified by field gatekeepers (Alexander, 2003, pp. 91-97; Peltoniemi, 2015, p. 46), and cultural stereotypes can influence the gatekeeping process (Griswold, 1992; Sinckler, 2014); (4) prominent U.S. public and private foundations have historically prioritized financial subsidy for mid to large sized arts and cultural institutions, rather than for individual artists, small arts-based businesses and/or creative enterprises, community cultural arts organizations (Chang, 2010, p. 218; Graves, 2005; Mañjon & Vega, 2012; Miller & Yudice, 2002, p. 68). Furthermore, research evidences cases of nepotism, racial discrimination and gender inequities within arts, creative and cultural industries (Banks & Milestone, 2011; Conor, Gill, & Taylor, 2015; Dunlop, 2007; Eikhof & Warhurst, 2013; French, 2014; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2015; Jones & Pringle, 2015; Shade & Jacobson, 2015). Such local experiences may motivate core workers in arts industries to engage in entrepreneurship out of necessity rather than as a result of the discovery of an opportunity (Valdez & Richardson, 2013, pp. 1158-1159).
Problem statement

Empirical entrepreneurship research tends to focus on factors that both shape and influence the organizing of new for-profit businesses. However, while all businesses are organizations, not all organizations are businesses\(^6\); and largely due to a broader empirical research focus within the field of entrepreneurship on for-profit business development, research on the organizing of arts organizations (both non and for-profit) remains absent from the core entrepreneurship literature. Additionally, research suggests that there may be commonalities in arts entrepreneurship (as framed); as research in cultural economics suggests that new ventures in artist labour markets are often short-term, project-based and often never intended to be long-lasting.\(^7\)

Often in an effort to overcome common challenges to producing, exhibiting, subsidizing and legitimizing both art and works of art, there is evidence that core workers engage in the act of organizing arts organizations (Abbing, 2002; Gilmore, Johnson, Levi, Markusen, & Martinez, 2006; Hawthorne, Szántó, & National Arts Journalism Program [NAJP], 2003; Henry, 2007; Preece, 2015). While most arts organizations are observed as small groups and companies (Chang, 2010), others are commonly recognized as mid to large scale cultural institutions. Essentially, given the absence of this entrepreneurial

\(^6\) In discussing entrepreneurship for the creative and cultural industries, Kolb supports this position when she states, “Organizations are groups of people who share a common goal” (2015, p. 12).

\(^7\) Research supports this perspective. When discussing firm survival within artist labour markets, Towse states, “…as research on artists’ labour markets has shown, short-term contracts are common, particularly with groups of artists – musicians, dancers, film-makers, and so on – getting together for specific undertakings that were never intended to be long-lasting. Such ventures may last just as long as the project grant or other finance and then disband. When that is so, the ‘start-up’ firm is not a failure, it has simply fulfilled its purpose” (2010b, p. 384).
activity as a research focus within top tier entrepreneurship journals, there is a need for researchers to conduct empirical entrepreneurship research for the purposes of informing contextual entrepreneurship education and practice.

Taking on this inherent challenge, I press forward in an attempt to lay a foundation for empirical research in the emerging academic field of arts entrepreneurship. In Chapter 2, I begin the journey by conducting a purposive review of the entrepreneurship literature for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of both the nature of entrepreneurship, and common research challenges which have hindered the entrepreneurship field. In Chapter 3, I clarify my sectoral frame. I reference and discuss models which ultimately aid me in developing a conceptual framework for research and analysis. I also make definitional choices that further shape and influence my frame of inquiry. Importantly, I also disclose and justify those choices, as it is equally important to point out what I did not decide to use, and thus explain my rationale. In Chapter 4, I reference and discuss my research methodology for conducting and addressing the study’s research questions. I also identify the scope of the study by identifying sectoral boundaries which align with my conceptual framework for research and analysis. I also identify and discuss limitations within the study, and subsequently identify controls for addressing such limitations. In Chapter 5, I analyze the results of my research activities through the lens of a conceptual framework. I also provide an interpretation of the generated data, with the underlying goal of making greater sense of the data to aspiring, nascent and veteran arts entrepreneurs. Finally, in Chapter 6, I provide an overview of the dissertation by summarizing my research journey, discussing new understandings that
emerged from the research, and identifying how subsequent research studies can be used to build the emerging field of arts entrepreneurship.

Research questions

The following research questions will guide and shape this dissertation research study. Note that my questions are situated within a distinct sectoral frame further explored and defined in Chapter 3. Please also note that the research questions are intentionally broad, both in an effort to make room for emergent discoveries, and to capture a wide range of data for comparative analysis. While the broader research question is in this study is, “What is the state of entrepreneurship in the Ohio arts sector?”, specific questions include:

1. What are demographics and characteristics of entrepreneurs in the Ohio arts sector?
2. What are experiences of entrepreneurs in the Ohio arts sector?
3. What are venture trends and tendencies in the Ohio arts sector?
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Distinguished entrepreneurship scholars Shane and Venkataraman (2000) define the field of entrepreneurship as the scholarly examination of how, by whom, and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated, and exploited (p. 218). However, despite such clarity, the question “what is entrepreneurship?” remains a topic of great debate amongst entrepreneurship scholars. Given the abundant amount of proposed definitions, dimensions, sub-categories and typologies of entrepreneurship, a purposive literature review was conducted in an effort to better clarify and inform my frame of inquiry. Equipped with a better understanding of the nature of entrepreneurship, as well as common research challenges in the field, I will be able to better explain and describe to scholars, students and entrepreneurs what I am actually researching. In addition, by gaining a better understanding of common research challenges in the entrepreneurship field, I will be more aware of potential pitfalls I may encounter throughout the course of the research process.

Before moving forward, it is important to reiterate that whether framed as new venture creation, ideation, innovation, process, method, activity or other common conceptualizations; scholars suggest that entrepreneurship remains across all dimensions, sub-categories and typologies both subject to and influenced by the context in which it is situated (Gelderen & Masurel, 2012). For easier communication, the employed term “entrepreneurial context” will hereafter refer to the conditions that exist where and when
entrepreneurship takes place. For example, arguably the entrepreneurial context of the 18-19th century differs in many respects from that of the 21st century. New advances in technology such as the Internet have changed the way entrepreneurs identify and evaluate venture opportunity.\textsuperscript{8} Social revolutions and changing socio-political power dynamics have both enabled and constrained venture opportunity for citizens of such nations. Changing consumer demographics have shifted economic supply and demand both across and within major and minor industrial sectors. New government policies have reshaped the rules of order that regulate the way entrepreneurship is practiced. Furthermore, globalization has made the world smaller, and as a result, competition for venture capital has increased. Arguably, all of these conditions contribute to an entrepreneurial context that both shapes and influences the process, methods and practical experiences of entrepreneurship across all proposed dimensions, subcategories and typologies. Additionally, entrepreneurs’ own venture inspirations and motivation(s) for engaging in entrepreneurship contribute to specific individual factors that both shape and influence individual entrepreneurship experiences (Kuratko, 2013, pp. 10-11; Morris, Pryor, Schindehutte, 2012, pp. 1-35). In short, because entrepreneurship is both subject to and influenced by the context(s) in which it is situated, entrepreneurs themselves are also subject to and influenced by such context(s). In taking this perspective, framing both entrepreneurship and the context(s) in which it occurs seems a necessary exercise; as the

\textsuperscript{8} Hereafter the term new venture opportunity will refer to an opportunity to start something new or do something different.
way researchers frame entrepreneurship guides the kinds of questions they ask about entrepreneurship.⁹

For example, based on the literature review, it is clear to me that despite over half a century of rapid growth in the business school of thought, and despite over one hundred peer reviewed journals in English alone, the term “entrepreneurship” remains a broad, highly contested and illusive concept (Carsrud, Brannback & Harrison, 2014, p. 1). Ironically, the reviewed literature suggests to me that what the entrepreneurship field needs most is consensus on existing definitions - rather than additional proposed definitions. For example, while proposing and arguing the need for a conceptual framework for entrepreneurship research, authors Shane and Venkataraman (2000) refer to entrepreneurship as a broad label under which a hodgepodge of research is housed (p. 217). Continuing, they assert that the largest obstacle in developing a conceptual framework for research and analysis in the field of entrepreneurship has been the lack of consensus on a definition of entrepreneurship (p. 218).

Notably in an effort to build consensus as to the definition of entrepreneurship, renowned entrepreneurship researcher and scholar William B. Gartner famously conducted a Delphi study utilizing quantitative methods and a purposive sample of academics, politicians and business leaders (1990). A review of Gartner’s findings indicates the most important entrepreneurial attributes to the sample: (1) organization creation, (2) innovation and (3) acquisition and integration of resources. Alternatively, the least important attributes among the sample were found to be: (1) no growth business,

(2) non-profit businesses and (3) personality characteristics of entrepreneurs.

Consequently, after a statistical factor/cluster analysis of identified entrepreneurship attributes, two main viewpoints emerged from the sample frame: (1) the characteristics of entrepreneurship (entrepreneur, innovation, growth, and uniqueness) and (2) the outcomes of entrepreneurship (creating value, for profit, owner-manager).

Markedly, entrepreneurship scholars Bull and Willard (1993) propose guidelines both for theory development and for gaining definitional consensus. They begin by referencing entrepreneurship scholar William Bygrave’s observation that “…scholars are still bickering over a working definition of entrepreneurship” (p. 185). Instead of proposing yet another definition, Bull and Willard argue in support of Joseph Schumpeter’s (1942) definition: “An entrepreneur is a person who carries out new combinations, causing discontinuity.” Collectively, they argue that Schumpeter’s definition is both broad and specific enough to accommodate the diversity within the entrepreneurship field. Continuing, Bull and Willard suggest the existing literature be grouped into five broad categories for research and analysis purposes: (1) focus on the definition of entrepreneurship, (2) trait approach, (3) success strategies, (4) formation of new ventures and (5) effects of environmental factors on entrepreneurial actions.

Alternatively, Gartner defines entrepreneurship broadly as the organizing of organizations; famously proposing a conceptual framework for researching and analyzing this process, aptly framed as new venture creation (NVC) (Gartner, 1985, pp. 696-706). Continuing, Gartner argues that (to date), sample populations in entrepreneurship

---

10 See implications and conclusions section in Gartner, 1990, pp. 27-28
research have been sporadic and heterogeneous. To address this research challenge in the field, he argues for the identification of specific variables which describe how each venture is created, as well as the selection of more homogeneous sample populations. In doing so, Gartner posits that both differences and similarities among homogeneous samples will provide entrepreneurship researchers with more meaningful data.

Notably, in an extensive review conducted by Morris (1998), approximately seventy-seven definitions of entrepreneurship were found to exist within a review of journal articles and textbooks over a five-year period (p. 16).11 Interestingly, the word entrepreneur can be traced back to French origin (e.g. entreprendre); meaning “to undertake”. Perhaps given that many things can be undertaken in society, scholars have elected to define the terms entrepreneur and entrepreneurship broadly throughout much of the reviewed literature. For example, entrepreneurship scholar Donald F. Kuratko defines entrepreneurship as, “a dynamic process of vision, change and creation that requires an application of energy and passion toward the creation and implementation of new ideas and creative solutions” (2013, p. 23). Kuratko goes on to suggest that entrepreneurship is a process of innovation and new venture creation, both accomplished on multiple dimensions (e.g. individual; organizational; environmental; process) and aided by collaborative networks (e.g. government; education; institutions) (2013, p. 23). Notably, Kuratko defines an entrepreneur as one whom, “…undertakes to organize,

---

manage and assume the risks of a business” (Kurtako, 2013, p. 4). Kuratko goes on to further describe the entrepreneur as:

“…an innovator or developer who recognizes andseizes opportunities; converts those opportunities into workable/marketable ideas; adds value through time, effort, money, or skills; assumes the risks of the competitive marketplace to implement these ideas; and realizes the rewards from these efforts (2013, p. 4).

Interestingly, within the same text (2013, p. 3), Kuratko also makes a point to identify proposed distinctions between entrepreneurs and small business owners:

The terms entrepreneur and small-business owner sometimes are used interchangeably. Although some situations encompass both terms, it is important to note the differences in the titles. Small businesses are independently owned and operated, are not dominant in their fields, and usually do not engage in many new or innovative practices. They may never grow large, and the owners may prefer a more stable and less aggressive approach to running these businesses; in other words, they manage their businesses by expecting stable sales, profits, and growth. Because small firms include those purchased as already established businesses as well as franchises, small-business owners can be viewed as managers of small businesses.

Efforts to both contextualize and specify “entrepreneurship” have led to new and emergent frames in the form of major and minor sub-categories; usually evidenced by the inclusion of a prefix such as: small business entrepreneurship; corporate entrepreneurship; educational entrepreneurship; cultural entrepreneurship; community entrepreneurship; commercial entrepreneurship; government entrepreneurship; scalable start-up entrepreneurship; technology entrepreneurship; large company entrepreneurship;
For example, in researching the history of the entrepreneurship field, author Hans Landstrom (2005) has often pointed to the growing divergence in the academic field which emanates both from (1) the normative economic frame in the majority of entrepreneurship research approaches, and (2) the calls for a broadening of entrepreneurship research beyond the business context (pp. 83-84). Still, admittedly within the majority of the reviewed entrepreneurship literature, entrepreneurship is commonly associated with new venture creation, albeit with the venture either subtly or overtly framed as a for-profit business opportunity. Such findings come as no surprise given that the field of entrepreneurship has Hayek, Kirzner and Schumpeterian origins (Smith & Stevens, 2010, p. 578).

While numerous sub-categories of entrepreneurship exist, social entrepreneurship emerged as a major sub-category within the reviewed literature (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010, p. 39). Again, given that socially-oriented ventures can be undertaken in a wide variety of ways, scholars define social entrepreneurship broadly as:

Innovative and effective activities that focus strategically on resolving social market failures and creating opportunities to add social value systemically by using a range of organizational formats to maximize social impact and bring about change (Nicholls, 2006, p. 23).

A form of entrepreneurship that exhibits characteristics of nonprofits, governments, and businesses, combining private-sector focus on innovation, risk taking, and large-scale transformation with social problem solving (Kuratko, 2013, p. 99).
In discussing social entrepreneurship, Kuratko states, “The social entrepreneurship process begins with a perceived social opportunity translated into an enterprise concept; resources are then ascertained and acquired to execute the enterprise’s goals” (2013, p. 99). In a relevant article, scholars Smith & Stevens (2010) suggest that rather than a focus on the creation of economic or financial value, “…social entrepreneurship is first and foremost concerned with the creation of social value” (p. 583). In addition, Smith & Stevens (2010) recognize the importance of understanding context in the academic field of social entrepreneurship, when they state, “…different types of social entrepreneurship, based upon the geography in which they are situated, will be associated with differing degrees of embeddedness” (p. 576). Interestingly, the concept of embeddedness seems to not only be a central concept within social entrepreneurship literature (Smith & Stevens, 2010, pp. 582-584), but also seems relevant to the opportunity-based view of business entrepreneurship (Shane, 2000; Short et al., 2010); as embedded social ties and networks arguably grant certain entrepreneurs privileged and priority access to new business opportunities over others. For example, consider the business opportunity granted by an entrepreneur’s socio-economic status (SES). Banks and lending institutions commonly reflect on distinct societal factors when considering the disbursement of small business loans (notably a form of venture capital). Societal factors of influence commonly include (but are not limited to) one’s credit score and credit history, employment history and occupational positioning, highest level of completed education, annual income, number of dependents and criminal record; arguably all distinct societal factors which evidence embedded social ties within society.
Moreover, a large body of research suggests that an entrepreneur’s race, ethnicity, gender and/or social class can both enable and limit their access to venture capital (i.e. the necessary resources one must obtain in order to start a new venture) in various forms (Butler, 2005; Butler & Kozmetsky, 2004; Furchtgott-Roth, 2008; Shane, 2008, p. 138; Wood et al., 2012). Notably in the case of entrepreneurs who desire to engage in the process of entrepreneurship for non-profit purposes (Ballantine, 1982; Glaeser & Schleifer, 2001; Williams & Nadin, 2012), venture capital may consist of government grants, individual monetary gifts and tax-deductible donations; arguably sources of financial capital that require a certain amount of social capital (e.g. both bonding and bridging) in order to secure (Carolis & Saporito, 2006, pp. 42-44).

While there are many ways to categorize and typify entrepreneurial activity, entrepreneurship is further specified via entrepreneurs’ intentionality. Consequently, while categories and typologies do make the intended purposes of entrepreneurial activity more explicit, they may also contribute to assumptions in the entrepreneurship field. For example, neatly defined categories and typologies may be challenged in cases where entrepreneurship is undertaken for multiple purposes. Consider Rob’s Barbershop Community Foundation, a non-profit organization with a mission to improve the grooming, hygiene and well being of target populations who lack access to regular personal care products and services.¹² Is this venture an example of small business entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, arts entrepreneurship or cultural entrepreneurship? Clearly the boundaries blur in such an example. Nevertheless, given

¹² See http://www.therbcf.com/
established and emerging sub-categories and typologies, the major analytical levels identified by Kuratko (e.g. micro, macro), the multiple dimensions and/or units of analysis (e.g. individual; organizational; environmental; process) and the various schools of thought and/or frames of inquiry (Kuratko, 2013, pp. 8-15); it clearly seems important for me to disclose both my frame of entrepreneurship, and identify the context(s) in which my frame of entrepreneurship either is occurring, has occurred or is proposed to occur within my study. Failure to disclose such key details will likely contribute to misinterpretations from those students, scholars and entrepreneurs who will utilize my research as a guide for arts entrepreneurship education, policy and practice.

Notably gaps in the entrepreneurship literature abound for many reasons, such as the aforementioned lack of definitional consensus (Deeds, 2014, p. 12), and the tendency for the majority of entrepreneurship research to be focused on successful entrepreneurs in major for-profit driven industries - whom often identify both as white and male (Deeds, 2014, p. 13; Puryear, et al., 2008; Wood et al., 2012). To address this gap, scholars have developed theories in the minority entrepreneurship literature to account for how minority entrepreneurs develop new organizations in spite of the racism, sexism and systemic inequities they face; notably the theory of middleman minorities (Bonacich, 1973, pp. 583-594), ethnic enclave theory (Portes & Bach, 1985) and the theory of economic detour (Butler, 2005, Chapter 2, Section IV, para. 5). For example, Bonacich and Model (1980) used the theory of middleman minorities to explain the phenomenon of Asian entrepreneurship in low-income communities. Portes and Bach (1985) used ethnic enclave theory to explain entrepreneurship and economic development among Cuban
Americans. Butler (2005) both introduced and used the theory of economic detour to explain why levels of Black entrepreneurship tend to be lower than those of other groups; which he argues is largely due to systemic market exclusion (Chapter 2, Section IV, para. 21). As research on minority entrepreneurship often identifies unique challenges and barriers to entrepreneurs outside of the dominant racial, ethnic and cultural majority, such research addresses gaps in mainstream entrepreneurship literature.

As in any academic field, common research challenges will no doubt arise throughout the process of field development. Given the broad nature of entrepreneurial action(s), it is of no surprise to find out that the field of entrepreneurship is plagued with research challenges. For example, Deeds (2014) points out that the study of entrepreneurship is a study of context-dependent idiosyncratic ventures (p. 12). Continuing, Deeds asserts that in order for empirical research to be successful, measures, metrics and techniques need to be chosen or designed to suit the population being studied (p. 13).

What is important is to understand that entrepreneurship is contextual (Welter, 2011). Understanding the context in which entrepreneurship takes place is critical. Therefore comparative studies across different business contexts yield different research results – and there is nothing wrong with that. The world is varied! (Deeds, 2014, p. 2).

Continuing, Deeds identifies additional research challenges in the field of entrepreneurship: (1) the lack of agreed-upon definitions in the field; (2) the lack of established and readily available outcome variables; (3) the lack of publicly available databases and secondary data for entrepreneurial firms and (4) the difficulty in finding
and creating solid sample frames (2014, pp. 13-15). Importantly, Deeds also speaks to the fact that entrepreneurs are generally often unnoticed by society until their ventures have achieved a measure of sustainability and legitimacy (2014, p. 13). Essentially, due to the emergent nature of entrepreneurial activity, it is often difficult for researchers to “catch it as it occurs”, because we usually only notice entrepreneurship after it has occurred. This is perhaps evidenced by the tendency of the entrepreneurship researchers to focus on well-known and accomplished successful entrepreneurs - rather than the more common relatively unknown, struggling entrepreneurs who are usually unsuccessful in creating a new business, developing a new product or organizing a new organization (Deeds, 2014, p. 13).

Notably, in my effort to frame entrepreneurship and situate entrepreneurs appropriately within the context of a defined arts sector, the review thus far has provided me with much needed awareness and guidance. For example, considering that much of the reviewed literature frames entrepreneurship through an economic lens as new venture creation undertaken for pecuniary purposes, I believe an alternative frame of inquiry is needed in order to be inclusive of the non-pecuniary venture aspirations of entrepreneurs in arts, creative and cultural industries; and respectively within arts, creative and cultural sectors. For example, earlier within the introduction to this dissertation, I cited common creative industries classifications. As there is evidence that core workers in creative industries engage in entrepreneurship (i.e. the organizing of organizations) primarily for

---

13 Creative industries classifications commonly include advertising, arts and antiques market, architecture, crafts, design, designer fashion, film and video, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software and computer services, television and radio (Prince, 2010, p. 122).
the purpose of making the challenging, time intensive and resource demanding task of production and (re)production in creative industries less challenging, more frequent and sustainable (Alexander, 2003, pp. 112-130; Becker, 1982; Gilmore et al., 2006), logic suggests that it would be inattentive to narrow my frame of inquiry within such industries and sectors to entrepreneurship sorely undertaken for pecuniary purposes. Moreover, as there exists both for- and non-profit organizations in the arts, and because there may be many owners and founders of arts organizations whom identify as entrepreneurs which Kuratko might relegate to the status of managers of small businesses (Chang, 2010); there is a need to figure out how to best differentiate the arts entrepreneur from the arts manager in arts entrepreneurship research. For example, consider two arts entrepreneurs who organize arts organizations in the field of theatre. While one group may organize to meet a market demand, another group may organize to bring about public benefit. However, recall that an organization refers to a group of people who share a common goal. A question emerges. Are we then to recognize arts entrepreneurs as all individuals who played a part (rather big or small) in each organization’s development process? Is the individual who wrote a check to provide seed funding for the non-profit theater company also an arts entrepreneur? Or should we recognize arts entrepreneurs by there unique position within the venture (i.e. individuals who take on primary responsibility for organizing the venture), rather than holistically as a collective, or based on the shared goals and purposes of all individuals involved? Clearly, in pursuing empirical arts

\[\text{14 In discussing entrepreneurship for the creative and cultural industries, Kolb supports this position when she states, “Organizations are groups of people who share a common goal” (2015, p. 12).}\]
entrepreneurship research, it will be a challenge to identify a solid and defensible sample frame; notably a common challenge that affects the broader field of entrepreneurship (Deeds, 2014, p. 15). In any case, arguably in recognizing arts entrepreneurs as both (1) *entrepreneurs* and (2) *a subgroup of core workers*, I acknowledge them as unique members within the core of a defined arts sector (i.e. arts entrepreneurs); and subsequently in taking that perspective, I hope to become more aware and knowledgeable of the unique role that arts entrepreneurs play within a defined arts sector.

Still, how does one truly recognize and identify an entrepreneur in any sense? While Kuratko’s perspective provides guidance, entrepreneurship scholar William Gartner offers a practical solution. In the seminal article *Who Is an Entrepreneur? Is the Wrong Question*, Gartner (1988) famously advocated for a behavioral approach to entrepreneurship research; arguing that the behavioral approach would tell researchers more about the process of entrepreneurship than research focused on the traits of entrepreneurs. Moreover, Gartner’s seminal article criticizes the trait approach to entrepreneurship research, an oft used analytical approach that long contributed to assumptions in the field. In direct opposition to the trait approach, Gartner’s article cautions researchers on generalizing traits as “entrepreneurial”; notably an activity that Gartner argued could lead to the utilization of prescriptive characteristics based largely on subjective assumptions. To that end, Gartner famously reiterates that *you cannot separate the dancer from the dance*; a pivotal perspective in the entrepreneurship literature suggesting that entrepreneurs are best recognized and identified by what they do.
So what might arts entrepreneurs in an arts sector do? In framing arts entrepreneurship as the act of organizing arts organizations, it’s plausible that they engage in a similar experience in new venture creation as entrepreneurs do within other fields, industries and sectors of human society. While entrepreneurship experiences no doubt differ based on where they take place (i.e. entrepreneurial context), there are evident commonalities if we frame entrepreneurship as the organizing of organizations; commonalities that have been observed for years within arts and entertainment industries. Examples include the creation and establishment of U.S. state arts agencies (SAA’s)\textsuperscript{15}, the development of media conglomerates in the film, television and radio industries (Bernstein, 2015, pp. 128-151) and the organizing of over 113,000 non-profit arts organizations across the United States (Rosewall, 2014, p. 1). However, as entrepreneurship research specifically within the arts sector seems to be a new direction in the reviewed entrepreneurship literature, it may in fact be more advisable to lay a foundation for empirical research by exploring the act of organizing arts organizations on multiple levels of analysis. Such a perspective is supported by author and entrepreneurship scholar David Deeds, who while identifying and discussing common empirical research challenges in the entrepreneurship field, suggests that researchers choose a focus by clarifying three dimensions in the entrepreneurial process: (1) the level at which you are going to study (e.g. individuals, organizational ventures, field, industry), (2) the process/stage of entrepreneurial development (e.g. emergent, nascent); (3) the industry or market in which the entrepreneurial activity is to take place (Deeds, 2014, p.\textsuperscript{15} See http://www.nasaa-arts.org/
16). Essentially by clarifying such details in my arts entrepreneurship research study, I may be able to better understand the nature of arts entrepreneurship as it occurs within a defined arts sector.

For example, consider two aspiring arts entrepreneurs: (1) Lisa, with a desire to start her own production company in the film industry, and (2) Brian, with a desire to establish a non-profit theatre company in the performing arts industry. Notably as both Lisa and Brian are aspiring arts entrepreneurs rather than nascent or veteran arts entrepreneurs, they will no doubt lack prior experience in arts entrepreneurship practice. Naturally, entrepreneurship education, field mentorship and existing arts organizational models may be helpful for guiding and informing both Lisa and Brian’s venture aspirations in a defined arts sector. However, it is important to note that without an opportunity there is no entrepreneurship (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). In taking this important perspective, the opportunity to organize one’s respective arts organization within an arts sector will likely shape and influence how successful one actually is in doing so. Obviously the more we know about the environment in which such entrepreneurial activity is taking place (i.e. the related fields, industries and structural components that make up an arts sector), the more aware we will be of how such an environment affects both Lisa and Brian’s respective venture opportunities. For example, devoid of rehearsal space for dance production in an arts sector, Brian’s actors will be unable to rehearse, which subsequently may affect Brian’s opportunity to produce non-profit theatre within an arts sector, and thus enable public benefit. Likewise, in Lisa’s case, devoid of an opportunity to exhibit her films within an arts sector, there will be little
to no opportunity for Lisa’s films to be seen by the market, which subsequently may affect Lisa’s opportunity to make a profit in the arts sector. Essentially, devoid of such venture opportunities in an arts sector, both Lisa and Brian may look elsewhere for venture opportunities within another arts sector.

Eventually, should venture opportunities be identified, both Lisa and Brian will nevertheless need to acquire the necessary venture capital in order to engage in the act of organizing their respective arts organizations. Several questions now emerge. What forms of venture capital are needed in order to initiate such actions? Where do such necessary forms of venture capital exist respective to the arts sector? Who between Lisa and Brian has greater access to such forms of venture capital (i.e. financial, social, human, cultural, etc.)? Furthermore, within the frame of new venture creation, upon incorporation with the state, new organizations are situated within a legal structure which affords them the ability to operate legally for non- and/or for-profit purposes. Arguably, according to the new venture creation frame of business entrepreneurship, it is at the point of legal incorporation that entrepreneurship ends and scalable start-up management begins. In considering the legal benefits and limitations of various organizational structures (e.g. LLC, LLP, L3C, S-Corp, C-Corp, etc.), the choice of structure will inherently impose rules of order that will shape and influence both Lisa’s and Brian’s entrepreneurship experience from early post start-up phase into maintenance, expansion and/or exit/transition phase (Lundström & Stevenson, 2005, pp. 57-60).

In summary, given that entrepreneurship is both subject to and influenced by the context(s) in which it is situated, there may be many contextual factors which shape and
influence arts entrepreneurship experiences across a defined arts sector. Notably scholars in the field of entrepreneurship policy have recognized the importance of understanding context on multiple levels of analysis (i.e. micro, meso, macro), going so far as to identify context as the base of entrepreneurship policy (Lundström & Stevenson, 2005, pp. 153-187). Taking into account both the review and the above scholarly perspectives, I now identify definitional choices and positions which have both shaped and influenced my frame of inquiry.

1. Entrepreneurship is the act of organizing organizations
2. Entrepreneurs are individuals who are recognized as those primarily responsible for organizing an organization
3. Entrepreneurship is both subject to and influenced by the context(s) in which it is situated; and
4. Entrepreneurs are both identified and recognized by what they do.

Such positions are necessary to disclose, as they will undoubtedly shape and influence the dissertation research and analysis process. As the interpretation of a study’s results depends upon how one frames that study, the way I frame entrepreneurship will inherently guide the kinds of questions I ask about entrepreneurship (Gartner, 1990). For example, evidently there appears to be no consensus to date in the nascent specialized literature on a definition or frame of for the term arts entrepreneurship (Chang & Wyszomirski, 2015). Notably authors Chang and Wyszomirski (2015) engaged in a comprehensive review of the nascent specialized literature on arts entrepreneurship;
looking for clusters of common meanings and re-occurring assumptions in the literature for informing definitional consensus. Upon conclusion of the review, the authors frame arts entrepreneurship as, “a management process through which cultural workers seek to support their creativity and autonomy, advance their capacity for adaptability, and create artistic as well as economic and social value” (2015, p. 24). Notably, Chang and Wyszomirski’s frame of arts entrepreneurship (as a management process) differs from my disclosed frame of arts entrepreneurship (i.e. the act of organizing arts organizations). Essentially, one major take-away from this literature review is that meaning and sense-making in arts entrepreneurship research will largely depend upon how the researcher(s) frame arts entrepreneurship. With this understanding, I urge the reader to go forward in this dissertation with the frame of arts entrepreneurship as the act of organizing arts organizations, because in the absence of that disclosed frame, the data to be generated in this study may not make sense to students, scholars and practioners of arts entrepreneurship.
CHAPTER 3: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Equipped with a better understanding of both definitional discourse and common research challenges within the broader field of entrepreneurship, I now turn my attention to the development of a conceptual framework for research and analysis; collectively a defensible rationale for making sense and greater meaning out of the data to be generated in this dissertation (i.e. conceptual framework). To aid me in focusing my research, I draw upon earlier advice from Deeds (2014) on conducting empirical entrepreneurship research. As referenced in the literature review, Deeds (2014) suggests that in an effort to produce high quality defensible and replicable research in entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship researchers should clarify their research focus by identifying (1) the level at which they intend to study entrepreneurship, and (2) the specific field(s) or industries wherein their frame of entrepreneurship takes place (p. 16). In addition, because entrepreneurship is both subject to and influenced by the context in which it is situated, it became clear to me that I needed to be able to more thoroughly describe the sectoral frame in which arts entrepreneurship (i.e. the act of organizing arts organizations) is to take place (i.e. the arts sector). To reiterate from the introduction, in this chapter, I reference and discuss models which ultimately aid me in developing a conceptual framework for research and analysis. I also make key definitional and analytical choices that further shape and influence my frame of inquiry. Importantly, I disclose and justify those choices, as it is equally important to provide a rationale both for
what I did and did not decide to use. Before going forward, it is important to note that within this dissertation, the term “conceptual framework” refers to a collection of ideas and commitments for informing and guiding a research study (Ravitch & Riggan, 2012, p. xiii). For easier identification, I provide subheadings for the reader in an effort to better identify the meta-cognition (i.e. thinking about thinking) that evidences how I arrived at distinct choices in the conceptual framework.

Thinking about a sectoral frame

In thinking about how a defined arts sector might look from the bottom-up, and subsequently from the top-down, I am largely guided by Wyszomirski’s proposed model of a U.S. creative sector (Figure 1); notably a model that has helped me to recognize the important role that ancillary organizational structures might play within the infrastructure of a defined arts sector.

It is becoming increasingly clear that looking at the arts through the broader sectoral lens can have many benefits. It can widen and deepen our knowledge of how cultural affairs work, help us devise better cultural policies, and facilitate advocacy coalitions (Cherbo, Vogel & Wyszomirski, 2008, p. 10).

---

16 In discussing the role of conceptual frameworks in guiding research, Ravitch and Riggan define a conceptual framework as an argument about why the topic one wishes to study matters, and why the means proposed to study it are appropriate and rigorous (Ravitch & Riggan, 2012, p. 7).
17 See Cherbo et al., 2008, p. 14
Figure 1. Wyszomirski’s model of the U.S. Creative Sector

Perhaps as an answer to Bill Ivey’s call for a map of America’s arts system that is both reconciliatory and inclusive of both the non-profit and for-profit commercial activities within proposed fields of art, authors Cherbo, Vogel and Wyszomirski (2008) conceptualize a U.S. creative sector as, “a cluster of related arts and arts-related industries that require for production a pool of talented and skilled individuals, who along with ancillary organizations, provide products and services integral to the workings of the creative industries” (pp. 9-10). Cherbo et al. go on to propose seven clusters of related industries that produce the majority of arts and cultural products in the U.S. (p. 15). Wyszomirski proposes a holistic model of the U.S. creative sector useful for mapping and
identifying infrastructural components (p. 15). Importantly, in referring to the ancillary (infra)structures which support core workers, Cherbo, Vogel and Wyszomirksi state, “The creative core cannot sustain itself. A constellation of support systems is an integral part of the infrastructure of the arts and creative sector” (p. 15).

In considering the various ancillary organizational structures embedded within the upstream production, downstream distribution and general public support infrastructure of Wyszomirski’s creative sector, I began to recognize opportunities that such organizational structures both independently and collectively afford to core workers. For example, core workers in the Museums and Heritage industries will likely rely upon public subsidy in an effort order to make their organizational ventures more sustainable. Notably in Wyszomirski’s model, opportunity for subsidy is embedded within the general public infrastructure, aptly situated as public funding, commonly enabled by private and public foundations. Alternatively, independent visual artists in visual arts and crafts industries often seek opportunities for exhibition; opportunities afforded by art galleries, art museums, art facilities and/or art venues; opportunities aptly embedded in the downstream distribution infrastructure. Essentially in considering Wyszomirski’s model of the U.S. creative sector, I began to recognize ancillary organizational structures in the U.S. creative sector as opportunity structures; or embedded sources of venture opportunity for core workers. Additionally, in considering Wyszomirski’s model, I began to theorize how venture opportunity might look; not from the traditional perspective of aspiring for-profit business owners (i.e. business opportunity), but from the perspective of
core workers who facilitate production in the U.S. creative sector (i.e. sectoral opportunity).

Importantly in considering Wyszomirski’s model of a U.S. creative sector for policy purposes, I quickly ran into a massive amount of scholarly discourse associated with the utilization of the “creative” policy frame. Before elaborating on some of this, it is important to note that the creative sector, creative industries and creative economy policy frames have origins in the U.K; likely terms adapted from the cultural sector, cultural industry and cultural economy policy frames evidenced within 1980’s and 1990’s U.K. focused literature and policy.¹⁸ Note that the origin of the creative industries policy frame is distinctive, in part because it emerged from a broad shift in U.K. cultural policy; largely a push among U.K. scholars, leaders and policymakers for a broader and more inclusive view of U.K. cultural production as undertaken for both non and for-profit purposes.¹⁹ According to Towse (2010a), the global creative industries policy frame positions innovation and creativity as the primary driver of 21st century economic growth.

The view is now that this ‘sector’ is the driver of the twenty-first century economy and it relies on creativity protected by copyright to deliver growth (UNCTAD, 2008). The shift integrates those industries previously known as the ‘cultural industries’ with the arts, calling them collectively ‘creative industries’ (p. 462).

Arguably, while the global creative industries policy frame has circumvented philosophical barriers between both high/elitist and low/popular culture, it has also

---
¹⁸ See Throsby, 2008, p. 218
¹⁹ See Towse, 2010a, p. 462
conformed to the economic frame of cultural production. Towse suggests this conformity has led to an emphasis on quantity over quality, and ultimately has marginalized both art and culture as a minor sector (pp. 462-463). To that end, Towse offers criticism of the creative industries term, “…it fudges the distinction between the primary creators of cultural content (‘artists’) and others working in the creative industries; and it elides individual artistic creativity with entrepreneurship by firms in these industries” (pp. 462-463). Nevertheless, some U.S. scholars and policymakers are adopting the global creative industries concept as a guiding frame for research and policy initiatives.20 However, national adoption of this policy frame has been meager to date when compared to that of neighboring countries.21 Admittedly the term “creative” is highly subjective, and those business and organizational entities deemed “creative” are usually included within creative economy/industry reports and creative place-making initiatives, while those deemed “un-creative” are omitted. As such, subjectivity no doubt contributes to discourse both towards and within the paradigm of creative industries research22; discourse that has likely stalled national adoption of the global creative industries concept across the decentralized U.S. cultural policy infrastructure. Nevertheless, equipped with a proposed model of a U.S. creative sector, and better informed of the semantic discourse associated with the global creative industries policy frame, I am more prepared to develop a distinct

20 See the Americans for the Arts Creative Industries Reports (www.americansforthearts.com); National Assembly of Arts Agencies Creative Economy Research and State Policy Briefs (www.nasaa-arts.org); NEA Creative Placemaking study by Markusen & Gadwa (2010).
21 See Cherbo, Vogel & Wyszomirski, 2008, p. 12
22 For an introduction to the discourse on creative industries policy, see Tremblay, 2011.
Thinking about multiple levels of analysis in entrepreneurship research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Bourdieuan orienting concepts</th>
<th>Operationalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macro-level (society, culture, political economy)</td>
<td>Macro-field</td>
<td>Social regulation context, industrial relations, legislation, business environment, labour market dynamics, prevailing discourses of legitimacy, structures of resources and constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso-level (sector and organisation)</td>
<td>Meso-field Habitus</td>
<td>Objective structures pertaining to the organisation and sector, sectoral rules and procedures, sectoral patterns of legitimacy and competition entrepreneurial networks which may include associational, professional and organisational linkages, informal codes of conduct, sectoral and organisational history and culture, informal rules of legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-level (entrepreneurs and small business owners, i.e. ESB agents)</td>
<td>Capital (in social, economic, cultural and symbolic forms) and Strategies, dispositions</td>
<td>Educational, financial, cultural, network etc. resources owned by ESB agents Strategies that ESB agents utilise to gain capital and to legitimise their presence in the field Entrepreneurial attributes, biographies and motivations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Forson et al.’s multi-level framework for entrepreneurship and small business research

In thinking about multiple levels of analysis in entrepreneurship research, I am guided by the article, *Multi-level approaches to entrepreneurship and small business research – transcending dichotomies with Bourdieu* (Forson et al., 2014); notably a source that has aided me in better understanding how multiple levels of analyses are framed within entrepreneurship research studies, and in addition, how researchers align plausible factors of influence with those levels of study. Within the article, Forson et al. discuss levels of research and analysis (i.e. micro, meso, macro) common to entrepreneurship research studies, while also criticizing traditional analytical approaches.
For example, Forson et al. point out that mainstream entrepreneurship research still frames the entrepreneur as “…*homoeconomicus* stripped largely of affect, intersubjectivity, personal narratives, discursive groundings or intersectional complexities” (p. 54). Importantly, Forson et al. suggest that widespread adoption of this view in the field has led to, “…a monolithic framing of entrepreneurial activity as decontextualized, purely economic and universally convergent” (p. 56). Given the need for a broader lens of analysis, Forson et al. propose a re-attention to the micro, meso and macro-level interplay that both shapes and influences entrepreneurial activity in society (p. 56, p. 59). To that end the authors draw upon four Bourdieuan concepts (e.g. field, habitus, capitals, strategies) as a catalyst for broadening entrepreneurship analysis (p. 62).

Essentially Forsen et al’s model suggests to me that there is micro, meso and macro-level factoral interplay that shapes and influences entrepreneurship experiences, both within fields of art and across a creative sector. For example, research suggests that whereas some venture opportunities are created, others are discovered as a result of endogenous and exogenous shocks to a field or industry.23 Consider now the affect that public opinion has on public funding (a form of venture capital) in the non-profit arts sector; funding which when disbursed, likely acts as an exogenous shock (albeit a positive one) to core workers in the non-profit arts sector. Moreover, research suggests that entrepreneurs often encounter individual challenges in recognizing venture opportunity due in part to limited access to key information.24 In taking this perspective, prior employment and/or experience in arts fields and arts industries will likely aid in the discovery of new venture

24 See Hayek, 1945.
opportunities within arts fields and arts industries, as research suggests entrepreneurs discover venture opportunities related to their prior knowledge (Shane, 2000, p. 449).

Admittedly skeptical at first, Forson et al’s notion of interplay became more plausible to me while reviewing the Bourdieuan multi-level framework (BMLF) for entrepreneurship and small business research (p. 63). Consider now Figure 2 for reference, which calls for a reconceptualization of micro-level analysis. Notably, the traditional approach to entrepreneurship research on the micro-level has tended to focus on factors of influence which are part of an internal locus of control (Kuratko, 2013, p. 10). However, this traditional approach has been criticized for underplaying the significance of contextual factors in shaping individual venture motivations (Forson et al., p. 57). In an effort to address this limitation, notably Figure 2 calls for a re-attention to the interplay between entrepreneurs’ individual venture motivation(s), and contextual factors such as capital, employed strategies, practices and/or common dispositions that both shape and influence individual venture motivations. Importantly in recognizing this interplay, I became much more interested in not only discovering the venture motivations of arts entrepreneurs, but also contextual factors which shape and influence individual venture motivations.

Figure 2 also calls for a re-conceptualization of the meso-level of analysis, notably a practice-centered level that is excluded from Kuratko’s volume (Kuratko, 2013). Interestingly, Figure 2 specifically calls for a re-attention to habitus; or the
worldviews, prevalent attitudes and common dispositions that guide practice within a field. With this understanding, consider now Bourdieu (1977) who defines *habitus* as:

The universalizing mediation which causes an individual agent’s practices, without either explicit reason or signifying intent, to be none the less “sensible” and “reasonable (p. 79).

…this immanent law, lex insita, laid down in each agent by his earliest upbringing, which is the precondition not only for the co-ordination of practices but also for practices of co-ordination (p. 81).

In short, the habitus, the product of history, produces individual and collective practices, and hence history, in accordance with the schemes engendered by history (p. 82).

Clearly in the Bourdieuan sense, habitus not only influences individual practice in a field, but also shapes trends and tendencies in new venture creation. In taking this into consideration, I employ the term *venture habitus*; which hereafter refers to the generally accepted practices, trends and tendencies that guide entrepreneurs’ decisions and actions. Consider for a moment the tendency of core entrepreneurs in the performing arts field to organize their ventures within a 501c3 structure. One wonders to what degree aspiring core entrepreneurs consider alternative models of organization before selecting the perceived standard in the performing arts field. In the Bourdieuan sense, such practices, trends and tendencies over time contribute to a venture habitus which both

---

25 For easier communication, I hereafter employ a general definition of the term “field”: “an area or division of an activity, subject, or profession” (Merriam Webster, 2013).
26 See research by Cherbo, 1998
shapes perceptions of legitimacy and general arts entrepreneurship practice in the performing arts.

Lastly, figure 2 calls for a re-conceptualization of the macro-level of analysis; notably a view that has traditionally focused on the broad array of external factors that contribute to firm start-up, endurance and dissolution (Kuratko, 2013, p. 9). Largely in an effort to draw attention to the interplay amongst the broader factors of influence; Forson et al. point to the interplay between society, culture and political economy; noting the influence such interplay has on labor market dynamics, social regulation, government-industrial relations and cultural notions of legitimacy. However, given the need to research entrepreneurship in context, (Deeds, 2014, p. 12), I concluded that Forson et al.’s macro-level propositions were too broad in scope. Society culture and political economy are vast social science concepts, and devoid of context and specificity (i.e. which society?; who’s culture?; what political economic factors?), such concepts may mistakenly be perceived as universally significant factors of influence within all fields and across all sectors of human society. Furthermore, devoid of context and specificity in macro-level entrepreneurship research, it is difficult to determine where such macro-level interplay begins and ends. Nevertheless, both Forson et al.’s framework and commentary have provided me with a great amount of insight and inspiration. Equipped with a better understanding of how micro, meso and macro-levels are conceptualized within entrepreneurship research studies, and better informed of the criticisms and limitations of traditional analytical approaches to entrepreneurship research, I am better prepared to clarify my research focus.
Clarifying my sectoral frame

In a point of departure from Cherbo, Vogel and Wyszomirski’s U.S. creative sector concept, I hereafter frame the sector of dissertation study as an *arts sector*; notably abstaining from utilizing the frame of a creative sector. The rationale for this choice is as such. While I agree that creativity is the seed needed for entrepreneurship both within creative fields, creative industries and across a creative sector, it could be argued that the same seed is needed to enable entrepreneurship within all fields, subfields, major and minor sectors in society.\textsuperscript{27} Given my desire to analyze entrepreneurship within a *distinct* sectoral frame (inclusive of distinct fields and distinct industries), I concluded that a greater distinction was necessary. Secondly, what is/is not creative is notoriously difficult to determine, and such an exercise seems beyond the scope of this dissertation. Thirdly, I came to realize over the course of this dissertation that although core workers work within fields of art for various individual purposes; the production, exhibition, subsidization and legitimization of art en mass remains their collective benefit to society. While creativity remains an essential component, it is important to note that creativity is *one* of many means necessary to bring about such ends in the arts. For example, in addition to creativity, artists may need tools, materials, participants, funding and inspiration in order to create works of art within the arts. In addition to creativity, administrative workers may need money, space, time and staff in order to organize production within the arts. In addition to creativity, technical workers may need education, technology and expertise in order to increase the experiential value of

\textsuperscript{27} Support for this position can be found in Towse, 2010a, pp. 469-470. Additionally, see “Classifying Creative Industries” in Towse, 2010b, p. 376.
products, services, cultural and entertainment experiences in the arts. Essentially in considering all that it takes to bring about core workers collective benefit to society, I posit labor convergence rather than intrinsic creativity as the primary means by which such collective societal benefit(s) are realized.

Decisively, an additional point of departure is being taken. Many entrepreneurship scholars define entrepreneurship broadly in an effort to appease the increasing diversity and multi-disciplinarity within the academic entrepreneurship field. However, with the understanding of entrepreneurship as context-dependent and idiosyncratic, scholars have increasingly called for more specificity, clarity and focus in entrepreneurship research. Given my desire to lay a foundation for empirical entrepreneurship research in the context of a defined arts sector, I decided that greater specificity was necessary in order to make this intention explicit. Therefore, in alignment with the sector in which entrepreneurial activity in this study takes place (i.e. arts sector), entrepreneurship is hereafter framed in context (i.e. arts entrepreneurship), guided by the venture opportunity school of thought 28, and defined as the act of organizing arts organizations.29

Importantly, in making the choice to focus on arts organizations rather than arts-based businesses, I broaden my frame of inquiry to include non-profit organizations as a potential sample frame. To reiterate, while all businesses are organizations, not all organizations are businesses. Were I to frame arts entrepreneurship as the act of

28 “The venture opportunity school of thought focuses on the opportunity aspect of venture development. The search for idea sources, the development of concepts, and the implementation of venture opportunities are the important interest areas for this school. Creativity and market awareness are viewed as essential” (Kuratko, 2013, p. 11).
29 Support for this position can be found in Gartner, 1985, p. 697.
organizing an arts-based business, both unincorporated arts organizations and incorporated non-profit arts organizations would be excluded from my research focus. Furthermore, in discussing entrepreneurship within the context of creative and cultural industries, Kolb (2015) reminds us that, “Organizations are groups of people who share a common goal” (p. 12). In taking this perspective, although inclusive of arts-based businesses, my frame of arts entrepreneurship (as defined) does not equate to the creation of a business (arts-based or otherwise), but rather to the broader act of organizing groups of people into organizational structures for shared goals and purposes in the arts sector-inclusive of both non and for-profit goals and purposes. Importantly, as the act of organizing requires first that one have a sense of one’s own capability of doing so 30, agency is hereafter framed as an essential component of arts entrepreneurship (as defined). Distinguished sociologist Anthony Giddens supports this position when he states:

Agency refers not to the intentions people have in doing things but to their capability of doing those things in the first place (which is why agency implies power: cf. the Oxford English Dictionary definition of an agent, as ‘one who exerts power or produces an effect’). Agency concerns events of which an individual is the perpetrator, in the sense that the individual could, at any phase in a given sequence of conduct, have acted differently (Giddens, A., 2013, pp. 686-689).

In addition, there are personal reasons for the aforementioned choices and disclosed points of departure. Admittedly, I desire to make this dissertation research more

30 See McKnight, J., & McKnight P. J., 2014, pp. 48-72.
meaningful, relatable and understandable to researchers, educators, theorists and practitioners in the field of arts entrepreneurship; an emerging academic field currently hindered by a lack of empirical research for guiding theory development, education and practice.\textsuperscript{31} For example, in calling for theory development in the emerging field of arts entrepreneurship, White (2015) referenced the lack of proposed theory or theories of arts entrepreneurship within the fields premier journals (p. 6).\textsuperscript{32} As advanced theories often guide general practice, and as new theory is often advanced based on empirical research which supports theorists’ propositions, empirical research is needed in order to advance the academic field of arts entrepreneurship.

Markedly, while employing the frame of an arts sector does avoid the semantic discourse of \textit{creativity}, it is important to note that this frame is not without it’s own set of semantic challenges. As sociologist Victoria Alexander has suggested, “the arts” are socially-driven (i.e. societal) and therefore are often what we (distinct members of a society) say they are (2003, p. 2). As such, there may be many arts sectors respective to both the cultural and geographical diversity of a society. Nevertheless, I am prepared to specify which arts sector the study is concerned with.

\textsuperscript{31} Support for this position can be found in Essig, 2015, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{32} A search within Artivate (www.artivate.org) and Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Research (www.jaer.ncsu.edu) was conducted on January 21, 2015.
Arts Sector

A societal sector comprised of (1) nationally recognized fields and sub-fields of art, (2) a core of distinct sectoral workers and (3) an infrastructure made up of opportunity structures, which via rules of order, both enable and constrain sectoral opportunities for core workers.

Figure 3. Sectoral Frame

Figure 3 discloses my sectoral frame in the form of a multi-level model of the arts sector. Note that the arts sector is framed as societal rather than economic. This is important to note because sectors are commonly framed either as economic sectors, sub-sectors of a broader economic sector, or non-economic sectors which contribute to broader economic sectors in society. Notably in framing the arts sector as societal rather than economic, I recognize the activity that takes place both within art fields and across the arts sector as socially-driven, rather than economically-driven; the former being a perspective shared by many sociologists. For example, in discussing Art Worlds,
sociologist Howard Becker rightly reminds us that many people (in addition to the artist) contribute to the work of art (1982, pp. 2-14). Moreover, while the romantic view of artists as the sole creators and producers of art remains a common view in society, that view is easily complicated when one recognizes the artistic, administrative and technical labor convergence that enables a play to be performed on stage for an audience. In such an example, one can hardly argue that the work of art (i.e. the production of a play) was accomplished by one artist, let alone driven primarily by economic means. Such is the case with the exhibition, subsidy and legitimacy of art en mass; arguably all socially-driven activities that require labor convergence in order to be realized in the arts sector. Additionally, employing a societal frame keeps the arts sector from being marginalized within economic sectors and sub-sectors, and in addition, keeps the arts sector from being buried within recreation and entertainment classifications (as is so often the case).³³

Before moving forward, it is important to note that the sectoral frame is greatly influenced by Cherbo, Vogel and Wyszomirski’s sectoral perspective, “The creative core cannot sustain itself. A constellation of support systems is an integral part of the infrastructure of the arts and creative sector” (2008, p. 15). While my sectoral frame departs from the classic production of culture approach (i.e. production, distribution, consumption), my frame nevertheless recognizes that there are (infra)structural components in the arts sector which both support core workers and enable sectoral benefit (i.e. opportunity structures). Moreover, recognition of an infrastructure in the arts

³³ NAICS (North American Industry Classification System) situates the arts sector in code 71 along with entertainment and recreation.
has not only helped me to better understand the conditions that exist where arts entrepreneurship occurs (i.e. entrepreneurial context), but has also aided me in theorizing and thinking about the role that arts entrepreneurs play in infrastructural development.

Building a theory of arts entrepreneurship

For example, in theory, whereas arts administrators and managers are appointed to assist in the sustainability of arts organizations, arts entrepreneurs are un-appointed individuals who take on primary responsibility for organizing arts organizations. Plausibly through the act of organizing and ultimately establishing a new arts organization within a given arts sector, there will exist opportunities within the infrastructure of the arts sector that previously were not available. For example, from the perspective of such core workers as playwrights, actors, actresses, dancers, directors, tech theatre workers, arts managers and administrators; performing arts organizations equate to sectoral opportunities for production and (re)production in performing arts fields. Consider now the establishment of a community art gallery in a given arts sector; arguably an **opportunity structure** embedded within the infrastructure of the arts sector which affords local community artists sectoral opportunities for exhibition. Consider now the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences; arguably an opportunity structure embedded within the infrastructure of the California arts sector which enables actors, actresses, directors and film producers sectoral opportunities to gain legitimacy in the interrelated fields of film and television.

Alternatively, consider sectoral opportunities constrained by the lack of arts organizations (i.e. opportunity structures) in a given arts sector. For example, while art
museums enable sectoral opportunities for artists to exhibit their works of art to the public en mass, such organizational structures constrain artists’ opportunities for exhibition by setting rules of order (i.e. policy) that determine which works will be exhibited over others, and when such works will be exhibited. Consider now arts organizations which afford core workers sectoral opportunities for subsidy. Core workers will likely equate the absence of arts and cultural foundations (i.e. opportunity structures) which either absorb or considerably reduce the cost of art production to a lack of opportunity for subsidy in the arts sector. Moreover, while prominent subsidy structures in the arts (e.g. National Endowment for the Arts) afford core workers opportunities to considerably reduce the cost of facilitating arts programs, artist services and cultural arts experiences; they also constrain sectoral opportunities for subsidy by setting rules of order (i.e. policy) that dictate which programs, services and experiences are to be subsidized, and who can and cannot apply for consideration. Consider again the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences; arguably a prominent opportunity structure that both enables and constrains sectoral opportunities for legitimacy, by setting rules of order (i.e. policy) dictating criteria for membership, voting and nomination. While there are no doubt additional forms/types of sectoral opportunity embedded within the infrastructure of the arts sector, in theory, sectoral opportunity in the arts is enabled and constrained both by the agency of arts entrepreneurs, and by arts organizations embedded within the infrastructure of the arts sector. This is an important perspective to note because both the
absence and presence of opportunity structures have been found to be important
predictors of entrepreneurial activity.\textsuperscript{34}

Importantly, the emerging theory is supported by a structuration approach to
trepreneurship; an approach that draws from a theory of structuration initially
conceived by Anthony Giddens.\textsuperscript{35} In discussing a theory of structuration, Gidden’s
(2013) points out that one of the main propositions in structuration theory is that the rules
and resources drawn upon in the production and reproduction of social action are at the
same time the means of systemic reproduction; a re-occurring theme within structuration
theory referred to as the duality of structure (Chapter 1, para. 33). Utilizing Gidden’s
tory of structuration as a new lens to view and make sense of entrepreneurial activity,
Sarason, Dean and Dilliard (2006) point out that while the traditional view of
entrepreneurship fills market gaps, the structuration view proposes a reciprocal
relationship between the actions of entrepreneurs’ and the sources of opportunity
afforded by social systems (p. 286).

The act of entrepreneurship occurs as the agent
specifies, interprets, and acts upon the sources of
opportunity. This is a dynamic process whereby the sources
of opportunity are acted on by the agent, and the agent is
affected by the sources of opportunity (2006, p. 287).

\textsuperscript{34} See Valdez & Richardson, 2013 p. 1150
\textsuperscript{35} “In structuration theory ‘structure’ is regarded as rules and resources recursively
implicated in social reproduction; institutionalized features of social systems have
structural properties in the sense that relationships are stabilized across time and space.
‘Structure’ can be conceptualized abstractly as two aspects of rules – normative elements
and codes of signification. Resources are also of two kinds: authoritative resources,
which derive from the co-ordination of the activity of human agents, and allocative
resources, which stem from control of material products or of aspects of the material
world” (Giddens, 2013, Introduction, para. 32).
Interestingly, if we view the agent within Sarason Dean and Dilliard’s frame as the arts entrepreneur, and arts organizations as embedded sources of opportunity, the structuration lens might help us better understand the vital role that arts entrepreneurship plays in infrastructural development within a given arts sector. For example, importantly structuration theory situates entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial activity, entrepreneurs and venture opportunity within the context of social systems (Sarason, Dean & Dilliard, 2006, p. 287). Additionally, it equates entrepreneurs to agents with the capability to act upon (i.e. take advantage of, leverage, exploit, utilize) existing sources of opportunity within a given social system (e.g. arts sector). Applying the structuration lens to emerging arts entrepreneurship theory, structuration theory suggests to me that sectoral opportunity in the arts sector may be enabled and constrained both by the actions of arts entrepreneurs, and by opportunity structures that exist within a given arts sector.

So what sectoral opportunities are we talking about? And furthermore, how can arts entrepreneurship research help arts entrepreneurs to better identify existing sources of opportunity within a distinct arts sector? Admittedly, at the moment I am unsure of how best to do this. However, if arts entrepreneurship differs from other forms of entrepreneurship (e.g. business, technology, health, educational, policy, social, cultural, etc.) than a point of opportunity differentiation may be in order. Devoid of differentiation, one could make the claim that all arts organizations (i.e. opportunity structures) enable and constrain the same type of sectoral opportunities in an arts sector; a broad claim that will surely be difficult if not impossible to advance. In any case, by obtaining a greater understanding of how arts entrepreneurs perceive opportunity within a specific arts sector,
sector, the nascent field of arts entrepreneurship may be better informed as to the means utilized to identify, discover, evaluate and/or exploit such opportunities. Still, in utilizing a structuration lens to make sense of arts entrepreneurship activity, it is important to recognize that existing sources of opportunity (in the arts or otherwise) do not necessarily equate to accessible opportunities for all. Sarason et al. support this position by reiterating that opportunities do not exist as a singular phenomenon, but are idiosyncratic to the individual (p. 294). Given this reality, particularly as it pertains to core workers outside of the dominant racial, ethnic and/or cultural majority, arts organizations (i.e. opportunity structures) might need to be re-organized in order to make some sectoral opportunities more accessible.

Figure 4. Units of Analysis
Framing arts entrepreneurship research on the micro-level

Guided by Forson et al.’s (2014) multi-level framework for entrepreneurship and small business research, in this study micro-level arts entrepreneurship research will focus on identifying and making meaningful comparisons between groups of arts entrepreneurs, and in addition, discovering significant factors of influence that affect arts entrepreneurs’ capability to organize distinct arts organizations. While there are many factors which can be proposed and tested, Figure 4 identifies constructs of interest (i.e. units of analysis) which will guide analysis of the data to be generated. Importantly, while the focus on demographics is an explicit attempt to describe who the arts entrepreneur is, the focus on entrepreneurial characteristics is not to be confused with an attempt to discover entrepreneurial traits (or arts entrepreneurial traits for that matter), but rather is proposed for the purpose of recognizing commonalities and making meaningful group comparisons amongst arts entrepreneurs of study.

Interestingly, Social Identity Theory (SIT) provides support for this position. To summarize, social identity theorists generally perceive social identities as both groups to which one belongs and meaningful aspects of one’s self-concept. As such individuals seek to maximize their self-esteem by striving to achieve a positive social identity. According to SIT, individuals will identify with highly ranked groups largely because this identification contributes to their self-esteem. Alternatively social identity theorists posit that a disadvantaged position of one’s own self-identity leads to a negative social

---

36 See Deaux, 1993
37 See Hechter, 2004, p. 402
38 See Hechter, 2004, p. 403; Walker & Lynn, 2013
identity; therefore individuals will avoid identifying with low-ranked groups.\textsuperscript{39} Scholars suggest that the recognition of one’s disadvantaged position triggers one’s attempts to improve that position or status.\textsuperscript{40} Where such disadvantaged social positions are evidenced, coping strategies (e.g. arts entrepreneurship) may be desired. To that end scholars suggest that strategies for coping with a negative social identity will likely be dependent upon how individuals perceive themselves in relation to their group affiliation.\textsuperscript{41}

Importantly, because \textit{all core workers} possess the potential to engage in arts entrepreneurship (i.e. to organize arts organizations), and subsequently to be recognized as arts entrepreneurs for doing so; researchers in the emerging field of arts entrepreneurship need to make distinctions between those who aspire to do it (i.e. aspiring arts entrepreneurs), those who are doing it for the first time (i.e. nascent arts entrepreneurs) and those who have done it in the past (i.e. veteran arts entrepreneurs). While admittedly such distinctions are difficult to determine, in the absence of such distinctions, arts entrepreneurship research studies may possess low validity. Moreover, Deeds (2014) has discussed difficulties in finding and creating solid sample frames in empirical entrepreneurship research; a well-known challenge in the field largely brought on by the absence of both homogenous and defensible lists from which to draw quantifiable sample frames (p. 15). Admittedly, while there are a wide variety of categorical demographics and entrepreneurial characteristics to choose from, the micro-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{39} See Mullen, Brown & Smith 1992; Tajfel 1982; Turner, 1987; Van Knippenberg & Ellemers, 1993
\item \textsuperscript{40} See Tajfel & Turner, 1986
\item \textsuperscript{41} See Mummendey et al., 1999
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
level in Figure 4 lays a foundation by calling attention to the interplay between the power, means and socio-economic status (SES) of arts entrepreneurs of study.

Power

To be an agent implies the ability to intervene in the world, or to refrain from intervention, and presumes that the agent is able to deploy a range of causal power, including that of influencing others. An agent ceases to be such if he or she loses the capability to “make a difference”, that is, cannot exercise some sort of power (Giddens, 1984, p. 14).

Plausibly in the arts sector, recognition of arts entrepreneurs productive, expressive and/or relationship power amongst core workers increases their sense of agency. For example, the acquisition of artist labor likely affords arts entrepreneurs the capability of converting the unique complexities of human experience into cross-cultural forms of communication and symbolic meaning; often evidenced via the works of art that artists create, the socio-cultural services that artists provide, and the arts and cultural experiences that artists make possible. In cases where this is evidenced, artist labor might be recognized by aspiring, nascent and veteran arts entrepreneurs as a form of expressive power. Subsequently while prior experience facilitating labor convergence in the core likely affords arts entrepreneurs productive power, social capital (i.e. who you know) in the core likely affords arts entrepreneurs relationship power. While such forms of power

---

42 *Productive power* refers to the ability to make things or provide goods, services, or financial resources of worth to someone. *Expressive power* refers to the ability to convert information and ideas into easily understood forms through writing, speaking, stories, music, drama, or visual art. *Relationship power* refers to the power of love and respect, which is built on the natural bonds that unite people, or the ability to bring diverse people together. See McKnight & McKnight Plummer, 2014, pp. 192-193.
may not necessarily be labor attributed or universally convergent; interestingly they are recognized as causal factors in community organizing literature.\textsuperscript{43} Operating under the assumption that arts entrepreneurs are both entrepreneurs and a sub-group of core workers; and given that power is in many respects, “individual, group, or structural capacity to achieve intended effects as a result of force, influence, or authority”\textsuperscript{44}, and, “a result of interaction”\textsuperscript{45}, an analysis of the power that arts entrepreneurs possess (pre-incorporation) will aid me in making meaningful group comparisons.

Means

Notably, Kuratko (2013) implies that every entrepreneur planning a new venture confronts the same dilemma, “where to find start-up capital” (p. 232). Based on the literature review, capital clearly seems to be the generally accepted essential resource necessary for success in entrepreneurship practice. Often framed in a pecuniary form, capital nevertheless comes in many different forms, including but not limited to human, social-relational, social-systemic, cultural and symbolic. Despite the many forms of capital, admittedly the term is often framed to a dominant degree in the entrepreneurship literature through an economic lens. With this understanding, and with a desire to research entrepreneurship in the context of the arts, I have chosen to employ the term “means” as a proxy for the term capital, largely in an effort to utilize terminology more relatable to the emerging field of arts entrepreneurship\textsuperscript{46}. Notably in employing the term

\textsuperscript{43} See McKnight & McKnight Plummer, 2014, pp. 192-193, p. 200
\textsuperscript{44} See Dobratz, Waldner & Buzzell, 2012, Chapter 1, para. 7
\textsuperscript{45} See McKnight & McKnight Plummer, 2014, p. 188
\textsuperscript{46} See Essig, 2015
“means” as a proxy, I do not abandon the economic frame of capital, but rather employ a semantic change in an effort to include non-traditional forms of capital that nevertheless may aid arts entrepreneurs in achieving emergent ends; a perspective supported by effectuation theory. Moreover the semantic change is further supported and rationalized by social bricolage theory, which Preece (2014) suggests involves (1) creating something from nothing, (2) using discarded, disused, or unwanted resources for new purposes, (3) engaging hidden, untapped local resources others fail to recognize, value or use” (p. 24). Essentially in identifying and analyzing the means by which arts entrepreneurs either achieve or hope to achieve their ends, I hope to uncover both commonalties and make meaningful group comparisons.

Socio-economic status (SES)

Undoubtedly, SES characteristics will greatly aid me both in evidencing demographics, and in making meaningful group comparisons amongst arts entrepreneurs of study. In addition, recognition of one’s own SES no doubt contributes to one’s own sense of agency. Needless to say I was exposed to prominent factors within the literature review (i.e. social class, race, gender) which contribute to the construct of socio-economic status (SES); itself a term that broadly refers to the social standing or class of an individual or group. For example, research evidences SES as being strongly correlated with race and ethnicity. Individuals of low SES are often perceived to have less access to resources in comparisons to other groups within distinct sample frames, as

47 See Sarasvathy, 2001
48 See APA, 2007
49 See House & Williams, 2000; Healey, 2013, pp. 16-17; APA, 2007
well as an association with issues of privilege, power and control.\textsuperscript{50} While social scientists continue to disagree about how best to measure SES, research suggests that common indicators include (1) level of education, (2) annual income and (3) occupation.\textsuperscript{51} Still, it’s worth noting that according to Saegert et al. (APA, 2007), the fundamental conceptualization of SES involves \textit{access to resources}

\textit{Social class} broadly refers to an individual’s position and status in a given society.\textsuperscript{52} Notably an individual’s social class has been found to affect his/her educational opportunities, employment/job prospects, health care quality and access to socio-economic capital.\textsuperscript{53} Although contemporary class distinctions are commonly perceived as lower, middle and upper; Karl Marx (1971) famously discussed class inequalities and identified two major class distinctions in an industrial society; the bourgeoisie (e.g. those who own the means for production) and the proletariat (e.g. the working class).\textsuperscript{54}

Sociologist Max Weber famously ushered intersectionality into the Marxist notion of social class,\textsuperscript{55} arguing that income inequality is not just based on economic disparities, but rather on ownership and control of wealth, poverty and income; prestige between groups; power and the ability to influence others.\textsuperscript{56} Notably intersectionality theorists urge sociologists to analyze how such statuses are linked to each other and form a matrix

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{50} See http://www.apa.org/topics/socioeconomic-status}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{51} See Grusky, 2001, pp. 9-10}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{52} See Healey, 2013, p. 13}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{53} See Abelev, 2009; Borrell et al., 2001; Cornwell & Cornwell, 2008; Healey, 2013, pp. 12-13; Hossler, 1998; Waddington, 1977}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{54} See Marx & Jordan, 1971}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{55} See Brennan, 1997}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{56} See Healey, 2013, pp. 14-15}
of domination”.

For example, according to bell hooks (2000, p. 8), class disturbs the illusion of racial solidarity by introducing a degree of intersectionality into such notions. hooks further posits that, “Acknowledging class differences destabilizes the notion that racism affects us all in equal ways”. Likewise, hooks points out that both race and gender have historically been used to deflect attention away from the harsh realities class politics exposes (p. 6). According to Hechter (2004), class politics rests on the impermeability of class boundaries, the strength of class organizational capacity and the salience of class consciousness (p. 403).

Notably distinct from *ethnicity*, which is defined as a group characteristic often based on national origin, ancestry, language, or other cultural characteristic; Delgado and Stefancic (2012) define *race* as “a distinct biological type of human being, usually based on skin color or other physical characteristics”. Notably both “whiteness” and the “white race category” is normative in both critical race theory and critical white studies, and therein sets the standard in dozens of critiques and situations (Chapter 5, Section B, para. 4). However contrary to popular belief, race is rarely binary (black/white), but is rather subjectively derived by way of a combination of shared traits/characteristics and overlapping self-interests (i.e. intersectionality) (Chapter 4, Section A). Still, although no science supports the practice, Delgado and Stefancic (2012) point out that concerning race, “American society prefers to place its citizens into boxes based on physical attributes and culture”, largely in an attempt to make sense of a complex racial reality.

---

57 See Healey, 2013, p. 16
58 Gloria Jean Watkins prefers to use the pen name “bell hooks” when cited or referenced
59 See glossary of terms
(Chapter 5, Section A, para. 7). To that end, common U.S. racial categories include: Black or African American, White or Caucasian, Latino, Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Other. While such categories do allow for easier descriptive and inferential statistics on target populations of study, minority groups who do not fit into these broadly defined categories stand to become marginalized and invisible (Chapter 5, Section A).

Moreover, according to Delgado and Stefancic (2012) racial categories are not objectively derived, but are rather constructed by society; invented, manipulated and retired when society deems it convenient (Introduction, Section F, para. 3). Several scholars seem to concur with this position.\textsuperscript{60} Still it is important to note that not all individuals in society have the power to change racial categories on the policy level, and therefore regardless of such an individual’s desire to re-invent, manipulate or retire such racial categories, policymakers ultimately dictate how race is classified.

According to APA.org, gender refers to, “the socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for boys and men or girls and women”.\textsuperscript{61} Healey (2013) suggests that gender is socially constructed, and states that like race, “…gender has both a biological and a social component and can be a highly visible and convenient way of judging and sorting people” (p. 21). Healey also points out that although gender roles and relationships vary from society to society, gender inequities exist, as men typically claim more property prestige and power than women (p. 21). Common contemporary gender categories include but are not limited to male, female and transgender. For example, the term transgender refers to those

\textsuperscript{60} See Omi & Winant, 1986; Smedley, 2007
\textsuperscript{61} See http://www.apa.org/topics/lgbt/transgender.aspx
individuals whose gender identity expression and/or behavior does not conform to that which they were assigned at birth. While binary sexual categories (e.g. male/female) form the basis for gender roles and gender identity in society, gender is not to be confused with “sex”, as sex is biologically defined rather than gender - which is culturally defined. In the biological sense, sex is often determined based upon an individual’s chromosomes, hormone prevalence and external/internal anatomy. In this way sex differs from sexual orientation, the latter of which refers to, “an enduring pattern of emotional, romantic and/or sexual attractions. It is important to note that while sexual orientation is rarely visible on the surface, sexual attraction may be highly visible, and therefore (where observed or perceived) may contribute to gender classification and stratification.

Framing arts entrepreneurship research on the meso-level

Guided by Forsen et al.’s (2014) view of the meso-level as a practice-based level of analysis, meso-level arts entrepreneurship research will focus on the practice of arts entrepreneurship; or perhaps more appropriately framed, the lived experience of organizing arts organizations (Berglund, 2007, pp. 75-93). Notably Morris et al. (2012) provide a wealth of support for the experiential frame and direction in entrepreneurship research. For example, when discussing entrepreneurship as experience, Morris et al. (2012) argue in support of a new view of entrepreneurship which moves the field past the traditional static snapshot perspective, and frame entrepreneurship as a dynamic socially-
situated process driven by unfolding and emerging events (p. 5, pp. 14-15). Continuing, they remind us that every venture is experienced by different actors in differing ways (p. 5). They touch on the uniqueness of entrepreneurship experiences (pp. 16-19). They draw from a wide variety of literature within other fields to both rationalize their experiential perspective, and they identify how one might conduct research on an entrepreneurial experience (pp. 254-275). Collectively, Morris et al.’s (2012) book suggests to me that by gaining a better understanding of the ways in which significant events shape and influence individual arts entrepreneurship experiences, I may be able to better understand how arts entrepreneurship occurred, and to identify the actions individual arts entrepreneurs take to help make those outcomes happen (p. 3).

Importantly, in an effort to differentiate between research in arts entrepreneurship (i.e. the organizing of arts organizations) and that of arts management (i.e. the management of existing arts organizations), research on the meso-level centers on the interplay between venture inspiration and organizational incorporation. Although closely associated with the construct of inspiration\(^{65}\), motivation is a common factor of study within the reviewed entrepreneurship literature.\(^{66}\) For example, researchers Verheul, Thurik, Hessels and Zwan van der (2010) suggest that entrepreneurs decide to engage in entrepreneurship as a result of differing combinations of motivations (p. 2). In an attempt to classify and distinguish from amongst the multitude of motivational possibilities, entrepreneurship scholars have adopted prominent categories: Push motivations (i.e.

\(^{65}\) Inspiration is hereafter broadly defined as a force or influence that makes someone want to do or create something.

\(^{66}\) See Shaver & Schjoedt, 2007, pp. 734-735
negative situational factors that push people into entrepreneurship); Pull motivations (i.e. positive situational factors that pull people into entrepreneurship) (p. 2). To that end Verheul et al. offer examples of situational factors that are believed to push people into entrepreneurship (e.g. exit or risk of unemployment, family pressure, dissatisfaction with present employment situation) and situational factors believed to pull people into entrepreneurship (i.e. need for achievement, desire for autonomy, desire for higher socio-economic status) (p. 2). In addition, Block and Wagner (2007) offer opportunity and necessity distinctions:

The difference between the two types of entrepreneurs is in the motivation of the entrepreneurs to start their venture. Opportunity entrepreneurs are viewed as entrepreneurs who start a business in order to pursue an opportunity, while necessity entrepreneurship is more need-based (p. 155).

Although both motivation and inspiration are related concepts in the entrepreneurship field, inspiration seems a more appropriate unit of analysis given that core workers in fields of art have been known to draw upon sources of inspiration for motivation. For example, sources of art inspiration include personal memories, emotional and spiritual experiences, socio-political events, life situations and other works of art. Moreover, regardless of an opportunity or necessity to do so, once inspired, arts entrepreneurs may nevertheless become motivated to organize the means necessary for various ends. In taking this perspective, an analysis of the sources of inspiration amongst arts entrepreneurs of study can help me to better identify that which inspires.

67 Support for this position can be found in Essig, 2015
them to organize means for various ends in the arts sector. Consider the question: What inspires core workers to engage in arts entrepreneurship? As there are many possible sources of inspiration, I have chosen to remain open to atypical sources in the hopes that new understandings will emerge and be used as a foundation for knowledge discovery in this dissertation. Additionally, it is helpful to situate meso-level inquiry from inspiration to incorporation, as arguably upon incorporation, arts entrepreneurship (i.e. as framed) ends and arts management begins. Notably in making the choice to frame arts entrepreneurship on the meso-level as a lived experience rather than a pre-determined process, I become sensitive to the temporal events (both latent and critical) which both shape and influence individual arts entrepreneurship experiences, and in addition, become sensitive to the volume, velocity and volatility of such events. While it is possible to utilize action research methodology to both engage in and research the experience of arts entrepreneurship as it occurs; admittedly due to the practical difficulty of doing so, researchers might also look to retrospective qualitative methodologies such as oral histories, narrative inquiry, critical incident technique, focus groups and structured/unstructured interviews in an effort to generate data for thick description.

Framing arts entrepreneurship research on the macro-level

In alignment with the macro-level identified within the sectoral frame, arts, macro-level arts entrepreneurship research centers on identifying the broader sectoral factors which affect venture start-up, endurance and dissolution within specific fields and/or sub-fields of an arts sector of study. Figure 4 identifies macro-level units of
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68 See Morris et al., 2012, pp. 10-19
analysis in the dissertation research study. Traditionally entrepreneurship analysis on the macro-level has centered on the broader environmental, economic and socio-political factors which influence the entrepreneurship process.\textsuperscript{69} Moreover macro-level entrepreneurship research has tended to focus on systemic factors which exhibit a strong external locus of control.\textsuperscript{70} While Howard Becker’s (1982) concept of Art Worlds\textsuperscript{71} is useful for theorizing broader sectoral factors which may affect arts entrepreneurship, field theory guides analysis on the macro-level of Figure 4.\textsuperscript{72}

While there are many conceptualizations of a field, scholar Martin (2003) contends that field theory is more or less a coherent approach in the social sciences for explaining regularities in individual actions relative to the positions of other field actors (p. 1). Martin suggests that fields connect and align organizations, and in doing so, “…induce shared subjectivities, or “culture” as we call it” (p. 42). Notably in framing artistic professions within fields, author Lipstadt (2003) denotes that according to Bourdieu (1992), social space is made up of many fields, which he (Bourdieu) frequently compares to games, whereby there exist distinct players (agents) who commit themselves to the rules of the game for the purpose of production and reproduction in a field (p. 397). Additionally, in taking a Bourdieuean perspective, Lipstadt argues in support of a field effect, “an instrument born of his (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992) fundamental definition of a field as a ‘space within which an effect of the field is exercised, so that what happens

\textsuperscript{69} See Kuratko, 2013, p. 9
\textsuperscript{70} See Kuratko, 2013, p. 9
\textsuperscript{71} “Art worlds consist of all the people whose activities are necessary to the production of the characteristic works which that world, and perhaps others as well, define as art” (Becker, 1982, p. 34).
\textsuperscript{72} Support for this position can be found in Lipstadt, 2003; Martin, 2003
to an object that traverses that space cannot be explained solely by the intrinsic properties of the object in question” (p. 395).

Arguably arts entrepreneurship activity plays an important role in regional development.\textsuperscript{73} Moreover, new ventures in fields and sub-fields of the arts sector further diversify products, services and experiences of aesthetic, symbolic and entertainment value in arts industries. Additionally, arts-based ventures are often project-based and labor intensive, and thus contribute to new jobs and employment.\textsuperscript{74} Importantly in taking a field perspective, I recognize that there may be many fields and sub-fields which collectively characterize the arts. Therefore it is important to note that research and analysis on the macro-level will not necessarily be representative or generalizable outside of disclosed field and/or sub-field boundaries.\textsuperscript{75} In addition, many fields and sub-fields in the arts sector may be interrelated, such as film and television, or musical theatre. Given these understandings, analysis on the macro-level calls attention to the interplay that contributes to venture habitus both within and across both broad fields and specific sub-fields of a given arts sector. To aid in this task, the conceptual framework therein follows the footsteps of the 2015 Kauffman Index of Entrepreneurial Activity\textsuperscript{76}, which takes annual measures to indicate, infer and evidence rates of (1) venture start-up, (2) venture endurance and (3) venture dissolution. Given the meanings derived from previous

\textsuperscript{73} Support for this position can be found in Lindeborg & Lindvist, 2013
\textsuperscript{74} See Lindeborg & Lindvist, 2013, p. 6
\textsuperscript{75} Researcher and scholar Alasuutari provides support for this position while arguing for cultural research that reveals a local and historically specific cultural or bounded system, when she states, “Getting a grasp on a culture and its worldview or structure of meanings does not get us any nearer to understanding another culture, except for the fact that we may better realize how different cultures may be” (1996, p. 372).
\textsuperscript{76} See http://www.kauffman.org/microsites/kauffman-index
Kauffman studies, entrepreneurship data generated on the macro-level of the arts sector can help me to answer basic entrepreneurship questions respective the arts sector, such as: “How many new ventures do we have in the field of Theatre?” “Where are they located?” “How many of those ventures have since dissolved?” “How many of those ventures have endured?”. In addition, the generation of such data will give me the ability to conduct comparative analyses of such arts-based ventures by time, location and other independent variables of interest.

Conclusion

In review, this chapter lays bare my conceptual framework for research and analysis, which consists of a collection of ideas, theories and commitments for informing and guiding empirical arts entrepreneurship research. In addition, the conceptual framework has clarified my dissertation research focus by describing the levels in which I intend to study arts entrepreneurship (i.e. micro, meso, macro), specifying my units of analysis, and by identifying, describing and discussing the context in which my frame of arts entrepreneurship is to take place (i.e. arts sector). Before moving forward with a description of proposed research methods, it is important to reiterate that given the sizeable amount of semantic discourse associated with the broader entrepreneurship field, the conceptual framework is inherently shaped by my definitional choices, my emerging theories and my socio-cultural position in society. Importantly throughout the dissertation, I have made efforts to disclose such details; largely because the choices I’ve

---

77 Additional support for this frame of a conceptual framework can be found in Ravitch & Riggan, 2012, p. xiii.
made and the positions I’ve taken have no doubt shaped and influenced both my frame of inquiry, and the questions I intend to ask about arts entrepreneurship in the arts sector.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I reference and discuss my research methodology for conducting and addressing dissertation research questions. I draw from scholars to provide evidence of the appropriateness of my proposed methods. I discuss limitations and disclose efforts to address potential biases. I also identify the scope of the dissertation research study by identifying field boundaries in alignment with my conceptual framework for research and analysis.

Although there are many changing and expanding definitions, mixed methodology broadly refers to an approach to knowledge discovery by way of both qualitative and quantitative research and analysis. According to Creswell (2014), mixed methodology was founded on the idea that all methods have biases and weaknesses, and subsequently that the utilization of both quantitative and qualitative methods neutralizes weaknesses in each form of data (p. 14). In theory, the utilization of mixed methods not only frees researchers from paradigmatic restrictions, but also embeds triangulation in the research process; essentially a process whereby two or more research methods are used to confirm results. In discussing mixed methodology, Creswell (2014) writes:

It involves the collection of both qualitative (open-ended) and quantitative (closed-ended) data in response to research questions or hypotheses. It includes the analysis of both forms of data. The procedures for both qualitative and

78 See Creswell, 2011, pp. 271-272
quantitative data collection and analysis need to be conducted rigorously (e.g., adequate sampling, sources of information, data analysis steps). The two forms of data are integrated in the design analysis through merging the data, connecting the data, or embedding the data. These procedures are incorporated into a distinct mixed methods design that also includes the timing of the data collection (concurrent or sequential) as well as the emphasis (equal or unequal) for each database. These procedures can also be informed by a philosophical worldview or a theory (see Chapter 3)” (p. 17).

Given the research questions and goals of the conceptual framework, I selected mixed methods for data generation. Although Creswell has discussed several overarching design options (e.g. Explanatory Sequential, Exploratory Sequential, Embedded, Transformative, Multiphase, etc.), my methodology was guided by a convergent parallel design. According to Creswell (2014), in a convergent parallel design, “the researcher collects both quantitative and qualitative data, analyzes them separately, and then compares the results to see if findings confirm or disconfirm each other” (p. 219). Creswell goes on to state, “The key idea with this design is to collect both forms of data using the same or parallel variables, constructs, or concepts” (p. 219). In theory this design generates data that converges via a process of triangulation, while also addressing inherent limitations present in both quantitative and qualitative research paradigms. Admittedly, I employed this research design under the assumption that by utilizing mixed methods, the study would remain adaptable to addressing emergent questions across research paradigms. In addition, by using a convergent parallel design, I did not feel committed to a particular research paradigm, but rather felt free to use whichever methods made the most practical sense to me for research purposes.
Scope

In an effort to establish sectoral boundaries, I chose to conduct arts entrepreneurship research on a state level, situating the arts sector within the state of Ohio (i.e. the Ohio Arts Sector). To that end a congressional district map of the State of Ohio (see Figure 5) is provided in order to better visualize geographic boundaries in which the Ohio Arts Sector is situated.\(^79\) Notably although geographic boundaries collectively bind the study’s sample frames, importantly all sample frames differ on micro, meso and macro-levels.

The sample frame on the micro-level equates to a random sample of owners and founders that incorporated target Ohio arts organizations over the course of the years 2000-2015.

The sample frame on the meso-level equates to a purposive sample of Ohio-based arts entrepreneurs, hereafter identified as those individuals who are recognized as being primarily responsible for organizing an arts organization.

The sample frame on the macro-level equates to a census\(^80\) of Ohio Theatre ventures corresponding to SIC\(^81\) codes 79220000, 79220100, 79220202, 79220203, 79220300 and NTEE\(^82\) code A65; which over the course of 2000-2015, either started, have since dissolved or are currently still in existence.

---

\(^{79}\) See www.sos.state.oh.us

\(^{80}\) Importantly, the word “census” is utilized here to reference the goal of gathering information from every individual in the population of study.


\(^{82}\) National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE). See http://nccs.urban.org/classification/ntee.cfm
Before moving forward, it is important to note that there is currently no official U.S. government sanctioned classification to indicate what does and does not constitute an arts organization; nor a national or state-based creative, cultural or arts industry/sector. Nor is there any official U.S. government sanctioned list of target businesses and/or organizational entities which are proposed to make up/derive such concepts. Obviously the lack of a nationally sanctioned definition for the term “arts organization” decreases the validity of arts entrepreneurship research as framed (what are you researching?). However, in recent years Americans for the Arts (AFTA) has both proposed and developed a list of creative industries; reportedly tracking over 702,771 arts-related businesses and organizations which are involved in the creation and distribution of the arts in the United States. Markedly on 2/11/16, a review of the language on the AFTA website stated:

For the purposes of this study, the Creative Industries are composed of arts-centric businesses that range from nonprofit museums, symphonies, and theaters to for-profit film, architecture, and advertising companies. We have guarded against overstatement of the sector by excluding industries such as computer programming and scientific research—both creative, but not focused on the arts.

Review of AFTA’s (2015) organizational list of creative industry entities indicated 644 codes of classification. Criticism of this list of classification is expected, largely due to the fact that the developers of this list employ the creative frame

---

83 See http://www.americansforthearts.org/by-program/reports-and-data/research-studies-publications/creative-industries
previously discussed in the dissertation. Furthermore, careful review of the AFTA creative industries codes will indicate differentiations with National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) categories of art, culture and humanities (i.e. Category A).\textsuperscript{84} Still, while the creative industries classifications are in no way put forth by AFTA as a national standard\textsuperscript{85}, AFTA classification does serve as a foundation for state-wide comparative analysis of (1) owner and founder demographics, (2) entrepreneurial characteristics, (3) entrepreneurship practice and (4) venture trends and tendencies within fields and sub-fields of art. In an effort to account for both the non and for-profit organizations in the Ohio arts sector, target ventures were classified utilizing both selected Category A/NTEE (National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities) codes (NCCS, n.d.) and selected SIC (Standard Industry Classification) codes used to produce the 2015 AFTA creative industries reports.

\textsuperscript{84} For information on NTEE coding, visit http://nccs.urban.org/classification/NTEE.cfm
\textsuperscript{85} Randy Cohen, personal conversation
Quantitative methods

This section attempts to summarize quantitative research activities. In an effort to generate nascent entrepreneurship data on the micro-level, the researcher designed, pre-tested and administered an online survey to participants within the micro-level sample.
frame.\textsuperscript{86} In the social sciences, researchers often use surveys to ask questions (data collection) to specific segments of a population (sample), and upon obtaining answers from the sample, to produce numerical descriptive and/or inferential statistics (Fowler, 2013, p. 1). Modes of data collection commonly include in-person, over the phone and online Internet formats; with each method possessing its own advantages and disadvantageous (Fowler, 2013, pp. 71-73). As the disadvantageous can both directly and indirectly contribute to survey error, it is important to make an attempt to control for such disadvantageous, both by evaluating and pre-testing the quality of survey measures and items, and by disclosing the limitation(s) of the selected form of survey administration in survey research studies.

The title of the survey used in this dissertation research study was “Survey of Entrepreneurship in the Creative and Cultural Industries” (SECCI). Under the assumption that the organizing of arts organizations (i.e. arts entrepreneurship) is evidenced by for-profit business ownership, legal incorporation and/or non-profit organizational development, the purpose of the survey was to generate data evidencing demographics and characteristics of owners and founders of arts organizations within the Ohio arts sector. To account for the differences in intentionality between owners of for-profit commercial arts organizations and founders of non-profit arts organizations, two versions of the SECCI were developed (i.e. a for-profit version, a non-profit version).

\textsuperscript{86} Fowler (2013) states, “The sample frame is the set of people that has a chance to be selected, given the sampling approach that is chosen. Statistically speaking, a sample only can be representative of the population included in the sample frame” (p. 14).
Note that given the fact that non-profit organizations cannot be legally owned, and given the desire for a more homogenous sample design, I decided to stratify the micro-level sample into two distinct datasets: a (1) non-profit dataset targeting founders and a (2) for-profit dataset targeting owners. Although research estimates a population of 19,941 or more Ohio-based arts-centric business owners (Americans for the Arts, 2015), a purchased list from the NAICS association\(^{87}\) utilizing AFTA classification returned 6,675 business addresses from which to administer a survey to potential participants \((N = 6,675)\). Based on this estimated population, I used a sample size calculator \((95\% \text{ confidence level} / 5\% \text{ confidence interval})\) to set the goal of achieving a representative sample \((363)\) for the for-profit owner dataset. To encourage a greater return, I oversampled at 566, and included a prize drawing incentive.

Alternatively, the Guidestar database served as the primary source for deriving the non-profit founder dataset.\(^{88}\) Research and commentary suggests that Guidestar consistently gathers business and organizational data on more than 1.8 million non-profit organizations across the United States.\(^{89}\) Notably, Guidestar uses NTEE coding for organizational entity classification. A purchased list from the Guidestar association utilizing NTEE classification (Category A) returned 230 organizational addresses from which to administer a survey to potential participants \((N = 230)\). Based on this estimate, I used a sample size calculator \((95\% \text{ confidence level} / 5\% \text{ confidence interval})\) to set the goal of achieving a representative sample \((166)\) for the non-profit dataset. To encourage a

\(^{87}\) See http://www.naics.com/
\(^{88}\) For more information, visit Guidestar.org
\(^{89}\) See Hines, 2003; Hosford, 2012
greater return, I oversampled at 230, and included a raffled donation incentive. It is important to note that via an excel analysis, some duplicate records were identified on both the Guidestar and NAICS queries. In such cases, *such records were situated into the appropriate dataset based on their status of incorporation.*

Prior to administering the respective versions of the SECCI to the stratified sample frame(s), pre-testing in the form of cognitive think-aloud sessions were conducted in an effort to generate formative feedback. Four test sessions occurred over the phone. Permission was given for phone recordings prior to the beginning of test sessions. Although survey test participants were recruited from the population of study, test participants consisted of individuals whose organizational ventures were incorporated outside of the State of Ohio. This kept potential participants within the State of Ohio from taking the SECCI twice. Feedback from pre-testing was used to inform the final survey drafts. Survey test participants received a small honorarium for their time. Prior to administration, a final draft of the survey was presented to both an assessment expert (Dr. Kristin Koskey, Associate Professor of Assessment and Evaluation, University of Akron), and a content expert (Dr. Wendy Torrance, Director of Research, Kauffman Foundation) in an effort to inform the final survey version. Promptly upon receipt of results, survey data was analyzed using cross tabulations. Visual aids are provided in Appendix C of this dissertation. Cross tabulations that were found to be either meaningful or of interest were utilized for confirmatory purposes.

---

90 Copies of both the non and for-profit versions of the SECCI are included in the Appendix of this dissertation.
Continuing, in an effort to generate nascent macro-level data on venture habitus, I merged the purchased Guidestar and NAICS queries into one major dataset (i.e. venture dataset). Importantly, the Ohio Secretary of State business database was used extensively to check the validity of the venture dataset. For example, upon comparison of venture dataset records with the Ohio Secretary of State database, it was determined that a significant amount of the purchased records acquired from the NAICS association queries possessed incorrect dates of incorporation and dissolution. Furthermore, a significant amount of the purchased records from Guidestar were not registered within the Ohio Secretary of State database; an important finding that motivated me to begin inputting queried records into the Ohio Secretary of State database for validity checking. Quickly realizing that it was not possible for me to check the validity of all the records queried within the dissertation research timeframe (N = 6,905), I set a practical benchmark, checking the validity of all the records that corresponded to the field of Theatre (specific NTEE/SIC organizational codes disclosed in the macro-level sample frame). With the assistance of my wife, I was able to check the validity of 786 out of 6,905 records in the venture dataset, inclusive of those disclosed codes attributed to the Theatre field. Promptly upon receipt of results, data was analyzed using cross tabulations. A summary and discussion of descriptive statistics are provided in Chapter 5 of this dissertation. Cross tabulations that were found to be either meaningful or of interest were utilized for confirmatory purposes.

For confidentially purposes, it is important to note that Qualtrics served as the platform for online survey administration. Qualtrics SSL encryption feature was enabled
in order to protect participants’ sensitive information. Importantly there were also no forced responses coded into the SECCI survey protocols, so participants were allowed to skip any questions they did not feel comfortable answering. Although the Guidestar and the NAICS queries were delivered to me in such a manner that participants could be identified, efforts were made to de-identify participants in both the for/non-profit datasets. For example, survey respondents are not coded in the datasets by name, but rather by position within the venture: [For-Profit] (1) Sole-Owner, (2) Co-Owner, (3) Former Owner; [Non-Profit] (4) Founder, (5) Co-Founder. Further, identifying information derived from focus group sessions is masked at the discretion of participants within the dissertation (i.e. via pseudo names and pseudo organizational names). Thus in accordance with IRB policy, efforts were taken to make sure that disclosure of participants' responses will not reasonably place participants at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to participants financial standing, employability, or reputation. Moreover, because the acquisition of certain identifying information was necessary for the study, informed consent was requested on the first page of each of the online surveys. The language states, “All self-report data will be used exclusively by the researcher for comparative analysis of owners and founders of target businesses and organizations within the State of Ohio, and that at no time will any self-report data be used for any means outside of that purpose without documented permission from participants.”
Qualitative methods

Within entrepreneurship research, data evidencing entrepreneurship practice is usually derived quantitatively via survey research methodology. However, in framing entrepreneurship on the meso-level as an experience, qualitative research methodology seemed more appropriate for generating data of thick description. To that end, meso-level data was generated by way of three semi-structured interview sessions. Under the assumption that arts entrepreneurs are not recognized as entrepreneurs until after their respective organizational ventures have achieved a measure of sustainability and legitimacy in a field or sub-field of the arts sector, the sample frame on the meso-level consisted of a purposive sample of Ohio-based arts entrepreneurs, specifically defined as those individuals who are recognized as being primarily responsible for organizing a new arts organization.

Within the sample frame, identifying information on the participants is purposively limited within the interview transcripts. The pseudo names, Luke, Ruth and Maggie are hereafter employed to reference the three research participants. While I realize that this choice will create validity questions (are they really arts entrepreneurs?), I was more concerned with maintaining the trust of the actual participants, and in addition, protecting them from any harm should they be identified. Recall that entrepreneurship is a social-undertaking, often filled with highs and lows, good times and bad times, handshakes and heartaches. As such, I made a commitment to the participants to treat the experiential data I gathered via qualitative research activities with the sensitivity and confidentially it deserves.
All participant interview sessions took place on 2/15/16. While one of the sessions was conducted at the home of a participant, two of the sessions were conducted at Artswave in Cincinnati, Ohio. Written letters of informed consent were signed and obtained from participants on the day of interview session activities. All sessions were tape recorded and transcribed for the purpose of informing the results section of this dissertation study. Upon conclusion, both the recordings and the transcripts were analyzed inductively by the researcher via thematic analysis; essentially a search for meaningful themes that emerged while reading and re-reading the data. Emergent themes will be discussed in the meso-level analysis section of Chapter 5 within this dissertation.

Guided by Morris et al., (2012), it is important to note that during the semi-structured interview sessions, I was particularly interested in drawing out and identifying significant events which both shaped and influenced participants’ arts entrepreneurship experiences. Importantly, Morris et al. (2012) point out that experiences in entrepreneurship flow much like other dominant aspects of life (p. 4). Mistakes are common. Relationships are tested. Positive and negative emotions and feelings correspond with venture successes and failures. Particularly in the case of negative events largely caused by the entrepreneur themselves, or in the case of significant events long past; recalling, disclosing and discussing such events are not as easy as one would think.

To encourage event recall, I drew upon literature on the critical incident technique (CIT). Notably, CIT is a retrospective qualitative method utilized by entrepreneurship

---

91 For more information see www.theartswave.org
92 See Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006, p. 6
Importantly, CIT assisted me in both shaping the flow of the session, and in formulating appropriate interview questions. Markedly in discussing entrepreneurship as experience, Morris et al. (2012) refer to scholars who have used CIT to generate qualitative data in entrepreneurship research studies (p. 266). Moreover, Chell identifies CIT as a qualitative interview procedure which facilitates the investigation of significant occurrences (events, incidents, processes or issues) identified by the respondent. Continuing, Chell notes the objective of CIT, “… to gain an understanding of the incident from the perspective of the individual, taking into account cognitive, affective and behavioral elements” (p. 48). Notably in a point of departure from the traditional frame of the critical incident (i.e. a business related event that dramatically affects an entrepreneur’s business and/or personal life), I equated a critical incident to a significant event; a semantic change that I felt would be more relatable and understandable to participants.

Limitations

As with all mixed methods studies, the researcher needs to establish the validity of the scores from the quantitative measures and to discuss the validity of the qualitative findings. In the explanatory sequential mixed methods approach, additional validity concerns arise. The accuracy of the overall findings may be compromised because the researcher does not consider and weigh all of the options for following up on the quantitative results. Attention may focus only on personal demographics and

---

93 See Brundin, 2007, p. 284
94 See Chell, 2004
95 See Cope, 2003; Cope & Watts, 2000
96 See Chell, 2004, p. 48
97 See Chell, 2004, p. 45
Creswell’s above commentary points to the dangers of employing a research design without understanding both its potential and inherent limitations. Given that every research design has limitations, this study’s design is no exception. For example, the employed design utilizes a self-report measure in the form of a survey to generate descriptive statistics for micro-level analysis. Self-report measures have long been subject to self-report bias. Survey participants may also experience difficulty in understanding survey questions. Moreover, the study uses semi-structured interviews to capture data on participants’ entrepreneurship experiences. However, it is possible that during these interview sessions, participants may have held back on disclosing certain significant events associated with their entrepreneurship experiences, either because the event was unpleasant, or because disclosure of the event may have put the participant in an unfavorable light. Also, CIT calls for participants to recall events from the past in order to answer research questions. Human memory is known to be more unreliable after the passage of time. Therefore, human memory may also contribute to limitations. Also, it is important to note that all interview sessions were transcribed by a third-party. As such, it is possible that certain words, meanings and nuances from the original recorded interview sessions have been lost in translation. Additionally, it is possible that upon
receipt of survey data gathered online, key responses may have been missing - as participants may have answered proposed questions quickly without much thought. Such occurrences arguably contribute to limitations which affect the validity of the results of the study.

While self-report bias will always be present in survey methodology, in an effort to increase the clarity of the survey questions and items, I ran drafts of the SECCI surveys through a series of cognitive interviews. Cognitive interviewing has been known to help researchers identify survey questions and/or survey prompt language that require further clarification.98 Through cognitive interviewing, I obtained formative feedback that motivated me to both re-phrase certain survey language and eliminate certain survey questions and prompts that were continually reported to be misunderstood.

To account for words, meanings and nuances lost in translation, I emailed respective copies of the edited interview transcripts to research participants for validity checking. Additionally, interview sessions have been known to make participants self-conscious about responding truthfully. Practically speaking, it may be difficult for some participants to disclose personal feelings and experiences to one individual that they do not know. Given this understanding, it is possible that some participants may have been uncomfortable disclosing certain feelings, emotions, and significant events associated with their arts entrepreneurship experience. Such an occurrence may have limited the

98 Collins (2003) describes, “Cognitive interviewing is a diagnostic tool for pre-testing survey instruments such as questionnaires. It focuses mainly on the questionnaire rather than the survey process, paying explicit attention to the mental processes respondents use to answer survey questions and thus allows covert as well as overt problems to be identified” (p. 235).
amount and quality of data generated. To address this limitation, potential participants were both identified and referred from a well-known policy leader in the Cincinnati arts sector (Alecia Kintner, CEO of ArtsWave), largely in an effort to build upon the trust shared by Alecia and participants. In addition, I sent letters of informed consent on Ohio State letterhead to each participant in advance of the interview sessions; documentation that disclosed research purposes, summarized participant rights and confidentiality practices. In doing so, I established trust with participants, all in an effort to make them feel more comfortable in participating and disclosing significant events within their respective arts entrepreneurship experiences.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I referenced and discussed my research methodology for conducting and addressing dissertation research questions (convergent parallel research design). I drew from scholarly sources and similar research studies to provide evidence of the appropriateness of my selected mixed research methods (i.e. survey research and semi-structured interviews). I discussed limitations and disclosed efforts to address potential biases. I also identified and specified the scope of the dissertation research study by identifying sample frames on multiple levels of analysis (i.e. random sample of owners and founders of arts organizations on micro-level; purposive sample of arts entrepreneurs on meso-level; census of theatre ventures on macro-level). In addition, I identified both geographic boundaries (i.e. The State of Ohio) and field boundaries (i.e. selected SIC and NTEE codes) in alignment with my conceptual framework for research and analysis. Importantly, while there are many ways to research arts entrepreneurship as
framed, I utilize the aforementioned methodology not only in an effort to address research questions, but also in an effort to provide one replicable example of how researchers can conduct empirical arts entrepreneurship research on multiple levels of analysis.
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

In this chapter, I summarize, analyze and discuss the data generated through the aforementioned mixed method research activities. I also identify and discuss emergent themes. Importantly, I utilize the lens of the conceptual framework to aid in interpretation, with the goal of making sense of the data to researchers, educators and practitioners in the emerging field of arts entrepreneurship.

Note that concerning research on the micro-level, I was unsuccessful in achieving generalizable response rates for both the for-profit dataset (sample target = 363) and the non-profit dataset (sample target = 166). Total respondents for the for-profit (FP) SECCI came to 62. Total respondents for the non-profit (NP) SECCI came to 53. To be clear, this outcome means that research findings on the micro-level are not generalizable beyond the scope of the micro-level sample frame. It also means that per the low survey response rates, I am unable to make statistical inferences from the data. In addition, it is important to note that the SECCI is a work in progress, and as such does not yet adequately align with all the goals of the conceptual framework. In full disclosure, new understandings arose both during and after survey administration, and thus future surveys will no doubt require revision. For example, not all SECCI questions were found to be relevant to the goals of the conceptual framework, and thus not all survey responses are reported. Nevertheless, the SECCI was useful for providing descriptive statistics.
What are demographics and characteristics of entrepreneurs in the Ohio Arts Sector?

Research on the micro-level aided me in addressing the first dissertation research question. Although survey questions, charts and visual diagrams corresponding to item responses can be found in Appendix C within this dissertation, a summary of shared characteristics and meaningful demographic comparisons emerged while analyzing the survey responses. For example, analysis of the survey data indicates that the majority of Ohio arts entrepreneurs of study were owners of for-profit arts organizations, and in addition, founders of non-profit arts organizations who either work as staff or serve as board members. Additionally, according to research results from Q2 (i.e. question 2 on the SECCI), most of the arts entrepreneurs of study (both for- and non-profit) were comfortably engaging in day-to-day activities. Importantly this finding serves as an indicator of the most common stage of entrepreneurship (Deeds, 2014, p.16), and furthermore, situates the majority of arts entrepreneurs of study in the maintenance and expansion phase of entrepreneurship policy; which according to Lundstrom and Stevenson (2005), concerns itself with both administrative and tax burdens, labor regulations and rules, technology adoption, growth financing, internationalization and bankruptcy issues (p. 59). Additionally, it is important to note that according to analysis of Q10 and Q11, the great majority of arts entrepreneurs of study were nascent arts entrepreneurs (i.e. first-timers), rather than veteran arts entrepreneurs (i.e. those who had previously engaged in the act of organizing arts organizations).

In terms of demographics, the majority of Ohio arts entrepreneurs in the micro-level sample frame were found to between the ages of 45-68, with the youngest being 24,
and the oldest being 86. In terms of venture capital characteristics, even though the majority of Ohio arts entrepreneurs of study possessed between $1-999 in pre-incorporation start-up (financial) capital, it is important to note that prior to incorporation, the majority of Ohio arts entrepreneurs of study made between $80-100,000 or more in annual income. Again, while this finding is not generalizable, it does evidence the presence of a substantial financial safety net despite the seemingly low pre-incorporation start-up (financial) capital requirements ($1-999) of arts entrepreneurship. This interpretation is further supported by the fact that the majority of arts entrepreneurs of study acquired financial capital to support for-profit ventures via earned income and personal savings, or in the case of non-profit ventures, via public and private grant funding. Essentially, whereas the majority of arts entrepreneurs did use their own personal income to support the organizing of for-profit arts organizations, they did not use their own personal income to support the organizing of non-profit arts organizations.

In terms of education, it is important to note that while a great majority of arts entrepreneurs did receive a formal arts education within Pre-K-12, community and/or higher education settings prior to incorporation (68.33% FP; 69.39% NP), the majority of arts entrepreneurs of study did not receive any entrepreneurship education (63.93% FP; 58% NP). Consequently, the majority of arts entrepreneurs of study indicated that they did receive management education prior to incorporation (54% FP; 57% NP). While a greater sample size is needed for correlative studies, future studies are needed in order to assess the impact that such forms of education have on arts entrepreneurs. Additionally, analysis indicates that the majority of arts entrepreneurs of study had
earned a degree at the Bachelor level; a finding which when compared with the majority of arts entrepreneurs reported annual income (i.e. $80-100 K or more) and the dominant race of micro-level research participants (i.e. white), arguably paints a picture of the dominant SES in the sample.

Concerning entrepreneurial motivation, the majority of Ohio arts entrepreneurs of study who started for-profit organizations were self-motived to organize. However, the majority of Ohio arts entrepreneurs of study who started non-profit organizations either recognized an opportunity to address a social need, or were motivated by some other reason. While the former rationale is typical of those who engage in non-profit entrepreneurship, it is important to note that there were many reasons given outside of item choices. As the reasons are both plentiful and atypical, clearly more research is needed to uncover arts entrepreneurs’ motivations and inspirations, specifically for those who desire to organize non-profit arts organizations.

Alternatively, it is important to note minority arts entrepreneurship demographics and characteristics in the sample frame. Such disclosure can aid us both in recognizing distinct challenges that arts entrepreneurs outside of the dominant socio-economic and cultural majority face, and aid us in making meaningful group comparisons amongst minority arts entrepreneurs in arts entrepreneurship research. For example, very few arts entrepreneurs identified as co-owners of for-profit arts organizations (9.68%), and as co-founders of non-profit arts organizations (13.21%). This finding suggests to me that the majority of arts entrepreneurship experiences in the sample frame were driven by one individual, rather than by multiple individuals who shared equitable organizational risk
and responsibility. Also, it is important to note that the overwhelming majority of Ohio arts entrepreneurs in the sample frame identified as White (76.56% FP; 91.84% NP), rather than American Indian or Alaska Native, Arab, Asian, Black or African American, Bi-racial, Hispanic or Latino, Multi-racial, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Other, or Prefer not to answer. Furthermore, concerning the gender of arts entrepreneurs, while there are a moderate concentration of women arts entrepreneurs in the sample frame (40.62% FP; 42.86% NP), none of the arts entrepreneurs of study identified as transgender. Such findings both encourage and challenge me to think about how I can make future micro-level arts entrepreneurship research studies more representative of the socio-cultural diversity within diverse arts sectors of study.
What are experiences of arts entrepreneurs in the Ohio Arts Sector?

Findings from the meso-level research activities aided me in addressing research question 2. Although the analyses will reference arts management issues, the analyses will center on what occurred pre-incorporation. It is important to reiterate that although management no doubt occurs within entrepreneurship; *entrepreneurship is not management.* This is an important assumption to disclose, because even though the interview transcripts identify many organizational management issues, this study is an entrepreneurship study. Again, largely because incorporation evidences the legal birth/existence of an organization, I have chosen to focus my analyses on the time period that strategic management research often ignores (i.e. venture inspiration to organizational incorporation).

Markedly through the utilization of the critical incident technique discussed in the methodology section, I was also able to draw out significant events which shaped and influenced the development of participants ventures from inspiration to incorporation; and in addition, to confirm the sources of inspiration which motivated participants to engage in arts entrepreneurship. As significant events from each interview session have aided me in addressing research question 2, shared arts entrepreneurship experiences amongst all three participants will be disclosed after a summary of each Interview session. Note that edited transcripts of all three interview sessions are included in Appendix D of this dissertation.99

99 Upon reviewing the session transcripts, readers will find identifying information which I believed could be used to easily identify participants is [masked]; aptly enclosed by [brackets]. While all transcripts have been edited for confidentiality purposes, for the
Summary of Interview 1

Interview 1 was conducted on 2/15/16 at a local arts organization called Artswave (www.theartswave.org) in Cincinnati, Ohio. The session took place within a small conference room in the early morning. The participant (Luke) met with me for about one hour. Guided by the critical incident technique, I began the interview with the goal of encouraging participant recall. To facilitate this, I asked Luke for a general summary of his organization’s mission and programmatic activities. While disclosure of the exact mission would violate participant’s confidentiality, I will attempt to summarize by saying that since incorporating in 2004, Luke’s non-profit arts organization has existed in the City of Cincinnati, OH; providing art gallery exhibition space, art education classes, juried art exhibition opportunities, publishing opportunities and employment opportunities to members of the greater Cincinnati community.

Prior to engaging in arts entrepreneurship, Luke had worked as a professional artist and a museum professional. However, Luke reports that while working as a college art teacher up-for-tenure at a local university in Cincinnati, he encountered jealousy from one of the tenured faculty members, which he believes was due in part to a college supported arts-based venture he was leading along with several students. Initially, this venture started out as a student-led public art exhibition. Overtime, in teaching his students to curate shows and install them professionally in public spaces, Luke’s students

most part, responses from both participants and myself are reported verbatim. Participants were selected based on their recognition by Alecia Kintner (CEO of Artswave) as Cincinnati arts entrepreneurs, or individuals who are primarily responsible for organizing arts organizations in Cincinnati, Ohio.
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started doing so on their own within a local restaurant space. Inspired by his students’ passion for this arts-based venture, and largely influenced by one student’s suggestion [Sue] to develop the venture into an independent arts organization, Luke was motivated to engage in arts entrepreneurship. In fact, when given the opportunity by his Dean to resign from his tenure-track position with two years of paid leave, Luke accepted, and focused all his time and energy on arts entrepreneurship.

Interview 1: Significant Events

Although there are many events (explicit and implicit) that may have contributed (directly or indirectly) to Luke’s arts entrepreneurship experience, Luke explicitly identifies [Sue’s] suggestion (“We should not do this as a university thing, because we have strings attached to the university” “We should do this as a non-profit”) as the significant event which triggered his arts entrepreneurship experience in 2004. Markedly, Luke also identifies the dialectic process which he helped to bring into existence (through his teaching) as the significant event which ultimately motivated [Sue] to make that suggestion:

So we started this thing called [masked event] at the [masked local restaurant], where I was kind of teaching the students how to curate shows, and install them professionally. And so that was our first attempt at an exhibit for the public, coming out of the dialectic process.

And that got them sort of convinced that, yes, exhibitions in the public space are really important. And so they started shopping for spaces to rent. And they were thinking we could get money from the university, or we could do car washes and bake sales, or we could write grants or...There were lots of possibilities.
In taking this into consideration, I recognize (1) the dialectic process as Luke’s source of *inspiration*, and (2) [Sue’s] suggestion as the initial event which *motivated* Luke to incorporate; markedly two events of significance within the arts-based venture that both shaped and influenced Luke’s arts entrepreneurship experience. Ironically, in the absence of jealousy (in Luke’s view) from the faculty, Luke may have chosen to stay at the university in the tenure track position, and subsequently, arts entrepreneurship may have never occurred. For example, although Luke states that “not getting tenure” was a terrible tragedy for him, he also perceives it as a miracle, because the situation enabled him to get two years paid leave, and afforded him the necessary time to focus on organizing the arts organization. Such events mirror a web of possibilities, further evidencing arts entrepreneurship as a context-dependent idiosyncratic experience.

It is important to note that upon further review of the transcript, additional significant events (post-incorporation) were explicitly identified within Interview 1. For example, finding the perfect building with cheap rent and a landlord that was willing to work with them - changed the course of the organization for the better, largely by providing Luke with a physical and affordable space from which to conduct organizational operations. Also, it is important to note that some reported events (post-incorporation) remain unexplored for lack of time; as evidenced by the following testimony, “We've had challenges every single year. Staff leaving, staff coming, you know, like buildings being sold and bought, and threats to rent going up, neighborhood changing...”. Essentially there are many significant events which shaped and influenced Luke’s venture post-incorporation, including but not limited to: signing the lease and
committing to launch; receiving education and subsidy from a local community arts foundation; dealing with new building ownership; threats by the new owner to raise the rent; expanding and re-launching the art gallery space; and making staff full-time. Again, while such events occurred after the birth of the organization, they are no doubt still significant events which both shaped and influenced Luke’s arts entrepreneurship experience.

Summary of Interview 2

Interview 2 was conducted on 2/15/16 at a local arts organization called Artswave (www.theartswave.org) in Cincinnati, Ohio. The session took place within a small conference room in the early morning. The participant (Maggie) met with me for about one hour. Guided by the critical incident technique, I began the interview with the goal of encouraging participant recall. To facilitate this, I asked Maggie for a general summary of her organization’s mission and programmatic activities. While disclosure of the mission would violate the participant’s confidentiality, I will attempt to summarize by saying that since incorporating in 2010, Maggie’s non-profit arts organization has existed in the City of Cincinnati, OH; annually presenting a classical music festival to the Greater Cincinnati community via collaborations with both local, internationally known and Grammy award winning musicians.

Prior to engaging in arts entrepreneurship, Maggie had traveled the world working as a professional classical musician (concert violinist). Attracted by the large amount of arts organizations present within the city of Cincinnati, Maggie eventually decided to settle down and make Cincinnati her home. However, Maggie reports that after settling
down within the greater Cincinnati area, she noticed that a great many of the smaller Cincinnati chamber music groups and non-profit arts organizations were not collaborating with each other. Essentially, recognizing an opportunity for collaboration, Maggie began to think about how best to capitalize on that opportunity, eventually conceptualizing and settling on a festival format.

Interview 2: Significant Events

There are of course many events (explicit and implicit) that may have contributed (directly or indirectly) to Maggie’s arts entrepreneurship experience. However, within the transcript, Maggie explicitly identifies her inspiration for engaging in arts entrepreneurship; notably to raise the national and international profile of the smaller music organizations by organizing a collaborative music festival (i.e. the arts organization). For example, in her own words she states:

“And so the original inspiration was to put together quite a few local organizations and present their concerts as part of the festival, as well as bring current Grammy Award-winning musicians who travel all over the world to be part of the same festival, and therefore raise the profile for the small arts organizations”

Importantly although Maggie states that her motivation for incorporating was to obtain non-profit status for donation purposes (“Because people will gladly give you the money if it’s a write-off…” “Basically, that’s why I incorporated and got tax-exempt status as soon as possible”), she also identifies the significant event which motivated her to incorporate, when she states:
And so I had lined up the idea with a few key people who I felt would be supporting the festival...

...and **made a few presentations**. And once they, I th-, I saw a very good response and I knew that they would be supporting the festival, I had to incorporate and get a nonprofit status.

In taking this into consideration, I recognize (1) the lack of collaboration amongst local music organizations as the source of Maggie’s *inspiration*, and the (2) response to her presentation for support as her *motivation* for incorporating as a non-profit organization in 2010; markedly two events of significance that both shaped and influenced Maggie’s arts entrepreneurship experience. Additional significant events (post-incorporation) were identified within Interview 2. For example, when Maggie brought on a college intern, the intern was able to take on some of Maggie’s responsibilities, which freed Maggie up to tackle other organizational issues. Additionally, in the second year of the festival (post-incorporation), Maggie recalls making the decision to implement too many performances and workshops at once, which spread her organizational resources too thin; notably an event that exhausted the staff and volunteers of the organization. Such an event speaks to the importance of decision-making in the arts management process, and evidences the chain-reaction effect(s) that arts entrepreneurs’ decisions can have on their new arts organizations. Importantly, Maggie also recalls that while the acquisition of donations and tax-deductible contributions have greatly aided the organization, both the overreliance on and loss of big donors has also contributed to significant challenges, as evidenced by Maggie’s comments:
Last year, we had a situation where two of the bigger donors kind of pulled out, because they felt like they were not in a good place financially, and that presents a challenge, because then, you know, they are quite, they've got big chunks of our budget. And if that happens, you have to go and search for something else.

So that's the weak spot, and we are working on that too, because it's, um, it's probably an idea, and that's what we're trying to do, is to diversify where the funding comes from.

Summary of Interview 3

Interview 3 was conducted on 2/15/16 at the private home of the participant in Cincinnati, Ohio. The session took place within a kitchen/dining room area in the late afternoon. The participant (Ruth) met with me for about one hour. Guided by the critical incident technique, I began the interview with the goal of encouraging participant recall. To facilitate this, I asked Ruth for a general summary of her organization’s mission and programmatic activities. While disclosure of the mission would violate the participant’s confidentiality, I will make an attempt to summarize by saying that since incorporating in 2007, Ruth’s non-profit arts organization has existed in the City of Cincinnati, OH; both co-creating, facilitating and producing interdisciplinary, exploratory and off-the-beaten path performances with local symphony musicians and non-instrumentalists.

Prior to engaging in arts entrepreneurship, Ruth had worked as both an assistant music professor at a local college, and as a professional classical musician with the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra (CSO). While working with CSO, Ruth became aware of a gap within the local classical music scene in the greater Cincinnati area. Self-motivated to fill this gap, Ruth began to think about how she could re-invent/re-envision the
classical music experience. With a growing passion for the emerging venture, Ruth shared her venture aspirations with a close friend; a conversation which inspired Ruth’s friend to provide funding for arts entrepreneurship.

Interview 3: Significant Events

Similar to Interview 1 and 2, there are many events (explicit and implicit) that may have contributed (directly or indirectly) to Ruth’s arts entrepreneurship experience. Many of these experiences are latent and remain unexplored for lack of time. However, within the transcript, Ruth explicitly evidences an awareness within the local classical music scene, as demonstrated by the following comments:

RUTH: Well, um, there's nothing going on in Cincinnati like that. There was nothing.

JASON: Like what?

RUTH: Like, nontraditional chamber music.

In considering Ruth’s recognition of the lack of non-traditional chamber music in Cincinnati, I recognize Ruth’s own sectoral awareness as the source of inspiration for her venture. Additionally, while Ruth does identify that her motivation for incorporation (501c3) in 2007 was to be eligible for non-profit grant funding, Ruth also identifies the significant event which motivated her to think about incorporating in the first place; arguably the conversation with her friend (an arts patron), whom inspired by that conversation, would later convince her boyfriend to sign-off on providing seed funding for arts entrepreneurship. Ruth also identifies what this significant event (i.e. the
conversation) meant to her, when she states, “I think I saw suddenly, maybe, a possibility of some significance in our work” “You know that this idea had some traction here”.

Although post-incorporation, Ruth goes on to identify the organization’s first concert performance; a well attended event which increased her confidence in the venture, and increased public support for the organization. Additional significant events were identified within Interview 3 (post-incorporation). For example, while the (initial) board conflict that Ruth experienced in her first year of operations (2007) threatened the identity of the organization, the commitment that Ruth received from Opera guild members led to the establishment of an official board in 2010. Furthermore, for Ruth, designing the organization’s website perhaps denotes an event of significance, largely because Ruth saw the website as a storefront; a perception which caused her to think critically about the arts organization’s brand identity. In addition, she reports additional brand identity struggles in the third year of operations. Importantly within the transcript, Ruth also references various strategic partnerships which have both shaped and influenced her arts entrepreneurship experience. Such events not only evidence common arts management practices, but also common challenges that arts entrepreneurs may encounter quickly after the birth of their organizations.
What are venture trends and tendencies in the Ohio arts sector?

Research on the macro-level aided me in addressing the third dissertation research question. Meaningful comparisons emerged while analyzing the responses. To reiterate, *Theater* was selected as the field of study; notably a field of art recognized by the National Endowment for the Arts, and a field of art which AFTA positions within the broader field of Performing Arts. Analysis in the field of Theatre highlights fifteen year trends and tendencies in new venture creation from the year 2000 to the year 2015. Field boundaries were defined by way of selected 8-digit SIC (i.e. 79220000, 79220100, 79220202, 79220203, 79220300) and NTEE code (A65). Notably SIC codes that corresponded to arts and cultural occupations (e.g. actor/actress) were omitted from the venture dataset in an effort to distinguish target ventures of study from self-employment activities. Within Appendix E, figures 36, 37 and Table 1 collectively identify descriptive statistics on the start-up, endurance and dissolution rates of Theater ventures that have existed (at one time or another) from 2000-2015 in the Ohio arts sector (N= 41). For example, red colored highlights in Table 1 indicate that among the 41 Theatre ventures, only five have dissolved to date (12/3/2015). Figure 36 identifies Ohio Theatre venture trends by zip code. Interestingly over the last 15 years, Ohio Theatre ventures have tended to cluster relatively close to major metropolitan cities; most notably in the city of Cincinnati, and particularly in Hamilton county. Figure 37 indicates that the highest rates of incorporation occurred respectively in 2003 & 2008 (i.e. five a year), while the lowest rates of incorporation occurred respectively in 2006, 2009, 2014, and recently in 2015 (i.e. one a year). Measures of central tendency in Table 1 indicate that at present
(12/3/15), the average endurance rate (i.e. mean) among all 41 Theatre ventures is 8 years, while the most common rate of endurance (i.e. mode) is 5 years. Concerning venture habitus in the field of Theatre, Figure 38 indicates that out of all of the 41 Ohio Theatre ventures, the majority were situated in the NTEE category Theater (34.15%) and in the SIC category Theater Producers and Services (34.15%). Notably from the years 2000-2015, the sub-field of Community Theater Production has had the lowest rate of incorporation (2.44%) amongst all 41 Ohio Theatre ventures. In addition, Figure 39 indicates that over the years 2000-2015, the overwhelming majority of Ohio Theatre ventures have been registered as not-for-profit organizations (73.17%); a telling indicator of venture habitus.

Figure 38. Ohio Theatre Venture Tendencies 2000-2015

Figure 39. Ohio Theatre Venture Registration Tendencies 2000-2015
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

In this study entrepreneurship was framed within the context of the arts, defined as the act of organizing arts organizations, situated within a model of the arts sector and analyzed on multiple levels of analysis. Utilizing the lens of the conceptual framework, the micro, meso and macro-level research findings collectively suggest to me that through the act of organizing arts organizations, Ohio arts entrepreneurs of study have embedded opportunity structures within the infrastructure of the Ohio arts sector, and subsequently by establishing rules of order, have both enabled and constrained sectoral opportunities for core workers. For example, in reviewing the meso-level research transcripts and findings, we can see that Luke’s arts organization provides sectoral opportunities for local artists to gain legitimacy by way of its juried art exhibition program. However, it is important to note that as an opportunity structure within the arts sector, the arts organization’s rules of order will dictate which works are eligible to be juried, and which are not. While the residency program in Luke’s arts organization affords artists an opportunity to gain studio space suitable for creation; as an opportunity structure, the arts organization’s rules of order will mandate which artists gets to access that opportunity, and which do not. While the [masked] program within Luke’s arts organization both produces books (i.e. production opportunity) and features local and internationally renowned artwork (i.e. exhibition opportunity); notably as an opportunity structure, the arts organization’s rules of order will dictate whose books are actually
produced, and what artwork is actually exhibited. Also, while Luke’s arts organization offers local artists employment opportunities to teach on a course-by-course basis, as well as employment opportunities for administrative personnel who seek to assist in day-to-day operations; as an opportunity structure embedded within the infrastructure of the Ohio arts sector, the arts organization’s rules of order will dictate who can apply for employment, who actually gets employed, and for how long such individuals will be employed.

Utilizing the lens of the conceptual framework, such findings suggest to me that arts organizations function as opportunity structures embedded within the infrastructure of the Ohio arts sector. Consequently, while Luke, Ruth and Maggie’s arts organizations respectively enable and constrain various sectoral opportunities for core workers, it is important to recognize that Artswave (i.e. the local community arts foundation) both enables and constrains subsidy opportunities for Luke, Ruth and Maggie’s non-profit arts organizations. As evidenced by the transcripts, such findings suggest to me that there are unique opportunity structures (i.e. subsidy, exhibition, production, legitimacy, etc.) within the infrastructure of a given arts sector, and in addition, unique relationships between such structures. Moreover, where such opportunity structures are present, they will undoubtedly play an important role in the lives of core workers; as the organizing of Luke, Maggie and Ruth’s arts organizations have no doubt afforded core workers the possibility of discovering and exploiting sectoral opportunities that were previously unavailable.
Importantly, analysis of Ruth’s arts entrepreneurship experience (in particular) has had a profound effect on me, as her awareness of a gap in the arts infrastructure (i.e. the lack of non-traditional chamber music) has helped me to better understand venture opportunity in the context of the arts sector. For example, given Ruth’s sectoral awareness, it clearly seems possible to identify venture opportunity in the arts sector by gaining an awareness of opportunity structures in the arts sector that are missing. Consider the culturally specific sub-field that is African American visual art.100 Arguably, devoid of dedicated exhibition structures in this sub-field, there is little to no sectoral opportunity for African American visual artists to exhibit their work(s) to the public en masse. Plausibly an awareness of this lack of sectoral opportunity may motivate core workers to engage in arts entrepreneurship. Furthermore, faced with opportunity barriers such as nepotism, racism and sexism, access to sectoral opportunity in a given arts sector may be limited for core workers outside of the dominant cultural, ethnic and/or gender majority. In cases where this is true, core workers affected by such opportunity barriers will have little to no sectoral opportunity for production, exhibition, subsidy, and legitimacy in a given arts sector. Motivated by an awareness of opportunity barriers in the infrastructure of the arts sector, aspiring arts entrepreneurs may engage in arts entrepreneurship for the purpose of overcoming barriers to sectoral opportunity in the arts; a noble venture which when accomplished, may render existing sectoral opportunities more accessible to core workers in the minority.101

100 See https://www.arts.gov/artistic-fields
101 For an example of this, see https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/hollywoods-race-problem-an
White’s theory of arts entrepreneurship

Given the literature review, and new understandings derived from the micro, meso and macro-level research results, I am prepared to propose theory that may guide and inform contextual entrepreneurship education, policy and practice in the emerging field of arts entrepreneurship. I begin by positing that devoid of arts entrepreneurship (i.e. the act of organizing arts organizations), there is no sectoral opportunity in the arts sector. Arguably sectoral opportunity in the arts sector is constrained by an oversupply of core workers\(^\text{102}\), stratified by field gatekeepers\(^\text{103}\), and fragmented, largely due to the decentralized nature of an unofficial U.S. cultural policy.\(^\text{104}\) Operating within this unique entrepreneurial context (i.e. the constraint, stratification and decentralization of sectoral opportunity in the arts), arts entrepreneurs engage in the act of organizing arts organizations. Notably through this act, arts entrepreneurs embed opportunity structures within the infrastructure of the arts sector, and subsequently by establishing rules of order, both enable and constrain sectoral opportunities for core workers. Moreover, as sectoral opportunity is both enabled and constrained by opportunity structures embedded within the infrastructure of any given sector, sectoral opportunity in the arts cannot exist independent of the infrastructure of a given arts sector, and as a result, cannot be understood separate from one another.

\(^\text{102}\) See Menger, 1999, p. 545
\(^\text{103}\) See Alexander, 2003, pp. 92-97
\(^\text{104}\) See Miller & Yudice, pp. 35-71
Notably upon engaging in arts entrepreneurship, arts entrepreneurs often appoint arts managers to help them foster their respective arts-based ventures from early post start-up phase into maintenance, expansion or exit/transition phase. Importantly as arts entrepreneurs are a subgroup of core workers, they will likely not be recognized as *entrepreneurs* until after their respective arts-based ventures have achieved a measure of sustainability and/or legitimacy within a field or sub-field of the arts sector.

Implications for the arts entrepreneurship field

In generating nascent data for comparative analysis of arts entrepreneurship in the Ohio arts sector, I have laid a foundation for empirical arts entrepreneurship research. While scholarly critique and more research is needed in order to advance the conceptual framework for research and analysis, I am confident that this dissertation research study can serve as a replicable model for empirical arts entrepreneurship research, and in addition, greatly inform contextual entrepreneurship education, policy and practice in our emerging field. For example, equipped with demographics and entrepreneurial characteristics of arts entrepreneurs, arts policymakers may be more informed of the state of arts entrepreneurship within given arts sectors; information that can be very useful for improving access to start-up support services, better situating arts incubators where they are needed the most, identifying and reducing opportunity barriers in arts entrepreneurship, increasing arts entrepreneurship activity amongst specific population groups, and strengthening entrepreneurial culture, climate and capacity in given arts sectors.
Equipped with a library of arts entrepreneurship experiences, students and educators in the arts entrepreneurship field will be able to draw upon a diverse collection of case studies for educational purposes. Additionally, significant events embedded within arts entrepreneurship experiences can be isolated and de-constructed for educational purposes. Furthermore, rather than based on personal assumptions, arts entrepreneurship curricula can be guided by venture challenges and opportunity barriers commonly identified within arts entrepreneurship experiences, specific to art fields and subfields, and respective of distinct arts sectors worldwide.

Equipped with venture trends and tendencies in art fields, aspiring, nascent and veteran arts entrepreneurs will be able to identify opportunity structures in a given arts sector from the top down, prior to entry! In doing so, arts entrepreneurs will be better prepared to recognize venture opportunity in the arts by way of an increased sectoral awareness, and subsequently to organize their arts organizations in communities and districts that need what they have to offer, rather than organizing in a community or district that is oversaturated with similar arts organizations, or entering sorely based on individual passions and assumptions.

Final Thoughts

Ironically, I leave this study with more questions than answers, largely because the dissertation has opened up my mind to new directions for the emerging field of arts entrepreneurship. For example, I wonder what we might learn from replicating the Kauffman approach; essentially by conducting empirical arts entrepreneurship research nationwide on an annual basis for comparative analysis? In doing so, I wonder what new
knowledge, new meanings and new understandings might this provide to aspiring, nascent and veteran arts entrepreneurs? In what ways might this new knowledge be both similar and differ from the knowledge that the business school provides to business entrepreneurs? Furthermore, how do we ensure that our research gets read by arts entrepreneurs? Obviously, we will not know the answer to that question until we can better identify them through micro-level arts entrepreneurship research. Additionally, what language should we develop to best communicate our research to the arts community, to the broader entrepreneurship field, and to arts entrepreneurs? Needless to say, I am very excited about the empirical research possibilities, as research which was previously considered by many to be impossible has now become possible. This dissertation research study serves as evidence of that.
REFERENCES


Appendix A: SECCI (For-profit version)
Welcome to the Survey of Entrepreneurship in Ohio Creative & Cultural Industries. This survey is estimated to take no more than 15 minutes to complete. For confidentiality purposes, responses are anonymous and identifying information will be masked within all disseminated reports. Data will be used exclusively by the researcher for comparative analysis of owners and founders of target businesses and organizations within the State of Ohio, and at no time will any self-report data be used for any means outside that purpose without documented permission from participants. Upon submission of this survey by the deadline of 10/31/15, participants will automatically be entered into a drawing for a chance to win a $500.00 Visa gift card. A random drawing will occur on 12/1/15, and gift cards will be shipped that same week.

Q1 What is your current position within the business venture?

- Owner (1)
- Co-Owner (2)
- Former Owner or Former Co-Owner (3)
- Neither Owner nor Co-Owner (4)

Q2 From among the following, please select an option that best describes the current stage of your business venture.

- Recently incorporated (1)
- Testing the business model (2)
- Working towards business sustainability (3)
- Comfortably engaging in day to day activities (7)
- Looking to expand business operations (4)
- Seeking to exit the business (5)
- Business is no longer in existence (6)
Q3 Please select the option that best describes your primary motivation for starting the business.

- Desired employment for either myself or others (1)
- Desired to support a non-profit mission (4)
- Desired greater autonomy in my career or work (8)
- Did not make enough money at my previous job (3)
- Dissatisfaction in my previous career or place of employment (7)
- Driven to do it myself (2)
- Pressured to go into the family business (5)
- Saw a profit-making opportunity (6)
- Other (9) ____________________

Q4 Please select any and all options that best describe your greatest business challenge(s) since incorporation.

- Building business reputation and industry credibility (1)
- Gaining access to industry networks (2)
- Gaining funding and/or financing (3)
- Getting distribution (4)
- Getting past industry gatekeepers (5)
- Handling day-to-day management responsibilities (6)
- Keeping business costs/expenses down (7)
- Keeping prices competitive (8)
- Keeping the business relevant (9)
- Marketing effectively (10)
- Recognizing business opportunities (11)
- Retaining audiences, customers, clients and/or participants (12)
- Hiring and Staffing (13)
- Time Management (14)
- Other (15) ____________________
Q5 Close to incorporation, about how much financial capital did you have readily available for start-up activities?

- $1-$999 (1)
- $1,000-$3,999 (2)
- $4,000-$6,999 (3)
- $7,000-$9,999 (4)
- $10,000-$12,999 (5)
- $13,000-$15,999 (6)
- $16,000-$18,999 (7)
- $19,000-$21,999 (8)
- $22,000-$24,999 (9)
- $25,000-$27,999 (10)
- $28,000-$30,999 (11)
- $31,000-$33,999 (12)
- $34,000-$36,999 (13)
- $37,000-$39,999 (14)
- $40,000-$42,999 (15)
- $43,000 or more (16)

Q6 Which one of the following best served as your primary source of business financing?

- Bank loan(s) (1)
- Credit cards (2)
- Donations from family/friends (3)
- Earned income or personal savings (4)
- Equity financing (gave away a percentage of the business in exchange for capital) (5)
- Public or private grant funding (6)
- Private loan from family member(s) (7)
- Rotating credit association (8)
- Used no financing/started from scratch (9)
- Other (10) ____________________
Q7 Has your business venture ever received state or city sponsored support in the form of entrepreneurship education? If so, rate how helpful the support was.

- Yes, but the level of support was not very helpful (2)
- Yes, and the level of support was somewhat helpful (3)
- Yes, and the level of support was very helpful (4)
- No, never received this type of support (1)

Q8 Has your business venture ever received state or city sponsored support in the form of seed funding? If so, rate how sufficient the support was.

- Yes, but the level of support was insufficient (2)
- Yes, and the level of support was sufficient (3)
- Yes, and the level of support was substantial (4)
- No, never received this type of support (1)

Q9 Has your business venture ever received state or city sponsored support in the form of technical assistance? If so, rate how helpful the support was.

- Yes, but the level of support was not very helpful (2)
- Yes, and the level of support was somewhat helpful (3)
- Yes, and the level of support was very helpful (4)
- No, never received this type of support (1)

Q10 Prior to incorporation, did you have any experience starting a new business?

- Yes, I once started a previous business, and that business is still active today (2)
- Yes, I once started a previous business, but that business is no longer in existence (3)
- No, this is/was my first time starting a business (1)
Q11 In which of the following broader categories of Creative & Cultural industries is/was your venture positioned?

- Architecture and Design (2)
- Community Arts (4)
- Entertainment Industries (7)
- Fine and Performing Arts (5)
- Literary Publishing (1)
- Museums and Cultural Heritage (6)
- Visual Arts and Crafts (3)
- Other (8)

Q12 Prior to incorporation, had you ever worked within the Creative & Cultural industry in which your venture is/was positioned? If so, please estimate your level of prior industry-related work experience.

- Yes, about 1-2 years of prior industry-related work experience (1)
- Yes, about 3-5 years of prior industry-related work experience (2)
- Yes, more than 5 years of prior industry-related work experience (3)
- No, this is/was my first time working within this industry (4)

Q13 How often have you acquired new industry opportunities largely due to one of your family member’s inter-industry connections?

- Not at all (1)
- Occasionally (2)
- Frequently (3)

Q14 Prior to incorporation, had you ever had any formal visual, literary or performing arts education? If so, please indicate where the majority of this education took place.

- Yes, primarily within community settings (1)
- Yes, primarily within Pre K-12 school settings (2)
- Yes, primarily within higher education (college) settings (3)
- Yes, within a variety of community, Pre K-12 school and college settings (4)
- No such education (5)
Q15 Prior to incorporation, had you ever had any formal entrepreneurship education? If so, please indicate where the majority of this education took place.

- Yes, primarily within community settings (1)
- Yes, primarily within high school settings (2)
- Yes, primarily within higher education (college) settings (3)
- Yes, within a variety of community, high school and college settings (4)
- No such education (5)

Q16 Prior to incorporation, had you ever had any formal management education? If so, please indicate where the majority of this education took place.

- Yes, primarily within community settings (1)
- Yes, primarily within high school settings (2)
- Yes, primarily within higher education (college) settings (3)
- Yes, within a variety of community, high school and college settings (4)
- No such education (5)

Q17 Which of the following broader racial and/or ethnic categories do you commonly identify as?

- American Indian or Alaska Native (1)
- Arab (2)
- Asian (3)
- Black or African American (4)
- Bi-racial (5)
- Hispanic or Latino (6)
- Multi-racial (7)
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (8)
- White (9)
- Other (10) ____________________
- Prefer not to answer (11)

Q18 Please enter your current age using only numeric values (ex. a thirty five year old individual should enter 35, a sixty five year old individual should enter 65).
Q19 Please select the option that best represents your gender.

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Transgender (3)
- Prefer not to answer (4)

Q20 Prior to incorporation, what was the highest degree or level of education you had completed?

- 8th grade or less (1)
- 9th, 10th or 11th grade (2)
- 12th grade, no diploma (3)
- High school graduate - high school diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED) (4)
- Some college credit, but less than 1 year (5)
- 1 or more years of college, no degree (6)
- Associate degree (for example: AA, AS) (7)
- Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, BFA, AB, BS) (8)
- Master's degree (for example: MA, MFA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA) (9)
- Professional degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD) (10)
- Doctorate degree (for example: PhD, EdD, DMA, DFA) (11)

Q21 Prior to incorporation, what was your estimated annual household income?

- $19,999 or less (1)
- $20,000 to $29,999 (2)
- $30,000 to $39,999 (3)
- $40,000 to $49,999 (4)
- $50,000 to $59,999 (5)
- $60,000 to $69,999 (6)
- $70,000 to $79,999 (7)
- $80,000 to $89,999 (8)
- $90,000 to $99,999 (9)
- $100,000 or more (10)
Appendix B: SECCI (Non-profit version)
SECCI - Non-Profit Organizations

Welcome to the Survey of Entrepreneurship in Ohio Creative & Cultural Industries. This survey is estimated to take no more than 15 minutes to complete. For confidentiality purposes, responses are anonymous and identifying information will be masked within all disseminated reports. Data will be used exclusively by the researcher for comparative analysis of owners and founders of target businesses and organizations within the State of Ohio, and at no time will any self-report data be used for any means outside that purpose without documented permission from participants. Upon submission of this survey by the deadline of 10/31/15, participants will automatically be entered into a drawing for a chance to win a $500.00 donation to their non-profit organization. A random drawing will occur on 12/1/15, and the winning organization will be notified that same week.

Q1 What is your current position within the non-profit venture?
- Founder (1)
- Co-Founder (2)
- Staff or Board Member (3)
- Neither Founder, Staff or Board Member (4)

Q2 From among the following, please select an option that best describes the current stage of your non-profit venture.
- Recently incorporated as a 501c3 organization (1)
- Testing the organizational model (2)
- Working towards organizational sustainability (3)
- Comfortably engaging in day to day activities (7)
- Looking to expand mission operations (4)
- Seeking to dissolve the organization (5)
- Organization is no longer in existence (6)
Q3 Please select the option that best describes your primary motivation for starting the non-profit venture.

- Desired greater autonomy in my work/career (8)
- Desired to do it myself (10)
- Did not make enough money at my previous place of employment (3)
- Dissatisfaction with previous state of career (7)
- Needed access to public funding (4)
- Needed to employ myself and/or others (1)
- Pressured to go into the family business (5)
- Recognized an opportunity to address a social need (6)
- Other (9) ____________________

Q4 Please select any and all options that best describe your greatest organizational challenge(s) since incorporation.

- Building organizational reputation and industry credibility (1)
- Gaining access to industry networks (2)
- Gaining funding and/or financing (3)
- Getting distribution (4)
- Getting past industry gatekeepers (5)
- Handling day-to-day management responsibilities (6)
- Keeping operational expenses down (7)
- Keeping prices competitive (8)
- Keeping the mission relevant (9)
- Marketing effectively (10)
- Recognizing organizational and/or mission opportunities (11)
- Retaining audiences, customers, clients and/or participants (12)
- Hiring and Staffing (13)
- Time Management (14)
- Other (15) ____________________
Q5 Close to incorporating your non-profit, about how much financial capital did you have available for start-up activities?

- $1-$999 (1)
- $1,000-$3,999 (2)
- $4,000-$6,999 (3)
- $7,000-$9,999 (4)
- $10,000-$12,999 (5)
- $13,000-$15,999 (6)
- $16,000-$18,999 (7)
- $19,000-$21,999 (8)
- $22,000-$24,999 (9)
- $25,000-$27,999 (10)
- $28,000-$30,999 (11)
- $31,000-$33,999 (12)
- $34,000-$36,999 (13)
- $37,000-$39,999 (14)
- $40,000-$42,999 (15)
- $43,000 or more (16)

Q6 Which one of the following best served as your primary source of start-up financing?

- Bank loan(s) (1)
- Credit cards (2)
- Crowdfunding (5)
- Earned income or personal savings (4)
- Financial gifts from family/friends (3)
- Private loan(s) from family member(s) (7)
- Public or private grant funding (6)
- Rotating credit association (8)
- Used no financing/started from scratch (9)
- Other (10) ____________________
Q7 Has your non-profit venture ever received state or city sponsored support in the form of entrepreneurship education? If so, rate how helpful the support was.

- Yes, but the level of support was not very helpful (2)
- Yes, and the level of support was somewhat helpful (3)
- Yes, and the level of support was very helpful (4)
- No, never received this type of support (1)

Q8 Has your non-profit venture ever received state or city sponsored support in the form of seed funding? If so, rate how sufficient the support was.

- Yes, but the level of support was insufficient (2)
- Yes, and the level of support was sufficient (3)
- Yes, and the level of support was substantial (4)
- No, never received this type of support (1)

Q9 Has your non-profit venture ever received state or city sponsored support in the form of technical assistance? If so, rate how helpful the support was.

- Yes, but the level of support was not very helpful (2)
- Yes, and the level of support was somewhat helpful (3)
- Yes, and the level of support was very helpful (4)
- No, never received this type of support (1)

Q10 Prior to incorporation, did you have any experience starting a new non-profit organization?

- Yes, I started a prior non-profit, and that organization is still active today (2)
- Yes, I started a prior non-profit, but that organization has since dissolved (3)
- No, this is/was my first time starting a non-profit organization (1)
Q11 In which of the following broader categories of Creative & Cultural industries is/was your non-profit venture positioned?

- Architecture and Design (2)
- Community Arts (4)
- Entertainment (7)
- Fine and Performing Arts (5)
- Literary Publishing (1)
- Museums and Cultural Heritage (6)
- Visual Arts and Crafts (3)
- Other (8)

Q12 Prior to incorporation, had you ever worked within the Creative & Cultural industry in which your venture is/was positioned? If so, please estimate your level of prior industry-related work experience.

- Yes, about 1-2 years of prior industry-related work experience (1)
- Yes, about 3-5 years of prior industry-related work experience (2)
- Yes, more than 5 years of prior industry-related work experience (3)
- No, this is/was my first time working within this industry (4)

Q13 How often have you acquired new industry opportunities largely due to one of your family member’s inter-industry connections?

- Not at all (1)
- Occasionally (2)
- Frequently (3)
Q14 Prior to incorporation, had you ever had any formal visual, literary or performing arts education? If so, please indicate where the majority of this education took place.

- Yes, primarily within community settings (1)
- Yes, primarily within Pre K-12 school settings (2)
- Yes, primarily within higher education (college) settings (3)
- Yes, within a variety of community, Pre K-12 school and college settings (4)
- No such education (5)

Q15 Prior to incorporation, had you ever had any formal entrepreneurship education? If so, please indicate where the majority of this education took place.

- Yes, primarily within community settings (1)
- Yes, primarily within high school settings (2)
- Yes, primarily within higher education (college) settings (3)
- Yes, within a variety of community, high school and college settings (4)
- No such education (5)

Q16 Prior to incorporation, had you ever had any formal management education? If so, please indicate where the majority of this education took place.

- Yes, primarily within community settings (1)
- Yes, primarily within high school settings (2)
- Yes, primarily within higher education (college) settings (3)
- Yes, within a variety of community, high school and college settings (4)
- No such education (5)
Q17 Which of the following broader racial and/or ethnic categories do you commonly identify as?

- American Indian or Alaska Native (1)
- Arab (2)
- Asian (3)
- Black or African American (4)
- Bi-racial (5)
- Hispanic or Latino (6)
- Multi-racial (7)
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (8)
- White (9)
- Other (10) ________________
- Prefer not to answer (11)

Q18 Please enter your current age using only numeric values (ex. a thirty five year old individual should enter 35, a sixty five year old individual should enter 65).

Q19 Please select the option that best represents your gender.

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Transgender (3)
- Prefer not to answer (4)

Q20 Prior to incorporation, what was the highest degree or level of education you had completed?

- 8th grade or less (1)
- 9th, 10th or 11th grade (2)
- 12th grade, no diploma (3)
- High school graduate - high school diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED) (4)
- Some college credit, but less than 1 year (5)
- 1 or more years of college, no degree (6)
- Associate degree (for example: AA, AS) (7)
- Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, BFA, AB, BS) (8)
- Master's degree (for example: MA, MFA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA) (9)
- Professional degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD) (10)
- Doctorate degree (for example: PhD, EdD, DMA, DFA) (11)
Q21 Prior to incorporation, what was your estimated annual household income?

- $19,999 or less (1)
- $20,000 to $29,999 (2)
- $30,000 to $39,999 (3)
- $40,000 to $49,999 (4)
- $50,000 to $59,999 (5)
- $60,000 to $69,999 (6)
- $70,000 to $79,999 (7)
- $80,000 to $89,999 (8)
- $90,000 to $99,999 (9)
- $100,000 or more (10)
Appendix C: SECCI SURVEY RESPONSES
Q1 FP: What is your current position within the business venture?

Q1 NP: What is your current position within the non-profit venture?

Figure 6. Results from Q1 FP

Figure 7. Results from Q1 NP
Q2 FP: From among the following, please select an option that best describes the current stage of your business venture.

Q2 NP: From among the following, please select an option that best describes the current stage of your non-profit venture.

Figure 8. Results from Q2 FP

Figure 9. Results from Q2 NP
Q3 FP: Please select the option that best describes your primary motivation for starting the business.

Q3 NP: Please select the option that best describes your primary motivation for starting the non-profit venture.

Figure 10. Results from Q3 FP
### Figure 11. Results from Q3 NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Needed to employ myself and/or others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desired to do it myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needed access to public funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desired greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other
- Needed to employ myself and/or others
- Desired to do it myself
- Needed access to public funding
- Desired greater
Q5 FP: Close to incorporation, about how much financial capital did you have readily available for start-up activities?

Q5 NP: Close to incorporating your non-profit, about how much financial capital did you have available for start-up activities?

Figure 12. Results from Q5 FP
Figure 13. Results from Q5 NP
Q6 FP: Which one of the following best served as your primary source of business financing?

Q6 NP: Which one of the following best served as your primary source of start-up financing?

Figure 14. Results from Q6 FP

Figure 15. Results from Q6 NP
Q10 FP: Prior to incorporation, did you have any experience starting a new business?

Q10 NP: Prior to incorporation, did you have any experience starting a new non-profit organization?

Figure 16. Results from Q10 FP

Figure 17. Results from Q10 NP
Q13 FP: How often have you acquired new industry opportunities largely due to one of your family member’s inter-industry connections?

Q13 NP: How often have you acquired new industry opportunities largely due to one of your family member’s inter-industry connections?

Figure 18. Results from Q13 FP

Figure 19. Results from Q13 NP
Q14 FP & NP: Prior to incorporation, had you ever had any formal visual, literary or performing arts education? If so, please indicate where the majority of this education took place.

Figure 20. Results from Q14 FP
Figure 21. Results from Q14 NP
Q15 FP & NP: Prior to incorporation, had you ever had any formal entrepreneurship education? If so, please indicate where the majority of this education took place.

Figure 22. Results from Q15 FP
Figure 23. Results from Q15 NP
Q16 FP & NP: Prior to incorporation, had you ever had any formal management education? If so, please indicate where the majority of this education took place.

Figure 24. Results from Q16 FP
Figure 25. Results from Q16 NP
Q17 FP & NP: Which of the following broader racial and/or ethnic categories do you commonly identify as?

Figure 26. Results from Q17 FP
Figure 27. Results from Q17 NP
Q18 FP & NP: Please enter your current age using only numeric values (ex. a thirty five year old individual should enter 35, a sixty five year old individual should enter 65).

Figure 28. Results from Q18 FP
Figure 29. Results from Q18 NP
Q19 FP & NP: Please select the option that best represents your gender.

Figure 30. Results from Q19 FP
Figure 31. Results from Q19 NP
Q20 FP & NP: Prior to incorporation, what was the highest degree or level of education you had completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th grade, no diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED equivalent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college credit, but less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more years of college, no degree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree (ex. AA, AS)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree (ex. BA, BFA, AB, BS)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree (ex. MA, MFA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree (ex. MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree (ex. PhD, EdD, DMA, DFA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32. Results from Q20 FP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or more years of college, no degree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree (for example: AA, AS)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree (for example: BA, BFA, AB, BS)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree (for example: PhD, EdD, DMA, DFA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate - high school diploma or the equivalent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree (for example: MA, MFA, MS, MEng, MEd, MBA)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college credit, but less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 33. Results from Q20 NP
Q21 FP & NP: Prior to incorporation, what was your estimated annual household income?

Figure 34. Results from Q21 FP
Figure 35. Results from Q21 NP
Appendix D: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS
Interview 1: LUKE

Jason: So, I'd like you to provide me with a general summary of your organization's mission and programmatic activities. We kinda already started that, but...

Luke: Sure. Uh, I'll start with program. Um, now, after 12 years, our organization has four programs. People often associate us with our gallery, and the gallery is just one of the four. So we have the exhibition space, which is obviously what so many people think of when they think of our organization, because it's the most publicly accessible part of the organization.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: 'Cause it's free and open to the public, you know, thousands, a thousand hours a year or something like that -- 800 hours a year. And there's the drawing center, which you're aware of, which is in [masked], uh, which is a little, a little less accessible, because it's courses that you have to sign up for and just pay for.

Almost all of them have to have some sort of tuition, so it's not like you can just walk in and have an experience. You have to plan, and you have to commit a certain amount of time to be involved, and effort, so that naturally narrows its field of involvement and therefore awareness.

And then there's the [masked], which is our publication program where we produce books featuring artwork, for the purpose of both opening our exhibition program up to artists that can't get us artwork, because it's expensive to ship, it's too big, it doesn't exist any longer.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: So artists from around the world can be involved more easily, because all they have to do is send us a print-quality image.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: They still get juried in as what they do with our exhibits, but they're not hindered by shipping costs or any logistics.

But the other side of that is it's also so that we can disseminate the artwork in collections to a broader public, 'cause you can ship a book anywhere, and they can experience 100 or 150 works of art, beautifully selected and laid out, where they can't get to the gallery.

Jason: Mm. Mm.
Luke: We also give those books away to schools, or give 'em, you know, use them as incentives for teachers to use for classroom materials, things like that, so that the [masked] is a program that sort of opens up our doorways, our pathways to other, broader geographies and demographics.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: And then lastly, in our newest program, the Artist Residency, where we competitively award one or two artists free studio space for a year.…

Jason: Wow.

Luke: …adjacent to the gallery, and provide them the opportunity to teach at the [masked] so they can become, they can develop the teaching skills. They also get to participate in [masked] programs, most of which are free for them as part of the residency.

They help us with our selection of artworks for the gallery, and they get us a solo show of their work made during the residency at the gallery, towards the end of the residency.

That's just in its fourth year, um, which has been greatly successful. It's been like the fourth leg of a four-legged table. When we realized we needed that program, it was like, "Eureka."

Jason: [laughs]

Luke: Although we've gotten no funding at all for it whatsoever, so we've had to subsidize it with everything else that we do.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: It's the most, probably the most deserving of funding, ironically.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: But, we can't get funding for it right now. But we believe in it enough that we still maintain it, because it does complement the other three programs perfectly.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: So, that's the programs in a nutshell, but there's a rationale for the structure...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: …of the programming, and you could think of it like this table, two halves. There's a process half and a product half, and as a professor, I started, you know, strongly
thinking about the philosophy of the need of both. Some people teaching contemporary fine art will say, "Process is all that matters."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: "It doesn't matter what you end up with," and I've disagreed with them wholeheartedly all along, because you can't judge your process unless you look at the product. Now, maybe the type of product doesn't matter so much, or the shape and form of it may be variable, but there has to be a product in order for there to be a process, and vice versa.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: You can't have one without the other, so when we started the organization, we were committed to that idea of embracing the whole spectrum, from the very beginning, the genesis of ideas, to the very end, the experience of those ideas by third parties...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...the public, and so the [masked] represents process. It's where people go to learn, and where they go to make things, and to test and try, and to refine and develop skills.

The gallery is where artists, not necessarily the same artists at the [masked], but artists compete rigorously with each other in order to have their work selected based on quality alone, and then have it showcased in an exhibit that they public experiences as a great end result...

Jason: Wow.

Luke: ...of a process. And you could also look at the books, and the residency as two parts of those halves as well, the residency as process, the learning and the growing. The book's a product.

Jason: Hmm.

Luke: They're like exhibits as well. The books are considered to be exhibits in print.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: So that's the, sort of the programs...

Jason: OK.

Luke: ...and the rationale for why they exist the way they do, and...and relate the way they do. That's pretty much what makes our organization unique, both our philosophy, but also the relationship of those pieces...
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...and how they work together.

Jason: Can you state for me -- I don't think I caught it -- the mission statement?


Jason: [laughs]

Luke: And I... you know, to be honest, I don't memorize it because I...I really don't like it. We formulated a mission by virtue of a coach that was on our board at the time, that said, "This is kind of how mission statements have to be." And it says what it needs to say, but it's generic, and kind of bland...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...and not very emotional, and I...I've been working on changing it, but haven't gotten there yet. But in essence, it is to serve three constituent groups -- students, professors and the public, which kind of comprises everybody, but we identify those three groups, students, professors, and the public, with exhibits, studio programs, and publications...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...in order to stand for the importance of quality in the visual arts.

Jason: Awesome.

Luke: It's...It's a paraphrase.

Jason: OK. OK.

Luke: But...but the primary golden seed of that is quality.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Everything we do...We're not always perfect, but our first mission is to do everything excellently. That's the first priority, and to stand for that, and to select excellent work, so we jury. We jury. Almost every exhibit is juried through a panel.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Those panelists are professionals. They're teachers, they're professional artists, people who have clearly established themselves. They do so voluntarily. They don't get paid to do it, and they do so anonymously. It's not about their identity as sort of a celebrity juror.
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And instead of... A lot of competitive exhibits will have one celebrity juror, and they...they brag about, "So and so's going to jury the show."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: So people will think, "I want that person to accept my work, so I can put that on my resume."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And even though that would help us bring in more entries, which is revenue for us, we don't do it 'cause we don't want to use fake bait....

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...for vanity's sake.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: So we say, no, we're going to use 5 to 10 jurors instead of one, which is a lot of work for us because we have to compile all those scores, because everything gets scored, and come up with the best.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: We say, "No, we're not going to let you know who they are, and they're not going to know who you are. It's all anonymous. You have to trust us, and if you don't trust, don't submit your work, um, and judge us by the results. When you see the results on our website and the publications, you can decide whether we're for real or not, and whether our jury is for real or not."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And after 12 years we've proven it over and over again. We're for real, and the process is for real.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: And you know, most people get that and appreciate it. But some are so used to the sort of standard celebrity juror...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...um, and sort of being kind of in the know about that, and also being tempted by it, that they expect it of us. And so I often find myself answering those questions.
Jason: Mm.

Luke: You know, this is why we do it the way we do it. And there's a long explanation on our website too if...if you happen to need that.

Jason: No, this is much better. [laughs]

Luke: But it's really important to us that we do it the way we do it. And that comes from our experience as professors, students, and artists.

Jason: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

Luke: Because everybody that was involved in the formation, and is currently running as staff running the organization are trained in the arts.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: So we're not just, like, business people that come together to say, "We're going to do these things."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: We are artists making something in the world that we knew needed to be there.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: And we knew that we needed it to be done this way because it's not done this way in most cases.

Jason: Wow. Thank you very much for that. I appreciate it.


Jason: This is great. So question two. Probably a simple question. When did you incorporate your organization, like what year?


Jason: 2004?


Jason: Ok. The follow-up question to that is - why did you decide to incorporate? Now I ask that question with the understanding that you probably were doing something before that (2004), but why did you decide to actually, you know, turn this into...

Jason: ...an organization.

Luke: Well, it started...The genesis of it was in a classroom that...in my classroom at [masked].

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: I was head of painting and drawing there, the sole teacher of painting and drawing, and I was also the founding, uh, I guess you would call me the adviser, founding adviser for a student government organization called [masked]. My students were really galvanized by my teaching…and motivated. And [masked], you know, just...you're familiar with the university I'm sure.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: [masked], which strives to get their students to behave in a way that's in line with that mission; social responsibility, body, mind and spirit, balance of, you know, life and work. And I was taking that to heart, and getting really revved up for doing more than just making art.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And so they started this group, and asked me to be their advisor. And it made sense because they were mostly my students, and I had experience in the arts already as a working artist, and as a museum professional for 10 years.

And so one of the things that they were working on intellectually was, “what do we do for society as artists?” The first answer to that generically was - artists make art. They process culture.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And that's enough in most cases as the artist, the role of the artist in the world. But when you're at [masked], you're a student, you're trying to live up to more than just the every day; that wasn't good enough. And I asked them, "So what do you guys think is good enough, and what's the job you have to do besides make the art."

And they said, "Well, we need to get it in society. We need to get it out there and create experiences with the art, not just make the art."

And I was like "Sounds great. Good. So how do you do that?"

Jason: [laughs]

Luke: And so we started to produce a dialectic process...

Jason: Mm.
Luke: ...that was, well how do you...you know, galleries, you know, you show your work, collaborate; lots of different ideas were thrown around, and at some point we were meeting every week. This was at their initiative, at seven o'clock in the morning before classes at a local restaurant in [masked] just to chat.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: They wanted to talk outside of the classroom, philosophy, and just be social, but also be art oriented. And so the owner there, was so used to us we became friendly. All of us became friendly with her. You've been to the local restaurant, haven't you?

Jason: I've heard of it.

Luke: Um, not far from where the [masked] used to be. We'd have as many as 16 students there at a time.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: So they pushed all the tables together for us. Somehow it came around that we asked the owner, "Could we put on an exhibit here?"; Cause they had a long wall that was pretty much blank, except they had cheesy posters up.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: She said, "Sure." So we started this thing called [masked] at the local restaurant, where I was kind of teaching the students how to curate shows, and install them professionally. And so that was our first attempt at an exhibit for the public, coming out of the dialectic process.

And that got them sort of convinced that, yes, exhibitions in the public space are really important. And so they started shopping for spaces to rent. And they were thinking we could get money from the university, or we could do car washes and bake sales, or we could write grants or...There were lots of possibilities.

And I only knew a little because I wasn't an entrepreneur yet.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: I was a teacher and an artist and a former museum professional. So I didn't know what I was doing, but I had ideas. And together, we shopped for spaces and found nasty ones that we couldn't afford and great ones that we couldn't afford - and then came across the one where the gallery is now.

And it was nasty, but it was great.

Jason: [laughs]
Luke: I mean, we...All the other ones, we were like, "No. Still doesn't feel right. Location doesn't feel right. The space doesn't feel right. The potential." And this one was like, "Yes." It was filled with junk. The whole building had been a halfway house that was trashed and vacant.

Um, it was really bad. And it was really perfect. And the rent was good.

Jason: [laughs]

Luke: And the landlord was willing to work with us.

Jason: Awesome.

Luke: So we left there and thought, "That's it." And at the time, politics at [masked] were changing.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And...Well... “They” weren't changing. “My situation” was changing because of politics.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And this is all gonna be sort of anonymous, I assume.

Jason: Absolutely.

Luke: And so treated with the sensitivity you feel it needs to be.

Jason: Absolutely.

Luke: Um, my galvanizing the students...there was only three faculty, uh, when I started there. Two tenured faculty that had been there for a long time.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And I came in with gusto. And I was the only painting and drawing teacher, so I had to sort of take on a big role. And I think that the fact that I got the students galvanized, and working way above and beyond what they usually did threatened the other folks.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: It made them uncomfortable.

Jason: Mm-hmm.
Luke: And the students knew this. Even though I tried to shelter them from it, there was something clearly going on. And Sue, the president of the student-run organization, who was helping lead this group...cause they had their own government structure, you know, president, vice president...

Jason: Right.

Luke: ...I was just the advisor.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: She said, "You know what?"; she was leading the effort looking for the gallery. She said, "We should, we should not do this as a university thing, because we have strings attached to the university."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And I think that she knew that things were going on with me that, you know, what if one of the other faculty got involved and they didn't. They wanted my support.

Jason: Mm-hmm.


Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: She said, "We should do this as a nonprofit."

Jason: Hmm.

Luke: "We should really do this." Because part of the ideal was, um, also coming out of the drawing sessions that I was running at [masked]; sessions which ended up becoming the [masked], which I was inviting people from out of [masked] to join the people at [masked] because [masked] was such a bubble. The students were isolated.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: They didn't know what was going on at the [masked] or [masked] or [masked]. And so I was inviting students from other schools and other faculty to come join us and draw, so that my students could get a broader view and make friends with colleagues. And so the idea of a Switzerland, if you will...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: A neutral zone for all of these students and professors to come together, that was not in somebody's house.
Luke: Sue said, "We should do this as a nonprofit, outside of the university, so it really is neutral." At about the same time...This is a little personal story...

Luke: ...um, we found out my wife was pregnant with our first and only child.

Luke: And I went to the dean of the College of [masked] at the time. And I said, "something's weird here. I get weird vibes from the faculty. I'm not comfortable. Something's going on."

Luke: "I don't know what I'm doing wrong. You know, I'm doing everything that I've been coached to do, mentored to do." And she said to me, "They're uncomfortable, and they're gonna do everything they can to make your life miserable. And I can't do anything about that, because they're tenured, and you're not."

Luke: And long story short, it came down to...It was very stressful, but it came down to her basically apologizing and saying, "If you wanted to..."

Luke: ..."If you want to leave this position, we will give you two years of paid leave."

Luke: Full pay, because there was nothing she could do with those faculty.

Luke: Which is the reality of cruddy academic politics.

Luke: I was in heaven with my students and vice-versa. And somebody was jealous, or uncomfortable, or whatever. And I took it. I knew the writing was on the wall. They would have made my life miserable. If I had two years off and my wife was gonna have a baby, I could...My wife is the breadwinner, to be honest. She teaches at [masked].

I'll take it, and I'll be a stay-at-home dad for half a year, and help this thing that it looked like we were about ready to start.
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And right about that time, we signed that lease and committed to launching the organization.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: So all three of those things, for me, happened at the same time. It was this massive convergence.

Jason: [laughs]

Luke: And so it was myself, my wife, with two co-founders and Sue, the student at the time who was the president of the student-run organization.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: And so the three of us signed the lease together. And the three of us, even Sue, somehow she had an inheritance or something; the three of us committed to fairly put in equal amounts of money as a donation. It was a donation. A thousand dollars each. So we started with three thousand dollars.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And that was it. We had to renovate the space, do everything we needed to do with that money. We got one gift from a colleague, a professor at the time, who helped pay for our track lighting.

And it was a small gift. And then anything else that we needed for that first year, we loaned. Each of us would loan as much as we could with the understanding that we'd pay it back.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And we loaned, you know, a couple thousand dollars over the course of the year and ended up paying ourselves back.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: So that's, that's that first genesis moment.

Jason: That's awesome.

Luke: I'll let you ask for clarification if you want more.

Jason: It sounds to me like Sue made the initial suggestion to you.
Luke: Yeah. I mean, who, I don't remember how...we talked a lot, all of us did. But I distinctly remember -- and who knows if it's accurate or not -- I distinctly remember her saying, "We should do this separate from the university."

Jason: Wow. Wow.


Jason: That's great.

Luke: And I'm sure it was her saying, "Why not...Why not do a nonprofit? Let's just...Let's see what we can do." 'Cause it was her that did all the footwork to figure out how do you get nonprofit status.

Jason: Mmm.

Luke: You know, getting the lawyer to file for us. I don't even know exactly how it was done anymore, it was so long ago. But, you know, she did most of that footwork.

Jason: Would you consider Sue as a co-entrepreneur?

Luke: She was a co-founder.

Jason: Co-founder?

Luke: Yeah, yeah. The three of us...Well, in terms of the decision-making and the launching, it was equal on all three parts.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Um, because my wife was having a baby and then eventually had a baby, she was working. She was a little more restricted in her ability to be hands-on. But she was still a board member, a founding board member. But Sue and I did a lot of the on-the-ground work. And we had two students that were my students at [masked], who at the time were Sue’s classmates. Younger, younger classmates than Sue, um, underclassmen who helped. They were our first...We call them founding interns. They were our first interns, our first volunteers.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: And they helped us renovate the space. We did everything, you know, drywall, flooring, everything. And I taught them how to do it.

Jason: [laughs]
Luke: So like not only did we sort of teach people how to do it. We teach ourselves how
to do a business, and teach people how to run a business and how to sort of create a
philosophy about an organization. We taught them how to put up wallboard and drywall.

Jason: We'll come back to that. [laughs]

Luke: I'll talk as long you want me. Cool.

Jason: Um, let's see here. You kinda mentioned this already, just wanna make sure I get
a chance to ask you this. How did you determine... think back to that time where you
talked to Sue and you were just starting to think, "OK, well, this is actually feasible and
possibly doable and sustainable."


Jason: How did you determine your organization's potential to be feasible and
sustainable? Talk to me a little bit about that.

Luke: We didn't, we didn't know it was sustainable.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: We had no clue. I, I had a student's parent ask me, "What's your exit
plan?"

Jason: [laughs]

Luke: I'm like, "What?"

Jason: What? [laughs]

Luke: I'm just grabbing on with both hands and holding on tight. I don't have an exit
plan. [laughs] And I still don't. I'm still here. We did not know it was sustainable. We just
knew that we could cover the rent if we had to, 'cause it was cheap enough.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: For the duration of the lease at the time. We didn't have to pay utilities, 'cause the,
the landlord agreed to pay the utilities. So that created a less variability in our expense.
That helped. And we knew that there was, there were models out there that, um, like
exhibition models, where you have calls for entry and artists pay a fee to submit.

You know, it's a jury fee. So it was like, at the time, it was $10 per work. You submit
three works, you pay $30. You submit one work, you pay $10. And that's an extremely
common model that, that 99 percent of artists embrace. And what they need to do is just
check the background of the organization that they're submitting to or the gallery and
decide that they really are good for it.
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: 'Cause a lot of them may give us a bad name.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: There are a lot of people that got burned by submitting to something that was either a scam or wasn't nearly what it should've been.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And so they've, they have kind of a bitterness about entry fees.

Jason: I see.

Luke: But we knew that...I mean, I submitted as an artist. Even as a professor, you know, working for a living, I would still submit my work out to there to competitions, because competitions matter. And if you get measured up by a jury or a space you respect, and you get included, then it means something.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And so we knew that meant something to us. I had been teaching my students to step up and teach them to do good enough work, first of all, be competitive, and then, they're carefully selecting competitions that they would submit to as students.

Jason: Mmm.

Luke: And they were getting in and showing alongside professionals.

Jason: Mmm.

Luke: "Whoa, this is, this is measuring me, and it's something that's doable, in terms of getting recognition." And so some of those same students were those that helped start this organization. They were already tasting the benefits of such a program. So we figured, there's got to be some sort of revenue stream that could come from that.

Jason: Right.

Luke: We had no idea how much.

Jason: Right.

Luke: But we knew that we could get some. We knew if we were a nonprofit, we could get some membership support. The community would embrace us a little. We had no idea how much.

Jason: Mm-hmm.
Luke: And we knew that we would, as a nonprofit, be eligible for grants.

Jason: Mm-hmm.


Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Aand we had no idea, you know, how successful that would be. But we knew that was all possible, but that there was no certainty of sustainability.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: So it was in light of...despite there was some kind of sense that this could work, we didn't look at models, other than the idea of a model of, um, you know, the exhibition entry fees. But we did not look at other organizations and say, "We want to be like them. We're gonna model ourselves after them." We did not do that.

We looked at our neighborhood. We looked at the location. We looked at our own experiences and said, "We're gonna create something in that empty space, because the empty space defines what it needs." You know, you look at a corner in a room and that corner tells you what needs to be there.

Jason: Hmm.

Luke: You know, you don't decide, "I'm gonna force something to go in there." You know, and my wife and I lived in the neighborhood. So I would drive up every day to go to school at [masked].

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Driving through this blighted street that had nothing in it but trash on the sidewalks. And I'm like, "We need..." I mean, we always said, "They need a bookstore, they need a coffee shop, and they need an art gallery. And maybe a pizza place."

Jason: Mm-hmm. [laughs]

Luke: And so, you know, literally, a half a mile away, was our house. And it all felt right. So far more than in a sense of sustainability and promise, was a sense of doing the right thing...

Jason: Mm.

Luke: ...and having faith that, because it was right, and we really believed in it deeply, that it would work.
Jason: It was blind faith.


Jason: Mm-hmm.


Jason: Thank you so much for sharing that.


Jason: Appreciate it. Let's try this question.

Luke: OK.

Jason: So arts entrepreneurship is broadly defined in my dissertation as the act of organizing arts organizations.


Jason: Um, I'd like you to describe, you've kinda done this a little bit...


Jason: …your organization's development from this inspiration point...


Jason: …to this incorporation point. When you think back to that process, that time of actually developing, what sorts of things contribute to that experience? What significant events...


Jason: …occurred, that moved the experience forward…


Jason: …either positively or negatively?


Jason: You know, 'cause sometimes a negative thing can help us, too.

Luke: Mm-hmm. Yeah. Well it's a lifetime of experiences. That's why I find it hard to imagine, not hard to accept, hard to imagine teaching people how to do this. [laughs]
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Because I don't think it's unfair to say that I was the column or the core of the establishment of this organization. I inspired the students, and I sort of filled their minds with ideas that they chewed on, and then, sort of, reassembled into an initiative.

That without their energy, and without my energy - they wouldn't have gotten that. Without their energy, we wouldn't have done what we did.

Jason: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

Luke: So it's like giving good energy and it expands, and then, it gets given back, and it expands further.

Jason: Hmm.

Luke: I was teaching head over heels as an adjunct; as many as five classes a term at two to three different colleges or programs. Tons and tons of teaching. All different kinds of stuff, some of which developed philosophies about art and design…

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: …which are embedded into our organization; the idea of design and art not being separate, but being a part of the continuum, whereas, some people will say, "Well, they're way different. They're worlds apart."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Even at [masked], two different schools, instead of one school; art and design. Skills, like digital skills to create a website...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...I learned, 'cause I had to teach it.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: I had to teach the digital design, not because I was a digital designer, because I…

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: …I taught myself design software. But I was a drawer, and they recruited me to teach digital design. So I had to get better and more knowledgeable about digital stuff, so then, when it came time, I could create the website for our organization.

Jason: Mm-hmm.
Luke: And I know how to create entry forms, and membership forms, and learned how to use PayPal and integrate it into the website.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Those are little things I picked up along the way...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...like a snowball accumulating snow. And then going back further, working at the [masked] for 10 years, little over 10 years, um, dealing with exhibition design. Knowing and developing a philosophy around how important it is to create an experience for the public, and how much that is an art form.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: It isn't just a tutorial, sort of, scholarly process, it is an artistic process.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Even the people at [masked] were hard to convince that.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: It took forever, and then, before I left, we'd created the [masked] which had never existed before.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: And now, it's, it's, you know, that's fully staffed.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: Um, including processes that we use at our organization, in terms of design. We design every exhibit to scale at our organization, before we select the work, before we finalize the selection of the work.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: 'Cause we wanna know how that exhibit is gonna feel like a work of art.

Jason: Mm. Mm-hmm.

Luke: Does that make sense?

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: The whole exhibit is a work of art...
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...that contains works of art.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: That comes from my time there, and my philosophy about how museums should behave, be, and function in society. I mean I thought a lot about that, even though I wasn't a curator. I was maybe thinking more broadly than the curators, because I didn't have that task of, "I gotta create this exhibit."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Or, "I, I, I'm a expert in this area." I was a museumologist, in a sense.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: …where I was the… my colleagues that were curators were curators of specific disciplines...

Jason: Right.

Luke: …or areas of art history, and my experience as a student.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: The things that I saw as deficiencies in programs that I had studied in, schools that I had studied in.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: I developed strong ideas about those. And then, when I sort of come back in time or come forward in time, when I became a teacher, after I left the [masked], got my master's degree, I became the professor...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...things that I was seeing that were deficiencies, academic red tape.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: You know, the, the politics of academia.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: All of that kind of swirled around and mixed. And again, my experience as an artist and and seeing how poorly art can be displayed, and how art can be ruined through poor display.
Jason: Mm. Mm-hmm.

Luke: Or how unprofessionally venues will treat artists...

Jason: Mm.

Luke: ...how inconsiderately...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...they will treat artists.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: All of those things, for me, for my part, boiled into this really, like, almost a condensed into a black hole, super massive intensity of potential...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...that was just waiting for release. And when I went to [masked], and I embraced the mission, and I embraced these students, and they embraced me...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...something happened.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: It's all, and that was all combined with, sort of, being in the neighborhood at the time.

Jason: Right. Being local, too, like...


[laughter]

Luke: I think that answers your question.


Luke: And any other - there are positive and negative things in there. Most of it's positive.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Most of it's positive or neutral. Some of it's negative, if you think of being critical of something that you're seeing as being negative...
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...like intellectually critical of things. And, some of it's negative like, in some ways, my experience at [masked] was a terrible tragedy. I mean I had got the tenure-track that everybody wants.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And it was gonna set me and my wife up, you know, for a family and everything, and a house and, sort of, American dream, sort of. And I was working so hard. I had earned that, and it broke my heart to have it happen the way it happened; but at the other side of it...it was a miracle...

Jason: Mm.

Luke: ...because of what really happened.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And so when I talk about it with people now, I'm like, "I don't regret anything...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...that happened.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: I know I didn't do anything wrong, and I was, when I went in there, I decided you know, "I'm gonna do this the way I know it should be done best."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: "I'm gonna be the most integrous person I can be, and do my job at a hundred percent. And if that hurts me, then I don't belong here."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Um.

Jason: Wonderful.

Luke: And something good will come from it.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And something did. So in terms of inspiration, incorporation - I think of our organization, I know official incorporated corporation...
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...to become a business.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: But I think for us, other than that official date of incorporation, slide those two together, the two lines exist like this.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: We are constantly inspired and constantly incorporated.

Jason: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

Luke: And “incorporation” may be the wrong word. It may be evolving and developing into whatever.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: But everything's always growing and changing. And we're always looking for that opportunity to go, "Aha. That's something we need to do."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Or, maybe we don't need to do that anymore, we need to change that.

Jason: This is just, I'm gonna give you accolades after this is over. This is great. [laughs]

Luke: Tell these guys, because they are the ones that helped us.

Jason: Oh, cool.

Luke: Yeah, Artswave. Well, yeah, I can't leave this room without saying that Artswave taught us how to be our organization.

Jason: Oh.

Luke: How to be that non-profit.

Jason: OK.

Luke: In order to get, um, I don't remember exactly the rules, but we got project funding early on.

Jason: Mm-hmm.
Luke: 'Cause we were the startup, you know, if you wanna call us a startup. And so, we couldn't get operating support, but we could get project funding.

Jason: OK.

Luke: So we got little bits, here and there from Artswave…

Jason: OK.

Luke: ...and a couple of other places.

Jason: OK.

Luke: Um, they bought our first, our folding chairs that we still use today, for when we show videos and have public gatherings and artist talks. Um, I forget what else they helped fund, but early on, it was a couple of small… but, at the time, it felt like a lot of money...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...not just grants. But they, in order to be involved to some degree in Artswave; and I don't know if it was the grant writing, or if it was the business on board...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...business, um, board members matching program. They call it “board way bound”, now, I think. We had to go through training, ourselves.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: How to be a non-profit, which is the same thing that they put the potential board members through, now. And so, I think with mostly Sue and I, my wife might have gone to a couple, you know, we came to sessions where they would have speakers speak, and they would give us handouts, and they would give us resources on the web to learn. Arts Incubator is one of them.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: So they tutored us a little, as groups, and then you know, any time we needed help, we asked for it.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And they have it. They would tell us something, give us…. and they hooked us, kind of, into the network with non-profits in Cincinnati.

Jason: Mm-hmm.
Luke: But I think it was our sort of commitment to being steadfast and being really rigorous in our quality. And our reputation grew with Artswave, the community of non-profits in the area, and with the public.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: So depending on the day that you're looking at, you know, we're this little non-profit that's just, kinda chuggin' along a couple years and then...boom!

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Artists around the world are paying attention to us.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And so, it was within a couple of years that we, we stated our tagline which is still applicable, "[masked]."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Because, we thought we'd reach regional schools, mostly. We thought we'd be getting schools and professors, students and professors from the region.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And then, it wasn't long before we were getting submissions from all across the country, Canada, England, and we were like, "Where'd they come from?"

[shared laughter]

Luke: But it came from us being very vocal about our philosophy...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...very, very outspoken about it, being very communicative with the artists, upfront, so that they didn't feel like they were being left behind or left uninformed. And then showing off the results. You know, championing their res-, you know, the good results of the exhibits that we did or the publications.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: And so, the reputation exploded, but eventually, Artswave started giving us operating support.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And we've gotten it every year since we started.
Jason: Wow.

Luke: And you know, we still come to workshops and seminars and what not, and discussions like this. You know they help coordinate things that, either directly or indirectly help us.

Jason: This is great.

Luke: Yeah. So, so...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...I think that, you know, the majority of what caused this to happen, we didn't know about Artswave when we started. We didn't know it was an option to learn from them, so that came somewhat after the launch, if you will. But it wasn't that long after. And I've honestly said to groups when I've spoken on behalf of Artswave, if it wasn't them, we wouldn't exist.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: Yeah. We wouldn't have existed this long.

Luke: We wouldn't have made it. So sustainability, to a large degree, is given credit to Artswave, I think.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: That said, it isn't a lot that we get.

Jason: Mm-mm.

Luke: We get one of the smallest amounts that any organization gets in the city from them, and we kinda...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...we're kinda, we complain about it, because we do so much, our impact is so great.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And our longevity is so solid.

Jason: This is, this is fantastic. What are some significant events that have negatively impacted, specifically, your organization's operational capability, like over the years? You've been in business for like 12 years, essentially.

Jason: So, um, talk to me about the negatives, and then we'll talk about the positives.

Luke: Specific events?

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: I don't know if there has been any that I would say have permanently hurt us.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: But, so, I'm just gonna talk.

Jason: Maybe along the way?

Luke: Or, you can decide if, if they qualify to answer your question.

Jason: Ok.

Luke: The building that we're in - which is our headquarters, offices, gallery, and the source of most of our revenue…

Jason: [coughs] OK.

Luke: …the building was for sale, [smacks lips] and we couldn't afford it. We had not money at all and no backing. And it's mostly, you know, two floors above us are all residential.

Jason: OK.

Luke: And we didn't want to have to manage that. We weren't ready to do something like that. So we couldn't buy it anyway, but regardless, we didn't have the money or the funding.

We did have a long-term lease that we negotiated, and you know, over the years we had adjusted it, amended it, with the original landlord. And he was very compliant. He would, he would give us, pretty much...

Luke: ...what we wanted, within reason.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: It was so it was great for us. Very long-term lease, I think it was a 10 to 15 years total. Something like that with lots of good options for expanding the space for a little cost.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: And then, the building sold to a developer in New York.
Jason: Oh. Ok.

Luke: So, not just a guy around town who bought it, and...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...is gonna do something with it.

Jason: When was this?


Jason: OK.


Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: The board, staff, me, very much.

Jason: 'Cause somebody bought your space.

Luke: Yeah, and we still had a lease, and the lease, you know, was, legally transferable. You know, we weren't necessarily gonna be able to get kicked out, but, you know, they can...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...take it to court, or they can sue us, or they can say...

Jason: Whatever.

Luke: ..."You know, we're gonna buy out your lease," and yet, everything we do, within that program, and even the residency and what not, it's contingent upon the space...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...the environment. You can't do that anywhere. It has to be the right kind of space, in the right location, in terms of the neighborhood.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And we had developed a a relationship with the neighborhood, that they were depending on us.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: We were leading this revitalization...
**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Luke:** ...just by virtue of being there. So it wasn't like you could just pick up and go someplace else, and it was very affordable.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Luke:** And so, we had several meetings with these two guys; New York accents and all, Brooklyn accents.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Luke:** Um, hostile to some degree, because they were, they didn't like our lease.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Luke:** They did not like this, what they had bought. And yet, they bought it. They choose to buy it, and I think it was fully disclosed, upfront, you know.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Luke:** It wasn't hidden from them. And, they tried to get us to change it, and our board president, who was matched to us from Artswave about five or six years ago or so, said, "No. This is our lease. We need you to honor our lease. In fact, if you, if you really want to, give us a $50,000 donation."

**Jason:** [laughs]

**Luke:** I'll never forget her saying that. And they're like... [laughs]. But she's like pushing it back at 'em.

**Jason:** Uh-huh.

**Luke:** Like, don't try to take from us, try to give to us.

**Jason:** Uh-huh.

**Luke:** And we have lawyers on our board, and they were there.

**Jason:** Mm.

**Luke:** I mean this was like a sit down and like, "Oh, God."

**Jason:** [laughs]

**Luke:** I was, I could've gotten an ulcer from it. I, I didn't sleep well.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.
Luke: It was my baby.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: If you, some people think of this as my baby, although, it was our baby.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: It was vulnerable. And, ultimately, they agreed. They said, "OK." And we came to terms, and everybody seems to be hap-, seemed to be happy, and continued to be happy.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: They renovated the second and third floors, kicked all the original artist tenants out, and tripled the rents, which we knew they were, that was their goal, the-...

Jason: Right.

Luke: ...which is sad and unfortunate. Um, but at least they didn't kick us out, and so, we still have our place in the neighborhood.

Jason: So, they left your lease alone, essentially?


Jason: Wow.

Luke: Yes. But, that was a major threat that we had to rally our resources and, and it could've come out differently. They could've taken us to court, done whatever options they could do to get us out of the lease.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: And it would've put us out on the street. We did not have an alternative.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: We did not and do not. And now, we've slowly expanded, because of our lease, into the entire floor. We started with one corridor of the floor of this building, and we ended up expanding to the higher floor. We renovated additional gallery space, increased it by 66 percent, added the residency space and an office space.

Jason: I gotta check that out.

Luke: So, yeah, the exhibit that's up now is up through Friday, and then we're down for two weeks.
Jason: OK.

Luke: You're welcome to come in anytime, even if we're down...

Jason: OK.

Luke: ...just tell 'em who you are.

Jason: Cool.

Luke: So, that was a big one.

Jason: OK.

Luke: And, it still haunts us.

Jason: Mm.

Luke: Because we are an institution. One reason we've started our organization is because so many artist-run, small non-profits or co-op galleries, they're only open a couple hours on Saturday...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...or by appointment, and they go defunct within a year or two.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: They're not reliable for the communities.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And we wanted to prove that you can do it really well, on a shoestring budget, world class, get recognition, critical recognition, and be open, and stick around...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ... for you know, public accessibility. And we've done that. 12 years is pretty good, so we've, kind of feel like we have proven that we are; we are what we need to be. We are what's needed. But that lease expires at some point.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And if the landlord does with our rent, what he did with the upstairs rents, we won't be able to push for it.

Jason: When is your lease up?
Luke: The end of [masked], I think. [coughs]

Jason: Mm.

Luke: I think something like that. And I've told Artswave this.

[laughter]

Luke: And then, this is good for you to hear, because...

Jason: Yup.

Luke: ...you know, they're always talking about impact.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And we make impact.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: The community will say it. They say it all the time, even, even [masked] is saying it, finally, and they're, they're in a different kind of state than [masked].

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...with all the buildings being torn down, and there are plans for the big redevelopment.

Jason: Right.

Luke: They're finally sort of seeing what we can be for them.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: But Artswave talks about impact which is, you know, point A to point B. You know, you invest in impact, and then you have it happen.

And, we've impacted, impacted, impacted, impacted, impacted! Not a year ago or so, the same landlord who bought the building comes to us and says, "I have a problem. [smacks lips]. “My taxes went way up, like doubled, because of the improvements you've made on the street and in the gallery…

[laughter]

Luke: “…in your gallery space. And I didn't account for that when I agreed to let you keep the lease."

Jason: Oh, man.
Luke: And we were like, "Raise the rents on your tenants if you have to."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Not that we want him to do that...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...but you bought this. We're doing good things. And it wasn't contentious, but it was a little bit of a threat.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And it brought that specter of worry again.

[laughs]

Jason: OK.

Luke: I made the point to him that all of that investment that we put into this space was highly unique to our gallery space, or it was just cosmetic. It was paint and what not. It wasn't stuff that really merits doubling your taxes.

So either they're increasing taxes because of what you did upstairs, or they're increasing because of the change in property values in the neighborhood.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: Which we may or may not have something to do with.

[clearing throat]

Luke: And, he asked, "Well, would you, would you testify at a hearing, a tax hearing, um, to that effect?" I said, "Sure. I'll do whatever I can to help you out. You've helped us out. I'll help you out." And I did it, and they reduced his taxes about by half.

Jason: Hmm.

Luke: They thanked me. He thanked me. His lawyer thanked me, and we kind of proved our point. That it was capital for our organization if it was anything.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: It was our capital investment...

Jason: Absolutely.

Luke: ...not his. Even though it was in his building...because the lease was so long.
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: He had no chance to gain from anyone. Um, even if he sold his building the buyer would not get benefit from that until our lease was up.

So we ended up good there. But I am reminded…I was sitting in this room doing sort of a quarterly report with a representative from Artswave, or operating report, and I said, "You got us to point B. Fund impact, get impact. What do you do when the impact hurts the impactor?

Jason: Mm.

Luke: You drive up property values.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: ...flourishing, landlord's taxes go up.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And the organization that makes a good impact gets flushed out of the system.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: And she's like, "You know what? We've never talked about that."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: "You guys need to talk about this."

Jason: [laughs]

Luke: You need to operate like you're gonna do the things that you're saying you're doing to fund it.

Jason: Um-hmm.

Luke: And think about three or four times out, like a chess game. It's complicated. It's not like a checkers game.

Jason: Um-hmm.

Luke: A to B, it's not, it's A to Z. What happens all along the way? You've gotta think about the impact on the impactors, or the impact of the impact on the impactor.

Jason: Oh, super-cool. Thank you for that. Last question, I'm going to switch that from negative to positive.

Jason: Choose one significant event that you can remember, over the last 12 years, that has positively impacted your organization.

Luke: More recently, within the past year and a half, the rent at a subsidiary building of ours was threatened to be doubled. Doubled!

Jason: Wow!

Luke: And we had to fight that. And we got them just to agree a 50 percent increase. And we had to swallow 50 percent increase in order to stay there. So that's just another half of that same problem.

Jason: Right.

Luke: We make an impact, we look successful, our costs go up. We can't afford it...

Jason: Right.

Luke: ...because we can't get big funding.

Jason: Um-hmm.

Luke: We're doing everything we can to get the revenue that we get. So I just want to add that to that bit.

Jason: Sure.

Luke: In a positive event, a singular, you see, it's like the same challenges same as before. We've had challenges every single year. Staff leaving, staff coming, you know, like buildings being sold and bought, and threats to rent going up, neighborhood changing...

Jason: Um-hmm.

Luke: Positives and negatives. Same thing with the positives, um, I don't know if I can say one singular positive...

Jason: You can talk about a couple, that's fine, 'cause there's probably a couple of them.

Luke: We tried international awards for our books, three of them, which has made, made us, made us very happy, in competition, places like Metropolitan Museum of Art or the Whitney Museum of Art, with their publications, we've won prizes.

Jason: What has that done for your organization?
Luke: Very little, except allowed us to say...Very little that I can put my finger on, but it has allowed us to say, "Look, we're serious with these books, so the artists and the public can say, "Yeah, this is a viable program, the publications are."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: I think, well just to say something really recently; last Saturday we had an event at the [masked] in order to announce a major new program that we're gonna launch there, and to show off some renovations we'd done in that space at our expense.

And we had 158 people come, which was a lot of people in our reasonably small studio space. They fit, but barely. And we did a program. We had video, we had two live speakers. I came to speak about drawing and about our organization. I spoke after the president of our Board spoke. And it was a fantastic, perfect event.

Jason: Hmm.

Luke: And the folks were there, the council members of the community, even the president of the community council was there and he was thrilled.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: He was so tickled. He was so giddy with how it felt, how happy they were that we were there. That was a really positive event but we have those, probably more than I can ever remember, that kind of sprinkle back in time, like a dotted line.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: That's the first one we've done at the drawing center quite like that. But we've expanded our gallery. We got a lot of funding. In about five months' time we needed like to raise like 50 or 60 thousand dollars and we did it, to expand our gallery, to renovate and expand.

Jason: Mmm.

Luke: We've grown our staff. When I was able to make staff full-time, that was a big deal for me.

Jason: When did it happen?

Luke: I think it was a year and a half ago. I think it was. At least my office manager. That person has since left and I've hired somebody new who now is the operations manager. She got a promotion and, uh, a tally of change.

Jason: OK.
Luke: Because she's so important and does a lot more than people think an office manager does. That was a big deal.

To increase hours by double, from 15 hours a week to 30 hours a week which just happened [masked]…was a huge deal.

These are behind the scenes things. But helping people be part of us and investing in them means a whole lot to me. And I get a thrill out of knowing that if you invest in it, behind the scenes, your gonna see great responses in front of the scene, programming, quality of work, quality of the space and everything.

The re-launch of the gallery was probably one of the most memorable 'cause we didn't know what we were doing. You know, renovating the gallery in May, June of 2004.

Luke: We opened the gallery January of 2005. And we did press releases. We emailed our friends. We emailed faculty. We got news coverage, tons of news coverage in the early days, tons of papers and stuff that we've saved over the years that were just all over the place, and that were fantastic.

We didn't know what was gonna happen that night. We were just polyurethaning the floor a couple of days before, painting the façade - to get ready for it and it was just two-room gallery at the time; just first two rooms, tiny locks at the back.

And we didn't count people at the time. We do it now. We've done it every day since, so we know very accurately how many people come to the gallery.

But that night we didn't. And we estimate that we had 400 people there.

Jason: Wow.

Luke: Not all at one time, it was a four-hour opening...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: But it was jam-packed full and everybody was thrilled. So if had to cast my mind back...

Jason: [laughs]

Luke: That's a high point…

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Luke: …in our organization's existence. Because we didn't expect it, and it was in total embrace that this little thing, and it kind of gave us juice to what was to come, which was figuring out how to make things work. [laughs]
Jason: Mm-hmm. Luke, this is beyond fantastic. I just wanna tell you that. It's an honor.

Luke: OK.
Interview 2: MAGGIE

Jason: Can you provide a general summary of your organization's mission and programmatic activities?

Maggie: Well at the moment, I mean, I have a summary of the mission, the actual exact summary of the mission on...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: ...the website, so you can take it from there if you need to.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: Essentially, it's an organization that started out as a festival of music and arts, and we present artists who are international, internationally renowned and Grammy Award-winning musicians.

And then we also put them together in different type of collaborations that are not only German, uh, German music and classical music, but also collaborations with dancers, with actors, with, um, essentially with digital art and things like that. And also, we have children's concerts and things like that. But it's a festival. It's a yearly festival, annual festival.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: And then over the five seasons, it has grown into kind of like in three different categories. It's gone...it's kind of more like a brand at the moment...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: ...that has three different categories. So one is the festival and the second one is the outreach concerts, where we go to schools and give, um, performances and interact with kids, and also make them familiar with different organizations, which present, um, art stuff around town, which are not necessarily expensive, and so that there is not that barrier that, "Oh I can't afford art, the arts."

So, and then also to dif-, demystifying art and music and saying, "Look, you can actually do it every day yourself." You can get involved in different things, and even apps. You can make your own music, you can create your own art. So it's not something that has to be outside of your life. It can be part of your everyday life, if you only want it to be.

Jason: Wow.
Maggie: So that's the second, um, thing. And the third part of the brand is we started presenting digital projects, which are...for example so far we have created two really cool music videos. So very often in pop music, we have, uh, really terrible songs...

Jason: Mm.

Maggie: ...and really bad lyrics…

Jason: [laughs]

Maggie: ...but the music video is awesome.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: Right? So it makes you watch it. You don't even understand what the hell you're listening to. And often it's kind of like, it just catches you by itself, and so the music video is great. In classical music, it's the other way around.

Jason: Mm.

Maggie: The music often is really amazing, but it's really badly presented in terms of digital room. So I haven't really seen any good music videos. Um, so what we're trying to do is change that, and present kind of cool, um, cool music, but also in a really great way, so that it's spent...so that it sounds really well.

And then we also help to co-produced, um, a documentary music, um, about music. And it's called [masked].

Jason: OK.

Maggie: And it's by a local director, and it's, uh, actually now being sold. It took like three years to make. But it's now being sold in 10 different countries, and it's going to be in America very soon as well. So we're just doing DVDs now. And that's the kind of stuff that's, that's kind of like a much bigger picture.

And it's been picked up by [masked], which is one of the biggest distributors of documentary movies, um, in America. So it's kind of been very successful that way. We are only a small co-produce, uh, co-producers of it....

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: ...financially, but we...but I'm very, um, involved myself. I produced all the music for the movie, and sort of advised them on all different aspects of, of it. But it's, uh, it's not like a film, like a movie. It's not really your typical documentary style, you know, where you're sitting there and you're very bored, and you might not necessarily want to sit there through to the end.
But this movie is very cool, and it has a story. It has all sorts of things happening, and they followed, um, a few really amazing musicians around the world. They went to Japan, then Germany and a couple of other places, and so it's, it's kind of interesting.

**Jason:** Hmm.

**Maggie:** So, um, what else? That's kind of the extended version of our mission. But essentially, our mission, um, the short version is that we would like to introduce music, especially the class-, the type that's called classical. Because it's not really classical, but it's, you know, it's, it's from like the 12th century to now.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Maggie:** That's all called classical, which is really misleading. But essentially, we're trying to introduce it to younger crowds and people, and also people who would not normally go to classical music concerts.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Maggie:** Because of the way we present our events. We don't really change the music so much as we present it in a way where it's just fun, and it's a little different, and there are different type of collaborations, and the event itself always has a visual art exhibition, or a digital art component, or dancers.

**Jason:** Fantastic. Thank you so much for that. So the second question would be, when did you incorporate your organization? What year did you?

**Maggie:** 2010.

**Jason:** 2010? OK, and a follow-up question to that is...why did you decide to incorporate? Now I ask this with the understanding that you probably were doing programmatic activities before you decided to incorporate.

**Maggie:** I did not. I incorporated first because the nature of the music festival is that it's a nonprofit, and it's mostly supported by foundations and private donors.

**Jason:** Hmm.

**Maggie:** And sometimes corporations, if we're...

**Jason:** Right.

**Maggie:** ...you know, lucky. And so I had lined up the idea with a few key people who I felt would be supporting the festival...

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.
Maggie: ...and made a few presentations. And once they, I th-, I saw a very good response and I knew that they would be supporting the festival, I had to incorporate and get a nonprofit status.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: Because people will gladly give the money if it's a write-off, other than you know, they're not going to necessarily, um, invest in the idea because they know it's a nonprofit and, you know, it's a festival, and they...basically, that's why I incorporated and got tax-exempt status as soon as possible.

Jason: Wonderful. OK. Um, so let's talk a little bit about this process. I'm interested in figuring out what your initial inspiration was for organizing this.

Maggie: Um, that's easy. As I said, the festival has..., the brand… our brand hasn't evolved in five years. But the original idea was that I lived in the city for quite a while, and I am a violinist, concert violinist myself, and...

Jason: OK.

Maggie: ...I traveled around the world before, then I kind of settled here. I have three children, and I thought that it was a very cool city to live, and especially with all the things that are going on.

Because for the size of it, it has, um, an amazing number of musical and other arts organizations on a quite a good level actually. And so if you were to compare it to big cities, there's just quite a bit going on for the size of the city here.

But what I always found is that those small organizations often don't really collaborate with one another. They just have this, their own little local following, and outside of the city they're not really known. And nobody kind of knows that that's happening here, and that much is happening here.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: And so the original inspiration was to put together quite a few local organizations and present their concerts as part of the festival, as well as bring current Grammy Award-winning musicians who travel all over the world to be part of the same festival, and therefore raise the profile for the, of the small organizations by...and by default, you also have a really substantial festival as a result. And that, I did for the first three years.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: So the inspiration was essentially to tell the rest of the world that Cincinnati has a lot of other small organizations; not just the big, you know, five or whatever they are.
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: Um...

Jason: [laughs]

Maggie: ...but there is lots more going on than just that.

Jason: Wonderful. Thank you so much. Um, let's talk a little bit about this process, then, from inspiration to incorporation. How did you actually determine your organization's potential to be feasible and sustainable?

And I'm interested in this, too, because you just told me that you started a nonprofit prior to really moving this forward. So how did you determine organizational feasibility and sustainability?

Maggie: Well, you know the first three years are always the ones that will determine whether you'll survive or not. So you cannot really predict a 100 percent this what is going to be feasible or fantastic and all of it will all work out. You might try it out, and it might not work out, and then you move to a different idea or you change that idea.

But in my case I was quite lucky because I knew there were just a handful of big donors and supporters who would want to sustain this type of an idea, and that saw the need just as I did for this type of a festival. And so I took my chances and said, "Look, I can deliver if you can support it." And so my...it's quite simple.

I know that whatever...if I do something...I know that I'm going to do it and that I will deliver from my part. So all I need is the other part which is financial, and then that I kind of knew that I was going to get at least for the next two or three years, and so we went for it.

Jason: Ok. In this study arts entrepreneurship is defined as the act of organizing arts organizations. I think you've done this, but I'd like to spend some time getting from your perspective what this process from inspiration to incorporation has been.

Maggie: You just want more details. So it's actually funny that you asked. For the arts organizations, musical festivals and art festivals usually are very fluid organizations because there are a lot of volunteers, there are a lot of interns, um, there are just a few part-time employees, and most of the time unless it grows, unless you want to grow the actual organization itself - it kind of stays that way every year.

There's people changing, and there's different staff almost yearly. And you know, annually, and change over. That's just the nature of the organization. There are bigger festivals which then grow and have a bigger staff, and the festivals at this...for this particular organization - I don't envision that.
I would envision growing it a little bit, but not as an organization to be too big. But it’s just...we're super productive and that's kind of our model is more presenting what we know how to do really well, and growing in different directions like going to different cities.

Like next month, we have two projects which we take to Chicago and St. Louis. So we are taking the brand outside of the city - therefore making it visible and bringing back attention to Cincinnati, essentially.

**Jason:** I see.

**Maggie:** To answer your question, I actually have my first year intern. She was an art admin student at [masked].

**Jason:** OK.

**Maggie:** And she's absolutely brilliant. She was a double major. She was business and art admin. She was also running the festival for the first year, and in fact her friend from...who was also my intern, they wrote a book, a little handbook, on how to start a festival after that whole experience.

**Jason:** [laughs]

**Maggie:** And so if in fact you're interested I can share that with you. It's a very cool thing to do, because if you want to start a festival it's really pretty comprehensive. I don't think anybody else has really done that. So it's pretty comprehensive and it's very useful.

You need to have...it's a small organization, but actually there is just like in any...just to name a few departments there is development, there is administrative, there is marketing/PR, there is artistic, and there is also part of administration. That's just, those are just the general. And then there's finance.

So all of those things essentially can be run by different people, or they can be run by one or two people, but they need to be covered. So to get to that point where you are an organization, you kind of have to have those people in place. You have to have a plan of what happens when.

We also have an extensive...we are pretty organized in that we have a project plan throughout the year; so we know what needs to be done, when it needs to be done throughout the year. So closer to the time right now we have over 1,000 tasks that need to be taken care of.

Even though it's not...essentially it's not a big festival, it's two weeks, but it's...there are thousands of little things that need to be, you know, done for it. So essentially you need to have people who will do...to make sure that the organization runs smoothly.
Jason: So did you come into this process from 2010 already having staff members or...?

Maggie: No.

Jason: It sounds like you had already had funding going in.

Maggie: Well, um, I had somewhat...I had an idea somewhat, and what I did was I approached [masked] and they...I just asked for their artistic administration students.

Jason: Wow.

Maggie: And they gave me three different people, and one of them was much more responsible than anybody else. She was the actual festival manager for the time being.

Jason: Wow.

Maggie: So, she had a part-time salary and she helped to really set stuff up. Essentially I was just guiding. Because I have a vision for things, how they need to happen, and she was trying; making sure that everything happens.

Jason: Mm-hmm. That's fantastic. Thank you for that. Just two more questions. So thinking about this process again from inspiration to incorporation, I'd like to find out from your perspective what some of the significant events have been, those that have taken place; specifically those that have negatively impacted your organization’s capability... if you can share some of those.

I know you've been here since 2010 and things do happen. So what are some of those challenges that have occurred over the last, um, what is it, six years now?

Maggie: Well, we had like in our second year...so the first year we approached several organizations I handpicked, really good quality organizations, and I said, "Do you want to be a part of the festival?" And everybody said yes. And so we had a 13-event festival.

But the next year everybody heard about it, and we actually...I had to say no to a few organizations because I didn't feel like their quality artistically was up to par. But what happened in the second festival, um, because we needed to make sure that everybody's projects got scheduled and didn't clash with anybody else's project the festival took over...it was about a month in length.

Over the space of a month there were all these projects going on, and we had about 24 performances, and lots of workshops, and god knows what. So there was, it was so big for this city it just didn't make any sense whatsoever because then you have to promote all of the concerts, and you don't know what you are actually focusing on.

We did get very positive responses still. I mean, people still attended these other organizations' concerts for the first time ever. Things like that, those are positives, where they didn't know about those organizations. We introduced them to the local things that
are going on throughout the year. That was a very good thing. But for us as an organization, that didn't make any sense and we learned that it was too much.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: And so the year after we actually had a showcase, and produced music videos so that we had a little break; because it was way, way too much, and didn't make sense for the city. So that was a negative in a sense where we just spread ourselves too thin in a way.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: We presented really great stuff, but, um, you can't get enough audience to attend everything, and you also can't get...we didn't have enough staff to really do proper PR and proper marketing for everything. And you know, people will only come to like one or two things, and they cannot come to 24 things.

Jason: [laughs]

Maggie: So, uh, it's not that...And it's, plus it's throughout the month of October.

Jason: Um.

Maggie: That's when it was. So it was a busy month. So that was a learning step, and we, uh, really kind of regrouped after that, and, um, you know...the one positive throughout the entire five years is that we presented over 60 world premieres. And I'm very proud of our artistic achievements.

So we've done all sorts of different collaborations, and, um, I would say, are kind of a feisty little festival in that respect.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Maggie: But we do have a lot of work to do in terms of marketing and PR, often. We had a few negative things happen. Like last year some of the concerts were very badly attended. That was in April.

Now we moved the festival to April, because it's easier for me to get people over in April; but then of course it presents a challenge, because there are also many events in April, and it's also Easter, and all sorts of holidays and graduations. So that’s always going to be a busy time. And this, you know… people are busy.

And so our biggest channel of challenges to, um, like for example… some of our events were not very well attended last year. So we tried to work out why that was. And so we have made certain, um, kind of...well, we're trying to find solutions to that problem. So that was a kind of a negative, but a positive. Because there's always something you can kind of learn.
**Jason:** Absolutely.

**Maggie:** To see what you can do better in that respect. Other negative things? I guess, um, a lot of our funding comes from private donors, and those are really die-hard music fans; and they are usually older.

And so last year we had a situation where two of the bigger donors kind of pulled out, because they felt like they were not in a good place financially; and that presents a challenge, because they've got big chunks of our budget. And if that happens, you have to go and search for something else.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Maggie:** So that's the weak spot, and we are working on that too… to diversify where the funding comes from.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm, right.

**Maggie:** But in terms of, as an entrepreneur, you know, someone like myself, I don't really come from that background. I just have ideas and vision, and the visions as to how things should go. So essentially that is what you really need to be an entrepreneur, because…and you of course need to have connections, and you need to have ideas of how you want to realize your whole organization, how you want it to be.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Maggie:** And I think, then everything else comes from God.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Maggie:** Because you know, you can…you are talking about, you know, starting something. Starting something. Basically I think the main thing is the vision. You have a vision. Everything else will come from that. Of course you have to then work your butt off, but that's...

**Jason:** [laughs]

**Maggie:** ...You know, that you cannot really avoid.

**Jason:** Wonderful. That's all I got for you. Thank you so much.
Interview 3: RUTH

Jason: So, please provide me with a general summary of your organization's mission and programmatic activities. We'll start there.

Ruth: My organization is in the middle of our ninth season creating collaborative, interdisciplinary, exploratory, and sort of off-the-beaten-path performances that allows us as symphony musicians to be chamber musicians, and to also invite non-instrumentalists to be chamber musicians with us. That is really the key dialog that we're interested in...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...in terms of bringing a different perspective to our work and to music.

Um, and through this, our hope is to bring more people into the fold of dramatic musical experience or even their first musical experience or their...

Ruth: ...first literary experience [laughs] even.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: So, it's kind of a...a fusion of genres that can draw in new audiences and maybe cultivate younger audiences too; and educate people who already think they know music in a different way.

Jason: And how do you actually do that, like programmatically, um, performances or...

Ruth: Well...yeah, performances. We will brainstorm something with maybe an artist or writer. I had the privilege of working with [masked] who was a drama teacher at [masked].

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: You know that name?

Jason: No.

Ruth: He retired recently, but I just wrote him a letter. I said, "I saw that you have done 'L'Histoire du Soldat,' I wanna do L'Histoire du Soldat, but I wanna use a different script." And he said, "Oh, great idea! Let's do it."

And we ended up writing the script from the princess's point of view whose...in the original story she doesn't have any lines. She's just a character. But through her eyes, seeing the soldier come home, he sells his soul to the devil for a violin. And the modern reinterpretation of it is, he came for war and has suffered from PTSD...
Jason: Mm-mm, I see.

Ruth: ...sold his soul...

Jason: Right.

Ruth: ...and she watches this happen. And it's only from her point of view. And the musicians were able to do some clapping, some sound effects to be part of the drama as well as tell a story with the instruments.

Jason: Well, OK.

Ruth: That was cool. That was one way. Another one is, um, we decided that we were gonna do "Quartet for the End of Time"...

Jason: OK.

Ruth: ...and Samuel Beckett's "Waiting for Godot" as two corollary but intersecting stories of this interminable waiting for something that's never gonna come.

Jason: Mm-mm.

Ruth: We saw these parallels between these two works and dovetailed them. Some people hated it, and some people loved it [laughs]. But that, that is something I would say is probably one of the top 10 projects that I've been able to work on. Not only because you develop such a deep relationship with the people you're creating this project with...

Jason: Mm-hmm?

Ruth: …but because the product was so strong, in one way or another.

Jason: You had mentioned on the way over, um, educational programs. Can you talk a little bit about that?

Ruth: Yeah, so I also teach at [masked].

Jason: OK.

Ruth: And when I was in college, um, I remember, wanting, loving, having a big passion for putting German music shows together. What I'm realizing now, a part of a desire is coming to fruition.

I took business classes, at [masked]. And I think that gave me a little bit of confidence when you talk about, you know, "Think about the critical things that happen in your life," this was one of them, I think, just to chew, sit in take some business courses. I took an entrepreneurship course there. Fascinating.
**Jason:** Um-hmm.

**Ruth:** And I just tucked it away. The education part of it came from teaching countless students who want to be. They want to play. The only organizations they know of that they can play, in which they can play are in symphony orchestras, and be gainfully employed.

And so every year there's 30 clarinet players enrolled at [masked] who want to do this. And the graduation, the, er, success rate of graduates in this school is known to be five percent to get into the symphony orchestras - five percent.

**Jason:** Um-hmm.

**Ruth:** All these students. "I know. You have great potential, but...Do you want to make money? Do you need to make money? No? OK, great." [laughs] You know, you should try to get as much experience doing as many different things as you can.

Can you put together a concerto orchestra? Do you have the charisma to get your friends together? And if you don't, can you still find a way to do it? [laughs] You know, how much do you really want to gain some meaningful experiences in school by chamber music?

So teaching my students, um, made me realize there was a big need...

**Jason:** Um-hmm.

**Ruth:** ...and I approached the university about it.

**Jason:** Wow. Ok, we're going to get to that. [laughs]

**Ruth:** OK. [laughter]

**Jason:** Um, specifically...If there's anything else you want to add...

**Ruth:** Next generation work program?

**Jason:** What's that?

**Ruth:** That's the program that we created through our organization.

**Jason:** Ok.

**Ruth:** Which is the first phase that I was telling you about; the higher level, factorial Master's student groups...

**Jason:** OK.
Ruth: ...from [masked] and [masked] who've...um, [masked] is offering a course, so they can sign up for course credit for doing, um, apprenticeship, performing side-by-side, joint concerts, creating their own programs to take around the city.

And they get the marketing, they get branding, they get board formation, non-profit status, how to create that. How to arrange…they get coaching and they can volunteer to work on any aspect of organization.

They want to do development? Great. Here, let's work on this grant together. Or, you want to do, um, fund raising? You know, so you can make your presentation, la, la, la. So that's been going on. This is our second year…

Jason: Oh, wow.

Ruth: ...and then, next year, the kids are going to start to go out and take programs into schools...

Jason: Yeah?

Ruth: ...and get involved in stuff with elementary school kids.

Jason: Fantastic.

Ruth: Yeah.

Jason: OK, so a couple of things I wanna touch on. When did you incorporate the organization, actually?

Ruth: Immediately.

Jason: Immediately. OK, was...

Ruth: 2000. It was actually… was actually 2007. And our letter, our article, or our letter…

Jason: Articles of Incorporation.


Jason: OK.

Ruth: So it was actually backdated to October 2007.

Jason: OK, a follow up question to that. Why did you decide to incorporate? Now, I ask this question with the understanding that owners and founders of arts organizations may be doing things long before they incorporate. That's my assumption.
But in your case, maybe you just said, "Let's incorporate first, and then, you know, develop this organization." So, I'm just kinda interested to see where you land on that, you know. Why did you initially decide to incorporate?

Ruth: I think it was very easy back then. Because my only affiliation here in Cincinnati was through the symphony...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...that was my [masked] year with the symphony, when we started meeting about getting something together.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: And my understanding was that to get any donations, people would be more willing to donate if they could deduct. So, I met a lawyer who specialized in non-profit...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...work. And she did it very quickly. It didn't cost us that much money, and it was approved right away. The only part of that was that we had a, um, a board of three people for a little while...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...which didn't really function as a board. It was just on paper.

Jason: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. So correct me if I'm wrong, the main reason was more or less to be eligible for, you know, non-profit grant funding? For sustainability purposes?

Ruth: Yeah.

Jason: OK. Awesome. All right, question four. You'd started to allude to this. How did you determine your organization's potential to be feasible and sustainable?

Ruth: Well, um, there's nothing going on in Cincinnati like that. There was nothing.

Jason: Like what?

Ruth: Like, non-traditional chamber music.

Jason: Got it. And how did you...well, you obviously knew that, maybe from six years in Cincinnati, like, what did see? What had you seen, like around the area at that point in time?

Ruth: I saw [masked].

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: Um, a couple of little...other little ensembles, maybe. One folded right when we started. There's another one, I think it just has three people in it.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: They've been around for a little while, so, there's little stirrings of things, but, um, to me, nothing that involves more than just three or four rehearsals to put together...

Jason: Mm-hmm. And you wanted something that...

Ruth: ...out of the script. I wanted something to be more, to put the music, um, in a three-dimensional dramatic telling, like a theatrical telling. So the music is an experience, rather than a, um, well, it's a three-dimensional experience rather than a two-dimensional experience. Four-dimension, rather than three.

Jason: OK.

Ruth: How 'bout that?

Jason: Explore that a bit. Help me out with that a little bit.

Ruth: Well, there's a layer...there's layers of storytelling going on.

Jason: OK.

Ruth: Like for instance, we had a photographer. Do you know [masked]?

Jason: No.

Ruth: Local guy, does all sort of...he did BB King, and Mary Lou, uh, Harris, and Over the Rhine. Oh my gosh he was this soulful photographer. He was my photography teacher when I moved here.

Jason: Oh, cool!

Ruth: So I said, "Hey, how would you like to do some photography in a live concert, because I think it would be really neat..."

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: "...for people to hear the music and see how you respond to it." And so we hooked 'em up, and, whatever triggers your...whatever triggers the shutter in the pop-up.
Jason: Wow.

Ruth: So he just sort of walked around, and sometimes he didn't take pictures. And sometimes he got down really low, and he got some-, a finger or two; and I just think that when you sit so far away, you don't get to see the fingers up close. And so he was able to see the fingers up close. You were able to see the fingers up on the big screen. And you were able to experience his story, and the story of the music, and the story of the musicians at the same time, which is...was really fun. We did it as a portrait of the cellists. There were eight cellists playing.

Jason: Oh, wow. OK.

Ruth: Yeah.

Jason: Wow.

Ruth: So he just got down low. He stood behind people, and he kinda went between, and...

Jason: Did this pop up, like, during the performance, or, was it on the big screen?

Ruth: Yeah, it was up above. Up above.

Jason: And how was that received?

Ruth: Great.

Jason: Hmm.


Jason: When did that happen?

Ruth: That was 2-, maybe 2010?

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: Something like that. I think there's just...if we could tell a story of the music with a twist...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...that's exciting.

Jason: So it sounds to me like maybe you, well I don't know, you said you incorporated first.

Ruth: Mm-hmm.
Jason: Some arts organizations, they just, you know, “hey we're passionate about it, we're just gonna do it”. Was it one of those situations, or did you sit down with a business plan? Or...like, how did you determine or evaluate, hey, this is something that may be doable, sustainable?

Ruth: Oh I didn't really. I think, um, I wasn't thinking in terms of sustainability. [laughs]

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: I think I was just doing it for fun, and great if it could live on. But I was also thinking of having a team. I envisioned having a team. Like in college, you know, your buddies get together, "Oh, I'll write the graphs! Oh, I'll do this! Oh, I'll do the marketing pieces."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: And the friends here were all having babies, or some people were going off once a week to teach at [masked]. Someone got divorced, and nobody was really...we're not...we weren't working together as a team.

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: So then finally, I said, "Well, I have five ideas. We're just gonna do a season."

[laughter]

Ruth: "You guys OK not getting paid? OK. Great, cool." So, um, I talked to somebody who's a patron of the arts in Cincinnati, someone I knew through the symphony, and I have to say that my connections to the symphony have been one of the biggest reasons why my organization has succeeded in the way it has. And she said, "Come over, let's talk." I just wanted some advice.

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: I said, "How do I, you know, I wanna do this. Cincinnati doesn't have something like this. The symphony musicians are interested too. Um, the [masked] is four concerts a year, and it's nothing. We can't rely on that. This is our soul music, and this is what we like to do."

And there happened to be an article in the New York Times the day before...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...talking about the future of classical music, and how it needs to be reinvented. And it profiled a couple of groups that did concerts, like we were proposing to do.

Jason: Mm-hmm.
Ruth: You know, put it in the path of the people.

Jason: Mm.

Ruth: They're going to the coffee shop, or they're going to the museum, or they're going to, um, the bar, or whatever.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: And so she said, "You know..." She was dating a philanthropist in town.

Jason: [laughs]

Ruth: He arrived home during our conversation, and she's like, "This article really got me thinking. You know, I think...I think you should definitely do this. Hey! Dear! Do you think we can donate 15 thousand to them this year?" [laughs] And then I walked away with a check!

Jason: [laughs]

Ruth: And I had just wanted advice. So I was able to pay everybody that year. Next year we went up to 25...

Jason: Oh, wow.

Ruth: So it was creeping. We're sort of stopped at about 120, our budget...

Jason: OK. OK.

Ruth: ...every year is about 120.

Jason: Wow.

Ruth: Um, having support is not the same as having high, high, high, high level, um, contacts and, and inside, you know. Uh, we don't have that.

Jason: Mm.

Ruth: We have passionate people, but we're not the...I don't even know how you would describe it, mover, shaker type, you know, very...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: I know some other people who have that, which is great.

Jason: You had mentioned, a while ago, “team” and, like, “you guys”, and “do you wanna get paid”, or, you know. Well, you obviously have a staff now, right?
Ruth: [smacks lips] Um, I'm...

Jason: How does that look right now?

Ruth: ...half-time staff, and there's another half-time staff.

Jason: OK. Do you have volunteers?

Ruth: We have volunteers.

Jason: OK.

Ruth: Yeah, we have, um, board member volunteers. It's a working board...

Jason: OK.

Ruth: ...of 13 people.

Jason: OK. Talk to me a little bit about how you amassed that. Like, how did that come together, in terms of getting that board involved or...

Ruth: OK. The board, the same woman who is my advisor and, basically my mentor…

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: …and, who really empowered my vision. We weren't that close. She believed in the project. We had three people for a long time, and I'd call my friends. And then, another woman I called in, and she became a person on the board.

Jason: OK. Go ahead.

Ruth: And, um, she started wanting to change the vision...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: …of the organization to more of a soloistic rather than the chamber music.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: And so since she was on the board, she had a friend of hers also on the board.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: And we three made all the decisions.

Jason: OK.
**Ruth:** [smacks lips] And, so when I said, "No, no, no. [taps table] We shouldn't change," two versus one was...

**Jason:** Mm.

**Ruth:** ..."Yeah, we have to." And, suddenly, um, it wasn't gonna be a team thing. It was gonna be concertos, and stuff like that, and, um, not using symphony musicians. [laughs]

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Ruth:** So I called up my friend, and I said, "I really need a real board."

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Ruth:** "So, it's going on," so she, because she was affiliated with the symphony, she didn't go to the symphony people.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Ruth:** She went to the opera people...

**Jason:** Mm.

**Ruth:** ...who, during the nine months off, during September through May...

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Ruth:** ...they're just in their offices planning and working. And she said, "Hey, would some of the guild members like to be part of this? This is really cool. They do a lot of stuff with singers, too." And we amassed a board of 10 ten people, [claps] on the spot.

**Jason:** Wow.

**Ruth:** We had a big meeting at her house.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Ruth:** We said, "Who's in?" 10 people raised their hand, and we had a board. [laughs]

**Jason:** Wow.

**Ruth:** It was pretty amazing.

**Jason:** That's pretty amazing.

**Ruth:** And then, we all decided, "Hey, what direction do we want to go in? Do you wanna do this concerto thing?" "No." [laughs]
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: So it was voted on, and it was great.

Jason: When did that actually happen?

Ruth: Oh, uh...

Jason: Can you remember?


Jason: When you sort of amassed your first board...

Ruth: First year. Mm-hmm.

Jason: ...official board.

Ruth: And then, we got our bylaws. We got everything in order.

Jason: OK, so you were, you said you incorporated 2007, came through in 2008...

Ruth: Did we have it in 2008?

Jason: ...got the official board around 2010?

Ruth: Yeah, we had three seasons before the official.

Jason: OK. Wow. Before the organizing of the official board, three seasons?

Ruth: Yeah.

Jason: Got it.

Ruth: Yeah. So we had two big struggles. The third year was a big struggle for me, in terms of identity of the organization, what direction it was going to go in.

Jason: OK.

Ruth: The other thing came two years later, or one year later with one of the board members being a judge. And he wanted to call everybody in the organization, everyone we paid a cent to, “employees”.

Jason: Oh, dear.

Ruth: And...

Jason: Mm.
Ruth: ...that was the second crisis point.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: And, we got through that by, um, hiring an accountant who said, "I'll fix your books," 'cause he already submitted all of that, worker's comp.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: And we were getting phone calls, twice, three times a day saying, "What's going on? I'm not your employee."

Jason: Mm.

Ruth: "I was freelancer."

Jason: Mm. Mm-hmm.

Ruth: So, that was a, that was...

Jason: Mm-hmm. So, you had some...

Ruth: ...very interesting….

Jason: ...board conflict?

Ruth: Yes!

Jason: Don't plenty people have that?

[laughter]

Jason: I won't say too much on tape, but you're not alone.

[shared laughter]

Jason: OK. So we talked about feasibility, sustainability. In this study arts entrepreneurship is defined as the act of organizing arts organizations; with arts entrepreneurs broadly defined as, those who are the primary responsible parties for organizing the organization.

So I want you to take a second to think about your point of inspiration. Can you identify that initial point of inspiration that, um, led you to incorporate? Just that initial point, where you went, "You know what? [snaps] I think we should incorporate."

Like, what does that moment look like for you, when you realized, "You know, we need to actually do this."
Ruth: Well, maybe it was part of the conversation with my, my friend, who's a patron.

[pen clicking]

Ruth: I think I suddenly saw, maybe, a possibility of some significance at work.

Jason: Right, and...

Ruth: You know this idea had some traction here.

Jason: And probably walkin' away with a check helped out immensely with that.

[shared laughter]

Ruth: Yeah.

Jason: But, yeah, so...

Ruth: I think probably that conversation.

Jason: That it was doable. You know, you had somebody, maybe...


Jason: Got it. OK. So, if you think about that point...that initial point of inspiration. I'd like you to describe, in your own words, your organizational development process, from inspiration to incorporation.

If you just think about that timeline, where you went, "Hmm. [hits table] Somebody, actually, interested in supporting this. How do I actually do this." What does that process look like to you, from inspiration to incorporation?

Ruth: You mean, um, getting venues, booking venues, and stuff like that?

Jason: Mm-hmm. The nitty-gritty of it, you know, the details.

Ruth: That was really fun for me, actually.

Jason: Cool.

Ruth: 'Cause I would practice, and then, I would think of, "Oh, cool. We could, we could rent a big projector and do this." [laughter] You know, so that part of it was really fun...

Jason: Mm.

Ruth: ...and just getting together with my friend. So, we played at [masked], you know, free places.
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: That was our first concert. And, I met a few people there, who are still good friends and still come to all the concerts. It was a donation based thing. And we just agreed to open the doors at 8:00, and the [masked] would serve food, and we would play a couple sets of music.

Jason: Mm.

Ruth: And I had a projector up, and we had enough money to pay for lighting, so we had, you know, the stage lit. There's a little stage area at [masked].

Jason: And, when you say get together with friends, I'm assuming these are colleagues...

Ruth: They are the colleagues, yeah. Yeah.

Jason: ...from [masked]?

Ruth: Yeah.

Jason: Got it. OK.

Ruth: We had a couple rehearsals, and just kinda played through different pieces that we thought were fun, duets to trios to Stravinsky L'Histoire du Soldat...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...and some other things.

Jason: OK. And, how did that make you feel? Let's, let's talk about that a little bit.

Ruth: I loved the designing of the postcards.

[laughter]

Ruth: That's what a-, and the website, too.

Jason: OK.

Ruth: Designing the website made it very real, because you have to ask certain questions on the website.

Jason: Mm. Mm-hmm.

Ruth: You know? You have this, it's a storefront, so you have to identify yourself, and you have to put out your personality. So, a lot of that...the vague ideas of something became very clear. And that was a very fun process, first process of branding that we did.
Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: You know? And um, the postcards were all, I just designed them, sent them to the printer, put 'em around town.

Jason: Did you get a good, um, fairly attended event?


Jason: Were there any specific, I don't want to say bombs, but, you know, um, sometimes we do put on things and, hmm.

Ruth: Um, for chamber music, because, and the board has asked this question, "What makes, keeps it intimate? How big can we get before..."

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: ...it loses intimacy?" I think for chamber music, anywhere between 75 and 275. 275 I think getting too big. We have had houses of 300.

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: 800 was the top one, and that was because we'd had a great partner organization who's well-known. But usually a hundred. We just, at the [masked] we got 110.

Jason: Mm.

Ruth: And it was just, basically, that's kind of been 110 to 150 has been the average. So when you compare, and you're writing grants and they're comparing the small organizations with big organizations...

Jason: Mm.

Ruth: ...they're thinking, "You're only reaching blah, blah, blah people." You can't think of it that way.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: You know? You're reaching a hundred people every concert that, otherwise, would never have had this type of experience. So you know, some days it's so hard.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: I'm doing all this [taps table] work for a hundred people...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...or 200 people? [sighs]
[laughter]

**Ruth:** So, you know.

**Jason:** That's great.

**Ruth:** But that's sort of how, I enjoyed every process. I enjoyed all the hats.

**Jason:** Hmm? How many hats did you think you wore during that time?

**Ruth:** Oh, I took tickets. I've made tickets.

[laughter]

**Ruth:** You know, swept the floor, made the signs for the bathroom, [laughs] did like, rented dollies, and schlepped stuff, so.

**Jason:** Wow.

**Ruth:** And we didn't have contracts or anything. People just played, and then, as soon as the board; you know, after the first little three-person board, [serious tone] "Well, we have to have contracts. Duh, duh, duh."

**Jason:** Mm. Mm.

**Ruth:** "We have to be official."

**Jason:** Mm-hmm. But, these are your friends.

**Ruth:** Yeah, so, we never signed contracts. [laughs]

**Jason:** OK. Um.

**Ruth:** We have them, now. We have agreements, now.

**Jason:** OK. Well, yeah, because you have more... [laughs]

**Ruth:** But it was so fun. And you know, just who, who knows what's gonna happen? It's just a big adventure.

**Jason:** Mm-hmm.

**Ruth:** And, for a long time people thought it was a secret club...

**Jason:** Mm?

**Ruth:** ...because we just didn't advertise.
Jason: Mm.

Ruth: Mm-hmm.

Jason: Let's touch on two more questions 'cause this is going great. Let's get to that challenge part. All right. So, [taps on table] what are some significant events that you can think back on? And again, I'm interested in...

[chair scooting]

Jason: ...that point between inspiration and incorporation. What are some of the significant events that have negatively impacted your organization's operational capabilities since incorporation.

Ruth: Operational including, um, just paying for the everyday?

Jason: Mm-hmm. That could certainly be operational.


Jason: It can, it can be. Just...It depends because I could see, you know, obviously that's a big part of your organizations operations as well, but, um...And then, it doesn't necessarily have to be one big thing. I'm just kind of interested...

Ruth: Well, I...

Jason: ...in probing that a bit for you.

Ruth: I think something that's always a challenge is the coming and going of board members.

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: I think the terms... We have terms that say it's a two-year board. You serve for two years. But I know that we've had people for six years. Half of our board has been there for six years, in different capacity. Sometimes they're President. Sometimes they're secretary, sometimes they're just advisor...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...you know? So, it kind of rotates, but they stay involved. That kind of longevity I need in a President.

Jason: Mm.

Ruth: I needed a leader.

Jason: Mm-hmm.
Ruth: And um, I'm ready. I have been ready to share leadership for a long time. Even as I envision the organization, it has been in a shared capacity. So leadership for me is something that I learned just by having to do it. So, that was my personal challenge.

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: Personal challenge of leadership. And asking for money is always a thing. It was not second nature to me. And then leadership in terms of a director of staff, which is something that's been on my wish list for a long time...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...an Executive Director. We don't have the money to hire one.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: So we're trying to figure out creative staffing solutions...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...that takes more organization, but uses more people, uses less time from more people.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: And most of them are volunteers.

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: We have a marketing person on our board, a young professional who's creating a young professional series of events that parallel.

Jason: Has that been kind of the biggest challenge you can think of? Like, maybe just more turnover with the...

Ruth: Leadership. Shared leadership.

Jason: Shared leadership?

Ruth: Yeah.

Jason: That's been tough for you.

Ruth: Well, because, um, when I started this I was single. And then, now I have a family...

Jason: Mm.
Ruth: ...of three boys, you know...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...so that's been really hard, and moving, and...So one organizational challenge has also been...we have been lucky in getting the money that we needed every year, but we start every year with zero.

And I would love to have a year cushion in the bank. I just don't know how to do it. Artswave has been very supportive, but they change their guidelines a lot. So for this year, we applied for a project grant and did not get anything, which we were counting on. I mean, that's like 10 percent of our operating budget, is coming from Artswave.

So that said, I realized you cannot at Artswave apply both for a project grant and for the sustaining impact grant. So we're in line to do that. But that will be for next season, so we have this gap. And we also for the first time; we're in a strategic partnership with [masked].

Jason: Mm.

Ruth: And for the first time, we're paying a, a half-time staff who's a shared associate. He works at [masked]...20 hours...each a week.

Jason: OK.

Ruth: We paid for him - which is a new thing for us.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: It's a 20 percent budget increase to be able to do that.

Jason: So, presently, right now, who is handling the development side of your organization?

Ruth: Um, one of the board members and the shared associate...

Jason: Got it.

Ruth: ...and an intern.

Jason: And it used to be all you? When you talk about these hats...

Ruth: Mm-hmm.

Jason: ...so, you used to do all that?

Ruth: Mm-hmm.
Jason: Whoa!
[laughter]
Ruth: Yeah.

Jason: Wow. Was there any time where you felt exhausted from all that?

Ruth: Mm-hmm. Yeah, especially when I have to play too, like today. After this interview, I'm going to fix my problems in my music...

Jason: [laughs]

Ruth: ...for instance. Um, there's a lot to think about and everybody's saying, "Hey, can I have a comp?" And you're like, "Wait a minute."

Jason: Oh dear.

Ruth: "I'm just talking to the actor about this line. Hang on a second. What?" [laughs]

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: "You need four comps? Talk to Joe." So, they don't really know who to go to now.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: And when I talked about this, I talked to my department. I would love to be...I'm just artistic. Everything else is over here. That's my dream.

Jason: Just to position yourself as kind of, maybe the Artistic Director of it all?

Ruth: Actually...

Jason: Is that where you see yourself?

Ruth: Actually...

Jason: Or artist? I don't know.

Ruth: I see a team of artistic directors.

Jason: OK, but I mean you specifically. Where would you like to...

Ruth: I would like to be kind of a, a... [sigh] Right now, I'm, I'm called the Managing Artistic Director.

Jason: Mm-hmm.
Ruth: Um, I definitely don't want to manage. I think I would love for someone to be able to do the managing and tell me [laughs] what the deadlines are for things.

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: Instead of the other way around. And then, I love working with people. That keeps my energy really high. So my husband is very into it too.

Jason: Hmm.

Ruth: And so we'll sit around and talk about ways to make this cool, and, "Oh, did you know that Rudyard Kipling wrote this short story? We could insert it here." [laughs] I'm like, "OK, yeah. I love it."

And then we have another friend who plays bassoon who's been helping too. Listening to music and saying, "Oh, you know, that piece of music, it fits with the theme, but it's a piece of crap. We're not playing that, sorry."

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: "OK," because I will do it for a theme. [laughs] And then there's two younger players on the orchestra that I kind of want to tap their energy...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...because they're keen on performing chamber music as much as they can. And I have this organization. I need help. We're doing five concerts a year. I would love to do one or two, if they could take three, you know?

So we'll have co-artistic directors, and I would continue working with the board, and making presentations and, you know, steering the vision in the right way.

Jason: Fantastic Ruth. I'm going to hit you with one more question and then I'm going to get out of your hair.

Ruth: OK. [laughs]

Jason: What are some significant events that have positively...We just talked about negative. Let's switch it – “positively” impacted your organizations operational capability? Some of those significant...

Ruth: I would say the strategic partnership with [masked]...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...for sure. The visibility. Having an office. Having rehearsal space. Well, not right now, because the [masked] being renovated. But having that support, and also being able
to do productions with them. Any partnership is incredible. Partnering with the [masked]…

Jason: Who are they?

Ruth: They're an organization from [masked]. They came up and we did some projects together. So having an organizational partnership with people who are as vested in a performance as you. You know, not hiring a couple artists...

Jason: Mm-hmm.

Ruth: ...here and there. You're, "OK, you're on my"

Jason: Like a shared goal.

Ruth: Yeah, exactly.

Jason: How many of those have you had?

Ruth: I would say two a year.

Jason: Whoa. You're a case study. [laughs]

Ruth: Like [masked].

Jason: Yeah.

Ruth: We did it with [masked] last year. We did this, um...

Jason: What?

Ruth: We did this amazing piece by John Adams, "Alleged Dances," "John's Book of Alleged Dances." I heard a lot of hip hop in it. I'm like, "Hey, what do you think of this music?" They did an amazing job. 11 movements, 11 dances.

Jason: Whoa!

Ruth: I could not have been more proud of that. The kids who did spoken word. Every movement had meaning. It was just amazing.

Jason: My goodness.

Ruth: So, two...that was a very good partnership because we marketed each other. We were supported in ways where one couldn't, the other could. And it saved us the fees because we're not paying fees for them, and they're not paying fees for us. They're just taking care of their part of it, and we're taking care of our part of it.

Jason: Do you share your marketing in that too? Is that...
Ruth: Yeah, we just did our own thing. But we printed the postcards and things, and they sent out to their email list.

Jason: Wow.

Ruth: That is very good. Those productions, I was still very strong going into.

Jason: Well, fantastic.
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Figure 36. Ohio Theatre Venture Trends by Zip Code 2000-2015\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{105} Note that N=41.
Figure 37. Ohio Theatre Venture Start-up Rates 2000-2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Organization</strong></th>
<th><strong>YOI</strong></th>
<th><strong>YOD</strong></th>
<th><strong>ROE</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reg as</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convergence-Continuum</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark Midland Theater Association</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe West Performances Inc.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Black Theatre Company</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm X Performance Ensemble</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Steps To Broadway</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RTN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gallery</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams County Community Theatre</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Ministries</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Theatre of Mason Inc.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Landmark Productions</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foluke Cultural Arts Center</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted Performing Arts Inc.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappies of Greater Cincinnati</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liminis</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old West Festival</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showbiz Players</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ananda Center</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lexington Community Theatre</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Sports Television Ltd</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C N C Exclusive Entertainment</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy Theatre Inc.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Theater Inc.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenia Area Community Theater Inc.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Monkey Theater Ensemble</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Community Theatre</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Civic Theatre Inc.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Performance Academy</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrville Community Theatre</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Art Theatre Association</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist First Talent &amp; Booking</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast Fest</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Huron Playhouse</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Playground LLC</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Ohio Community Theatre Asso.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodeo Music Hall Inc.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Community Theater - Stars</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Country Music Hall Of Fame</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Aggregated Start-Up, Endurance and Dissolution Rates 2000-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Start-Up</th>
<th>Endurance</th>
<th>Dissolution</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blair Hall Theatre</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kbk Music</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the following abbreviations: YOI (Year of Incorporation); YOD (Year of Dissolution); ROE (Rate of Endurance); Reg as (Registered as); NP (Not-for-profit corporation); LLC (Limited Liability Company); DBA (Doing Business As); C (C-Corporation); RTN (Registered Trade Name). Additionally, note that a dash (-) in the column “YOD” denotes a venture that was still in existence at the time the study took place.

---

106 Note the following abbreviations: YOI (Year of Incorporation); YOD (Year of Dissolution); ROE (Rate of Endurance); Reg as (Registered as); NP (Not-for-profit corporation); LLC (Limited Liability Company); DBA (Doing Business As); C (C-Corporation); RTN (Registered Trade Name). Additionally, note that a dash (-) in the column “YOD” denotes a venture that was still in existence at the time the study took place.