Research on Entrepreneurship within the Creative Industries: Debates and Trends

Autoria: Eduardo Davel, Fernando Fachin

Abstract

The field of entrepreneurial studies has progressed in several ways, capitalizing on multidisciplinary approaches. Consequently, many conceptions of entrepreneurship have emerged, such as economic (e.g., Casson, 1982), social (e.g., Aldrich & Martinez, 2003), psychological (e.g., Kets de Vries, 1985), discursive (e.g., Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004), and institutional (e.g., Garud, Hardy, & Maguire, 2007). Throughout this diversity of disciplinary influences, entrepreneurship remains fundamentally conceptualized as start-up firms: firms being often perceived as objective and static realities. Indeed, as Lindgren and Packendorff (2003) point out, a temporary understanding of entrepreneurship remains neglected by research. These authors thus propose a conception of entrepreneurship as a project-based activity, occurring as people interact in time by creating temporary collective experiences in different contexts.

Our study responds to the scarcity of research on entrepreneurial activity both as project-based organization and socially constructed events. This perspective advocates pluralism in entrepreneurship research, acknowledging different meanings and including new theoretical fields (e.g., identity theory). Focusing on social interaction among individuals allows a fine understanding of not only how and why people interpret meanings to enterprise but also individuals’ potential to reconstruct identities, in a co-constructionist and self process.

We thus conceive, methodologically, creative industries as a fertile field for generating knowledge on project-based entrepreneurship, since entrepreneurial efforts in this context always face some sort of organizational finitude. Every project is always organized by a beginning, a development and a conclusion. Thus, entrepreneurs in creative industries are conscious that their endeavor will eventually end and this has an impact on their behavior. More precisely, we seek to examine how entrepreneurship has been studied by existing research in creative industries, a context that has been neglected by literature reviews on entrepreneurship (e.g., Sharma & Chrisman, 1999). We thus provide a descriptive and analytical overview of research production in creative industries while proposing new perspectives and avenues for future research.

Methodologically, we identify two main axes (being-having modes and agency-structure perspectives) relating the general field of entrepreneurship to specificities of the context of creative industries. Thus, we select and analyze publications based on concomitant criteria. First, we select publications that mention “entrepreneur” or “entrepreneurship” in the title or abstract. Second, we only include academic texts that focus on creative industries or use similar vocabulary to describe them, such as cultural industry, cultural sector, media industry, arts organizations, or focus on their subset, namely music, cinema, theater, museums, and visual and performing arts.

The being mode and the Aristotelian logic of proportion emerge as key insights for orientating entrepreneurship research and practice.

Introduction

We seek to examine how entrepreneurship has been studied by academic research in creative industries. We organize the literature through two axes, namely being-having modes (Fromm, 1976) and agency-structure perspectives (Giddens, 1984), relating respectively to tensions in
creative industries and entrepreneurship research. We thus provide a descriptive and analytical overview of research production in creative industries while proposing new perspectives and avenues for future research.

This paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we develop two axes for analyzing and understanding entrepreneurial studies within creative industries. The first axis deals with the tension between artistic and commercial orientations of entrepreneurial studies on creative industries. It is as a particular dimension on scholarly debates about creative industries. Following Fromm’s (1976) lead, we propose the “having” and “being” modes as a conceptual device for better understanding the dynamics of this conflict. The second axis refers to agency and structure as key concepts for understanding individual and collective perspectives of entrepreneurship. In the second section, we present research methods and classify existing research following four combinations that come to light by inter-crossing both axes: (a) agency-based perspective of being mode, (b) agency-based perspective of having mode, (c) structure-based perspective of being mode, and (d) structure-based perspective of having mode. The fourth section is devoted to discussing the analysis that emerges from this classification. Discussion is oriented by the idea of proportion between dichotomous polarities (e.g., having-being and agency-structure) within entrepreneurial research, as well as ideas on orienting research by the being mode.

**Entrepreneurship in creative industries**

Studies on creative industries are grounded on the long-dated sociological debate concerning the rapport between art and commerce. Although it is not the intention of this paper to revise the terminology used thus far (see O’Connor, 2007 for a full review), we attribute importance to the tension between culture (or art) and industry (or commerce) as the very core of any of terminology relating to this sector. For example, this tension is alluded to either in the terminology used by Hirsch (1972), who uses the term “cultural industry” to refer to profit-oriented organizations producing cultural goods, or, more recently, in Caves (2000; 2003), who depicts “creative industries” as a contract between art and commerce. Following the evolving research on this sector, we opt for inclusiveness. We use the term “creative industries” since it encompasses core creative fields, cultural industries, and creative industries and activities, leaving out only the part of the economy that comprehends manufacturing and service sectors that are not directly involved in the output of creative goods (O’Connor, 2007). This choice of terminology allows us to relate to these industries in a wide-reaching way, focusing on what appears to be a consensual perception of this sector: tension (between cultural and commercial orientations) and variety (several possibilities of relationship between these orientations). Combining artistic and commercial orientations demonstrates sensitivity to context, both in theory and in practice. In fact, the junction of art and commerce is far from static. Tension is continuously nourishing creative work and enterprising activity in each and every aspect of the creative process, reaffirming the intersection of “entrepreneurship, art, and the economy” (Swedberg, 2006, p.243).

In terms of sectors, we typically mention creative industries as being composed by the following activities: film, television, video, music, the visual and performing arts (Throsby, 2001). Fundamentally, they concern the production of goods and services based on a substantial element of artistic, imaginative or intellectual effort (Turok, 2003). Embedded in symbolic-intensive creation work (Hesmondhalgh, 2007; Lawrence & Phillips, 2002), creative industries rely mainly on experiential consumption (e.g., Hoolbrook & Hirschman, 1982), taste (e.g., Hirsch, 1972) and aesthetic judgment (e.g., DiMaggio, 1977). Within creative industries, creative workers become entrepreneurs, evolving their careers both as artists and managers (Ellmeier, 2003; Neff, Wissinger, & Zukin, 2005). Throughout this twofold work, entrepreneurs build their careers progressively, legitimating the reputation
developed and adding symbolic value to future projects. In this sense, since each project has a predetermined end, entrepreneurship is experienced as an endless or lifetime condition. Doing art and business simultaneously, entrepreneurs learn progressively entrepreneurial capability, identity (Rae, 2004), and how to deal with high levels of uncertainty (Dempster, 2006). Consequently, within this context of twofold work, entrepreneurial activity may at some point of the career become predominantly artistic-orientated and in other career stages become commercial-oriented. It may also oscillate between individual or collective-based predominance, depending on career development.

Having and Being Modes in Creative Industries

Embedded in a context of economic utilization of art, unlike amateur artists who may have only their own creative calling to follow, creative industries are immersed in the opposing fields of art and commerce. Following the lead of sociological debates, most recent studies on this sector (e.g., Alvarez, Mazza, Pedersen, & Svejenova, 2005; Alvarez & Svejenova, 2002; Banks, Lovatt, O'Connor, & Raffo, 2000; R. Caves, 2000; 2003; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006, 2007; Ellmeier, 2003; Jeffcutt & Pratt, 2002; Svejenova, 2005; Turok, 2003) identify the tension between art and commerce as the most emblematic.

In varied forms, studies about creative industries deal with the conflicting overlap of artistic and commercial values. An enriched thinking on this tension and its implications in terms of research can be stimulated by considering Eric Fromm’s having (commerce) and being (art) modes (Fromm, 1976). Rooted in sociological traditions, these modes are inherent dimensions of social life. Creative industries, insofar as art rejects any economic orientation, embody these modes as they deal with the paradox of marketing non-economic values (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007).

In Fromm’s (1976) theory, the acquisitive society, based on possessing, is the foundation of the having mode. In this mode, one must have things in order to live, satisfying human nature’s will to survive. Thus, the nature of the having mode of existence follows from the nature of property. Clearly, if the relationship to the world is to possess, if one “has” nothing, one is nothing (Fromm, 1976). This mode explains a deliberate market orientation in creative industries: goods only have value via market exchanges, that is, value is not considered before any exchange. Considering this emphasis on the market, practices focus on the most efficient use of resources, with quantity, quality and cost as the main considerations (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007). The rationale of the having mode is calculation and standardization, focused on profit and utility (Chiappelo, 1998).

While the having mode refers to material things, the being mode refers to experience. Following Fromm’s (1976) thinking, this mode is based on the inherent human condition to overcome isolation by expressing talents. The being mode is rooted in independence and freedom, with a deep-rooted relatedness to the world, focusing on one’s undivided nature, not on an appearance or façade. Through experiences, by renewal and development, to be is to become (Fromm, 1976; Simmel, [1900] 2004). This mode is associated with the context of the creative industries where the immediate intention of the creative practice is “l’art pour l’art”. In effect, “art for art’s sake” invokes the artist’s growth from doing creative work (R. E. Caves, 2003), based on intuition, imagination and uniqueness (Chiappelo, 1998), without economic reasoning (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007). “Art for art’s sake” is thus the emblematic incarnation of the being mode. As Eikhof and Haunschild (2007, p. 524) remark, “bringing artistic motivation to the market runs the risk of ultimately destroying it.” Clearly, it is not that market values do not exist at all, but that disposing of creative freedom to create art as a greater good is dominant (Swedberg, 2006).

In short, research on creative industries deals with both artistic and commercial values, and the mode towards which they are oriented is what guides our analysis. On the one hand,
studies that are having-oriented emphasize the monetary value of culture. These studies describe supply and demand of creative goods, marketing, resource constraints, access to financing, and economic impacts on local development. Also, they relate success to the bottom-line, usually indicated by revenue and number of tickets sold. On the other hand, studies that are being-oriented focus on non-instrumental values. They emphasize artistic motivation and freedom, putting the accent on values that oppose traditional economic ones. Success, in these studies, is generally indicated by creating art as a greater good.

Agency- and Structure-based Perspectives of Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship research is embedded in an ongoing discussion concerning its individual (agency) or collective (structure, institution) significance. Although entrepreneurship, among all the management sciences, is probably the most agent-centered, relating to actors who are leveraging resources to create or transform institutions (DiMaggio, 1988; Garud et al., 2007; Maguire, Hardy, & Lawrence, 2004), entrepreneurship can also be studied from an institutional (structure) perspective, contextualizing past habits and future projects within momentary contingencies (Emirbayer & Misce, 1998). In short, an ongoing debate concerns the role of structure and agency in organizational and more recently in institutional entrepreneurship (see Garud et al., 2007). We briefly review both perspectives in order to relate them to entrepreneurship in the context of creative industries.

Structure-based perspectives of entrepreneurship assume that structure, the external environment (e.g., Aldrich & Wiedemayer, 1993), frustrates or enables agency by individual actors. Structures refers to rules and resources reproducing social systems (Giddens, 1984), expressing a pattern of practices that have evolved and become legitimate within an organization and environment (Pfeffer, 1982). Relying on structure, it is possible to foresee practices based on the perception of cultural values, routine and tradition, since institutionalized understandings of taken-for-granted activities are concerned (Jepperson, 1991).

Agency perspectives of entrepreneurship tend to promote heroic models of actors (Garud et al., 2007), for example psychological or cognitive perspectives (e.g., Shaver & Scott, 1991), giving little attention to unintended consequences of action (Maguire et al., 2004). Agents, when knowledgeable of the structure, are purposeful, knowledgeable, reflexive, and active, having power to intervene in the world and influence others. Thus, mobilizing resources and enacting rules, agents can transform the structure. Agency, therefore, implies the existence of structure, since structures only exist because of actions of agents (Giddens, 1984). In other words, while structure shapes people’s practices, people’s practices constitute and reproduce structure, in a continuous process.

Since both structuration theory and the domain of entrepreneurship focus on the nexus of individuals and social systems, the insights of structuration theory are particularly applicable to the nature of the entrepreneurial process. Applying structuration theory to the domain of entrepreneurship, we can see how entrepreneurs both create and are created by the process of entrepreneurship. The mechanism of this co-creation involves the recursive interaction of entrepreneur and opportunity over time. Knowledgeable entrepreneurs are empowered to act in a manner that influences structures (opportunities) and to monitor reflexively the impact of their actions, leading to actions that reinforce, modify, or create new opportunities (Sarason, Dean, & Dillard, 2006).
Analyzing research on entrepreneurship in the creative industries

Methodological Design

In order to understand the literature on entrepreneurship in the context of creative industries, we have established two criteria for selecting publications for systematic analysis. The first criterion refers to the presence in the title or abstract of the terms “entrepreneur” or “entrepreneurship”. We believe that only by spotting these terms in the title or abstract can we be sure that the main focus is on entrepreneurship, and that terms are not referred to only in passing. For example, Malem (2008) mentions “entrepreneur” in the text relating it to the ability to “think as an entrepreneur”. Some studies may thus mislead the analysis we are establishing in this paper. The second criterion concerns the context of creative industries. In this case, we included publications locating their studies in one of the following industries: creative, cultural, entertainment, film, television, video, music, the visual and performing arts, advertising, publishing, design activity, software or new digital media. Unlike the first criterion, the selection is not restricted to a term, but to a context that represents in some way that of creative industries. Once all existent publications were selected following these criteria, we analyzed each text and classified it according to two axes: being-having and agency-structure. This classification generates four types of research, as presented in Figure 1. We have analyzed more carefully each group of publications composing a type of research.

**FIGURE 1: Types of Entrepreneurship Research in the Context of Creative Industries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
<th>PERSPECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having Agency</td>
<td>Being Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Structure</td>
<td>Being Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following sub-sections, we present and characterize publications identified for each type of entrepreneurship research.

Agency-based Perspective of Having Mode

Publications classified for presenting an agency perspective and a having orientation represent a significant group of research. Focus on agency is illustrated by the capacity of entrepreneurs – considered in the publications as musicians, painters, film, union or festival directors – as active agents in the creation of new ideas or concepts in terms of distribution (e.g., Yamada & Yamashita, 2006), trading (e.g., Murphy, 1997), marketing (e.g., Edmondson, 2008; Rentschler, 2007) or value systems (e.g., Basu & Werbner, 2001; Weber, 2004). Focus on the having orientation is based on purposes of economic independence (e.g. Yamada & Yamashita, 2006), economic impact (e.g., Murphy, 1997), commoditization of reputation (e.g., Rentschler, 2007; Weber, 2004), monetary rewards (e.g., Basu & Werbner, 2001; Edmondson, 2008), profit maximization (e.g., Weber, 2004), cost minimization (e.g., McVeigh, 2004), quantity of consumers (e.g., Jackson & Oliver, 2003), reduction of financial risk (e.g., Peterson & Berger, 1971; Weber, 2004) and obtaining funding (e.g., Fillis, 2004; Rentschler, 2002).
An agency perspective of the having mode is demonstrated, for example, by Yamada and Yamashita (2006). The authors contextualize the Japanese film industry, which is structured in such a way that most entrepreneurs are at an economic disadvantage because they cannot distribute their films without the networks of major studios. Yamada and Yamashita (2006) present the case of three companies that developed their own unique production systems to remain independent from major studios. Maintaining autonomy and independence, they were no longer dependent on major studios and could overcome unfavorable economic circumstances.

Similar studies demonstrate entrepreneurs and their action on collaborative networks. Basu and Werbner (2001) show the expansion of networks that organized black music as a small cultural industry, transforming primordial elements of their culture into commodities. Edmondson (2008) talks about entrepreneurs actively engaging in cooperative partnerships to develop and expand product lines and services in the billion-dollar hip-hop industry.

Rentschler (2007) describes the marketing methods of two female artists in early 20th century Australia as reacting inventively to environmental change and to gain access to artistic organizational elites (e.g., art museums). The artists are viewed as entrepreneurs of their own artistic projects, who, in order to earn a reputation and become recognized, incorporated the rise of feminism. Subsequently, their new art became a commodity and consequently a signifier of social status and cultural capital (DiMaggio, 1983).

Briefly, scholars who are oriented toward the having mode focus on individuals and instrumental values, although some also consider non-instrumental aspects, such as economic independence leading to more creative freedom (Yamada & Yamashita, 2006). An agency perspective within the context of creative industries tends to portray entrepreneurs acting upon networks to gather necessary resources to enterprise and to have a more favorable situation within structured distribution systems.

**Agency-based Perspective of Being Mode**

This type of research is distinct from the previous group for its orientation by a being mode. Like the previous group of publications, the current group constructs its research around the idea that entrepreneurs create new value for cultural life by challenging predominant social assumptions. The main sectors studied include music performance, theater, media and fashion organizations and museums. The being mode appears in these research in the form of orientations based on personal values (e.g., Poettschacher, 2005), artistic motivation (e.g., Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006), political and historical elements (e.g., Johnson, 2007), learning experiences (e.g., Griffin, 2003) and ethics and loyalty to values of a community or culture (e.g., Sköld & Rehn, 2007).

As illustration, we may refer to Poettschacher’s (2005) study with founders of businesses within the creative industries. The focus of this study is on how values, beliefs and assumptions drive entrepreneurs. Poettschacher’s (2005) research shows that certain entrepreneurs manage their business somewhat irrationally, with an identity that opposes traditional economic values. Individual values can contribute to the development of a country’s cultural infrastructure. Studies with an orientation towards substantive entrepreneurial values also examine the formation of identity in an economic context. Neff et al. (2005) discuss dual identities, elucidating that forces such as “the cultural quality of cool”, “creativity”, and “autonomy” give rise to entrepreneurial labor. Similarly, in their study of German theater, Eikhof and Haunschild (2006) investigate how entrepreneurs integrate the identities of artist and firm. The authors analyze the intertwining of lifestyle and work to show how entrepreneurs can still devote themselves to “art for art’s sake” when performing traditionally instrumental practices, such as self-marketing.
Johnson (2007) shows that entrepreneurship in the Paris Opera incorporated specific historical and political elements that remained for a long time features of the organization. The author describes the process of “imprinting” by which cultural elements of the founding context shape organizations and these founding characteristics are reproduced for years. “While the language of imprinting implies that the environment itself somehow stamps elements onto the new organization, it is in fact solely through the efforts of entrepreneurial individuals that organizations acquire the elements from their historical contexts” (Johnson, 2007, p.117). Imprinting is thus viewed with an entrepreneurial agency perspective. In short, these either show how individuals oppose having-oriented structures and enterprise according to their personal values or how they are influenced by contextual values, other than non-instrumental ones, when enterprising. The focus is on substantive or non-economic elements of entrepreneurship and on individual action. While instrumental values may be somehow discussed and structure taken into account, as demonstrated in Johnson (2007), they are not the lead concern of these studies.

**Structure-based Perspective of Having Mode**

One group of publications on entrepreneurship within creative industries, either having or being oriented, adopts a structure-based perspective. This perspective appears as certain contextual dimensions and transformations that drive and guide entrepreneurship activity. Structure is thus understood as rules, norms and changes in terms of technology (e.g., Brindley, 2000; Mezias & Kuperman, 2001; Reed, Heppard, & Corbett, 2004), firm capital, strategic alliances, personal networks, location (e.g., Mezias & Kuperman, 2001), distribution systems (e.g., Davenport, 2006; Nicholas C. Wilson & Stokes, 2004; 2005), industry deregulation (e.g., Reed et al., 2004), national and local government regulation (Bruin, 2005; Mulcahy, 2003) and access to the audience, sponsors and government (Jones, 2001; Rae, 2004). This group of research focuses on the film and music industries, or more broadly on the creative industries in a societal context. They are also oriented by a having mode, generally translated into the quest for economic profits, rewards and funding. Nevertheless, economic rewards here are often associated with local or national economic development. Economic orientation appears thus more in the public sphere than in the private one.

Some studies emphasize how opportunities arise from an environmental and societal context. For example, in their study on entrepreneurship in the American Film Industry from 1895 to 1929, Mezias and Kuperman (2001) adopt an evolutionary community perspective to show that it is a population of organizations acting in similar activities to those of the entrepreneurial firm that actually create opportunities. As an example, cinemas could not exist until films appeared. The authors demonstrate that promoting entrepreneurship throughout the community promotes innovation on not only their own population, but also other populations within the community. Mezias and Kuperman (2001) focus on economic innovation, creating consumer demand and dealing with distribution. Briefly, new industries do not simply emerge: new opportunities are shaped by social institutions, and the entrepreneur reacts – or not – to these opportunities (Jones, 2001; Mezias & Kuperman, 2001).

However, some scholars demonstrate how structure frustrates entrepreneurship. They actually emphasize a lack of entrepreneurship and innovation, mostly due to submission to distribution systems. Davenport (2006) demonstrates that UK film companies are weak and dependent upon the distributors that control them. Entrepreneurs in these companies raise money by pre-selling all rights and thus depend on the owner of the rights. Similarly, Wilson and Stokes (2005) examine the access to finance in the UK music industry and show that entrepreneurs in this context are dependent on major corporations within the industry.

Finally, some studies approach structure as either a constrainer or enabler of entrepreneurial activity. Jones (2001) shows how entrepreneurial careers are embedded in social systems,
explaining how firms create barriers to imitation through legitimization. Jones (2001) argues that these legitimacy strategies can either constrain or enable the entrance of new firms into the industry.

Similarly, Wilson and Stokes (2004) indicate that in order to access resources, entrepreneurs must be legitimate within a structure. The authors depict the structure of the music industry as a value-chain, from creation to distribution. Entrepreneurs depend on cooperation and various forms of networks, and their behavior, according to the authors, cannot be fully understood in isolation from the social and market networks within which they operate. As Reed et al. (2004) show in the study on entrepreneurship in rock and roll networks, small structural changes can have profound impacts on individual members.

Public policies can also constrain and enable entrepreneurship in creative industries. Thompson (2003) suggests that some forms of public accountability and control can either repress or encourage cultural entrepreneurship in the public-sector context in comparing public control in museums in New Zealand and the United Kingdom. The approach is rather to analyze policies that make environments more conducive to entrepreneurship by demonstrating “symbiotic interdependence at the various levels of entrepreneurship” (Bruin, 2005, p.149) in a particular context.

In short, these studies focus on instrumental values and collective processes of entrepreneurship and on demonstrating how structure can either enable or constrain entrepreneurship within creative industries. A structure-based perspective emphasizes entrepreneurial opportunities that arise due to social contextual forces or how these forces frustrate entrepreneurial activity. In the context of creative industries, the latter derives mainly from financial dependence on established distribution systems and unfavorable governmental policies.

**Structure-based Perspective of Being Mode**

This group of publications is significantly less numerous than the others. Like the group of publications in the previous section, this group constructs research assuming that entrepreneurs are subject to structural forces. The distinction from the previous category concerns the being mode orientation, as it reveals non-instrumental rather than instrumental values. However, unlike in the preceding section on agency-based perspective of being mode, these values are contextual rather than individual. Thus, non-instrumental orientation in these studies appears more in the public than in the private sphere, demonstrating how contextual forces mould entrepreneurial activity towards political and cultural forms of expression (e.g., Tams, 2002), knowledge (Raffo, O'Connor, Lovatt, & Banks, 2000), social responsibility (Beeton, 2008), passion (e.g., Tams, 2002), societal values, democratization of culture, socio-cultural equity, national heritage, and interacting civic and aesthetic values (e.g., Mulcahy, 2003).

Mulcahy (2003) conceives entrepreneurs as contractual intermediaries, mediating the private sector, government, and public to realize a general cultural good. Exempt from commercial hegemony, entrepreneurs promote general societal values, communicating the value of art and culture for the society, with aesthetic and cultural representativeness in step with civic values. Mulcahy (2003) contests commercialization dictating aesthetic decisions and stresses that the entrepreneur is as an “advocate of culture”. Being part of democratic culture, entrepreneurs facilitate public access to artistic performances and support for arts and cultural organizations. Moreover, entrepreneurs are part of promoting the right of every citizen to participate in cultural activities. Briefly, according to Mulcahy (2003), entrepreneurs promote aesthetically inclusive and broadly accessible cultural goods.

Similarly, Beeton (2008) argues that entrepreneurs need to consider their social responsibilities to communities. Beeton shows how filming in small rural communities can
lead to increased visitation of these areas. Entrepreneurs must be conscious of the social impact of their films since, for example, there can be a significant loss of privacy of people who live in these areas due to tourism-business activities related to the film. Tams (2002) also argues that entrepreneurs should not abandon the values of a community, and that culture is a way of identification and promoting social equity.

Raffo et al. (2000) argue that cultural capital developed through activities is embedded in social-cultural contexts. The authors discuss the nature of entrepreneurial learning and training in a dialogic and discursive environment, arguing that stimulation of learning is contextual. Knowledge is the product of the activity, context and culture; entrepreneurs can learn through qualitative and reciprocal exchange of ideas. Briefly, these studies focus on collective processes of entrepreneurship and demonstrate how contextual non-instrumental values guide entrepreneurial activities. A structure-based perspective emphasizes entrepreneurship as a process of promoting culturally shared values within a community. Entrepreneurs in these studies are not active agents promoting personal values. They are rather seen as mediators, enterprising due to structural forces that lead them to promote cultural-shared and local-sensitive values. In the context of creative industries, entrepreneur’s social responsibility, without major concerns with the bottom-line, guide entrepreneurial activity.

Discussion

The analysis based on the intersection of two axes can lead us to make several observations. We focus this discussion on the idea of proportion between dichotomous polarities (agency-structure and having-being). Following our analysis, agency perspectives and having modes have received most of the attention from researchers. It is expected that studies on entrepreneurship remain strongly oriented towards agency perspectives, and a long tradition of economic studies on entrepreneurship lead orientation towards a having mode. Nevertheless, studies working with a structure-being orientation are not undesirable. As demonstrated in our analysis, few studies focus on systems of norms, rules or values that give support to entrepreneurial activity for community development in terms of quality of life or cultural experiences. These studies bring relevant insights to entrepreneurial activity in creative industries.

Being Orientation for Entrepreneurial Research

Another observation is that having and being modes can be generalized and applied to entrepreneurship in other contexts. While institutional theory deals with agency- and structure-based perspective for directing research production, being and having as modes of enterprising have not been used as guiding theoretical tools. Doing so could refresh the dominant assumption in which entrepreneurs are often perceived to be motivated by the desire for money or palpable outcomes. As Banks (2006) puts it, understanding of moral or ethical considerations influencing entrepreneurial activity in creative industries is still quite vague, as little attention is paid to entrepreneurs from an understanding based on their aesthetic, political or social motivations and contributions. Orientation towards a being mode is most prominently found in studies on social and civic entrepreneurship, focusing on social, aesthetic and environmental aspects of entrepreneurial activity (J. Thompson, Alvy, & Lees, 2000). Also, these entrepreneurial studies are significantly oriented towards an agency-based perspective. Social entrepreneurship is often related to an individual with particular traits and behaviors (Leadbeater, 1997) who can “make a difference” by perceiving social needs (J. Thompson et al., 2000). From this perspective, entrepreneurs mobilize resources (Henton, Melville, & Walesh, 1997) and are in control of
the environment (Prabhu, 1999) to promote their desire for social change (J. L. Thompson, 2002).

Contrastingly, with a structural perspective, Williams (2007) demonstrates that people in rural areas are more incline than those from urban areas to engage in social rather than commercial entrepreneurship. Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern (2006) posit that contextual forces have different impacts on entrepreneurs because these forces affect differently entrepreneurs of social ventures and those of a commercial ones. For example, on the one hand, social entrepreneurs may consider less profit-driven contextual forces. On the other, considering these forces can enable a strategy that takes into account various contingencies. This behavior may facilitate entrepreneurial endeavors whether the focus is on economic or social returns (Austin et al., 2006). It seems nevertheless relevant to understand how the being mode take place within a structure-based perspective on entrepreneurship, especially when a society is structured towards a having mode, as in Mulcahy’s (2003) study on entrepreneurship and American cultural patronage.

Hitherto, studies on entrepreneurship in creative industries have largely related to economic competitiveness rather than to sense of social duty and forms of expression. Although there might be an indication that entrepreneurs are guided by profits, this apparent utilitarian orientation seems to be assumed by the capitalist hegemony thesis, as it has not been empirically validated (Williams, 2007). Just as it can be argued that utilitarian principles are increasingly applied to social enterprises, there is evidence that profit-oriented entrepreneurship is gradually losing space to values such as environmental responsibility (Burchell & Cooke, 2006). Rather than the instrumental, rational and useful view of entrepreneurship, there seems to be a lack of the detached, expressive and community values that guide or limit entrepreneurial activity. Non-instrumental values can shape practices of cultural entrepreneurship. Although most researchers neglect addressing substantive aspects of cultural work, a sense of place and community obligation can impose limits to instrumental, profit-seeking goals. These moral commitments contradict the popular model of a self-interested and depoliticized culture (Banks, 2006).

**Perspective Proportion Sustaining Entrepreneurial Research**

Entrepreneurship within creative industries is approached by existing research in a fluctuating way. Some research emphasizes the capacity of entrepreneurs to change structural conditions while other studies deal with entrepreneurship as innovative action following given rules, norms and cultural parameters. For example, entrepreneurship can be conceptualized as the creative expression of the art form and as a way of embracing managerial creativity (Rentschler, 2003), but also as a co-evolutionary process intertwined with careers, institutional rules and competitive dynamics in emerging industries (Jones, 2001).

Entrepreneurship research faces current questioning around the agency and structure debate. Influenced by Giddens’ structuration theory, researchers seek to find ways of considering these two perspectives. Entrepreneurs do not fill market gaps; they purposefully co-evolve with social structures to create opportunities and enact ventures. Understanding the creative act as the nexus of entrepreneurship portrays the entrepreneur as both the medium and outcome of social structures as well as being enabled and constrained by them (Sarason et al., 2006).

In the practice of research, multi-perspective edification and implementation can become difficult. Different combinations are possible and finding an appropriate proportion between these two perspectives can become a sensitive and dubious path. We can exemplify this through the different ways of dealing with the relationship between authenticity and legitimacy, both indispensable to entrepreneurial accomplishment within creative industries. The proportion of attention given by a researcher to authenticity or legitimacy dimensions
depends on a contextual analysis that allows innovation (contribution) to emerge and be constructed. Legitimacy structures and normative beliefs provide the criteria for evaluation and exploitation of opportunities. These structures are transformative relationships providing the basis to choose among opportunities (Sarason et al., 2006). The convergence of organizational practices is a result of the structural constraining of activities, whereas individuals act, or at least seem to act, in accordance with institutional pressures in order to be legitimated by the environment (Battilana, 2006).

As Becker (1982) demonstrates, art work is a social activity in which the creator needs collaborative support to produce and diffuse work. An entrepreneurial attitude in this context relies on the creation or replacement of those that do not support the creator. For example, visual artists can create their own display spaces when not supported by art galleries. Breaking conventions and their manifestations in social structure decreases the external support but increases freedom to choose unconventional alternatives. The choice can oscillate between conventional ease and unconventional lack of recognition. Broadly speaking, the more one follows conventions, the less difficulty one has. There is thus a reconciliation of idiosyncrasy and the need to obtain resources from the field in order to keep producing art work.

The context of creative industries enables and constrains authenticity work, leading to both continuity and change. Being authentic in this context is being distinctive, having freedom of action. Human agency is authentic through authority, power and self-doing (Svejenova, 2005). From the periphery, agents initiate and promote institutional change, and over time style coming from the periphery becomes institutionalized (Jones, 2001). Thus, embedded in a structural context that enables or constrains authenticity work, powerful actors shape authenticity (Svejenova, 2005).

Shaping authenticity can be seen as the “invention of a tradition”. Peterson (1997) has studied the “fabrication of authenticity” in country music, creating specific organizational practices and responding to commercial purposes. Such inventions stabilize cultural identities, legitimate institutions and socialize people in particular contexts. Consequently, there is a “legitimacy of authenticity,” which, according to Peterson (1997), is “distinctiveness.” Both manufactured and creative authenticity appear to be produced, or are at least influenced, by the structure, as a creative voice mediated by the system in which it takes place (Delmestri, Montanari, & Usai, 2005).

Authenticity thus drives agency exclusivity, while legitimacy guarantees institutional inclusion. Artistic concerns for exclusivity and a business rationale for profit guarantee legitimacy (and hence inclusion) in the field. Whereas art exerts pressure for exclusivity and idiosyncratic style, for example, in auteur films and movies (artistic differentiation), business lends its support to film, attracting audiences and generating profits (audience appeal) (Alvarez et al., 2005). Unique levels of legitimacy can result in tremendous resources and opportunities. Interpretation of demands from the institutional environment enables individuals to pursue entrepreneurial activities. Thus, in order to gain legitimacy and resources, one should to a certain extent conform to the structure (Mathieu, 2006). But, as Alvarez et al. (2005) point out, legitimacy provides the ability to claim valuable resources at the same time as limiting freedom of action.

**Orientation Proportion Sustaining Entrepreneurial Research**

In the field of creative industries, the relationship between art, commerce, economy and culture is always subject to tension and debate. Different labels are used for categorizing the polarities of the dichotomous tension: culture and commerce (e.g., DiMaggio, 1982), culture and economy (e.g., Throsby, 2001), art and economy (e.g., Lampel, Lant, & Shamsie, 2000),
art and market (e.g., Moulin, 2000); art and commerce (e.g., R. Caves, 2000) culture and administration (Adorno, 1997). This debate has appeared in several publications we have analyzed showing that sometimes one polarity is emphasized and sometimes both polarities are considered in a similar proportion.

This takes us back to the underlying tensions in creative industries. Capitalism, as the principle of unlimited accumulation, puts art and culture in a critical situation. The value of culture can be distorted when used for profit. Inversely, cultural value sets a limit to profit-maximization. Thus, creative industries may represent a culture thoroughly absorbed by the economy (Adorno, 1997). Whereas creative work tends to be spontaneous and incalculable, not following stringent rules, commerce necessitates administrative procedures to organize art economically. While the predominance of the having mode can weaken the very artistic resources of creation (i.e. an artistic practice dominated by an economic logic jeopardizes the resources vital to creative production), “art for art’s sake” can hinder commercial objectives. Consequently, the having mode constrains the being mode to the extent that artistic activity only has freedom within the organized structure of a market (Banks et al., 2002). In Hesmondhalgh’s (2007) terms, the market limits (invades) the autonomy of “symbol creators”, who, in turn limit (invade) the market.

Thus, when proposing having and being as conceptual devices for understanding that tension, we have opened our minds to visualize that tension in an inclusive way. Having and being are two fundamental modes of experience, the respective strengths of which determine the differences between the characters of individuals and various types of social characters (Fromm, 1976). They are two different kinds of orientation towards self and the world. They are not separate qualities, but rather two interrelated paths orienting feelings, thinking, and acting. The social structure – its values and norms – decides which of these two becomes dominant (Fromm, 1976). Context becomes thus the parameter for knowing the adequate dose of one or another orientation. If the entrepreneurship researcher seeks to capitalize on proportion logic, he or she will need to show some competencies in terms of discernment and perceptual refinement, which are directly associated with contextual judgment, practical wisdom, and “phrasonic” knowledge (Cowan & Darsoe, ; Kessler & Bailey, 2007; Noel, 1999).

Different combinations of the having and being modes orientating current research on entrepreneurship suggest that these modes are not regulated by a quest for equilibrium or balancing. Different emphases are relevant in function of context. Thus, understanding the logics of proportion becomes strategic for understanding how to deal theoretically with the having-being tension constantly faced by entrepreneurs within creative industries. On that matter, the concept of proportion in Aristotelian theory, as well as the concept of Phronesis (Noel, 1999) and Wisdom (Cowan & Darsoe, 2008; Kessler & Bailey, 2007), can be a source of inspiration for future research into entrepreneurship.

For this reason, we should not conceive these tensions as a dichotomy or “polarities” (Lampel et al., 2000). Rather, our research suggests that they are mutually dependent. For example, an entrepreneur who already has financial resources does not need to accept certain forms of dependence (Becker, 1982), being more free to explore his or her creative calling. Likewise, a true expression of the self can lead to more economic profits than would an otherwise profit-maximization orientation.

Following the lead of Aristotle, who in Nicomachean Ethics examines proper shares in various relationships, we propose the logic of proportion. From the idea that mutual subjective utility can be the very basis of exchange, Aristotle develops the concept of reciprocity in accordance with proportion. Aristotle notes that fair exchange is a type of reciprocity, not of equality, but rather of proportion. Thus, an exchange ratio is not a ratio of goods alone nor merely a ratio of people exchanging the goods involved in the transaction. It is rather
simultaneously a ratio reflecting the relationships among and between people and goods – in their entirety – involved in this transaction.

**Conclusion**

This research has produced two main insights. The first refers to the general assumption that sector analysis can contribute to advancing knowledge on entrepreneurship activity. The second concerns the idea of rethinking perspectives and orientations embedded in research practice by: (a) considering the being mode as relevant for entrepreneurship research, and (b) adopting a notion of proportion instead of seeking a balance or equilibrium between opposed polarities. Proportion requires refocusing our attention on the relevance of context and wisdom. In other words, it demands a quest for contextual dimensions and elements guiding judgment about how to define proportion in practice (for research, immediately, and for entrepreneurial practice, secondly).

In order to get to these two insights, we have selected and analyzed the creative industries as a sector presenting its enlightening and fertile specificities. A central specificity is the conflicting relationship between art, commerce and economy. We have proposed the having and being categories (Fromm, 1976) as conceptual paths to deal with that tension more productively. We have also identified the relationship between agency and structure as an insightful one in the field of entrepreneurship studies. After selecting and analyzing the literature on entrepreneurship and creative industries, we evaluated the type of relationship established by researchers in their studies. Dichotomous polarization (exclusion of one perspective or orientation) or quest for equilibrium has dominated the academic debate and the way research has been done. Both being orientation and proportion (established by context-sensitive perspicacity) was discussed and proposed as relevant ideas for new academic investigations on entrepreneurship.
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