
Artmaking as Entrepreneurship: Effectuation and Emancipation in Artwork Formation

Author(s): Adrienne Callander

Source: *Artivate*, Summer 2019, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Summer 2019), pp. 61-77

Published by: University of Arkansas Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.34053/artivate.8.2.4>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.34053/artivate.8.2.4?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
Artivate

JSTOR

Artmaking as Entrepreneurship

Effectuation and Emancipation in Artwork Formation

Adrienne Callander
University of Arkansas

ABSTRACT: In this article, I assess how the improvisational and collective models of organizing known as effectuation (Sarasvathy 2001) and emancipation (Rindova, Barry and Ketchen 2009) apply to the making of socially engaged artwork. This case study focuses on the entrepreneurial nature of art-making exemplified by *FOOD* (1971), a collaborative work initiated by Gordon Matta-Clark and Carol Goodden and made possible by a host of co-creators throughout its three-year run. This article explores the motives and means that generated this work and argues that under certain conditions, an artwork functions in distinctly entrepreneurial ways. I also argue that the case of *FOOD* demonstrates how entrepreneurship can be central to *artwork formation*. Specifically, the processes involved in structuring a socially engaged artwork rely on the effectual principles of affordable loss, strategic alliance, exploitation of contingencies, and control of an unpredictable future, as well as the emancipatory principles of seeking autonomy, authoring, and making declarations. This article also introduces the term "artwork formation" to tether effectuation and emancipation to the *continuous* formation of socially engaged artwork. By recognizing the entrepreneurial process as an aspect of socially engaged art-making, I seek to invite discussion on the connection between artistic production and entrepreneurship and to support the validity of entrepreneurship in creative pedagogy and practice. **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.34053/artivate.8.2.4>

Introduction

In this article, I assess how the improvisational and collective models of organizing known as effectuation (Sarasvathy 2001) and emancipation (Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen 2009) apply to the making of socially engaged artwork. Specifically, the processes involved in structuring a socially engaged artwork rely on a number of effectual and emancipatory principles. These include affordable loss, strategic alliance, exploitation of contingencies, and control of an unpredictable future, as well as seeking autonomy, authoring, and making declarations. This

case study focuses on the entrepreneurial nature of art-making exemplified by the collaborative and participatory artwork, *FOOD* (1971), to demonstrate how entrepreneurship can be central to *artwork formation*. Here, the term “artwork formation” tethers effectuation and emancipation to the continuous formation of socially engaged artwork.

FOOD belongs to the category of socially engaged art, though no one had yet coined the term in 1971. The work was an extension of participatory and experiential art movements of the 1960s and a precursor to what Joseph Beuys refers to as “social sculpture,” a type of art informing “how we mould and shape the world in which we live” (Beuys 1986, 9). In the 1990s, social sculpture’s shaping of interactions between people and their environment morphed into relational aesthetics, defined by Bourriaud (1998) as “art taking as its theoretical horizon the realm of human interactions and its social context” (Bourriaud 1998, 14). What we know today as “socially engaged art” is a successor to these efforts. Socially engaged art, also referred to as “social practice” or “social cooperation art” (Finkelpearl 2013), is an art form that generates human engagement, challenges institutions, and embraces change. When tracing the lineage of social practice, relational art, and social sculpture, one inevitably encounters *FOOD*. *FOOD* traces its own evolution to event scores, happenings, and chance operations of the preceding decade and, before that, to the performative rebellion of the Dadaists who protested the murderous absurdity of WWI with what *FOOD*’s co-founder, Gordon Matta-Clark, referred to in Schumpeterian terms as “a devotion to the imaginative disruption of convention” (Moure 2006, 65).

The example of *FOOD* demonstrates how effectual and emancipatory features such as privileging creation over discovery, collaboration over competition, and improvisation over planning apply to the formation of socially engaged artwork. Accordingly, this article seeks to not only broaden the discussion of how art and entrepreneurship interact but also to lessen the burden on the field of arts entrepreneurship to defend the presence of entrepreneurship in art pedagogy and practice. (Gangi 2015); (Nyth 2012); (Lord 2012); (White 2013); (Essig 2012; 2015); (Roberts 2012); (Thom 2016). In arts entrepreneurship literature, entrepreneurship frequently appears as a tool to promote art. As I argue here, the lens of utility does not frame the intersection of art and entrepreneurship in its entirety. This article argues for acceptance of entrepreneurship research within—rather than merely alongside—artmaking. Here I want to assert that acceptance of entrepreneurship as an art process depends on the degree to which entrepreneurship extends art, not via commercialization of its products, but by establishment of its own credibility as a medium—a credibility that may entail identification of entrepreneurial processes hiding in plain sight within the making of canonical artworks, and that may depend on destabilization of existing frameworks in both art and entrepreneurship in order to allow for integrative forms.

Comparisons of art and entrepreneurship beg their respective definitions. Neither is monolithic. Both entail distinct subdomains, with their own sometimes contradictory or divergent theories, methods, processes, and outcomes. Is art defined as an object, concept, process, exchange, or institutional critique? Is entrepreneurship understood as organization

formation, economic disruption, market discovery, or opportunity creation? Does arts entrepreneurship derive from entrepreneurship or from art? Is their intersection a distinct phenomenon? Regard for the co-constitutionality of art and entrepreneurship supports a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between the two.

This article presents a historiographical case study of the organizational aspects, both effectual and emancipatory, of *FOOD*. It begins by briefly considering indicators of organizing—intentionality, resources, boundaries, and exchange (Katz and Gartner 1988)—in *Interfaith Charity Shop* (2017), *The Store* (1961), *Bliz-aard Ball Sale* (1983) and Dorchester Projects (2008-present), and then introduces key elements of effectuation and emancipation. It proceeds with a detailed exploration of *FOOD* and its conceptual, physical, social, cultural, and fiscal features and their effectual and emancipatory characteristics. Critiquing the conflation of business and entrepreneurship, I challenge the separation of art and entrepreneurship—of artist and entrepreneur—and propose that, in the integration of art and entrepreneurship, the small-medium enterprise might serve as a vehicle for impact usually attributed to innovation-driven enterprise (Aulet & Murray 2013). As I argue, arts entrepreneurship literature neglects entrepreneurship as an art form or a factor in the formation of an artwork. This article questions that omission and calls for further research into the parallels between effectual and emancipatory processes and the formation and performance of socially engaged art.

Organizing, Effectuation, and Emancipation

Embedded in Selfridges, the London-based department store, and funded by Artangel, the vanguard charitable arts organization, Miranda July's *Interfaith Charity Shop* ran as a store, an art installation, and a curatorial project for six weeks in 2017. Operated and staffed by four separate faith-based charity shops selected by July, *Interfaith Charity Shop* reflected what July called the “inherently participatory conventions of commerce” (“Interfaith Charity Shop at Selfridge’s,” 2006). Hannah Ellis-Peterson (2017) wrote for *The Guardian*, “The shop is as much a curated art piece as a functioning retail venue. . . .” The shop constituted a social practice platform for Muslim, Buddhist, Jewish, and Christian collaboration, and for participants to engage in ecumenical, commercial, and creative exchange. The art was activated by commercial transactions that were themselves micro vehicles for diversity and harmony within the established frameworks of socially engaged art—characterized by “dependence on social intercourse as a factor of its existence” (Helguera 2011, 2)—and charity retail. One can readily identify signs of organizational emergence—intentionality, resources, boundary, exchange—and the potential for sustained performance (Katz & Gartner, 1988), but *Interfaith Charity Shop* adhered to fine art conventions; the shop was a show that ran for six weeks.

One might be tempted to term *Interfaith Charity Shop* “entrepreneurial art”, but the category does not exist despite a lineage spanning more than half a century of entrepreneurial processes operating within artworks. Claes Oldenburg's *The Store* (1961) retailed crude,

painted plaster versions of everyday items in “the realm of five-and-dime commerce” (Keats, 2013). David Hammons’s *Bliz-aard Ball Sale* (1983) mimicked city sidewalk vending with a layout of snowball inventory arranged on a blanket and available for purchase. Theaster Gates’s Chicago-based Dorchester Projects (2008–present) merges urban planning, real estate development, and socially engaged artwork; to fund building renovations for Stony Island Arts Bank (2015–present), one of many Dorchester subprojects, Gates sold marble tiles from its urinals as \$5,000 bonds.

That these projects operate according to a conceptual rationale that is not tethered to financial return makes them no less entrepreneurial. Referring to venture formation, or organization emergence, as “organizing,” Gartner writes:

Organizing, as a phenomenon, can occur in various formats and situations that are not necessarily businesses, or for-profit, or, for that matter, anything other than a phenomenon that is assembled in a way that is: intentional, requires resources, bounded in scope, and entails exchanges between others (Gartner 2015).

Organizing posits that organization formation, or emergence, is detectable in the setting of a goal and initiation of its realization; the seeking and gathering of resources; observable differentiation between the emergent body and its environment; and transactions. These four properties combined suggest entrepreneurial action (Katz & Gartner 1988). *Interfaith Charity Shop* and *The Store* marshal resources, rent space, and conduct commercial transactions to conflate commercialization of art and commercialization as art. *Interfaith Charity Shop*, a form of socially engaged art, facilitates communion through sales. *The Store*, in the Pop Art vernacular of consumer culture, sells sculptures off the shelf to narrow the margin between fine art object and ubiquitous commercial product. Stony Island Art Bank’s tile-bond increases in value for its holder for the very reason that it is understood to be an artwork; resource and art are the same.

Bliz-aard Ball Sale presents more subtle and subversive handling of intention, resources, boundaries, and exchange. Hammons sold snowballs on the sidewalk. He hawked fragile white forms; he operated outside of the gallery system. Speculation persists: is *Bliz-aard Ball Sale* commentary on the status of the black artist, a critique of the art market, a jest? Hammons, “best known to the art world for his refusal to participate in its rites and rules” (Filipovic 2017, 16), provides little guidance but his simultaneous engagement with and rejection of the art market is well documented (Filipovic 2017). Analysis often grounds *Bliz-aard Ball Sale* in the art practice of institutional critique, but its entrepreneurial properties are irrefutable. *Bliz-aard Ball Sale* pushes the qualifications for organizing to their limit: the product is ephemeral, the resource is dependent on the weather, the marketplace is temporary and illegal, and the exchange is largely conceptual. Conventionally, tax status might articulate a boundary (Katz & Gartner 1988, 434), but *Bliz-aard Ball Sale* is a black market action; it is unregulated. In a nod to marginalization, *Bliz-aard Ball Sale* points to boundaries by strategically minimizing them. Filipovic writes, “. . . Hammons knows that to be black in an

art world as white as the walls of its museums, and in an America where privilege and presence and whiteness go hand in hand, is to realize that visibility is something to mess with, to disavow.” (2017, 16). While *Interfaith Charity Shop*, *The Store*, and Dorchester Projects embrace organizing, *Bliz-aard Ball Sale* organizes to articulate the precariousness of boundaries, resources, and exchange.

Intentionality, resources, boundaries, and exchange indicate organization emergence; the entrepreneurial models of effectuation and emancipation offer frameworks for means and motive that are well suited to an examination of both the formation of certain ventures and the formation of certain artworks. Effectuation, an entrepreneurial process that seeks to “control an unpredictable future rather than predict an uncertain one” (Sarasvathy 2001, 259), claims as entrepreneurial a long-standing art practice: improvisation. It blends bricolage (Levi-Strauss 1967)—the ability to “create something from nothing by exploiting physical, social, or institutional inputs” (Baker and Nelson 2005, 329)—and convergence (Baker, Miner, & Eesley, 2003)—“composition and execution” occurring simultaneously (Moorman and Miner 1998, 1)—to form a highly agile approach to organizing. Situating effectuation in the business context, Sarasvathy (2001) defines the effectuator as “an imaginative actor who seizes contingent opportunities and exploits any and all means at hand to fulfill a plurality of current and future aspirations, many of which are shaped and created through the very processes of economic decision making and are not given a priori” (Sarasvathy 2001, 262). Drawing on March, Mintzberg, and Weick, effectuation theory emphasizes the “exploration of new possibilities” over the “exploitation of old certainties” (Sarasvathy 2001, 254), learning and discovery over expertise, options over planning, and strategic alliances over the competition to build, rather than predict its world. In effectuation, rather than the end determining the means, the means determine the end. What comes next is shaped by what happens now.

While effectuation values bricolage and strategic alliances, emancipation merges the two to mirror a key aspect of “social bricolage”, described in the context of social entrepreneurship: the exploitation of social resources “at hand” to drive “community stakeholder participation” in the creation of the venture (Di Domenico, Haugh, Tracey 2010, 696). Who is at hand is as important as what is at hand. A nexus of three activities—seeking autonomy, authoring, and making declarations—spurs and supports emancipatory entrepreneuring, defined as “efforts to bring about new economic, social, institutional, and cultural environments through the actions of an individual or group of individuals” (Rindova, Barry and Ketchen 2009, 477-8). Drawing on research that indicates a variety of entrepreneurial goals beyond the maximization of profits (Baker and Nelson 2005); (Baker and Pollock 2007), emancipatory theory emphasizes change creation over wealth creation. In the emancipation model, the entrepreneur seeks to break up the status quo and break free of perceived constraints of “an intellectual, psychological, economic, social, institutional, or cultural nature” (Rindova, Barry and Ketchen 2009, 479-480). Seeking autonomy emphasizes the collective over the individual. It relies on authoring and making declarations—both

inherently relational processes—to mediate the tension that emerges when a venture disrupts established practices and proposes new perspectives while at the same time requiring support and acceptance of the disruption from established networks and systems. Authoring is a process in which “relationships, arrangements, and rules of engagement” (Rindova, Barry and Ketchen 2009, 479) are defined and developed to strengthen the change potential of the venture. It positions the venture “in a system of exchange relationships with resource holders” (Rindova, Barry and Ketchen 2009, 485) to preempt potential resource holder demands that could undermine the emancipatory goals of the venture. Making declarations, a reinforcement device that complements authoring, delivers “unambiguous discursive and rhetorical acts” that make sense of the change proposition. Making declarations positions the venture within “webs of meaning” (Rindova, Barry and Ketchen 2009, 485) that ease acceptance of the venture’s break with conventions.

The collaborative and participatory artwork, *FOOD* (1971), opened its doors for business forty-six years before Interfaith Charity Shop, and it practiced effectual and emancipatory principles thirty years before their categorization in the entrepreneurship literature. What follows is a study of *FOOD* as a forerunner of the integration of art and entrepreneurship, specifically socially engaged art and effectual and emancipatory models of entrepreneurial process.

Art Was Restaurant Was Art

Some 40-odd years before July’s *Interfaith Charity Shop*, on September 25, 1971, *FOOD* opened at 127 Spring Street in the warehouse district of lower Manhattan. Initiated by artists and embraced by a diverse strata of people who accepted its experimental nature and participated in it as workers and as patrons, *FOOD* was “a restaurant, performance place, gathering space, a place to hang out, and a place an artist could earn quick money waiting tables” (Morris, 1999). A performative and socially engaged artwork that incorporated the restaurant model, *FOOD* was a sustained improvisation that integrated cooking, art, architecture, and business (Lee, 2001). The site-specific piece was “at once a meeting place, a business, and a conceptual work of art” (Morris, 1999).

FOOD began as a party conversation between Carol Goodden and Gordon Matta-Clark. Goodden, a dancer, provided the bulk of the financial investment. Matta-Clark, a sculptor and trained architect, inspired the conceptual scaffolding that encompassed cuisine, performance, sculpture, and the built environment. Goodden (2016) recalls, “Gordon’s idea was that the whole restaurant was an art-piece, a living sculpture.” Building on the “event score,” on “happenings,” and on food art—all of which, in turn, had built credibility on the earlier phenomena of Marcel Duchamp’s readymade and Dada’s Cabaret Voltaire—*FOOD* escaped the conventions and constraints of the gallery and presented the commercial transaction as a medium.

Sunday Night Guest Dinners showcased artists-as-chefs who produced “meals of a decidedly artistic bent” (Lee, 2001). Goodden (2016) writes, “The serving of these dinners

and the public reaction to them, Gordon saw as performances.” For the meal-performance *Alive*, Matta-Clark served live brine shrimp in hard-boiled egg white hollows; for *Bones*,

[t]he entrée was a platter of bones of all sizes and their attendant meat – frog, chicken, and beef. . . . When the customers were through eating their dinner, the bones went to musician Richard Peck who scrubbed them up, then went to sculptor/jeweler Hisachika Takahashi who drilled holes in them and strung them on a rope. Along with their check stubs, the waitresses gave the bone necklaces to the customers so they could wear their dinner home.

Paul Ha (in Goodden, 2016) refers to *FOOD*’s capacity to feed body, mind, and spirit as “arts sustenance.” Ideas of sustenance could take a surreal turn. Matta-Clark (in Moure, 2006) wrote to fellow artist St. Lee Junior, enticing him to offer himself up as the main course: “Lee—just imagine what a fabulous treat you would make. It seems to be the perfect achievement for the artist lover or saint to give all of himself and be well chewed before swallowing. You would not only be well remembered but superbly catered.”

This nexus of food, performance, and the participatory had precedent. Fluxus artists of the 1960s used food as a medium and the meal as context in what are historically labeled event scores: “simple actions, ideas, and objects from everyday life recontextualized as performance” (Knowles, 2019). Allison Knowles made a salad (*Make A Salad*, 1962); Ken Friedman served the audience soup (*Twenty Gallons*, 1967); Emmet Williams and Ben Vautier each staged elegant dinner parties that eventually opened up for audience participation (*Supper*, 1965); Bengt af Klintberg complicated eating by intentionally missing his mouth while attempting to eat an entire meal on stage (*Food Piece for Dick Higgins*, 1963). Matta-Clark himself had previously roasted a pig under the Brooklyn Bridge (*Pig Roast*, 1970–71) fried photographs (*Photo Fry*, 1969), and planted a cherry tree in a gallery (*Cherry Tree*, 1970).

Fluxus was a process-oriented and performative collective of interdisciplinary artists, many of them residing in lower Manhattan, who often engaged audience members as participants in the creation or completion of an artwork. The collective championed the call of the late 1950s and early 1960s to incorporate chance operations in artmaking as promoted by pioneering composer John Cage and to operate in what Robert Rauschenberg referred to as the gap between art and life.

Fluxus artist Allan Kaprow, credited with the development of the performance artworks known as “happenings,” identifies a gap between the recognizable and the as-yet-to-be-named when artists challenge established art modes. He called this gap “nonart.” In his 1971 essay, “The Education of the Un-Artist,” he wrote:

Nonart is whatever has not yet been accepted as art but has caught an artist’s attention with that possibility in mind. . . . Nonart’s advocates, according to this description, are those who consistently, or at one time or other, have chosen to operate outside the pale of art establishments—that is, in their heads, or in the daily or natural domain.

Matta-Clark and his peers measured their liberation by the extent to which they could operate in this “natural domain.” *FOOD* was activated by exchange; it was participatory. It was realized through civic communion and the personal and political realities those exchanges encompassed, and it reflected Matta-Clark’s personal aesthetic philosophy: “[U]nlike other artists, I feel the need to become directly involved in a context that is physically, politically and socially structured, in short, to leave the studio and go out on the streets” (in Moure, 2006). Matta-Clark was neither alone nor original in this desire.

FOOD relied on everyday interactions and participants willing to enter into an unscripted territory and to adapt to conditions as they arose. An advertisement for *FOOD* that ran in the Spring 1972 issue of the arts magazine *Avalanche* lists more than 100 cocreators. In addition to artists cooking, dancers danced, films were shot, and “art was discussed, inspired and produced” (Morris, 1999). While Goodden and Matta-Clark are credited with financially and creatively initiating *FOOD*, it was made possible by a host of collaborators who joined the action during its three-year run. Matta-Clark (in Moure, 2006) would later profess, “As an artist, for years I have endeavored to channel my actions toward an idea of social welfare. . . . I don’t wish to be considered an artist who does everything himself.”

A critique of norms played out beyond *FOOD*’s curb, where a constellation of concerted and sustained art actions had inspired its inception: 112 Greene Street, the experimental exhibition and workspace owned by Jeffrey Lew who “gave artists the opportunity to work with abandon”; Anarchitecture, the think tank that met weekly to conceptually “deconstruct existing structures . . . anything from a building to a herd of sheep”; and the locally produced arts magazine *Avalanche*, an “important social and intellectual link in the Soho art universe” and “perfect media vehicle” for both *FOOD* and 112 Greene Street (Morris, 1999).

In *More Songs about Buildings and Food*, Thomas Crow (2006) writes that while *FOOD* was “something of a permanent stage for Matta-Clark and numerous friends,” it also provided “reasonably cheap, fresh, and healthy nourishment for the youthful contingent of loft-dwellers in a neighborhood with next to no commercial infrastructure.” By the late 1960s, the postwar exodus of manufacturing firms from lower Manhattan had culminated in mass vacancy. Artist Jene Highstein (in Donoso, 2016) remembers, “People thought the neighborhood was dangerous, but it was just deserted—after 5 o’clock there was nobody there.” Artists living south of Houston street prior to 1971 squatted in largely abandoned commercially zoned industrial spaces. In January 1971, in an effort to ameliorate conditions, the New York City Housing Authority adopted an artist-in-residence (A.I.R.) amendment, effectively rezoning the area—later branded SoHo—for joint living and work use by “certified” artists who were thus categorized by law as light manufacturers (“City Planning Commission N800458ZRM,” 1981).

Ironically, the very artists vying for consideration within this category in order to afford the city and maintain proximity to its marketplace were actively transforming concepts of both goods and production. The interdisciplinary arts community south of Houston Street

would not confine itself to discrete or established methods or outputs. Artist Jane Crawford (in Donoso, 2016), Matta-Clark's widow, recalls transgression as the norm:

The artists who were attracted to SoHo came from all around the country, and the world, working in all areas of the arts. They didn't mind living primitively on the fringes of society in exchange for roomy studio space. There were many different political theories and social theories, ethnicities and aesthetics—but everybody was opposed to the war . . . and the establishment. . . . We felt that all institutions were aligned with “the establishment,” and so they needed to be turned upside down and reevaluated.

FOOD redefined the conventional restaurant by overlapping its space and function with social, economic, and aesthetic complexities. Diners became patrons and collectors—as in *Bones*, one might wear one's dinner home—while artists became stakeholders. In lieu of profit, *FOOD*'s return on investment comprised wages, affordable nutrition, and community. *FOOD* financially supported artists and was an artwork in its own right—it produced both artist and art. While 112 Greene Street, Anarchitecture, and *Avalanche* provided the conceptual groundwork for *FOOD*, carving out alternative spaces for the production of experimental and increasingly dematerialized work of the late 60s and early 70s, *FOOD*'s innovation extended beyond production to distribution. While *FOOD* participated in what Crawford (2016) refers to as the “out-of-the-gallery movement,” a subtler relocation of the art “product” to the commercial transaction itself was taking place. *FOOD* conflated art and non-art labor. The art was accessed not only by entering the physical space of the restaurant or participating in its improvisational culinary events but also, specifically, in the everyday economic micro exchanges that it contained. Exchanges of labor for remuneration or trade-in-kind supported a process equal parts aesthetic and pecuniary.

Conceptually and pragmatically, *FOOD* was designated as art in tandem with its designation as business. “Half dreaming, half sweating, still planning the restaurant,” Matta-Clark (in Moure, 2006) wrote to St. Lee Junior. “This so much absorbs and demands my energies. . . I keep wondering why I am doing this. . . It cannot be for business or money alone. There are deeper needs and pleasures at stake.” *FOOD* was improvisational; the process itself was a deliverable. However, improvisation was not without orchestration. Open from eleven in the morning until midnight throughout the week, *FOOD* served the growing population south of Houston Street. Staff shopped the Fulton Street fish market and took delivery of meat and produce orders throughout the day; people paid for meals; people worked; people were paid. While *FOOD* has been referred to as “more of a utopian enterprise than a business,” (Kennedy, 2007), Catherine Morris (1999) writes, “For Goodden, the restaurant was also a business venture. It was a way to earn a living. . .” Goodden (2016) herself recalls,

For three years, *FOOD* earned enough money to pay its bills, feed Gordon and me, some friends, our workers, and some bums who came in the back door. For three years *FOOD*

employed, over that time, roughly sixty artists so that they could afford to live in New York while they struggled with their art career.

As a result, *FOOD* challenged conventions within the domains of art and business alike. The restaurant-as-art might be as confounding to the conventions of art as the restaurant-as-not-business might be to business.

Before *FOOD* disbanded in 1974, Matta-Clark and Goodden would attempt to sell it to the art dealer Leo Castelli. Castelli, a midtown dealer who in 1971 had opened a satellite gallery on Greene Street around the corner from *FOOD*, declined to acquire the startup. Thus, *FOOD* ended its run. Thirty-four years later, in a 2007 *New York Times* food section review of the Whitney Museum's Matta-Clark retrospective, critic Randy Kennedy writes of the many practices—once deemed “countercultural”—that emerged from *FOOD* and which are today widespread:

fresh and seasonal foods, a geographically catholic menu, a kitchen fully open to the dining room, cooking as a kind of performance—have now become so ingrained in restaurants in New York and other large cities that it is hard to remember a time when such a place would have seemed almost extraterrestrial. (Kennedy, 2007)

FOOD, like *Interfaith Charity Shop*, elevated an everyday setting to the status of stage and enabled chance encounters coupled with commercial transactions to generate an art form that merged art and business operations in what could be labeled “entrepreneurial art,” not only because it manifested signs of organizing, but because it performed entrepreneurial processes as art processes. The art was restaurant; the restaurant was art.

Artwork Formation

FOOD, a socially engaged artwork that ran for three years, was continuously organizing. This ongoing act of organizing, *artwork formation*, extends the improvisational and collective models of effectuation and emancipation to the continuous formation of socially engaged artwork. Because art was restaurant and restaurant was art, signs of intentionality, resources, boundaries, and exchange are readily apparent. Effectual principles of affordable loss, strategic alliance, exploitation of contingencies, and control of an unpredictable future are also evident, as are emancipatory principles of seeking autonomy, authoring, and making declarations.

FOOD innovated by merging meals, art, and architecture in a “living sculpture” (Goodden, 2016) that generated the restaurant-gallery, the meal-performance, and the artist-chef. *FOOD* improvised. It created and implemented simultaneously, “design and execution of novel activities converge[d]” (Baker, Miner, & Eesley, 2003). Its creators were effectuators who bet what they had, made use of what was on hand, contracted with local vendors, networked with neighbors—many of whom were fellow artists already seeking to “work with

abandon” and to “deconstruct existing structures”—and collaborated with patrons who might wear their dinner home. *FOOD* converted unforeseen events into opportunities to sustain a dynamic venture that operated “outside the pale of art establishments” (Kaprow 1971). Those who participated in the creative evolution and financial sustainability of *FOOD* became economic actors rather than those acted upon, the traders instead of the traded (Rindova, Barry, & Ketchen, 2009). They sought creative and economic autonomy not only for themselves but also for the cultural collective of which they were apart.

Making declarations to develop webs of meaning is par for the course in art. This idea is especially true for the avant-garde; dismantling conventions requires an interpretive framework. Much is known about Matta-Clark’s intentions and how he anticipated others would receive the artwork because in interviews, letters, and written statements he announced them; in declaring and recording his intentions, Matta-Clark may have had his legacy in mind, but he was also priming the audience. That audience, those stakeholders, included the art critics and journalists who would amplify the declarations. Declarations were made in other ways. The advertisement for *FOOD* in *Avalanche* promoted the project; in listing 100 cocreators it declared what kind of project it was.

Sarasvathy writes that the logic for using effectuation processes “is particularly useful in areas where human action (locally or in the aggregate) is the predominant factor shaping the future” (2001, 252). Beyond Goodden’s monetary investment and the purchase of meals, it was social capital that fueled *FOOD*. Participation was a resource. Resource holders were those who engaged with *FOOD* as patrons, cocreators, and customers. A network defined “the relationships, arrangements, and rules of engagement” that would “preserve and potentially enhance the change potential” (Rindova, Barry, & Ketchen 2009, 483) of the project. The effectuator’s definition of the market—“a community of people willing and able to commit enough resources and talents to sustain the particular enterprise” (Sarasvathy 2001, 252)—fits. Of effectuation, Sarasvathy writes, “the structure of what exactly the enterprise is is left open and is dependent upon the particular commitments made by the stakeholders” (Sarasvathy 2001, 252). Socially engaged artwork does not know how it will end. The artist initiates, but ultimately relies on others—and unknowns—to fully realize the artwork.

While most writings about *FOOD* focus on its sculptural, performative, architectural, culinary, and urban development implications, few focus on the entrepreneurial, and none explicitly name it as such. The omission may stem from a conflation of entrepreneurship with business and the perception that the efficiencies of business thinking are antithetical to the aspirations of artmaking. By the standard account, business locks down processes and standardizes outputs; art cultivates an embrace of unknowns and shifts perspectives. According to this narrative, the art market reduces the artist to a cog in the supply chain, while the field of artistic practice positions the artist to transgress. To label *FOOD* entrepreneurial would thus be to negate its designation as art; profit cannot substitute for soul, so the thinking goes.

These reductive narratives indeed render entrepreneurship and art incommensurable. However, this perspective relies on an oversimplification of entrepreneurship as a profit generator and of artmaking as self-expression. Newer ways of thinking emerging out of the entrepreneurship field have challenged such binary thinking, pointing in particular to the palpable costs it incurs to business. In “Inviting the Unexpected: Entrepreneurship and the Arts,” Meisek and Haefliger (2011), for example, posit that in setting remunerative goals instead of valorizing creative process and the production of meaning, a venture curtails its full potential and cuts short entrepreneurship’s inherently creative capacity. “The dominant account of entrepreneurship,” they maintain, “neglects concomitant processes by which meaning rather than business value is created” (Meisek, Haefliger, 2011, 79).

Disaggregating business and entrepreneurship, Meisek and Haefliger (2011) contrast “the analysis, planning and implementation impetus” against the entrepreneurial impulse to create new forms:

If we assess entrepreneurs’ value propositions only in terms of their pay-off, we lose a more nuanced account, where the meaning of a novelty is not equal to its functionality or economic success, but relates to the aesthetical and ethical sentiments it evokes, and where dreaming, discovering and free imagination are central aspects of the process of creation.

Identifying the unexpected as an essential component of novelty creation, they note that in an entrepreneurial process that measures success according to an economic rationale, unexpected events—while initially welcome—are ultimately problematic: “The entrepreneur has to avoid them or adapt to them quickly to maintain stakeholder connections and to secure the economic success of the venture” (Meisek & Haefliger, 2011).

Meisek and Haefliger (2011) argue for a more nuanced account of entrepreneurship—one in which “the unexpected takes the role of something to be invited throughout the process of creation, rather than something merely to hope for in the beginning and to react to later.” In “Arts Entrepreneurship vs. the Sum of Its Parts,” E. Andrew Taylor (2015) resists disaggregation of the entrepreneur, the entrepreneuring, and the enterprise:

What if the unique and compelling aspect of arts entrepreneurship is not its separate parts, nor the paths between them, but its complete integration as a system? What if the person, the process, and the outcome inform and transform each other in ways we cannot observe or explain when considering them separately?

Taken further, if the dominant account of entrepreneurship were to acknowledge “concomitant processes by which meaning rather than business value is created” (Meisek, Haefliger, 2011, 79), it would not be so easy to draw a line between art and entrepreneurship (Meisek & Haefliger, 2011). At the point where art and entrepreneurship become indivisible, entrepreneurship could be recognized as an art form and the arts entrepreneur as, simply, an artist.

These examples of recent academic scholarship in the field of entrepreneurship and art entrepreneurship offer a way forward for thinking about how we might conceptualize the integration of art and entrepreneurship. The recent history of art offers a trove of examples—*FOOD* paramount among them—demonstrating the ways artists have already begun and continue to implement such integration. In the case of *FOOD*, the business and the art are one and the same. When one recognizes that Matta-Clark not only supplied food in a food desert but also introduced innovations in art, architecture, and cuisine that reverberate to this day, it is difficult to separate the artist from the entrepreneur.

Perhaps the most apt model to characterize such an endeavor is at the threshold between what Aulet and Murray (2013) describe as two distinct entrepreneurial models: Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) and Innovation Driven Enterprise (IDE). Aulet and Murray (2013) identify SMEs as vehicles for self-employment that “give people the opportunity to work independently and use their skills.” Enterprise defined as SME is most commonly the formation of small or medium firms focused on recognizable products and services. For example, an opera company might ditch the opera house for a subway platform, but if it still provides something recognizable as opera, it is operating as an SME. Enterprise defined as IDE, by comparison, pursues “global opportunities based on bringing to customers new innovations that have a clear competitive advantage and high growth potential” (Aulet & Murray, 2013). IDEs generate “new-to-the-world ideas.”

Aulet and Murray (2013) do not suggest that IDEs are better than SMEs, or that an SME is incapable of growing into an IDE, but that support for each is different, and institutions need to approach them with their differences in mind. In a nutshell: an SME can get off the ground and employ people quickly, and—if successful—will experience steady linear growth, but an SME is limited to local or regional impact. Generally, an IDE takes much longer to launch, operates initially at a loss, and requires large amounts of investment capital. However, when an IDE launches—if successful—its economic growth potential is exponential. An IDE has a global transformative impact.

By all appearances, *FOOD* was an SME. It looked like a restaurant. It acted as a restaurant. It was a vehicle for self-employment that “gave people the opportunity to work independently and use their skills.” But *FOOD* also generated “new-to-the-world” ideas. It intersected the architectural and the culinary in the arts, significantly impacting all three fields. Its concepts and practices were scaled over time and across sectors. *FOOD* was both IDE and SME. And it was art.

Arts entrepreneurship literature often reinforces the distinctions between arts and business. Its apologists defend entrepreneurship as a means of growing audience participation (Nytch 2012; Lord 2012), increasing employment within the arts (Roberts 2012; White 2013; Thom 2016), developing an entrepreneurial mindset in future arts leaders (Essig 2012), strengthening community engagement (Wilson and Manti 2017), enhancing collaborative practices (Whitaker 2017), and activating authentic career trajectories (Hart 2015). Positioning entrepreneurship as the means and art as the end, Essig’s ouroboros model of arts

entrepreneurship draws on entrepreneurial orientations ranging from entrepreneurial mindset to firm formation for sustaining and strengthening the production and distribution of art, rather than mere maximization of profits (Essig 2015). Gangi beautifully articulates alignment between effectuation and creative process to support effectuation as a highly relevant pedagogical tool for arts entrepreneurship education, the goal of which is “to help artists, and non-artists who desire to work in the arts, to create their own opportunities and ventures that result in sustainable careers” (Gangi 2017, 46). Arts entrepreneurship, a nascent and controversial field, relies on such advocacy to counter “perceptual barriers” (Gangi 2015, 247) and “longstanding romantic notions” (Bonin-Rodriguez 2012, 9) that foster disciplinary resistance to entrepreneurship and frame art as high, commerce as low, and the artist as disinterested.

Bonin-Rodriguez traces a vein of this resistance to 1980s neoliberal rhetoric that weaponized the term “entrepreneur” to cynically promote self-reliance and unravel social welfare programs and he interrogates issues of “access, strategy, and privilege” (Bonin-Rodriguez 2012, 12) in the handling of the term within an art context. In “The Value-Based Approach to Economics” (2016), cultural economist Arjo Klammer argues that, despite the myth of the artist as a lone genius, an individualistic narrative runs counter to prevalent artistic values. While these values do not skirt monetary or aesthetic concerns, Klammer points out, they underscore a strong engagement with the social (contributions to a specific community) and the societal (contributions to “social justice, political freedom, human rights, or national identity”) (2016, 369). In a values-based approach, rational choice (the economic premise that all action is motivated by self-interest) and neoliberal valorization of entrepreneurship as proof that self-reliance trumps social cohesion do not sit well. In their 2015 literature review, Chang and Wyszomirski offer a definition of arts entrepreneurship that supports the perspective that the arts maintain the social as a core concern: “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” (Chang and Wyszomirski 2015, 24). The measures do not have to be equal, but social value is part of the equation.

Socially engaged art allows for seamless integration of social value and entrepreneurship and enables arts entrepreneurship research to direct its efforts at both venture formation and artwork formation. If arts entrepreneurship can be an art form in its own right, will it still be necessary to argue whether arts entrepreneurship belongs more to art or more to entrepreneurship? The apologist defends the controversial; the appropriator takes ownership of material not their own. The apologist plays an important role in justifying entrepreneurship’s place in the fine arts, and may also substantiate the relevance of the arts to broader entrepreneurship research, but in identifying alignments between art and entrepreneurship, might we also call on appropriators? Certain entrepreneurial motives and processes apply to the formation of certain kinds of art. This certain kind of art is always in formation; the work itself is entrepreneurial.

Conclusion

My research and writing in this article responds to, resists, and works around a long line of “art for art’s sake” presumptions about art and artists, perhaps best exemplified by the work of art critic Clement Greenberg (1909-1994). Greenberg sought to preserve painting’s autonomy from cultural relativism by advocating its turn inward. Greenberg argued for purity and singularity. He made a case for painting’s niche. Painting was to concern itself with that which only painting could accomplish. According to Greenberg, modernist painting could only withstand the threat of intrusion by isolating its core and delineating its boundaries. This tactic enabled the discipline to withstand upheaval wrought by ideological encroachment, but the concentrated center of any practice loses relevance when it amputates the exploratory and often integrative fringe that would infuse—even as it threatens—the core. The single-trajectory narrative of Abstract Expressionism eventually gave way to multivalent painting terrains, but porousness was possible only after perpetuity was certain. A degree of destabilization is essential to innovation, but acceptance of the new requires some measure of continuity. Arts entrepreneurship scholarship makes eloquent and empirical arguments that support entrepreneurship’s inclusion in arts pedagogy and practice, but full acceptance of entrepreneurship by art will depend on the extent to which art appropriates entrepreneurship as a medium and a process, in form and formation.

Socially engaged art embraces process and relinquishes control to the chance operations engendered by human interactions. The socially engaged artwork is itself an act of organizing; it continuously emerges. Embedded in the form and formation of socially engaged art are effectual and emancipatory processes. What other entrepreneurial processes might apply? How might these processes apply to other forms of art? As entrepreneurship confronts art, inevitably the inverse arises: art confronts entrepreneurship. How might social engagement theory inform entrepreneurship? And what does entrepreneurship-as-medium look like in fields outside the fine arts?

In defense of entrepreneurship studies in a liberal arts education, Godwyn writes, “[E]ntrepreneurship represents not only engagement with the outside world, but also the attempt to change the world according to a particular vision” (Godwyn, 2009, 36). In “Entrepreneurship as a new liberal art,” Baker and Powell link organizing, agency, and participation in civic life:

For most of us, accomplishing anything of substance in the contemporary world requires using an organization (Aldrich 1979; Tausky, 1970). Because existing organizations are mostly oriented toward what someone else is trying to do, accomplishing what we want often means needing to create a new organization. Therein lies a primary and distinctive domain of entrepreneurship: organization creation (Gartner, 1985). If we consider this ability to pursue one’s own desires to create accomplishments of substance part of peoples’ freedom to participate fully in society, then the skills and knowledge required to engage in entrepreneurship are therefore vital elements of citizenship. (Baker and Powell, 2019, 405).

The cooperative principles of a socially engaged art practice temper the individualistic tone of these statements without sacrificing entrepreneurship's change-making potential and application to civic participation. The socially engaged art effectuator becomes an agent of participatory democratic practice. In conversation with the editor of the influential arts blog, Hyperallergic.com, the curator and social practice critic Nato Thompson asked, "To what degree are we talking about the role of artists in civil society?" and answered, "I do think they have a huge role to play in terms of dream makers. And I don't mean this even tangentially . . . look to Occupy Wall Street, there were artists directly involved" (Vartanian 2017). Beyond assuaging artists' very real concern that entrepreneurship could invade and co-opt the arts with a neoliberal agenda that is antithetical to the arts' imperative to add social value, the merits espoused above point to arts and humanities imperatives embedded within the practice of entrepreneurial processes. They give artists leeway to make entrepreneurship essential to rather than in service of their practice.

References

- Aulet, William & Murray, Fiona E. (May, 2013). A tale of two entrepreneurs: understanding differences in the types of entrepreneurship in the economy. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2259740>
- Baker, Ted, Miner, Anne S., & Eesley, Dale T. (2003). Improvising firms: bricolage, account giving and improvisational competencies in the founding process *Research Policy*, 32, 225–276. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.513.273&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Baker, T., and Nelson, Reed E. (2005). Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50 (3). 329–366.
- Baker, T., & Pollock, T. G. 2007. Making the marriage work: The benefits of strategy's takeover of entrepreneurship for strategic organization. *Strategic Organization*. 5: 297–312.
- Baker, T., and Powell, E. E. (2019). Entrepreneurship as a new liberal art. *Small Business Economics*, 52(2). 405–418.
- Beuys, Joseph. (1986). *What Is Art?* Edited with essay by Volker Harlan. Stuttgart: Verlag Urachhaus, p9.
- Bonin-Rodriguez, Paul. (2012). What's in a name? Typifying artist entrepreneurs in community based training. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts* 1(1). 9–24.
- Bourriaud, Nicolas. (2002). *Relational aesthetics*. [Dijon] :Les Presses du reel.
- Chang, W. J., Wyszomirski, M. (2015). What is arts entrepreneurship? Tracking the development of its definition in scholarly journals. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts*, 4(2). 11–31.
- Crawford, Jane. (2016). "Gordon Thought You Should Have Art for Breakfast, Lunch and Dinner; You Should Make Art All The Time." *Gordon Matta-Clark: Experience Becomes The Object*, edited by Pedro Donoso, Ediciones Polígrafa S.A., p. 107.
- Crow, Thomas. (2006). "More Songs about Buildings and Food." *Gordon Matta-Clark*, edited by Thomas Crow, Corinne Diserens, Christian Kravagna, and Judith Russi Kirshner, Phaidon Press, 44.
- Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., Tracey, P. (2010). Social Bricolage: Theorizing Social Value Creation in Social Enterprises. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4). 681–703.
- Ellis-Peterson, Hannah. (August, 2017). Miranda July curates interfaith charity shop opening in Selfridge's. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2017/aug/31/miranda-july-curates-interfaith-charity-shop-opening-in-selfridges>
- Essig, Linda. (2012). Frameworks for educating the artist of the future: teaching habits of mind for arts entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts*, 1(2). 66–77.
- Essig, Linda. (2015). The ouroboros of arts entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts* 4(1). 3–7.
- Filipovic, Elena. (2017). *David Hammons: Bliz-aard Ball Sale*. London: Afterall Books.
- Finkelpearl, Tom. (2013). *what We Made: Conversations on Art and Social Cooperation*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, p. 6.
- Friedman, Ken, Smith, Owen, & Sawchyn, Lauren (Eds.). (2002). *The Fluxus performance workbook*. Online: Performance Research e-Publications. Retrieved from <https://www.deluxxe.com/beat/fluxusworkbook.pdf>

- Gangi, Jonathan. (2015). The synergies of artistic and entrepreneurial action. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 45(4). 247-254
- Gangi, Jonathan J. (2017). Towards consensus: suggested foundational building blocks for arts entrepreneurship research and pedagogy. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 6(1). 46-62.
- Gartner, William B., (2015). Arts Entrepreneurship: Scope, Practice and Community. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts* 4(2). 3-9.
- Godwyn, Mary. (2009) Can the liberal arts and entrepreneurship work together? *Academe*, 95(1). 36-38.
- Gooden, Caroline. (2016). "FOOD." Gordon Matta-Clark: Experience Becomes the Object, edited by Pedro Donoso, Ediciones Polígrafa S.A., p. 28.
- Hart, James. (2014). Arts entrepreneurship and the hero's journey. *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(1). 49-72.
- Helguera, Pablo (2011). Education for socially engaged art. New York, NY: Jorge Pinto Books.
- Highstein, Jene. (2016). "Anarchitecture was an invention of the time." *Experience Becomes the Object*, edited by Pedro Donoso, Ediciones Polígrafa S.A., p. 133.
- July, Miranda. (n.d). Interfaith charity shop at Selfridge's. Miranda July's official website. Retrieved from <http://www.mirandajuly.com/interfaith-charity-shop-at-selfridges-2/>
- Kaprow, Allan. (1971). "Education of the Un-Artist." *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life*. Berkley: University of California Press, p. 98.
- Katz, J., & Gartner, W. (1988). Properties of emerging organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 429-441. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.library.uark.edu/stable/258090>
- Keats, Jonathan. (July 2013). Pop artist Claes Oldenburg's legendary Lower East Side store comes to MoMA (but you'll have to buy your chickenwire lingerie elsewhere). *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jonathonkeats/2013/06/11/pop-artist-claes-oldenburgs-legendary-lower-east-side-store-comes-to-moma-but-youll-have-to-buy-your-chickenwire-lingerie-elsewhere/#2f959e609739>
- Kennedy, Randy. (February 2007). When meals played the muse. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/21/dining/21soho.html>.
- Klamer, Arjo. (2016). The value-based approach to cultural economics. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 40(4). 365-373.
- Knowles, Alison. (n.d.). Event scores. Alison Knowles's official website. Retrieved from <https://www.aknowles.com/eventscore.html>
- Lee, Pamela M., editor (2001). *Object to Be Destroyed: The Work of Gordon Matta-Clark*. Boston: The MIT Press.
- Lord, Clayton. (2012). Shattering the myth of the passive spectator: Entrepreneurial efforts to define and enhance participation in "non-participation" arts. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts* 1(1). 35-49.
- Meisek, Stefan & Haefliger, Stefan. (2011). Inviting the unexpected: entrepreneurship and the arts. *Art Entrepreneurship*, Mikael Scherdin and Ivo Zaner, eds. Cheltenham: Edward Elger Publishing, pp. 78-97.
- Morris, Catherine. (1999). *FOOD: Gordon Matta-Clark*. Köln: Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther König.
- Moure, Gloria (Ed). (2006). *Gordon Matta-Clark: Works and Collected Writings* edited by Gloria Moure. Barcelona: Ediciones Polígrafa, 2006. pp. 29, 120
- New York City Planning Commission report, N800458ZRM (1981). Retrieved from <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/planning/download/pdf/about/cpc/800458.pdf>
- Nytch, Jeffrey. (2012). The Case of the Pittsburgh new music ensemble: An illustration of entrepreneurial theory in an artistic setting. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts* 1(1). 23-34.
- Rindova, Violina, Barry, Daved, & Ketchen, David J. (July 2009). Introduction to special topic forum: entrepreneurship as emancipation. *The Academy of Management Review* 34(3), pp. 477-491
- Roberts, Joseph. (2012). Infusing Entrepreneurship within non-business disciplines: Preparing artists and others for self-employment and entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts* 1(2). 55-63.
- Sarasvathy, Saras D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2). 243-263
- Taylor, Andrew E. (2015). Arts entrepreneurship vs. the sum of its parts. *Artivate* 4(1). pp. 3-7.
- Thom, Marco. (2016). Crucial skills for the entrepreneurial success of fine artists. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts*, 5(1). 3-24.
- Vartanian, Hrag. (October 25, 2017). Curator Nato Thompson on Politics and the State of Social Practice Art. *Hyperallergic.com*. Retrieved from <https://hyperallergic.com/407599/curator-nato-thompson-on-politics-and-the-state-of-social-practice-art/>
- White, Jason. (2013). Barriers to recognizing arts entrepreneurship education as essential to professional arts training. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts* 1(2). 28-39.
- Wilson, K., and Mantie, R. (2017). Inspiring soulful communities through music: connecting arts entrepreneurship education and community development via creative placemaking. *Artivate: A journal of entrepreneurship in the arts* 6(2). 32-45.