Journal of Enterprising Culture
Vol. 24, No. 1 (March 2016) 79–99
© World Scientific Publishing Company
DOI: 10.1142/S0218495816500047

World Scientific
www.worldscientific.com

Urban Creativity: An Entrepreneurial Focus

Shoshanah B. D. Goldberg-Miller
Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
Goldberg-Miller.1@osu.edu

Eugene F. Fregetto
Midwest Technology Access Group, Inc.
800 Laurel Avenue, Des Plaines, IL 60016, USA
fregetto1@yahoo.com

This paper discusses the power of the creative sector to revive today's cities by broadening the discussion of the creative sector to include all the tools, assets, and processes of urban creativity. While scholars commonly tie the creative class to specific neighborhoods, especially "silo-ing" creative producers into being the solution for decaying and decrepit neighborhoods and areas, this paper presumes that urban cities already have the depth of diversity to support urban creativity if the dominant planning logic is shifted to proximity of resource from a specific location development.

Keywords: Urban planning; entrepreneurship; creativity; placemaking; policy shocks; creative capital; innovation.

INTRODUCTION

Creativity and innovation are of great value for urban centers and are the hallmarks of the creative class and the creative economy, giving rise to imagination as the key asset for arts entrepreneurs and cultural entrepreneurs. These components of urban creativity stimulate an in-depth conversation about creative outputs, including anchor institutions, arts and cultural businesses, temporal arts and cultural events, entrepreneurship and urban planning that can make a huge difference in cities, regions, and states.

Urban creativity broadens the discussion of the creative class to include entrepreneurship, arts and culture, and the creative capital that resides within the proximity of urban centers. An urban creativity perspective is essential to urban planning due to the urban ecosystem that is exposed to (1) economic and social shocks, (2) intra-city, intra-state, national, and global competition, and (3) urban problems. Urban creativity is a strategy that simultaneously considers the contributions of the creative class, entrepreneurship, arts and culture, and the urban center's creative capital, and the synergy of all of these contributions will revive the urban center's ecosystem. Treating each contribution separately and in isolation of other contributions will result in an ineffective approach for solving urban centers' ills.

The power of urban creativity incorporates the tools of innovation and creativity, which are effective in facilitating solutions to many of the problems found in local, regional and global cities. Based on the work of Richard Florida (2002, 2005), we know that many creative workers are located in urban centers. Consequently, it is critical that planners broaden their perspective through the concept of proximity to understand a city's idiosyncratic resources sited within its geographic boundaries.

ARTS AND CULTURE — MURKY BOUNDARIES

What are we talking about when we use the term "arts and culture?" Is it art, is it culture, or is it some murky combination of the two concepts? Crane (2011) used the term "confusing" when sharing her opinion of the terms used to discuss arts and culture:

> I have heard just about every combination of the words *arts, culture, community, and development*, to the point where I wonder if there is a magnetic poetry set available. To list a few: culture-based development/revitalization, cultural community development, community cultural development, art-based community development, artist space development, creative community building/development, cultural economic development, and the list goes on and on. These terms exist in addition to the already confusing worlds of traditional arts, community-based arts, cultural democracy, creative economies, and more.

Unfortunately, the preferred choice among many professionals as well as many scholars is the third option, to use some murky combination of the two concepts. The murkiness between the two concepts causes problems, as discussions lead to other aspects of the "arts and culture" field. Subsequently, scholars may unwittingly shuffle together individual-level issues with societal-level issues, leading to erroneous findings and weak strategies. The core problem with the murkiness is explained by the fallacy of composition, i.e., principals that are true at the micro-level are not equally valid at the macro-level, and visa versa. There are two distinctive and undeniable concerns in the "arts and culture" world: (1) the artist's career, and (2) the passage of culture to the next generation. The first concern is an individual-level concern, while the second concern is a societal-level concern.

Arts and culture certainly are intertwined as well as interdependent, and are impossible to separate without significantly diminishing the value and meaning of the other. However, the intertwining and interdependence of arts and culture provides no justification for treating the concepts as interchangeable, thus creating a murky boundary between the two concepts. In order to clear the murkiness of any topic, the best approach is to begin again with the dictionary definition of words.

Culture – The integrated pattern of human behavior that incorporates thoughts, speech, actions, and artifacts and depends on man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations. (Societal Level)

Arts – The conscious use of skill and creative imagination in the production of aesthetic objects. (Individual Level)

Culture, as stated in the above definition, is an accumulation of the "integrated pattern of human behavior" for transmission to the next generation. Culture, understood in its most fundamental form, is of great concern as well as of great value to its society, and the management and sustainability of strategies to collect, manage, fund, and transmit culture are worthy of all the scholarly work that discusses best practices for culture. In contrast, arts, as stated in the above definition, is the use of skill and creative imagination, and these attributes are certainly those of an individual, rather than societal institutions dedicated to the transmission of culture. Clearly, the career aspirational concerns of the individual artist are significantly different from the "transmission of culture" concerns of societal institutions. Likewise, the fundamental strategies for each are distinctly different, even though synergy between the two areas of arts-production and

culture-transmission is very important, as both share the same macro goal although their micro-goals are notably different.

THE URBAN ECOSYSTEM: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SHOCKS, INTRA-CITY, INTRA-STATE, NATIONAL, AND GLOBAL COMPETITION

What are the challenges facing cities today? The "short list" of challenges include public and private transportation, economic development of depressed areas, income disparity, persistent social inequities, increased competition at the regional, national and global levels, workforce development, and the diminishing ability of taxation to pay for solutions for social problems. Today, cities have few options to surmount the numerous challenges facing the urban ecosystem. The traditionally strong manufacturing economy has not only moved to high-technology requiring an educated and specially-skilled workforce, but also the low-paying, low-skilled manufacturing jobs have been exported. Our higher education system is being challenged, and often burdens graduates with life-long debt. Howard Gardner (2008, p. 17) writes, "I believe that current formal education still prepares students primarily for the world of the past, rather than for the possible worlds of the future."

Investing more money into bricks-and-mortar solutions will achieve little in today's world of immediate communications, uninhibited capital flow among countries, and a world in which the virtual world is a shared reality. The most severe constraint for cities, states, and nations is simply the exhaustion of our natural resources needed to feed, clothe, and shelter not only our growing populations but the aspirations of many to achieve the middle-income, livable, quality-of-life standard of living. The answers given to us by the "Greatest Generation" (Brokaw, 2004) that turned a military-industrial complex into a massive consumer-goods machine, raising the standard of living for millions by feeding the insatiable consumer appetite, has reached its limits. Today, we need to re-vamp the industrial mindset. Today, we need better ideas to solve problems in this complex, seamless, and demanding world. Today we need more creativity.

The answer proposed in this paper is an urban creativity perspective. The urban creative perspective will ensure that creative economy options and interventions will have a place at the municipal planning level during strategic conversations among those who want to break from the status quo and tap the creativity and innovation of the creative class and entrepreneurs.

Urban creativity is the burgeoning perspective of the creative economy and will articulate the value, power, and strength of the creative economy and entrepreneurs to play a major role in the economic development toolkit of urban centers. Three areas of importance have emerged in understanding the role and power of creativity in urban cities today: 1) economic and social shocks; 2) intra-city, intra-state, national and global competition; and, 3) urban problems.

Economic and Social Shock

Economic and social shocks can be either endogenous or exogenous shocks, meaning that they be internal, such as amalgamations or changes in leadership, or external, such as economic shifts or the migration of residents. The tragedy of 9/11 is certainly the most infamous exogenous shock that shattered the status quo within our lifetime, and that shock caused the most creative minds to devise a homeland security system. Lesser-known but more frequent shocks force city leaders to recognize the need to rethink or just simply discard some urban development strategies. How do cities react to the loss of major employers, a sudden in or out migration of residents, advanced technologies that eliminate job categories, dramatic shift in consumerism driven by the Internet, and the rise of the "text to me, don't talk to me" generation along with the city ills caused by global competition for jobs and capital? The old "build it and they will come" planning strategy works for a growing economy with trade barriers. However, today's cities enjoy few competitive advantages, and a city's competitive advantages will not be recognized by the "build it and they will come" planning strategy, because these shocks shatter the status quo with unmanageable debt, stagnant economic growth, and the demise of the middle class.

Today, more so than with any previous generation policymakers are looking to entrepreneurs to create new industries. Policy entrepreneurs, or those who formulate policy alternatives that can be implemented during times of change, are especially welcomed to present alternative economic strategies for cities (Kingdon, 1995). In addition, high expectations are attached to arts entrepreneurs and cultural entrepreneurs. These exogenous and endogenous shocks have opened the door to allow alternative perspectives. These shocks are the fundamental tipping point wherein the creative city solutions have found greater acceptance today (Goldberg-Miller, 2015).

Consequently, exogenous and endogenous shocks have an enormous positive effect on urban creativity, serving as an inspiration for entrepreneurs and the creative class to thrive, but entrepreneurs and the creative

class cannot do it alone. If the status quo, "build it and they will come," strategy remains the dominant logic in policymaking, urban creativity as a strategic approach will be marginalized.

Intra-city, Intra-state, National, and Global Competition

Competition among cities has intensified as each strives to brand its core identity and draw businesses, tourists, and residents (Eisinger, 2000). It could be argued that cities implemented strategies to attract businesses and new residents first and foremost and, to date, have done little to focus on strategies to retain residents. The factors of economic and societal shocks, such as illegal migration, a shift in consumer demand, and challenges to once-dominant fields including manufacturing mean that cities must be agile and nimble in order to respond to the changing demands. Municipalities want to remain a viable option for the creative class and prevent entrepreneurs from moving elsewhere. Certainly, one of the top challenges faced by today's cities is the issue of the decay of city cores. Urban decay, i.e., the demographic shifts that naturally occur as industries and residents migrate from their original neighborhoods, is forcing cities to find solutions to undervalued and low-tax revenue real estate.

Due to the low cost of living in these decaying areas, in many instances artists have been the ones who have migrated to these areas and they have played a vital role in regenerating many of these formerly decrepit neighborhoods (Grodach and Loukaitou-Sideris, 2007; Markusen and Schrock, 2006; Scott, 2004). Using this logic, one can conclude that the best place for the most valuable urban resource is a neighborhood that has reached total decay. However, from an urban creativity perspective, many of those "decayed areas" are separated from the vibrant part of the city by an area that is in the process of decaying and are not the most preferred area for citywide development. Using a broader view of "proximity" rather than place, urban centers can devise a more meaningful economic development strategy. Consequently, the concept of proximity, rather than place, is important to urban creativity.

PROBLEMS OF THE CITY

During the 1800s, the problems were disease, pauperism, alcoholism, rising infant mortality, and vice (DiMaggio, 1982). Immigration and industrialization wrought traumatic changes to America during the 1800s; two world

wars, the Great Depression, and the atomic bomb wrought traumatic changes to America during the early 1900s. The peace-time conversion of the industrial-military complex, the rise of consumerism, the Baby Boomers, the middle-class, and the Cold War wrought traumatic changes to America during the mid- and late-1900s; codification of knowledge via digitalization, the Internet, Globalization, and virtual commerce are the sources of wrought traumatic changes to America during the first decades of the 21st century. Each age has its unique sources for traumatic changes causing a different mix of urban problems. Today, we still face many urgent problems, education, crime, income disparity, transportation challenges, poverty, neighborhood abandonment, environmental issues and the abandonment of center cities all are challenges faced by urban centers.

Entrepreneurship is an important part of the solution to these urgent problems. Entrepreneurship is touted as the engine of prosperity, and along with the relatively recent creative cities' movement presents a the feel-good trend touted by brand-builders, tourism advocates and international spokespeople for cities. The perennial upbeat "good news" story of the ways that dead city centers came back to life after municipal actors adopted strategic plans integrating arts and entertainment options has led to a plethora of "creative" citybuilding, and the desire to attract high-growth entrepreneurs has caused the adoption of separate initiatives independent from arts and culture initiatives. However, fostering urban creativity must begin with an understanding of what can and cannot be accomplished, rather than the blind belief in the magic of arts and culture creativity and entrepreneurial innovation can operate independent of each other (Carr and Servon, 2009). Rather than a wizard with a wand, urban creativity offers a solution with specific components, goals and outcomes.

URBAN CREATIVITY

Urban creativity is a doable strategy. Simply stated, urban creativity is the synergy of entrepreneurs, the creative class, "arts and culture," and the city's creative capital. The definition of urban creativity recognizes Florida's portrayal of cities as the urban centers for creativity and innovation which must be supported by the city's creative capital, consisting of the city's educational and skill development resources, arts and cultural producers, and media and entertainment resources. It is important to note that the rise of urban creativity does not include an assessment of a city's "bricks and mortar" resources nor the need to attract a major event such as

the Olympics or the Super Bowl, that provide only a marginal impact on the city, at best.

Instead, urban creativity is focused on people, especially entrepreneurs and the creative class, and the intellectual and social resources resident in the city. With a full implementation of an urban creativity strategy, every city will be able to devise its own idiosyncratic image, support network for sustainable growth, and a sustainable economic development strategy if the strategy is properly conceived and properly implemented by urban planners.

Entrepreneurship Intertwined with Business and the Creative Sector

Uncovering the synergy between urban creativity and entrepreneurial thinking is a principal goal of this urban creativity. The connection between urban creativity and entrepreneurship is best understood as the synergy of the creative class, arts and culture, and entrepreneurship within urban centers with significant creative capital. John Howkins (2013) also observed the connection between creativity and entrepreneurship:

> Creativity and its business-like cousin innovation are the most interesting and most profitable areas of the economy and the presiding genius of the internet. … Creativity by itself has no economic value until it takes shape, means something and is embodied in a product that can be traded. This, in turn, needs a marketplace with active sellers and buyers.

Generally, entrepreneurs are viewed as independent and self-sufficient, having little need for help beyond capital and management assistance as entrepreneurs bring the vision and energy to transform ideas into marketable products and services. Incubators and technology centers are leading methods to attract, support, and encourage entrepreneurship within an urban center. However, the vast amount of creative capital resident within the urban center and relationships with the creative class are normally absent from any strategy to help entrepreneurs. In fact, most programs to help entrepreneurs are only tactics, good tactics, but generally just a "bullet point" in the urban center's economic development strategy. Studies have shown that the independent and self-sufficient entrepreneur is at a competitive disadvantage in this age of global competition, as are the cities they reside in. Cities that fail to include entrepreneurs within their urban creativity strategy are likely to achieve significantly less than their aspirations. It is the creative class, in cooperation with entrepreneurs, who will employ a

city's creative capital to develop new creative industries as Howkins (2013) believes the two are interwoven" "Creative people are becoming more business-like; and business is becoming more dependent upon creativity. … Without creativity, we could not imagine, discover or invent anything. … The future is not out there to be discovered. It is created, created first in the mind and then in the action."

Traditional industrial-age economic development strategies have fostered growth using a rational choice framework, wherein the cost-benefit analysis is central to every decision. The rational choice framework is useful in a "bricks-and-mortar" world where the value of land is based on its production value, the rational choice approach wherein each investor, public or private, is expected to maximize its utility. However, in a world that needs new ideas of how to combine our finite resources, the cost-benefit analysis is of little value for assessing the future value of an idea. "We have moved from a world of diminishing returns, based on the scarcity of physical objects, or the repetitive economy, to a world of increasing returns based on the infinity of possible ideas and people's genius for using ideas to generate new products and transaction, or the creative economy (Howkins, 2013). The fact is that creativity cannot be planned; creativity can only be stimulated. Creativity is a personal inspiration, and innovation occurs when that inspiration is shared via innovation. This is the core connection between the creative class and entrepreneurs co-existing in self-forming social networks within urban centers brimming with creative capital. Applying the strict scrutiny of the rational choice framework will never uncover the true value of urban creativity, and the rational choice framework will never be able to calculate the multiplier effect of an innovation in its embryonic stage.

The ecosystem's expectation is to achieve significantly greater output than input, much greater than expected from the industrial-age approach to planning, in order to achieve a livable, quality of life or milieu. Today, the "currency" is creativity, and it is the creative class and entrepreneurs who own the means of production and their output can be enormous as "Creative people have a voracious appetite to know what is new and interesting, and the best way to do this is to work together" (Howkins, 2013).

For the established urban planner, urban creativity as a strategy may be a difficult concept to grasp. One core reason for the difficulty is the fact that creativity is not an industry, whereas industry is the fundamental aspect of the industrial-age urban planning approach. Even though there is no NAICS code for creativity, creativity is present in all industries, and creativity is needed by all industries. Creativity is ubiquitous, and

networks stimulate synergy among creative actors and creative capital as Enhuber (2014) also observed: "This, (the) self-reinforcing circle of urban regeneration through a change in the population composition creates a network of relationships that spills over to adjacent industries and establishes a powerful web of actors who can make or break urban trends." The potential synergy among people working for different industries adds significantly to the urban center's creative capital inventory as the clustering of like-minded people with high aspirations did in previous generations.

> Cities and new ideas feed off each other. Cities provide hothouse conditions for change and diversity, generating fashions, entertainment and glamour in unstable combinations, marked by extremes of wealth and poverty, physical intimacy, noisy and full of follies. Creativity is sharpened, made more public and finds more buyers. Howkins (2013)

CLUSTERS, 'IDIOSYNCRICITY', AND PROXIMITY

Since the early 1800s, industrialized countries experienced three major migration patterns. The first migration was from the farm to large or small central cities, many of which were industrial centers on a large scale, such as Chicago, or a smaller scale, such as mining towns. The next major migration pattern, up to 1920, was the concentration of people in major urban centers, with people coming from both small towns and open immigration. The third major migration occurred after WWII with the suburban sprawl, which saw people escaping the larger urban areas but not returning to rural or agricultural life. Today, the fourth major migration is occurring. Today, people are migrating into clusters, according to researchers such as Florida (2005), Chapain *et al.* (2010), and Evans (2009).

Where do they cluster? More importantly, why do they cluster? The answer to both questions is basically the same answer: resources and social networks to tap those resources. Today, people, especially the creative class and entrepreneurs, cluster in geographic areas that contain the resources and networks within the proximity of their location. The most interesting aspect of today's clustering behavior is that the clusters are ethnically, economically, and socially diverse. Unlike the migration of ethnic groups during U.S.'s period of open immigration where ethnic ghettos were the standard

form, today's 'clustering' is race and gender-neutral and instead is focused on resources and networks.

The creative clustering phenomenon has been explored, most recently by Florida, and creatives will move regularly due to three prevailing trends: (1) rapid change in jobs caused by technology and the short-term, profit-maximizing behavior of firms, causing the creative class to both improvise and re-formulate their personal and professional lives as they do their best to mitigate the gap between their long-term goals and firms' short-term goals; (2) high likelihood of career changes as the creative class matures and younger, freshly educated and lower-cost labor becomes available; and (3) the low level of company loyalty prevalent among the creative class. The entrepreneur is also likely to move regularly as the serial entrepreneur is highly valued and urban centers compete for their ventures. The successful entrepreneurs create large multi-state and even global enterprises, and will relocate to the urban centers with the best resources and networks for their particular ventures.

The underlying dynamics of the creative class and entrepreneurs' clustering behavior is idiosyncratic behavior, i.e. seeking resources and networks that are peculiar to their careers or their ventures (Pink, 2002, p. 82). Consequently, urban centers that try to imitate other urban centers and seek to compete using the same factors, e.g., provide low-cost commercial developments, tax-incentives, and reduction of red-tape, are simply in a "dogfight" – a race to be the lowest-priced and possibility the lowest-valued place. Conversely, urban centers that package all the resources that are within the proximity of a particular place, and provide a seamless social and economic network by which to tap those resources will have developed their own idiosyncratic "brand," one that also will provide an immutable competitive advantage that other urban centers will find difficult to overcome.

Clustering and Proximity

The National Endowment for the Arts' first study of artistic location patterns examined the clustering phenomenon simultaneously from both a macro- and micro-perspective (Grodach *et al.*, 2014). One of the study's fundamental findings is that the macro-perspective is different from the micro-perspective, i.e., localized perspective, of artistic location patterns:

> In short, while macro findings are consistent, the specificity of place dynamics should motivate those regions big and

> small – that are not necessarily New York or Los Angeles – to cultivate the types of localized (micro) attributes important to arts clusters.

Case studies, i.e., a microanalysis of a particular city, neighbor or individual, as well as studies using regional, state, or national databases, i.e., macro-analysis, are common methodologies for understanding artistic location patterns. Both types of studies seek to achieve the common scholarly goal of uncovering and explaining valid underlying principles that govern the artistic location patterns. Both approaches are worthy efforts and should be continued. However, a notable problem arises when the findings from the two methods are combined in order to make policy recommendations, as each method is based on a different unit of measure and most likely is studying a different phenomenon. One method is examining human behavior at a collective level, i.e., regional or national level, and the other method is examining human behavior at an individual level, i.e., localized or personal level. We know from the study of economics that making the presumption that human behavior at the macro-level is the same as human behavior at the micro-level is to make the "fallacy of composition."

The clearest explanation of the fallacy of composition is to compare human spending behavior at the macro- and micro-level: At the macro-level perspective, our economy is better off when people spend; at the micro-level perspective, people are better off when they save. There are efforts to resolve the fallacy of composition. However, the first step is to recognize that the fallacy of composition is a critical issue that resides within the present discussion of urban planning. The study sponsored by the National Endowment of the Arts provides a clear notice that the macro-perspective and micro-perspective of artistic locations patterns are significantly different, and as the report suggests, will result in different policy recommendations; and the study recognizes the void created by focusing on either the macro- or the micro-level:

> … there has been no attempt to simultaneously explore these streams of literature by attempting to understand if and how the arts exhibit common patterns across places and geographic scale. For its part, the case study work is very localized, not generalizable across many places … In contrast, the economic geography literature tends to focus on the regional-level and often considers a very large group of creative industries and occupations. … We question the

> generalizability of such cases to the majority of the USA where different processes and trends may be at work.

Additionally, the study clears states its goal, in slightly different terms, to resolve the fallacy of composition resident in the present scholarly work regarding artistic location patterns:

> We seek to understand the extent to which particular social, economic and demographic attributes may shape or are shaped by the presence of arts clusters at both the metro (macro) and neighbourhood (micro) levels.

The study did conclude that the two different perspectives would result in different policy ramifications:

> In response to the lack of scalar comparative work, we explore if and how these attributes vary by place and both undertaking a macro regional comparison and looking more closely at different measures of neighbourhood dynamics. The use of these two different geographies suggests different ramifications for development and policy initiatives along with our understanding of how the arts spatially concentrate.

The National Endowment for the Arts' study also provides support for an urban creativity strategy based on the belief that each urban center has its own idiosyncratic resources that should be used to develop an urban creativity strategy resulting in an immutable competitive advantage. In the discussion of the findings, the study states that the attributes of place are specific to a place, and that those variables are idiosyncratic:

> In short, the variables that influence arts cluster locations appear to be both place and neighbourhood specific and vary according to the type of arts cluster, … Population groups show little variation from the broad finding that variables are idiosyncratic to place and arts cluster type.

The study continues its conclusion by linking the idiosyncratic attributes of cities with proximity, i.e., broader attributes of certain types of cities:

> Our results at the neighbourhood level using both measures report many opposite results from the metro level, suggesting that arts clusters may seek out the broader attributes of certain types of cities, but locally require different attributes in their production processes and 'work life', … these different arts

> clusters are drawn to neighborhourhoods comprised of different characteristics. This suggests that various types of art production – whether design industries, film, or music – relay on different agglomeration economies and resources.

The study makes the following policy recommendation statement regarding the arts' milieu, i.e., the attributes that are in the vicinity of the arts' place:

> Arts-driven economic development is currently applied through a very crude overarching arts district or 'creative city' initiative rather than looking at the specific relationship between local artistic clusters and their milieu. Such approach also ignores local dynamics between other industries and land use and zoning that may inform and shape economic geography of firms and industrial activity.

Proximity Over Place

Why is urban creativity's shift in focus to proximity from place important as an urban planning strategy (Stern and Seifert, 2008)? The shift in focus is necessary in order to align with the shift to a freelance workforce from an industrial-age workforce. The shift in the workforce culture is quickly moving away from the industrial-style office job where workers can spend their career in a cubicle in the same office building. Today's workforce is mobile and becoming more mobile, and the importance of a specific place is becoming less important than resources available within proximity to the professional's location, as loose-knit networks are the dominant form of relationship.

The freelance workforce has three fundamental members: (1) artists who have always tended to be freelance workers, (2) an increasing cadre of professionals who are contract workers rather than employees, as Forbes predicts that one-half of American jobs will be freelance by the year 2020, and (3) the millions of multi-national corporate employees whose work is defined by their mobile devices connecting them to project teams across the globe. Pofedlt (2012) declares, "Freelancers are now being institutionalized within the business structure." The digitalization of information, together with social media tools, has allowed today's workforce to form many more relationships than during the industrial age. However, scholars generally agree that these relationships are weaker, and the dependence on social media has weakened strong relationships, causing the creative class and entrepreneurs to manage

more relationships with less commitment attached to each relationship. Consequently, urban centers that are designed to help the creative class and entrepreneurs develop and maintain multiple and loose-knit networks will attract people with both the ideas and the capabilities to innovate.

In our present world of mobile devices, loose-knit networks, and fluid project teams, a coffee shop with fast Internet is as important as a corporate boardroom. An urban center with an array of different-sized meeting areas that are easily found, easily used, easily accessed via transportation and in the proximity of diverse resources will attract the aspiring creative class and entrepreneurs. Consequently, another important "public utility" for leading urban centers is communication – communication to facilitate the growth and sustainability of mobile loose-knit network and fluid workplace environments. An urban center's "public utility" communication network must facilitate the integration of voice, visual, and physical capabilities into a seamless, secure, and dependable system that connects with the urban center's creative capital for easy access. The need for a high-speed, open-access, urban-based communication network is self-evident when you consider the following facts of today's virtual world:

> In 2012, 2.4 billion people, 34 per cent of the world's population, had their own access to the Internet (and) had access to a network that is built on the three propositions of the creative ecology: universality, freedom, and markets; several million people are searching Google every second. One hour of video was being uploaded to YouTube every second. Facebook has over a billion registered users and over 150 million are online at any time. There are over six billion mobile phone subscriptions (and) the number of connections always increases faster than the number of people. (Howkins, 2013)

Creating a communication system to tap these resources is an awe-inspiring task and is a task that will require private technologies to behave like a public utility.

An additional requirement of the awe-inspiring task is the goal of providing the communication system with the same ease as switching on a light bulb. The analogy with society's achievement to transform our social life and commercial life via the ubiquity of electricity is an appropriate analogy, as few of us can fully appreciate the enormous capital investment and required cooperation to form the electrical grid in order to bring light to every person at the touch of a wall switch. An equal amount of investment

and cooperation among providers will be needed to create and sustain an urban center's "communication utility."

The task of creating a communication utility is assuredly as daunting as the task that our forefathers faced when pursuing the goal of providing electricity as a public utility. However, we are fortunate today to have two advantages: (1) we have a success story of the electric industry to emulate; and (2) the essential capital equipment is already installed. The two remaining components are to make this vision translate into the terms of an urban plan, and to ensure cooperation among stakeholders within both the public and private sectors. The last component, cooperation, may be the hardest to achieve without endogenous and exogenous shocks to urban centers.

The awe-inspiring tasks accomplished by past and present societies inspire today's leaders in all fields to create and produce goods and services for livable, quality of life urban centers. Realizing the past awe-inspiring accomplishments makes an urban creativity strategy doable. However, two additional and equally awe-inspiring tasks remain for urban planners in their effort to develop an idiosyncratic urban creativity strategy. The first task is to clean up the 'arts and culture' murkiness, as stated earlier, and the second task is to reduce the confusion about entrepreneurship.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP: INCORPORATING ARTS AND CULTURE

As urban creativity gains interest as a tool for urban transformation, some may ask, "Why is the distinction between arts and culture important?" The first reason for the importance of the distinction was stated earlier: it is the fallacy of composition. The second reason is linked to urban creativity strategies and directly linked to arts entrepreneurship and cultural entrepreneurship as core components of an urban creativity strategy. A few scholars have developed arts entrepreneurship with an individual perspective, as well as having developed cultural entrepreneurship with a societal perspective. Hopefully, more scholars will continue the work of these few scholars.

"… cultural entrepreneurship is to do with balancing cultural and economic values and also with caring for society's infrastructure. … I have looked at cultural entrepreneurship as a societal and discursive practice in a national and local political context." (Kolsteeg, 2013)

Chang and Wyszomirski (2015) offer a succinct definition of arts entrepreneurship, saying,

"…'Arts entrepreneurship' is a management process though which cultural workers seek to support their creativity and autonomy, advance their capacity and adaptability, and create artistic as well as economic and social value."

If the study of entrepreneurship in the fields of arts and culture were to begin again with the above two, fundamentally distinct definitions of entrepreneurship, the scholarly work in these fields would then be able to sort out, align, and develop more meaningful and purposeful definitions of the following terms where scholars experience difficulty in grasping the phenomenon of entrepreneurship in the fields of arts and culture: self-employment, subsistence entrepreneurs, artist-producer, transformational entrepreneurs, economic entrepreneur, artistic entrepreneurs, innovative entrepreneurs, social entrepreneur, business entrepreneur, social and cultural entrepreneurship, arts managers, arts-based social entrepreneurship, cultural policy entrepreneurship, cultural heritage entrepreneurship, creative entrepreneurship, intellectual entrepreneurship, policy entrepreneur, local policy entrepreneurs, non-market entrepreneurs, and cultural capitalists (Wyszomirski and Goldberg-Miller, 2015). All of the preceding terms appear in scholarly work that discusses entrepreneurship in the fields of arts and culture. It is of little wonder why confusion still persists.

The use of the above wide array of terms is an example of the confusion that exists among arts and culture scholars regarding the kind of entrepreneurship being practiced in arts and culture. However, the cause of their confusion comes from a different source: Failure to integrate the prevailing scholarship published about entrepreneurship. The scholarly entrepreneurship literature is bursting with excellent insights regarding the entrepreneurship phenomenon as well as entrepreneurial models, strategies, and tactics and some insightful research regarding the entrepreneurial mindset and entrepreneurship education.

Names like Timmons, Katz, Gartner, Brush, Fayolle, and many more scholars should be common names listed among the references for articles that discuss entrepreneurship in arts and culture. Unfortunately, those names, along with their insights and scholarship, are missing from the "entrepreneurship in the arts and culture" literature. Fortunately, *Artivate*, a new journal that focuses on entrepreneurship in the arts, had the foresight to invite William B. Gartner, a scholar of entrepreneurship, to write *A Perspective on Arts Entrepreneurship* (Gartner, 2015). In his perspective, he gave the following advice: "It would behoove those scholars from outside

entrepreneurship area to explore the field more comprehensively … (in) an effort to identify the scope of the entrepreneurship field." Gartner followed his recommendation by providing a short list of scholars and sources.

Arts and culture scholars can choose to continue their current research stream, which is likely to add to the present confusion, or arts and culture scholars can heed Gartner's recommendation to begin with an understanding of the scope of entrepreneurship. This can be followed by the above recommendation to re-structure the study of entrepreneurship in the arts and culture lexicon by focusing on the "classic entrepreneurship" aspect of arts entrepreneurship and cultural entrepreneurship, wherein the classic entrepreneur is a private sector and profit-maximizing entrepreneur studied by economists and business scholars.

DISCUSSION

Urban planners treat the arts and culture developments independently from initiatives to stimulate entrepreneurship within their urban centers by investing millions on the development of an arts district and millions more in a technology center, each geographically isolated from the other. This paper presents a compelling argument for the synergy of the arts and culture developments with entrepreneurship initiatives, and provides the basis upon which to begin the discussion of that argument.

We know that creativity and innovation are siblings residing within every new product, service, and modification that comes to market. We know that artists dedicate themselves to learning the skills to create new ideas, subsequently contributing those ideas to society via some art form. We know that entrepreneurs dedicate themselves to learning the skills to crack open established markets or create new markets for their ventures. We know that each creative person, the artist or entrepreneur, has a unique skill acquired from years of education and experience and driven by their aspirations. We also know that most artists lack business skills and frequently spend their artistic careers as "starving artists." We know that most new businesses, 93% of new ventures, are started in pretty mundane, run-of-the mill industries (Shane, 2008). In the first case, creativity is lost; in the second case, innovation is wasted, often on a mundane venture.

Urban centers and nations need better answers, rather than fewer, to solve the burgeoning societal problems that are beyond the industrial-age mindset. More and better answers will be achieved by an urban creativity strategy that taps the resources within the proximity of its urban center, rather than a

specific location, and creates a plan to facilitate communication within the creative class, especially between artists and entrepreneurs.

CONCLUSION

Artists and creative workers are comfortable with experimentation, failure and risk. Creative people are filled with ideas, and have both the wherewithal and the tenacity to experiment with their concepts as they are honing their creative craft. However, they often don't have the knowledge, skills base or "moxie" of the classic entrepreneur. Each of these fields can be both attracted and repelled by one another. The classic entrepreneurs know that they need more creativity and innovation, more resiliency, and just plain strength to carry on. The arts and cultural entrepreneurs need training, financial backing, access to resources, and strategic planning skills, many of which often are found in traditional entrepreneurship study and practice.

It is clear that the two sides of this magnet, or the positive and negative charge of two magnets can find a powerful attraction when brought together. There is an opportunity for tremendous synergy in the concept. Rather than teaching entrepreneurs to be creative, or teaching creative people to be entrepreneurial, perhaps there is a way to synthesize the strengths of each of these fields in order to create a more powerful and sustainable whole. Recognizing that many arts and cultural entrepreneurs and classic entrepreneurs may be located in proximity to one another, municipalities can find and develop strategies to synergize the two. Fostering a community of innovation will mean providing the tools for success, including access to land, buildings, startup funding and training. Innovators from these camps can avail themselves of these and other resources, resulting in a continued flow of money, outputs and ideas.

References

Brokaw, T. (2004). *The Greatest Generation* New York: Random House.

Carr, J. H. and Servon, L. J. (2009). Vernacular culture and urban economic development: Thinking outside the (big) box. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 75(1):28–40.

Chang, W. J. and Wyszomirski, M. J. (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.

Chapain, C. Cooke, P. De Propris, L. MacNeill, S. and Mateos-Garcia, J. (2010). Creative clusters and innovation. *Putting creativity on the map.* London: NESTA.

Crane, L. (2011). Building worlds together: The many functions and forms of arts and community development. *America for the Arts, Animating Democracy.* http://www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2013/by_program/afta_pubs/afta_reports/LCraneTrendPaper.pdf. Accessed 8.21.15.

DiMaggio, P. (1982). Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: The creation of an organizational base for high culture in America. *Media, Culture and Society*, 4:33–50.

Eisinger, P. (2000). The politics of bread and circuses. *Urban Affairs Review* 35 (3):316–333.

Enhuber, M. (2014). How is Damien Hirst a cultural entrepreneur? *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(2).

Evans, G. (2009). From cultural quarters to creative clusters–creative spaces in the new city economy. *The sustainability and development of cultural quarters: International perspectives.* Institute of Urban History, Stockholm, 3259.

Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Florida, R. (2005). *Cities and the Creative Class.* New York: Routledge.

Gardner, H. (2008). *Five Minds for the Future.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Gartner, W. (2015). "Arts Entrepreneurship: Scope, Practice and Community." *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 4(2):3–9.

Goldberg-Miller, S. B. D. (Winter 2015). Creative Toronto: Harnessing the Economic Development Power of Arts & Culture. *Artivate.* 4(1):25–48.

Goldman, L. (2015). The liminal freelance landscape: Geography, proximity and community. *The Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Research.* 1(1).

Grodach, C., Currid-Halkett, E. Foster, N. and Murdoch, J. (2014). The Location of Artistic Cultures: A Metro- and Neighborhood-level Analysis. National Endowment for the Arts, Grant # 12-3800-7004. OnlineFirst Version of Record – Feb 10, 2014.

Grodach, C., and Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (2007). Cultural development strategies and urban revitalization: A survey of US cities. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(4):349–370.

Howkins, J. (2013). *The Creative Economy*, 2nd Edition. London: Penguin Books.

Kingdon, J. W. (1995). The policy window, and joining the streams. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, 165–195.

Kolsteeg, J. (Summer 2013). Situated cultural entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, Vol. 2.

Markusen, A., and Schrock, S. (2006). The artistic dividend: Urban artistic specialization and economic development implications. *Urban Studies*, 43(10):1661.

Pink, D. (2002). *Free Agent Nation: The Future of Working for Yourself.* New York: Warner Books.

Pofedlt, E. What you'll need to know to be the boss in 2020, *Forbes Online*, www.forbes.com/sites/elainepofeldt/2012/04/03/what-youll-need-to-know-to-be-the-boss-in-2020. Accessed 8.20.15.

Scott, A. J. (2004). Cultural-products industries and urban economic development. *Urban Affairs Review*, 9:461–490.

Shane, S. (2008). *The Illusions of Entrepreneurship: The Costly Myths that Entrepreneurs, Investors, and Policy Makers Live By.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Stern, M. J., and Seifert, S. C. (2008). From creative economy to creative society: A social policy paradigm for the creative sector has the potential to address urban poverty as well as urban vitality. *Progressive Planning, The Magazine of Planners Network*, 107:14–18.

Wyszomirski, M. J. and Goldberg-Miller, S. (2015). Adapting the Promethean fire of business for arts and cultural entrepreneurship. In R. Kooyman, (Ed.) *Creating Cultural Capital: Cultural Entrepreneurship in Theory, Pedagogy and Practice.* Delft, Netherlands: Eburon.