

Music Teachers' and Administrators' Perspectives on Entrepreneurship in Norwegian Higher Music Education: An Exploratory Pilot Study

Benjamin Toscher

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Abstract: Arts entrepreneurship education has been increasingly offered in Norwegian Higher Music Education (HME) since 2011 (Watne & Nymoene, 2017). I argue that a teacher's perspective and definition of entrepreneurship influences how they teach the subject. Using a qualitative content analysis approach (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Mayring, 2000), this article explores a small (n=37) pilot survey of administrators and teachers from four institutes of HME in Norway. In addition to mapping respondents' definitions of entrepreneurship to the most influential definitions of entrepreneurship from the literature, I explore their perceptions of the need for entrepreneurship in HME and their prescriptive changes for entrepreneurship education's integration into the curriculum. Respondents most commonly defined entrepreneurship in the "opportunity creation, recognition, and exploitation" sense, with definitions related to "self-employment" and "innovation" being the second and third most common response, respectively. 95% of respondents perceive a need for entrepreneurship education in HME. Prescribing curricular changes, 57% of respondents see a need for a more market oriented and entrepreneurial focus in the current curriculum to "some extent", 19% to a "large extent", 16% to "a little extent", and 8% to a "very little extent." Rationale for such changes is further analyzed using Bridgstock's (2013) typology of arts entrepreneurship pedagogical approaches. I conclude by guiding educators and readers to existing knowledge and tools in the literature as they relate to each arts entrepreneurship pedagogical approach – an

Citation of this chapter: Toscher, B. (2021). Music Teachers' and Administrators' Perspectives on Entrepreneurship in Norwegian Higher Music Education: An Exploratory Pilot Study. In E. Angelo, J. Knigge, M. Sæther & W. Waagen (Eds.), *Higher Education as Context for Music Pedagogy Research* (pp. 323–350). Cappelen Damm Akademisk. <https://doi.org/10.23865/noasp.119.ch13>
License: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.

organization of knowledge that is important given the field's diversity of perspectives and the power an educator has in the subject's implementation.

Keywords: arts entrepreneurship education, higher music education, entrepreneurship education pedagogy, educator perspective

The purpose of this exploratory pilot study is to explore pedagogical perspectives on teaching of entrepreneurship in Norwegian higher music education (HME) through a small pilot survey responded to by 37 music teachers and administrators in Norwegian HME. In this pilot survey, respondents: (a) defined entrepreneurship, (b) rated their perceptions of the need for entrepreneurship courses in the HME curriculum, and (c) prescribed what changes should be made to the curriculum, if they felt to a relatively larger extent that there needed to be a more entrepreneurial focus in the current curriculum. In other words, the respondents provided their pedagogical perspectives in terms of the “what”, the “to what extent”, and the “how” of entrepreneurship education in HME. Their responses are analyzed using a qualitative content analysis approach (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Mayring, 2000), in which the most influential scholarly definitions of entrepreneurship and Bridgstock's (2013) typology of arts entrepreneurship education are used as templates (Brooks et al., 2015) to map their responses into the existing pedagogical literature. But why should these perspectives be studied? While previous research makes an effort to characterize the perceived needs of entrepreneurship from the perspective of music students (Schediwy et al., 2019; Toscher, 2019; Toscher & Bjørnø, 2019), it is largely the educator who decides what entrepreneurship *is* in the context of their classroom and to what extent entrepreneurship should be integrated into the curriculum. So far, research studying this perceived need from the perspective of teachers and administrators in HME, which may be collectively referred to as faculty, is lacking.

But so what? Some may view that entrepreneurship is being increasingly institutionalized into HME as evidenced by its rapid growth in many countries across the world (Beckman, 2005; Schediwy et al., 2019; Watne & Nymoén, 2017). Yet, there appears to be no standardized curriculum

for the subject and profoundly different pedagogical approaches (Bridgstock, 2013). If one can agree with the importance of the premise that how an educator defines and interprets a concept influences how they decide to teach it in their educational practice, then differences in various educators' definitions and interpretations of entrepreneurship may be a reason why there are several distinct and profoundly different pedagogical approaches to teaching arts entrepreneurship (Bridgstock, 2013). Even the broader field of entrepreneurship is characterized by a multitude of definitions and perspectives as to what entrepreneurship actually *is* (Landström et al. 2012). More importantly, the impact of an educator's perspective and subsequent choice of pedagogical approach should not be understated if one assumes that in an HME institutional environment, there may exist constraints in teaching resources, compacted study and degree plans which are already filled with courses, established institutional requirements regarding individual course plans and learning outcomes, and differing perspectives on the place of entrepreneurship in the music curriculum.

Such a pedagogical choice by an educator may not only be influenced by their definitions of entrepreneurship, but also by how they perceive the need of entrepreneurship in the music curriculum, where the subject's integration is rather new when considered against the backdrop of higher music education's 17th century origins (Angelo et al., 2019; Beckman, 2005). While the general consensus in the literature examining the professional lives of working musicians seems to be that some degree of entrepreneurial skills and knowledge are needed in their careers, only recently has research examined how music students perceive such needs and the role entrepreneurship education may play in helping them acquire the skills to meet such needs (Schediwy et al., 2019; Toscher, 2019; Toscher & Bjørnø, 2019). An understanding of this perception of needs from the perspective of teachers and administrators is important for a few reasons. First, a need may be defined as "the difference between a current and expected or desired state" (McKillip, 1987), and that if something is desired, one arguably has a positive attitude towards it. Further, social psychologist Peter Burke claims that "persons who have a positive attitude toward a particular behavior are seen as more likely to perform that behavior" (Burke, 1991,

p. 191). Thus, a music student's perceptions of the need for entrepreneurship may arguably influence their subsequent entrepreneurial behavior, including whether or not they would take a course in entrepreneurship if it was optional and not a required course. Using the same logic, I can imagine that an arts educator's behavior in teaching entrepreneurship, including the extent to which they think it should be integrated in the curriculum, may be influenced by their own attitudes and perceived needs of teaching that subject in their educational environment.

Previous research has documented "artists' resistance, politically and methodologically, to the 'entrepreneur' label", (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012, p. 9) perhaps due to some cultural connotations of profit-maximization implied by the term entrepreneur (Mulcahy, 2003). Moore (2016) persuasively argues why music educators may be skeptical or reluctant to the "institutionalized push for musical entrepreneurship ... rooted in the discourse and ideals of neoliberalism" (p. 33), an attitude which, in some circumstances, has resulted in the "resistance" of entrepreneurship's integration into the arts curriculum by faculty (Roberts, 2013). Some argue this tension between art and entrepreneurship has to do with conflicting bohemian and entrepreneurial identities – perhaps meaning that artists are not willing to consider themselves to be "entrepreneurs" due a potential conflict in values between money and art, or for entrepreneurship's potential associations with neoliberal political ideology (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006; Moore, 2016) – a tension which other education researchers argue should be resolved in order for students to sustain a career in the arts (Wyszomirski & Chang, 2017). Yet, this tension may be more observable amongst teachers than amongst the students, who may just care about pursuing higher musical education in order to pursue a musical career rather than purely artistic ideals. Brook and Fostaty Young (2019) found that over 72% of the higher music education alumni they surveyed pursued their studies in HME to prepare for a job in music. Further, given that other empirical research examining the perceptions of musical career identities of 146 music students in the Netherlands revealed that these students do not necessarily experience a tension between entrepreneurial and bohemian "imperatives" (Schediwy et al., 2018, p. 174), it may be particularly interesting to study both this perceived need and

conceptualization of entrepreneurship from the perspectives of teachers and administrators whom help comprise the artistic context of HME.

But again, so what – why does this all matter? Ultimately, an empirically based articulation of teachers' perspectives which includes “what” entrepreneurship is to them and “to what extent” it should be taught in HME may be useful for other educators whom have been given the assignment to teach arts entrepreneurship and whom can potentially identify with one of these perspectives. Subsequently, they can be directed to existing educational tools, resources, and knowledge for this quickly growing field. In other words, depending on a reader's own “what” and “to what extent” of entrepreneurship, it would be of value to provide some direction to further resources on the particular “how” of teaching arts entrepreneurship. If you are such a reader and you already know what your pedagogical perspective is and what actually needs to be or should be taught when it comes to teaching entrepreneurship in HME, simply skip ahead to table 6 towards the end of this paper to find the organization of resources and literature which may assist in the teaching of the subject.

For others, this article proceeds as follows. First, I briefly discuss the background literature which describes and explains the emergence of entrepreneurship education in HME, alongside the definitional diversity of the term entrepreneurship. I then conduct a thought experiment to demonstrate how different notions of the term entrepreneurship will influence how the subject is taught. I follow by presenting my research questions and method, after which I present the results from a small (n=37) survey of teachers and administrators in Norwegian HME alongside discussion and interpretation of these results. I conclude the paper by guiding both educators and readers to existing knowledge, tools, and resources in the literature as they relate to the various arts entrepreneurship pedagogical approaches examined in this study.

Background Literature

Research shows that musicians require a set of entrepreneurial skills (Lackeus, 2015) such as networking (Coulson, 2012), recognizing opportunities (Beckman, 2011; van Zuilenburg, 2012), and managing multiple

professional roles simultaneously (Brown, 2005; Cawsey, 1995) in order to maintain their careers in music. As a potential response, entrepreneurship education has been integrated into the higher arts education curriculum in the United States, Australia, Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK as a possible way to help arts students acquire such skills (Beckman, 2007; Brandenburg & Roosen, 2016; Pollard & Wilson, 2014; Thom, 2017). Norway is no exception to this trend, where in higher music education (HME) there are at least 35 courses where entrepreneurship is a stated competency goal and 49 obligatory courses where entrepreneurship is either a minor or main component of the course and that this offering has been growing since 2011 (Watne & Nymoen, 2017). Despite the growth of this curricular offering, which is commonly referred to as arts entrepreneurship education or sometimes cultural entrepreneurship (Essig, 2016), scholars and educators have a variety of interpretations and definitions of what the concept of arts entrepreneurship actually is (Chang & Wyszomirski, 2015; Essig & Guevara, 2016; Hong et al., 2012). Through their discussion about how different definitions of entrepreneurship are used by various actors in the music field, Watne and Nymoen (2017) note that the “music field makes it possible for different definitions of entrepreneurship” (p. 372).

Even the broader research field of entrepreneurship is no stranger to this definitional and interpretational variety of entrepreneurship (see Landström et al. 2012 for an excellent review of the entrepreneurship research field’s historical development). The following thought experiment may illustrate how different definitions of entrepreneurship may have a significant pedagogical impact. With 15,919 Google scholar citations as of May 29, 2020, one of the most highly cited definitions of entrepreneurship is offered by Shane and Venkataraman (2000), who define entrepreneurship as the “examination of how, by whom, and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated and exploited;” they speak primarily about acting upon and recognizing *opportunities*. Compare this with the definition proposed by Schumpeter (1934), whose notion of the word entrepreneurship relates more closely to *innovation* and “doing things that are not generally done in the ordinary course of business routine” (Schumpeter,

1934). To understand how these two distinct definitions might influence pedagogy, let's imagine a teacher in HME has been assigned the task of teaching a course in entrepreneurship. Now let's imagine that this teacher views entrepreneurship in the *opportunity* sense of the word as defined by Shane and Venkataraman. In this teacher's entrepreneurship course, students are asked to perform an assignment in which they must speak with their social networks, go out into their community, approach people they have never spoken to before and find an *opportunity* to book a performance gig in their own town within the next two hours. After preparing, promoting, and performing the event, they consider what new opportunities have emerged from it – whether it is connecting with a new audience or perhaps serendipitously meeting a promoter in attendance who wants to book them for another gig. This happens to be an actual entrepreneurship assignment that takes place at the Julliard School in New York City (Beeching, 2016). However, imagine instead this teacher defined entrepreneurship in the *innovation* sense described by Schumpeter. Based on this view of entrepreneurship, they might ask their students to be innovative and re-imagine, freshen up, and breathe new life into a classical piece of music in a way that it could connect with hip, young, modern audiences. Maybe these students would be assigned Ralph Vaughan Williams's *Lark Ascending* as an example of a piece from the classical repertoire whose performance needed an innovative re-imagining. This teacher would want their students to be entrepreneurial by being *innovative*, doing new things like incorporating real-time audience feedback mechanisms (like by using *Twitter*) into the piece's performance, or otherwise creating a new concert experience by combining things which had never been combined before. The above two definitions of entrepreneurship can be further contrasted by Gartner's (1988) own definition – entrepreneurship is simply *organization creation* or “the process by which new organizations come into existence.” If the teacher in our imagined example instead viewed entrepreneurship in this *organization creation* sense, they might simply have their students learn about the formalities of establishing a legal entity like a corporation or non-profit foundation, keeping records, filing taxes, issuing invoices, and other aspects of administering an organization.

Questions of “What”, “To What Extent”, and “How”

To summarize, I have so far argued that how an educator defines the concept of entrepreneurship may influence how they teach the subject, and that how they perceive the need of the subject may influence to what extent they teach it. It is important to note, however, that I have not argued there should be only one definition of entrepreneurship (the “what” of entrepreneurship in HME) or that there is an objective, optimal extent to which entrepreneurship should be integrated in the HME curriculum (the “to what extent” of entrepreneurship); nor it is the intent of this paper to argue such points. Instead, I submit that these latter questions of normativity are to be decided by the educators themselves based on their own arts entrepreneurship pedagogical perspective, which I define as being comprised of their definitions of entrepreneurship and their perceptions of its need in the curriculum – and that empirical research is lacking which characterizes what these perspectives actually are. Of the limited empirical research, which has explored educator perspectives, some evidence indicates that Norway may be an interesting context to examine these questions in more depth. In their survey of 23 leaders of Norwegian HME institutions, Watne and Nymoene (2017) found that a majority of participants believed musical skills to be more important than entrepreneurial skills when considering their institution’s strategic plans for teaching, plans which other research has shown teachers and leaders in Norwegian HME often refer to (Angelo et al., 2019). Yet, “a plurality of the participants admit[ted] that there is a potential for strengthening entrepreneurship teaching at their institutions. One reason given is the challenge of balancing entrepreneurship on one hand and ‘pure’ music subjects on the other” (p. 367) and that “participants’ own associations to the concept of entrepreneurship has an impact on their responses” (p. 381), perhaps because the “music field makes it possible for different definitions of entrepreneurship” (p. 372).

Thus, I have the following research questions:

RQ1. What are music teachers’ and administrators’ definitions of entrepreneurship in Norwegian HME?

RQ2. To what extent do music teachers and administrators perceive the need of entrepreneurship in relation to the current HME curricula in Norway?

RQ3. What existing educational tools, resources, and knowledge are available to help teachers teach entrepreneurship in higher music education depending on how they choose to teach it?

Method - Empirical Data

To answer research questions 1 and 2, a survey was disseminated to music teachers and administrators at institutes of HME in Norway during the spring of 2018. The survey was distributed through a variety of informal and formal channels such as social networks and e-mail lists. The sampling approach may be characterized as a type of nonprobability convenience sampling in which “members of the target population meet certain practical criteria, such as easy accessibility, geographical proximity, availability at a given time, or the willingness to participate are included for the purpose of the study” (Etikan et al., 2016, p. 2). However, this sample was also purposive in the sense that faculty in higher music education were the most appropriate individuals to participate in answering the research questions in this study (Bernard, 2006). The majority of institutes of HME in Norway were approached regarding the survey and respondents from 4 institutes were willing to participate and thirty-seven individuals from faculty responded, with 24 self-reporting their role in their HME institution as a “teacher”, 11 as an “administrator”, and 2 reporting as both “teacher” and “administrator”.

To answer research question 1, respondents were asked to answer the following open-ended question: “How do you define entrepreneurship?” To answer research question 2, respondents were first asked to respond to the following question using a likert-type scale: “To what extent do you see a need for a more market-oriented and entrepreneurial focus in today’s curriculum?” Those respondents who answered either “to some extent”, “to a large extent”, or “to a very large extent” to this question were then asked: “which concrete changes do you think should be done to the curriculum?” This follow-up question was asked to this subset of respondents for the following reasons: first, those teachers who see a greater need (McKillip,

1987) for entrepreneurship in music education may be more likely to argue or work towards its implementation in the HME curriculum in the future (Burke, 1991); second, such teachers are being directly asked what “concrete changes” they think should be done to the curriculum; and third, these responses may provide further qualitative insight into their arts entrepreneurship pedagogical perspectives. Readers should note that I relate and operationalize the words “entrepreneurship” and “entrepreneurial” in the same way that I relate and operationalize the words “music” and “musical”; the latter is simply the adjective form of the former, which is a noun.

After a discussion of results from research questions 1 and 2, RQ3 is addressed through an organization (via literature search) of some of the existing educational tools, resources, and knowledge available in the literature to orient the reader to relevant information, depending upon their arts entrepreneurship pedagogical perspective.

Method of Analysis

To analyze the results from research question 1, I use nine definitional themes of entrepreneurship which are listed in Table 1 as a template to analyze and code the respondents’ responses. This form of “template analysis” (Brooks et al., 2015) utilizes the same approach other researchers have used to study how music students define entrepreneurship in HME (Toscher & Bjørnø, 2019), and is based upon a literature review of the most influential and widely cited definitions of entrepreneurship used in both the entrepreneurship (Landström et al., 2012) and arts entrepreneurship research fields. For each of these definitions, table 1 displays the author, the thematic focus of that author’s definition, the word-for-word operationalized definition I used to analyze responses, and the full citation from which the definition first appeared in the literature. This table is provided for both the purposes of transparency in my research methodology but also to encourage the reader to familiarize themselves with these definitions (which may be new to them) and to begin contemplating just how different some of these definitions are. If you recall the previous discussion of how the *opportunity*, *innovation*, and *organization creation* definitions of entrepreneurship would affect the teaching of the subject,

Table 1 Definitions of Entrepreneurship Used to Code Responses

Authors	Definition - Thematic Focus	Operationalized Definition	Work
Shane and Venkataraman	Opportunity	"The field of entrepreneurship [is] the scholarly examination of how, by whom, and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated and exploited."	Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> , 25(1), 217-226.
Schumpeter	Innovation and Disequilibrium	"... entrepreneurship, as defined, consists in doing things that are not generally done in the ordinary course of business routine, it is essentially a phenomenon that comes under the wider aspect of leadership."	Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). <i>Theory of economic development</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Gartner	Organization Creation	"The creation of organizations, the process by which new organizations come into existence."	Gartner, W. B. (1988). "Who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question. <i>American Journal of Small Business</i> , 12(4), 11-32.
Knight	Uncertainty	"Entrepreneurs attempt to predict and act upon change within markets. The entrepreneur bears the uncertainty of market dynamics"	Knight, F. H. (2012). <i>Risk, uncertainty and profit</i> . Courier Corporation.
Kirzner	Alertness/Arbitrage	In essence, entrepreneurship is the recognition and action upon profit opportunities, and the entrepreneur is like an arbitrageur	Kirzner, I. M. (1973). <i>Competition and entrepreneurship</i> . University of Chicago press.
McClelland	Personal Traits and Characteristics	An entrepreneur is "someone who exercises some control over the means of production and produces more than he can consume in order to sell (or exchange) it for individual (or household) income ... In practice such people turned out to be traders, independent artisans and firm operators."	Child, Storm, and Veroff (1958), as cited by McClelland, D. C. (1961). <i>The achievement society</i> . Princeton, NJ: Von Nostrand.
Casson	Information and Volatility	"Establishment of)... organisations which identify and monitor key sources of volatility"	Casson, M. (1982). <i>The entrepreneur: An economic theory</i> . Rowman & Littlefield.
Penrose	Resources, Subjectivity, & Growth	Growth orientation	Penrose, E.T. (1959). <i>The Theory of the Growth of the Firm</i> . New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
Bruyat and Julien	New Value Creation	"Entrepreneurship is the dialogic between individual and new value creation"	Bruyat, C., & Julien, P. A. (2001). Defining the field of research in entrepreneurship. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 16(2), 165-180.
Norwegian Dictionary	New Venture Creation	"Initiative and ability to create new business"	Språkrådet og Universitetet i Bergen. (n.d.). <i>Entreprenørskap</i> . In <i>Bokmålsordboka</i> . Retrieved October 28, 2020, from https://ordbok.uib.no/perl/ordbok.cgi?OPP=entreprenørskap

one can begin to consider how the six other definitional themes influence the nature of an assignment in the entrepreneurship classroom.

To analyze the results for research question 2, I first present the descriptive statistics resulting from the responses to the likert-type scale question. I then perform a qualitative content analysis (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Mayring, 2000) of the open-ended responses from respondents who indicated a need for more market-oriented and entrepreneurial focus in the current curriculum to either “some”, “large”, or “very large” extents. These responses are then coded using Bridgstock’s (2013) typology of arts entrepreneurship education approaches as a template. Examples of how responses were coded according to Bridgstock’s typology can be found in the right-hand most column of table 5 in the results section. Bridgstock’s (2013) effort may represent the most comprehensive typology of arts entrepreneurship education, which could be interpreted as the pedagogical manifestation of the perceived needs of entrepreneurship by those educators who created the courses which form the basis of such a typology. Building on Beckman’s (2007) early empirical efforts to understand the pedagogical approaches to arts entrepreneurship, Bridgstock (2013) describes three main approaches to the subject: (1) employability and career self-management, (2) being enterprising, and (3) new venture creation. While the *employability and career self-management* approach focuses on “the artist’s ability to build a sustainable career through recurrently obtaining or creating arts employment, and the skills relating to career self-management” (p. 127), and the *being enterprising* approach is about “less tangible capabilities such as opportunity recognition, entrepreneurial behavior, or resilience ... the identification or creation of artistic opportunities and exploitation of those opportunities in terms of applying or sharing artistic activity in order to add value of some kind” (p. 126), the *new venture creation* approach “is a more traditional view which corresponds the most closely to Business School notions of entrepreneurship ... students learn skills and knowledge associated with starting and growing an artistic enterprise, including sales and marketing, legal issues, business strategy and finance” (pp. 125–126).

Finally, to analyze the results for research question 3, I use Bridgstock’s typology to organize a list of resources, tools, and knowledge in

conjunction with recent research from Schediwy et al. (2019). Schediwy et al. have created an inventory of factors as they relate to each type of arts entrepreneurship approach described by Bridgstock and directly address a perceived need for entrepreneurship in HME. This inventory of factors is based on their empirical survey of 167 music students in HME in which they used Bridgstock's typology to identify, articulate, and empirically test 22 concrete factors which determine pedagogical activity; they then surveyed music students to understand music students' perceptions of the need for these factors as they relate to their future careers. While Schediwy et al. applied these factors to the perspectives of students, this study is concerned with these factors as perceived by the music faculty, and is thus concerned with how teachers may practically approach teaching arts entrepreneurship depending upon their own perceptions of the need for the topic in the curriculum and their pedagogical perspective.

Results and Discussion

In this section, I present and discuss the results from the survey organized by their relation to each specific research question.

RQ1. What are music teachers' and administrators' definitions of entrepreneurship?

The results for RQ1 relate to questions of "what" in arts entrepreneurship education, and table 2 shows that the most frequent definition offered by the respondents relates to opportunity (32%) in the sense proposed by Shane and Venkataraman (2000). This indicates that perhaps amongst the respondents, the term entrepreneurship is not predominantly viewed to be in conflict with aesthetic ideals, such as the notion of "art-for-arts-sake" (Beckman, 2005, p. 21). This conflict may emerge by those teachers and administrators who view entrepreneurship education as simply vocational training, which has been observed to "be a conflict between the mission of liberal arts institutions and entrepreneurship education ... an obstacle" (Beckman, 2007, p. 93). The pedagogical implications of framing entrepreneurship in this opportunity sense should not be understated. First, whereas a teacher's framing of entrepreneurship as strictly "new venture creation" may see students learning relevant information and performing

tasks relevant for their career (like how to write a grant application or understanding how to set up a legal entity), this information could arguably be learned from books and, as is the case with the trade-offs involved in any course design, taught in lieu of other more experiential activities directly related to recognizing and acting upon opportunities as an artist – something which is arguably relevant for music students who may often need to act as “artist-producers” (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012) in creating their own flow of sustainable projects and gigs. Indeed, with only 5% of the respondents defining entrepreneurship in the “new venture creation” sense, it may appear that the majority of respondents are perhaps in agreement with this perspective. Notably, the second most frequently offered definitions relates to “self-employment” (22%). In related research, this was the most frequently offered definition on a survey of Norwegian music students with approximately 32% of the respondents defining entrepreneurship in this way (Toscher & Bjørnø, 2019). It may not be surprising that this is the second most common definition of entrepreneurship in this study, as “employment and career self-management” has been offered as its own type of arts entrepreneurship pedagogy by Bridgstock (2013) due to its observed prevalence in practice. An understanding of career options and the encouragement of students to take ownership over their careers are argued, by Schediwy et al. (2019), to be factors which comprise this pedagogical approach. Unsurprisingly, these important and applicable aspects of career preview have been explored elsewhere in the literature (Bennett & Bridgstock, 2015), and given the nature of portfolio careers which many artists must maintain (Cawsey, 1995), it may make sense why self-employment was the second most common definition. Further, the third most common definition was in the Schumpeterian sense of “innovation”, which may indicate the respondents in general situate the concept of entrepreneurship in a broader sense than simply vocational training. Regardless, the respondents did not uniformly define entrepreneurship in a singular sense, nor do I argue that they should. Instead, I submit that how they define entrepreneurship is important since it will influence how and what they teach. The findings show that there are indeed many different definitions of the term, and that perhaps a first step in making a choice in how to teach the subject is an array of choices, which articulates and

makes explicit these different perspectives. In order to consider and re-examine how one thinks about a subject, I would argue they first need to expose their own thoughts on the subject. In this sense, the present study makes a contribution to making explicit such a range of options.

Table 2 Presents the results of how the respondent music teachers and administrators defined entrepreneurship

Definition of Entrepreneurship (Author (s))	# of Respondents	% of Sample
Self-Employment / Personal Traits (McClelland)	8	22%
Opportunity (Shane and Venkataraman)	12	32%
Business Creation (Norwegian Dictionary)	3	8%
No answer	3	8%
Organization Creation (Gartner)	4	11%
New Value Creation (Bruyat and Julien)	2	5%
Innovation (Schumpeter)	5	14%

Table 2 – Music Teachers' and Administrators' Coded Definitions of Entrepreneurship

RQ2. To what extent do music teachers and administrators perceive the need of entrepreneurship in relation to the current HME curricula in Norway?

The results to RQ2 are summarized in tables 3, 4, and 5. Table 3 presents results which show how respondents perceive the general need of entrepreneurship courses in HME and table 4 elaborates on this perception by showing to what extent respondents' perceive a need for a more market-oriented and entrepreneurial focus in the current HME curriculum. Table 5 further builds upon these perceptions of the extent of need, and displays results for the concrete changes which should be made to the current HME curriculum according to those respondents who perceive a further need for entrepreneurship to "some" or a "large" extent.

The results of RQ2 relate to questions of "what extent" in arts entrepreneurship education, and table 3 shows that a large majority (95%) of respondents view a need for entrepreneurship courses in Norwegian HME. This result is a piece of evidence which could indicate that the conflict between arts and entrepreneurship described elsewhere in the literature (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Bridgstock, 2013; Moore, 2016) may not be

a significant issue for the respondents in terms of their view of its need in the curriculum. Watne and Nymoens's (2017) finding that in Norwegian HME there were at least 35 courses where entrepreneurship is a stated competency goal and 49 obligatory courses where entrepreneurship is either a minor or main component of that course further supports this view. They also found that entrepreneurship courses had been increasingly offered since 2011. As seen in table 4, the majority (57%) perceive there to be a need for a more market-oriented and entrepreneurial focus in the curriculum to "some extent" and 19% to a "large extent", perhaps indicating that the trend Watne and Nymoens observed may continue into the future. While roughly a quarter (24%) of the respondents view the need for more entrepreneurship to a "very little" or "little" extent, the concrete changes prescribed by those who perceive a greater need reveal what type of arts entrepreneurship pedagogical approaches should be implemented. Table 5 displays the distribution of these prescriptive changes using Bridgstock's (2013) typology of arts entrepreneurship pedagogy, with 61% prescribing *career self-management*, 7% prescribing *being enterprising*, and 14% prescribing the *new venture creation* type of arts entrepreneurship pedagogy. Eighteen percent could not be coded to Bridgstock's typology; however, based upon these specific responses, this seems much more likely due to a misunderstanding of the question rather than respondents providing a response which could not be reasonably coded to the typology as it currently is, as opposed to representing a potentially fourth type of pedagogy. Whether there is indeed a fourth type of pedagogy is another interesting question, which could perhaps be answered by performing a thorough analysis of entrepreneurship curricula and course descriptions in HME all over the world. Examples of how these responses were coded are included in table 5.

These results are not particularly surprising when considered in light of the frequency which the "self-employment" definition was provided by respondents. The predominance of this *career self-management* perspective seems to be consistent with other discussions regarding vocational training in the arts entrepreneurship literature, which again may not be a big surprise. It is also notable that despite "opportunity" being the most commonly provided definition of entrepreneurship by respondents, the

pedagogical approach in which the idea of opportunity recognition and action arguably most closely fits – the “being enterprising” approach – was prescribed the least frequently. One can speculate in many different directions as to why this is the case. But I will offer a few potential ideas. First, perhaps in the field of arts entrepreneurship education, where to many administrators the “practical experience of potential instructors” is balanced against their “academic legitimacy” (Beckman, 2007 p. 94), such educators may lack to a certain extent formal pedagogical training related to the “being enterprising” approach. This approach closely resembling other experiential entrepreneurship education with origins in the disciplines of business and economics (Cooper et al., 2004; Neck & Corbett, 2018). Alternatively, it could be these respondents are personally aware of the real and observed demands of being a self-employed musician in a portfolio career that awaits students after they graduate. This reality might simply weigh more heavily on the minds’ of these respondents, and that the correspondent *career self-management* approach is perhaps more concrete than the “less tangible” (Bridgstock, 2013, p. 126) approach of *being enterprising*, thus arguably more appropriate to address what some may call a HME in “crisis” (Orning, 2017).

While I cannot conclusively argue for a new typology of arts entrepreneurship pedagogical perspectives, various responses in the survey allude to the broad spectrum of views when it comes to the suitability and extent entrepreneurship’s integration in HME. For example, while one respondent said that “we need to assure that entrepreneurial thinking is a common thread throughout all the music performance subjects. [Entrepreneurship] has to be integrated into other subjects to a greater extent rather than replacing them.” Another said there should be a “big focus on creating your own projects/brands, and give students knowledge and tools to maintain/administer these.” However, other respondents took a rather different perspective. One noted that “I think it is sad such a [entrepreneurship] course is necessary in music education, I think to be a musician should be the only thing necessary in a music education,” and another that “I am also unsure to which degree it should be up to the educational institutions to take care of this knowledge. As I said in the previous answer, I think it is up to the students themselves, which

has a lot of positive sides.” This could be interpreted as evidence of the previously documented debates regarding entrepreneurship’s place in the arts curriculum (Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Moore, 2016; Roberts, 2013), but more importantly, it points to the diversity, importance and power of the individual teacher’s perspective. Further, this qualitative result also tells a somewhat different story than the quantitative results from RQ1 and RQ2 discussed earlier – a subtle narrative difference which perhaps reinforces the importance and influence of a single individual teacher’s autonomy and perspective on the matter. It is the teacher, after all, who has a regular practice of meeting the student during the coursework.

Table 3 Respondents (Teachers and Administrators) Perceptions of the Need for Entrepreneurship Courses in Norwegian HME

“Is there a need for music-oriented entrepreneurship courses at institutes of higher education in Norway?”		
	# of Respondents	% of Sample
Yes	35	95%
No	2	5%

Table 4 Respondents (Teachers and Administrators) Perceptions of the Extent of the Need for A More Market-Oriented and Entrepreneurial Focus in the Current Curriculum

“To what extent do you see a need for a more market-oriented and entrepreneurial focus in today’s curriculum?”		
Extent of Further Need	# of Respondents	% of Sample
To a very little extent	3	8%
To a little extent	6	16%
To some extent	21	57%
To a large extent	7	19%

RQ3. What existing educational tools, resources, and knowledge are available to help teachers teach entrepreneurship in higher music education depending on how they choose to teach it?

Table 6 presents a list of factors from Schediwy et al.’s (2019) Perceived Need of Entrepreneurship Education Scale. This scale is comprised of a list of factors which are then organized into one of 3 arts entrepreneurship education pedagogical types described by Bridgstock (2013). I then present, in the

Table 5 Responses by Surveyed Teachers and Administrators as to What Concrete Changes Should be Made to Current Curriculum

Those who answered there is a further need for entrepreneurship to 'some extent', to a 'large extent', were asked "what concrete changes should be made?" Responses coded to Bridgstock, 2013			
Arts Entrepreneurship Pedagogical Approach (Bridgstock, 2013)	# of Respondents	%	Example Responses
Career Self Management	17	61%	R13: "Give the students various practical experiences during their bachelor studies, so that they come in contact with working life and the music field. To a greater extent include project based courses which give students experience with entrepreneurial thinking which is relevant for musicians." -- R12: "I Don't know. I think it is sad that such a subject is necessary in a music education, because I think to be a musician should be the only important thing in the education. I also see however that a certain level of knowledge about the market and entrepreneurship can be necessary to be able to meet the working life."
Being Enterprising	2	7%	R23: "Entrepreneurship is necessary but it is almost receiving too much focus. It shouldn't be the new religion. Teaching in entrepreneurship should have with it the philosophical and ideological foundations that entrepreneurial thought builds upon." -- R6: "We have to ensure that entrepreneurial thinking goes as a 'common thread' through all music performance courses. It has to be integrated in other courses to a greater extent rather than becoming it's own subject."
New Venture Creation	4	14%	R25: "Greater focus on making your own projects/brands, and giving the students the knowledge and tools to manage/adminster these." -- R35: "Involve the students more in concert production: make an interesting concert program, plan a tour, run public relations, promote ideas and concepts around the concert to the audience."
Could not be coded // No answer	5	18%	R30: "I base my choice here on statements I have heard from students. I know too little about teaching and teaching components to suggest changes or improvements." -- R19: "We should prepare for more study programs where students that don't fit into classical, jazz or folk music can also be adapted for the teaching."

Table 6 Existing Knowledge, Tools, and Resources Addressing Specific Perceived Needs for Entrepreneurship Education in HME

Factor from Perceived Need of Entrepreneurship Education Scale (adapted from Schediwy et al., 2019)	Promising Existing Resource Which Explores This Factor in Depth
<i>Employment and Career Self-Management</i>	
Self-confidence	Bandura, A. (2010). Self-efficacy. <i>The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology</i> , 1-3.
Dealing with challenges in music industry	Vaag, J., Giæver, F., & Bjerkeset, O. (2014). Specific demands and resources in the career of the Norwegian freelance musician. <i>Arts & Health</i> , 6(3), 205-222.
Being flexible and adaptive in career	Johnson, S. (2015). <i>Who moved my cheese?</i> Random House.
Encouragement in ownership of career	Hall, D. T. (2004). The protean career: A quarter-century journey. <i>Journal of vocational behavior</i> , 65(1), 1-13.
Career options in music sector	Baskerville, D., & Baskerville, T. (2018). <i>Music business handbook and career guide</i> . Sage Publications.
Managing uncertainty and taking risk	"Strategies for Dealing with Uncertainty and Risk", pp. 39-43. Anderton, C., Dubber, A., & James, M. (2012). <i>Understanding the music industries</i> . Sage.
<i>Being Enterprising</i>	
Identifying and recognizing opportunities	Saks, N. T., & Gaglio, C. M. (2002). Can opportunity identification be taught? <i>Journal of Enterprising Culture</i> , 10(04), 313-347.
Innovative thinking	Brousseau, K. R., Driver, M. J., Eneroth, K., & Larson, R. (1996). Career pandemonium: Realignment organizations and individuals. <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i> , 10(4), 52-66.
"What record labels think is good music"	Essling, Christian and Koenen, Johannes and Peukert, Christian, Competition for Attention in the Digital Age: The Case of Single Releases in the Recorded Music Industry (May 22, 2017). Information Economics and Policy, Forthcoming. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2444708 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2444708
Self promotion to record labels, publishers, and syncing services	Powers, D. (2011). Bruce Springsteen, rock criticism, and the music business: Towards a theory and history of hype. <i>Popular Music and Society</i> , 34(02), 203-219.
"What music journalists care about"	Kearney, S. A. (2010). Could the professional music journalist vanish in the digital age URL: www.clearmindedcreative.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Could-the-Professional-Music-Journalist-Vanish.pdf .

Factor from Perceived Need of Entrepreneurship Education Scale (adapted from Schediwy et al., 2019)	Promising Existing Resource Which Explores This Factor in Depth
Understanding audience preference and behavior	Participations Journal of Audience & Reception Studies https://www.participations.org/
Developing audience	Beeching, A. M. (2016). Who is audience? <i>Arts and Humanities in Higher Education</i> , 15(3-4), 395-400.
Promoting to journalists	Waters, R. D., Tindall, N. T., & Morton, T. S. (2010). Media catching and the journalist-public relations practitioner relationship: How social media are changing the practice of media relations. <i>Journal of Public Relations Research</i> , 22(3), 241-264.
<i>New Venture Creation</i>	
Managerial finance	Warren, C., Reeve, J. M., & Duchac, J. (2013). <i>Financial & managerial accounting</i> . Cengage Learning. (*The applicability of law varies jurisdiction by jurisdiction, or country by country; so educators are advised to find a resource which applies to their jurisdiction/country.)
Business Strategy	Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. <i>Academy of management Review</i> , 26(2), 243-263.
Marketing	O'Reilly, D., Larsen, G., Kubacki, K., & Larsen, G. (2013). <i>Music, markets and consumption</i> . Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers Limited.
Starting a business	Educators are advised to find a resource which is suitable for your jurisdiction/country/state regarding incorporation of a business.
Legal issues in the music industry	Stim, R. (2018). <i>Music law: How to run your band's business</i> . Nolo. (*The applicability of law varies jurisdiction by jurisdiction, or country by country; so educators are advised to find a resource which applies to their jurisdiction/country)
Writing grant applications	DeVereaux, C. (2015). Fund-Raising and Grant-Writing Basics for Arts Managers. <i>The Arts Management Handbook: New Directions for Students and Practitioners</i> Gamble, J. R., Brennan, M., & McAdam, R. (2017). A rewarding experience? Exploring how crowdfunding is affecting music industry business models. <i>Journal of business research</i> , 70, 25-36.
Selling music	Peter Tschmuck's Music Business Research article database is a comprehensive resource which contains many articles related to selling music in the music industry, as well as other factors listed in this table: https://musicbusinessresearch.wordpress.com/article-database/ (Accessed January 23, 2020)

right hand column, promising existing resources which explores these factors in greater depth and could be used as an educational tool, resource, or record of knowledge to help teachers of entrepreneurship in higher music education, depending on which factor they perceive to be important and which type of arts entrepreneurship pedagogy they embrace.

Finally, while it is not the aim of this paper to thoroughly examine such individual teacher autonomy nor to argue for the importance of such autonomy, table 6 does provide existing knowledge, tools, and resources which address specific perceived needs for entrepreneurship education in HME. The intention behind this table is to direct the reader (who may perhaps be a teacher interested in arts entrepreneurship education) to existing resources and knowledge, and allow the reader to direct themselves to those resources depending upon how they perceive the need of entrepreneurship in music education, and as such, respects their autonomy. The list is not exhaustive, and is merely a starting point for further study.

Limitations

This study has a few limitations. First, despite that respondents provide their own definitions and perceptions of the need for entrepreneurship in HME, this may not be a perfect proxy for understanding how those who teach entrepreneurship in these institutional contexts actually do so in practice. In the future, a case study could be conducted with a purposeful sample of the teachers actually teaching entrepreneurship at these institutions in order to study their perspectives in greater depth. Second, a future study could benefit from both building on some of the initial findings from this exploratory pilot survey in order to build a refined survey instrument and increase the number of respondents. While there were thirty-seven respondents for the survey used in this study, there are many more teachers and administrators working in HME – meaning this number of respondents could be seen as low. This study has not attempted to make statistical predictions to larger populations or to demonstrate any causality or correlative relationship – thus increasing the total number of respondents in a future study could help further characterize the perspectives of those teaching in Norwegian HME. Further, my nonprobability

sampling approach in this study could be considered convenience sampling (Etikan et al., 2016), thus the findings are limited to the samples themselves, rather than as representative of a broader population (such as, for example, the entirety of teachers in higher music education in either Norway or the entire world) due to uncertainties surrounding generalizability. In convenience samples as in this study, participation is to a large extent based on whom I had access to and whom was willing to participate in a study, thus raising the prospect that those participants who feel strongly about an issue may be the individuals more likely to participate (Sousa et al., 2004). This is a potential response bias which should be recognized as a limitation. Third, besides respondents' self-reporting as either a "teacher" or "administrator", this study does not make use of any other information which could further describe respondents' roles and responsibilities within their educational institution. Future studies could examine their perspectives on entrepreneurship based on a more granular analysis of these varying roles and responsibilities, and whether there are any interesting differences between such perspectives or between teachers and administrators. This type of analysis, however, was not the aim of this study. Finally, it should be noted that the empirical context of this study is in Norwegian HME, and that there exists a diversity of socio-economic and cultural contexts throughout the world. In turn, various endogenous aspects of such cultural contexts may have an impact on this study's findings or impacts on a future study, if it was conducted in a different socio-economic context. For example, there could be significant differences in cultural policy and the perspectives on the roles of both the market and the state as a source for finance or economic stimulus in the professional lives of musicians when comparing contexts such as the USA and Norway. As such, the reader is encouraged to consider the context of this study, and it may be of interest in future studies to replicate this study's approach in a variety of different contexts.

Conclusion

This study has empirically explored music teachers' and administrators' perspectives on entrepreneurship in Norwegian higher music education –

in particular questions related to the “what”, “to what extent”, and “how” of entrepreneurship in HME. Through a small survey, the results indicate that the most common definitions of entrepreneurship relate to the “opportunity”, “self-employment” and “innovation” definitions of the word – indicating the respondents do not view entrepreneurship as simply business creation, but frame the concept a bit more broadly as it relates to a life living, working, and creating as a musician. However, while 95% of respondents perceive a need for entrepreneurship courses in the HME curriculum and 76% perceive that the current curriculum needs a more market-oriented and entrepreneurial focus to either “some” or a “large extent”, 61% of these respondents think such changes should be implemented through what may be characterized as the *career self-management* type of arts entrepreneurship pedagogy. The tendency to prescribe this type of pedagogical approach most frequently, despite the prevalence of the “opportunity” definition offered by respondents and that “opportunity” most closely relates to the competing *being enterprising* approach, is an interesting finding. One can further question whether this is due to a lack of formal training or familiarity in experiential education pedagogy associated with the *being enterprising* approach in arts entrepreneurship pedagogy; or whether the more immediate, practical concerns of the likely realities of self-employment/portfolio careers faced by students upon graduation may explain this notable discrepancy. Regardless, through the examination of the diversity of perspectives of entrepreneurship in HME, the importance and influence of the individual educator’s perspective and pedagogical autonomy is highlighted amidst what some may call the increasing institutionalization of entrepreneurship into HME as interpreted by its recent growth. The question of how and what should be taught is a normative inquiry which is not the aim of this chapter, and is perhaps better addressed in a broader analysis of educational policy and what the goals of HME should be. Irrespective, an evidence-based investigation which might include an examination of identified needs from professional musicians within a given socio-economic context or the measured learning outcomes of pedagogical interventions, may be a significant contribution to the study of what and how entrepreneurship in HME should be taught. But for now, a list of resources related to the

teaching of entrepreneurship in the context of HME – depending on an individual's own arts entrepreneurship pedagogical perspective – is provided in an effort to assist those in this quickly growing field.

References

- Angelo, E., Varkøy, Ø., & Georgii-Hemming, E. (2019). Notions of mandate, knowledge and research in norwegian classical music performance studies. *Journal for Research in Arts and Sports Education*, 3(1), 78–100. <https://doi.org/10.23865/jased.v3.1284>
- Beckman, G. D. (2005). The entrepreneurship curriculum for music students: Thoughts towards a consensus. *College Music Symposium*, 45(2005), 13–24. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/40374517>
- Beckman, G. D. (2007). “Adventuring” arts entrepreneurship curricula in higher education: An examination of present efforts, obstacles, and best practices. *Journal of Arts Management Law and Society*, 37(2), 87–112. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JAML.37.2.87-112>
- Beckman, G. D. (2011). Disciplining arts entrepreneurship education: A call to action. In G. Beckman (Ed.), *Disciplining the arts: Teaching entrepreneurship in context* (pp. 25–33). Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Beeching, A. M. (2016). Who is audience? *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 15(3–4), 395–400. <https://doi/10.1177/1474022216647390>
- Bennett, D., & Bridgstock, R. (2015). The urgent need for career preview: Student expectations and graduate realities in music and dance. *International Journal of Music Education*, 33(3), 263–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761414558653>
- Bernard, H. R. (2006). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (4th ed.). Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bonin-Rodriguez, P. (2012). What's in a name? Typifying artist entrepreneurship in community based training. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(1), 9–24.
- Brandenburg, S., & Roosen, T. (2016). Toward an adapted business modeling method to improve entrepreneurial skills among art students. *A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 5(1), 25–33.
- Bridgstock, R. (2013). Not a dirty word: Arts entrepreneurship and higher education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 12(2–3), 122–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022212465725>
- Brook, J., & Fostaty Young, S. (2019). Exploring post-degree employment of recent music alumni. *International Journal of Music Education*, 37(1), 142–155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761418821165>

- Brooks, J., McCluskey, S., Turley, E., & King, N. (2015). The utility of template analysis in qualitative psychology research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(2), 202–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2014.955224>
- Brown, R. (2005). Performing arts creative enterprise: Approaches to promoting entrepreneurship in arts higher education. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 6(3), 159–167. <https://doi.org/10.5367/0000000054662836>
- Burke, P. J. (1991). Attitudes, behavior, and the self. In J. A. Howard & P. L. Callero (Eds.), *Self-society dynamic: Cognition, emotion, and action* (pp. 189–208). Cambridge University Press.
- Cawsey, T. (1995). The portfolio career as a response to a changing job market. *Journal of Career Planning and Employment*, 56(1), 41–46.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.34053/artivate.4.2.0011>
- Cooper, S., Bottomley, C., & Gordon, J. (2004). Stepping out of the classroom and up the ladder of learning an experiential learning approach to entrepreneurship education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 18(1), 11–22.
- Coulson, S. (2012). Collaborating in a competitive world: Musicians' working lives and understandings of entrepreneurship. *Work, Employment and Society*, 26(2), 246–261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017011432919>
- Eikhof, D. R., & Haunschild, A. (2006). Lifestyle meets market: Bohemian entrepreneurs in creative industries. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15(3), 234–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2006.00392.x>
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Essig, L., & Guevara, J. (2016). A landscape of arts entrepreneurship in US higher education. https://herbergerinstitute.asu.edu/sites/default/files/a_landscape_of_arts_entrepreneurship_in_us_higher_education_o.pdf
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). “Who is an entrepreneur?” is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4), 11–32.
- Hong, C., Essig, L., & Bridgstock, R. (2012). The enterprising artist and the arts entrepreneur: emergent pedagogies for new disciplinary habits of mind. In N. Chick, A. Haynie, & R. Gurung (Eds.), *Exploring more signature pedagogies: Approaches to teaching disciplinary habits of mind* (pp. 68–84). Stylus.
- Lackeus, M. (2015). Entrepreneurship in education: What, why, when, how. *Background Paper for OECD-LEED*, 1–45. <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/>

- BGP_Entrepreneurship-in-Education.pdf%0Ahttp://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/
BGP_Entrepreneurship-in-Education.pdf
- Landström, H., Harirchi, G., & Åström, F. (2012). Entrepreneurship: Exploring the knowledge base. *Research Policy*, 41(7), 1154–1181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.03.009>
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2).
- McKillip, J. (1987). *Need analysis: Tools for the human services and education (applied social research methods)*. Sage Publications.
- Moore, A. (2016). Neoliberalism and the musical entrepreneur. *Journal of the Society for American Music*, 10(1), 33–53. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S175219631500053X>
- Mulcahy, K. V. (2003). Entrepreneurship or cultural darwinism? Privatization and American cultural patronage. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 165–184.
- Neck, H. M., & Corbett, A. C. (2018). The scholarship of teaching and learning entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(1), 8–41.
- Orning, T. (2017). If higher music education is in crisis, how do we solution ? *Music & Practice*, 3.
- Pollard, V., & Wilson, E. (2014). The “entrepreneurial mindset” in creative and performing arts higher education in Australia. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1234/artivate.v3i1.67>
- Roberts, J. S. (2013). 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), 53–63.
- Schediwy, L., Bhansing, P. V, Loots, E., & Group, F. (2018). Young musicians' career identities: Do bohemian and entrepreneurial career identities compete or cohere? *Creative Industries Journal*, 11(2), 174–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2018.1489197>
- Schediwy, L., Loots, E., & Bhansing, P. (2019). With their feet on the ground: A quantitative study of music students' attitudes towards entrepreneurship education students' attitudes towards entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Education and Work*, 31(7–8), 611–627. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2018.1562160>
- Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Harvard University Press.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.
- Sousa, V. D., Zauszniewski, J. A., & Musil, C. M. (2004). How to determine whether a convenience sample represents the population. *Applied Nursing Research*, 17(2), 130–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2004.03.003>
- Thom, M. (2017). Arts entrepreneurship education in the UK and Germany. *Education + Training*, 59(4), 406–426. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-05-2016-0089>

- Toscher, B. (2019). The skills and knowledge gap in higher music education: An exploratory empirical study. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*. <http://doi.org/10.26209/ijea21n10>
- Toscher, B., & Bjørnø, A. M. (2019). Music students' definitions, evaluations, and rationalizations of entrepreneurship. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 49(6), 389–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2019.1646178>
- Van Zuilenburg, P. L. (2012). Personality traits of successful music entrepreneurs. *Acta Academica*, 45(1), 100–118.
- Watne, Å., & Nymoen, K. (2017). Entreprenørskap i høyere norsk musikkutdanning [Entrepreneurship in Norwegian higher music education]. In Ø. Varkøy, E. Georgii-Hemming, A. Kallio, & F. Pio (Eds.), *Nordic Research in Music Education, Yearbook 18*, 367–385. <http://hdl.handle.net/11250/2490527>
- Wyzomirski, M., & Chang, W. J. (2017). Professional self-structuration in the arts: Sustaining creative careers in the 21st century. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 9(6), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9061035>