Introduction from the Editors

Gary D. Beckman and Josef Hanson

A (hopefully) post COVID-era welcome to this special issue of the *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Education*. This is the first of three special editions. A second featuring student authors exclusively is expected near the new year and a third focusing on decision makers’ thoughts on the field should follow shortly after. The focus of this issue is teaching case studies—a somewhat popular topic for many in the field. In an effort to take a more innovative tack, we enlisted JAEE board member Dr. Emma Fleck from the Sigmund Weis School of Business at Susquehanna University to lead this special issue.¹

Most understand the teaching case study model as something generated by our colleagues in the business school. However, since there is interest on the topic and most are unfamiliar with case studies as a pedagogical technique, we asked Dr. Fleck to develop an introductory guide in case study development specifically for Arts Entrepreneurship educators. This special issue is in two parts: (1) a brief guide for Arts Entrepreneurship educators desiring to develop case studies, written by Dr. Fleck, and (2) two teaching cases with accompanying instructor’s manuals. Our aim is for educators to use Dr. Fleck’s guide to generate case studies and then submit these works for publication and subsequent use by the field. Note that research case studies using descriptive, ethnographic, or mixed methodologies, while not featured in this issue, are equally vital to the field and worthy of publication in future issues of the JAEE.

Interest in the case model for pedagogical and research purposes is axiomatic. Since this emerging field’s suffix is “entrepreneurship,” we naturally look to our parent discipline for many things: scholarship and pedagogical materials lead the way for many. As we know, case studies are both critical and prevalent in business school pedagogy. However, not implementing this model—especially in our context—has been an obvious gap in the field’s pedagogy, which has implications for the field’s growth and sustainability.

Emerging fields develop by borrowing from other disciplines and noting differences in scholarship, theoretical models and pedagogical trajectories. However, there does come a time when borrowing simply becomes ineffective if not inauthentic and indistinguishable from the borrowed disciplines. The rub, then, is (in part) to determine how this borrowing either informs or provides a basis for the development of what is unique in the emerging field. It appears our scholarship is beginning to show some of this growth. We ask then: is our pedagogy?

¹ Special thanks to others who assisted with this issue: Dr. Rand Harmon (University of Northern Colorado), Andrew Heise (University of Missouri-Kansas City) and Dr. Jonathan Gangi (Pennsylvania State University).
ment, many educators continuously experiment with pedagogical innovations in the classroom. As most of us know, some things work and some do not. The point is that many educators appear to intrinsically feel that our prefix should inform our pedagogy, which requires educators to identify what distinguishes *Arts* Entrepreneurship from *Entrepreneurship*.

When speaking to fellow educators, there is an almost collective sense of not knowing how to genuinely innovate our pedagogy. Certainly, we can look at models and apply them to classroom topics, yet the lack of direction is palpable: how do we take an existing pedagogical model and craft it to reflect our field for our students? Though the reasons for our apparent reluctance to seriously engage this question (in this context) may be multifaceted, this resulting hesitation to share our classroom successes (and failures) may be stifling the field’s pedagogical development. Shared experiences help everyone and radical innovations change everything—including disciplinary identity. For example, Schumpeter’s famous “creative destruction” remark separated (at least in a theoretical if not moral context) the emerging field of Entrepreneurship from its parent discipline of “Business.” The differences are there for all to see, yet Schumpeter provided the needed impetus the *then* field needed to construct its identity as we understand it today. Perhaps Schumpeter provides a model for our field as well.

This special issue of the Journal suggests that case studies are critical (in part) to constructing the field’s pedagogical identity. Specifically, this issue provides an opportunity for educators to interrogate that which is unique to *Arts* Entrepreneurship. Yes, we should be asking these questions via our theoretical discourse, but this questioning can also occur through our shared pedagogical innovations and experiences. Trickle-down scholarship takes time to reach the classroom and perhaps our field’s broader identity can be marked or constructed (again in part) by pedagogical responses. A more research-based “trickle up” case study topic could interrogate how aesthetics (writ large) is both leveraged and critical in differentiating from (and properly uniting with) our parent discipline. The opportunity for identifying an unknown similarity ensues: how important is “beauty” or its role in our market-based economic system? Is “beauty” different for an arts business or similar to a non-arts business with ratio being the only determinant?

Note that most case studies interrogate study objects to demonstrate certain methods or experiences, but their potential role in the field’s identity construction should be strongly considered. Yes, we can focus our case studies on successful artists and arts organizations—which is important—but case studies articulating why artists give up their artistic and business goals are perhaps more crucial. While our parent discipline sometimes engages in this topic, one wonders how an artist “failing” is different from a non-artist “failing.” Is it really a difference or a connection not yet identified?

With all this said, the reader may ask simply: why should case studies become a part of our pedagogy? Other than benefitting from our fellow educators’ intuition and moving towards constructing the field’s authentic identity, there is another reason: disciplinary growth. Though we should be collectively quite proud of the over 100 Arts Entrepreneurship programs across the country, we would be less entrepreneurs our-
selves if we did not take steps to buttress and solidify this rapid growth. We should note there are only a few four-year undergraduate degrees in our field and a handful of graduate programs. Again, there are many reasons why this might be, but one may be the lack of pedagogical materials unique to our field, especially for graduates. A move to make case studies a part of graduate (if not undergraduate) Arts Entrepreneurship pedagogy would help in diversifying the pedagogical options educators have at their disposal.

It is our hope that you find this special issue of the Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Education helpful and interesting. Our thanks again to Dr. Emma Fleck for putting together the guide and working tirelessly with the authors. Additional thanks to both Steven Wasser and the duo of Sidney Pink and Stephanie Chin for writing the cases and instructor’s manuals.
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