

## **Social Capital and Music Entrepreneurs**

**Nancy Rossiter, Jacksonville University**

**Peter Goodrich, Providence College**

**John Shaw, Jacksonville University**

### **Abstract**

Entrepreneurs are venture capitalists who start their own businesses. What drives entrepreneurs? This article combines social capital to music entrepreneurship to determine what drives those who have recently started businesses to take on the endeavor of entrepreneurship.

In this article we apply the concept of social capital to music entrepreneurship, specifically the concept of strategic creativity. We provide an overview of the socioeconomic variables and motivations for explaining entrepreneurial aspirations alongside individual characteristics of entrepreneurs, and how they relate to the psychology of entrepreneurship within the music industry as compared to other forms of business. We evaluate social and strategic entrepreneurship and how it relates to motivation of musical entrepreneurs.

Keywords: Music, Entrepreneurship, Social Capital, Strategic Creativity, Motivations

## **Introduction**

To understand what motivates a musical entrepreneur, one must first account for what motivates an entrepreneur in any realm of business, and from there take apart the pieces that conform only to fiscally driven corporations and incorporate the psychology of music, relating social capital and the idea of social entrepreneurship to music entrepreneurship. Definitions of social capital and an explanation of the concept of strategic creativity must also be outlined before a thorough understanding of musical entrepreneurs' motivation can be comprehended. How does one gauge a standard of motivation for especially talented individuals? Where are the lines between passion and tangible results intertwined?

## **Entrepreneurial drive**

Entrepreneurial motivations are defined by Hessels as the motivation for founding a business. Primary studies on the subject presented only two means for motivation: opportunity or necessity (Reynolds et al. 2001) The next type of studies on the subject seek to provide an explanation for one's decision to start a business (Douglas and Shepherd 2002). The psychological entrepreneurial motivation such as the need for achievement (McClelland 1961) or the need for power (McClelland 1975) suggests motivation beyond control of socioeconomic factors.

Entrepreneurial drive is a fundamental component to understanding what motivates an entrepreneur to start their own business. Hessels' study identifies to what extent entrepreneurial motivations are forceful entrepreneurial aspirations. The three types of entrepreneurial motivations include: the independence motive, the increase-wealth motive, and the necessity motive. Investigating and measuring entrepreneurial aspirations as well as motivations often use country-level data. This data is taken from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) for the years 2005 and 2006 (Hessels 2008). The GEM expounded upon the model of only two-equations for explaining aspirations, while Hessels' expounds further through the use of motivations and socioeconomic variables to account for what drives someone to take on the challenge of beginning something new on their own. Some account it is the increase-wealth motive which dictates the relationship between socioeconomic variables as well as entrepreneurial aspirations for more modern business-focused entrepreneurialism.

The independence-motivated entrepreneurial motivation applies to those who seek autonomy or independence and because of this start a business, but will experience limited growth ambitions within that business since their primary drive is merely the start and successful running of the business as an individual. These personnel seek to make their own goals, schedules, and work as they please, which self-employment serves (Breaugh 1999). Autonomy is considered an intrinsic motive which has been shown to relate to creativity (Amabile 1996). Initial research on the matter had once stated that independence served as a prime entrepreneurial motive for creativity (Corman et al. 1988).

Hessels describes the increase-wealth motive as prudent to business growth, more ambition, and innovation, all combined to achieve a higher income. Financial motivations and aspirations have a positive relationship. Motivation primarily for financial success aids in growth

preference, in risk-return preference, as well as sales and employment. Necessity-motivated entrepreneurs are theorized to be dependent upon their business for economic survival, and often found in lower-income areas constrained by a lack of access to new technology, financial capital, or even human capital.

The level of motivation attuned to financial rewards was studied by Hessles. Three hypotheses were predicted: 1) “A country’s prevalence of entrepreneurs aspiring to innovate is positively related to a country’s incidence of increase-wealth-motivated entrepreneurs”, 2) “A country’s prevalence of entrepreneurs aspiring to grow (in terms of jobs) is positively related to a country’s incidence of increase-wealth motivated entrepreneurs”, and 3) “A country’s prevalence of entrepreneurs aspiring to export is positively related to a country’s incidence of increase-wealth-motivated entrepreneurs” (Hessels 2008). Expounding upon past empirical literature, Hessles examines what affects the quality of entrepreneurship at the country level so as to test the following hypotheses: 1) “A country’s prevalence of entrepreneurs aspiring to innovate/grow (in terms of jobs)/ export is positively related to a country’s level of economic development”, 2) “A country’s prevalence of entrepreneurs aspiring to innovate/grow (in terms of jobs)/ export is positively related to a country’s rate of economic growth”, and 3) “A country’s prevalence of entrepreneurs aspiring to innovate/grow (in terms of jobs)/ export is negatively related to a country’s level of social security” (Hessels 2008).

Drivers of entrepreneurial motivations are defined as 1) Necessity versus opportunity (or push versus pull) entrepreneurship. This motivation is determined by the level of economic development. It encompasses both the development of the present economy in the short run, as well as in the long run (Thurik et al. 2008). This type of entrepreneurial motivation decreases with the level of economic development (Wennekers et al. 2005). Gross domestic product (GDP) growth has a positive impact on opportunity entrepreneurship (van Stel et al. 2007).

Examining the remaining two motivations against one another, the income/wealth motive versus the independence motive must take into account individual determinants including experience, personality, education, and financial position. The entrepreneurial motivation will be influenced by the nature of the opportunity, such as the love and passion associated with writing and performing music for the sake of bettering the world. Another determinant to consider is the nature of the environment in terms of hostility, munificence, and dynamism and how these each impact entrepreneurial motivation.

To test the aforementioned theories, Hessles implemented regression analysis within the two-equation model framework. They examined the impact of entrepreneurial motivations and socioeconomic variables on entrepreneurial aspirations, and, empirically-speaking, what is the influence of socioeconomic variables (while including controls) on entrepreneurial motivations. The two-equation model included entrepreneurial aspirations on one end and motivations on the other. In fact their results suggest that the promotion of the increase-wealth motivation is advantageous in an entrepreneurial society. They also found there is an indirect, negative impact on the growth of entrepreneurialism based upon the country’s level of economic development.

## Individual Characteristics of Entrepreneurs

As Hessels, study takes into account room left for analysis of individual characteristics within the entrepreneurial society and of individuals; Florin studies the theory of planned behavior. Also analyzed are the attitudinal dimensions of the entrepreneurial drive (ED) using the model developed by Juan Florin. In this study, the students distinguish between five attitudes. These five attitudes promote entrepreneurial behavior. Specifically, the five attitudes promote the preference for innovation, nonconformity, a proactive disposition, self-efficacy, and the achievement motivation. All five act as drives for different entrepreneurs with a balance in any direction.

The focal point of this study encompasses a proactive disposition. While previous research has only expounded upon the idea that entrepreneurs are born and not made, this study begs to differ as it presents an argument that the entrepreneurial drive can influence students and thus create future entrepreneurs based on planned behaviors. Not only was the aforementioned hypothesized, but an instrument of measurement was created which would review the development effort. There has been what Florin deems “unprecedented growth in undergraduate-level entrepreneurship education” over the course of the last decade, however nearly no empirical research to accompany it. The entrepreneurial drive can be positively influenced by the environment and role models. Florin proposes a construct of entrepreneurial drive which serves to guide the development of entrepreneurial initiatives.

The prediction of behavior can be weighed based on the combination of personality and attitudes when applied toward one specific goal. Here, the attitudinal approach is the focus of the research. The social-psychology perspective of the entrepreneurial drive supports that positives traits are learned and thus, potential entrepreneurs can be empowered through positives teaching. It is socially desirable to have innovation promoted, and while entrepreneurs are inherently creative, as well as innovative, they often posit an attitude of nonconformity. The five attitudes which drive an entrepreneur are innovation, a proactive disposition, self-efficacy, achievement motivation, and overall nonconformity. These dictate the perceived feasibility and intentions of the entrepreneurial drive. Individuals who take their creativity and channel it toward original innovations are the basis of the entrepreneurial society. While nonconformity carries with it a negative connotation, socially desirable nonconformity is vocal about innovative and constructive ideas which challenge the status quo and bring with it career success (McCarthy, 2002).

*Proactive behavior* is as an individual’s initiative to improve on or to create entirely new circumstances (Crant, 2000). This behavior is in fact linked to an individual’s career success (Seibert et al., 2001). Proactive behaviors include socialization, feedback seeking, issue selling, innovation, career management, and stress coping (Crant, 2000). Entrepreneurs are opportunity seeking, forward looking, and anticipating competitors’. They will find opportunities, show initiative, and persevere until they bring about change in any environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Harmonious with the aforementioned conceptualizations, entrepreneurs are individuals that “pursue an opportunity regardless of the resources they control” (Timmons, 1994, p. 7). Without a proactive disposition, an individual’s venture’s ability to compete and grow will fail.

*Self-efficacy* is an individual's perceptions of their own ability to perform certain tasks. In this case, self-efficacy functions under the auspices of an individual's ability to convert their creative and innovative attitude into proactive behavior within the entrepreneurial society (Ajzen, 1982, 1991). A recent study found that those individuals with higher self-efficacy were able to successfully start businesses (Markman, Balkin, & Baron, 2002). Another recent study uncovered that self-efficacy in the realm of entrepreneurs directly relates to the individual's perceived ability to obtain what resources they need to successfully start a business (Erikson, 2002). An individual's self-efficacy in business dictates differences within work interest and performance. A person's self-efficacy levels will affect their individual persistence, their initiative, as well as their performance (Krueger, 2000). This concept can be taught to students with guidance from staff and faculty to encourage outside of classroom activities to promote entrepreneurialism.

*Achievement motivation* among individuals is primarily defined as people more achievement-oriented than most (Hornaday, 1982). Positive feedback to students and those beginning entrepreneurs aids in positive behavior, proactive attitudes, and higher self-efficacy.

## **Psychology of Entrepreneurship**

The psychology of entrepreneurship is based upon the passion individuals incorporate into their business ventures. Individuals are able to succeed as entrepreneurs based upon components such as personality, competencies, motivation, and cognition, as well as additional factors for consideration such as cross-cultural entrepreneurship, leadership, intrapreneurship, entrepreneurship education, action theory, and the entrepreneur as an organizational product. The field of Industrial and Organizational Psychology is thus linked to entrepreneurship. An important hindrance in this study is that psychology is limited in its correlation to entrepreneurship, merely measuring aspects within performance. Individual traits only influence outcomes in conjunction with a particular condition. A particular condition might include a setting or phase (Baum, 2007)

## **Social Entrepreneurship**

Social entrepreneurship envelopes the concepts of entrepreneurs who seek to improve the lives of those around them, through creative new business ideas and opportunities these entrepreneurs serve as motivation and inspiration to others (Martin). It is nothing short of interesting to study why and how entrepreneurs begin their own business. Social entrepreneurs attract audiences and followers who view them as extraordinarily creative beings whose success is achieved against seemingly impossible odds. Social entrepreneurs improve people's lives one creative idea at a time. Music is a key component in improving people's lives. Social entrepreneurship indicates the essential to push social change, with its enduring, transformational profit to society. Social entrepreneurship is now an activity so inclusive not a single manner of society avoids benefits. The differences between the contributions made by traditional social service organizations and the results of social entrepreneurship are nearly immeasurable, as a social service makes contributions to people's hearts, minds, and souls, not through means of capital gain or tangible materials.

## Strategic Entrepreneurship

Within the business atmosphere, *Strategic planning* is when long-range plans are formulated for the effective management of the company's environmental opportunities, bearing in mind their strengths and weaknesses. *Strategic management* is the process which guides how the organization is approached. It also ensures growth of the firm within the context for developing and implementing any strategy which drives the operations of the business (Schendel & Hofer, 1978). Effective management is a major component of strategic management. It includes defining achievable objectives within the mission statement of the company, developing new strategies, and setting policy guidelines (Hitt et al., 2009). Strategic management process uses the conditions of the ever-changing market and matches them to the competitive structure of a business's evolving resources, capabilities, and competencies. Strategic planning is necessary to determine the future direction of a business. There are five basic steps (Hitt et al., 2009) which should be pursued within strategic planning:

1. Examine the internal and external environments of the venture (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats).
2. Formulate the venture's long-range and short-range strategies (mission, objectives, strategies, policies).
3. Implement the strategic plan (programs, budgets, procedures).
4. Evaluate the performance of the strategy.
5. Take follow-up action through continuous feedback.

Within entrepreneurship, this type of behavior differs from a firm or corporation in that it includes:

- (1) initiative taking,
- (2) the organizing or reorganizing of social economic mechanisms to turn resources and situations to practical account, and
- (3) the acceptance of risk of failure (Shapero, 1975)

Ireland, Hitt, Camp, and Sexton (2001) argue that entrepreneurial and strategic actions are meant to discover a new market or a competitive space. Dimensions of strategic management are defined under the auspices of entrepreneurial innovation, proactive behavior, networks, organization, leadership, and growth. Better understanding and implementation of the aforementioned leads to higher quality strategic actions within the entrepreneurial society. Kuratko (2009) developed a definition which acknowledges this combination such that, "Entrepreneurship is a dynamic process of vision, change, and creation. It requires an application of energy and passion towards the creation and implementation of new ideas and creative solutions."

No matter the type or venture, strategic management is a dynamic process much like entrepreneurialism whose main concerns are that of business performance. The difference lies in that the former expects businesses to exploit any competitive advantage while the latter calls for competitive advantages through product and innovations (Amit, Brigham, & Markman, 2000).

Entrepreneurship is a means of business which promotes strategic agility, flexibility, creativity, as well as continuous innovation. Entrepreneurs discover new sources of value through products as well as process innovations which lead them to greater profitability. Entrepreneurial activity emphasized objectives, strategies, reward systems, control systems, planning approaches, and structure. Entrepreneurship is a mindset.

This entrepreneurial mindset alongside concepts of strategy creates strategic entrepreneurship. Covin and Kuratko (2008) discuss *strategic entrepreneurship* as a broad array of entrepreneurial phenomena. Strategic entrepreneurship involves the exhibition of managerially substantial advances adopted in the pursuit of competitive lead. This concept involves simultaneous opportunity-seeking and advantage-seeking behaviors (Ireland, Hitt, & Sirmon, 2003). Opportunity-driven innovations expound upon the companies' past strategies, incorporating former products, markets, as well as older organizational structures, business models, or capabilities.

Strategic entrepreneurship includes five different forms:

- 1) *Strategic renewal*
- 2) *Sustained regeneration*
- 3) *Domain redefinition*
- 4) *Organizational rejuvenation, or*
- 5) *Business model reconstruction* (Covin & Miles, 1999).

*Strategic renewal* is when the business “seeks to redefine its relationship with its markets or industry competitors by fundamentally altering how it competes” (Covin & Miles, 1999, p. 52). *Sustained regeneration* is when the business “regularly and continuously introduces new products and services or enters new markets” (Covin & Miles, 1999, p. 51). *Domain redefinition* is when the business “proactively creates a new product-market arena that others have not recognized or actively sought to exploit” (Covin & Miles, 1999, p. 54). *Organizational rejuvenation* refers to when the business “seeks to sustain or improve its competitive standing by altering its internal processes, structures, and/or capabilities” (Covin & Miles, 1999, p. 52). Lastly, the *Business model reconstruction* is when the business “designs or redesigns its core business model(s) in order to improve operational efficiencies or otherwise differentiate itself from industry competitors in ways valued by the market.

With research on the newly proposed topic very slim, it is imperative to accept all five as equally importance entrepreneurial phenomena whose diverse views of strategic entrepreneurship are valued.

### **Social Capital and Creativity**

Social capital has been described as an “umbrella concept” (Hirsch & Levin, 1999) that refers to “the goodwill that is engendered by the fabric of social relations that can be mobilized to facilitate action” (p. 17). Theorists have proposed that the “goodwill that others have toward us” (p. 18) is a valuable resource to an individual, and, as such, may be used to pursue economic ends. Given that, social capital can be a social concept that facilitates action and creates value for

the individual. Generally, social capital is defined as "... the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from the network of relationships possessed by an individuals or social unit" (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998, p. 243). From an organizational perspective, Arregle et al (2007) define social capital as the relationships between individuals and organizations that facilitate action and create value. The concept of social capital has been used to explain and understand a wide variety of organizational phenomenon including informal organization, trust, culture, social support, social exchange, social resources, embeddedness, relational contracts, social networks, and inter-firm networks.

Theorists have proposed that the beneficial effects of social capital stem, in part, from the facilitation of information and influence made available by such goodwill. The first benefit of social capital, for the social actor, is that it facilitates access to diverse information sources and improves information's quality. The second benefit of social capital is influence, control, and power which facilitate goal achievement. Indeed, research has shown that social capital reduces transaction costs, facilitates access to information sources, and improves the quality of information, knowledge creation and accumulation (Burt, 2000; Lin, 2001; Nahapiet & Ghosal, 1998).

Additionally, Perry-Smith and Shalley (2003) showed that social capital improves creativity. As an individual construct, creativity is defined as an approach to work that leads to the generation of novel and appropriate ideas, processes, or solutions (Amabile, 1996; Ford, 1996; Perry-Smith & Shalley, 2003; Shalley, 1991). Although earlier research primarily examined creativity as an individual trait, there is a burgeoning interest among management scholars to explore the contextual factors that can impact an individual's creative ability. Theorists have now proposed that creativity is, in part, a social process. From a social dimension, interpersonal communication and interpersonal interaction should be two important social factors that impact creativity.... Given that the social capital concept refers to the relationship between individuals, it should represent a mechanism through which the social context influences creative ability. Social capital can be used to explain and understand a wide variety of social factors relevant to creative ability.

For example, several contextual factors have been linked to creativity including the communication of ideas and information both internal and external to the firm, access to different social circles, a wider array of individuals, and more non redundant information.

### **Concept of Strategic Creativity**

The concept of strategic creativity encompasses the aspects under which any business or entrepreneurial endeavor is begun. Namely, economic enterprises are a side effect of friendships; The main motivation in this case is spending time with one another and ensuring that there is space for creativity and inspiration as well as achieving personal rewards. (Poetshacker, 180)

### **Motivations for Musical Entrepreneurs**

There are many people in the music industry who have recently started businesses. Fascinating, is what drives them to start businesses. Opposing most business aspects of an entrepreneurial drive, the musicians studied have no an innate passion which drives their music and their business, with self efficacy galore, neither challenge too big or situation too poor.



Winterbloom is a musical group based out of Boston whose musicians include the entrepreneurial talents of Meg Hutchinson, Antje Duvekot, Anne Heaton and Natalia Zukerman. Famous for being “in session” during the winter holidays, their contemporary folk songs encompass their families and tales drawing attention to the beauty inlaid in the end of each year. They combine covers and original songs to create unique compositions, the motivation for which is merely holiday cheer and the chance to combine musical talents and lend the nation a group production full of passion, creativity, and innovation.

Each member of Winterbloom, however, leads a double life as a single musical entrepreneur. Antje Duvekot is based out of Somerville, MA as a singer, songwriter, and guitarist. Songwriting awards line her resume, a resume which began at the age of 16. Antje admits her motivation loud and clear: "I think it's fair to say that over all I turn to music in times of trouble and need as a therapeutic tool to get me through sadness," said Duvekot in an interview. "That's why I tend to turn to music. So my songs tend to be a little darker, because that's where I tend to go for solace. So themes like personal struggle with relationships and existential issues."

Natalia Zukerman, a singer and guitarist, is noted most famously for her “contemporary beats and dark, sweet, provocative vocals. Musically sophisticated, intimate and irreverent all at once”. She claims that some of her work serves as a “wake up call to those who tell the same stories over and over again to anyone who will listen”, others noted for presenting the notion “that the people we are striving to be are there all along, waiting for us to catch up to what we already know we are capable of”. Her motivation rests in things change: landscapes, ideas, music. “I consider myself a student of traditional music, even though some would say the noise I make is not so traditional”.

A third member, Meg Hutchinson, from South Egremont, MA, is a singer, songwriter recognized worldwide for her musical contributions and social entrepreneurship in the music industry. While she has been labeled, "a master of introspective ballads" -Performing Songwriter Magazine, "a folkster made of sterner stuff" -The Philadelphia Inquirer, "elegant and free-floating melodies that sound both modern and rooted" -The Boston Globe, with "music as powerful as it is gentle" -No Depression, she claims that songwriting is not anything that she chooses, but rather something “I’ve just somehow always known...is what I love to do. This is what I can’t help but do.” Fulfilling the role of a social entrepreneur, her albums serve as an “answer to the American cultural search for meaning and connection in the midst of bank bailouts, work-aholism and global warming” as well as “Americans' struggle to unplug from high-tech gadgets and more fully connect with each other”. Accepting her role as a role model, Hutchinson says. “We have forgotten how to be alone in our thoughts. All the best work comes out of that rich stillness of waiting."

The fourth member of the seasonal musical group is Anne Heaton. Anne comes from New York with musical trades as a folk singer, a songwriter, and a pianist. Her album *Give In* was deemed "tender, amusing, barbed and spiritual by turns" by The Washington Post. Having toured nationwide, her collection of awards and opening performances includes a resume of impressive musical icons. Heaton states that her motivation comes from within and her last

“record is about going inward to connect to the truest part of yourself in order to make changes in your life.” Her music envelopes the social context of raw and honest emotion.

Another musical entrepreneur, Rose Polenzani, is a folk singer with a musical style so distinctive and full of emotion. Very down-to-earth, her personal website includes a free download each day, a personal blog, and links to all performances and other social networking sites of which she is a part. Her music is tied directly to her personal life and she exploits it willingly for all her fans to appreciate. Bringing to her entrepreneurial endeavor, Polenzani escapes the economic and fiscal pressures of a business by being open with her fans and leaving them to enjoy her work and donate to her continued cause: a cause of obscure lyrical images and emotions.

Venturing away from the folk music genre, Christine Hynde is a rock musician known most famously for her lead in the band The Pretenders. As a singer, songwriter, and guitarist, her role in the band has been maintained since its inception during the 1970's. Building upon her entrepreneurial drive, she left a significant impact upon the musical scene as one of a rare few female bandleaders during the punk wave. Starting in 1978, Hynde began recording demo tapes as an individual and then, following professional advice to expound upon her talents by incorporating a band, she gathered the original performers and Paris was exposed. Critical acclaim was achieved throughout Europe and then the United States. Hynde has continued to serve as a social role model for females worldwide. She has gained the respect of her fans through her hard work, dedication, and entrepreneurial drive which never stopped her from achieving her dreams. She gleans crowds with her open truthfulness during interviews as well as independent edginess. Admittedly, her entrepreneurial motivations are the camaraderie of the group, no matter the shifting members. She commented that, ““There's no time limit so it'll be out when I feel ready.”

The last musical entrepreneur is Jennifer Trynin. Originating from Boston, she is a singer, songwriter, and an author. Her musical endeavors include productions as an individual and as part of a band. She has authored the book about her musical industry experience entitled, Everything I'm Cracked Up To Be. Starting off her career in college, while a creative writing major, she was part of a rock band whose music lent it to be shut down by police nearly as quickly as it had began. Nonetheless, she notes that she “never had so much fun” during those years. Venturing away from folk music and into the rock scene, her entrepreneurial attempts at the age of thirty take a complete 180 degree turn as she fulfills the rock band theme of “sex, drugs, and rock n' roll” through battles with high-end courtships, sexual promiscuity within her band, drugs, drinking, starvation. She noted that “her passion for rock and roll seems to be more about youthful rebellion than music”. Her entrepreneurial attempt leads to a quick rise and a rapid fall.

## **Conclusions**

While there are many factors which motivate an entrepreneur, a standard of motivation for especially talented individuals within the music industry to the line between passion and tangible results. Musical entrepreneurs have separate motivation for founding a business beyond

control of socioeconomic factors. Their entrepreneurial drive is more independence-motivated entrepreneurial motivation since independence serves as a prime entrepreneurial motive for creativity. The individual characteristics within the entrepreneurial society include innovation, nonconformity, a proactive disposition, self-efficacy, and the achievement motivation. Music entrepreneurship embodies a psychology of entrepreneurship in a unique fashion as it is based upon the passion individuals incorporate into their music. Their music takes into account their own personality, competencies, motivation, and cognition. Socially, musical entrepreneurs are icons to society, whose music seeks to touch the souls of their fans. Overall, they seek to improve the lives of those around them while serving as motivation and inspiration to others. Musicians seek to speak their words while also improving people's lives one creative idea at a time. Musical entrepreneurship is a social service whose contributions change people's hearts, minds, and souls. They expound upon strategic entrepreneurship to discover new markets, new music, new inspiration, and competitive space seeking higher quality strategic actions within the entrepreneurial society. Music entrepreneurs combine their proactive behavioral resources with their capabilities to produce social capital. Friendships aid the formation of musical ventures through the concept of strategic creativity which lends itself to pursuing creativity and inspiration as well as achieving personal rewards.

## References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- Amabile, T. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Amit, R.H., Brigham, K., & Markman, G.D. (2000). Entrepreneurial management as strategy. In G.D. Meyer & K.A. Heppard (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship as strategy* (pp. 83–99). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 103-118.
- Baum, J.R., Frese, M. Baron, R.A., (2007) The psychology of entrepreneurship. *Business and Economics*.
- Breaugh, J. A. (1999). Further investigation of the work autonomy scales: Two studies. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13(3), 357–373.
- Corman, J., Perles, B., & Vancini, P. (1988). Motivational factors influencing high-technology entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 26(1), 36–42. Crant, J.M.(2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 435-462.

Covin, J.G. & Kuratko, D.F. (2008). The concept of corporate entrepreneurship. In V. Narayanan & G.O'Connor (Eds.), *The Blackwell encyclopedia of technology and innovation management*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Covin, J.G. & Miles, M.P. (2007). Strategic use of corporate venturing. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(2), 183–207.

Douglas, E. J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2002). Self-employment as a career choice: Attitudes, entrepreneurial intentions, and utility maximization. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 26(3), 81–90.

Erikson, T. (2002). Entrepreneurial capital: The emerging venture's most important asset and competitive advantage. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17(3), 275-290.

Florin, J., Karri, R., and Rossiter, N. (2007) Fostering Entrepreneurial Drive in Business Education: An Attitudinal Approach. *Journal of Management Education*. 31 (1), 17-42.

Hessels, J, van Gelderen, M., and Thurik, R. (2008) Entrepreneurial aspirations, motivations, and their drivers. *Springerlink*.

Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., & Hoskisson, R.E. (2009). *Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalization* (8th ed.). Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.

Hornaday, R. H. (1982). Research about living entrepreneurs. In C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton, & K. H. Vestper (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 20-34). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ireland, R.D., Hitt, M.A., & Sirmon, D.G. (2003). A model of strategic entrepreneurship: The construct and its dimensions. *Journal of Management*, 29(6), 963–989.

Krueger, N. (2000). The cognitive infrastructure of opportunity emergence. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(3), 5-23.

Kuratko, D. F. and Audretsch, D. B. (2009), Strategic Entrepreneurship: Exploring Different Perspectives of an Emerging Concept. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33: 1–17.  
doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2008.00278.x

Markman, G. D., Balkin, D. B., & Baron, R. A. (2002). Inventors and new venture formation: The effects of general self-efficacy and regretful thinking. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 27(2), 149-165.

Martin, R.L., and Osberg, S. (2007) Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*

McCarthy, J. F. (2002). Does having a proactive personality lead to career success? *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(2), 168-170.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.

Reynolds, P. D., Bygrave, W. D., Autio, E., Cox, L., & Hay, M. (2002). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: 2002 Executive Report*. Kansas City, MO: Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership.

Schendel, D. & Hofer, C. (1978). *Strategic management: A new view of business policy and planning*. Boston: Little Brown and Company.

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(4), 845-874.

Shapiro, A. (1975). *Entrepreneurship and economic development* (p. 187). Project ISEED, Ltd. Milwaukee, WI: Center for Venture Management.

Thurik, A. R., Carree, M. A., van Stel A. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (2008). Does self-employment reduce unemployment? *Journal of Business Venturing*, forthcoming

Timmons, J. (1990). *New venture creation: Entrepreneurship in the 1990s* (3rd ed.). Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Van Stel, A. J., Carree, M., & Thurik, A. R. (2005). The effect of entrepreneurial activity on national economic growth. *Small Business Economics*, 24(3), 311–321.

Wennekers, S., & Thurik, R. (1999). Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Small Business Economics*, 13(1), 27–55.