

RETHINKING CULTURAL BUSINESS MODELS THROUGH ARTISTIC INTERVENTIONS IN TOURISM-RELATED CONTEXTS

MARGHERITA DE LUCA, CHIARA CAROLINA DONELLI AND
FABRIZIO PANOZZO

Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy

ABSTRACT

This chapter explores how artistic interventions in tourism-saturated contexts provide insight into alternative cultural business models (BMs) that could enhance their economic viability. Drawing on critical perspectives from cultural entrepreneurship, the creative industries, and BM theory, the chapter examines how notions such as bricolage, informality, and situated practice help make sense of artistic work that does not conform to standard entrepreneurial frameworks. Through three cases of artistic interventions situated in tourism-driven environments, the chapter identifies four recurring patterns: ultra-light and non-bureaucratic organizational forms, pragmatic yet ethically filtered engagement with markets, a critical stance toward dominant tourism imaginaries, and a shift in artistic labor from authorship to mediation and facilitation. Together, these patterns reveal cultural producers practicing BMs through assemblages, relational networks, and everyday experimentation. By foregrounding bricolage as an organizing logic, the chapter

advances a plural, place-based conception of cultural BMs that acknowledges informality, context-specific value creation, and artistic autonomy as pillars of sustainable cultural production.

Keywords: Cultural entrepreneurship; artistic interventions; sustainable tourism; business models; bricolage; creative industries

INTRODUCTION

Although artistic and cultural work has long been associated with the public good, autonomy, and public support, the past few decades have radically transformed how cultural production is conceived and organized. With the rise of the cultural and creative industries (CCI) paradigm in the late 20th century, cultural producers have been increasingly encouraged to operate as market actors, positioning themselves as businesses, thinking entrepreneurially, and devising their own “business models” (O’Connor, 2009). This policy discourse has had a significant impact on cultural organizations’ financing, evaluation, and representation. However, this transformation of discourse raises crucial questions: To what extent do cultural producers embrace entrepreneurial logic? Do they internalize marketplace expectations and the BMs? Most importantly, how are these changes being implemented in practice, particularly in tourism-related contexts where artistic activity is intertwined with tourism economies? Conventional tools such as the BM Canvas often fall short in capturing the fluid, adaptive nature of creative and cultural enterprises, especially in the context of heritage tourism (Edensor et al., 2009; Flew & Cunningham, 2010).

This chapter examines the limitations of applying traditional BMs to CCIs operating within tourism-driven contexts and explores alternative practices that promote (economic) sustainability in these settings.

While acknowledging that sustainability is an inherently multidimensional concept encompassing social, environmental, and cultural domains, and that a holistic approach addressing all three is necessary, this study focuses specifically on the economic dimension in relation to the BMs of cultural producers. By examining a variety of practices in photography, video, performance, and participatory arts, this study sheds light on how artists and cultural producers navigate the complexities of tourism economies while balancing creative autonomy with economic sustainability.

To address this question, we first survey the literature on BMs in arts and cultural organizations, before tracing the emergence of new BMs that seek

to translate the discourse of strategy and entrepreneurship into the artistic field. We then analyze a qualitative approach comparing three episodes of artistic intervention designed to stimulate a reflection on sustainability issues within tourism-related urban and rural contexts. Shadowing artists during their interventions enabled us to access forms of knowledge and practice typically excluded from mainstream organizational research, while also reflecting on the broader objective of sustainable tourism.

Each case study provided a unique perspective on how cultural producers respond to the pressures, expectations, and opportunities associated with tourism. Rather than viewing these cases as static examples, we interpret them as situated experiments that demonstrate how BMs are constructed, improvised, and reconfigured.

This analysis yields three key insights: the normalization of market orientation among cultural producers; the fragmented, unstructured nature of their operational models; and the emergence of bricolage as a strategic organizing logic.

We conclude by discussing how these findings support a more nuanced understanding of cultural entrepreneurship, one that resists business templates and instead centers on the adaptive, collaborative, and context-specific nature of artistic production in tourism-related contexts. We also propose future research directions aimed at advancing sustainable tourism and culturally sensitive urban development through inclusive, artist-led innovation.

LITERATURE REVIEW: BMS IN THE CULTURAL SECTOR

BMs have become a central focus of management studies, providing a conceptual lens to understand how organizations create, deliver, and capture value (Teece, 2010). However, mainstream BM literature has traditionally prioritized large, profit-driven industrial companies in Western economies, with a strong emphasis on technological innovation and financial outcomes (Chesbrough & Rosenbloom, 2002; Foss & Saebi, 2017). This leaves important gaps when analyzing small- and medium-sized enterprises, particularly in the cultural sector, where organizations often pursue ecological, social, and artistic goals alongside economic viability (Gasparin et al., 2022).

Challenges of BMs in the Cultural Sector

The cultural sector poses unique challenges for BM research. Cultural organizations often pursue dual objectives: maintaining financial viability

while preserving creative autonomy and delivering social impact (Spieth et al., 2019). Unlike traditional industries, which follow standardized frameworks (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010), CCIs operate through fluid, hybrid structures that resist rigid categorization (Fillis, 2023). Emerging from this industrial legacy, the diffusion of BM thinking in the cultural sector has been shaped by the rise of the CCI paradigm. Within this framework, culture is reframed as an economically productive activity, increasingly detached from traditional expectations of public subsidy and evaluated by its potential to drive innovation, growth, and urban regeneration (Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005). As a result, cultural producers are routinely exposed to external pressures, operating in environments where accessibility, clarity, and responsiveness to audiences often take precedence over artistic autonomy.

Consequently, many resist adopting business-related terminology for fear that it may compromise their artistic integrity. As Rex (2018, p. 6) observes: “The majority of practitioners would not describe the way they manage resources using this terminology [business model].”

Expanding the BM Framework

To address these tensions, Schiuma (2017) proposes the Business Model Prism (BMP), a multidimensional framework that integrates economic sustainability with non-financial values, such as social and cultural capital. Although the BMP provides a more comprehensive perspective, it still tends to overlook the lived experiences of individual cultural producers, many of whom operate through temporary collaborations or informal networks rather than stable organizations (Banks & O’Connor, 2017). This challenges conventional BM models, which assume linear hierarchies and fixed organizational structures.

Similarly, Moureau and Sagot-Duvaurox (2012) identify four distinct BMs employed by contemporary artists, highlighting the diversity of economic practices in this field. Some rely on traditional gallery systems, while others leverage digital platforms and participatory methods to diversify their revenue streams. Yet, as Fillis (2023) notes, BMs in the cultural sector tend to be reactive rather than strategic, developed out of necessity rather than opportunity. Beckman (2022) takes this further by describing this dynamic as a “tyranny” (p. 14), in stark contrast to mainstream entrepreneurship literature, which is premised on deliberate planning and scalability (Banks & O’Connor, 2017).

The Artist as Entrepreneur

The literature on entrepreneurship offers alternative insights, particularly through the figure of the “artist-entrepreneur” (Beckman, 2022; Oakley, 2014). This perspective highlights artists’ ability to create cultural value through visionary entrepreneurial actions (Klamer, 2011). Cultural policy is increasingly promoting self-reliance, innovation, and adaptability as core competencies for creative workers, reflecting broader neoliberal transformations in cultural labor (McRobbie, 2016).

From a critical standpoint, entrepreneurialism in the cultural field can also be understood as a discourse that reframes structural challenges as personal opportunities. Rather than identifying systemic constraints that limit agency, the entrepreneurial discourse encourages individuals to innovate and “disrupt” structures. It emphasizes personal creativity and treats external barriers as individual challenges, rather than issues to be addressed through collective social or political action.

Überbacher et al. (2015) examine how artists acquire entrepreneurial competencies and become “skilled cultural operators,” highlighting the dynamic, context-specific nature of these transformations.

Two key approaches emerge from this literature:

- *Survival approach*: Many artists engage in entrepreneurial activities, such as self-promotion, grant writing, and side jobs, primarily out of necessity, driven by unstable income streams and shrinking public support (Fillis, 2023; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2013).
- *The passion economy paradox*: Digital platforms offer enhanced visibility and market access but often require constant self-branding and emotional labor. As Duffy (2017) and Poell et al. (2021) argue, this form of platform-driven entrepreneurship can intensify rather than alleviate precarity.

Cultural entrepreneurship thus unfolds through informal networks and temporary collaborations, rather than formal institutions (Bilton, 2017). It combines hybrid revenue streams, including public funding, commissions, commercial ventures, and joint projects (Bilton & Cummings, 2010), and often occurs in project-based economies marked by discontinuity (Sydow & Staber, 2002).

Despite theoretical advancements, existing models still struggle to capture the improvisational, fragmented nature of artistic careers, characterized by unstable and interdependent income streams (Fillis, 2023). The precariousness

of cultural work (Hesmondhalgh, 2013; McRobbie, 2016) underscores the need for hybrid economic structures and strategic skillsets, such as teaching, grant-seeking, and merchandizing (Comunian et al., 2015).

RESEARCH GAP AND CONTRIBUTION

This review reveals a persistent gap in the literature: the absence of an artist-centered, dynamic BM theory that reflects the precarity and non-linear trajectories typical of cultural work. The present study contributes to the existing literature by exploring how cultural producers in tourism-related contexts develop sustainable BMs.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a multiple case study approach to examine how cultural producers operate within tourism-driven contexts and to identify the alternative practices they employ, beyond conventional BMs, to achieve economic sustainability.

The three cases are artistic interventions conducted through art-based research (Barone & Eisner, 2011; Leavy, 2015) and developed in tourist-related contexts: urban or rural settings where tourism is pervasive or emerging, often raising complex questions about sustainability, identity, and cultural representation. These interventions followed a dialogical and interventionist approach, in which researchers and artists collaboratively shaped the research agenda and co-developed the research questions (Cacciatore & Panozzo, 2025).

Methodologically, our approach included:

1. Ethnographic observation of the artistic interventions before, during, and after their development;
2. Semi-structured interviews conducted at the conclusion of each intervention (approximately 90 minutes in length), during which artists reflected on their process, the context, and their working models.

Interviews were conducted with the following artists involved in the three case studies:

- Filippo Tognazzo, actor and director at Zeldia Teatro (*Souvenir*).
- Andrea Signori, photographer (*Souvenir*).

- Giovanni Pellegrini, video maker and director at Ginko Film (*Venezia è Africa*).
- Fabio Bonelli, sound artist and musician (*TOTEM*).

These interviews offered valuable insights into the artists' BMs and the nature of their interventions. The dialog between practice and analysis revealed several key findings concerning the role of artistic work in relation to heritage, tourism, and contemporary cultural production.

ARTISTIC INTERVENTIONS

To provide a practical context for these theoretical discussions, we analyze three artistic interventions: two in Venice, a city that embodies the tensions between heritage and mass tourism, and one in Roana, a small mountain town in the Veneto region that has a strong local identity and is environmentally fragile. These cases, developed in collaboration with Ca' Foscari University, show how artists can translate their creative practice into adaptive BMs, engaging new stakeholders and rethinking the relationship between culture, community, and tourism.

Souvenir: An Exploration of Artisan Memory

Souvenir: An Exploration of Artisan Memory was a project conducted by Ca' Foscari University of Venice in collaboration with the theater company Zeldà Teatro and photographer Andrea Signori in the summer and autumn of 2024. The project addressed a shared research question: how can artistic languages contribute to creating new imaginaries associated with Venice and its artisan traditions? It explored the relationship between material culture and the transmission of artisanal knowledge, prompting reflection on the survival of craft skills in a changing urban context.

The project combined photography, storytelling, and academic inquiry to document the lives and practices of retired artisans. Theatre director Filippo Tognazzo (Zeldà Teatro) wrote monologs based on interviews, while photographer Andrea Signori produced a series of dual portraits. Each artisan was represented by two images: one with a glitched face that foregrounded the crafted object, and another focusing solely on the individual, creating a visual contrast between identity and labor.

The project was previewed on October 5, 2024, at the *Salone dell'Alto Artigianato Italiano*, which was held at the Arsenale in Venice. The *Souvenir*

exhibition featured six panels combining photographic portraits, excerpts from the monologues, statistical data on Italian craftsmanship, and QR codes linking to the recorded stories performed by actors.

In a city shaped by mass tourism and commercial pressures, *Souvenir* revisited the stories of retired artisans to explore the interplay of skill, identity, and cultural resilience. Using photography and performative storytelling, the project challenged romanticized narratives of artisanal heritage, positioning artists as cultural mediators. Beyond its artistic dimension, *Souvenir* also informed policy discussions on knowledge transmission and was submitted to international exhibitions to increase public engagement.

Venezia è Africa

Venezia è Africa was developed in summer 2024 through a collaboration between Wetlands Books, a publisher focusing on social and environmental sustainability and the challenges of the Anthropocene, and Ginko Film, a film and audiovisual production company specializing in auteur cinema and creative documentaries. The project once again addressed the shared research question of how artistic languages can contribute to generating new imaginaries associated with Venice and its productive heritage. It responded by reinterpreting the city through an Afro-diasporic lens, aiming to decolonize cultural narratives and situate Venice within a broader transnational dialog.

Combining literature, cinema, and academic inquiry, the project focused on a series of video interviews with African and Afro-descendant authors in artistic residency. Conducted by Ginko Film, these conversations used Venice as a reflective space to explore the historical entanglements between Africa and Europe. The authors' observations challenged Eurocentric heritage frameworks, revealing traces of African presence often erased from mainstream narratives. They reflected on how the city's enclosed form shapes perception, particularly through sound, silence, and spatial memory.

The project culminated on September 1, 2024, during the Venice Film Festival, one of the world's most prominent cultural stages. The videos were also showcased at the launch of *Afterwords*, Wetlands' latest literary series, curated by the author Maaza Mengiste. This dual cinematic and editorial platform extended the work's public resonance across artistic and cultural circuits. In a city where global tourism often reduces complexity to spectacle, *Venezia è Africa* offered an alternative vision grounded in absence, dialog, and cultural entanglement. By foregrounding marginalized voices and repositioning Venice within a decolonial framework, the project broadened the city's imaginary

beyond dominant tropes, fostering a connection between artistic creation and critical discourse.

TOTEM – The Sound of Memory

TOTEM – The Sound of Memory was developed in early 2025 by sound artist and musician Fabio Bonelli, in collaboration with Ca' Foscari University as part of the iNEST Spoke 6 Lab Village initiative. Based in Roana, a small mountain town in the Veneto region, the project addressed a shared research question: how can artistic languages be used to re-narrate the identity of a mountain landscape that is experiencing ecological and cultural erosion, including the disappearance of snow and other emblematic features?

Despite being geographically distant from Venice, Roana provided a significant contrast, offering an alpine setting where cultural identity is closely intertwined with memory, landscape, and local storytelling traditions.

The project explored the relationship between sound, memory, and place through a participatory process involving Roana's residents. Bonelli invited locals to share personal objects linked to their past, using them as prompts for storytelling and sonic interpretation. Instead of documenting these stories in traditional formats, he reworked them into a layered soundscape – blending voices, ambient recordings, and musical composition – to create a multisensory experience.

The project culminated in February 2025 with a video performance at Museo Radici, Lavarone's cultural hub. Here, the collected voices and compositions merged to create an immersive installation, offering audiences a resonant, sound-based experience of the town's heritage.

Set in an area distant from mass tourism yet not untouched by tourism-related pressures, TOTEM questioned the role of contemporary art in sustaining local identity. Developed within the community, the project avoided extractive dynamics and presented artistic practice as a form of cultural inquiry. By amplifying personal memory through sound, it showed how artistic interventions can strengthen the bonds between people, place, and heritage, while exploring new forms of storytelling and cultural preservation.

FINDINGS

We identified four recurring patterns across the artists' narratives about their BMs, which diverge from the configurations proposed by traditional BMs. These dimensions emerged inductively through the coding and interpretation

of interviews and field observations. Their identification of four patterns contributes to the debate on BMs in the cultural sectors, particularly by shedding light on how cultural producers operate within tourism-driven contexts and the alternative practices they adopt to achieve economic sustainability.

The first pattern concerns the operational model of artistic work: how artists structure their practice, the types of organizational or legal frameworks they adopt (if any), and whether their work follows a continuous or project-based logic.

The second pattern focuses on the artists' market orientation, examining to what extent their work is financed through public funding and private commissions, as well as how they position themselves in relation to commercial demands.

The third pattern explores the artists' attitude toward tourism, and the effect that working in a highly touristic city like Venice, or in contexts marked by tourism, has on their practice, both materially and symbolically.

Finally, the fourth pattern examines the artists' self-perception in their work: whether they see themselves exclusively as creators or tend to identify with other roles.

Operational Model

Across the four interviews, a shared operational logic emerges: artistic production is predominantly project-based (Davies et al., 2011) and developed within lightweight organizational structures that rely more on informal networks than on hierarchical institutions. While some adopt legal business forms (such as an Srl in *Zelda Teatro's* case or as a production company in *Ginko Film's* case), these are used pragmatically to secure fiscal and contractual legitimacy, rather than as markers of market-driven enterprise. The artists' working methods reveal a distinct artisanal, reticular model based on collaboration, temporality, and mobility. Projects are developed around specific contexts and then disbanded, requiring the continual reactivation of professional and personal connections. While flexible and adaptive, this model complicates long-term planning and underscores the need for intermediary structures capable of sustaining dissemination and continuity beyond the ephemeral moment of creation.

Revenue Stream: At the Crossroads of Market Orientation and Public Funds

Market orientation varies, but all four practitioners navigate a mixed economy of cultural production. While some rely more on public funding

(e.g., Bonelli and Tognazzo), others, such as Signori and Pellegrini, more regularly integrate corporate commissions into their practice. Interestingly, private commissions do not entail a wholesale shift toward commercial language. Instead, all interviewees describe a delicate negotiation in which their artistic voice is preserved, even when operating within marketing contexts. For Pellegrini, private work subsidizes documentary filmmaking; for Signori, it provides a platform for conceptual experimentation within esthetic boundaries set by the client. While all these artists acknowledge increasing market pressure on cultural production, none adopt a fully market-oriented logic. Instead, they pursue “meaningful” collaborations, often turning down projects that do not align with their ethical or creative standards.

Spatial and Symbolic Context of Intervention

A key dimension in the discussion of cultural BMs is the spatial and symbolic context in which artistic practices unfold, in line with tourism studies that conceptualise tourism products as culturally embedded, co-produced, and shaped by extended networks of actors rather than by firms alone (García-Rosell et al., 2007). In this case, Venice emerges not only as a physical site of work and residence but also as a powerful cultural and economic framework. The artists’ engagement with the city reveals a deliberate and critical distance from its dominant tourism-driven economy. While Venice’s esthetic and symbolic weight undeniably shapes audience perception, as noted by Signori, the practitioners consistently resist allowing tourist imaginaries to dictate the terms of their work. For example, Tognazzo asserts that the city’s touristic identity had no influence on the artistic structure of *Souvenir*, while Pellegrini reflects on the challenge of eluding the “tourist gaze,” even in politically engaged projects. Bonelli, who works primarily outside the city, articulates this dynamic most explicitly: “In highly touristic contexts, culture is often swallowed up by tourism.” In all these cases, tourism emerges not as a productive opportunity but as a structural constraint that reduces artistic complexity to spectacle unless it is actively challenged. This tension reveals how cultural BMs in tourist-saturated environments must not only navigate economic pressures but also engage in symbolic negotiations, balancing visibility with integrity and resisting commodification through deliberate positioning.

Beyond Authorship

Finally, all four artists assume roles that transcend conventional definitions of authorship. Tognazzo and Pellegrini challenge the label of “artist,” leaning

instead toward terms such as cultural artisan or visual craftsman. Signori identifies as a cultural mediator, while Bonelli emphasizes the pedagogical and relational aspects of his work. These redefinitions reposition the artist as not only a creator but also a researcher, facilitator, educator, and translator. In doing so, they illustrate how contemporary artistic work, especially in a tourist setting, intersects the symbolic, social, and economic domains to shape relationships and enable new forms of civic engagement.

DISCUSSION: EXPANDING CULTURAL BMs

The four patterns identified in our fieldwork reveal how cultural producers adapt their practices in tourism-driven contexts through pragmatic and flexible forms of entrepreneurship. These practices challenge traditional assumptions about BMs by prioritizing informality, improvisation, and context-specific value creation.

Operational Models: Non-organizational Infrastructures and Informal Architectures

In all four cases, cultural production is structured through temporary, project-based arrangements rather than stable organizations. Artists operate with minimal internal infrastructure, and any legal entities primarily serve to secure fiscal legitimacy. This organizational fluidity is not a sign of immaturity but a strategic adaptation to the constraints of the field. As [Bilton \(1999\)](#) and [Moureau and Sagot-Duvauroux \(2012\)](#) have noted, informal coordination is a defining feature of cultural work, offering agility and reduced overheads. Our findings support this view, showing that artistic production relies on networked collaboration, ephemeral teams, and relational maintenance rather than institutional consolidation. This challenges conventional BM frameworks, which often assume structured firms with managerial continuity ([George & Bock, 2011](#); [Ghezzi & Cavallo, 2020](#)).

Market Orientation: Situated Pragmatism over Ideological Resistance

The artists in our study display a clear and context-sensitive engagement with market dynamics. This engagement is not an ideological capitulation but a strategic response to precarious funding landscapes and fragmented audiences. They navigate between public funding and private commissions,

tailoring their outputs to multiple stakeholders while preserving creative autonomy. This reflects what [Flew and Cunningham \(2010\)](#) and [Schramme \(2023\)](#) describe as tactical deployment of entrepreneurial rationality. Rather than aspiring to growth or profit maximization, the artists build project portfolios, minimize fixed costs, and cultivate meaningful collaborations, often refusing projects that conflict with their values. Such practices challenge the binary opposition between market-driven and publicly subsidized cultural work.

Spatial and Symbolic Context of Intervention: Anticipatory Calibration and Critical Distance from Tourism

Operating in a tourism-saturated environment such as Venice can put specific pressures on cultural production. Rather than passively responding to tourist demand, our interviewees *anticipate* and negotiate it. This anticipatory calibration reshapes their practice stylistically, logistically, and symbolically without fully aligning with the commodified “cultural delivery” logic often found in heritage cities ([Evans, 2009](#); [Richards, 2014](#)). These artists resist allowing tourism imaginaries to frame their work and often express concern about the risk of cultural homogenization. Nevertheless, the tourism economy creates a structural demand for accessibility, which many address by adopting flexible modes of production, rather than by contesting tourism ideologically. This reinforces the need to conceptualize entrepreneurship in place-based and tourism-influenced terms.

Artists’ Role: Beyond Authorship, Toward Facilitation, and Translation

The fourth pattern highlights how cultural producers reframe their role beyond traditional notions of authorship. They see themselves as facilitators, educators, mediators, or artisans – roles that emphasize process, participation, and knowledge exchange. This resonates with [Gherardi’s \(2000\)](#) concept of *knowing-in-practice*: a form of embedded coordination and learning that emerges from doing, adjusting, and improvising. The BM here is not a pre-defined plan but an ongoing enactment. These artists compose rather than plan; they repurpose resources, reconfigure teams, and build momentum iteratively. This actor-dependent, improvisational mode of action aligns with the idea of bricolage described by [Duymedjian and Rüling \(2010\)](#) and [Glasbeek \(2024\)](#): a form of strategic improvisation under constraint.

Bricolage as a BM Logic

Far from being marginal or deficient, bricolage emerges as the dominant BM logic in our cases, in line with the definition of entrepreneurial bricolage proposed by Baker and Nelson (2005). It reflects how artists mobilize symbolic capital, relationships, and infrastructure through informal, responsive, and iterative means. This logic is similar to Actor–Network Theory (Latour, 1987), which defines innovation as the process of assembling and maintaining provisional alliances. While bricolage fosters adaptability and resilience, it also limits the artists' ability to meet institutional expectations for growth, visibility, and formalization (Bhardwaj et al., 2024; Valliere & Gegenhuber, 2014). Our study highlights this tension: the very features that ensure survival – flexibility, improvisation, and fluidity – can undermine legitimacy in fields that reward standardization.

Challenging Assumptions in BM Theory

Taken together, these patterns challenge the foundational assumption in BM theory that the organization is the natural unit of analysis. In the cultural field, BMs are not organizational blueprints but situational practices grounded in material constraints, ethical orientations, and place-based dynamics. Recognizing this paves the way for a more pluralistic and situated theory of cultural entrepreneurship, one that measures success not by growth or scale, but by sustainability, relevance, and adaptive coherence in uncertain environments. These dynamics reflect deeper structural transformations, prompting a rethinking of how cultural BMs are theorized and supported. Building on these findings, the concluding section identifies key implications and outlines directions for future research.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has illuminated three interrelated shifts that challenge dominant assumptions about cultural entrepreneurship and BMs in heritage tourism contexts. First, we have shown that market orientation is increasingly normalized among cultural producers, not as an ideological capitulation to neoliberalism, but as a pragmatic and often ethically mediated response to external demand and resource scarcity. Second, we have identified a clear departure

from the firm-based, growth-driven assumptions that underpin much of the BM literature. In contrast, cultural work emerges here as fluid, fragmented, and project-based, resisting institutionalization and long-term consolidation. Third, we have proposed bricolage not as a residual or deficient mode, but as a strategic organizing logic: one particularly well-suited to the complex, uncertain, and materially constrained environments in which many artists operate.

These findings call for a rethinking of how cultural BMs are conceptualized and supported, particularly in tourism-related contexts where cultural policy, market logics, and sustainability agendas intersect. Rather than evaluating cultural entrepreneurship in terms of scalability, efficiency, or organizational maturity, we argue for a more situated and pluralistic perspective, one that acknowledges informality, relational coordination, and context-specific improvisation as legitimate and strategic features of cultural economic life.

Ultimately, this study contributes to a growing body of work that seeks to decenter standardized templates and firm-based theories of entrepreneurship. We advocate an expanded understanding of BMs in the cultural field – one that recognizes artistic autonomy, organizational fluidity, and adaptive creativity not simply as survival tactics, but as core strategic resources essential for building more resilient and sustainable forms of cultural production in heritage cities.

Future research could build on these insights by:

- Investigating how bricolage strategies evolve in response to shifting policy frameworks, audience expectations, or funding conditions;
- Comparing these dynamics with non-tourism-driven contexts, to better understand how exposure to tourism reconfigures cultural business practices;
- Exploring how cultural producers construct legitimacy and continuity in the absence of stable organizational forms;
- Examining the role of intermediaries, infrastructures, or support mechanisms that can sustain fragmented cultural actors without imposing formalization;
- Expanding the notion of value by exploring how cultural BMs contribute to sustainability in ways that go beyond economics, such as memory-making, community engagement, pedagogical functions, and decolonial perspectives.

REFERENCES

- Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005). Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 329–366.
- Banks, M., & O'Connor, J. (2017). Inside the whale (and how to get out of there): Moving on from two decades of creative industries research. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 20(6), 637–654.
- Barone, T., & Eisner, E. W. (2011). *Arts based research*. Sage.
- Beckman, G. D. (2022). *The new arts entrepreneur: Navigating the art ecologies*. Routledge.
- Bhardwaj, R., Bindra, S., Singh, T., & Sahay, A. (2024). Toward a typology of entrepreneurial bricolage and its capabilities. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 16(6), 1453–1480.
- Bilton, C. (1999). *The new adhocracy: Strategy, risk and the small creative firm*. University of Warwick, Centre for Cultural Policy Studies.
- Bilton, C. (2017). *Management and creativity: From creative industries to creative management* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bilton, C., & Cummings, S. (2010). *Creative strategy: Reconnecting business and innovation*. Wiley.
- Cacciatore, S., & Panozzo, F. (2025). Rethinking research through artistic experimentation. *European Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, 14, Article 13047.
- Chesbrough, H., & Rosenbloom, R. S. (2002). The role of the business model in capturing value from innovation: Evidence from Xerox Corporation's technology spin-off companies. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(3), 529–555.
- Comunian, R., Gilmore, A., & Jacobi, S. (2015). Higher education and the creative economy: Creative graduates, knowledge transfer, and regional impact debates. *Geoforum*, 59, 1–6.
- Davies, A., Brady, T., & Prencipe, A. (2011). Innovation in complex products and systems: Implications for project-based organising. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 28, 3–26.
- Duffy, B. E. (2017). *(Not) getting paid to do what you love: Gender, social media, and aspirational work*. Yale University Press.

Duymedjian, R., & Rüling, C. C. (2010). Towards a foundation of bricolage in organization and management theory. *Organization Studies*, 31(2), 133–151.

Edensor, T., Leslie, D., Millington, S., & Rantisi, N. (Eds.). (2009). *Spaces of vernacular creativity: Rethinking the cultural economy* (Vol. 30). Routledge.

Evans, G. (2009). From cultural quarters to creative clusters creative spaces in the new city economy. In M. Legner (Ed.), *The sustainability and development of cultural quarters: International perspectives* (pp. 32–59). Institute of Urban History.

Fillis, I. (2023). *Business models for the arts and creative industries*. Routledge.

Flew, T., & Cunningham, S. (2010). Creative industries after the first decade of debate. *The Information Society*, 26(2), 113–123.

Foss, N. J., & Saebi, T. (2017). Fifteen years of research on business model innovation: How far have we come, and where should we go? *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 200–227.

García-Rosell, J. C., Haanpää, M., Kylänen, M., & Markuksela, V. (2007). From firms to extended markets: A cultural approach to tourism product development. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 55(4), 445–459.

Gasparin, M., Green, W., Lilley, S., Quinn, M., Saren, M., & Schinckus, C. (2022). Business as unusual: A business model for social innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 125, 698–709.

George, G., & Bock, A. J. (2011). The business model in practice and its implications for entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 83–111.

Gherardi, S. (2000). Practice-based theorizing on learning and knowing in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 21(6), 1051–1075.

Ghezzi, A., & Cavallo, A. (2020). Agile business model innovation in digital entrepreneurship: Lean startup approaches. *Journal of Business Research*, 110, 519–537.

Glasbeek, L. (2024). Bricolage and its strategic connotations: A study of Greek social entrepreneurs in times of crisis. *British Journal of Management*, 35(1), 45–63.

- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2013). *The cultural industries* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Hesmondhalgh, D., & Baker, S. (2013). *Creative labour: Media work in three cultural industries*. Routledge.
- Hesmondhalgh, D., & Pratt, A. C. (2005). Cultural industries and cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1), 1–13.
- Klamer, A. (2011). Cultural entrepreneurship. *Review of Austrian Economics*, 24(2), 141–156.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Harvard University Press.
- Leavy, P. (2015). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice*. Guilford Publications.
- McRobbie, A. (2016). *Be creative: Making a living in the new culture industries*. Polity.
- Moureau, N., & Sagot-Duvaouroux, D. (2012). Four business models in contemporary art. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 14(3), 44–56.
- O'Connor, J. (2009). Creative industries: A new direction? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(4), 387–402.
- Oakley, K. (2014). Good work? Rethinking cultural entrepreneurship. In C. Bilton & S. Cummings (Eds.), *Handbook of management and creativity* (pp. 145–159). Edward Elgar.
- Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business model generation: A handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers*. Wiley.
- Poell, T., Nieborg, D., & van Dijck, J. (2021). Platformisation. *Internet Policy Review*, 8(4).
- Rex, B. (2018). *New business models for cultural organisations: A critical literature review*. Creative Lenses Working Paper No. 1.
- Richards, G. (2014). Creativity and tourism in the city. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(2), 119–144.
- Schiama, G. (2017). The business model prism: Managing and innovating business models of arts and cultural organisations. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 3(3), 1–13.
- Schramme, A. (2023). Cultural entrepreneurship and funding policies in Europe. In S. Comunian, B. E. Mitchell, & S. K. Watson (Eds.), *The handbook of cultural work* (pp. 229–244). Bloomsbury Academic.

Spieth, P., Schneckenberg, D., & Ricart, J. E. (2019). Business model innovation – State of the art and future challenges for the field. *R&D Management*, 44(3), 237–247.

Sydow, J., & Staber, U. (2002). The institutional embeddedness of project networks: The case of content production in German television. *Regional Studies*, 36(2), 215–227.

Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 172–194.

Valliere, D., & Gegenhuber, T. (2014). Entrepreneurial remixing: Bricolage and postmodern resources. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Innovation*, 15(1), 29–38.