<fresh page>

<cn>7<ct>Creative industries and higher education: what curriculum, what evidence, what impact?

<au>*Ruth Bridgstock*

<2 lines space>

<a>**Introduction**

It has been twenty years since the publication of the initial creative industries mapping documents which made an explicit link between disciplinary creative practice[1] and economic growth. This link began with an emphasis on the impact of creative sectors and industries, but over time also became about the creative workers within them. Policy makers and scholars argued that the application of creative human capital, in the context of an increasingly services-based, knowledge-intensive economy, could add economic value, as well as the cultural and social value traditionally associated with cultural activity (DCMS 1998; UNCTAD 2008; Potts and Cunningham 2008; Hearn *et al.* 2014).

In countries where creative industries policy has found purchase, such as the United Kingdom and to a lesser extent Australia, some higher education institutions (HEIs) with creative disciplinary education and research offerings have shifted their practices to accommodate the concept (Comunian and Gilmore 2016). The shift can be found in creative campuses and precincts, which emphasise knowledge exchange between HEIs and industry, and also creatively based regional economic regeneration initiatives (Comunian *et al.* 2014; Ferguson 2014). Both of these engagement-focused strategies often also involve government partnerships. Shifts can also be found in thinking and practice in creative higher education curriculum towards human capital – developing the disciplinary and transferable capabilities of students in creative degree programmes, including high-level critical capacities – to prepare them for work in the creative industries and thus ready them for contributing to the creative economy (Oakley 2013), and also the creative human capital that exists within HE

academics and other staff, who teach students but also contribute directly to the creative economy through their creative practice, research and engagement activities.

The creative workforce

The creative industries policy agenda is based on human capital arguments around the economic value that creative-cultural activity can add, both within creative sectors and across the economy. It has been critiqued extensively by scholars who document the lived experiences and labour market outcomes of some types of creative practitioners. For a significant proportion of people who are attempting to pursue creative careers, insecure employment arrangements, underemployment and over-education, poor remuneration and portfolio career arrangements, with multiple job-holding across creative and non-creative roles, are common (Hesmondhalgh and Baker 2010; Throsby and Petetskaya 2017).

The evidence presented in these kinds of studies of cultural-creative work and workers is seemingly contradicted by national Census-based 'Creative Trident' studies (Cunningham 2014). These studies have shown that between a third and a half of creative workers are employed in creative roles outside the creative industries. That is, they are 'embedded' in other industry sectors entirely, such as manufacturing or the public service. This finding has been taken as evidence that creative-disciplinary activity is indeed valued across the economy (Hearn *et al.* 2014). These studies have also shown that employment growth in creative industries and occupations often exceeds national averages.

Some of the apparent contradiction is explained by more nuanced census-based occupational mapping in Australia: high growth is found in business-to-business *creative services* at almost twice the growth of the rest of the economy. This high growth in digital content, design, and media and communications is not restricted to creative sectors. The embedded creative services workforce, comprising content creators, designers, communicators and so

on, has experienced good levels of growth in industry sectors such as manufacturing, construction and public service. The relatively high growth patterns in creative services (both embedded and non-embedded) can be explained by rapid increases in demand for digital applications and services such as websites, applications and online visual communication, as well as digital advertising. This increased demand is supported by widespread converged digital technologies that create, reproduce and disseminate digital content, such as digital cameras, video, audio, and online sharing through social media. There is also a growing appreciation and skills base for design and communication activities, and increasingly sophisticated demand for these services.

By contrast, the *cultural production* workforce, including artists, musicians and filmmakers, is growing much more slowly or may exhibit steady state or even decline (there are often dramatic declines in journalism employment). The growth of cultural production practitioners working inside cultural production industries is slower than the overall economy. However, cultural production roles in creative services sectors and also embedded across the economy are growing more strongly. These findings collectively have been taken to support the notion that creative activity is economically important, with creative services and cultural production both becoming important inputs into other industries and acting as enablers to change the way that business is conducted. However, cultural production activities inside cultural production industries are much less likely to drive economic growth directly. These activities are more likely to be engaged with cultural and social 'bottom lines' rather than commercial ones, and may be subsidised by the government (although this is not always the case – for example, the film industry accommodates a wide range of capital-based, subsidised or hybrid funding models across social, cultural, for-profit or hybrid bottom line purposes). As such, cultural

production practitioners may be more likely to experience more precarious careers and underemployment than creative services practitioners.

<a>**Creative graduate pathways and trajectories**

Building a sufficiently nuanced picture of the early workforce experiences and trajectories of graduates of creative degrees has also proved challenging. In both the United Kingdom and Australia, national early graduate destination statistics (Social Research Centre 2018; Higher Education Statistics Agency 2018) show consistently that creative graduates as a broad category[2] have the poorest outcomes of any fields of education, at least when full-time employment is used as an indicator of success. The use of these survey measures has been criticised on a variety of methodological grounds, including the short length of time after course completion; the use of full-time employment as a proxy for employability and other measures of career success; and the over-aggregation of fields of education resulting in meaningless data (for example, Jackson and Bridgstock 2018). Recent changes to the survey measures have improved their usefulness somewhat by including longitudinal data collection, and a wider variety of indicators of graduate outcomes such as over-education/ underemployment. They have also been supplemented by other studies that help build a more realistic picture of graduate career pathways across different creative disciplinary areas.

A significant body of literature from the United Kingdom and Australia presents commentary that creative graduates can struggle through an extended education-to-work transition period that can involve multiple entry attempts, unpaid work experience, movement to other employment markets, further education or/training, and reliance on family and friends for financial support (Galloway *et al.* 2002; Ball *et al.* 2010; Bennett and Bridgstock 2015). These studies tend to focus on degrees associated with cultural production disciplines. Studies of graduate transitions indicate that many creative students also experience

significant identity uncertainty and revision as they attempt to move into the world of work (Nystrom 2009; Bridgstock 2011).

Some of the creative precarity phenomenon occurs among graduates because of oversupply of entrants into an unregulated, oversaturated market where portfolio working is the norm (Banks and Hedmondhalgh 2009; Oakley 2013). To some extent it is likely that there is also 'supply side' failure, where creative graduates are not appropriately equipped for the world of work which they are entering. Two major recent UK studies shed further light on this. The 'Creative Graduates, Creative Futures' study (Ball *et al.* 2010) was a survey-based study of 3500 art, media, crafts and design graduates up to eight years after course completion. It found evidence for precarious employment, especially in the first year after graduation, documenting high levels of self-employment and portfolio working, albeit with a significant proportion of graduates engaged in creative work.

Comunian and colleagues (Comunian *et al.* 2011) subsequently analysed creative graduate destinations through analysis of the UK-wide 'Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education' survey. These researchers conducted statistical analyses on surveys submitted by graduates from Advertising, Architecture, Crafts, Design, Film and Television, Fine Art, Music, Performing Arts, Technology and Writing and Publishing disciplines. Comunian and her colleagues found a complex picture of destinations that nonetheless broadly supported the findings of Census-based Trident Mark II in Australia (Cunningham 2014). Some creative graduates (particularly those from creative services-related degrees such as architecture, advertising and publishing) were much more likely to be employed full-time and with higher wages than others (particularly those from broadly cultural production-related degrees such as craft, and the fine and performing arts). Comunian *et al*. (2015) then used the same

methodology to demonstrate that graduates of digital creative degrees also demonstrate high levels of full-time employment and receive comparatively high salaries, compared with creative arts graduates, and further, that digital graduates are finding employment destinations throughout the economy.

Cunningham and Bridgstock (2012) conducted a single-institution study of 400 journalism, media and communications graduates going back to 10 years post-course completion. The data in that study supported Creative Trident findings that journalism, media and communications professionals are found throughout the economy. Then in 2014, Bridgstock and Cunningham also conducted a national study that captured the trajectories, experiences and destinations of more than 900 Australian creative graduates up to six years post-course completion. The study involved anonymous web-based surveys of 916 graduates from undergraduate creative degrees corresponding to cultural production disciplines. They found that no matter what the employment destination, graduates who perceived that they were adding creative value of some kind through their work reported high levels of career satisfaction (although many graduates employed outside specialist cultural production still aspired to this type of work, and synonymised it with success). Second, their graduate results supported important observations from the Trident Census analyses. Embedded creative and creative services jobs were associated with a far greater degree of full-time, employee-based job holding, lower unemployment, higher earnings per hour, and a higher average number of paid hours of work per week than specialist and cultural production jobs. Graduates engaged in cultural production work did exhibit a tendency towards portfolio career configurations, undertaking multiple concurrent cultural production jobs, or working in other-than-creative or creative services roles in addition to cultural production jobs. While the Creative Trident facilitated much better quantification of creative employment through enumeration of both

creative occupations and industries, Bridgstock and Cunningham (2014) found that it can significantly underreport creative cultural work when this work is engaged in as part of a second or third job. These second or third creative jobs are more likely than first jobs to be undertaken on a part-time or self-employment basis.

Two further areas of literature are of relevance to a discussion of creative graduate pathways and trajectories. First, in both the United Kingdom and Australia, human capital arguments around the value of higher education to economic growth have led to the enrolment of unprecedented numbers of students in degree programmes, in both creative disciplinary areas and more broadly. This so-called 'massification' of higher education has led to a decline in graduate outcomes in general, due to a saturated graduate labour market across many fields (Karmel and Carroll 2016), intensification of scrutiny around the employability of graduates, and the capabilities (so-called 'employability skills') that they are acquiring at university. In Australia, recent changes to government policy around funding for domestic student places signal that, along with student retention figures, graduate employment outcomes for institutions will soon be used to determine levels of funding contribution that the government is prepared to make for student places.

There also continues to be strong evidence of student demand for university courses in cultural production disciplines (Faggian *et al.* 2013), despite comparatively low and declining graduate outcomes for these discipline areas. Students are enrolling in creative degree programmes in unprecedented numbers, and higher education institutions are continuing to accept and teach them, even though for many, the initial (and sometimes ongoing) economic returns associated with acquiring a creative degree qualification are not very good. These findings can be taken to mean that for many students in creative (and particularly cultural

production discipline) degrees, the achievement of stable and secure professional graduate work outcomes may not be as strong a motivator as for students in other fields.

<a>**What should we teach in creative degree programmes?**

It is widely accepted that higher education plays an important role in preparing learners for their professional futures (Australian Qualifications Framework Council 2013), as well as supporting them to develop capabilities for productive participation in society more broadly. In many disciplines from teaching to engineering, professional readiness is assured through strict accreditation requirements mandated by professional bodies. However, across the creative industries, external professional accreditation is comparatively rare (one notable exception being architecture), which means that universities offering creative degree programmes are free to set their own curriculum content and teaching approaches to a much greater extent than in other fields. The extent and type of industry input into curriculum varies, as does the extent and type of faculty/ school institutional policy input. Creative degree programmes have been criticised for curricular gaps in industry relevance relating to digital capabilities (for example, Haukka 2011; Rowley 2012).

In the light of the creative labour debates, creative industries policy and wider graduate employability imperatives as documented above, and considering the prevalence of non-externally accredited creative degree programmes, it is worthwhile to ask with what universities are choosing to populate their degree curricula. Mirroring the wider debates, the ideological and disciplinary perspectives, content and student learning experiences might be expected to vary widely across disciplines within the same School, and subjects within the same programme, as well as between institutions.

Prior to now widespread adoption of the language of graduate employability, degree programmes focused almost exclusively on the development of disciplinary and technical

knowledge and skills. Across the creative arts, studio-based learning and 'conservatoire'-based education emphasising learning through action were dominant approaches, and continue to be common in creative higher education. Early curriculum treatments designed to foster graduate employability emphasised the development of 'graduate attributes' based on transferable knowledge and skills (also known as 'soft' or generic skills) that can be applied across multiple employment contexts, such as written and oral communication, digital literacy, critical capacities (Turner 2011), and even generic (rather than disciplinary) forms of creativity.

In general, transferable skill fostering in curriculum makes sense when considering the Census-based findings about creative workers being embedded across many industry sectors (Hearn *et al.* 2014), and also studies of the creative-cultural portfolio career, which indicates that creative practitioners may hold a variety of roles – both creative and non-creative, and across different industries – at once.

It should be noted that some scholars have criticised the idea of transferable skills, saying that they are artificial constructs with limited usefulness. These scholars argue that both the development and deployment of transferable skills are highly context-dependent, and embedded into the disciplinary epistemologies in which they are conceptualised and learned (Jones 2009). Bridgstock (2009) adds to criticism of the graduate attributes movement within higher education, by pointing out that curricular engagement with transferable skill development can sometimes be tokenistic, and evidenced through compliance-driven curriculum-mapping exercises rather than developed in a deep way through whole-of-programme curriculum development and good learning design.

Given the reconception of creative practice in terms of the creative industries and creative workforce, and arguments around creative activities contributing to innovation and therefore economic growth (Bakhshi and Windsor 2015), one might expect that contemporary creative degree curricula might address the development of both generic and disciplinary creative capabilities, and their effective application outside 'specialist' creative practice across a wide set of industries. Bridgstock and Cunningham (2016) did find that the cultural production graduates in their survey study reported that they had acquired skills they saw as relevant to their careers both within and outside the creative industries. The graduates believed that the cultural production degree courses they undertook were valuable, and that they had acquired skills they saw as relevant to their careers. It seems that 'non-creative', as well as creative work in which the graduates are engaged, were perceived to require a fair amount of creative disciplinary capability, and also generic capabilities developed during creative degrees, such as generic creativity, critical thinking, teamwork, and written and oral communication (see also Oakley *et al.* 2008). However, there is a scarcity of literature examining first whether the creative degree curriculum explicitly addresses generic creativity, or if this is just assumed to be part of disciplinary creative learning; and second whether curriculum addresses the application and transferability of creative disciplinary and transferable capabilities into 'non-creative' industry contexts.

Strongly associated with a discussion of the curricular development of capabilities relating to the application of creativity across industry contexts is the curricular inclusion of innovation and entrepreneurship learning. In recognition of the significant proportion of creative workers within creative sectors who are self-employed or employed in micro-businesses, at least to some extent (Throsby and Petetskaya 2017), it could reasonably be expected that a contemporary employability-focused creative curriculum would include creative

entrepreneurship learning experiences. For many students in cultural production-related disciplines, these creative entrepreneurship learning experiences would ideally include knowledge and skills required to navigate both government subsidised creative activities (such as grant-writing), and commercially orientated work (such as venture start-up), and also hybrid cross-commercial/subsidised practices (Beckman 2007; Bridgstock 2013). A creative industries-orientated curriculum would also address capability development for innovation and intrapreneurship, focused on learning to identify and make the most of opportunities to add creative value *inside* organisations, while working as an employee.

Over time, many scholars have noted a reluctance in some quarters to include innovation and entrepreneurship learning in the creative degree curriculum, particularly in cultural production disciplines. This tension reflects a wider perceived 'antagonism between art and business' (Eikhoff and Haunschild 2007, p. 234), which stems from a discourse around 'selling out', and that money harms rather than enables the creation of art (Beckman 2007). It is not entirely clear whether concerns are that an innovation and entrepreneurship curriculum may alienate students who want to focus on development of their creative disciplinary skills rather than their business skills (Brown 2007) and thus harm enrolment numbers, or whether these curricular choices simply reflect the ideological positioning of teaching staff, their prevailing teaching subject matter expertise, and/or unquestioned legacy degree profiles that do not include this type of learning.

Another useful approach in exploring the curriculum of creative degree programmes moves beyond looking at the capabilities that are included or foregrounded, to explore learners' career identity development through their degree experiences. Identity capital relates to the learners' ability to draw upon their learning experiences to develop an adaptive career self-

concept and express a productive narrative relating to life and work (Tomlinson 2017). Identity also plays a key role in determining career and learning decisions and behaviour, with identity providing both a frame through which students can interpret their capabilities and previous experiences, and a meaningful way to focus future career activity.

Bridgstock (2005), drawing upon career theory developed by Hall (2004), discusses the idea of the creative practitioner as a 'protean careerist', who maintains strong intrinsic motivations in career, and at the same time is able to adapt to employment options and requirements, to add value across different employment scenarios (including in 'non-creative' roles, via embedded work, and so on). Brook and Comunian (2018) suggest that protean creative practitioners might be thought of as harbingers of a growing group of workers across the economy, who continually adapt to an increasingly mutable and complex employment market. Automation and machine learning, the gig economy, global competition, and structural changes to labour markets and labour policy are changing the way that careers unfold. It is now accepted that the majority of the working population will experience a multiplicity of employment experiences over their lives (Foundation for Young Australians 2015).

Thus, for the protean creative worker, the development of a wide variety of transferable capabilities, along with the ability to adapt or translate creative capabilities to add value across many contexts, is underpinned by a self-concept that permits flexible movement between different projects, roles, occupations, places of work, and even industries. Gotsi *et al.* (2010) and Schediwy *et al.* (2018) document how different kinds of creative practitioners construct a protean career identity. Bridgstock (2011) undertook a longitudinal quantitative study of creative industries graduates, and demonstrated an empirical link between creative

protean career identity, career building capabilities (including finding or creating relevant work), and career success.

The development of the protean career identity occurs through career development learning. Career development learning usually happens naturally (if haphazardly and tacitly) through exposure to the world of work and professional contexts over time. Among higher education students, this traditionally happens after graduation. Career development learning provides significant learning and employability advantages if embedded into curriculum explicitly (for example, Bridgstock and Hearn 2012), including opportunities to reflect on career interests, abilities and values, and in turn learn about, and experience, a spectrum of career possibilities. Exposure to a wide range of work and career possibilities helps to foster vocational identities and narratives that are both adaptive and adaptable (Brook and Comunian 2018), even if the student commences with strong fixed ideas of their desired professional identity (related to the seminal concept of identity foreclosure (Marcia 1987)). Through exposure to different ways and contexts in which their creative capabilities can add value, such as through different forms of work integrated learning, students learn to think of themselves and their work as being applicable across many employment opportunities and in different ways. They also start to learn to articulate the relevance of their capabilities across these opportunities, and to build creative protean careers.

<a>**Methodological approach**

This study examines published creative undergraduate degree programme and faculty information to explore the extent to which, and ways in which, creative industries-congruent curriculum content and approaches have been included. These findings can be taken to indicate the extent of adoption of creative industries ideas in higher education in Australia, and the maturity of curricular practice in fostering the capabilities that lend themselves to creative industries notions of creative work (such as embedded creative roles, creative

services employment, and creative innovation and entrepreneurship). All information analysed was publicly available, and included faculty and school information pages, online marketing materials, degree information, and specific subject outlines. This published information was retrieved for 40 Australian higher education institutions in early 2018, and analysed thematically in search of indicators as shown in Table 7.1.

<insert Table 7.1 about here: Indicators of Creative Industries-congruent curriculum elements in published creative degree programme information>

An important limitation of the study to note is that the documents varied widely in level of detail between institutions, and even within institutions across degree programmes. The analysis of published documents was therefore supplemented with interviews with 15 degree convenors representing a wide range of creative disciplinary areas at different higher education institutions across Australia (seven from 'cultural production'-related degrees, six from 'creative services' degrees, and two from interdisciplinary degrees). An initial sample of 35 were contacted via email and invited to participate. In the audio recorded interviews, the degree convenors were asked about the extent to which they thought their faculty had adopted creative industries ideas in learning and teaching, and how this was conveyed in the curriculum of degree programmes across their faculties.

<a>**Findings**

<b>Titles and terminology

Analysis of the titles of creative faculty and school names across the 40 Australian universities revealed that only four institutions had adopted the title of 'Creative Industries'. Nine institutions referred to their schools/ faculties as 'Creative Arts', and 25 used the term 'Art' or 'Arts'. Where 'Arts' or 'Creative Arts' terminology was used, it was often in conjunction with other disciplinary descriptors (for example, 'Faculty of Media, Creative Arts and Social Enquiry', 'Arts, Education and Law Group'). In a small number of instances, faculties and schools within the same institution used a different terminology in their titles

(for example, the newly named 'School of Creative Industries' within the well-established 'Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences'). In two instances, more specific disciplinary terms were used only.

A total of 338 Bachelor's degree creative course titles across the 40 institutions were included in the analysis. When coded into cultural production vs. creative services disciplinary descriptors (per creative trident mark II – ref), there were significantly more degrees offered in cultural production disciplines than creative services disciplinary areas. A total of 150 of the degrees (44.4 per cent) corresponded to cultural production disciplines, such as film, TV & radio, publishing, music, performing and visual arts. Creative services disciplinary titles, across architecture, design, advertising and marketing, digital content and software development, accounted for 100 degree titles. Another 16.6 per cent spanned both (such as 'Bachelor of Art and Design'). Thirty-two were undifferentiated in terms of discipline, or were clearly multi-disciplinary ('Bachelor of Creative Industries').

Student-facing marketing and branding documents for creative faculties, schools and Bachelors degree programmes were coded for terminology. Multiple codes were permitted, with some documents referring to multiple terminology categories in one body of text. The terms used aligned somewhat with the titles chosen for the corresponding faculties and schools, with 67.5 per cent (27) of the universities referring to 'the arts' or 'creative arts', and 20 per cent (8) referring to 'cultural industries'. A total of 18 institutions (45 per cent) made reference to 'creative industries' in these documents. A pattern of terminology use was found in the marketing documents, with study areas and degree names often referred to as 'arts' or 'creative arts', and then promotion of potential career destinations linked with creative industries terminology. One example of this mixed use of terminology was, 'xx university's

Bachelor of Creative Arts gives you the ability to thrive in a range of exciting career opportunities across the creative industries…'.

<b>Curriculum content

Analysis of Bachelors degree course and subject outlines) across 338 degrees covered:

<nl>

1.<em>The inclusion of creative industries and innovation policy (vs. other kinds of government policy that speaks to government or wider policy context, such as cultural or arts policy).

2.<em>Evidence of transdisciplinary learning, such as multidisciplinary project work, application of disciplinary capabilities across diverse applications and contexts.

3.<em>The inclusion of creative-specialist digital, design and communication capabilities in degrees with a disciplinary emphasis other than these (for example, visual arts degrees with design or digital curriculum also included).

4.<em>Emphasis on transferable skills for creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship, including commercial as well as subsidised entrepreneurship, and intrapreneurship.

5.<em>Career development learning that promotes destinations outside the creative industries; protean career identity development; work integrated learning and placements/ internships beyond creative industries sectors.</nl>

Curriculum documents from only four degree programmes across the 338 (1.2 per cent) indicated any explicit learning about creative industries policy or theory. The subjects that engaged with policy were nearly all elective (non-core), and placed at advanced levels of degrees. Mention of cultural and arts policy or theory was likewise only found in a small number of curriculum documents (in a total of 4.5 per cent of degree programmes). While beyond the scope of this study, a brief informal review of postgraduate coursework degree

documentation seemed to indicate greater curriculum engagement with creative and cultural policy at postgraduate rather than undergraduate levels.

The opportunity to study across disciplinary areas was very common, at least in terms of provision of elective subject choices. Where the information was able to be retrieved from documentation, an overwhelming proportion of degrees (95.9 per cent of 290 degrees) offered the opportunity for students to study a limited number of elective subjects outside their degree subject specialisms as part of the programme. However, mention of multidisciplinary learning inside the 'core' or 'major' creative degree curriculum was less common, and was only found in the 87 (25.7 per cent) degrees where students could choose multiple creative disciplinary study areas, such as a major in visual design and a major in creative writing. There was comparatively little evidence of truly transdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary synthesis learning in any of the degree programmes studied. Where mentioned in documents, opportunities to work across disciplines were typically offered as part of capstone or work integrated learning courses. However, nearly all work-integrated learning subjects across the degrees (where specific information was available) made no mention of transdisciplinary learning or the opportunity to apply creative capabilities in non-creative workplaces or wider contexts. This question was explored further in the interviews with teaching staff documented below.

Content relating to innovation or entrepreneurship was found across 7.4 per cent and 22.3 per cent of degree programmes respectively. Creativity as a transferable capability (as opposed to disciplinary creative capabilities) was found as a specific curriculum element in very few documents indeed (only 4, or 1.2 per cent of degree programmes), indicating that perhaps the development of creativity as a transferable skill was thought to occur through disciplinary

creative learning, perhaps that transferable creativity was not seen as an important part of disciplinary creative learning, or perhaps reflecting the legacy attitude that it is something that students cannot learn at university, or already possess as an attribute (*cf.* Philip 2015).

Innovation and entrepreneurship in the curriculum were most often found in stand-alone subjects found in the latter half of degree programmes. Cultural production-related degrees were more likely to contain a stand-alone subject relating to entrepreneurship (39.3 per cent), whereas in creative services-related degrees, innovation and entrepreneurship learning outcomes were much less likely to contain a stand-alone subject (16 per cent), with entrepreneurship more likely to be integrated into design and digital disciplinary subjects. In cultural production-related degrees, entrepreneurship subjects overwhelmingly contained content relating to subsidised practice, such as grantsmanship and arts management practice (of 49 such subjects, 47 did this). Only four degree programmes in total contained subjects that focused on commercial start-up and business management.

Evidence of career development learning elements in the curriculum was found in 70 per cent of the 336 degree courses, most commonly in work-integrated learning and other capstone subjects. As with innovation and entrepreneurship, career development elements were clustered towards the end of the degree programmes. Across all disciplinary degree types, career development elements focused on job search/ acquisition and career building topics, such as portfolio, show reel, and/or resume development (234 degrees, 69.6 per cent of the total sample). Some career exploration and career identity development could be identified in early parts of 50 (14.9 per cent) of the degree programmes, such as industry and role research, industry exposure and career planning. In the 44 degrees where more specific information about career and industry exploration learning could be identified, 39 (88.7 per

cent) indicated a focus on specific specialist roles inside particular industries, for example, in a fashion degree, exploring different specialist fashion roles inside different parts of the fashion industry.

<b>Interviews

The interviews with 15 degree convenors revealed a mixed understanding of creative industries as a policy agenda and the implications for the curriculum of their degree programmes. Several were able to articulate the central creative industries argument that creative disciplinary practice could add economic value within and beyond core creative sectors, but for others the creative industries movement was 'about employability, starting your own business and such' (I7), or 'it's really a marketing thing at this university, telling students that they'll have successful careers if they study with us' (I3).

Ten of the staff indicated that creative industries as an idea had found very little or no purchase in their institutions, faculties or degree programmes. When asked why they thought this was, a range of curricular, staff expertise and attitude, and student expectation reasons were provided. Several staff indicated a tension around student expectations of their degree programmes:

<quotation>

It's just not what students want. They want to be successful in their area of interest, build a career in it. That's why they choose [our programme]. If we add all these other things to the degree, they just don't think it's relevant. (I9)

<line space>

Do we prepare them as far as we can for a career in the (disciplinary) industry, or do we consider the options beyond the industry. If we spend too much time ... in a 'spray and pray' ... they are less well-equipped for film, which is what they are here for anyway.

(I2)</quotation>

Some pointed out the challenges of finding teaching staff with the right kinds of capability sets and backgrounds to teach transdisciplinary curricula, career development learning, innovation and enterprise, and other curriculum elements important to creative industries learning:

<quotation>

Most of the staff have backgrounds in specific creative disciplines – and we've not ever needed to go beyond that ... Sometimes you can find good sessional staff who have an interesting skills mix, but you can't build a course around them. It's the other way around, you ask them to teach the module you have. (I9).</quotation>

For staff who had integrated creative industries curriculum elements into their degrees, there was a strong sense of balancing a crowded curriculum:

<quotation>

We embed multidisciplinary and entrepreneurial learning into our studios. This does mean a trade off with the number of discipline units they can take. It's the difference between a fine arts degree where you've got the depth, and the (multidisciplinary) degree where you've got more breadth and they can't do some of the disciplinary things. (I1)</quotation>

Work integrated learning was included in most of the degree programmes that the staff convened. For a few, 'embedded' placements and internships where students were sent out to work with non-creative sector employers were available to students, and for a few more, multidisciplinary projects partnered with industry were available.

There is the … scheme, where students sign up to work with a community partner on a project, and you have our students in there with law, business and science students etc. It's an amazing experience apparently, I've had several students come back and say that it changed the way they think about what they want to do… but it's administratively challenging and we can only send a few each semester. (I1)

<line space>

The real challenge with the embedded WIL is that there are strict requirements about who can supervise students and what they can do on an internship. We can't have students going to micro-businesses, or working in people's garages. Likewise we can't have students going to do an internship where there is no one in their discipline to supervise. Another thing is they have to be directly in their major area of study. The irony of it … some ways our WIL (is) not like … working in the creative industries at all. (I15)

<line space>

The industry partners. It's easy to find placements for students in specialist design firms, we have the contacts and networks for that going back for years, but no one thinks about … big retail or government unless they contact us first asking for students. (I1)</quotation>

Career development learning was described as an increasing feature of degree programmes due to pressures around graduate employability. In congruence with the document analysis, staff talked about career development learning almost entirely in terms of the ability to find, obtain or creative work, rather than career exploration or identity development.

<quotation>

…the social media profile that they have online, their professional presence and portfolio and ensuring that they're ready to work in the industry. (I15)

<line space>

At this level it's how to build a career in music, including to some extent the business side,

really just starting them off and they can build on that afterwards as they need.

(I2)</quotation>

When asked about career identity development through curriculum, interviewees tended to

talk about how students had the opportunity to learn about, affirm or refine a disciplinary

identity, rather than explore, widen or make more adaptable possible career identities:

<quotation>

We have guest speakers from industry to talk about journalism and how publishing is

changing … the opportunities that they can have as journalists and what they'll need to do …

we know that most of them won't end up in journalism … sooner or later… but it's a good

foundation. (I12)</quotation>

<a>**Discussion**

The document analysis and brief interviews with degree convenors showed that creative

industries terminology and concepts are not widespread among Australian universities.

Although the sample of interviewees was reasonably small, their responses suggested a lack

of understanding of the ideas behind the creative industries movement, and the curriculum

implications associated with this. Both the document analysis and interviews conveyed a

sense that 'creative industries' was a way of marketing existing degrees, or a way of labelling

their offerings to appeal to a contemporary student market that may be more interested in

solid employment outcomes than those in previous eras. The relative absence of

transdisciplinary learning experiences (apart from the long-standing and easy to implement

elective subject) and innovation and entrepreneurship learning in higher education institutions

that are now saturated with graduate employability rhetoric and curriculum, indicates that

creative industries ideas are not widely adopted. Rather than being rooted in scepticism about

the creative industries (although there is also plenty of evidence for this from other studies),

the findings indicate that prevailing curriculum choices are mostly about risk aversion and other institutional barriers. There seems to be a fear that if the curriculum strays too far from traditional creative-disciplinary patterns, students will be dissatisfied with their degree experiences, or may even choose competitor programmes and institutions. Further, curriculum renovation along creative industries lines involves significant changes to the capability profile of teaching staff. With a workforce of many tenured teaching staff from traditional disciplinary teaching backgrounds, including the leadership of degrees, schools and faculties, 'turning the ship around' to embrace different perspectives and curriculum possibilities is challenging and slow, and without a perceived appetite for change from students and other stakeholders, it may not ever occur.

The wider picture that is emerging around creative curriculum choices in higher education in Australia suggests that we are not educating 'for' a significant proportion of creative professional pathways, in large part because they are not top of mind for students, teachers and our institutional leadership. It is incumbent upon us as educators to offer educational options that reflect the range of career identities and professional trajectories that students may adopt, alongside developing capabilities and identities that are broader than the vocational (such as social participation and wellbeing). A key challenge in doing this is to provide sufficiently nuanced and personalised learning that meets the needs of students who already possess a wide range of backgrounds, existing capabilities, interests and goals. This learning not only develops their disciplinary and transferable capabilities towards desired outcomes, but also supports protean career identity development through career development learning. Whether or not institutions subscribe to creative industries discourse, a large tranche of studies of the future of work and society now indicate that we will all increasingly be tasked with constant self-reinvention.

A research agenda for creative industries curriculum

The study reported here is among remarkably few that explore published material across degree programmes to indicate prevailing attitudes and engagement with different perspectives on the experiences of creative work (*cf.* Pettinger *et al.* 2018). The methodological approach adopted has limitations, which could be addressed through further research. It is important to note that while published curriculum documents can be taken as indicative of perspectives adopted in faculties and degree programmes, they do not necessarily reflect either the taught curriculum or what is actually learned. Observational studies of teaching practice, and further interviews with students and staff, including industry partners, would help reinforce and refine findings from analysis of published documents. The findings herein reported are limited to Australian HEIs. Equivalent analyses in the United Kingdom and in other countries where creative industries policy has found some purchase would provide important comparative data.

A number of avenues for research suggest themselves as potentially fruitful sources of information for strengthening creative higher education. First, the graduate destination data evidence needs to be completely joined up with the Census studies. Better evidence of where graduates end up over time (and indeed across their lifespan) is crucial to the development of curriculum that can meet learner requirements. This destination data must be refreshed continually, as destinations and capability needs change over time. Avenues for feeding this information into curriculum development and renewal processes in systematic and meaningful ways must also be developed.

Further research into the protean career identities of creative graduates and practitioners and how people can develop them across different disciplinary areas and employment contexts also seems central to ensuring the efficacy of creative degree programmes. In turn, research

that investigates how to build an adaptive teaching staff profile through professional learning, recruitment and institutional change management processes will support the development and delivery of a more effective curriculum.

<a>**Notes**

---

[1] Creative occupations included in the UK Department for Culture, Media and Sport's (2015) Economic Estimates include: Advertising and Marketing; Architecture; Crafts; Design; Film, Television, Radio and Photography; IT, Software and Computer Services; Publishing, Museums, Galleries and Libraries; Music, Performing and Visual Arts.

[2] In Australia, the broad Creative Arts Field of Education category corresponds to degrees in: performing arts, visual arts and crafts, graphic and design studies, journalism, communication and media studies, and other creative arts. Architecture and information technology degrees are located in other Fields of Education (Social Research Centre, 2018). In the United Kingdom, the Creative Arts and Design subject area corresponds to degrees in: fine art, design studies, music, drama, dance, cinematics and photography, crafts, and imaginative writing. Architecture, mass communications and journalism, and computer science (including games and visual effects) are located within other JACS codes (Higher Education Statistics Agency, 2018).

<References to follow on from here>

<a>References

Australian Qualifications Framework Council (2013), *Australian Qualifications Framework, 2nd edn*, accessed 8 February 2019 at http://www.aqf.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/AQF-2nd-Edition-January-2013.pdf.

Bakhshi, H. and Windsor, G. (2015), 'The creative economy and the future of employment', *Nesta*, accessed 8 February 2019 at https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/the_creative_economy_and_the_future_of_ employment.pdf.

Ball, L., Pollard, E. and Stanley, N. (2010), *Creative Graduates, Creative Futures*. London: Council for Higher Education in Art and Design.

Banks, M. and Hesmondhalgh, D. (2009), 'Looking for work in creative industries policy', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, **15** (4), 415–30.

Beckman, G. (2007). '"Adventuring" arts entrepreneurship curricula in higher education: An examination of present efforts, obstacles, and best practices', *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, **37** (2), 87–112.

Bennett, D. and 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), 263–77.

Bridgstock, R. (2005), 'Australian artists, starving and well-nourished: What can we learn from the prototypical protean career?', *Australian Journal of Career Development*, **14** (3), 40–48.

Bridgstock, R. (2009), 'The graduate attributes we've overlooked: Enhancing graduate employability through career management skills', *Higher Education Research and Development*, **28** (1), 27–39.

Bridgstock, R. (2011), 'Skills for creative industries graduate success', *Education & Training*, **53** (1), 9–26.

Bridgstock, R. (2013), 'Not a dirty word: Arts entrepreneurship and higher education', *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, **12** (2–3), 122–37.

Bridgstock, R. and Cunningham, S. (2014), 'Graduate careers in journalism, media and communications within and outside the sector: Early career outcomes, trajectories and capabilities', in G. Hearn, R. Bridgstock, B. Goldsmith and J. Rodgers (eds), *Creative Work Beyond the Creative Industries: Innovation, Employment and Education*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 226–44.

Bridgstock, R. and Cunningham, S. (2016), 'Creative labour and graduate outcomes: Implications for higher education and cultural policy', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, **22** (1), 10–26.

Bridgstock, R. and Hearn, G. (2012), 'A conceptual model of capability learning for the 21st century knowledge economy', in D. Rooney, G. Hearn and T. Kastelle (eds), *Handbook On the Knowledge Economy, Volume Two*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 105–22.

Brook, S. and Comunian, R. (2018), '"Dropping out and working": The vocational narratives of creative graduates', in L. Martin and N. Wilson (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Creativity at Work*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 125–41.

Brown, R. (2007), 'Promoting entrepreneurship in arts education', in C. Henry (ed.), *Entrepreneurship in the Creative Industries: An International Perspective*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 126–41.

Comunian, R. and Gilmore, A. (2016), *Higher Education and the Creative Economy: Beyond the Campus*. London: Routledge.

Comunian, R., Faggian, A. and Jewell, S. (2011), 'Winning and losing in the creative industries: An analysis of creative graduates' career opportunities across creative disciplines', *Cultural Trends*, **20** (3–4), 291–308.

Comunian, R., Faggian, A. and Jewell, S. (2015), 'Digital technology and creative arts career patterns in the UK creative economy', *Journal of Education and Work*, **28** (4), 346–68.Comunian, R., Taylor, C. and Smith, D. (2014), 'The role of universities in the regional creative economies of the UK: Hidden protagonists and the challenge of knowledge transfer', *European Planning Studies*, **22** (12), 2456–76.

Cunningham, S. (2014), 'Creative labour and its discontents: A reappraisal', in G. Hearn, R. Bridgstock, B. Goldsmith and J. Rodgers (eds), *Creative Work Beyond the Creative Industries: Innovation, Employment and Education*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 25–46.

Cunningham, S. and Bridgstock, R. (2012), 'Say goodbye to the fries: Graduate careers in media, cultural and communication studies', *Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy*, **145** (1), 6–17.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) (1998), *Creative Industries Mapping Document*. London: DCMS.

Eikhof, D. and Haunschild, A. (2007), 'For art's sake! Artistic and economic logics in creative production', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **28** (5), 523–38.

Faggian, A., Comunian, R., Jewell, S. and Kelly, U. (2013), 'Bohemian graduates in the UK: Disciplines and location determinants of creative careers', *Regional Studies*, **47** (2), 183–200.

Ferguson, M. (2014), 'Knowledge exchange between universities and the creative industries in the UK: A case study of current practice', *Industry and Higher Education*, **28**(3), 177–83.

Foundation for Young Australians (2015), *The New Work Order: Ensuring Young Australians have Skills and Experience for the Jobs of the Future, not the Past*. Melbourne: Foundation for Young Australians.

Galloway, S., Lindley, R., Davies, R. and Scheibl, F. (2002), *A Balancing Act: Artists' Labour Markets and the Tax and Benefit Systems*. London: Arts Council of England London.

Gotsi, M., Andriopoulos, C., Lewis, M. and Ingram, A. (2010), 'Managing creatives: Paradoxical approaches to identity regulation', *Human Relations*, **63** (6), 781–805.

Hall, D. (2004), 'The protean career: A quarter-century journey', *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, **65** (1), 1–13.

Haukka, S. (2011), 'Education-to-work transitions of aspiring creatives', *Cultural Trends*, **20** (1), 41–64.

Hearn, G., Bridgstock, R., Goldsmith, B. and Rodgers, J. (eds) (2014), *Creative Work Beyond the Creative Industries: Innovation, Employment and Education*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hesmondhalgh, D. and Baker, S. (2010), '"A very complicated version of freedom": Conditions and experiences of creative labour in three cultural industries', *Poetics*, **38** (1), 4–20.

Higher Education Statistics Agency (2018), *Higher Education Leavers Statistics*, accessed 8 February 2019 at https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/28-06-2018/sfr250-higher-education-leaver-statistics-subjects.

Jackson, D. and Bridgstock, R. (2018), 'Evidencing student success in the contemporary world-of-work: Renewing our thinking', *Higher Education Research & Development*, **37** (5), 984–98.

Jones, A. (2009), 'Redisciplining generic attributes: The disciplinary context in focus', *Studies in Higher Education*, **34** (1), 85–100.

Karmel, T. and Carroll, D. (2016), 'Has the graduate job market been swamped?', NILS working paper series No. 228/2016. Adelaide: National Institute for Labour Studies.

Marcia, J. (1987), 'The identity status approach to the study of ego identity development', in T. Honess and K. Yardley (eds), *Self and Identity: Perspectives across the Lifespan*, New York: Routledge, pp. 161–71.

Nystrom, S. (2009), 'The dynamics of professional identity formation: Graduates' transitions from higher education to working life', *Vocations and Learning*, **2** (1), 1–18.

Oakley, K. (2013), 'Making workers: Higher education and the cultural industries', in D. Ashton and K. Noonan (eds), *Cultural Work and Higher Education*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 25–44.

Oakley, K., Sperry, B. and Pratt, A.C. (2008), *The Art of Innovation: How Fine Arts Graduates Contribute to Innovation*, London: Nesta.

Pettinger, L., Forkert, K. and Goffey, A. (2018), 'The promises of creative industry higher education: An analysis of university prospectuses in Malaysia', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, **24** (4), 466–84.

Philip, R. (2015), 'The invisibility cloak of creativity', *Higher Education Research & Development*, **34** (2), 436–8.

Potts, J. and Cunningham, S. (2008), 'Four models of the creative industries', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, **14** (3), 233–47.

Rowley, S. (2012), *Interactive Skills Education Scheme Education Report*. Sydney: University of Technology Sydney.

Schediwy, L., Bhansing, P. and Loots, E. (2018), 'Young musicians' career identities: Do bohemian and entrepreneurial career identities compete or cohere?', *Creative Industries Journal*, **11** (2), 174–96.

Social Research Centre (2018), *2017 Graduate Outcomes Survey National Report*, accessed 9 February 2019 at https://www.qilt.edu.au/docs/default-source/gos-reports/2017/2017_gos_national_report_final_accessiblea45d8791b1e86477b58fff00006709da.pdf?sfvrsn=ceb5e33c_4.

Throsby, D. and Petetskaya, K. (2017), *Making Art Work*. Melbourne: Australia Council for the Arts.

Tomlinson, M. (2017), 'Forms of graduate capital and their relationship to graduate employability', *Education+Training*, **59** (4), 338–52.

Turner, G. (2011), 'Surrendering the space: Convergence culture, cultural studies and the curriculum', *Cultural Studies*, **25** (4–5), 685–99.

UNCTAD (2008), *Creative Economy Report 2008: The Challenge of Assessing the Creative Economy: Towards Informed Policy-Making*. Paris: United Nations.